AI Entrepreneurship Contest

AIEC Handbook

January 27, 2026

Organized by

Outstanding Teenager Leadership Foundation (OTLF)

Contact: yef@otlf.ca

Contents

Chapter 1

Contest Overview

1.1 Organizational Structures

Organizer: Outstanding Teenager Leadership Foundation (OTLF)

Award Sponsors: Scotia Wealth Management

1.2 Contest Positioning

The AI Entrepreneurship Contest centers on a **3I framework** (Intelligence, Innovation, Impact) to guide middle and high school students in developing comprehensive competencies that balance scientific literacy, business acumen, and social responsibility in the AI era.

1.2.1 Intelligence: AI Technology Understanding and Technical Literacy

This contest emphasizes that youth should possess a foundational understanding of AI's underlying logic, model principles, data sources, and privacy protection, including:

- Properly recognizing and utilizing mainstream AI technologies (such as machine learning, generative AI, and intelligent interaction systems).
- The ability to apply AI to real-world problem scenarios.
- Evaluating technological feasibility, data risks, and model limitations.

Cultivating scientific spirit, technical judgment, and interdisciplinary understanding through contest.

1.2.2 Innovation: Business Insight, Design Thinking, and Entrepreneurial Practice

This contest focuses not only on technology itself but also emphasizes:

- Identifying customer needs and genuine market pain points
- Building clear business models, value propositions, and long-term viability
- Practicing product prototyping, hypothesis validation, and competitive landscape analysis

Students will experience the complete business innovation process through team collaboration, from ideation and research to business planning and pitch presentations, cultivating core competencies for future entrepreneurship and management.

1.2.3 Impact: Social Ethics, Fairness, and Sustainable Responsibility

As a contest with a public welfare mission, AIEC emphasizes that all AI business innovations must balance social benefits, including:

- Data privacy and fairness principles
- Model bias risk identification and prevention
- Environmental sustainability and social impact assessment
- Potential contributions to vulnerable groups, educational equity, or public services

By emphasizing AI Responsibility, Ethical AI, and ESG thinking, it cultivates students' sense of social responsibility and value judgment.

1.2.4 Comprehensive Positioning Summary

This contest aims to cultivate future young leaders equipped with AI technological understanding (Intelligence), business innovation capabilities (Innovation), and social impact awareness (Impact). Through interdisciplinary practice, participants will explore how AI serves as a core driver for advancing both social progress and commercial value, becoming the next generation of talent possessing scientific literacy, entrepreneurial potential, and civic responsibility.

1.3 Target Participants

This contest targets middle and secondary school students with potential for interdisciplinary learning, interest in AI applications and business innovation, and a desire to explore product development and entrepreneurial practice in real-world contexts. Participating teams typically possess the following capability characteristics (may meet some or all):

1.3.1 Intelligence Competency: Technical Understanding and Digital Literacy

Suitable for students with the following characteristics:

- Interest in AI technology, product logic, or data analysis
- Possess foundational skills in Python, JavaScript, machine learning, data processing, or front-end development (not mandatory)
- Ability to comprehend model principles, tool limitations, and privacy protection
- Ability to match technology with practical applications rather than pursuing conceptualization alone

Typical roles include: Technical Lead (AI Engineer/Tech Lead), Data Analyst, Algorithm Research Assistant (ML Explorer)

1.3.2 Innovation Competency: Business Insight and Market Analysis

Suitable for students with the following inclinations:

- Curiosity about business models, market structures, and user needs

- Proficiency in conducting interviews, user research, questionnaire design, and pain point analysis
- Ability to extract business value from data, trends, and competitive analysis
- Possess logical thinking skills in product planning, value propositions, and revenue models

Typical roles include: Business Strategist, Student Product Manager, Market Analyst

1.3.3 Impact Competency: Social Responsibility and Ethical Awareness

Suitable for students with the following traits:

- Concerned with social issues (e.g., educational equity, healthy aging, environmental sustainability, services for vulnerable populations)
- Sensitivity to identifying potential risks in AI (bias, fairness, privacy)
- Ability to integrate ethical principles into technology and business decisions
- Skilled at evaluating AI applications' impact from ESG or social value perspectives

Typical roles include: Ethical AI Lead, Impact Researcher

1.3.4 Collaboration Competency: Team Communication and Cross-Domain

Suitable for students with the following tendencies:

- Willing to listen, facilitate, and synthesize diverse perspectives during team discussions
- Skilled in meeting organization, document management, and project progress coordination
- Possesses an open learning attitude and willingness to collaborate across disciplines (e.g., technology $\times$ business $\times$ design)
- Capable of English communication, public speaking, or pitch presentations

Typical roles include: Team Leader, Operations Manager, Pitch & Communication Lead

1.3.5 Design Competency: Creative Expression and Design Skills

Suitable for students with the following interests:

- UI/UX design, prototyping, user experience development
- Visual communication, brand design, product interface art
- Proficiency in tools such as Figma, Canva, Adobe, and Notion
- Ability to translate abstract AI concepts into visual product experiences

Typical roles include: Product Designer, UI/UX Designer, Visual Designer, Creative Designer

1.3.6 Comprehensive Competency: Summary of Suitable Student Profiles

Participants typically possess one or more of the following traits:

- Enthusiastic about technology but not limited to it; eager to explore "how AI is transforming industries"
- Love business but don't want to just write proposals—want to do real product validation
- Focus on social issues and be willing to propose solutions
- Skilled in teamwork, communication, or pitching
- Have an entrepreneurial spirit and want to experience the journey from idea to product

This contest welcomes:

- Technical students
- Business-oriented students
- Innovative design students
- Social research students
- Students with comprehensive management skills

Regardless of individual strengths, teams that form a complementary structure of "Technology × Business × Social Value" meet the core requirements of this contest.

1.3.7 School-Level Suitability

This contest is highly suitable for:

- STEM/AI Specialized Programs (AP CSP / APCSA / ICS / AI Club)
- Business contest courses (DECA, JA, Business SHSM)
- Innovation and research projects (Capstone, Inquiry-Based Learning)
- Community service and social issue research projects

The goal is to integrate with the school's academic framework, supporting students in extending their learning outcomes to real-world AI innovation practices.

1.4 Contest Features

The AI Entrepreneurship Contest builds a youth AI innovation contest system with international vision and educational depth, guided by principles of fairness, academic rigor, and social responsibility. Its features include:

1.4.1 Three-Dimensional Integration of Technology × Business × Social Responsibility

Centered on the 3I framework of Intelligence (AI Technology Understanding) + Innovation (Business Innovation) + Impact (Social Impact), the contest drives students' comprehensive development across technological comprehension, business logic, and social value, delivering a truly interdisciplinary educational experience.

1.4.2 Dual Education Pathways: AI Technical Literacy + Business Thinking Training

The contest process emphasizes not only technical skills but also:

- Market Analysis & Demand Insight
- Business model design and financial logic
- Team Collaboration and Project Management
- AI Application Feasibility

Enabling students to experience the complete entrepreneurial journey from "idea → product → business → social value."

1.4.3 Multi-stage, Transparent Evaluation System

The contest features a rigorous three-stage evaluation mechanism:

- **Preliminary Round:** Blind review of materials, and originality check
- **Semi-finals:** Online pitch presentation and logical reasoning assessment
- **Final Round:** In-person presentations, poster evaluations, and investment pitch

The entire process employs mechanisms such as blind evaluation, conflict-of-interest avoidance, outlier score exclusion, and public feedback disclosure to ensure fairness, impartiality, and verifiability.

1.4.4 Emphasis on Ethical AI and Responsibility

The contest incorporates modules for Ethical AI Statement, fairness and bias detection, and data compliance checks. All submissions must balance social responsibility alongside technical and commercial value:

- Privacy Protection
- Fairness and Bias Prevention
- Sustainability Assessment

Establishing responsible AI innovation standards.

1.4.5 Academic & Industry Mentor Support

The evaluation team consists of:

- Scholars and professors (AI, business, data science)
- Engineers and entrepreneurs from technology companies
- Advisors from investment institutions

who collectively provide students with expert feedback, industry insights, and practical business guidance.

1.4.6 Emphasis on Prototype Development and Real-World Validation

The contest requires students to submit:

- Project Proposal
- Product Prototype / MVP
- Market Research and User Validation Data
- AI Technology Specifications and Application Logic

Emphasizing a product philosophy that is "testable, verifiable, and iterable," rather than remaining solely at the conceptual level.

1.4.7 International Perspective and Cross-Cultural Exchange Platform

OTLF will promote outstanding projects to:

- OTLF 2027 Youth Entrepreneurship Forum

Providing students with cross-regional and cross-cultural external exhibition and collaboration opportunities to broaden their global perspective.

Chapter 2

Eligibility and Registration

2.1 Eligible Participants

Middle and secondary school students aged 11–18 (including IB, AP, A-Level, OSSD, domestic high school systems, etc.)

2.2 Registration Requirements

To ensure teams possess foundational readiness in technical understanding, innovative thinking, and social responsibility, while maintaining contest fairness and educational value, registrations must meet the following requirements:

2.2.1 Team Composition

Team Size: 5–8 students

Each team must include:

- 1 Team Leader
- At least 1 Technical Role (AI/Data/Development)
- At least 1 Business Role (marketing/research/finance)
- At least 1 Social Responsibility Role (Ethics/ESG/Community Research)

This aligns with the 3I competency framework to prevent teams from being overly technical or overly business-focused.

2.2.2 Project Abstract / Proposal

Within 500 English words, ensure the team has preliminary thinking on AI application and business logic, rather than a hollow proposition. Clearly present the following key points:

- Real-world problem or societal pain point (Impact)
- Proposed AI technology or tools (Intelligence)
- Preliminary product concept or business value (Innovation)

2.2.3 Team Role Statement

Each member must submit their anticipated responsibilities, including but not limited to:

- Technology and Model Development
- Design and Product Prototyping
- Market Research and Business Model
- Data Analysis
- Social Impact Assessment / Ethical Risk Analysis

2.2.4 Mentor Declaration

To ensure the authenticity and fairness of the contest, the boundaries of mentor involvement are clearly defined. Mentors declare that they shall:

- Not write content on behalf of students
- Provide only directional guidance
- Ensure the originality of the work

2.2.5 Integrity & Originality Form

To uphold academic integrity and Ethical AI principles, teams must guarantee:

- All content is original or legally authorized
- Content generated by AI tools must be labeled with the tool name and usage method
- All data sources are legitimate, publicly available, and compliant

2.2.6 Prototype Sketch (Optional)

Provide conceptual visualizations to help reviewers understand feasibility in advance. Formats may include flowcharts, UI sketches, model architecture diagrams, or 30-second demo videos.

2.2.7 Preliminary Market Research or User Interview Records (Optional)

May include surveys, interview excerpts, or secondary data analysis to demonstrate preliminary validation of Innovation and Impact.

2.2.8 Ethical AI Snapshot (Optional)

Briefly describe:

- Does the data used exhibit bias?
- How privacy concerns are addressed
- Potential impacts on vulnerable groups

Foster a sense of responsibility and lay the groundwork for the Ethical AI Statement to be submitted for the finals.

2.3 Key Timeline

Phase	Date	Task
Registration Opens	January 2026 – April 3rd, 2026 (5:30PM EST)	• Online registration and submission system opens • Deadline for project abstract/proposal submissions
Preliminary Review	April 10th, 2026	• Deadline for all material submissions • Blind review and originality verification • Announcement of semifinalists
Second Round Defense	May 9th & 10th, 2026	• 5–10 minute online presentation • Q&A with judges • Logical expression assessment • Announcement of finalists
Final Round and Awards	June 13th, 2026	• AI Showcase (3 hours) • Contest Finals and Awards Ceremony (2 hours) • Networking (1.5 hours)

Chapter 3

Contest Focus and Evaluation Criteria

3.1 Contest Focus

This contest is open to all products, services, or business concepts driven by artificial intelligence that create tangible value. Teams may freely choose their entry point based on their interests, capabilities, and observed societal needs.

To inspire ideas, the following directions are provided for reference:

1. AI-Driven Industry Applications

Students are encouraged to start with "real-world problems" rather than pursuing AI for AI's sake. Address existing industry pain points by leveraging AI to enhance efficiency, user experience, or decision-making quality:

- **Education:** Personalized learning, AI teaching assistants, learning analytics
- **Healthcare:** Health monitoring, diagnostic assistance, mental health support
- **Urban:** Smart transportation, public safety, community services
- **Retail:** Recommendation systems, inventory forecasting, intelligent customer service
- **Finance:** Intelligent risk assessment, expense analysis, automated wealth management
- **Manufacturing:** Smart quality inspection, process optimization, predictive maintenance

2. AI-Powered Personal and Enterprise Productivity Tools

Tools designed for personal learning, organizational management, or creative activities:

- AI Knowledge Organization/Note-Taking Assistant
- Team Collaboration or Project Management Copilot
- Professional assistants (legal documents, contract drafts, data analysis)
- Automated content generation (scripts, emails, reports)

Such projects can focus on "small yet precise" pain points, offering higher feasibility.

3. AI and Consumer Experience Innovation

Focus on new lifestyles or novel entertainment models:

- Smart fitness, dietary planning, sleep analysis

- AI-driven social experiences, interest matching, learning companionship
- Gaming, 3D content, virtual avatars, and intelligent interactions
- Generative AI in creative industries (art, music, design)

Creative expression, interface design, and user experience are key evaluation criteria.

4. AI × Social Good and Sustainability (AI for Good / ESG)

Emphasis on social responsibility, educational equity, and support for vulnerable groups:

- Assistive tools for aging societies
- Environmental monitoring, waste identification, energy management
- Bias detection and fairness assessment tools
- Community care or public service optimization

5. Cross-disciplinary Integration and Emerging Scenarios

Suitable for teams with innovative vision:

- AI × Biotechnology (Health Behavior Prediction, Dietary Recognition)
- AI × AR/VR (Immersive learning or commercial scenarios)
- AI × Financial Innovation (Intelligent insights leveraging open data)
- AI × Hardware (Smart Terminals, IoT Assistive Devices)

6. Open Category

Free innovation directions not fitting any existing classification. A project is considered valid if it meets any one of the following criteria:

- AI capabilities form the core value of the product
- The project demonstrates a clear business concept or user value
- The project generates verifiable social impact

3.2 Submission Format

Projects should center on the theme "AI × Business," presenting an innovative product or business concept with practical value, technical feasibility, and social significance. This contest adopts a submission structure comprising three core materials and two supplementary materials.

3.2.1 Business Plan

Format: PDF or PPT ($\leq$ 15 pages)

This document should demonstrate the team's business insights, technical understanding, and the overall logic of their solution. It must include:

- **Problem & Insight:** Authentic pain points, target users, opportunity space

- **AI Logic:** Models/Tools, Core Processes, Data Sources, Privacy Considerations
- **Solution:** Product value proposition, uniqueness, user journey
- **Business Model:** Core value, revenue structure, cost assumptions, sustainability
- **Market Analysis:** Competitors, Differentiation, Market Size
- **Roadmap:** MVP Development Plan, Resource Requirements, Validation Plan

3.2.2 Product Prototype / MVP

Format: Video presentation ($\leq$ 3 minutes) or interactive demo

Content may include:

- Key interfaces (UI/UX) or functional workflows
- How AI is integrated into the product (inference process, data input/output examples)
- Usage scenario demonstration (walkthrough)
- Preliminary implementation code snippets (if applicable)

A complete product is not required, but it must demonstrate foundational functionality that is "verifiable, usable, and presentable."

3.2.3 Pitch Deck

Format: For use in the live finals, 5–10 minutes

Evaluates the team's communication skills, logical organization, and persuasiveness. Must include:

- Core value proposition (Why Now + Why This Team)
- Key validation data (user feedback, experimental results, competitive analysis)
- Key business viability highlights
- Social impact or ethical considerations (Impact / Ethical AI)

3.2.4 AI Technical Note

Format: 1 page or 1 table

Demonstrate technical literacy and ethical AI awareness:

- Models/algorithms used (e.g., GPT series, LLMs, CV models, recommendation systems)
- Training/data sources (public datasets, simulated data, user interviews)
- Data privacy and bias mitigation
- Technical limitations and risks

3.2.5 User Validation and Data Evidence

Format: Interview transcripts, questionnaire summaries, test data ($\leq$ 3 pages)

Demonstrates Innovation (market validation) and Impact (social value):

- User interviews/observations
- Research Data or Trial Feedback
- Key metrics from MVP testing

Material Category	Format	Core Function
Business Plan	PDF/PPT	Demonstrate overall logic and feasibility
Product Prototype / MVP	Video or Demo	Demonstrate technical implementation and product experience
Pitch Deck	PPT	Presentation delivery and persuasiveness
AI Technology Specifications	1 page/table	Demonstrating Technical Depth and AI Ethics
User Validation and Data	$\leq$3 pages	Demonstrate research and validation capabilities

** All submissions must include a brief AI technical specification sheet (covering models/frameworks used, training or data sources, and privacy/ethics statements).*

3.3 Scoring Weighting

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Description
Commercial Viability	30%	Clear market demand, well-defined target customers, reasonable cost-benefit model, manageable risks
Technology Implementation and Innovation (Technology & IP)	22%	Technical feasibility, roadmap clarity, originality, differentiation, and IP potential
User Validation and Data Support (User Validation & Metrics)	22%	Research methodology quality, sample representativeness, user feedback, and key validation metrics
Pitch Presentation and Q&A Performance (Pitch & Q&A)	18%	Presentation structure, narrative logic, communication effectiveness, and on-site response quality
AI Ethics, Compliance, and Social Impact (Ethics & Impact)	8%	AI ethics statement, explainability, compliance awareness, and social impact responsibility

3.4 Scoring Criteria

Refer to "AIEC Scoring Criteria Explanation Sheet.xlsx"

3.5 Judging Principles and Implementation Mechanism

This chapter aims to ensure the judging process is fair, transparent, verifiable, and operational, enabling all judges to execute based on unified standards. All procedures revolve around the 3I framework (Intelligence × Innovation × Impact), supported by the scoring sheet.

3.5.1 Preliminary Round (Online Review) Evaluation Mechanism: Blind Review of Materials

Preliminary Round Evaluation Objectives

- Evaluate the overall conceptual quality and fundamental feasibility of submissions
- Ensure teams meet entry requirements (material completeness, originality, ethical compliance)
- Select teams advancing to the semi-finals

Preliminary Round Review Process

Step 1: System splits team information and implements blind review mechanism

- Hides: Team name, school name, advisor name, student names
- Reviewers see only: Project ID + Submission Content
- System automatically generates review task lists

Step 2: Automated Plagiarism Checking and Compliance Pre-screening

Performed by the system and staff:

1. Check Duplication Rate (Text)
2. Check AI-generated content labeling
3. Verify Image/Video Originality (Spot-check when necessary)
4. Check for non-compliant content (privacy leaks, prohibited data)

Non-compliant submissions are routed directly to the "Manual Review" channel.

Step 3: Judges assign structured scores to materials

Dimension	Preliminary Round Weight	Content
Innovation	40%	Value proposition, uniqueness of concept, and insight into the integration of business and technology
Market & Business Viability	30%	Business logic, resource requirements, and clarity of MVP path

Dimension	Preliminary Round Weight	Content
Social Value Impact	30%	Existence of clear social significance, beneficiaries, and ethical considerations

** Each criterion is scored out of 10 points, with automatic weighting applied by the system.*

Step 4: Judges submit brief comments ($\geq$ 60 words per team)

Comments may include:

- 1 key strength
- 1 area for improvement
- Vague evaluations (e.g., "not bad," "okay," "fine") are not permitted.

Step 5: System automatically removes outliers and calculates total score

- Remove the highest and lowest scores for each team's submission
- Average the remaining scores
- Generate preliminary round ranking list

Step 6: Generate the list of finalists for the second round and publish the results

- Public content: Qualifier ID, Team ID, Score distribution range (judge names not disclosed)
- All entries receive judge feedback (automatically aggregated)

3.5.2 Semi-Final (Online Pitch) Evaluation Mechanism: Presentation and Q&A

Semi-Final Evaluation Objectives

- Assess team presentation skills, data support, and logical rigor
- Evaluate MVP and validation quality
- Determine whether teams possess the maturity to advance to the finals

Semi-Final Process

Step 1: Standardize Online Meeting Settings

- Each session will hold by judges
- Session scheduling automatically randomized by the system
- Host initiates recording

Step 2: Teams Deliver 5-Minute Presentation (Fixed Format)

Presentations must include:

- Problem Statement & Value Proposition
- AI Technology Logic + Product Prototype Demonstration

- Market Validation Data and Business Viability

Step 3: 5-Minute Q&A with Judges

Judges' questions may cover:

- Rationale for AI implementation
- User research and data authenticity
- Whether the business model is self-sustaining
- Risk and ethical considerations
- Appropriateness of team roles and responsibilities

Step 4: Judges independently complete structured scoring sheets

Dimension	**Semifinal Weight**	**Indicator Description**
Business Feasibility	30%	Clear market demand, well-defined business model, and implementable
Technical Feasibility and Innovation	25%	Appropriate AI technology, feasible processes, and well-defined innovation points
User Validation	20%	Authenticity and validity of data, interviews, and testing
Pitch and Presentation	25%	Structure, logic, responsiveness, visual presentation

** Scoring range: 1–10 points, automatically weighted by the system.*

Step 5: Semi-Final Judges Submit Written Feedback

Requirements:

- Each judge provide ≥ 80 words
- Include: Feasibility assessment, Risk warnings, and Suggested improvement directions

Step 6: System Calculates Total Scores and Determines Finalists

- Remove outliers
- Automatically weighted ranking
- Management team reviews borderline entries (± 0.2 points may be subject to discussion)
- Announce finalists and provide semi-final feedback

3.5.3 Final Day Evaluation Mechanism: Poster Presentation, Live Pitch, and Signature Scoring

Final Evaluation Objectives

- Comprehensive assessment of project maturity
- Observe team performance and professionalism during the live event
- Evaluate commercial potential and social impact

Final Day Process

Step 1: Poster Presentation (2 hours)

- Each team prepares one poster display and product demo
- Judges may engage with teams through walk-through discussions
- Judges will conduct at least one in-depth Q&A session per team
- Staff will record interaction times to ensure fairness

Judges may complete the Poster Presentation Observation Form (simplified version) for reference, but it will not be scored.

Step 2: Pitch Presentation (8 minutes) + Q&A (5 minutes)

The pitch presentation must include:

- Pain points and insights
- AI Technology and Product Highlights
- Business Model
- Data Validation
- Social Impact and Ethical Considerations
- Future Roadmap

Q&A: Judges may ask questions freely; the host manages the time.

Step 3: Judges Score Presentations

- Using a standardized scoring sheet (paper or electronic)
- Brief justification for each score ($\geq$ 20 words)
- Staff will collect scores on-site or submit them to the system
- Scores cannot be altered (unless due to obvious operational error documented by the organizing committee)

Step 4: System automatically aggregates scores and applies outlier removal

- Remove each team's highest and lowest total scores
- The weighted average of the remaining scores becomes the final score

- System locks scores, prohibiting manual adjustments

Step 5: Jury votes to confirm awards

- The system displays the rankings
- If a dispute arises within ±0.2 points for an individual team, a brief discussion ($\leq$ 10 minutes) is permitted
- Final awards are primarily based on scoring, with voting as a secondary factor (no skipping levels)

Step 6: Announce results + Provide feedback

- Publish individual category scores for each team (without revealing judges' names)
- Provide written feedback from judges (automatically compiled)
- Offer the "OTLF Feedback Pack" for team download

3.6 Professional Judging Criteria Reference (for judge training)

3.6.1 Comprehensive Evaluation Criteria Overview (A/B/C Grading Model)

Dimension	**A Grade (Excellent)**	**B Grade (Good)**	**C Grade (Needs Improvement)**
Business Viability (30%)	Comprehensive business model with well-validated market demand; clear and reasonable revenue and cost assumptions; significant and sustainable competitive advantages	Basic clarity in business logic; limited validation data; some assumptions require further substantiation	Unclear or unfeasible business model; lack of validation; ambiguous cost/revenue structure
Technical Implementation and Innovation (25%)	AI technology highly aligned with application scenarios; clear technical roadmap; robust data privacy and bias control; significant originality or innovation	Reasonable technology selection but insufficient depth; partial scenario mismatches exist; risk identification is adequate	AI usage is superficial; insufficient technical understanding; lacks feasibility or necessity

Dimension	A Grade (Excellent)	B Grade (Good)	C Grade (Needs Improvement)
User Validation and Data Support (20%)	Authentic and sufficient sample size; scientifically sound validation methods; clearly demonstrates hypothesis testing and data evidence; supports business decisions	Basic validation has been conducted; sample size is limited; insights remain relatively superficial; support for business logic is moderate	Virtually no validation; data is insufficient or unreliable; cannot support key conclusions
Roadshow Performance (25%)	Presentation structure is concise and persuasive; visuals are clear; Q&A performance is professional and fluent; team collaboration is strong	Presentation is complete but lacks appeal; Q&A performance is weak; structure could be optimized	Presentation lacks logical flow; content is disorganized; Q&A responses are weak; delivery is unclear
Social Impact & Ethics	Thoroughly identifies risks such as privacy, fairness, and bias; clearly articulates social value and beneficiary groups; demonstrates quantifiable ESG contributions	Basic ethical statements present; some risks acknowledged; average expression of social value	Lacks ethical awareness; fails to address risks; may negatively impact vulnerable groups

3.6.2 Business Feasibility Detailed Criteria

Scoring Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Needs Improvement)
Problem and Need Validation	Pain points are clearly defined with data support, and target users are precisely defined	Pain points are reasonable but lack data support	Pain points are vague or not genuine issues

Scoring Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Needs Improvement)
Business Model Clarity	Value proposition, revenue structure, and cost structure are complete and feasible	Business model section is clear but lacks key elements	Business logic is invalid or extremely unclear
Market size and competitive analysis	Market analysis is well-documented and demonstrates differentiated advantages	Market analysis is superficial with insufficient differentiation	Incomplete or inaccurate market and competitive analysis
Risk Identification	Comprehensive identification of financial, technical, and user risks	Risk identification is partially adequate	Virtually no risk considerations

3.6.3 Detailed Criteria for Technical Implementation and Innovation (AI Technical Merit)

Scoring Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Needs Improvement)
AI Technology Selection Alignment	Technology selection highly aligned with task requirements	Technology selection is reasonable but not optimal	Inappropriate or unnecessary technology selection
Model or Algorithm Understanding	Clear and reasonable understanding of model logic, data flow, and limitations	Surface-level understanding, without addressing constraints or biases	Lack of understanding of model principles or misuse
Data sources and privacy protection	Data is legally disclosed; privacy and bias controls are robust	Partial data explanation; insufficient privacy discussion	No data explanation or potential privacy infringement
Innovation	Demonstrates clear originality or innovative combinations	Partially innovative	Lacks innovation, primarily imitative

3.6.4 User Validation and Data Support Detailed Criteria

Scoring Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Needs Improvement)
Research Methodology and Sample Quality	Authentic samples, sufficient quantity, scientifically rigorous methodology	Limited sample size; methodologically sound foundation	Insufficient sample size or significant methodological bias
MVP Testing and Feedback	Clear testing process, user feedback, and evidence of iteration	Basic testing exists but lacks depth	No testing or testing is unreliable
Data Analysis Depth	Data insights support business decisions with logical reasoning	Data is presented but analysis is superficial	Data is missing or meaningless

3.6.5 Pitch & Presentation Detailed Criteria

Scoring Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Needs Improvement)
Structure and Logic	Information organization is concise and logical	Generally clear but lacks standout elements	Lacks logical flow or features confusing expression
Visual Presentation	Professional, readable, visually consistent, highlights key points	Visual presentation is average, readability is acceptable	Visually cluttered and difficult to comprehend
Q&A Performance	Accurate and insightful responses with strong team complementarity	Answers are generally complete but lack depth	Inaccurate responses or failure to address questions
Team Collaboration Performance	Clear division of labor, natural and coordinated communication	Average collaboration	Team performance is loose and inconsistent

3.6.6 Social Impact and Ethics (Impact & Ethical AI) Detailed Criteria

Indicator	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Needs Improvement)
Privacy Protection and Data Compliance	Clear data sources and robust privacy processing mechanisms	Partial privacy disclosures	No privacy statements or compliance risks exist
Bias and Fairness	Proactively identify bias risks and propose mitigation measures	Basic identification but lacking solutions	Complete lack of bias awareness
Social value contribution	Beneficiary groups clearly defined with quantifiable impact	Valuable direction but insufficiently specific	Unclear value, potentially negative impact

3.7 Awards

This section defines the official awards of the AI Entrepreneurship Contest. Awards are designed to recognize excellence aligned with the contest's 3I framework (Intelligence × Innovation × Impact), while maintaining transparency, fairness, and educational value.

3.7.1 Overall Excellence Awards

Overall Excellence Awards are determined primarily by the **final round aggregated score** (with outlier removal), and confirmed through the **jury validation mechanism** described in Section 3.7.3. All Overall Excellence Award recipients must meet contest eligibility, integrity, and ethics/compliance requirements.

1. **Scotiabank Award for AI Entrepreneurship Excellence**
2. **Scotiabank Award for Outstanding AI Venture (Runner-Up)**
3. **Scotiabank Award for Emerging AI Venture (Second Runner-Up)**

3.7.2 Special Awards

Special Awards recognize exceptional performance in specific dimensions. Unless otherwise stated, each Special Award is typically granted to one team, and may be awarded in addition to an Overall Excellence Award unless restricted by the jury for conflict-of-interest or fairness considerations.

1. **Scotiabank Award for AI Innovation**
2. **Scotiabank Award for Business Potential**
3. **Scotiabank Award for Social Impact in AI**
4. **Scotiabank Award for User Experience & Design Excellence**
5. **Scotiabank Award for Rising AI Entrepreneurs**

6. **Scotiabank Award for Team Excellence**
7. **Scotiabank Judges' Recognition Award**

Note: OTLF reserves the right to adjust or change the award naming and prizes based on the progress of the event and information regarding team formation, etc.

3.7.3 Award Generation Process (Transparency Mechanism)

Stage	Content
Stage 1: System Score Aggregation	Outlier Removal → Weighted Average → Ranking
Stage 2: Jury Review of Borderline Teams	Discuss teams with ranking gaps $\leq$0.2 points
Phase 3: Comprehensive Award Determination	Scores take precedence, supplemented by votes (no skipping of ranking tiers)
Phase 4: Special Awards Determined	Judges vote, providing quantified rationale for each award
Stage 5: Public Announcement of Results	Team IDs and category scores disclosed (judges' names withheld)
Stage 6: Feedback Provision	Each team receives a Feedback Pack (compilation of judges' comments)

3.7.4 Award Announcement Principles

- **Transparency:** Score ranges and average scores disclosed
- **Privacy Protection:** Judge names and excessive details are not disclosed
- **Auditability:** Scoring sheets are fully documented and may be retrieved for review by the organizing committee
- **Fairness Principle:** All awards must align with the 3I Framework (Intelligence × Innovation × Impact)

3.8 AI Ethics and Sustainability Statement

(Mandatory submission for all teams; key evaluation criterion in finals)

This section ensures all AI innovation projects adhere to **Responsible AI** principles, and integrate ethics, fairness, and sustainability throughout product design and business decision-making.

Teams must submit a **150–200-word** Ethical AI & Sustainability **Statement** and provide necessary explanations during the final pitch.

The statement should be based on the following five core principles:

3.8.1 Core Principles

1. Data Legality & Privacy

Teams must confirm and state:

- All data sources are legal, publicly available, and do not infringe on user privacy
- No unauthorized collection of real personal information; if simulated data is used, it must be clearly labeled
- Necessary privacy protection mechanisms are provided (e.g., anonymization, data masking)

Evaluation Criteria: Judges will verify whether data descriptions are clear, sources are reliable, and privacy leakage risks exist.

2. Model Bias & Fairness

Teams must:

- Identify potential sources of bias (data bias, model bias, user group bias)
- Explain how to mitigate the impact of bias
- Avoid systemic unfairness toward vulnerable groups

Review Criteria: Demonstrating proactive awareness of fairness is a key factor in Impact scoring.

3. Responsible Use of Generative AI (GenAI)

If the project utilizes generative AI (LLMs, image generation, etc.), it must specify:

- Authenticity verification and source attribution for generated content
- Avoid generating misleading, discriminatory, or unethical content
- Acknowledgment of generative model limitations (e.g., hallucinations, misinformation)

Evaluation Criteria: Judges will assess whether the team understands the risks and appropriate boundaries of generative AI.

4. Social Impact and Beneficiaries (Social Impact Assessment)

Teams must clearly define:

- The primary beneficiary groups of the project
- The positive impacts generated (e.g., education, health, environment, efficiency)
- Whether there are potential negative impacts (e.g., technological exclusion, unfairness, or effects on employment structures)

Key Evaluation Criteria: Judges will focus on whether statements are specific and quantifiable, rather than vague descriptions.

5. Environmental Sustainability

Teams must explain:

- Whether the project considers energy consumption, model efficiency, or computational resources
- Whether strategies exist to reduce resource consumption
- Whether it enhances the industry's long-term sustainability (e.g., reducing waste, improving efficiency)

Evaluation Criteria: In-depth analysis is not mandatory, but basic sustainability awareness must be demonstrated.

3.8.2 Statement Structure Template (for student reference)

Teams should address the following five points within 150–200 words:

1. **Data Sources and Privacy Protection**
   - Data Set Origin (Public/Self-built/Simulated)
   - Privacy Protection Measures (Anonymization/Non-collection of Sensitive Personal Information)
2. **Fairness and Bias Risks**
   - Identifying potential biases (gender, age, region, etc.)
   - Mitigation Measures (Balanced Sampling, Manual Verification, Restricting Model Usage)
3. **Generative AI Usage Principles**
   - If used, clearly state purpose, context, and limitations
   - How to Avoid Inaccurate or Misleading Content
4. **Social impact analysis**
   - Clearly define beneficiaries and societal value
   - Consider potential negative impacts
5. **Sustainability and resource utilization**
   - Acknowledge Model Efficiency Issues
   - Attempt to use lightweight models, limit inference iterations, or other resource-reduction methods

3.8.3 Submission & Review Process

Stage	Review Content
Preliminary Round	Verify declaration submission and data source compliance
Semi-Final	Reviewers examine data discrepancies, clarity of privacy statements, and appropriate use of generative AI
Final Round	Presentation boards and pitches must demonstrate compliance, social impact, and sustainability strategies

If significant risks are identified, the organizing committee reserves the right to:

- Require teams to revise their statements
- Deduct partial Impact scores
- Disqualify teams for severe violations (e.g., using illegal data, privacy infringement)

3.8.4 AI Responsibility Badge Assessment Requirements

Teams awarded this badge must demonstrate outstanding performance in the following areas:

- **Data Compliance:** Clear, transparent, and verifiable
- **Bias Identification:** Proactive rather than reactive
- **Privacy-by-Design:** Demonstrates accountability
- **Social Impact:** Positive and free from potential harm
- **Sustainability:** Resource usage is reasonable with improvement strategies

The badge will be printed on the team certificate and displayed alongside the Gold/Silver/Bronze awards.

3.8.5 Example: Standard Compliance Statement

(Example, Do Not Copy Verbatim)

> All data used in this project originates from publicly available datasets and has undergone anonymization, containing no identifiable personal information. We identified potential imbalances in age and regional distribution within the data, implementing balanced sampling strategies during model processing to mitigate bias. Generative AI was exclusively employed for interface copywriting assistance, not critical decision-making, with all generated content undergoing human review. The project aims to enhance learning efficiency for secondary school students, with no unfair impact on vulnerable groups. We selected lightweight models to minimize computational resource consumption and designed the system to reduce unnecessary inference calls, aligning with sustainability principles.

Chapter 4

Evaluation and Fairness Mechanisms

4.1 Phase One: Preliminary Round (Registration + Document Review)

Objective: Initial screening and eligibility verification

4.1.1 Process

- Schools/teams register online and submit a complete application form (including project summary, advisor statement, integrity pledge)
- Review criteria include: originality declaration, ethical review, and compliance with theme and age requirements
- Judging criteria published (with dimension explanations and examples)

4.1.2 Safeguard Mechanism

- All submissions undergo plagiarism checks and originality verification
- Initial review judges employ blind evaluation (names and institutions concealed)
- Preliminary results and scoring distribution (average score, variance) disclosed

4.2 Phase Two: Semi-finals (Online Defense / Video Presentation)

Objective: Evaluate team communication, logical reasoning, and on-site adaptability

4.2.1 Format

- 5-minute pitch + 5-minute Q&A
- At least 3 judges per session; scoring records preserved throughout

4.2.2 Evaluation Focus

- Clarity of thought and logical expression
- Teamwork and communication skills
- Ability to respond to critical questions

4.3 Phase Three: Finals (In-Person / Exhibition)

Objective: Comprehensive evaluation of presentation skills and social impact

4.3.1 Format

- Panel display + On-site defense + Roadshow (open to the public)
- Judging Panel Composition: 44% university experts, 44% industry representatives, 12% public jury (ensuring diversity)
- On-site announcement of evaluation criteria and scoring sheet format; immediate signature and archiving after itemized scoring

4.3.2 Fair Evaluation System

- Each group's scores are automatically aggregated by the system, with outliers removed and the average calculated
- All sub-scores and review comments disclosed post-event (students may download feedback)

4.3.3 Reward Mechanism

- Gold / Silver / Bronze Awards and Scotiabank Awards

4.4 Mechanism Highlight

1. **AI Ethics and Social Responsibility Assessment Module**
    a. Each project must submit a 150–200-word "AI Ethics Statement" (e.g., privacy, fairness, bias prevention)
2. **Feedback Transparency System**
    a. All shortlisted entries receive written feedback and improvement suggestions from judges
3. **Cross-border exhibition and exchange opportunities**
    a. Gold Award projects will be featured at the "OTLF Youth Entrepreneurship Forum (YEF)"

Chapter 5

Submission Guidelines

Overview: This chapter details the required submission materials, format standards, naming conventions, and the procedures for submitting projects. It also covers deadlines, platform instructions, resubmission policies, and important rules on intellectual property, use of AI tools, citations, data privacy, and ethics. All participants must follow these guidelines to ensure a smooth and fair evaluation process.

5.1 Submission Components and Format

Each team **must prepare a set of deliverables** for the contest submission. The required components (core materials) and any optional supplements are listed below.

At minimum, you must submit: a written project proposal, evidence of your prototype/MVP, and evidence of user/market validation. Ensure these materials collectively address all judging criteria (see Appendix C for scoring sheet). Incomplete submissions or those missing core components may be disqualified or receive point deductions.

All documents must be in English (or include an English translation if necessary):

5.1.1 Project Proposal (Written Report)

- A comprehensive document (5–15 pages maximum, PDF format) detailing your project.
- This report should cover the problem statement, your AI-driven solution, market analysis, business model, competitive analysis, technical approach, and results of any prototyping or user research.
- Include an "AI Ethics Statement" section (∼150–200 words) within the report, where you address how you handled privacy, fairness, bias mitigation, and data compliance in your project.
- All submissions must balance social responsibility alongside technical and commercial value. The written report **must be submitted as a PDF** (12-pt font, reasonable margins) and **written in English**.

5.1.2 Product Prototype or MVP Evidence

- Include evidence of a working prototype or MVP (Minimum Viable Product) to demonstrate technical feasibility. This may be in the form of **screenshots, a short video clip** (e.g. screen recording), and/or **a link to a demo**.

- If submitting a video demo, keep it concise (e.g. 1–3 minutes) and in a common format (MP4 or a YouTube/online link).
- Note: The prototype evidence is a core requirement: a basic demo or visualization of your AI solution's functionality will strengthen your submission.

5.1.3 Market Research and User Validation Data

- Provide any data gathered from surveys, interviews, or user testing that support your business idea.
- Ensure you summarize key findings (e.g. user pain points, feedback, or usage metrics) in the main proposal, with raw data or graphs in the appendix.
- All personal or sensitive data should be anonymized (no real names or identities of respondents).

5.1.4 Pitch Deck (Presentation Slides)

- *Optional but recommended.*
- Prepare a concise pitch deck (e.g. up to 10–15 slides) highlighting your project's key points: problem, solution, AI technology, market opportunity, business model, traction/validation, and team.
- You may submit the slide deck in PDF or PPTX format.

5.1.5 Supplementary Materials

Teams are allowed to include additional supporting materials if relevant:

- Code snippets or a link to a public code repository
- Extra charts or illustrations, or a short video pitch by the team (note: do NOT mention your school's name or identifying info to maintain anonymity)
- Supplementary files should be clearly labeled and referenced in the main report

5.2 Submission Procedure and Deadlines

All submissions will be handled through the official contest online portal. Teams will receive login credentials after registration.

5.2.1 Prepare Final Files

Ensure all required components from Section 6.1 are finalized. Have your report converted to PDF and all media files in the specified formats. Do not include student names, school name, or mentor names in the proposal or slides, as the preliminary review is blind.

5.2.2 Upload to the Portal

Log in to the contest submission portal. There will be designated fields to upload each component. Follow the on-screen instructions and verify that the file is successfully stored.

5.2.3 Complete Required Forms

As part of submission, you must also upload the signed **Integrity Pledge** (Appendix A) for all team members and their guardians, and if you have a mentor, the **Mentor Guidance Statement** (Appendix B) signed by your mentor.

5.2.4 Finalize and Submit

Once all files are uploaded, review each for correctness. When ready, click the "Submit" button. You should see a confirmation message.

5.2.5 Deadlines

The final submission deadline for all materials will be shown on the contest login portal. **No late submissions** will be accepted; the system will automatically cut off at the deadline.

5.2.6 Semifinal/Final Confirmation

After the preliminary judging, semifinalists will be announced on the contest login portal. Keep an eye on your email for these announcements.

Important: All deadlines are firm. Entries submitted after the stated deadline (even by a few minutes) will not be considered.

5.3 File Formats, Naming Conventions, and Language

Accepted File Formats: Written documents must be PDF files. Slide decks should be PDF or PowerPoint. Video demos can be submitted as a URL link (preferred) or as video files (MP4 format recommended).

Language: All submission materials must be in English.

File Naming Conventions: Use the provided Team ID or Team Name in your filenames:

TeamID_DocumentType_ProjectTitle.file

For example: *T7_Proposal_AI4Good.pdf*

Do not include school names or personal names in file names or within the documents.

Document Formatting: Write clearly and succinctly. Use headings, bullet points, tables, or diagrams as needed. The proposal should not exceed 15 pages of core content.

Language Tone: The proposal should be written in a **formal, academic-professional tone**.

5.4 Resubmission and Version Control

You are allowed to update or replace your files up until the submission deadline. **Only the last submitted version** as of the deadline will be evaluated.

Before Deadline: You can re-upload files on the portal. Judges will only see the final files after the deadline passes.

After Deadline: Once the submission deadline has passed, no further changes are allowed.

Multiple Submissions: Each team is only allowed one submission package.

Withdrawal: If a team needs to withdraw, notify the organizers as soon as possible.

5.5 Intellectual Property and Originality of Work

Summary: Be original, honest and transparent about the origins of your work. We value your team's creativity and effort. Borrowing ideas or content without proper credit not only undermines your integrity but can also lead to legal consequences. When in doubt, cite the source or inquire if a specific type of assistance is permitted. Upholding academic and entrepreneurial integrity is a core value of this contest.

5.5.1 Original Work

All submissions must be the **original work of the student team**. Plagiarism in any form is prohibited.

5.5.2 Use of Third-Party IP

If your project leverages existing intellectual property, you **must disclose this** in your report.

Entries must be original and not infringe on any laws, trademarks or copyrights. Judges and staff are bound by confidentiality (they will not disclose your detailed idea beyond contest purposes).

5.5.3 IP Ownership

Participating teams **retain full ownership** of their work and intellectual property. The contest organizers do **not** claim ownership of your ideas or project outputs. The goal of this contest is to encourage and reward student innovation, not to acquire IP rights.

OTLF may use team name, project title, abstract, images and excerpts for promotional and educational purposes, but not full reports or proprietary details without consent.

If your project is very sensitive (e.g., potentially patentable idea), you may mark certain pages or sections as "Confidential" in the submission to indicate you wish them to be kept internal. However, do note that effective judging requires understanding your project, so balance confidentiality with clarity.

5.5.4 Mentor and External Help

Your team's work should primarily be done by the student members. A mentor may provide guidance (see Section 6.6 and Appendix B), but they cannot do the work for you.

Any form of contract work or excessive non-student contribution is against the spirit of the contest. If we discover that key parts of the project were not done by the students, the team will be disqualified. Each team member and a guardian will sign the Integrity Pledge (Appendix A) affirming that the submission is the students' own work. The contest trusts all participants to uphold high ethical standards in this regard.

5.5.5 Intellectual Property Declaration

Within your submission, you should affirm that: "Only team members contributed to this project's deliverables. All content is original or properly credited."

5.6 Use of AI Tools and Citation Requirements

5.6.1 AI Tool Usage

Using generative AI (like ChatGPT, coding assistants, or AI image generators) is **allowed**, but with important **conditions**. If you use generative AI for any part of your work, you **must disclose and cite it**. For example:

- If you asked ChatGPT to help write a portion of your business plan, add a footnote or comment in your report such as "Certain phrasing in this section was aided by ChatGPT on Jan 1st, 2026".
- If you used an AI image generator for your app's UI mockup, mention in your materials "Concept image generated with DALL-E (OpenAI)."
- If an AI coding assistant helped you write a function, include a comment in your code and note it in your tech documentation.

Failing to cite AI assistance is considered plagiarism **just as not citing a human source would be**.

We expect you to detail how AI tools were used in an appendix or the references section of your report. There is no penalty for using AI per se; judges will not deduct points just because you used a tool, as long as you have original input and value-add. In fact, cleverly using AI to improve your work can be a positive – it shows resourcefulness – but only if you are transparent about it. If you use AI for research, cite it as you would any source (though be cautious, as AI outputs can be inaccurate).

5.6.2 Citation Requirements

Throughout your written proposal, cite sources for any non-original facts, figures, or definitions. Use a consistent citation format (for example, APA or MLA style).

We require each team to submit a brief **"AI Usage & References" document or section**. This section should explicitly list:

a Any AI tools used and their intended purpose.

b All external sources referenced, including articles, websites, datasets, and other relevant materials.

This consolidated section ensures compliance with citation requirements and facilitates easy review by judges.

5.6.3 Originality and AI

The judges are evaluating your originality and creativity. The core intellectual work should be yours. **Be transparent and ethical** in your use of AI and sources.

The Integrity Pledge you sign (Appendix A) includes affirmation that all external contributions are acknowledged. Judges may also ask in interviews (semifinals/finals) about how you developed certain things. If an answer reveals uncredited help, it will reflect poorly. Document your work carefully. If you need guidance on proper citation formats or have questions about whether to credit something, reach out to the organizers before submitting.

5.7 Data Privacy and Ethics Compliance

As many AI projects involve data (especially personal or user data) and have social impacts, teams must rigorously ensure compliance with data privacy laws and ethical standards. The contest places a strong emphasis on AI ethics, fairness, and social responsibility. Here are the guidelines to follow:

- **Personal Data and Privacy:** If your project collects or uses personal data, you **must** handle it in accordance with privacy best practices. Obtain informed consent from individuals if you collected data directly.
- **Compliance with Laws:** Adhere to relevant data protection regulations.
- **AI Ethics and Fairness:** Teams must consider ethical implications of their AI solution, including addressing potential **bias in algorithms**.
- **Regulatory and Safety Checks:** If your AI application is in a domain with specific regulations, do at least a basic analysis of any compliance need. We do not expect middle and high school teams to fully comprehend complex regulations, but demonstrating the awareness.
- **Environmental and Social Impact:** Think about your project's broader impact. In your report, you might include a brief section on "Social Impact and Sustainability" describing this. This ties into the contest's 3I framework (Intelligence, Innovation, Impact). Impact being about ethics and social value.
- **Appendix D Checklist:** Before submitting, go through the **AI Ethics & Data Compliance Checklist**.
- **Consequences:** Any serious breach of ethics or privacy can lead to penalties. The contest has a **zero-tolerance policy** for unethical behavior.

Treat ethical considerations as fundamental, not an afterthought.

Chapter 6

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

This chapter addresses common questions that teams and participants might have. If your question is not answered here, feel free to reach out to the organizers (yef@otlf.ca).

Q: Who is eligible to participate in the contest?

A: The contest is open to current middle and high school students who are roughly 11–18 years old, enrolled in grades 6–12 or equivalent programs. This includes students from any school system (public, private, international, IB, AP, A-Levels, OSSD, etc.), and from any country.

Q: How should teams be formed, and can we change team members later?

A: Teams must consist of 5–8 students each. Once your team is registered, you cannot add or change members except under special circumstances.

Q: Can our team have a mentor or adult advisor, and what is their role?

A: Yes, teams are highly encouraged to have a mentor. Mentors are there to support and advise the team, but within clear limits that the work and ideas must remain student driven.

Q: After submitting our project, can we revise or update it later?

A: Before the submission deadline, yes. Once the submission deadline passes, however, your entry is locked for judging and scoring.

Q: Are we allowed to use ChatGPT or other AI tools to help us?

A: You may use AI-based tools in assisting your work, but you must follow the rules on transparency and originality. If you use generative AI for any part of your work, you **must disclose and cite it**.

Q: If we have questions or technical problems, how can we get help?

A: The primary support channel is via email at yef@otlf.ca.

Q: What if we disagree with the judges' scores?

A: Judges' decisions are final and not subject to appeal. The contest employs a rigorous, multi-layered evaluation process to ensure fairness.

Q: Are team members required to attend the semifinal and final events in person?

A: For the Semifinals (online), as many members as of your team can (minimum one). For the Finals (in-person), at least one (preferably all) student representative from the team must be present.

Please inform us of any attendance issues as soon as possible. We will do our best to ensure all teams can compete, but certain elements such as a live pitch are essential to the contest.

Chapter 7

Appendix

- Appendix A: Integrity Pledge (Student/Guardian)
- Appendix B: Mentor Guidance Statement
- Appendix C: Sample Evaluation Scoring Sheet
- Appendix D: AI Ethics and Data Compliance Self-Assessment Checklist

7.1 Appendix A: Integrity Pledge (Student/Guardian)

AIEC Integrity Pledge

By signing below, **we pledge** the following on behalf of our team:

- The project we submit is the result of our own team's effort and ideas. All team members contributed to the work, and no part of the submission was plagiarized or copied without proper credit. We have cited all sources of information, content, or inspiration that are not our original work.
- We will uphold the highest standards of academic integrity and ethics throughout the contest. We will not engage in any form of cheating, dishonesty, or misrepresentation. This includes not falsifying data, not using AI tools or external assistance without disclosure, and not violating any rules intentionally.
- We understand and will follow all contest guidelines as laid out in the Handbook (and any updates provided by the organizers). We accept the judges' decisions as final and commit to respecting the contest outcomes.
- We agree to treat all other contestants, judges, and organizers with respect and professionalism. We will not partake in any harassment, bad sportsmanship, or behavior that would reflect poorly on the contest or our team.
- We verify that we meet the eligibility requirements of the contest (we are bona fide high school students) and that the information provided in our registration is truthful. If requested, we can provide proof of enrollment or age.
- We acknowledge that any violation of these pledges or contest rules may result in consequences, including disqualification of our team and forfeiture of any awards or recognition.

Each student team member and a parent/guardian must sign below. By signing, the student affirms the statements above.

Team Name: _____

Team ID: _____

	Student Name	**Signature**	**Date**
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			

7.2 Appendix B: Mentor Guidance Statement

This form is to be completed by the team's mentor.

AIEC Mentor Guidance Statement

As a mentor for Team _____ [team id], I pledge to adhere to the following principles:

- **Advisory Role Only:** I understand that my role is to **advise, guide, and teach** the students, not to do the project for them. I will not write any portion of the submission, develop code, create designs, or produce deliverables. All decisions and final work will be completed by the students.
- **Student Ownership:** I acknowledge that the project's ideas, execution, and final materials belong to the students. Any suggestions I offer are optional, and I will promote independent, critical thinking.
- **Fairness and Integrity:** I will follow all contest rules and uphold confidentiality. I will not provide any unfair advantage (including sharing non-public contest or judging information). If unclear about permissible support, I will consult the Organizing Committee. I will remind the team to properly **cite and disclose** any external assistance, including mine when applicable.
- **No Involvement during Evaluation:** During official presentations (e.g., semifinals/finals pitches and Q&A), I will not participate, prompt, or communicate in any manner that could be construed as coaching in real time. I will not contact judges or officials to influence evaluation outcomes.
- **Educational Focus:** My goal as a mentor is to support the students' growth and learning. I will prioritize skill development—technical, entrepreneurial, research, and communication—along with teamwork, time management, and resilience.

By signing, I confirm that any **conflict of interest** has been disclosed to the Organizing Committee. I understand that violations of these principles may result in consequences, including team disqualification.

Mentor Name: _____

Affiliation/Organization: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

Relation to Team: Teacher / Coach / Parent / Industry Advisor / Other _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

[0]We sincerely thank you for volunteering your time to mentor the next generation of innovators. Your guidance is invaluable to the students' learning experience.

7.3 Appendix C: Sample Evaluation Scoring Sheet

Below is a simplified preview of the scoring criteria that judges will use to evaluate submissions.

Dimension	Weight	Evaluation Criteria	Weight
Market & Business	30%	1. Market size & Pain point insights	10%
		2. Business model & Revenue path	10%
		3. Scalability & Competitive analysis	10%
Technology & IP	22%	4. Technical feasibility & Clarity of roadmap	8%
		5. Innovation & Differentiation	8%
		6. Technology maturity / MVP demonstration	6%
User Validation & Metrics	22%	7. Research methodology & Sample representativeness	8%
		8. User feedback & Key metric presentation	8%
		9. Hypothesis validation / Business metric forecasting	6%
Pitch & Q&A	18%	10. Presentation structure & Narrative logic	8%
		11. Investment appeal & Visual presentation	6%
		12. Q&A performance & Team collaboration	4%
Ethics & Impact	8%	13. AI ethics statement & Explainability	4%
		14. Social impact & Risk assessment	4%

(Note: This is a summary; the full scoring sheet includes detailed descriptions for each score level.)

7.4 Appendix D: AI Ethics and Data Compliance Self-Assessment Checklist

Teams should use this checklist to self-evaluate their project's adherence to ethical standards and data privacy requirements.

Mark each item once addressed:

- ☐ **AI Ethics Statement Prepared**
- ☐ **Bias Mitigation**
- ☐ **Privacy Protection**
- ☐ **Data Source Legality**
- ☐ **Transparency and Explainability**
- ☐ **Human Oversight**
- ☐ **Potential Misuse Risks**
- ☐ **Environmental Impact**
- ☐ **Compliance with Contest Ethical Guidelines**
- ☐ **Final Ethics Review**

Ethical foresight and data responsibility are as important as technical ingenuity in this contest. We want to foster a generation of entrepreneurs who instinctively integrate ethics into technology development. Use Appendix D as a guide to put those principles into practice.