

Student teams are ranked, based on the project points they score (0-10), according to the criteria described below:

CRITERIA	POINTS MULTIPLIER	APP. VALUE	INSTRUCTIONS TO FILL
Compliance with the top-level requirements of the mission: penalties if not compliant	N/A		If the mission is not compliant with any of the high-level mission requirements, the following penalties apply: - Satellite not capable of guaranteeing the correct conditions (temperature, mechanical stress, etc...) to the living payload: -2 points - No mean preventing living organic matter to escape the nanosatellite : -2pts - Overall duration of the mission (until end of life) lower than 2 weeks: -1 point - Total satellite volume above 8 U: -1 point - Satellite not capable of guaranteeing the correct attitude during the mission: -1 point - Satellite not capable of communicating with the ground stations: -2 points - Ground segment not based on ESA network or using non-specified bands: -1 point
Project consistency and physical soundness	0,25	10	Give points according to the criteria below: 0-3: The project is not consistent at all nor shows any 'state-of-art' comparison study 3-6: The project shows some consistency and a light 'state-of-art' comparison study 6-9: The project is consistent with discrete physical soundness. A clear 'state-of-art' comparison study is shown. 9-10: The project appears to be extremely sound, consistent, with a complete 'state-of-art' comparison study
Risk analysis	0,05	10	Give points according to the criteria below: 0-3: No risk analysis has been carried out 3-6: The project includes a minimal risk analysis 6-9: The project presents a moderately detailed risk analysis 9-10: The project shows a detailed risk analysis
Mission performance	0,1	10	Give points according to the criteria below: 0-5: The mission performance is worse than the minimal defined by the top-level requirements 5: The mission performance is barely minimal (e.g. it features 2 weeks duration, 8U satellite volume, transmission of 50% of the total produced science data, etc...) 5-10: The mission performance is better than the minimal one defined above (mission duration longer than 2 weeks up to 3 months, satellite volume lower than 8 Us, transmission of more than 50% of total produced science data, etc...)
Solution innovativeness	0,1	10	Give points according to the criteria below: 0-3: The project presents no innovations and is a copy-paste of another existing design 3-6: The project shows some minor innovation in at least one subsystem 6-9: The project shows a major innovation in at least one subsystem, or minor innovations in several subsystems 9-10: The project design is highly innovative in several subsystems
Document quality	0,2	10	Give points according to the criteria below: 0-3: Poor or non-existent sectioning or format; frequent copycats, poor understanding of the report 3-6: Moderate quality and sectioning, but still lacks a clear structure, format. The writing quality is mild and a few copycats are present 6-9: Great structure, format, and writing, including cross-references, no copycats, etc. 10: A prime example of document quality (no copycats)
Presentation quality	0,15	10	The oral presentation must be a video summary of the written PDR, but in a more illustrative and summarized way. The maximum duration is 15 minutes and must include the following contents: presentation of the team roles, of the overall mission and of the different nanosatellite subsystems designs. Give points according to the criteria below: 0-3: Poor presentation of the team roles and of the nanosatellite design/mission, with inappropriate language 3-6: Moderate quality of the presentation of both team roles and nanosatellite design/mission (appropriate language, sufficient presentation of the team roles, no clear overall view of the design) 6-9: Great presentation providing a clear overall view of the nanosatellite design/mission and of the team roles (within 15 minutes) 10: A prime example of presentation quality (outstanding presentation of the team roles and of the nanosatellite design/mission, within 15 min, with no video acceleration)
Team management, communication and organization	0,075	10	Give points according to the criteria below: 0-3: The tasks of the different team members have not been defined at all, the overall logic of the development is mysterious, and communication between team members or with the supervisor has been inexistent 3-6: The tasks of the different team members have been defined and the work split between the members, although it lacks a clear definition of the development logic. The communication between team members or with the supervisor has been poor 6-9: The tasks of the different team members have been clearly defined and a clear development logic can be appreciated. Communication between team members and with the supervisor has been appropriate 10: The work shows an outstanding logic in both the tasks assignment and the development plan, with a good communication both among team members and with the supervisor
Correct usage of NANOSTAR resources, tools, and methodology	0,075	10	Give points according to the criteria below: 0-3: No usage of NANOSTAR resources, tools and methodology 3-6: Limited use of some of the resources, tools and methodologies 6-9: Relevant use of NANOSTAR resources, tools and methodologies 10: Use of all possible NANOSTAR resources, tools and methodologies
Multidisciplinarity, gender balance, inter-institutionality and use of Nanostar communication tool	N/A	0,9	Sum bonus points based on the following team characteristics criteria: +0.2 to total project points, if the team is multidisciplinary +0.2 to total project points, if both genders are represented +0.2 to total project points, for inter-institutional teams +0.3 to total project points, if an active and responsible use of Nanostar collaborative tool for communication (fostering cooperation and discussion, and participation to organized videoconferences) has been recorded

TOTAL GRADE

10,90