ESTIMED (STF 685) Hackathon #1

Evaluation Criteria

October 30th 2025, Remote

Criteria (Short criteria title)	*Evaluation Level*		
	Excellent (4-5) *(What would make the proposal excellent)*	**Good (2-3)** *(What would make the proposal good)*	**Sufficient (0-1)** *(What would make the proposal sufficient/acceptable)*
Use case innovation and relevance (Applicable to Tracks #1, #2, and #3)	The proposal clearly addresses a real-world challenge with a strong novelty compared to typical one/M2M-MEC use cases and a compelling justification for using oneM2M-MEC interworking.	The proposal addresses a valid but moderately impactful challenge or problem. It shows some innovative features, but also overlap with existing solutions without much differentiation. A potential impact is plausible but only partially quantified.	The proposal addresses a generic challenge with a low-value in real context and a low level of novelty, as the proposed solution can be implemented without oneM2M/MEC interworking. The application domain is not clearly described or identified.
System requirements and KPIs (Applicable to Tracks #1, #2, and #3)	The proposal covers functional (e.g., data handling, analytics, device control, etc.) and non-functional (e.g., latency, reliability, security, scalability, etc.) requirements and shows a clear linkage to oneM2M-MEC capabilities. KPIs are realistic, measurable, and directly tied to oneM2M-MEC features, providing also a baseline versus expected improvement.	The proposal includes functional and non-functional requirements, but some are unclear or not appropriate with a partial linkage to oneM2M-MEC. Some critical aspects are not addressed (e.g., interoperability, scalability, etc.). The identified KPIs mix quantitative and qualitative metrics, and no baseline is provided.	The proposal includes only few or high-level requirements with no measurable targets and lacks consideration of oneM2M-MEC capabilities. The KPIs are missing or purely qualitative with no measurable performance targets.
Architecture (Applicable to Tracks #1, #2, and #3)	The architecture diagram is clear, complete, and technically correct. It proposes an explicit mapping to one deployment options with a strong justification for the choice. The proposed architecture shows component interactions (e.g., MEC platform, MEC applications,	The architecture is mostly clear, but lacks some details on component interactions. The deployment option is mentioned, but the proposed justification is limited. The main benefits are described but not fully quantified.	The proposed architecture is vague or incomplete, with no linkage to deployment options. The oneM2M-MEC integration and interworking is unclear or missing.

Co-funded by the European Union
Co-funded by EFTA

	oneM2M CSE, IoT devices, APIs, etc.) and clearly highlights performance advantages (e.g., reduced latency, improved resource usage, better interoperability, etc.).		
Prototype implementation (Applicable to Track #3)	The participant proposed a working prototype or a highly detailed technical blueprint using existing MEC and oneM2M platforms (e.g., MEC Sandbox, ACME, tinyIoT or Mobius). The prototype demonstrates correct use of standard APIs, and it is fully aligned with the chosen deployment option. The prototype is reproducible with provided technical material/documentation.	The participant delivered a partial prototype or mock-up with some functional components. The prototype has limited APIs integration or partial use of oneM2M-MEC features and shows reproducibility gaps.	The participant delivered a minimal or conceptual prototype only, with no real oneM2M-MEC integration and with no sufficient technical material/documentation for its reproducibility.
Quality of the presentation (Applicable to Tracks #1, #2, and #3)	Complete, well-organized technical material/documentation including use case workflow, architecture diagrams, sequence flows and APIs usage. Explicit mapping to oneM2M-MEC deployment option. The solution is easy to understand and replicate from the technical material/documentation alone.	The technical material/documentation is understandable but lacks some details for replication. The use case or architecture diagrams are partially complete or unclear.	The technical material/documentation is incomplete or poorly structured. The use case or architecture diagrams are missing and no technical explanation is provided.

Co-funded by the European Union
Co-funded by EFTA