EUREKA 2027

OFFICIAL RULEBOOK

Version 1.0.261009

OPEN PROBLEM - OPEN SOLUTION



Περιεχόμενα

0. Status, Scope and Interpretation 8
0.1 Purpose and Status of this Rulebook 8
0.2 Scope of the Rulebook 8
0.3 Official Companion Documents 8
0.4 Rulebook, Rubric and Annual Instructions 8
0.5 Interpretation of Rules 9
0.6 Examples, Guidance and Mandatory Requirements 9
0.7 Responsibility for Accurate Information 9
0.8 Language and Terminology 9
1. The EUREKA Competition 10
1.1 Purpose of the Competition 10
1.2 Identity and Philosophy 10
1.3 What EUREKA Is 10
1.4 What EUREKA Is Not 10
1.5 OPEN PROBLEM - OPEN SOLUTION 11
1.6 Problem, Need or Opportunity 11
1.7 Innovation 11
1.8 The Innovation Must Be Evaluatable 11
1.9 Evidence over Claims 12
1.10 State of the Art 12
1.11 Complexity Is Not Quality 12
1.12 Impact Is Contextual 12
1.13 EUREKA Is Not a Startup or Pitch Competition 13
1.14 International Character and Field Neutrality 13
1.15 Official Language 13
2. Participation Eligibility 13
2.1 Competition Divisions 13
2.2 School Divisions 14
2.3 University Division 14
2.4 Independent Ranking of Divisions 14
2.5 Mixed-Division Teams 15
2.6 Official Team Size and Additional Contributors 15
2.7 Coaches and Mentors 15
2.8 Institutional and Independent Teams 15
2.9 Participation in Multiple Teams and Team Changes 16

3. Project Eligibility 16
3.1 Open Theme 16
3.2 Eligible Fields 16
3.3 Problem, Need or Opportunity 16
3.4 Acceptable Project Forms 16
3.5 Innovation Requirement 17
3.6 Minimum Development Level 17
3.7 Evaluatable Implementation and Evidence 17
3.8 Prototype, MVP and Proof of Concept 17
3.9 Software, Algorithms and Artificial Intelligence 17
3.10 Scientific and Experimental Projects 18
3.11 Processes, Methods and Non-Physical Innovation 18
3.12 Low-Tech Innovation 18
3.13 Previous EUREKA Projects 18
3.14 Substantially Evolved Projects 18
3.15 Participation in Other Competitions or Exhibitions 19
3.16 Pre-existing Work and Third-Party Foundations 19
3.17 Ineligible Entries 19
4. Team Ownership & Contribution 19
4.1 Core Principle 19
4.2 Meaningful Team Contribution 19
4.3 Team Contribution Statement 20
4.4 Coach and Mentor Assistance 20
4.5 External Experts, Laboratories and Facilities 20
4.6 Commercial and Pre-Built Components 20
4.7 Libraries, Frameworks, Open Source, Data and Existing Methods 20
4.8 External Contracting and Work Performed by Third Parties 21
4.9 Ownership Verification During Judging 21
4.10 Ownership Review 21
4.11 Ownership Violations 21
5. Artificial Intelligence Policy 22
5.1 General Principle 22
5.2 AI as a Tool - Not a Replacement for the Team 22
5.3 Permitted Areas of AI Assistance 22
5.4 Verification of AI Outputs 22
5.5 AI Disclosure 23

5.6 Examples of Appropriate and Inappropriate Use 23
5.7 AI-Generated Sources, Data and Evidence 23
5.8 AI During Judging 23
5.9 Undeclared or Misrepresented AI Assistance 24
6. Research & Development Process 24
6.1 Purpose of the Development Process 24
6.2 A Flexible Development Framework 24
6.3 Research and State of the Art 24
6.4 From Research to Design Decisions 24
6.5 Implementation and Proof 25
6.6 Testing, Data and Validation 25
6.7 Evidence Quality 25
6.8 Comparison and Baselines 25
6.9 Iteration and Fail Forward 25
6.10 Reproducibility and Understanding 26
6.11 Limitations and Uncertainty 26
6.12 Future Development 26
6.13 Development Documentation 26
7. Required Submissions 26
7.1 Submission Package 26
7.2 Project Abstract 27
7.3 Project Video 27
7.4 Language, Formats and Deadlines 27
7.5 Late or Incomplete Submissions 28
8. EUREKA Project Portfolio 28
8.1 Purpose 28
8.2 Length and the First 16–20 Pages 28
8.3 Recommended Content 28
8.4 Evidence and Traceability 29
8.5 Production Quality 29
9. EUREKA Journey / Development Log 29
9.1 Purpose 29
9.2 Portfolio vs Journey Log 29
9.3 Format and Length 30
9.4 What the Journey Log May Contain 30
9.5 An Informative Log Is More Valuable Than a Large Log 30

9.6 Ownership and Authenticity 30
10. Competition Process 31
10.1 From Registration to Evaluation 31
10.2 No Standard Qualification Phase 31
10.3 Four-Day Competition Framework 31
10.4 Global Event 31
10.5 Judging Panel 31
10.6 Formal Judging Session 31
10.7 Booth Visits and Informal Observation 32
11. Presentation & Demonstration 32
11.1 Team Presentation / Pitch 32
11.2 Participation of Team Members 32
11.3 Integrating the Demonstration 32
11.4 Projects Without a Practical Live Demonstration 32
11.5 Safety 33
11.6 Coaches and Mentors During Judging 33
11.7 Technical Failure During Demonstration 33
11.8 Production Quality 33
12. Judges' Interview & Q&A 34
12.1 Position Within the Judging Session 34
12.2 Purpose 34
12.3 Duration 34
12.4 Answering and Defending the Project 34
12.5 Questions About Failure, Limitations and Unfinished Work 34
12.6 Difficulty Answering a Question 34
13. Evaluation System 35
13.1 Evaluation Philosophy 35
13.2 Innovation & Originality- 100 points 35
13.3 Technical / Scientific Excellence & Validation - 100 points 35
13.4 Impact, Relevance & Applicability - 80 points 36
13.5 Team Ownership, Development Process & Understanding - 80 points 36
13.6 Presentation & Q&A - 40 points 36
13.7 Total Score 37
13.8 Performance Descriptors 37
13.9 Normalization Between Judging Panels 37
13.10 Tie-Breaking 37

13.11 Judge Calibration and Internal Validation 37
14. Expectations per Educational Division 38
14.1 Same Rubric - Different Expectation Level 38
14.2 EUREKA PRIMARY 38
14.3 EUREKA LOWER SECONDARY 38
14.4 EUREKA UPPER SECONDARY 39
14.5 EUREKA UNIVERSITY 39
14.6 What Changes - and What Does Not 39
14.7 Detailed Division Expectations 39
15. Fairness & Competition Integrity 40
15.1 Equal and Consistent Treatment 40
15.2 Resource Neutrality 40
15.3 Plagiarism 40
15.4 Fabrication and Falsification 40
15.5 Misrepresentation 41
15.6 Integrity Violations vs. Low Scores 41
16. Safety, Ethics & Responsible Innovation 41
16.1 Relevance-Based Application 41
16.2 Safety 41
16.3 Human Participants and Privacy 41
16.4 Cybersecurity and AI Ethics 41
16.5 Sustainability and Accessibility 42
16.6 Misuse and Legal Compliance 42
16.7 Organizer Authority 42
17. Awards & Ranking 42
17.1 Independent Ranking by Division 42
17.2 Main Awards 42
17.3 Special and Technology Awards 42
17.4 Final Ranking 42
17.5 Publication of Results 43
18. Violations, Sanctions & Score Clarification 43
18.1 Principle of Proportionality 43
18.2 Possible Responses and Sanctions 43
18.3 Undeclared Assistance 43
18.4 Plagiarism, Fabrication and Falsification 43
18.5 Ownership Violations 43

18.6 Investigation and Team Response 43
18.7 Finality of Judging Decisions 44
18.8 Educational Score Clarification 44
18.9 Review of Serious Sanctions 44
19. Intellectual Property, Publication & Media 44
19.1 Project and Intellectual Property Ownership 44
19.2 Public Disclosure and Potentially Protectable Work 44
19.3 Confidential and Third-Party Material 44
19.4 Event Photography and Video 45
19.5 Team-Submitted Media 45
20. After the Competition 45
20.1 Official Results 45
20.2 Feedback and Learning 45
20.3 Score Clarification 45
20.4 Certificates and Recognition 45
20.5 Media and Continued Project Development 45
21. Appendices & Companion Documents 46
21.1 Participant-Facing Companion Documents 46
22. Core Principles - Quick Reference 46
22.1 Core Principles 46

0. Status, Scope and Interpretation

0.1 Purpose and Status of this Rulebook

This Official Rulebook sets out the rules, requirements and core procedures that govern participation in EUREKA 2027. It is intended to be the main reference document for participating teams, Coaches, Mentors and other persons directly involved in preparing or presenting an EUREKA project.

The Rulebook explains not only what teams are required to do, but also the principles behind the competition. EUREKA includes projects from very different fields and educational levels; therefore, some rules are deliberately principle-based rather than written for one specific technology or type of project.

Teams are expected to read the sections that apply to their participation before submitting a project. Lack of familiarity with a rule does not, by itself, exempt a team from that rule.

0.2 Scope of the Rulebook

This Rulebook covers participant eligibility, project eligibility, Team Ownership, permitted external and AI assistance, required submissions, presentation and demonstration, the evaluation framework, competition integrity, safety, awards, sanctions, intellectual property and media use.

Some operational details may vary from one edition of EUREKA to another. Examples include registration dates, submission deadlines, file formats, venue instructions, schedules and technical arrangements. These details may be published separately in the official announcement or event instructions, provided that they do not contradict the substantive rules of this Rulebook.

Example: the Rulebook may require a Project Video of a specified duration, while the upload platform, accepted file type and exact submission deadline may be announced separately for that year.

0.3 Official Companion Documents

The Rulebook is supported by additional official documents. These documents provide detail where placing the full material inside the Rulebook would make the main rules unnecessarily difficult to use.

The Official EUREKA Judging Rubric is a public document. It defines the detailed scoring criteria, performance descriptors, scoring anchors and the different expectation levels applied to the four educational divisions. When this Rulebook states that a criterion is evaluated “as described in the Judging Rubric”, the published Rubric forms part of the official evaluation framework.

Templates and declarations, such as the Team Contribution Statement, AI Disclosure, Coach / Mentor Declaration, Project Portfolio Template and Journey / Development Log Template, may also be issued as separate official documents. Where a template contains mandatory fields, teams are expected to complete those fields accurately.

The Judge Handbook is different. It contains internal or operational guidance for judges, including calibration procedures, bias awareness, common judging errors, example questions and inter-rater consistency procedures. It does not create additional hidden requirements for teams. A team must be able to understand what is being evaluated from the Rulebook and the public Judging Rubric.

0.4 Rulebook, Rubric and Annual Instructions

The Rulebook defines the stable competition rules. The Judging Rubric explains how the published evaluation criteria are applied. Annual instructions provide edition-specific administrative and logistical information.

Annual instructions may clarify how a rule is implemented in a particular event, but they should not silently change the fundamental competition model, scoring dimensions, Team Ownership principles or other substantive rules. If a substantive rule must change, the change should be communicated explicitly through an official update or a new version of the Rulebook.

0.5 Interpretation of Rules

Rules should be interpreted according to both their wording and their purpose. The competition is designed to compare genuine innovation work performed and understood by the participating team. A technical loophole that defeats this purpose should not be treated as permission to bypass Team Ownership, disclosure, safety or integrity requirements.

At the same time, rules should not be extended to create requirements that are not relevant to a project. For example, a project should not be penalized for lacking a business model when commercialisation is unrelated to its purpose, or for lacking a live physical prototype when its valid implementation is an algorithm, scientific method or software system.

Where a rule genuinely cannot be applied clearly to an unusual project, the Organizing Committee may provide an official interpretation. Such interpretation should preserve fairness between teams and remain consistent with the published competition principles.

0.6 Examples, Guidance and Mandatory Requirements

Examples in this Rulebook are included to make the rules easier to understand. Unless a section explicitly states otherwise, examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive. A project does not have to match one of the examples in order to be eligible, and an action is not automatically permitted merely because it is not specifically listed as an example of a violation.

Words such as “must”, “must not”, “required” and “shall” indicate mandatory requirements. Words such as “should”, “recommended” and “normally” indicate guidance or the expected good practice, unless the surrounding rule clearly gives them a different meaning.

0.7 Responsibility for Accurate Information

Teams are responsible for ensuring that the information they submit or present is accurate to the best of their knowledge. This includes statements about originality, project performance, test results, contributions, external assistance, AI use, sources and previous work.

An honest mistake or an incomplete result is not the same as deliberate misrepresentation. However, teams are expected to correct material inaccuracies when they become aware of them and to disclose relevant assistance before it is discovered during judging or an integrity review.

0.8 Language and Terminology

This Rulebook is written in English and uses several recurring competition terms, including Project, Team Ownership, Evidence, State of the Art, Portfolio, Journey / Development Log, Coach, Mentor, Judge and Division. These terms should be read consistently throughout the document. A glossary may be provided as a companion appendix for quick reference.

Where a term has a specific meaning in this Rulebook, that competition-specific meaning takes priority over a casual or everyday interpretation of the same word.

1. The EUREKA Competition

1.1 Purpose of the Competition

EUREKA is an international innovation competition designed to give young people and university participants a structured environment in which they can develop, demonstrate and defend original work. The competition is not limited to a particular technology, scientific discipline or type of problem. Its purpose is to evaluate how well a team can identify a meaningful Problem, Need or Opportunity, understand the context in which it exists, develop an innovative response and support its claims with real implementation, testing and evidence.

EUREKA therefore evaluates more than the final object or result. Judges also consider the reasoning behind the project, the development process, the quality of the evidence and the extent to which the team understands and owns the work it presents.

1.2 Identity and Philosophy

EUREKA is an open-theme and field-neutral competition. A project may come from science, engineering, software, artificial intelligence, robotics, education, the environment, social innovation, accessibility, design, low-tech solutions or another field. No field receives an automatic advantage simply because it appears more advanced, more fashionable or more socially attractive.

The central principle is simple: projects should be judged according to the quality of their innovation, development, evidence and understanding, within the context of the project itself and the educational division in which the team competes.

1.3 What EUREKA Is

EUREKA is a competition of innovation, development, evidence and understanding. Teams are expected to move beyond an initial idea and create something that can be meaningfully examined by judges.

For example, a team may present a working prototype, a software system, an algorithm, an experimental method, a scientific investigation, a process, a simulation or another form of implementation. These projects may look very different from one another, but they share one requirement: the team must provide enough real work and evidence for the project to be evaluated.

1.4 What EUREKA Is Not

EUREKA is not an idea-only competition. A promising concept without meaningful development, implementation or evidence is not sufficient. At the same time, EUREKA does not require every project to become a finished commercial product.

EUREKA is also not a startup or pitch competition. A polished business plan, market opportunity or persuasive presentation may be relevant to some projects, but these elements do not replace innovation, technical or scientific quality, evidence and team ownership.

Likewise, EUREKA is not a competition for the most expensive, complicated or visually impressive project. A simple solution that is original, effective and well validated may be stronger than a highly complex system that does not demonstrate a meaningful advantage.

1.5 OPEN PROBLEM - OPEN SOLUTION

The fundamental EUREKA principle is OPEN PROBLEM - OPEN SOLUTION. Teams are free to choose what they want to investigate and how they want to approach it, provided that the project complies with the eligibility, safety, ethics and integrity requirements of the competition.

There are no mandatory thematic categories. A team is not required to build a robot, use artificial intelligence, solve an environmental problem or create a commercial product. The project should be driven by the innovation itself rather than by an attempt to fit into a predefined competition theme.

1.6 Problem, Need or Opportunity

The word “problem” is used broadly in EUREKA. A project may begin with a clearly defined problem, but it may also begin with a need, an opportunity, a scientific observation, a technological possibility, a new method, a discovery or a new way of approaching an existing field.

For example, improving the safety of a device may begin with a problem; creating an assistive tool may begin with a user need; and developing a new measurement technique may begin with a scientific opportunity. All three can form valid foundations for an EUREKA project.

For this reason, the Rulebook generally uses the expression Problem, Need or Opportunity when referring to the starting point of a project.

1.7 Innovation

For the purposes of EUREKA, innovation means a meaningful new or differentiated approach that creates demonstrable value compared with what already exists. Innovation does not necessarily mean that every component of a project must be completely new.

Innovation may be found in the central idea, the way existing technologies are combined, a new method or process, a new application, an improvement in performance, a different design approach or another meaningful contribution. What matters is that the team can identify its actual contribution and explain why the difference is important.

Simply using a recent or advanced technology does not make a project innovative. For example, adding artificial intelligence to an otherwise conventional solution does not automatically increase its Innovation score. The team must show what the technology contributes and why that contribution represents a meaningful advancement.

1.8 The Innovation Must Be Evaluatable

EUREKA does not require one universal form of prototype. Different fields produce different kinds of valid evidence and implementation. A project may therefore be represented by a physical prototype, functional prototype, MVP, proof of concept, software application, algorithm, AI system, robot, electronic system, engineering structure, experimental setup, working model, validated method, scientific experiment, digital platform, process, simulation, assistive system or another appropriate form.

The essential requirement is: THE INNOVATION MUST BE EVALUATABLE.

This means that judges must have something more substantial than a description of what the team intends to do. They must be able to examine an implementation, result, experiment, method, dataset, demonstration or other appropriate evidence and determine how well the project supports the claims made by the team.

1.9 Evidence over Claims

A central EUREKA principle is: CLAIMS REQUIRE EVIDENCE.

A team should not receive credit simply for stating that its solution works, is faster, safer, cheaper, more accurate, more sustainable or more effective than another solution. Where such claims can reasonably be tested, the team should provide evidence that supports them.

Appropriate evidence may include measurements, experiments, observations, test results, comparisons, benchmarks, user feedback, quantitative data, qualitative results or another suitable form of validation. The appropriate type and depth of evidence depend on the project and the educational division.

For example, if a team claims that a new mechanism is faster than an existing one, timing measurements or repeated tests may support the claim. If a team claims that a user interface is easier to use, structured user testing may be more appropriate. EUREKA does not require the same evidence from every project; it requires evidence that makes sense for the claim being made.

1.10 State of the Art

Innovation cannot be evaluated without understanding what already exists. Teams are therefore expected, at a level appropriate to their educational division, to investigate relevant existing solutions, research, technologies, products, methods or previous approaches.

The team should be able to answer three basic questions: What already exists? What is different here? Why does that difference matter?

Younger teams are not expected to perform a university-level systematic literature review or patent search. They are, however, expected to make a reasonable effort to discover whether the idea or solution they present as innovative already exists. Expectations become progressively more demanding in the higher divisions.

1.11 Complexity Is Not Quality

Technical or scientific complexity is not an independent measure of quality. COMPLEXITY ≠ QUALITY.

A project does not receive additional credit merely because it uses more components, more code, a more advanced processor, artificial intelligence, expensive laboratory equipment or a difficult manufacturing process. Complexity is relevant only when it serves the purpose of the project and contributes to the quality of the solution.

A simple mechanism that solves a problem reliably and elegantly may therefore score higher than a technically complex system that is poorly justified, insufficiently tested or unnecessarily complicated.

1.12 Impact Is Contextual

Impact is evaluated within the context and purpose of the project. EUREKA does not rank projects according to how emotionally appealing, socially visible or globally important their topic appears.

A medical or environmental project does not automatically have greater impact than an industrial tool, a scientific method, an educational system or a laboratory instrument. Judges consider what value the project creates, for whom or for what purpose, how significant that value is within its context and how convincingly the team supports the claim.

A project can therefore demonstrate strong impact even if it addresses a narrow or specialized need, provided that the value created within that context is meaningful and well supported.

1.13 EUREKA Is Not a Startup or Pitch Competition

Commercial potential, market size, revenue model and business planning are not universal requirements. They may be useful evidence when they help demonstrate feasibility, adoption, sustainability, scalability or future potential, but only when those issues are relevant to the project.

A commercially attractive project does not automatically receive an advantage over scientific innovation, open-source innovation, educational innovation, social innovation, research tools, fundamental technology or other non-commercial work.

Presentation skill is evaluated, but its role is limited. A team should communicate clearly enough for judges to understand and examine the project; presentation quality cannot compensate for weak innovation, inadequate development or unsupported claims.

1.14 International Character and Field Neutrality

EUREKA is designed for participants from different countries, educational systems and institutional environments. Teams may have different access to laboratories, equipment, funding, specialist support or presentation resources.

These differences should not become scoring advantages by themselves. Judges evaluate what the team actually contributed, how effectively it used the resources available to it and the quality of the resulting innovation, evidence and understanding.

1.15 Official Language

The official language of international judging and the principal competition submissions is English, unless the Organizing Committee explicitly announces additional accepted languages for a particular event or document.

Participants are not expected to speak or write at native-speaker level. Accent, stylistic sophistication or advanced vocabulary are not scoring criteria. Teams must, however, communicate clearly enough for judges to understand the project, examine the evidence and conduct a meaningful Q&A.

2. Participation Eligibility

2.1 Competition Divisions

EUREKA is organized into four independent educational divisions: PRIMARY, LOWER SECONDARY, UPPER SECONDARY, and UNIVERSITY. The divisions are designed to allow projects to be judged against expectations appropriate to the participants' educational stage rather than against a single standard applied identically to all ages.

The same core evaluation philosophy applies across all four divisions. However, the expected depth of research, technical understanding, validation, independence, and presentation increases with the educational level. A strong Primary project is therefore not expected to demonstrate the same scientific or engineering depth as a strong University project; it is expected to demonstrate excellent work for its own division.

2.2 School Divisions

The three school divisions correspond to the educational stages Primary, Lower Secondary, and Upper Secondary. Exact eligibility boundaries are published for each competition season using clear administrative criteria, such as dates of birth and/or the corresponding educational level.

The annual season announcement is the authoritative source for the exact boundaries applicable to that year. This avoids ambiguity caused by differences between national education systems, school-entry ages, or academic calendars in different countries.

Teams should verify the eligibility of every official member before registration. Where a participant's educational situation does not correspond directly to the usual structure, the Organizing Committee may request appropriate information in order to determine the correct division.

Example - 2027 Competition Season:
For the 2027 competition, the age boundaries for the four educational divisions are:
EUREKA PRIMARY: participants born on or after 1 January 2015.
EUREKA LOWER SECONDARY: participants born from 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2014.
EUREKA UPPER SECONDARY: participants born from 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2011.
EUREKA UNIVERSITY: participants born on or before 31 December 2008, provided that they meet the University Division eligibility requirements described in §2.3.

These dates apply specifically to the 2027 competition season and are provided as an example of how the annual age boundaries are defined. Future competition seasons may use different dates, which will be published in the applicable annual season announcement.

2.3 University Division

The UNIVERSITY division is intended for participants who have an active educational or academic relationship with a university or equivalent higher-education institution. Eligibility is therefore based on that relationship and not simply on the participant being an adult.

Typical eligible participants may include undergraduate students, postgraduate students, doctoral candidates, and other persons whose academic relationship is accepted under the conditions published for the relevant competition season. The annual announcement may provide additional clarification regarding eligible university relationships where necessary.

Being above the age limits of the school divisions does not, by itself, create eligibility for the UNIVERSITY division. A participant must meet the applicable university-relationship requirement.

2.4 Independent Ranking of Divisions

Each division is evaluated and ranked independently. Projects from different divisions do not compete against one another for the standard division ranking.

Each division therefore produces its own ranking and its own three principal awarded positions. This structure is essential to the EUREKA principle of Same Rubric - Different Expectation Level: the evaluation framework remains common, while the level of performance expected is appropriate to the educational stage.

2.5 Mixed-Division Teams

A team may include members who would individually belong to different educational divisions. In that case, the entire team competes in the division corresponding to its oldest or highest-division official member.

For example, if two members are eligible for LOWER SECONDARY but one official member is eligible for UPPER SECONDARY, the complete team competes in UPPER SECONDARY. The project is then judged according to the expectations of that higher division.

This rule prevents teams from obtaining a lower expectation level by combining younger participants with one or more older participants while entering the younger division.

2.6 Official Team Size and Additional Contributors

An official EUREKA team consists of a minimum of two and a maximum of three official team members. These are the participants recognized as the competition team and the persons expected to represent and defend the project during the official judging process.

Additional contributors from the same age group may have supported the broader development of the project and may be acknowledged by the team in appropriate material, such as a project brochure, poster, banner, or acknowledgements section. Their contribution should be described accurately.

Additional contributors do not become official competition members merely because they are acknowledged. They do not increase the five-member limit and may not replace official members in activities reserved for the registered team during judging.

2.7 Coaches and Mentors

A team may register up to two Coaches and may receive support from any number of Mentors. Coaches and Mentors can provide education, guidance, specialist advice, feedback, safety supervision, and other forms of legitimate support within the limits described in this Rulebook.

The distinction between support and team ownership is important. Coaches and Mentors may help participants learn how to solve a problem, but the submitted project must remain the work that the team itself can understand, explain, defend, and reproduce. Detailed ownership and external-assistance requirements are defined in Chapter 4.

Mentors do not automatically receive an EUREKA award or official participation certificate. Teams may acknowledge Mentors for their contribution in their own project material where appropriate.

2.8 Institutional and Independent Teams

Participation is not limited to teams formally representing a school, university, laboratory, club, company, or other institution. Eligible participants may enter either as an institutional team or as an independent team, subject to the same competition rules.

Institutional affiliation does not provide an evaluation advantage. Judges assess the project and the team’s work, not the reputation, resources, or status of the institution associated with the team.

For the UNIVERSITY division, the required university or higher-education relationship still applies even when the team registers independently rather than officially representing that institution.

2.9 Participation in Multiple Teams and Team Changes

Any participation of the same person in multiple teams, as well as any change to the registered team composition, must be declared to the Organizing Committee and must comply with the applicable registration instructions.

Such arrangements may not be used to circumvent rules concerning eligibility, division placement, team size, or project ownership. In particular, the registered team presented for judging must accurately represent the participants who are responsible for the submitted work.

Where a team change occurs after registration, the Organizing Committee may request clarification of the affected member's contribution so that eligibility and ownership can be assessed correctly.

3. Project Eligibility

3.1 Open Theme

EUREKA is an open-theme innovation competition. Projects are not required to fit within a predefined topic, challenge, technology, industry or social field. A team may begin with any problem, need or opportunity that it considers worth investigating, provided that the resulting project satisfies the eligibility, ownership, safety and evaluation requirements of the competition.

This open structure is intentional. EUREKA is designed to evaluate the quality of the innovation process and the resulting work, rather than the team's ability to adapt an idea to a prescribed annual theme.

3.2 Eligible Fields

Projects may come from scientific, technological, engineering, software, artificial intelligence, environmental, educational, social, design-oriented, low-tech or interdisciplinary fields. This list is illustrative rather than restrictive.

A project may also combine several fields. For example, a team may develop an electronic assistive device supported by software, or a scientific method that uses a custom-built mechanical system for experimentation. The field itself does not determine the project's score or importance.

3.3 Problem, Need or Opportunity

An EUREKA project does not have to begin with a conventional "problem." The starting point may be a Problem, a Need or an Opportunity. An opportunity may include a new scientific or technological possibility, an improved method, a discovery, a more efficient process, or a new way of applying existing knowledge.

The team must nevertheless be able to explain clearly what motivated the project and why the proposed work is meaningful. The judges must be able to understand what the team is trying to improve, investigate, create or demonstrate.

3.4 Acceptable Project Forms

EUREKA does not prescribe a single form of implementation. Eligible work may include, among other forms, a physical or functional prototype, Minimum Viable Product (MVP), Proof of Concept (PoC), software application, algorithm, artificial-intelligence system, robot, electronic system, engineering structure, experimental setup, working model, validated method, scientific experiment, digital platform, process, simulation or assistive system.

The important requirement is not the format of the project but whether the work has progressed far enough to be meaningfully evaluated.

3.5 Innovation Requirement

The project must contain an identifiable innovative contribution. Innovation does not necessarily mean that every component must be completely new or that the team must invent a technology that has never existed before. Innovation may also result from a new approach, a meaningful improvement, a novel combination, a new application, a better method or a demonstrable advancement over existing solutions.

The team must be able to identify what it considers innovative and distinguish that contribution from technologies, methods, research or products that already existed.

3.6 Minimum Development Level

An undeveloped idea, concept description or future plan alone is not sufficient for participation. The project must have moved beyond the stage of simply describing what the team intends to create.

There must be some form of implementation, proof, experiment, validation, functional result or other evidence that allows judges to examine what the team actually achieved. The appropriate form of evidence depends on the nature of the project; a mechanical prototype and a scientific investigation, for example, will not be expected to demonstrate progress in exactly the same way.

3.7 Evaluatable Implementation and Evidence

The central eligibility test is that the innovation must be evaluatable. Judges must have something substantive to examine: a working or partially working implementation, experimental results, measurements, test data, validated behaviour, a demonstrable method, simulation results, documented trials or another appropriate form of evidence.

A project does not have to be commercially finished or technically perfect. A prototype may still have limitations, and an experiment may produce results that lead to further questions. What matters is that the team can show real development work and provide evidence that supports the claims it makes.

3.8 Prototype, MVP and Proof of Concept

Prototypes, MVPs and Proofs of Concept are fully acceptable forms of participation. EUREKA does not require a market-ready product. Early-stage implementations may be particularly appropriate when their purpose is to demonstrate feasibility, test a critical mechanism or validate an innovative approach.

The team should clearly state what its implementation is intended to prove and what remains outside its current scope. A small prototype that successfully validates the central idea may provide stronger evidence than a larger but poorly tested system.

3.9 Software, Algorithms and Artificial Intelligence

Software projects, algorithms and AI-based systems are eligible when their operation, development and results can be meaningfully examined. A team should be able to demonstrate what the system does, explain its own contribution and provide appropriate evidence of testing or performance.

The use of existing programming languages, libraries, frameworks, models, APIs or development tools does not by itself make a project ineligible. Their use must, however, be consistent with the Team Ownership and AI rules described elsewhere in this Rulebook, and the team’s original contribution must remain identifiable.

3.10 Scientific and Experimental Projects

Scientific investigations and experimental projects are eligible even when the principal result is knowledge, evidence or a validated finding rather than a conventional product. Such projects should present a sufficiently clear research question or objective, an appropriate method, observable results and an evidence-based interpretation.

A result does not have to confirm the team's initial expectation in order to be valuable. A well-designed experiment that disproves a hypothesis or reveals a limitation can still demonstrate strong scientific work when the team understands and documents what was learned.

3.11 Processes, Methods and Non-Physical Innovation

An innovation may be a process, procedure, method, workflow, model or other non-physical solution. Eligibility does not depend on the presence of electronics, machinery or a manufactured prototype.

For such projects, the team must provide a suitable way to evaluate the proposed innovation. This may include comparative testing, trials, measured outcomes, case studies, simulations or another form of validation appropriate to the claim being made.

3.12 Low-Tech Innovation

Low-tech projects are eligible and are evaluated on equal terms. Technical complexity is not an eligibility requirement and is not, by itself, evidence of innovation quality.

A simple mechanical change, material choice, process improvement or low-cost solution may be highly innovative if it addresses its objective effectively and is supported by strong reasoning and evidence. Teams should not add unnecessary technology merely to make a project appear more advanced.

3.13 Previous EUREKA Projects

The same project may not simply be presented again in a later EUREKA competition. Repeating substantially the same work, implementation and contribution does not constitute a new EUREKA entry merely because the presentation, team materials or minor technical details have changed.

This rule is intended to ensure that each participation represents a genuine new body of work rather than a repeated evaluation of an already presented project.

3.14 Substantially Evolved Projects

A project derived from a team's previous EUREKA work may be eligible when it has evolved so substantially that the new innovation can be evaluated independently from the team's authorship of the earlier version.

A useful conceptual test is to consider the previous project as though it had originally been created by somebody else. The team should be able to show that the new work contains a distinct contribution that would still justify evaluation as an innovation even if the earlier project were treated only as pre-existing background.

Simple maintenance, cosmetic redesign, routine upgrades, small feature additions or continued development without a sufficiently distinct new contribution should not be assumed to satisfy this requirement. The team is responsible for clearly documenting what existed previously and what is genuinely new in the current entry.

3.15 Participation in Other Competitions or Exhibitions

Previous presentation of a project at another competition, exhibition, conference, school event or similar activity does not automatically make it ineligible for EUREKA.

The team must still comply with all EUREKA requirements concerning ownership, originality, disclosure of pre-existing work and the identification of its own contribution. Awards or recognition received elsewhere do not create any advantage or disadvantage in EUREKA judging.

3.16 Pre-existing Work and Third-Party Foundations

Projects may build upon pre-existing research, datasets, software, open-source material, commercial components, established methods, published knowledge or other third-party work. Modern innovation frequently develops from existing foundations, and their legitimate use is not prohibited.

However, the team must distinguish these foundations from its own contribution and provide appropriate acknowledgement or attribution where applicable. Pre-existing work must not be presented as though it were created by the team. More detailed ownership and contribution requirements are defined in Chapter 4.

3.17 Ineligible Entries

An entry may be considered ineligible when it cannot be meaningfully evaluated, when it is fundamentally inconsistent with the competition's ownership or integrity requirements, when it involves unlawful activity, or when it presents serious unresolved safety concerns that make participation inappropriate.

Ineligibility is different from receiving a low score. A weak, incomplete or unsuccessful project may still be eligible and can be evaluated on its merits. Ineligibility concerns whether the entry can properly participate under the competition rules at all. Serious violations discovered during or after judging may also be handled under the sanctions and integrity provisions of this Rulebook.

4. Team Ownership & Contribution

4.1 Core Principle

THE TEAM MUST BE ABLE TO EXPLAIN, DEFEND AND REPRODUCE ITS OWN WORK.

Team ownership is a central requirement of EUREKA. The project presented to the judges must represent work that the team genuinely understands and in which the team has made the substantive intellectual, technical, scientific or creative contribution claimed in its presentation and documentation.

Ownership does not mean that every component must be invented, manufactured or written from scratch. Modern innovation normally builds on existing knowledge, tools, components, software, data and expert guidance. EUREKA therefore evaluates what the team itself contributed, how external resources were used, and whether the team can clearly distinguish its own work from the work of others.

4.2 Meaningful Team Contribution

Every official team member must have a real, declared and verifiable role in the project. Contributions do not need to be equal and do not need to be of the same type. One member may focus primarily on mechanical design, another on software, another on experimentation or research, and another on documentation or testing.

A team member should nevertheless understand the project sufficiently to participate meaningfully in judging. Only individuals who have genuinely contributed to the project may be listed as official team members.

4.3 Team Contribution Statement

The team must be able to identify who contributed to the major parts of the project and what each official member did. It must also disclose substantive assistance received from people outside the official team.

The purpose of this declaration is transparency, not to require identical workloads. Judges should be able to understand where the team's own contribution begins and ends.

4.4 Coach and Mentor Assistance

Coaches and Mentors may teach concepts, explain techniques, recommend sources, discuss alternatives, provide feedback, help the team organize its work, and supervise activities where safety or access requirements make adult supervision necessary.

They may not replace the team in the substantive development of the project. For example, a Coach may explain how a sensor works or help students diagnose why a circuit is unstable; the Coach should not secretly design and build the final circuit and allow the team to present it as its own work.

The relevant question is not whether assistance occurred, but what the assistance contributed to the final result, whether it was appropriately disclosed, and whether the team retained genuine ownership and understanding of the work.

4.5 External Experts, Laboratories and Facilities

Teams may consult specialists and may use universities, laboratories, workshops, fabrication facilities, specialized instruments or other resources that are not available to them directly. Access to such resources is not, by itself, an ownership violation.

The team must be transparent about what an external expert or facility provided. For example, using a university laboratory to perform a measurement that requires specialized equipment may be acceptable when the team designed the experiment, understands the method and interprets the results. It would be materially different if an external researcher designed the experiment, performed the analysis and supplied the conclusions while the team presented that work as its own.

4.6 Commercial and Pre-Built Components

Commercial, pre-built and off-the-shelf components may be used. A team is not expected to manufacture every sensor, motor, computer, structural element or other component used in a project.

When such components are used, the team's contribution may lie in their selection, integration, adaptation, programming, configuration, testing or novel application. Judges may examine whether the team understands the role and limitations of important components on which the project depends.

4.7 Libraries, Frameworks, Open Source, Data and Existing Methods

Third-party software libraries, frameworks, open-source projects, datasets, APIs, published methods and other existing resources may be used where appropriate. Their use does not automatically reduce the legitimacy of a project.

Teams must provide appropriate attribution where required, respect applicable licenses or terms of use, and must not describe third-party work as an original team contribution. The team should also

understand the important external elements well enough to explain how they are used and how they affect the project.

For example, using an established machine-learning library is different from claiming to have created the library or algorithm itself. The innovation may instead lie in the problem formulation, data collection, system design, adaptation, integration, validation or another genuine contribution made by the team.

4.8 External Contracting and Work Performed by Third Parties

A team may obtain ordinary services or fabrication that it cannot reasonably perform itself, provided that the service is disclosed and does not replace the substantive work being claimed by the team.

Contracting or assigning a substantial part of the project's design, research, programming, engineering, analysis or other core development to a third party is incompatible with team ownership when that work is then presented as if it had been performed by the team.

4.9 Ownership Verification During Judging

Judges may verify ownership through the Presentation, Demonstration, Q&A, Portfolio, Journey Log and direct questions to individual team members. They may ask the team to explain code, experimental procedures, design choices, calculations, failures, modifications, results or the contribution of specific members and external helpers.

Teams are not expected to memorize every minor technical detail. However, they should be able to explain the important decisions and mechanisms that are central to the work they claim as their own. A clear Journey Log and honest disclosure of assistance can provide important evidence of the actual development process.

4.10 Ownership Review

If the judging panel identifies a serious inconsistency between the work presented and the team's demonstrated knowledge, contribution or development record, the matter may be referred for a specific ownership or Competition Integrity review.

A review may consider the project documentation, development history, declarations, external assistance, third-party materials and the explanations provided by team members. The purpose is to distinguish legitimate assistance and use of existing resources from misrepresentation of authorship or contribution.

4.11 Ownership Violations

Presenting another person's substantive work as the team's own, concealing external assistance that materially contributed to the final result, or being unable to demonstrate ownership of a substantive part of the project may constitute a Competition Integrity violation.

Depending on the nature and significance of the issue, consequences may range from a reduction in the relevant score to disqualification, as described in the rules on Violations and Sanctions. Plagiarism, fabricated or falsified results, or deliberate presentation of another person's substantive work as original team work may justify the most serious sanctions.

The presence of third-party components, libraries, datasets, published methods, commercial products or external advice is not in itself a violation when these are honestly disclosed or attributed as appropriate, are not misrepresented as original team work, and the team can demonstrate sufficient understanding of their role in the project.

5. Artificial Intelligence Policy

5.1 General Principle

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools is permitted in EUREKA. The use of AI does not, by itself, reduce a project's score and is not considered a violation. EUREKA recognizes AI as one of many modern tools that teams may use during research, development, programming, analysis, design, documentation and communication.

What matters is not whether AI was used, but how it was used. The team must remain the actual owner of the project decisions, must understand the work presented, and must be able to explain and verify the final result.

5.2 AI as a Tool - Not a Replacement for the Team

AI may support the team, but it must not replace the team's understanding, judgment, decision-making or substantive contribution. A team may ask an AI system for explanations, suggestions, alternative approaches, code examples, debugging assistance, research directions or feedback. The team must still decide what to use, adapt it to the project and take responsibility for the result.

For example, using AI to suggest several ways to control a motor is acceptable. The team should then be able to explain which method it selected, why it selected it, how it implemented it and whether the final system works as intended. Simply presenting an AI-generated solution that the team cannot explain does not demonstrate team ownership.

5.3 Permitted Areas of AI Assistance

AI assistance may be used in areas including, but not limited to: programming and debugging; literature or background research; summarization and organization of information; data analysis; mathematical or technical support; brainstorming; electronic, mechanical or system design suggestions; generation or editing of text; images, diagrams or models; translation; and preparation of documentation.

The same ownership standard applies in every case. The fact that an AI tool can produce a sophisticated result does not make that result the team's contribution unless the team has meaningfully evaluated, selected, adapted, integrated and understood it.

5.4 Verification of AI Outputs

AI-generated output must not be treated as automatically correct. The team is responsible for checking information, calculations, references, code, design recommendations and other AI-generated material before using it in the project.

AI systems may produce incorrect facts, invented references, unsuitable code, invalid calculations or unsafe technical suggestions. If such material is included in the project, responsibility remains with the team. Saying that an error was produced by an AI system does not remove that responsibility.

Verification should be appropriate to the type of output. A factual claim may be checked against reliable sources; code may be tested; a calculation may be independently repeated; a design recommendation may be validated experimentally; and an AI-generated interpretation of data should be compared with the actual data and the team's own analysis.

5.5 AI Disclosure

Teams must disclose significant AI assistance used in the development of the project. Disclosure is intended to make the development process transparent; it is not a penalty and does not imply that the work is less valuable.

As a minimum, the disclosure should identify:

- Tool - the AI system or service used.
- Purpose - what the team used it for.
- What AI produced - the relevant output or type of assistance received.
- What the team changed - how the output was selected, modified, corrected, extended or integrated.
- How the final result was verified - the method used to confirm that the result was correct, functional, reliable or appropriate.

A concise disclosure is sufficient when the use is limited. More substantial AI involvement should be described in greater detail so that judges can understand the actual contribution of the team.

5.6 Examples of Appropriate and Inappropriate Use

Appropriate use: a team asks an AI coding assistant to propose a function, modifies the function for its hardware, tests it, identifies an error, corrects it and can explain the final code. The AI assistance is disclosed.

Appropriate use: a team uses AI to summarize several technical concepts during early research, then checks the relevant information against reliable sources and writes its own project analysis.

Potential ownership problem: an AI system generates most of an algorithm, report, design or analysis and the team presents it without being able to explain how it works, why key choices were made or whether the result is correct.

Integrity problem: substantial AI-generated work is intentionally presented as entirely team-created work without the required disclosure, especially when that assistance materially affected the final result.

5.7 AI-Generated Sources, Data and Evidence

AI-generated statements are not evidence merely because they were produced confidently or in technical language. Teams must not use invented citations, fabricated data or unverified AI-generated results as support for project claims.

Where AI is used to analyze, transform or interpret real project data, the original data and the team's validation process should remain available when relevant to judging. The team must be able to distinguish measured or observed evidence from content generated or inferred by an AI system.

5.8 AI During Judging

The project must be judged on the team's own understanding. During the presentation, demonstration and judges' interview, team members must personally explain and defend their work. AI tools must not be used to generate real-time answers on behalf of the team during judging unless the Organizing Committee has explicitly authorized a specific use for accessibility or another stated purpose.

Judges may ask follow-up questions about AI-assisted parts of the project in order to determine the team's understanding, contribution, verification process and ownership.

5.9 Undeclared or Misrepresented AI Assistance

Failure to disclose significant AI assistance may be treated as a Competition Integrity issue. The seriousness of the issue depends primarily on the extent to which the undeclared assistance contributed to the final project and whether the team misrepresented that work as its own.

Minor or incidental use is not treated in the same way as AI assistance that created a substantial part of the project. Depending on the circumstances, consequences may range from a scoring impact to disqualification, in accordance with the rules on Team Ownership, Competition Integrity and Sanctions.

The central principle is therefore simple: teams may use AI, but they must use it transparently, critically and with genuine understanding of the work they finally present.

6. Research & Development Process

6.1 Purpose of the Development Process

EUREKA evaluates not only the final result, but also the reasoning and development work that produced it. Teams should therefore be able to show how they moved from an initial problem, need or opportunity to an implemented and evaluated solution. The process may differ greatly between projects and is not required to follow a single fixed sequence.

6.2 A Flexible Development Framework

A useful reference framework is: Problem / Need / Opportunity → Research → Existing Solutions / State of the Art → Proposed Innovation → Development → Implementation / Proof → Testing → Evidence → Validation → Iteration → Impact / Potential → Future Development. This sequence is descriptive, not mandatory. Real projects often move backwards and forwards between stages. For example, testing may reveal a new technical limitation that sends the team back to research or redesign.

6.3 Research and State of the Art

Teams should investigate information relevant to their project and develop an appropriate understanding of existing solutions, methods, technologies or research. The depth and form of this research should be appropriate to the project and the educational division.

The purpose of State of the Art research is not to produce a long literature review. It is to help the team understand what already exists, identify meaningful limitations or opportunities, and explain where its own contribution fits. A team claiming that its solution is faster, safer, cheaper or more accurate than an existing approach should know what it is comparing against.

6.4 From Research to Design Decisions

Important design, scientific or methodological decisions should have a reason. Teams should be able to explain why they selected a particular approach, component, algorithm, material, experimental method or system architecture, especially when that choice materially affects the project.

A decision does not need to be perfect to be valid. A team may select an approach that later proves ineffective. What matters is whether the team can explain the reasoning, observe the result and use what it learned in subsequent development.

6.5 Implementation and Proof

The project must progress beyond an undeveloped concept. The form of implementation depends on the nature of the project and may include, for example, a prototype, MVP, proof of concept, software implementation, experimental setup, validated method, working model or other evaluatable evidence.

Implementation does not mean that the project must already be a finished commercial product. It means that the central idea has been developed far enough for the judges to examine meaningful evidence about what the team created and how it performs.

6.6 Testing, Data and Validation

Testing should be connected to the claims made by the team. Teams should ask what evidence would reasonably support or challenge each important claim and should select tests, measurements, observations or evaluation methods accordingly.

For example, a claim that a system reduces response time should normally be supported by relevant timing data. A claim that a method improves accuracy should be supported by an appropriate accuracy evaluation. A prototype that demonstrates only that a device powers on does not, by itself, validate unrelated claims about reliability, effectiveness or real-world performance.

6.7 Evidence Quality

Evidence should be presented in a form that allows judges to understand what was tested, under what conditions, what was observed and what conclusions can reasonably be drawn. Where relevant, teams should identify sample size, repeated trials, comparison conditions, measurement limitations or other factors that affect interpretation.

EUREKA does not require every project to use the same experimental methodology. The appropriate level of evidence depends on the project type, the claim being made and the educational division. The central principle remains: CLAIMS REQUIRE EVIDENCE.

6.8 Comparison and Baselines

When a team claims an improvement over an existing solution, method or previous version, the comparison should be fair and meaningful wherever such comparison is reasonably possible. Teams should explain the baseline used and avoid comparisons that exaggerate an advantage by using substantially different conditions.

Not every innovation requires a direct numerical benchmark. Some projects may instead demonstrate a new capability, a different method or a solution for a previously unaddressed context. In such cases, the team should still provide appropriate evidence for the specific contribution it claims.

6.9 Iteration and Fail Forward

Innovation rarely develops perfectly on the first attempt. Failed tests, rejected designs and unexpected results may be valuable parts of the development process when they lead to genuine learning and informed changes.

Failure is not rewarded simply because it occurred. What matters is what the team learned from it, how that learning affected subsequent decisions and whether the iteration is supported by evidence. A documented failed prototype followed by a reasoned redesign may demonstrate stronger development work than presenting only a final version while hiding the process that produced it.

6.10 Reproducibility and Understanding

Teams should maintain enough understanding and documentation to explain how important results were obtained and, where reasonably applicable, how the relevant work could be repeated. This supports both technical credibility and Team Ownership.

Reproducibility does not mean that every demonstration must produce an identical result under all conditions. It means that the team can explain the method, relevant inputs and conditions well enough for its evidence to be understood and critically examined.

6.11 Limitations and Uncertainty

Teams are expected to recognize meaningful limitations in their work. Identifying a limitation does not automatically weaken a project; in many cases it demonstrates technical or scientific maturity.

Examples may include limited test data, environmental constraints, assumptions, prototype-scale restrictions, measurement uncertainty, dependency on a specific dataset, incomplete validation or features that remain future work. Teams should distinguish between what has been demonstrated and what is still expected, predicted or planned.

6.12 Future Development

Teams may describe logical next steps, additional testing, improvements or potential applications. Future plans can help judges understand the project's direction, but they are not a substitute for the work and evidence completed by the time of judging.

6.13 Development Documentation

The Project Portfolio and Journey / Development Log serve complementary purposes. The Portfolio presents the project and its evidence in an organized form, while the Journey Log records the actual development path, including important decisions, changes, successes and failures.

Teams should not reconstruct an artificial development story after the project is complete. Documentation is most useful when it reflects the real process and helps demonstrate how the project evolved over time.

7. Required Submissions

EUREKA requires a compact set of materials that allows the Organizing Committee and judges to understand the project before and during the competition, verify the team's development process and contribution, and evaluate the evidence supporting the team's claims. The submission package is not intended to reward teams for producing large quantities of material. Each item has a different purpose and should contribute useful information about the project.

7.1 Submission Package

Unless otherwise specified in the annual competition instructions, the submission package includes the following:

- Project Abstract;
- EUREKA Project Portfolio;
- Journey / Development Log;
- Project Video;

- appropriate implementation, prototype, results or other project evidence, depending on the nature of the project;
- Team Contribution Statement;
- AI Disclosure, where applicable;
- Coach / Mentor Declaration; and
- any other required team declarations identified in the official submission instructions.

The exact technical method of submission, accepted file formats and any season-specific forms are communicated by the Organizing Committee. A requirement to submit a particular file format does not change the substantive project requirements described in this Rulebook.

7.2 Project Abstract

The Project Abstract is a concise introduction to the project. Its purpose is to allow a reader who has no previous knowledge of the work to understand, at a glance, what the team is working on, why it matters, what the proposed innovation is, and what has actually been developed or demonstrated.

EUREKA does not define the Abstract primarily by a fixed word count. Instead, teams should design it so that its essential content can reasonably be read and understood - including through diagrams, photographs or other visual material - in approximately two minutes.

An effective Abstract therefore prioritizes the central information rather than detail. It may combine short text with images, diagrams or photographs where these communicate the project more efficiently. Detailed methodology, extended results and supporting documentation belong in the Portfolio rather than in the Abstract.

7.3 Project Video

The Project Video must normally be between 1 and 3 minutes long. Its primary purpose is to give the Organizing Committee an early understanding of the project well before the on-site competition begins.

The video should therefore help a viewer quickly understand what the project is, what the team has developed, and - where appropriate - what the project looks like or how it works. Teams may show the prototype, software, experiment, system, process, results, development environment or other relevant project material.

The Project Video is not the team’s competition pitch and must not simply reproduce the team’s presentation slides. It is also not a substitute for the live Presentation, Demonstration or Judges’ Interview.

Project videos submitted by teams may also be used by the Organizing Committee for communication and promotional purposes in accordance with the media provisions of this Rulebook.

7.4 Language, Formats and Deadlines

Submission language follows the official language provisions of §1.15. Accepted file formats, submission platforms, naming conventions, deadlines and other technical requirements are announced for each competition season.

Teams are responsible for checking the applicable annual instructions and ensuring that submitted files can be accessed and reviewed in the required format.

7.5 Late or Incomplete Submissions

Late or incomplete submission may lead to non-acceptance or an appropriate administrative consequence. Teams should not assume that missing material can automatically be replaced or submitted after the published deadline.

Where a technical problem occurs, teams should communicate with the Organizing Committee as soon as reasonably possible and provide any relevant evidence of the issue. This does not guarantee acceptance of a late submission, but allows the circumstances to be considered appropriately.

8. EUREKA Project Portfolio

8.1 Purpose

The EUREKA Project Portfolio is the team's organized record of the project itself: what the team identified, researched, designed, developed, tested, learned and ultimately produced. It should allow a judge to understand the project in substantially greater depth than is possible from the Abstract or Project Video.

The Portfolio should support the team's claims with clear documentation and evidence. It is not simply a presentation booklet, advertising brochure or collection of attractive photographs. Its value comes from how effectively it communicates the substance of the work.

8.2 Length and the First 16–20 Pages

There is no fixed maximum length for the Portfolio. A team may use as many pages as it reasonably needs to document its project.

However, judges will base most of their initial study on approximately the first 16–20 pages. Teams should therefore place the information that is essential for understanding and evaluating the project within this first section whenever possible.

Pages beyond this range are not prohibited and may be examined by judges. They may contain appendices, extended data, calculations, technical drawings, source excerpts, additional photographs, test records, references or other supporting material. The absence of a page limit does not mean that judges are expected to study every supplementary page in equal detail.

A strong Portfolio therefore combines a concise, self-contained main section with additional evidence where that evidence is useful.

8.3 Recommended Content

Because EUREKA accepts projects from very different fields, there is no single mandatory chapter structure that fits every project. Where relevant, a Portfolio may include:

- Project Identity and a concise overview;
- Problem, Need or Opportunity;
- Research and State of the Art;
- the Proposed Innovation and its differentiation from existing approaches;
- Design and Development decisions;
- Implementation, Prototype, MVP, Proof of Concept or other form of proof;
- Testing methodology and results;

- Evidence supporting important claims;
- Failures, unexpected results and subsequent improvements;
- Validation and comparison with appropriate baselines or alternatives;
- Limitations and unresolved issues;
- Impact, value and practical applicability;
- Feasibility and possible future development;
- References, sources and relevant third-party material; and
- Appendices containing detailed supporting evidence.

Teams should adapt the structure to the nature of their project. For example, an experimental scientific project may devote more space to methodology, measurements and uncertainty, while a software project may emphasize architecture, testing, user evaluation and performance evidence.

8.4 Evidence and Traceability

Important statements in the Portfolio should be traceable to appropriate evidence wherever reasonably possible. If the team claims that a system is faster, more accurate, safer, more efficient or otherwise improved, the Portfolio should help the reader identify how that conclusion was reached.

References and third-party sources should be identified clearly enough to distinguish the team's own contribution from existing knowledge, tools, datasets, components or prior work.

8.5 Production Quality

Clear organization and readable presentation are encouraged, but professional graphic design is not a judging objective in itself. A simple, well-structured Portfolio with strong evidence is preferable to a highly polished document that obscures weak or incomplete project work.

Teams are therefore not expected to have access to professional designers, publishing software or expensive production resources. Documentation quality means clarity, organization, relevance and technical or scientific usefulness.

9. EUREKA Journey / Development Log

9.1 Purpose

The Journey / Development Log records the team's actual path over time. Unlike the Portfolio, which presents the project in an organized and relatively finished form, the Journey Log may show the work as it really happened: ideas that changed, tests that failed, decisions that were reconsidered, successful milestones, unexpected problems and the gradual development of the team itself.

Its purpose is not to demonstrate that the team followed a perfect process. On the contrary, a useful Journey Log often shows uncertainty, experimentation, correction and learning.

9.2 Portfolio vs Journey Log

The two documents serve different but complementary purposes:

PROJECT PORTFOLIO = the project result and its organized documentation.

JOURNEY / DEVELOPMENT LOG = the real path followed by the team toward that result.

Information may naturally appear in both, but the Journey Log does not need to be rewritten into a polished narrative. Its chronological and authentic character is part of its value.

9.3 Format and Length

The Journey Log may be printed or electronic. EUREKA does not prescribe a minimum number of entries, a maximum length or a required frequency of updates.

Teams should choose a format that they can maintain naturally throughout their work. A log that is informative and genuinely reflects the team's activity is more useful than one created retrospectively only to satisfy a formal requirement.

For individual entries, it is recommended - but not required - to make the date, a short title, and the most significant success, failure, decision or event easy to identify. Photographs, screenshots, sketches, measurements, links, technical notes and other supporting material may be included where useful.

9.4 What the Journey Log May Contain

The Journey Log may include project-related material such as ideas, hypotheses, research findings, design decisions, development steps, tests, failures, changes, iterations, results and individual or team contributions.

It may also include activities of the team that are not directly part of the technical or scientific development of the project. Examples may include team meetings, educational visits, participation in workshops, outreach activities, preparation activities or other experiences that help document the team's broader journey.

Such material does not automatically increase a project's judging score. Its value is contextual: it can help show how the team worked, learned, collaborated and developed over time.

9.5 An Informative Log Is More Valuable Than a Large Log

There is no advantage in creating entries simply to increase the apparent size of the Journey Log. Teams should instead aim to make it sufficiently informative that another person can follow the important stages of their journey.

A detailed log may be extensive, but detail should arise naturally from meaningful activity. Dates, intermediate versions, photographs, failed tests and changes in direction can often provide stronger evidence of genuine development than a long retrospective description written at the end.

9.6 Ownership and Authenticity

Judges may use the Journey Log as one source of evidence when examining team ownership, contribution, iteration and authenticity. It can help connect the final project to the sequence of decisions and activities that produced it.

The Journey Log is not, by itself, proof of ownership, nor is it the only method available to judges. It is considered together with the Portfolio, Contribution Statement, project evidence, Presentation, Demonstration and Judges' Interview.

10. Competition Process

10.1 From Registration to Evaluation

The EUREKA competition process follows a common sequence: registration, project development, required submissions, administrative and eligibility checks, participation in the Global Event, structured judging, publication of results and awards.

Detailed dates, submission platforms, venue information and operational instructions are announced for each competition season. These annual instructions organize the event but do not replace the substantive rules of this Rulebook.

10.2 No Standard Qualification Phase

EUREKA does not normally operate a preliminary qualification or elimination phase. Registered and eligible teams participate directly in the Global Event.

If the number of entries in a particular season makes an additional preliminary procedure operationally necessary, the Organizing Committee will inform affected teams in advance and explain the procedure, schedule and consequences in detail. Such a procedure is an exception created by participation volume, not a standard stage of EUREKA.

10.3 Four-Day Competition Framework

The competition, including any exceptional procedure required because of participation volume, is completed within the four-day EUREKA event framework.

Teams should therefore arrive prepared for all official activities identified in the published event schedule, including judging, booth activity and any required administrative procedures.

10.4 Global Event

EUREKA is conducted directly as a global competition within the MRC - Minoan Robotsports Competition. Teams are ranked within their applicable educational division according to the official EUREKA evaluation system.

10.5 Judging Panel

Each project is evaluated by a panel of at least three judges. Judges may come from academic, research, professional or business environments, and the Organizing Committee is responsible for creating the strongest reasonably available combination of expertise for each project.

The panel evaluates the project collectively under the common EUREKA framework. Regardless of any internal allocation of attention or expertise, all five scoring dimensions must be covered.

10.6 Formal Judging Session

Each team participates in one formal judging session. The session combines the team’s presentation or pitch, demonstration or other project evidence, and the Judges’ Interview & Q&A.

The presentation and demonstration do not need to be separated into rigid blocks. A team may demonstrate a feature while explaining it, move between explanation and evidence, or organize the session in another clear way that suits the project. The Q&A, however, takes place after the team has completed its uninterrupted presentation and demonstration portion.

The formal session is planned to remain below approximately 20 minutes in total under normal circumstances. Judges may extend the Q&A when additional questions are reasonably necessary.

10.7 Booth Visits and Informal Observation

The formal judging session is not the only opportunity for judges to observe a project. Judges may also visit team booths during the event, including at times that have not been specifically scheduled with the team.

These visits allow judges to see projects in a more natural exhibition setting, observe extended demonstrations, ask for clarification where appropriate, and gain additional context. A booth visit does not constitute a second formal presentation session and does not replace the structured judging process.

11. Presentation & Demonstration

11.1 Team Presentation / Pitch

The team must provide a concise presentation or pitch that introduces the project and communicates its essential value, innovation and development. The presentation portion has a strict maximum duration of 5 minutes and is timed. Judges may stop the presentation when the maximum time expires.

The purpose of the time limit is not to force every project into the same presentation style. It ensures that teams can communicate the core of their work clearly and leaves sufficient time for demonstration and meaningful questioning.

11.2 Participation of Team Members

All official team members are expected to speak during the formal judging session. In particular, each member should be able to explain their own contribution to the project and demonstrate an appropriate understanding of the work in which they participated.

The team may divide speaking roles according to members' actual responsibilities. Equal speaking time is not required, but the session should make the contribution of the official members visible rather than presenting the project through only one spokesperson.

11.3 Integrating the Demonstration

The demonstration may be integrated directly into the presentation rather than taking place strictly before or after it. Teams should choose the sequence that communicates the project most effectively.

Where a meaningful live demonstration is possible, teams are encouraged to show the project operating rather than relying only on descriptions of what it can do. The demonstration should focus on the functions, results or evidence that are most relevant to the team's claims.

If a complete demonstration requires more time than is practical during judging, the team should show the most representative or critical part. Judges may request or choose to observe a longer or complete demonstration later at the team's booth.

11.4 Projects Without a Practical Live Demonstration

A live demonstration is not appropriate for every type of project. Some scientific experiments may require long observation periods; algorithms may require lengthy computation; systems may operate at a scale that cannot be reproduced at the venue; and some processes may have been completed before the event.

In such cases, teams may use appropriate alternative evidence, including video, recorded results, datasets, simulations, photographs, logs, measurements or other documentation that allows judges to understand and evaluate the work.

A project should not be disadvantaged merely because its legitimate form makes a live demonstration impractical. The relevant question is whether the evidence presented is appropriate, credible and sufficient for the claims being made.

11.5 Safety

No demonstration requirement overrides safety. The Organizing Committee or judging panel may restrict, modify or prohibit any demonstration that presents an unreasonable risk to participants, visitors, equipment, facilities or the environment.

Where a live demonstration is restricted for safety reasons, the team should use suitable alternative evidence wherever possible.

11.6 Coaches and Mentors During Judging

For Primary and Lower Secondary teams, a Coach may be present during the formal judging session. The presence of a Coach does not change the requirement that the project must be presented, explained and defended by the team.

Intervention by a Coach or Mentor - including answering for the team, prompting answers, correcting team members during questioning or otherwise directing the judging interaction - is considered negatively because it reduces the judges' ability to assess the team's own understanding and ownership.

For other divisions, Coaches and Mentors do not form part of the formal judging interaction unless specifically permitted or requested by the Organizing Committee.

11.7 Technical Failure During Demonstration

A technical failure during judging does not automatically invalidate a project. If time remains within the team's presentation and demonstration portion, the team may attempt to restart, repair or repeat the demonstration without receiving additional guaranteed time.

Judges may also examine documented evidence showing previous successful operation, such as videos, logs, measurements, test results or earlier demonstrations. Such evidence may provide useful context, but judges are not required to assume that the system performed exactly as claimed solely because previous evidence exists.

Teams should therefore prepare for reasonable technical contingencies and preserve evidence from development and testing whenever possible.

11.8 Production Quality

Professional production quality is not a separate judging objective. Expensive displays, professionally produced videos, sophisticated visual effects or highly polished presentation materials do not substitute for innovation, evidence, understanding or project quality.

Teams are encouraged to communicate clearly and professionally using the resources reasonably available to them.

12. Judges' Interview & Q&A

12.1 Position Within the Judging Session

The Judges' Interview & Q&A takes place after the team has completed its presentation and demonstration portion. Judges do not interrupt the team's formal presentation with questions.

This separation allows the team to communicate its project coherently before the panel begins deeper examination.

12.2 Purpose

The Q&A is a substantive part of EUREKA judging. It allows the panel to move beyond prepared material and examine the project in greater depth.

Questions may address, among other relevant topics, the innovation itself, State of the Art, technical or scientific principles, development decisions, testing, evidence, results, impact, feasibility, limitations, team contribution, ownership and the use of external assistance or AI.

12.3 Duration

As a general guideline, the Q&A lasts approximately 5–7 minutes. This is not a strict maximum.

Judges may ask as many questions as they reasonably need and may extend the interview when clarification, technical examination or ownership verification requires additional time. Under normal circumstances, the complete judging session is intended to remain below approximately 20 minutes, but necessary questioning may extend beyond that target at the panel's discretion.

12.4 Answering and Defending the Project

Teams should be prepared not only to describe what they created but also to explain why decisions were made, how results were obtained, what evidence supports important claims, what limitations remain, and what each member contributed.

A strong answer does not require memorized technical language. Judges are looking for genuine understanding appropriate to the team's educational division and to the role each member had in the project.

Teams may openly acknowledge uncertainty or a limitation when they do not know something. A precise and honest answer is preferable to an unsupported claim.

12.5 Questions About Failure, Limitations and Unfinished Work

Judges may ask about failed approaches, unexpected results, design compromises, unresolved problems and future improvements. Such questions are not intended to punish teams for having encountered difficulties.

The ability to explain what failed, what was learned and how the project changed can provide meaningful evidence of authentic development, technical or scientific understanding, and iteration.

12.6 Difficulty Answering a Question

A single incorrect answer, incomplete explanation or moment of uncertainty does not automatically constitute an ownership violation and does not by itself justify disqualification.

Judges evaluate understanding and ownership in context, considering the project as a whole, the team's development evidence, the nature of the question, the member's role, the educational division and the overall judging interaction.

Persistent inability to explain substantial parts of the project, particularly when combined with other evidence suggesting undeclared external work or misrepresentation, may raise an ownership or competition-integrity concern and may be examined under the relevant provisions of this Rulebook.

13. Evaluation System

13.1 Evaluation Philosophy

EUREKA uses a Structured Multi-Dimensional Evaluation system. Projects are not judged by a single impression, by technical complexity alone, or by how professionally they are presented. The evaluation considers several distinct dimensions so that innovation, technical or scientific quality, evidence, impact, team ownership and communication are examined together.

The system is designed to be field-neutral and resource-neutral. Projects from different scientific, technological and creative domains may take very different forms, but they are evaluated through the same underlying principles. Likewise, access to expensive equipment, advanced laboratories, professional media production or substantial funding is not a scoring criterion by itself.

Scoring is evidence-based. Teams are expected to support important claims with appropriate evidence and to demonstrate understanding of their own work. The Official EUREKA Judging Rubric provides the detailed performance descriptors used by judges.

13.2 Innovation & Originality - 100 points

This dimension examines what is new, different or creatively advanced in the project and how meaningfully the team moves beyond existing approaches.

- Originality / Novelty - 35 points
- Innovative Approach - 25 points
- Advancement beyond Existing Solutions - 25 points
- Creativity & Ingenuity - 15 points

Innovation does not require a project to be unprecedented in every possible sense. Judges consider the relevant State of the Art, the team's context, the nature of the proposed advancement and whether the difference from existing solutions is meaningful and understood.

13.3 Technical / Scientific Excellence & Validation - 100 points

This dimension evaluates the quality of the technical or scientific work and the strength of the evidence showing that the project performs, behaves or supports conclusions as claimed.

- Technical / Scientific Quality - 30 points
- Functional Implementation - 25 points
- Testing & Validation - 25 points
- Reliability / Performance / Robustness - 10 points
- Technical / Scientific Depth - 10 points

The appropriate form of implementation and validation depends on the project. A physical prototype, software system, experimental study, algorithm or validated method will not necessarily produce the same type of evidence. Judges apply the criteria according to what is technically or scientifically meaningful for the project.

13.4 Impact, Relevance & Applicability - 80 points

This dimension examines why the project matters in its own context, what value it may create, and whether the proposed solution or advancement has a credible path toward useful application or further development.

- Problem / Need / Opportunity & Relevance - 15 points
- Effectiveness / Value Created - 20 points
- Potential Impact - 20 points
- Feasibility & Practical Applicability - 15 points
- Scalability / Future Potential - 10 points

Impact is contextual. EUREKA does not automatically favor projects addressing fashionable, emotionally compelling or globally large problems. A project may have strong impact because it solves a specific local problem, improves an existing method, creates scientific value, enables a new capability or addresses a clearly defined need effectively.

13.5 Team Ownership, Development Process & Understanding - 80 points

This dimension evaluates the team's genuine contribution, understanding and development journey. It is central to EUREKA because a sophisticated final result has limited competitive value if the team cannot demonstrate that it meaningfully created, developed, understood and evaluated the work.

- Team Ownership / Original Contribution - 25 points
- Technical / Scientific Understanding - 20 points
- Development & Iteration Process - 15 points
- Problem Solving & Design Decisions - 10 points
- Awareness of Limitations - 10 points

Permitted assistance, third-party components, open-source tools, mentors and AI do not automatically reduce this score. Judges consider what the team itself contributed, how external resources were used, whether assistance was transparently disclosed, and whether members can explain and defend the resulting project.

13.6 Presentation & Q&A - 40 points

This dimension evaluates how effectively the team communicates and defends the project during the formal judging session.

- Clarity & Structure - 10 points
- Quality of Demonstration & Evidence - 10 points
- Technical Communication - 5 points
- Q&A Accuracy & Depth - 10 points
- Professionalism & Time Management - 5 points

Professionalism does not mean professional production. Judges assess clear, appropriate and effective communication rather than expensive displays, professionally produced media or presentation polish beyond what is reasonably expected from the team.

13.7 Total Score

The maximum score is 400 points:

- Innovation & Originality - 100 points (25%)
- Technical / Scientific Excellence & Validation - 100 points (25%)
- Impact, Relevance & Applicability - 80 points (20%)
- Team Ownership, Development Process & Understanding - 80 points (20%)
- Presentation & Q&A - 40 points (10%)

The distribution intentionally prevents any single characteristic from defining the entire result. A strong EUREKA project combines innovation with credible development, evidence, understanding, relevance and the ability to communicate and defend the work.

13.8 Performance Descriptors

Detailed criterion-level performance descriptors are provided in the Official EUREKA Judging Rubric. These descriptors explain what different levels of performance look like and support consistent interpretation by judges.

The Rulebook defines the evaluation architecture and point distribution; the Judging Rubric provides the detailed scoring guidance. Teams should consult both documents.

13.9 Normalization Between Judging Panels

When a division requires multiple judging panels, EUREKA may apply a normalization procedure to support fair comparison between teams evaluated by different panels.

Normalization is intended to reduce the effect of systematic differences in scoring patterns between panels. It is a fairness mechanism and does not change the evaluation criteria, the relative importance of the five dimensions or the evidence expected from teams.

The Organizing Committee determines and applies the appropriate normalization procedure. The detailed statistical method forms part of the competition’s judging administration and is not prescribed in this Rulebook.

13.10 Tie-Breaking

If two or more teams have exactly the same final score, the team with the lower average age of its official team members ranks higher.

This rule applies only to an exact tie in the final score after any applicable judging procedures have been completed.

13.11 Judge Calibration and Internal Validation

EUREKA takes measures to ensure that all projects are evaluated as fairly and consistently as possible. Judges receive common guidance and calibration based on the Official EUREKA Judging Rubric, while procedures are used to reduce differences between judges and panels and limit potential bias.

All teams are evaluated according to the same published criteria and principles.

14. Expectations per Educational Division

14.1 Same Rubric - Different Expectation Level

All four EUREKA educational divisions use the same evaluation dimensions, criteria and maximum point distribution. EUREKA does not use a simplified rubric for younger participants or a separate scoring system for university teams.

However, the level of performance reasonably expected under each criterion changes with the educational division. The central principle is therefore:

SAME RUBRIC - DIFFERENT EXPECTATION LEVEL.

Judges assess the quality of the work relative to the educational level of the division while preserving the meaning of each criterion. A Primary project is not expected to demonstrate university-level methodology or technical depth. Conversely, work that may demonstrate exceptional depth for a Primary team may represent only a basic level of achievement in the University division.

This approach allows every division to value the same core qualities - innovation, evidence, understanding, development, impact and communication - without making age or educational level irrelevant.

14.2 EUREKA PRIMARY

At Primary level, emphasis is placed on curiosity, creativity, genuine understanding, making, experimentation and the ability to explain what the team did and learned.

Teams should be able to identify the problem, need or opportunity they addressed, explain their idea in their own words, show what they created or investigated, and provide age-appropriate evidence that they tried, tested or observed their work.

Judges should value meaningful exploration and authentic contribution rather than expecting advanced formal research methodology, sophisticated engineering analysis or complex statistical validation.

Failures and changes are particularly valuable when children can explain what happened, what they learned and what they changed as a result.

14.3 EUREKA LOWER SECONDARY

At Lower Secondary level, teams are expected to move beyond exploratory making toward a clearer and more structured development process.

Expectations include more purposeful research, clearer awareness of existing solutions, repeated testing where appropriate, collection of real observations or data, increasing technical or scientific understanding, and visible iteration based on results.

Teams should begin to justify important design decisions and discuss feasibility, impact and limitations at a basic but meaningful level. Evidence should increasingly support claims rather than relying mainly on description or demonstration.

14.4 EUREKA UPPER SECONDARY

At Upper Secondary level, judges expect a substantially more mature research and development process. Teams should demonstrate stronger knowledge of the relevant State of the Art, make reasoned technical or scientific decisions, and use structured testing and data analysis appropriate to the project.

Important performance claims should be supported through credible validation. Teams should be able to discuss trade-offs, limitations, feasibility and impact with increasing analytical depth and should demonstrate a clear connection between evidence and conclusions.

During Q&A, team members are expected to defend their choices and results with a level of technical or scientific understanding consistent with advanced secondary education.

14.5 EUREKA UNIVERSITY

University-level projects are expected to demonstrate advanced competence appropriate to higher education. Judges expect robust methodology, measurable evidence, mature implementation or proof of concept, and structured validation appropriate to the field.

Teams should demonstrate strong command of relevant existing work, justify methodological and technical choices, analyze results critically, recognize uncertainty and limitations, and distinguish clearly between demonstrated performance and future potential.

Where relevant, feasibility, scalability, reproducibility, practical constraints and a realistic development path should be considered. Not every University project must be commercially deployable or technically complete, but claims should reflect the higher level of evidence, rigor and understanding expected at this division.

The University division remains an innovation competition rather than a requirement for publishable academic research or a startup-ready product. Advanced complexity is not rewarded for its own sake.

14.6 What Changes - and What Does Not

Across divisions, the criteria themselves do not change. Innovation remains innovation; evidence remains evidence; ownership remains ownership. What changes is the sophistication, independence, rigor and depth reasonably expected in demonstrating those qualities.

Judges should therefore avoid two opposite errors: holding younger teams to standards designed for university research, or awarding high scores to older teams for work that demonstrates only elementary understanding relative to their division.

Resources also do not define expectation level. A younger team with access to an advanced laboratory is still judged at its educational division, while a University team with modest resources is not penalized merely for lacking expensive equipment. The evaluation focuses on what the team achieved, understood and demonstrated with the resources available.

14.7 Detailed Division Expectations

Criterion-level expectations and performance descriptors for each educational division are provided in the Official EUREKA Judging Rubric.

The detailed matrix is intended to help teams understand the expected level of evidence and maturity and to help judges apply the common rubric consistently across divisions. It does not create separate competitions with different evaluation philosophies.

Dimension	Points	Weight
Innovation & Originality	100	25%
Technical / Scientific Excellence & Validation	100	25%
Impact, Relevance & Applicability	80	20%
Team Ownership, Development Process & Understanding	80	20%
Presentation & Q&A	40	10%
TOTAL	400	100%

15. Fairness & Competition Integrity

15.1 Equal and Consistent Treatment

EUREKA is committed to fair and consistent evaluation regardless of a team's country, school, university, institution, economic background or access to resources. Projects are judged according to the published rules, evaluation dimensions and division-appropriate expectations.

Fairness does not require every project to use the same tools, budget, methodology or type of evidence. It requires judges to evaluate what is relevant to each project without creating advantages from factors that are not part of the published criteria.

15.2 Resource Neutrality

Expensive equipment, advanced laboratories, professional fabrication, substantial funding or professional presentation resources do not constitute scoring advantages by themselves.

Teams may use such resources where legitimately available, but judges evaluate the innovation, evidence, development, understanding and team contribution demonstrated through the project. A well-understood project developed with modest resources may therefore outperform a technically expensive project with weak evidence or limited team ownership.

15.3 Plagiarism

Presenting another person's substantive idea, code, design, research, text, results or contribution as the team's own is a serious Competition Integrity violation.

Using existing knowledge, open-source software, libraries, datasets, components, published methods or other third-party resources is not plagiarism when their role is appropriately acknowledged and the team does not misrepresent them as its own original contribution.

15.4 Fabrication and Falsification

Teams must not invent, alter or selectively misrepresent results, measurements, tests, sources, observations or other evidence in order to make a project appear more successful than it was.

Negative results and failed tests are legitimate parts of development. Fabricating a successful result is fundamentally different from presenting an unsuccessful experiment honestly and explaining what was learned.

15.5 Misrepresentation

Materially false statements about team contribution, external assistance, AI use, testing, project performance, originality, provenance or other information relevant to evaluation may constitute a Competition Integrity violation.

The seriousness of a misrepresentation depends on its nature, intent where relevant, and effect on ownership, eligibility or evaluation.

15.6 Integrity Violations vs. Low Scores

A weak, incomplete or unsuccessful project is normally an evaluation matter and should receive the score supported by its quality and evidence. It is not automatically an integrity violation.

Plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, serious misrepresentation or a substantive ownership violation are different: they concern the integrity of the competition itself and may activate the sanction procedures in Chapter 18.

16. Safety, Ethics & Responsible Innovation

16.1 Relevance-Based Application

Safety, ethics, privacy, sustainability, accessibility, misuse and legal or regulatory considerations apply where they are materially relevant to the project. They are not automatically universal scoring criteria for every EUREKA entry.

Teams should identify the issues that genuinely arise from their own project rather than adding generic ethical or sustainability statements with no meaningful connection to the work.

16.2 Safety

Projects should address the safety risks reasonably associated with their design, materials, operation and demonstration. Depending on the project, these may include mechanical, electrical, thermal, chemical, biological or other hazards.

Teams should use appropriate precautions, protective measures and operating procedures and should be able to explain important safety decisions when relevant.

16.3 Human Participants and Privacy

Projects involving people, personal information, user testing or other human-participant activities should use appropriate consent, privacy and data-protection practices.

Teams should collect only information reasonably needed for the project and should avoid exposing personal or sensitive information unnecessarily in submissions, presentations or public demonstrations.

16.4 Cybersecurity and AI Ethics

Cybersecurity, data security and AI-related ethical considerations should be addressed when materially relevant to connected, autonomous, data-driven or AI-based systems.

The expected depth depends on the project and educational division. Teams are not required to perform irrelevant cybersecurity or AI analysis simply because software or electronics are present.

16.5 Sustainability and Accessibility

Sustainability and accessibility should be evaluated when they form part of the project's purpose, design requirements or claims. If a team claims that a project is environmentally beneficial, accessible or inclusive, the claim should be supported appropriately.

Projects are not required to manufacture artificial sustainability or accessibility claims merely to satisfy a checklist.

16.6 Misuse and Legal Compliance

Teams should recognize serious and reasonably foreseeable misuse or harm associated with their work and should comply with applicable legal and regulatory requirements.

Participation in EUREKA does not authorize an activity that would otherwise be prohibited by law, institutional rules, venue requirements or applicable safety regulations.

16.7 Organizer Authority

The Organizing Committee may restrict, modify or prohibit an unsafe demonstration or activity. Such a decision is primarily a safety and event-management measure and does not automatically constitute a judgment on the project's scientific, technical or innovative merit.

Where possible, teams may present safe alternative evidence in accordance with Chapter 11.

17. Awards & Ranking

17.1 Independent Ranking by Division

Each educational division has an independent ranking. Teams compete for placement within their own division and are evaluated using the common EUREKA rubric at the expectation level applicable to that division.

17.2 Main Awards

Three projects are awarded in each educational division:

- First Place
- Second Place
- Third Place

There is no single overall Grand EUREKA Prize combining all educational divisions.

17.3 Special and Technology Awards

The Organizing Committee may establish additional special, thematic or technology-related awards for a competition season.

Such awards and any applicable conditions are announced through the organizer's official channels. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, they do not replace the main divisional ranking.

17.4 Final Ranking

Final ranking is based on the final competition score after completion of any applicable normalization and Competition Integrity decisions.

Exact ties are resolved according to the tie-breaking rule in §13.10.

17.5 Publication of Results

Official results are published by the Organizing Committee through the official competition channels. Informal calculations, preliminary information or unofficial announcements do not replace the published results.

18. Violations, Sanctions & Score Clarification

18.1 Principle of Proportionality

Sanctions should be proportionate to the nature and significance of the violation. In cases involving undeclared assistance or contribution, an important consideration is how much the undisclosed work contributed to the final project and how materially it affected ownership, eligibility or evaluation.

Minor practical assistance is not treated in the same way as substantial undeclared intellectual, scientific, technical or development contribution.

18.2 Possible Responses and Sanctions

Depending on the circumstances, possible responses may include clarification, a formal warning, a score adjustment, exclusion of a particular claim or item of evidence from consideration, exclusion from ranking or awards, or disqualification from the competition.

Not every irregularity requires the same response. The Organizing Committee considers the available evidence and the effect of the issue on the competition.

18.3 Undeclared Assistance

Significant assistance from Coaches, Mentors, experts, external contributors or AI must be disclosed in accordance with the applicable rules before it is independently discovered during judging or review.

Disclosure does not automatically create a penalty. Its purpose is to allow judges to understand what the team itself contributed and to evaluate ownership fairly.

18.4 Plagiarism, Fabrication and Falsification

Serious plagiarism, fabricated or falsified evidence, or presenting another person’s substantive innovation or contribution as the team’s own may justify direct disqualification where the seriousness of the conduct warrants it.

18.5 Ownership Violations

If it is established that the team does not own or understand a substantive part of the contribution it presents as its own, the matter may result in a major sanction, including disqualification.

The use of legitimate third-party components or assistance is not itself an ownership violation. The relevant issues are attribution, disclosure, actual team contribution and the team’s understanding of the resulting work.

18.6 Investigation and Team Response

When an integrity concern arises, the Organizing Committee may examine relevant submissions, declarations, references, Journey Log material, project evidence and judge observations.

Before a serious sanction is imposed, the team should normally be given a reasonable opportunity to explain the relevant facts and provide available supporting information, unless exceptional circumstances make this impracticable.

18.7 Finality of Judging Decisions

The technical and scoring judgment of the judges is final for competition-ranking purposes. A team may not appeal a judge's evaluation simply because it believes a criterion should have received a higher score.

This finality protects the competition from retrospective re-judging while preserving the separate educational clarification process described below.

18.8 Educational Score Clarification

A team may request an educational clarification meeting concerning a specific scoring criterion. The request should identify the criterion and may identify evidence or material that the team believes was not understood or was evaluated differently from its expectation.

The purpose of the meeting is educational: to help the team understand the evaluation and improve future work. It is not a competitive appeal, does not constitute a new judging session and does not change the official score, ranking or awards.

18.9 Review of Serious Sanctions

A serious sanction or disqualification may be subject to a separate review of the relevant facts and application of the Competition Integrity rules.

Such a review is distinct from an appeal against the technical judgment or scoring opinion of the judges. Its purpose is to determine whether the factual basis and applicable rule support the sanction.

19. Intellectual Property, Publication & Media

19.1 Project and Intellectual Property Ownership

Participation in EUREKA does not transfer ownership of the team's project, idea, innovation or intellectual property to the Organizing Committee.

Teams remain responsible for understanding and managing the ownership of material created by team members and any rights associated with third-party contributions, institutional work or collaborative development.

19.2 Public Disclosure and Potentially Protectable Work

EUREKA is a public competition environment. Presentations, demonstrations, booths, submitted media and event coverage may disclose information about a project.

Teams that believe their work may require patent, commercial or other intellectual-property protection are responsible for obtaining appropriate advice and taking any desired protective steps before public disclosure. The competition does not provide individual legal or patent advice.

19.3 Confidential and Third-Party Material

Teams should not submit or publicly present confidential information or third-party material unless they have the right to do so.

Teams are responsible for appropriate attribution and for complying with relevant permissions, licenses or usage conditions for third-party content, software, data, images, designs and other materials.

19.4 Event Photography and Video

Photos and videos may be recorded during the competition and may be used by the Organizing Committee to inform the public about, document and promote EUREKA and MRC through appropriate media, subject to applicable consent and privacy requirements.

19.5 Team-Submitted Media

Project videos and other media voluntarily submitted as part of the competition may be used by the Organizing Committee for competition communication and promotional purposes.

Such use does not transfer ownership of the underlying project or innovation to the organizer.

20. After the Competition

20.1 Official Results

Official rankings and awards are published through the competition's official channels after completion of the judging and any necessary administrative procedures.

20.2 Feedback and Learning

Feedback provided by judges or the Organizing Committee is intended to support learning and future development. It does not constitute a new evaluation or reopening of the competition results.

Teams are encouraged to use feedback together with their own evidence, limitations and development plans when deciding how to continue a project.

20.3 Score Clarification

Where a team seeks additional understanding of a specific criterion, the educational Score Clarification process described in §18.8 may be used. Its purpose remains educational and it does not alter the official competition outcome.

20.4 Certificates and Recognition

Certificates and other forms of official recognition are provided according to the arrangements announced for each competition season.

Mentors may be acknowledged by teams but do not automatically receive an official competition award or certificate solely because they are listed as Mentors.

20.5 Media and Continued Project Development

The media and publication provisions of Chapter 19 continue to apply after the event.

Teams remain free to continue developing, researching, publishing or otherwise advancing their projects after EUREKA, subject to any rights, obligations or agreements that apply independently of the competition.

21. Appendices & Companion Documents

21.1 Participant-Facing Companion Documents

The Rulebook is supported by additional participant-facing documents and templates where appropriate. These may include:

- Official EUREKA Judging Rubric and 400-Point Score Summary
- Performance-Level Descriptors
- Division Expectation Matrix

Companion documents support implementation of the Rulebook. They do not override it unless an officially published update explicitly states otherwise.

22. Core Principles - Quick Reference

22.1 Core Principles

The following statements summarize the central philosophy of EUREKA. They are a quick reference and should be read together with the complete Rulebook:

- OPEN PROBLEM - OPEN SOLUTION
- THE INNOVATION MUST BE EVALUATABLE
- CLAIMS REQUIRE EVIDENCE
- COMPLEXITY ≠ QUALITY
- IMPACT IS CONTEXTUAL
- THE TEAM MUST BE ABLE TO EXPLAIN, DEFEND AND REPRODUCE ITS OWN WORK
- SAME RUBRIC - DIFFERENT EXPECTATION LEVEL
- AI IS ALLOWED WITH TRANSPARENCY AND VERIFICATION
- RESOURCES DO NOT EQUAL QUALITY
- INTEGRITY VIOLATIONS ARE NOT THE SAME AS LOW SCORES

If a short principle appears to conflict with a detailed rule, the complete provision in the relevant chapter governs.