

AMIHACKS 1.0

National-Level 24-Hour Hackathon

Official Rules & Regulations

Applicable to all Problem Statement Tracks : Industry and NGO

Organized by:

Amity School of Engineering & Technology (ASET)
Amity University Rajasthan

Evaluation Head: Harsh Vardhan Singh

1. Event Overview

AMIHACKS 1.0 is a 24-hour national-level hackathon organized by the Amity School of Engineering & Technology (ASET), Amity University Rajasthan. It brings together students from universities across the country to collaborate, innovate, and build impactful technology solutions for real-world challenges within an intense 24-hour development sprint.

The hackathon features problem statements contributed by leading industry partners as well as social impact organizations, offering participants the opportunity to work on challenges inspired by current business needs, emerging technologies, and community-focused initiatives. This blend encourages teams to create solutions that are not only technically strong but also practical, scalable, and capable of delivering measurable impact.

Throughout the event, participants will ideate, design, develop, and present a working prototype or proof of concept while receiving guidance from mentors, industry experts, and academic professionals. Teams are encouraged to focus on innovation, user experience, technical implementation, scalability, and the overall feasibility of their solution.

All participating teams compete under a unified set of rules, timelines, submission requirements, and evaluation standards. Regardless of the source or domain of a problem statement, every submission is judged through the same calibrated and transparent process to ensure fairness, consistency, and equal opportunity for all teams.

AMIHACKS 1.0 aims to foster innovation, encourage interdisciplinary collaboration, strengthen industry-academia engagement, and provide students with a platform to transform ideas into impactful technological solutions.

2. Team Formation & Eligibility

- Team size: 1–4 members.
- Participants must be enrolled in a recognized college or university.
- Cross-branch and cross-year teams are permitted.
- Cross-college teams are permitted.
- A participant can be a member of only one team.
- Team composition cannot be changed after registration closes unless approved by organizers under exceptional circumstances.

3. Hackathon Format

3.1 Problem Statement Tracks

AMIHACKS 1.0 offers participants the opportunity to solve real-world challenges through problem statement tracks contributed by industry partners and social impact organizations. Each track is designed to encourage innovative, practical, and scalable technology solutions while maintaining a common development and evaluation framework.

Key Guidelines

- **Industry Partner Tracks:** Focus on solving real-world business, technology, and innovation challenges contributed by collaborating industry partners.
- **Social Impact Track:** Focuses on technology-driven solutions for community and societal challenges contributed by a partner social impact organization.
- **Problem Statement Reveal:** All problem statements will be officially unveiled during the Opening Ceremony and Problem Statement Briefing.
- **Track Selection:** Every team must select one problem statement track and develop its solution exclusively for that challenge throughout the hackathon.
- **Track Lock:** Once the development phase begins, teams are not permitted to switch to another problem statement or track unless explicitly approved by the organizing committee under exceptional circumstances.

Uniform Evaluation Across All Tracks

Regardless of the source of the problem statement, every track follows the same hackathon rules, timeline, submission requirements, mentoring process, and judging criteria. The evaluation process is standardized to ensure fairness, transparency, and equal opportunity for all participating teams.

3.2 Duration

Teams will have 24 hours to ideate, design, develop, test, and present their solution, starting from the official commencement announced at the opening ceremony.

3.3 Technology Freedom

Participants may use any technology stack, framework, programming language, platform, cloud provider, or hardware suited to their chosen problem statement.

4. Attendance & Participation Rules

4.1 Continuous Team Presence Rule

At least one team member must remain physically present at the venue at all times throughout the hackathon. Teams leaving their workstation unattended for prolonged periods without informing organizers may receive penalties.

4.2 Mandatory Checkpoints

All teams, regardless of track, must attend:

- Opening Ceremony
- Problem Statement Briefing
- Mid-Evaluation Round
- Final Submission
- Final Presentation Round
- Closing Ceremony

Failure to attend mandatory checkpoints may result in penalties or disqualification.

4.3 Progress Verification

Organizers reserve the right to conduct surprise inspections or progress reviews, on any track, to verify that development is genuinely occurring during the event.

5. Project Development Rules

5.1 AI & Open-Source Usage Policy

Allowed:

- Use of public APIs.
- Open-source libraries and frameworks, with proper attribution.
- AI-assisted development, including tools such as GitHub Copilot, ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Cursor, and similar assistants.
- Cloud platforms and third-party services.
- Pre-existing knowledge and prior research.

Not Allowed:

- Reusing previously built projects.
- Reusing significant portions of pre-written proprietary code.
- Purchasing code or solutions during the event.
- Outsourcing development to non-participants.
- Receiving technical implementation assistance from individuals outside the registered team.

5.2 Mentor Involvement

Mentors may guide any team, on any track, but cannot contribute code or directly build the solution. Mentor-assisted, participant-built development is standard practice at major hackathons.

5.3 Originality of Work

All substantial work must be completed during the official hackathon period. This standard applies equally to NGO and Industry tracks and aligns with common practice at national and international hackathons.

6. Mandatory Submission Requirements

Every team, irrespective of track, must submit the following:

6.1 Technical Deliverables

- GitHub Repository Link
- Source Code
- Architecture Diagram
- Deployment Link (if applicable)
- README Documentation
- Team Contribution Details

6.2 Presentation Deliverables

- PPT / PDF Deck (maximum 8–10 slides)
- Problem Statement
- Proposed Solution
- System Architecture
- Demo Screenshots
- Future Scope

6.3 Demo Deliverables

Teams must demonstrate:

- Core functionality
- Key features
- End-to-end user journey
- Technical implementation

Every submission, whether built for the NGO track or an Industry track, must include a working prototype or demonstrable MVP, consistent with requirements commonly used at major hackathons.

7. Evaluation Process Overview

Evaluation is percentage-based across all three tracks, ensuring the process scales fairly regardless of how many teams register for each track.

7.1 Round 1 - Concept Screening and Prototype Review

The **Top 10 teams** (subject to change at the discretion of the organizing committee) will advance to the next round based on their overall performance and progress throughout the hackathon. Evaluation will consider **problem understanding, alignment with stakeholder needs, solution clarity and innovation, feasibility and scalability, initial system architecture, working prototype, feature completion, technical progress, mentor feedback, and demonstrated development throughout the event**. Teams will be assessed on both the quality of their proposed solution and their ability to translate the idea into a functional, practical, and well-developed prototype.

7.2 Round 2 - Grand Finale

Finalists from every track present before a common jury panel consisting of NGO representatives, industry experts, academic experts, and technology professionals, ensuring every track is judged against the same standard.

8. Code of Conduct

All participants, mentors, judges, and volunteers are expected to:

- Treat fellow participants, organizers, mentors, and jury members with courtesy and respect at all times.
- Compete with honesty and represent only work genuinely completed during the hackathon.
- Use university property, equipment, and venue facilities responsibly.
- Refrain from any form of harassment, discrimination, or offensive conduct or content.
- Cooperate with organizers and jury members during inspections, briefings, and evaluations.

Violations of this Code of Conduct will be handled under the Disqualification Criteria and Event Conduct Violations described in Section 9.

9. Disqualification Criteria

Immediate disqualification may occur, on any track, if any of the following are observed:

9.1 Academic Integrity Violations

- Plagiarism of code or design.

- Copying another team's project.
- Submitting previously built projects.
- Misrepresentation of work completed during the hackathon.

9.2 Technical Violations

- Fake demos.
- Hardcoded outputs disguised as functionality.
- Non-functional submissions falsely claimed as complete.
- Fabricated AI/ML results.

9.3 Participation Violations

- Team member substitution after registration.
- External individuals contributing to development.
- Hiring freelancers or external developers.
- Using another team's repository or assets.

9.4 Event Conduct Violations

- Harassment or discrimination.
- Destruction of university property.
- Unauthorized access to systems or networks.
- Offensive, illegal, or unethical content.

9.5 Submission Violations

- Missing the final submission deadline.
- Failure to submit source code.
- Failure to present when called by judges.
- Failure to explain the implementation when questioned.

9.6 Jury Integrity Violations

- Attempting to influence judges.
- Misleading claims regarding functionality.
- Falsified metrics, datasets, or impact reports.

10. Tie-Breaking Rules

In case of a tie between teams, including teams from different tracks reaching the same evaluation stage:

- Team with female representation will be given preference.
- Higher Technical Complexity Score wins.

- Higher Functional Completeness Score wins.
- If a tie still persists, the final decision rests with the Jury Panel.

11. Final Authority

The decisions of the Organizing Committee and Jury Panel shall be final and binding in all matters related to evaluation, scoring, eligibility, penalties, and awards, across the NGO track and both Industry tracks.