ENTRY NO: TEAM XX	HOME KIT DESIGN COMPETITION				JUDGING DATE: XX June
JUDGING	**How well has the entry dealt with the following Design issues?**				
	10% - EXCELLENT	8% - GOOD	5% - OK	3% - POOR	0% - WEAK
MATERIALS & SUN: UNDERSTANDING AND MANAGEMENT OF HEAT FLOWS THROUGH THE ENVELOPE USING SOLAR AND THERMAL PROPERTIES OF MATERIALS+ENVELOPE DESIGN	Selection criteria are defined and justified. Candidate materials comparison is comprehensive and convincing. Materials evaluated based on relevant performance indicators. Chosen materials selection and envelope design demonstrate understanding of heat transfer processes and impact on the energy balance of the structure.	Selection criteria defined. Limited but coherent range of materials identified and compared on the basis of relevant physical properties. Impact on envelope design credibly demonstrated.	Selection criteria defined. Some candidate materials identified and compared. Design includes some work on materials performance but is not sufficiently developed. Impact on envelope design considered.	Selection criteria not credibly presented. Performance characterization is not sufficiently complete with regard to materials properties. Impact on envelope design not convincingly justified.	Selection criteria not credibly presented. Relevant performance data not identified for chosen materials. Impact on envelope design not credibly presented.
MATERIAL IMPACTS: HOLISTIC, DESIGN USING HEALTHY, LOW IMPACT + EMBODIED ENERGY MATERIALS, MINIMAL WASTE, BIOREGIONAL SOURCING + CIRCULAR ECONOMY IDEAS	Material selection and design result in a healthy environment with minimal impacts and solution uses local materials that are part of the circular economy. Impacts may be explained in general terms.	Material selection and design result in some impacts that are managed through the integration in the circular economy and or are offset by related benefits.	Fair consideration of impacts; however material selection and design result in avoidable impacts and a holistic approach is not evident.	Minimal or flawed considerations of the impacts of the material design, resourcing and associated waste.	No consideration of material impacts, resourcing and waste associated with the design
MATERIALS - COSTS AFFORDABLE BUILDING MATERIALS	Costs' calculations are very realistic and well presented.	Costs' calculations are relatively realistic and well presented.	Costs are referred.	Costs are not adequately shown.	Costs are not mentioned.
MATERIALS - REPLICABILITY: REPLICABLE BUILDING MATERIALS	The replicability of the chosen building materials' solutions is evident.	The replicability of the chosen building materials' solutions is well documented	The replicability of the chosen building materials' solutions is not evident.	The replicability of the solutions is not sufficiently shown.	The replicability of the solution is not referred.

ENERGY: PRIMARY ENERGY, RENEWABLE ENERGY (RE), STORAGE AND CO_2, (10%)	Top marks for energy will be given for innovative energy strategies employed to maximize the use of local wind and sun energy to provide comfort and reduce loads. Where modelling is undertaken the quality of its approach may be taken into account, as will resulting $C0_2$ emissions where local Renewable Energy (RE) or battery systems are used.	The ways in which energy is used + managed in / around the house are well developed with demand reductions well demonstrated. Modelling or experimental measurements are fine. Appropriate on-site RE strategies for minimized energy use and energy storage presented. CO_2 emissions are well calculated and presented.	Strategies for the energy performance of the house are adequately developed and energy demand of the house is reasonable and roughly quantified. Incomplete consideration of the appropriateness of local RE generators. Strategies for minimizing energy use are OK. The CO_2 emission reductions are fairly well supported.	The energy demands & storage opportunities of the house are poorly described and where appropriate, quantified. n-site RE and storage systems are minimal and there are few ways of minimizing energy demand shown. CO_2 emissions are mentioned but poorly quantified.	No consideration of the energy performance of the house is shown and there is no understanding of how the loads for the house will be met by RE or storage systems. CO_2 emission impacts missing.
THE CONTEXT: SITE, MICRO; MESO AND MACRO-CLIMATE, WIND, WATER, VEGETATION + ECOLOGY AND TIME	Work shows real initiative and/or originality at different stages of development in relation to the harvesting, storage and control of natural energy flows of wind, water and sun in and around the house and site including planting, flooding and climatic diurnal and seasonal performance.	Good work on the relationship between the ecological flows of energy, wind and water between the climate and ecology of the site and the house. Some demonstration of the performance of the structure over time.	Fair but incomplete consideration of the interaction between the climate and ecology of the site and the house. Little demonstration of the performance of the structure over time.	Some but incomplete consideration of the i the interaction between the climate and ecology of the site and the house	No consideration of the interaction between the climate and ecology of the site and the house
FUNCTION: FORM, STRUCTURE, EASE OF ASSEMBLY, USABILITY,	Form supports the design strategy. Structure, ease of assembly and usability are well-thought out, and at least one aspect of form, structure, ease of assembly or usability contains innovative approaches with the other two of a high standard.	Form supports the design strategy. All three of the aspects of structure, ease of assembly or usability are of a high standard.	Form supports the design strategy. At least two of either the structure, ease of assembly or usability are of a high standard.	Work is coherent and complete. Form may support the design strategy. However, either form, structure, ease of assembly or usability are compromised.	Work is not coherent. Form fails to support the design strategy. Structure is inadequate for the form. Ease of assembly does not conform with the brief. Usability is poor.
STRUCTURAL REPLICABILITY: REPLICABILITY OF THE DESIGN SOLUTION, EASE OF ASSEMBLY	The replicability of the design solution is evident.	The replicability of the design solution is well documented.	The replicability of the design solution is not evident.	The replicability of the design solution is not sufficiently shown.	The replicability of the solution is not referred.
	a	**b**	**c**	**d**	**e**

OVERALL DESIGN QUALITY (ODQ) **ELEGANCE OF THE DESIGN SOLUTION AND ITS PRESENTATION**	**20% EXCELLENT** Original and elegant design solution backed up by clear, coherent and excellently presented strategies rationales and analyses ticking all the above boxes. A final design worthy of being built.	**15% GOOD** Good quality design solutions backed up by credible and well-presented rationales that cover well, many of the requirements of judging criteria.	**10% OK** A fair design with a number of the judging criteria being well met and a fair standard of presentation for the entry but no demonstration of the elegance and coherence of the final design.	**5% POOR** The final house is not well developed, does not satisfactorily cover many of the design criteria and is poorly presented.	**0% WEAK** Poor presentation that does not show how the final house form meets many of the above judging criteria.
FINAL SCORE: (a + b + c + d + e) + ODQ **XX%**	**JUDGES COMMENTS**				