



BAKORMA

Badan Koordinasi
Kemahasiswaan



AITeC **VIII**
2026

— POLITEKNIK NEGERI LAMPUNG —

GUIDEBOOK

Agricultural Innovation and Technology
Competition (AITeC) VIII

— YEAR 2026 —

“ *Strengthening Vocational Innovation
Towards Smart and Sustainable Agriculture* ”



INNOVATE



COLLABORATE



SUSTAIN



www.polinela.ac.id



Bandar Lampung



2026



8th Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition
8th Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition
(AITeC VIII 2026)

COMPETITION GUIDEBOOK

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND
TECHNOLOGY
POLITEKNIK NEGERI LAMPUNG
2026**



WELCOME MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF POLITEKNIK NEGERI LAMPUNG

Assalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh,



Peace be upon us all. Praise and gratitude we offer to Allah SWT, the One Almighty God, who has bestowed His grace and blessings upon us all. Alhamdulillah, in 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung has been entrusted to host the 8th Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (AITeC VIII), a prestigious competition event for Polytechnic students throughout Indonesia.

AITeC VIII 2026 is an important momentum that brings together the best talents from various Polytechnics in Indonesia. This competition is not only an event to measure students' abilities and skills, but also a means to broaden horizons, strengthen networks, and build a spirit of collaboration among Polytechnic students.

We, Politeknik Negeri Lampung, feel greatly honored and proud to play a role in organizing AITeC VIII 2026, which is an annual agenda of the Student Coordination Board (BAKORMA) of Polytechnics throughout Indonesia. As the host, we are committed to giving our best in welcoming and serving the participants, judges, and all parties involved. We hope that through AITeC VIII 2026, new innovations, creative thinking, and solutions will emerge that can make a real contribution to the development of education and industry in Indonesia. This guidebook was prepared as a guide for all participants and the organizing committee in following and organizing every series of AITeC VIII 2026 activities. We hope this guidebook can be well understood and become a reference that makes it easier for all parties to participate to the fullest.

Finally, I would like to thank all the committee members and parties who have contributed to the preparation and implementation of AITeC VIII 2026. May this event run smoothly and successfully, and provide great benefits for us all.

Wassalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.

Director

Dr. Dwi Puji Hartono, S.Pi., M.Si.

WELCOME MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE STUDENT COORDINATION BOARD POLYTECHNICS THROUGHOUT INDONESIA



Assalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh,
Warm greetings to us all.

Praise and gratitude be to Almighty God for His blessings and grace, enabling the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (AITeC) 2026 to be held once again. This year, Politeknik Negeri Lampung has been entrusted as the host of AITeC 2026, which will be held on October 25–27, 2026, in a hybrid format.

On behalf of the Badan Koordinasi Kemahasiswaan Politeknik se-Indonesia (BAKORMA), I would like to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Director and the entire leadership and staff of Politeknik Negeri Lampung, the organizing committee, the leaders of participating polytechnics, academic advisors, the panel of judges, and all parties who have provided their support to ensure that this event can be successfully and smoothly implemented.

AITeC is not merely a competition. It is an important part of the student development process at polytechnics, providing opportunities to develop competence, creativity, innovation, problem-solving skills, and the courage to produce works that provide tangible benefits to society and industry. Agriculture and technology continue to develop while facing various emerging challenges. Therefore, vocational students are expected not only to master technology but also to create innovations that are applicable, relevant, sustainable, and capable of addressing real-world problems.

Through AITeC 2026, we aim to foster a culture of achievement while strengthening collaboration among polytechnic students throughout Indonesia. The competition should not merely be viewed as an effort to become a champion, but also as an opportunity to learn, exchange ideas, build networks, and improve the quality of works and competencies. Winning and receiving medals are certainly sources of pride, but the experiences, networks, character development, and learning processes gained through the competition are far more valuable.

I hope that all participants will uphold sportsmanship, integrity, honesty, and a spirit of healthy competition. Show that Indonesian polytechnic students are a generation that is skilled, adaptive, innovative, collaborative, and ready to contribute to the advancement of our nation.

To all participants, congratulations and best wishes for the competition. Give your very best and showcase your finest work. To the academic advisors and mentors, thank you for your dedication in guiding and developing our students. To Politeknik Negeri Lampung and the entire organizing committee, we extend our sincere appreciation for your commitment, dedication, and hard work in preparing AITeC 2026.

May AITeC 2026 run smoothly and successfully, and may it become a platform for inspiring new innovations from polytechnic students across Indonesia. Good luck and best wishes to all participants. Keep innovating, collaborating, and achieving for Indonesia. Salam BAKORMA Jaya, Jaya, Jaya!. Wassalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.

Chairman of BAKORMA
Dr. Tomy Andrianto, MM. Par

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE AITeC VIII 2026



Assalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh,

Praise and gratitude be to Almighty God for His blessings and grace, enabling the Agricultural Innovation and Technology Competition (AITeC) VIII 2026 to be held at Politeknik Negeri Lampung. With great gratitude and pride, we warmly welcome all participants, mentors, judges, and delegates from vocational higher education institutions across Indonesia to take part in this competition.

AITeC VIII 2026 is not merely an event to pursue achievement. It is also a platform for students to demonstrate their competence, creativity, innovation, teamwork, and readiness to face the challenges of the future of agriculture. Through this competition, we hope to foster a spirit of continuous learning, collaboration, and knowledge sharing, while encouraging participants to develop ideas and works that provide tangible contributions to agricultural development.

This competition guideline has been prepared as a common reference for participants, mentors, judges, and the organizing committee throughout the competition. It provides information on participant requirements, competition fields and categories, registration and implementation procedures, rules and regulations, assessment systems, awards, and other relevant provisions. We encourage all participants to read and understand this guideline carefully so that the competition can be conducted in an orderly, objective, transparent, fair, and professional manner.

We also encourage all participants to make AITeC VIII a valuable learning experience. Winning is certainly a source of pride, but the courage to compete, the opportunity to learn from others, build networks, and produce the best work are equally important parts of the journey toward becoming excellent and competitive vocational graduates.

To all participants of AITeC VIII 2026, we warmly say welcome to Politeknik Negeri Lampung and best wishes for the competition. Give your best, uphold sportsmanship and integrity, and enjoy every part of the experience. May AITeC VIII 2026 become a momentum for the emergence of new innovations that contribute to making Indonesian agriculture increasingly smart, productive, adaptive, and sustainable.

Finally, we would like to express our sincere appreciation and gratitude to BAKORMA, participating higher education institutions, partners, the panel of judges, mentors, the organizing committee, and all parties who have supported the successful implementation of AITeC VIII 2026. May this spirit of collaboration and togetherness continue to grow for the advancement of vocational higher education in Indonesia. Good luck, create meaningful works, and achieve excellence. AITeC VIII 2026 — *Innovate, Collaborate, Sustain!*

Wassalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.

Chair of the Organizing Committee

Riko Noviadi, S.Pt., M.P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF POLITEKNIK NEGERI LAMPUNG	2
WELCOME MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE STUDENT	
COORDINATION BOARD.....	3
WELCOME MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE AITeC VIII 2026	
ORGANIZING COMMITTEE.....	4
TABLE OF CONTENTS	5
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	8
1.1 Legal Basis	8
1.2 Background	8
1.3 Objectives and Benefits.....	9
CHAPTER II. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE COMPETITION	11
2.1 Competition Theme	11
2.2 Competition Logo	11
2.3 Competition Format	12
2.4 Competition Awards	13
2.5 Competition Implementation System	14
2.6 Competition Implementation Schedule	15
CHAPTER III. COMPETITION TECHNICAL GUIDELINES	18
3.1 Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition.....	18
3.2 Plant Grafting Technique.....	18
3.3 Coffee Bean Sorting.....	20
3.4 Chicken Carcass Processing Technique.....	21
3.5 Chicken Blood Sampling Technique.....	22
3.6 Livestock Feed Formulation.....	23
3.7 Fish Feed Formulation	24
3.8 Fish Seed Packing.....	25
3.9 Fish Filleting Technique	27
3.10 Fish Meatball Making Technique.....	29
3.11 Land Mapping Survey	30
3.12 Agricultural Tool and Machine Design with AutoCAD	31
3.13 Agricultural Extension.....	32
3.14 Barista (Manual Brew V 60).....	34
3.15 Photography Exhibition.....	35
3.16 Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC).....	38
3.17 Agricultural Photography Competition.....	38
3.18 Agricultural Videography Competition.....	40
CHAPTER IV. PARTICIPANTS.....	43
4.1 General Participant Requirements	43
4.2 Participant Code of Conduct	43

4.3 Participant Contribution.....	44
4.4 Participant Facilities.....	44
CHAPTER V. GENERAL INFORMATION.....	46
5.1 AITeC VIII 2026 Committee Structure.....	46
5.2 Secretariat, Information Media, and Contact Persons.....	47
CHAPTER VI. CLOSING.....	49
6.1 Overview of Politeknik Negeri Lampung.....	49
6.2 Overview of Lampung Province.....	50

APPENDICES	51
Appendix 1. Proposal Requirements for the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (<i>Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition</i>)	52
Appendix 2. Rubric and Assessment Sheet for Administrative Proposal Assessment (Desk Evaluation) of the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (<i>Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition</i>)	61
Appendix 3. Rubric and Assessment Sheet for Video and Poster Assessment of the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (<i>Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition</i>)	64
Appendix 4. Rubric and Assessment Sheet for the Final Round of the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (<i>Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition</i>)	67
Appendix 5. Rubric and Assessment Sheet for the Agricultural Vocation Skill Contest (<i>Agricultural Vocation Skill Contest</i>)	72

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Legal Basis

The organization of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung refers to several legal bases, namely:

1. Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System;
2. Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education;
3. Student Development Pattern of the Directorate General of Higher Education, 2006;
4. Articles of Association and Bylaws of the Student Coordination Board (BAKORMA) of Polytechnics throughout Indonesia;
5. Decree of the Forum of Directors of State Polytechnics throughout Indonesia (FDPNI) Number: 116/SK/FDNI/2026 dated 28 November 2025 concerning the Determination of Student Coordination Board Activities for 2026.

1.2 Background

The development of technology, digital transformation, and the demands of sustainable agricultural development require vocational higher education graduates to have technical competence, innovation capability, an entrepreneurial spirit, and the ability to collaborate in solving real problems in the agriculture, livestock, plantation, fisheries, food, and supporting technology sectors. Vocational higher education institutions have a strategic role in producing human resources who not only master science and technology, but are also able to apply it professionally in accordance with the needs of the business world, the industrial world, and society.

The Agricultural Innovation and Technology Competition (AITeC) is a competition event organized continuously by the consortium of agricultural polytechnics as a forum to measure the achievement of vocational students' competencies while encouraging innovation, creativity, and professionalism in the field of modern agriculture. Since its inception, AITeC has continued to develop into a forum that brings together students, lecturers, industry practitioners, and various stakeholders in building networks, exchanging experiences, and strengthening collaboration among vocational higher education institutions.

After the organization of AITeC VII in 2025 at Politeknik Negeri Jember, AITeC VIII 2026 is held at Politeknik Negeri Lampung (Polinela), which is regularly organized under the supervision of the Student Coordination Board of Polytechnics throughout Indonesia (BAKORMA) as a form of commitment to strengthening excellent, adaptive, innovative, and impactful vocational education. This activity is an important momentum to improve the quality of graduates through skill-based competition, technology innovation, problem solving, and the application of appropriate technology relevant to the development of the modern agricultural industry, digital transformation, and sustainable development.

As one of the leading vocational higher education institutions in Indonesia, Politeknik Negeri Lampung has the experience, resources, laboratory facilities, teaching factory, practice gardens, educational farms, and partnership networks with the business and

industrial world that support the organization of national and international scale competitions. Through the organization of AITeC VIII 2026, Polinela is committed to presenting a professional, objective, transparent competition oriented towards improving student competence in accordance with industry standards.

AITeC VIII 2026 is also a means of implementing vocational higher education policies that emphasize practice-based learning, project-based learning, teaching factory, and strengthening the link and match between higher education institutions and the business and industrial world. In addition to being a competition event, this activity is expected to strengthen a culture of innovation, increase graduates' competitiveness, expand collaboration among vocational higher education institutions, and produce various innovations that can provide real benefits for the development of Indonesian agriculture.

Through this Guidebook, it is hoped that all participants, mentors, the panel of judges, the organizing committee, and all stakeholders will obtain clear information regarding the requirements, mechanisms, code of conduct, assessment system, and implementation of all competition branches. Thus, the organization of the Agricultural Innovation and Technology Competition (AITeC) VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung can run in an orderly, objective, and professional manner, producing outstanding, innovative, and characterful vocational individuals who are able to contribute to realizing food security and sustainable agricultural development in Indonesia.

1.3 Objectives and Benefits

1) Objectives

The objectives of organizing AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung are:

1. To improve the competence of vocational higher education students in the fields of agriculture, livestock, plantations, fisheries, food, agricultural mechanization, and related fields in accordance with the needs of the business and industrial world (DUDI).
2. To develop creativity, innovation, critical thinking skills, and problem-solving skills through practice-based competition and the application of technology.
3. To encourage the application of science, technology, and innovation in producing applicable solutions for modern, productive, and sustainable agricultural development.
4. To foster a healthy, sportsmanlike, professional, and principled competitive culture among vocational higher education students.
5. To strengthen networks of cooperation and collaboration among vocational higher education institutions, industry, government, and other stakeholders in the development of vocational education.
6. To prepare graduates who have national and international competitiveness, are adaptive to technological developments, and are ready to enter the workforce or start their own businesses.

2) Benefits

The benefits of organizing AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung are:

For Students

- 1) Improving technical competence (hard skills) and non-technical competence (soft skills), such as communication, leadership, teamwork, creativity, and critical thinking skills.
- 2) Gaining competition experience in accordance with professional standards and industry needs.
- 3) Expanding academic and professional networks with students from various vocational higher education institutions and industry partners.
- 4) Increasing self-confidence, competitiveness, and readiness to enter the workforce or start a business.

For Higher Education Institutions

- 1) Serving as a means of evaluating the quality of the learning process and students' competency achievements.
- 2) Strengthening the implementation of the Outcome-Based Education (OBE) curriculum, project-based learning, and Teaching Factory.
- 3) Increasing the institution's reputation and competitiveness through student achievements at the national and international levels.
- 4) Expanding cooperation with the business world, the industrial world, the government, and other strategic partners.

For the Business and Industrial World

- 1) Gaining an overview of the competence of vocational higher education graduates that matches industry needs.
- 2) Serving as a medium for recruiting young talent who are competent, innovative, and job-ready.
- 3) Strengthening synergy between industry and higher education institutions in the development of technology, innovation, and human resources.

For the Government and Society

- 1) Supporting the improvement of the quality of vocational higher education that is relevant to national development needs.
- 2) Encouraging the emergence of applied innovation and technology that can increase the productivity, efficiency, and sustainability of the agricultural sector.
- 3) Contributing to the development of superior human resources capable of supporting food security, modern agricultural development, and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

CHAPTER II. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE COMPETITION

2.1 Competition Theme

"Empowering Vocational Innovation for Smart and Sustainable Agriculture"
 ("Strengthening Vocational Innovation Towards Smart and Sustainable Agriculture")

Tagline: **Innovate** • **Collaborate** • **Sustain**

2.2 Logo



Logo Meaning:

The logo of the Agricultural Innovation and Technology Competition (AITeC) VIII 2026 depicts the synergy between vocational education, technological innovation, and agricultural sustainability in building superior, adaptive, and globally competitive human resources. The combination of technology and nature elements reflects AITeC's commitment as a vocational student competition event to produce innovative solutions for the development of modern, productive, smart, and sustainable Indonesian agriculture.



Logo Element	Meaning
Blue gear	Symbolizes technology, engineering, innovation, automation, and digital transformation in the modern agricultural sector.
Green leaf	Symbolizes agriculture, life, growth, sustainability, and care for the environment.
Green arc	Depicts synergy, collaboration, and continuity between education, industry, government, and society in building the agriculture of the future.
Green color	Symbolizes fertility, sustainability, green innovation, and hope for the development of Indonesian agriculture.
Blue color	Symbolizes knowledge, professionalism, technology, integrity, and trust.
Gold color on the number VIII	Symbolizes achievement, excellence, quality, and the spirit to keep developing.
AITeC text	The identity of the Agricultural Innovation and Technology Competition as an innovation and technology competition event for vocational higher education students in the agricultural field.
Roman numeral VIII	Indicates that the competition is the 8th AITeC event.
Year 2026	Indicates the year AITeC VIII is held.
The words "Politeknik Negeri Lampung"	Indicates Politeknik Negeri Lampung (Polinela) as the host organizing AITeC VIII 2026.

2.3 Competition Format

In general, AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung in 2026 is held in 2 (two) competition categories, namely:

Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition

This competition is an event to showcase students' abilities in the agricultural field, emphasizing the basic abilities of an individual student and/or group of students at the level of knowledge, skills, and attitude in achieving competency standards in developing innovative technology to overcome various challenges in the agricultural field. The scope of this competition covers the agricultural sector in food crops and horticulture, plantations, livestock, animal health, fisheries, forestry, industry, economics, and technology. This category consists of 2 (two) competition branches, namely:

1. Agricultural Technology Innovation, Smart and Precision Farming sub-category
2. Agricultural Technology Innovation, Appropriate Technology sub-category

1. Agricultural Vocation Skill Contest

This competition is an event to showcase students' abilities, emphasizing the improvement of specific skills in the agricultural field and creativity in developing innovative competencies to improve the efficiency, productivity, and quality of

sustainable agriculture while still upholding the socio-cultural aspects of agriculture and local wisdom in Indonesia.

This category consists of 16 (sixteen) competition branches, namely:

1. Plant Grafting Technique
2. Coffee Bean Sorting
3. Chicken Carcass Processing Technique
4. Chicken Blood Sampling Technique
5. Livestock Feed Formulation
6. Fish Feed Formulation
7. *Fish Seed Packing*
8. Fish Filleting Technique
9. Fish Meatball Making Technique
10. Land Mapping Survey
11. Agricultural Tool and Machine Design with AutoCAD
12. Agricultural Extension
13. Barista (Brew V60)
14. Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)
15. Agricultural Photography Competition
16. Agricultural Videography Competition

2.4 Competition Awards

AITeC VIII 2026 awards at Politeknik Negeri Lampung are given to all participants, winners, and first-place holders with the following details:

1. Participants

All registered and attending AITeC VIII 2026 participants will receive an e-certificate.

2. Winners

Competition winners are awarded in 4 (four) sub-categories, namely:

1) Competent Category [coaching funds + physical certificate]

- 1st Place, Competent
- 2nd Place, Competent
- 3rd Place, Competent

2) Expert Category [physical certificate]

- 1st Place, Expert
- 2nd Place, Expert
- 3rd Place, Expert

3) Skilled Category [physical certificate]

- 1st Place, Skilled
- 2nd Place, Skilled
- 3rd Place, Skilled

4) Beginner Category [physical certificate]

- 1st Place, Beginner
- 2nd Place, Beginner

- 3rd Place, Beginner

3. Special Awards

Special Awards are given to participants or teams who show special excellence in certain aspects based on the judges' assessment:

Innovation Field:

No	Special Awards <i>Smart and Precision Farming</i>	Special Awards <i>Appropriate Technology</i>
1	Best Smart Farming Innovation	Best Appropriate Technology
2	Best Precision Agriculture Technology	Best Local Resources Utilization
3	Best AI & Data-Driven Agriculture	Best Low-Cost Technology
4	Best IoT Agriculture Application	Best Ease of Application
5	Best Automation & Control System	Best Agricultural Productivity Improvement
6	Best Sustainable Agriculture Technology	Best Energy and Resource Efficiency
7	Best Technology Implementation	Best Sustainable Technology
8	Best User-Centered Innovation	Best User-Centered Innovation
9	Best Commercial Potential	Best Technology Adoption Potential

Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)
Vocation Contest:

No	Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)
1	Best Teaching Factory Implementation
2	Best Agritech Business Performance
3	Best Industry Collaboration
4	Best Innovation Product
5	Best Business Model
6	Best Sustainable Teaching Factory
7	Best Technology Application
8	Best Commercialization & Market Potential
9	Best Presentation & Showcase

2.5 Competition Implementation System

The implementation of the AITeC VIII 2026 competition at Politeknik Negeri Lampung in 2026 refers to several provisions, namely:

- Each competition branch must be followed by at least 5 Higher Education Institutions.
- Adjustment of the AITeC VIII 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung theme "Empowering Vocational Innovation for Smart and Sustainable Agriculture" ("Strengthening Vocational Innovation Towards Smart and Sustainable

Agriculture") for several competitions, namely the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition, and Agricultural Extension.

In general, the implementation system of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung in 2026 consists of:

1. Internal Selection

Students registered as participants in AITeC VIII 2026 are the result of internal selection by each Higher Education Institution, as evidenced by the attached Internal Selection Minutes of Meeting.

2. Online Selection

Online implementation, or online selection, is the selection process for participants intended for 9 (nine) competition branches, namely:

- 1) Agricultural Technology Innovation, Smart and Precision Farming sub-category
- 2) Agricultural Technology Innovation, Appropriate Technology sub-category
- 3) Agricultural Extension
- 4) Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)

3. Offline Implementation

Offline implementation at Politeknik Negeri Lampung covers 4 (four) competition branches resulting from online selection, which are the final rounds of the competition branches that have previously gone through the online selection process, and 14 (fourteen) competition branches, including:

- 1) Plant Grafting Technique
- 2) Coffee Bean Sorting
- 3) Chicken Blood Sampling Technique
- 4) Chicken Carcass Processing Technique
- 5) Livestock Feed Formulation
- 6) Fish Feed Formulation
- 7) *Fish Seed Packing*
- 8) Fish Filleting Technique
- 9) Fish Meatball Making Technique
- 10) Land Mapping Survey
- 11) Agricultural Tool and Machine Design with AutoCAD
- 12) Barista (Brew V60)
- 13) Agricultural Photography Competition
- 14) Agricultural Videography Competition

2.6 Competition Implementation Schedule

AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung will be held on:

Day : Sunday to Tuesday

Date : 25 to 28 October 2026

Place : Politeknik Negeri Lampung

The detailed implementation schedule of AITeC VIII Politeknik Negeri Lampung 2026 is described through the following timeline.

Activity Schedule
8th Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (AITeC VIII)
Politeknik Negeri Lampung, 2026

No.	Activity	Schedule
	Account registration and entry of prospective participants and verification by the committee via the website https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id	10 – 25 Sept 2026
A	<i>Agricultural Innovation Competition (sub-categories 1 and 2) and Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)</i>	
	1 Participant entry into the competition branch menu via the website https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id	10 – 25 Sept 2026
	2 Submission of proposals (proposal upload) via the website https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id	10 – 25 Sept 2026
	3 Proposal selection (desk evaluation)	25 – 30 Sept 2026
	4 Announcement of proposal selection results	01 Oct 2026
	5 Submission of videos (video upload) via the website https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id	01 - 07 Oct 2026
	6 Announcement of video selection results and invitation to the AITeC VIII 2026 Final Round	14 October 2026
	7 Participant registration fee payment	Max. 20 Oct 2026
	8 <i>Technical meeting for participants heading to the AITeC VIII Final Round</i>	20 – 23 Oct 2026
	9 AITeC VIII Final Round	25 – 27 Oct 2026
B	<i>Agricultural Vocation Skill Contest (Online Selection) (1 agricultural extension competition branch)</i>	
	1 Participant registration and verification by the committee via the website https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id	10 Sept – 01 Oct 2026
	2 <i>Technical meeting for participants in the preliminary round (online selection)</i>	02 – 04 Oct 2026
	3 Online selection	07 – 10 Oct 2026
	4 Announcement of online selection results and invitation to the AITeC VIII 2026 Final Round	11 October 2026

	5	Participant registration fee payment	Max. 20 Oct 2026
	6	<i>Technical meeting for participants heading to the AITeC VIII Final Round</i>	20 – 23 Oct 2026
	7	AITeC VIII Final Round	25 – 27 Oct 2026
C	<i>Agricultural Vocation Skill Contest (Offline) (14 branches)</i>		
	1	Participant registration and verification by the committee via the website https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id	10 Sept – 06 Oct 2026
	2	Participant registration fee payment	Max. 20 Oct 2026
	3	<i>Participant technical meeting</i>	20 – 23 Oct 2026
	4	AITeC VIII Final Round	25 – 27 Oct 2026

Notes:

1. The list of competition branches accompanied by Online Selection is:

- 1) Agricultural Technology Innovation, Smart and Precision Farming sub-category
- 2) Agricultural Technology Innovation, Appropriate Technology sub-category
- 3) Agricultural Extension
- 4) Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)

2. The list of competition branches held offline is:

- 1) Plant Grafting Technique
- 2) Coffee Bean Sorting
- 3) Chicken Blood Sampling Technique
- 4) Chicken Carcass Processing Technique
- 5) Livestock Feed Formulation
- 6) Fish Feed Formulation
- 7) *Fish Seed Packing*
- 8) Fish Filleting Technique
- 9) Fish Meatball Making Technique
- 10) Land Mapping Survey
- 11) Agricultural Tool and Machine Design with AutoCAD
- 12) Barista (Brew V60)
- 13) Agricultural Photography Competition
- 14) Agricultural Videography Competition

CHAPTER III. COMPETITION TECHNICAL GUIDELINES

3.1 Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition

A. Competition Format

The Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition is expected to encourage the development of cutting-edge technological innovation in Agriculture and Food Systems, adopting smart and sustainable agriculture that can connect various sectors and disciplines in efforts to overcome 21st-century agricultural and food challenges, including: (1) Agriculture Engineering and Biotechnology; (2) Organic Agriculture; (3) Agro industry and Agribusiness; (4) Animal Nutrition; (5) Animal Production; (6) Animal Health; (7) Agriculture of Technology; (8) Food Safety and Security; (9) IT for Agriculture; (10) Renewable and Novel Energy; (11) Forestry; (12) Fishery and Marine; (13) Dryland Farming; (14) Horticultural; (15) Plantation; and (16) Agricultural Waste Treatment.

The Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition is expected to attract the attention and interest of the academic community from various disciplines to participate in contributing to finding solutions to agricultural and food system problems in order to support national food security. The competition is directed at improving the efficiency, productivity, and quality of agricultural products through the application of environmentally sound 4.0 technology. The purpose of this competition is to encourage students to be creative in developing innovative automation technology to overcome various challenges in the agricultural sector, covering food crops and horticulture, livestock, fisheries, and forestry.

B. Theme

The theme of the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition follows the theme of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung, namely “Empowering Vocational Innovation for Smart and Sustainable Agriculture (Strengthening Vocational Innovation Towards Smart and Sustainable Agriculture).”

C. Form of Technology Output

The expected form of technology output from the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition is hardware and software for agricultural technology, whether in the form of a finished tool/product, prototype, video, poster, model/design, or system.

D. Participants

The competition is open to active students from all disciplines, either individually or as a team/group (2-4 people). Each higher education institution may send more than one participant.

E. Competition System

1. The competition consists of 2 (two) sub-categories, namely:
 - a. Agricultural Technology Innovation, Smart and Precision Farming sub-category
 - b. Agricultural Technology Innovation, Appropriate Technology sub-category

2. The competition is conducted in 3 (three) rounds, namely Proposal Selection (Desk Evaluation), Progress Selection, and the Final Round;
3. Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges;
4. The decision of the panel of judges is final and binding.

F. Competition Implementation

1. Participants submit a competition proposal (pdf) in accordance with the format (Appendix 1) via the official AITeC VIII Politeknik Negeri Lampung website or <https://aiteclampung.polinela.ac.id>;
2. Round I selection consists of an online desk evaluation of the proposal by the panel of judges;
3. Proposals that have passed the desk evaluation proceed to Round II selection;
4. Round II selection is the progress of the technology innovation development in the form of a video (MP4) with a maximum duration of 15 minutes, a 16:9 ratio, minimum resolution of 720p, and a maximum video size of 225 MB;
5. The video is sent to the committee via the official AITeC VIII 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung website or <https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id>;
6. The twelve best teams in each sub-category will be invited to the Final Round, held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung;
7. Each finalist participating in the offline Final Round at Politeknik Negeri Lampung must be represented by at least 1 (one) student;
8. All finalist representatives are required to attend the Technical Meeting held before the Final Round is conducted;
9. The Final Round includes the presentation and demonstration of the innovative technology, which may be supported by a finished tool, prototype, video, poster, model/design, and system.

G. Assessment Criteria

The aspects assessed in this competition include:

1. Video and Poster Assessment
 - a. Systematics and clarity of the line of thought
 - b. Mastery of the topic and creativity of the proposed solution
 - c. Dynamics and quality of content visualization
 - d. Duration compliance (10 - 15 minutes)
 - e. Poster or banner (for the final round only)
2. Final Round Assessment
 - a. Presentation
 - b. Idea
 - c. Work Implementation

3.2 Plant Grafting Technique

Grafting is a vegetative plant propagation technique as well as an effort to improve plant quality by attaching a bud from one plant to the stem of another plant so that they grow together into a new plant. Grafting aims to combine the good traits of each plant to obtain a better plant variety. The plant grafting technique competition is an event to demonstrate the skills possessed by students in the agricultural field in demonstrating the grafting technique they have acquired as a result of their learning.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. Round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
5. The tools and materials used in the final round are provided by the committee, with mango seedlings as the type of plant used.
6. Participants are free to use any plant grafting method.
7. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Suitability of materials and tools;
2. Accuracy in making the grafting window;
3. Technique of taking the bud;
4. Technique of attaching or inserting the bud;
5. Technique of tying the graft;
6. Speed/Time/Duration;

C. Tools and Materials

- Tools

1. Grafting knife with standard specifications for grafting
2. Cutting shears
3. Measuring tool: calipers
4. Permanent marker

- Materials

1. *Scion (bud) from a selected parent tree, a dormant (sleeping) bud, characterized by an undeveloped bud that is not affected by pests and diseases*
2. The bud is taken from a branch or twig with a diameter of 1.5 – 2.5 cm and cylindrical in shape
3. *Rootstock aged 7 – 12 months with a minimum diameter of 2 cm, grown from seed, with a sturdy and healthy stem (free from pests and diseases)*
4. Clear plastic, 1.5 cm wide
5. Raffia string
6. Ice plastic/grafting plastic
7. 70% Alcohol
8. *Ditaine (fungicide)*

3.3 Coffee Bean Sorting

The coffee bean sorting and quality testing competition is conducted based on the Indonesian National Standard (SNI) for coffee beans, SNI 01-2907-2008, which is a revision of SNI 012907-1999.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.

3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. The tools used are provided by the committee, while the material used is robusta coffee beans (1 kg) from the 2026 harvest year, of unsorted (asalan) grade, sourced from each Higher Education Institution.
6. Each participant is given a maximum of 30 minutes to sort and assess the quality of the coffee beans by filling in the provided form.
7. Each participant submits the assessment (result) form to the committee upon completing the sorting and quality assessment of the coffee beans.
8. The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
9. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Accuracy in determining the green bean classification (size, shape, and color);
2. Selection of sorting method;
3. Speed in determining coffee bean quality (number of defective coffee beans and tolerated coffee bean defects);

C. Tools and Materials

- Tools

1. Petri dish
2. Analytical scale with 0.001 g precision
3. Watch glass, aluminum dish, or porcelain dish
4. White paper
5. Defect value determination form
6. Stationery

- Materials

Robusta coffee beans (300 g per participant)

Note: During the offline round, all tools and materials are provided by the Committee. For the fairness of the competition, all delegations are requested to bring coffee competition material to be mixed by the committee as competition material.

3.4 Chicken Carcass Processing Technique

Efforts to produce chicken meat that is ASUH (Safe, Healthy, Whole, and Halal) require a good chicken slaughtering production process, especially in the carcass process that meets technical requirements in accordance with SNI 3924-2009. In general, the chicken carcass process includes several stages: slaughtering, scalding, defeathering, evisceration, carcass grading, and cutting of carcass parts (retail cut).

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. Round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
6. The tools and materials used in the final round are provided by the committee.

7. The first carcass is cut into 8 parts, while the second carcass is cut into 9 parts.
8. Assessment begins when participants process 2 (two) chicken carcasses, starting with evisceration, cutting the carcass parts into eight and nine pieces/parts, and arranging the cut results in accordance with SNI Chicken Carcass Number SNI 3924-2009.
9. The time provided for the chicken carcass process is 20 minutes.
10. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Speed/Time/Duration;
2. Accuracy of carcass cutting or slicing;
3. Accuracy of evisceration;
4. Final result.

C. Tools and Materials

- *Tools*
 1. Personal protective equipment (work clothes, mask, apron, gloves, hair net)
 2. Knife (boning, trimming, cutting)
 3. *Crystal/sharpener/stone sharpener*
 4. Cutting board
 5. Work table
- *Materials*

2 (two) broiler chickens weighing 2 – 2.5 kg are used, already in carcass form; the chickens have been slaughtered and defeathered (bleeding and defeathering completed)

3.5 Chicken Blood Sampling Technique

Proper chicken blood sampling technique is required to obtain good samples and avoid bias during laboratory examination or analysis. Blood sampling is generally intended to obtain whole blood and serum, with additional items such as thin and thick blood smear preparations as a complement. In general, the chicken blood sampling process includes several stages: preparation of tools and materials, handling process, blood sampling procedure (before, during, and after), and sample treatment according to the direction of examination.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. The tools and materials used are provided by the committee.
6. Assessment begins when participants prepare tools and materials, use the tools and materials, apply the blood sampling technique, and prepare the blood sample to obtain serum and make a thin blood smear preparation.
7. Chicken blood is drawn via the ulnar vein by a single operator.

8. Each participant is given the opportunity to draw blood twice (if the first blood sampling attempt fails).
9. The time provided for the competition is a maximum of 30 minutes.
10. The time provided to obtain a serum sample in a microtube is a maximum of 120 minutes (2 hours) after the blood sampling process.
11. The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
12. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Skill in preparing tools and materials;
2. Handling proficiency;
3. Procedural accuracy;
4. Accuracy of the sample taken and prepared;
5. Minimal impact on the animal;
6. Time efficiency;
7. Final result (quality of serum and thin blood smear preparation).

C. Tools and Materials

- *Tools*
 1. Personal protective equipment (work clothes, mask, apron, gloves, hair net)
 2. Microtube rack
 3. Portable chicken cage
 4. Armless chair with a maximum height of 40 cm
 5. *Tray for thin blood smear preparations*
 6. *Tray for syringes used to obtain serum*
 7. Dropper pipette
 8. Microscope (for judges to view the quality of the thin blood smear preparation)
- *Materials*
 1. Live broiler chicken weighing 1.5-2.0 kg (1 bird/participant)
 2. *3 ml syringe*
 3. Object glass (2 pcs/participant)
 4. *Microtube (1 pc/participant)*
 5. Cotton
 6. Tissue
 7. 70% Alcohol (1 liter)
 8. Methylated spirits, preparation: 5% Methanol (p.a), 90% Ethanol (90%), and 5% Isopropyl Alcohol (p.a).

3.6 Livestock Feed Formulation

Feed formulation is the mathematical calculation of a mixture of feed ingredients that will meet all nutrient requirements such as protein, amino acids, energy, and others, in accordance with the needs of the livestock. Good feed must meet the requirements for maintenance and production. Feed costs can reach 70% of total production costs. Good rations must be formulated according to the needs of the livestock (balanced ration). Rations need to be formulated according to livestock needs, with appropriate ingredients

and low prices. Feed formulation is an effort to combine several types of feed ingredients in a balanced way (balanced ration) to meet nutrient requirements. The price of the ration must be economical while remaining balanced in order to provide optimal benefits. One method of ration formulation produces a ration that is low-priced with balanced nutrients (balanced least cost ration).

Feed formula standards depend on the type of livestock, body weight, and production phase. A good ration must be able to meet the requirements for energy, protein, fat, minerals, amino acids, and other nutrients; besides that, its price must be relatively low, with usage limits observed. Therefore, the selection of feed raw materials is the first step in preparing feed formulation.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. Round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
6. The tools and materials used in the final round are provided by the committee.
7. The type of feed to be competed is Poultry Feed using the Trial and Error Method.
8. Feed ingredient data to be used in the competition is determined by the committee and will be provided 10 minutes before the competition begins.
9. Participants may choose from the feed ingredients determined by the committee to use in determining the feed formulation (minimum of 10 feed ingredient choices).
10. The feed ingredients used in the competition consist of energy source ingredients, protein source ingredients, and supplements (complementary feed).
11. The time provided for the feed formulation competition is 45 minutes.
12. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Speed/Time/Duration;
2. Accuracy in selecting feed ingredients;
3. Ration nutritional balance;
4. Compliance with nutritional requirements;
5. Efficiency (price).

C. Tools

- *Tools*

1. Laptop or PC that can connect to the provided internet.
2. Calculator or MS Office Excel.

3.7 Fish Feed Formulation

Good fish feed must meet the requirements for maintenance and growth. Feed costs can reach 60 - 70% of total production costs, so feed must be formulated according to the fish's nutritional needs (balanced ration). Feed needs to be formulated according

to requirements at an economical price. Feed formulation is an effort to combine several types of feed ingredients in a balanced way (balanced ration) to meet nutrient requirements. Feed prices must be economical while the nutritional composition remains balanced in order to provide optimal benefits.

A good feed formulation means it contains all the nutrients fish need and is economically cheap and easy to obtain, providing optimal benefits. The nutritional composition of the raw materials contained in the feed varies depending on the nutritional needs of each aquatic organism. Therefore, the selection of feed raw materials is the first step in preparing feed formulation.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. Round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
5. The tools and materials used in the final round are provided by the committee.
6. The type of feed to be competed is Tilapia Feed.
7. Feed ingredient data to be used in the competition is determined by the committee and will be provided 10 minutes before the competition begins.
8. Participants may choose from the feed ingredients determined by the committee to use in determining the feed formulation (minimum of 10 feed ingredient choices).
9. The feed ingredients used in the competition consist of energy source ingredients, protein source ingredients, and supplements (complementary feed).
10. The time provided for the feed formulation competition is 45 minutes.
11. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Speed/Time/Duration;
2. Accuracy in selecting feed ingredients;
3. Ration nutritional balance;
4. Compliance with nutritional requirements;
5. Efficiency (price).

C. Tools

- *Tools*
 1. Laptop or PC that can connect to the provided internet
 2. Calculator or MS Office Excel

3.8 Fish Seed Packing

The aquaculture industry has become an important part of meeting human needs for fish supply. One important stage in this industry is fish seed packing, where young and vulnerable fish seeds are prepared for transportation and further care. Well-packed fish seeds shipped in optimal condition will have a higher chance of surviving, growing, and developing into healthy fish. An efficient, high-quality packing process minimizes stress on fish seeds, ensures adequate oxygen availability, and protects the seeds from

extreme temperature changes during transportation. Poor packing can result in death, disease, or stunted growth in fish seeds, which can potentially hinder the growth of the aquaculture industry as a whole.

Skill in packing fish seeds is a key factor in maintaining the quality and success of this process. First of all, choosing the right container is crucial. The packing container must ensure sufficient oxygen availability for the fish seeds, prevent physical damage, and protect the seeds from disease or infection.

In addition, careful handling of fish seeds is very important. Young fish seeds are vulnerable to bad handling and stress, and therefore require gentle treatment and avoidance of contamination. Selecting the right storage medium is also an important consideration, ensuring appropriate temperature and humidity stability.

Skill in measuring and weighing fish seeds is also a factor that must not be overlooked. Accuracy in measuring and weighing fish seeds ensures the correct quantity in each packing container, which is very important in controlling population and preventing excessive density. Monitoring of temperature and environment is also necessary to maintain the quality and success of packing, by avoiding extreme temperature changes and identifying potential risks that could affect the health and vitality of the fish seeds.

The impact of good fish seed packing is very significant for the aquaculture industry. Maintaining the quality and health of fish seeds will make a positive contribution to the growth and development of adult fish, which in turn increases production yield and operational efficiency of fish farming. In addition, high-quality fish seeds also create added value in the market, with consumers more likely to choose products derived from healthy, quality fish seeds.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. Round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
6. The tools and materials used are provided by the committee.
7. The type of fish seed used is catfish seed (± 10 cm) with a 50 x 75 cm packing plastic.
8. The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
9. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Packing process
 - a. Speed, the assessment focus is on the participant's ability to complete the packing process quickly and efficiently.
 - b. Accuracy, the assessment focus is on the participant's ability to pay attention to detail in the packing process, including measuring, weighing, and placing the fish seeds.
 - c. Technical skill, the assessment focus is on the participant's skill in using packing equipment, such as nets and spoons or scoops to move the fish seeds appropriately.

2. Packing quality
 - a. Cleanliness, the assessment focus is on the participant's ability to maintain the cleanliness of the work area, equipment, and hands during fish seed packing.
 - b. Packing density, the assessment focus is on whether the fish seeds are placed at the appropriate density inside the packing container.
 - c. Stress protection, the assessment focus is on the participant's ability to protect the fish seeds from physical or environmental stress during the packing process.
 - d. Water and oxygen quality, the assessment focus is on the participant's ability to ensure sufficient water and oxygen availability for the fish seeds during packing.
 - e. Health and vitality of the fish seeds, the assessment focus is on the participant's ability to assess the health condition and vitality of the fish seeds after the packing process. This includes assessment of signs of stress, physical damage, or disease in the fish seeds.
3. Overall appearance
 - a. Proportionality, the assessment focus is on the neat appearance of the fish seed packing, starting from a neat and easy-to-open packing tie, packing with an ideal water-to-air ratio, appropriate amount of water and stocking density, easy to carry, and clean.
 - b. Creativity, the assessment focus is on the participant's ability to demonstrate creativity and provide logical and appropriate reasoning for the various steps taken in the fish seed packing presentation.

C. Tools and Materials

- *Tools*
 1. Packing table
 2. Fish seed net
 3. Spoon or scoop
 4. Digital scale
 5. Cool box/styrofoam box
 6. Scissors
- *Materials*
 1. Catfish seed, 10 cm size
 2. 50 x 75 cm packing plastic
 3. Clean water
 4. Oxygen
 5. Rubber bands
 6. Disinfectant
 7. Label paper
 8. Ice cubes

3.9 Fish Filleting Technique

Fish fillet is the part of fish meat obtained by slicing the whole fish along the spine, starting from behind the head to near the tail. Several common types of fish fillet are:

- a. *Skin-on fillet, which is fish meat that has been separated from its skeleton without any other treatment.*

- b. *Skinless fillet, which is fish meat that has been separated from its skeleton and then given additional treatment in the form of removing the skin attached to the meat.*
- c. *Single fillet, in which the fish meat is sliced lengthwise along the spine, and each side of the fish body is made into a single fillet.*
- d. *Butterfly fillet, which consists of two single fillets connected to each other (the meat between the sides is not cut through) by an uncut portion.*

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. Round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
6. The tools and materials used in the final round are provided by the committee.
7. The fish used is skipjack tuna weighing 1.75 – 2.5 kg per fish.
8. Participants are free to determine the filleting method used, but the resulting type must be a skinless fillet.
9. The maximum allowed duration is 30 minutes, covering preparation, processing, presentation/packaging, and the presentation and demonstration of innovative technology in making the fish fillet.
10. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Speed/Time/Duration;
2. Suitability of materials and tools;
3. Standard fish fillet quality characteristics: number of bones, slice accuracy (shape), size accuracy, and completeness;
4. Neatness and cleanliness of the carcass;
5. Yield;
6. Sanitation and hygiene.

C. Tools and Materials

- Tools

1. Fish fillet knife according to SNI, 18-20 cm size
2. Fish fillet knife, 30 cm size
3. Cutting board
4. Knife sharpener
5. Digital scale, maximum 5 kg
6. 5 kg plastic/plastic wrap (for the fillet results)
7. Plastic tray
8. Fish storage box (ice box)
9. Stainless steel table/laboratory table
10. Water flow (fish washing sink and drainage with adequate equipment)
11. PPE (apron, head cover, gloves, mask, lab coat, closed shoes)
12. Trash bag

13. Stainless steel tray

- *Materials*

1. Fresh skin-on skipjack tuna weighing 1.75 – 2.5 kg/fish, 1 fish for each participant
2. Ice cubes in a box

3.10 Fish Meatball Making Technique

Fish meatballs are a processed product made from minced fish meat with added filler ingredients such as flour, seasonings, and other ingredients, mixed using several methods, then formed into balls and cooked until done. Fish meatball criteria can be determined from the quality requirements in SNI 7266:2017, namely round in shape, smooth texture, no cavities, clean, and having a bright color appropriate to the type of fish used. The distinctive taste of the fish meat should be dominant, appropriate to the type of fish used. The fish meatball formulation, with a process consisting of mincing the meat, mixing the dough, forming, and cooking the meatballs, greatly affects the quality of the resulting fish meatballs, both physically and sensorially. This activity is a competition in making fish meatballs using skipjack tuna as the raw material. The expected output is fish meatballs that comply with organoleptic SNI standards, are clean and hygienic, and are well presented.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. The tools and materials used are provided by the committee.
6. The raw material for making the meatballs is 200 g of ground skipjack tuna.
7. A demonstration of the use of the food processor will be given before the competition begins.
8. The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
9. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Assessment of the product-making process:
 - a. Time (duration) of making the fish meatballs
 - b. Sanitation and hygiene of the fish meatball processing
 - c. Uniformity of the size and shape of the fish meatballs
2. Assessment of physical quality and organoleptic test:
 - a. Color
 - b. Taste and aroma
 - c. Texture and slicing ability
3. Assessment of presentation and mastery of material:
 - a. Presentation material
 - b. Accuracy in answering questions

C. Tools and Materials

- *Tools*

1. Digital scale
2. Knife
3. Pot
4. Plastic tray
5. Work table
6. Apron, plastic mask, plastic gloves, and hair cover
7. Dish and hand soap
8. Trash bag
9. Stove
10. *Food Processor*
11. *Blender*
12. Cutting board
13. Mortar (cobek)
14. Eating utensils (plates, bowls, spoons, and forks)

- *Materials*

1. The main raw material used is 200 grams of skipjack tuna for each formulation
2. Filler and auxiliary ingredients (tapioca flour/sago flour, salt, pepper, sugar, garlic, fried shallots, cooking oil, soup leaves, leavening agent, eggs, and ice cubes)
3. The addition of filler and auxiliary ingredients and the formulation depend on the creativity of the participants

3.11 Land Mapping Survey

Measurement and mapping are activities to confirm and depict the location, boundaries, and area of one or more plots of land using specific methods and tools. Measurement results can be in the form of distance, direction, angle, elevation difference, area, and volume. In agriculture in general, land area is important information required for planning, management, and/or land mitigation activities, so accurate area information must be obtained through both terrestrial and extraterrestrial measurement. For practical purposes, area measurement can be carried out terrestrially using a theodolite.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete as a team (2 people).
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representative teams.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. The tools and materials used are provided by the committee.
6. The competition activities and scenario will be conveyed by the committee during the technical meeting. The competition consists of 1 (one) session, namely the area measurement competition using a Theodolite.
7. The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
8. The winner of the competition is the team with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Speed/Time/Duration;
2. Accuracy of the method used;
3. Accuracy of results;
4. Safety of equipment and activities;
5. Teamwork.

C. Tools and Materials

- *Tools*
 1. *Scientific Calculator*
 2. *Theodolite*
- *Materials*
Land plot to be measured

3.12 Agricultural Tool and Machine Design with AutoCAD

The design of an agricultural tool or machine cannot be separated from technical drawing activities. Currently, technical drawing is widely done using design software because it is more practical and has high accuracy. One design software that is widely used is AutoCAD. The AutoCAD technical drawing competition in this event consists of drawing agricultural and livestock machine tool components in 3-dimensional (3D) form.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
5. The tools and materials used are provided by the committee.
6. *The AutoCAD software used is a maximum of AutoCAD Release 2022.*
7. Participants are required to complete the drawing object, namely an agricultural tool determined by the committee, within a period of 60 minutes.
8. Participants are asked to create the object drawing until it is printed on the work paper. For uniformity of the drawing header and paper size, the committee has provided a template file to be used for drawing the object.
9. The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
10. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Accuracy;
2. Speed/Time/Duration;
3. Compliance with technical drawing rules.

C. Tools

- *Tools*
Minimum laptop or PC specification requirements for AutoCAD 2022:

1. Microsoft Windows 10 (64-bit only), 8.1 (32-bit & 64-bit), or 7 SP1 (32-bit & 64-bit)
2. 1 GHz *or faster processor*
3. RAM: 32-bit: 2 GB or 64-bit: 4 GB
4. Disk space: 4.0 GB
5. 1360 x 768 *display resolution with True Color*
6. Laptop or PC that can connect to the provided internet network

3.13 Agricultural Extension

Extension is a communication process for disseminating information and conveying ideas related to efforts to improve farming/fishing practices and farming/fishing businesses in order to achieve increased productivity, income for farmers, fishermen, and laborers, and improved family/community welfare. Therefore, an agricultural extension worker becomes a spearhead of change and progress in Indonesian agriculture. A capable extension worker can spark the advancement and economy of a region and country

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually.
2. The competition consists of 2 (two) stages, namely online selection and an offline final round.
3. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
4. The twelve best participants based on the online selection results will be invited to participate in the offline final round at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
5. The final round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
6. Each participant is required to prepare material based on the AITeC VIII 2026 theme, according to the perspective of their respective field of study.
7. Extension topics may be taken from the following fields:
 - 1) Crop Agriculture Field
 1. Organic Agriculture;
 2. Integrated Pest Management;
 3. Fertilizer and Fertilization;
 4. Cropping Pattern;
 5. Post-Harvest and Product Processing;
 - 2) Livestock Field
 1. Livestock Health;
 2. Alternative Feed;
 3. Artificial Insemination;
 4. Post-Harvest Handling and Livestock Product Processing;
 5. Increasing Livestock Production.
 - 3) Fisheries Field
 1. *Illegal Fishing*;
 2. Post-Harvest Handling and Fisheries Product Processing;
 3. Fish Hatchery;
 4. Fish Disease Management;
 5. HACCP for Fisheries Products.
 - 4) Forestry Field
 1. Forest Resource Conservation;
 2. Production and Technology of Forest Products;

3. *Illegal Logging*;
4. *Social Forestry*;
5. *Forest and Land Fire (Karhutla) Prevention*.
- 5) *Agribusiness Field*
 1. *Farm Business Analysis*;
 2. *Strengthening Agricultural Institutions/Agricultural Cooperatives*;
 3. *Regeneration and Development of the Younger Generation in Agribusiness*;
 4. *Development of Local Agricultural Products*;
 5. *Agricultural Development Policy and Its Impact on the Agricultural Sector*.
8. In the final round, each participant's extension topic will be randomly selected according to the field-of-study cluster through a draw conducted by the panel of judges, witnessed by all participants.
9. Each participant is given 45 minutes to prepare extension material and media in the form of PowerPoint and/or other media, which is then sent to the committee.
10. After the material and extension media uploads are received by the committee, a draw is then held to determine the presentation order, witnessed by all participants.
11. Each participant conducts the extension presentation with a maximum duration of 15 minutes.
12. The committee provides presentation media and internet access, while laptops and other supporting equipment are prepared by the participants.
13. Each participant is allowed to use supporting equipment, accessories, or costumes that enhance their performance during the extension presentation.
14. After all participants have completed their extension presentations, the Panel of Judges will provide evaluation and feedback for a maximum of 20 minutes.
15. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. *Message Design and Extension Media*;
2. *Verbal and Non-verbal Communication Ability*;
3. *Extension Communication Technique*;
4. *Time Utilization*;
5. *Mastery of Material*;
6. *Audience Engagement*;
7. *Compliance with the Theme*.

C. Tools and Materials

- *Tools*
 1. *Laptop*
 2. *Projector*
 3. *Stationery*
 4. *Leaflet/Brochure*
- *Materials*
 1. *Flip chart paper*

2. Props / other supporting materials

3.14 Barista (Manual Brew V60)

Barista (Manual Brew V60) is a vocational student skills competition in brewing coffee using the V60 pour-over method according to Specialty Coffee Association (SCA) standards. This competition aims to measure participants' ability to control the entire manual brewing process, from weighing the coffee, grinding, water temperature setting, blooming technique, pouring technique, to producing a cup of coffee with optimal flavor. The competition emphasizes precision, consistency, brewing technique, time efficiency, and the application of cleanliness and work sanitation principles.

A. Implementation

- 1) Participants compete individually.
- 2) The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
- 3) Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
- 4) All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
- 5) The tools and materials used are provided by the committee.
- 6) Each participant is given a maximum of 10 minutes to complete:
 - Coffee bean selection
 - Weighing the coffee
 - Grinding the coffee
 - Equipment preparation
 - Brewing using the V60
 - Serving the brewed result
- 7) Participants are required to:
 - Use the V60 method;
 - Use single-origin Arabica coffee with a medium to medium-dark roast profile;
 - Serve the brewed result to the panel of judges within the specified time.
- 8) The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
- 9) The winner is determined based on the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Compliance of Coffee Weight with the SCA Ratio (1:15–1:18)
2. Grind Size and Medium Consistency (0.5–0.8 mm)
3. Water Temperature (90–96°C)
4. Brewing Technique (Blooming, Pouring Technique, Brewing Sequence)
5. Cleanliness and Tidiness (Work Area, Equipment, Personal Hygiene).

C. Tools and Materials

- Tools
 1. V60 Dripper.
 2. Paper Filter.
 3. Gooseneck Kettle.
 4. Digital Thermometer.
 5. Digital Scale with Timer.

6. Server.
 7. Glass/Cup.
 8. Grinder (if needed).
 9. Apron
 10. Stationery
- Materials
1. Single Origin Arabica Coffee.
 2. Mineral water (TDS $\pm 75\text{--}150$ ppm).
 3. Paper filter.
 4. Tissue.

3.15 Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)

The Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC) is a national competition aimed at showcasing the successful implementation of Agriculture Teaching Factory (TEFA) in vocational higher education institutions as a production-based learning model that produces products, services, or business units that are actually operating.

This competition serves as a forum for students to present the implementation of a Teaching Factory capable of producing value-added products or services, improving student competence through industry-based learning experiences, and strengthening partnerships with the Business World, Industrial World, and Working World (DUDIKA) in supporting the development of vocational education relevant to industry needs.

ABTSC focuses on Teaching Factories that have been sustainably implemented, involve students in the entire business and production process, apply technological innovation, have good business governance, and demonstrate operational performance that can be proven through production, marketing, and business management activities.

The competition also encourages the downstream development of applied innovation, strengthening of Industry Collaboration, and the development of Teaching Factories that are adaptive to technological developments and the needs of the working world. Through this competition, it is hoped that an innovative, productive, competitive, and sustainable vocational learning ecosystem will be created, capable of producing competent, professional graduates ready to face the challenges of the modern agricultural sector.

The Teaching Factory presented may come from various agro fields, including:

- 1) Food Crop Teaching Farm
- 2) Horticulture Teaching Farm
- 3) Livestock Teaching Factory
- 4) Fisheries Teaching Factory
- 5) Plantation Teaching Factory
- 6) Forestry Teaching Factory
- 7) Food Technology Teaching Factory
- 8) Agricultural Mechanization Teaching Factory
- 9) Smart Farming
- 10) Precision Agriculture
- 11) Precision Livestock Farming
- 12) Digital Agriculture
- 13) Circular Agriculture
- 14) Green Technology

15) Agro-Based Production and Service Unit

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete as a team consisting of 2-4 students and 1 supervising lecturer.
2. All team members must come from the same higher education institution.
3. Each team is only allowed to submit one entry to this competition branch.
4. *The Teaching Factory presented must have been operating for at least 3 months prior to the competition.*
5. Each higher education institution may send more than one team in accordance with the committee's provisions.
6. The competition consists of 3 (three) stages: registration and administrative selection, online selection, and an offline final round.
7. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
8. In stage 1, participants upload documents via the AITeC VIII registration system in the form of:
 - Teaching Factory Proposal (maximum 20 pages according to the format) containing:
 - *Company Profile/Teaching Factory Profile.*
 - *Business Model Canvas (BMC).*
 - Teaching Factory implementation report.
 - Document or evidence of Industry Collaboration (MoU, MoA, Cooperation Agreement, Letter of Intent, or other forms of cooperation with the Business World and Industrial World (DUDI), if available).
 - Statement of Originality of Work.
 - Teaching Factory profile video (maximum duration of 10 minutes).
9. In stage 2, all documents will be assessed by the panel of judges based on the following aspects:
 - Teaching Factory Implementation;
 - Product or service innovation;
 - *Business Model Canvas*;
 - *Industry Collaboration*;
 - Teaching Factory Sustainability;
 - Proposal; and
 - Profile video.
10. The twelve best participants based on the online selection results will be invited to participate in the offline final round at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
11. The final round of the competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
12. All finalists must attend in person. Teams that do not attend the final round will be considered to have withdrawn.
13. Each participant is given the opportunity to present the Teaching Factory for 15 minutes and demonstrate the product or service for 10 minutes.
14. The committee provides presentation media and internet access, while laptops and other supporting equipment are prepared by the participants.
15. Each participant is allowed to use supporting equipment and accessories during the presentation.
16. After all participants have presented, the Panel of Judges will hold a question-and-answer session for 15 minutes.

17. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The assessment is an accumulation of the online selection assessment and the offline final assessment. The aspects assessed include:

1. Online Selection Assessment

No	Assessment Aspect	Weight (%)
1	Teaching Factory Implementation	20
2	Business Model Canvas (BMC)	15
3	Product/Service Innovation	20
4	Industry Collaboration	15
5	Teaching Factory Sustainability	15
6	Proposal	10
7	Profile Video	5
Total		100

2. Offline Final Assessment

No	Assessment Aspect	Weight (%)
1	Presentation	15
2	Mastery of Material	10
3	Teaching Factory Implementation	20
4	<i>Business Model Canvas</i>	10
5	Product/Service Innovation	15
6	<i>Industry Collaboration</i>	15
7	Sustainability and Development Potential (Scale-up)	5
8	Product/Service Demonstration	5
9	<i>Product Booth/Display</i>	2.5
10	Question and Answer	2.5
Total		100

3. Final Score

The participant's final score is calculated based on the following composition:

- Online Selection Score = 40%
- Offline Final Score = 60%

Final Score = (40% × Online Selection Score) + (60% × Offline Final Score)

C. Tools and Materials

- Tools provided by the committee
 1. Display table/booth.

2. Chair.
3. LCD Projector.
4. Screen.
5. Sound system.
6. Power outlet.
7. Internet access.
- Tools and Materials prepared by participants
 1. Laptop.
 2. Product, prototype, or Teaching Factory output.
 3. Banner or standing banner.
 4. Poster.
 5. Business Model Canvas (BMC).
 6. Company Profile.
 7. Teaching Factory Profile Video.
 8. Evidence of Teaching Factory implementation.
 9. Supporting documents for Industry Collaboration (if any).
 10. Demonstration equipment.
 11. Product brochure or catalog.
 12. Other presentation support tools.

Note: All equipment brought by participants is the responsibility of each respective team.

3.17 Agricultural Photography Competition

The Agricultural Photography Competition is a photography competition for vocational higher education students aimed at developing creativity, technical photo-taking ability, and participants' ability to convey information, stories, and messages about the agricultural sector through visual works. The competition uses the AITeC VIII theme:

“Empowering Vocational Innovation for Smart and Sustainable Agriculture”

Photography works are expected to depict activities, innovation, technology, human resources, products, the vocational learning process, and agricultural practices that reflect the development of smart and sustainable agriculture.

Objects or stories that may be featured include:

1. Food crop agriculture.
2. Horticulture.
3. Plantations.
4. Livestock.
5. Fisheries.
6. Forestry.
7. Agricultural mechanization.
8. Smart farming.
9. Precision agriculture.
10. Digital agriculture.
11. Teaching Factory.
12. Agricultural technology innovation.
13. Activities of farmers, livestock breeders, and agricultural business actors.
14. Activities of vocational students.
15. Agricultural and agro-industrial products.

16. Sustainable agriculture and environmental conservation.

A. Implementation

1. Participants compete individually
2. The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung
3. Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
4. Photography Exhibition participants are allowed to also participate as participants in other competition branches at AITeC VIII 2026.
5. All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
6. The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
7. Each participant must bring their own photography equipment. Photos may be taken with a DSLR, pocket, or mirrorless camera, with a minimum resolution requirement of 3200x2400 pixels, and adequate lighting.
8. The photo results must be in JPG/JPEG format, with a minimum resolution of 72 dpi (pixels/inch) and dimensions of 1620x1080 (4:6), 1080x1080 (1:1), 1350x1080 (5:4), or 1920x1080 (16:9), in HD image quality.
9. Each participant may only submit 1 (one) best photo along with a caption corresponding to the submitted photo.
10. Photos entered in the competition must be taken within the given time period and must not have been previously entered in a photography competition, must be the participant's own original work, and the participant is fully responsible for the work entered in the competition.
11. Photos must not contain elements of SARA (ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group relations), pornography, or other matters that contradict the ethics, norms, and laws in effect in Indonesia.
12. Photos may undergo basic editing such as cropping, rotating, sharpening, and contrast adjustment, as long as this does not change the authenticity of the subject and/or remove/alter elements within the photo.
13. Photos may be taken in either portrait or landscape orientation.
14. Photo results must be in color, not black and white.
15. Photos must not contain a watermark or copyright mark.
16. Photos entered in the competition may be used by the organizing committee throughout the AITeC event series, while the copyright remains with the photographer.
17. Participants are required to follow the official Instagram accounts of AITeC VIII 2026 and Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
18. Photo results will be published via the AITeC VIII 2026 organizing committee's account with collaboration features and/or tagging of the photographer's account and the official Politeknik Negeri Lampung account.
19. The organizing committee reserves the right to disqualify a participant and their work if cheating or violations of the competition rules are found
20. The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

Assessment

Assessment in this competition is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of Academics/Experts and Practitioners. The aspects assessed include:

1. Coherence and depth of the photo's visualization in relation to the theme elements;

2. Creativity and Originality;
3. Photo composition;
4. Technical ability;
5. The degree of emotional impact the photo can evoke (inspiring);
6. Storytelling/presentation.

B. Tools and Materials

- Tools
 1. DSLR, pocket, or mirrorless camera with a minimum resolution requirement of 3200 x 2400 pixels.
 2. Photo editing application.
- Materials

The photo subject is AITeC VI activities and/or activities at Politeknik Negeri Lampung that relate to the general competition theme, namely the agricultural sector.

Note: All equipment is brought by the participant and is the responsibility of each participant

3.18 Agricultural Videography Competition

The Agricultural Videography Competition is a videography competition for vocational higher education students aimed at developing creativity, technical video production skills, and participants' ability to convey information, stories, and messages about the agricultural sector through audiovisual works. The competition uses the AITeC VIII theme:

“Empowering Vocational Innovation for Smart and Sustainable Agriculture”

Video works are expected to depict activities, innovation, technology, human resources, products, the vocational learning process, and agricultural practices that reflect the development of smart and sustainable agriculture.

Objects or stories that may be featured include:

1. Food crop agriculture.
2. Horticulture.
3. Plantations.
4. Livestock.
5. Fisheries.
6. Forestry.
7. Agricultural mechanization.
8. Smart farming.
9. Precision agriculture.
10. Digital agriculture.
11. Teaching Factory.
12. Agricultural technology innovation.
13. Activities of farmers, livestock breeders, and agricultural business actors.
14. Activities of vocational students.
15. Agricultural and agro-industrial products.
16. Sustainable agriculture and environmental conservation.

A. Implementation

- 1) Participants compete individually.
- 2) The competition is held offline at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.

- 3) Each Higher Education Institution may send a maximum of 2 representatives.
- 4) Participants may also participate as participants in other competition branches at AITeC VIII 2026.
- 5) All participants are required to attend the online Technical Meeting.
- 6) Participants must bring their own video production equipment.
- 7) The competition is held in only 1 (one) round.
- 8) Participants film/record at locations and objects determined by the committee in accordance with the competition theme
- 9) The total implementation time is 210 minutes (3.5 hours), consisting of:
 - Preparation: 15 minutes
 - Filming: 120 minutes
 - Basic editing and finalization: 60 minutes
 - Submission of work: 15 minutes
- 10) Each participant produces 1 (one) video work.
- 11) The video must be made during the time period determined by the committee.
- 12) The video must be in accordance with the competition theme.
- 13) The video is the participant's original work.
- 14) The video has a duration of 3–5 minutes, including opening and closing.
- 15) Video format MP4 (H.264).
- 16) Minimum resolution of 1920 × 1080 pixels (Full HD).
- 17) Landscape video orientation (16:9)
- 18) Editing is allowed as long as it does not change the substance or main facts of the recorded object.
- 19) The video must have good image quality and adequate lighting.
- 20) The audio must be clearly audible and not interfere with the content of the story.
- 21) The video may use background music as long as usage permission is held or it comes from a permitted source.
- 22) Participants are allowed to use voice-over, dialogue, interviews, ambience, and sound effects.
- 23) The video must have a title.
- 24) The video may use subtitles if necessary.
- 25) The video must not contain elements of SARA (ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group relations), pornography, violence, practical politics, or other matters contrary to the ethics, norms, and laws in effect in Indonesia.
- 26) The video must not use visual or audio material that infringes the copyright of others.
- 27) Participants are allowed to edit to improve the quality of the presentation of the work, including:
 - Cutting and arranging footage.
 - Color correction.
 - Color grading.
 - Brightness and contrast adjustment.
 - Audio adjustment.
 - Adding subtitles.
 - Adding voice-over.
 - Adding music.
 - Adding sound effects.
 - Transitions.

- Adding opening and closing.
- 28) Participants are not allowed to use footage made before the competition period as a main part of the work
- 29) Participants are fully responsible for all material used in the work
- 30) The winner of the competition is the individual with the highest score.

B. Assessment

Assessment is carried out by an independent panel of judges consisting of academics/experts and practitioners with competence in videography, visual communication, media, agriculture, or related fields. The aspects assessed include:

1. Coherence and Depth of Visualization in Relation to the Theme
2. Creativity and Originality
3. Cinematography and Visual Composition
4. Technical Production Ability
5. Audio Quality and Editing
6. Inspirational Power and Message Impact
7. Storytelling

C. Tools and Materials

- Tools
 1. DSLR/mirrorless/digital camera/camcorder/action camera/smartphone with adequate video recording capability
 2. Supporting equipment
 - Tripod.
 - Monopod.
 - Gimbal/stabilizer.
 - External microphone.
 - Portable lighting.
 - Reflector.
 - Headphones.
 - Memory card.
 - Spare battery.
 - Power bank.
 - Laptop for editing
 - Other supporting equipment
- Materials
 1. The photo subject is AITeC VIII activities and/or activities at Politeknik Negeri Lampung that relate to the competition theme.

Note: All equipment is brought by the participant and is the responsibility of each Participant

CHAPTER IV. PARTICIPANTS

4.1 General Participant Requirements

The 8th Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (AITeC VIII 2026) at Politeknik Negeri Lampung in 2026 may be joined by individuals or teams of students from State and Private Higher Education Institutions registered in the Higher Education Database of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, subject to the following provisions:

1. Students at the Diploma and Bachelor's level (D1, D2, D3, D4, Applied Bachelor's, or Bachelor's).
2. Students with active status in PDDIKTI (Higher Education Database).
3. Register officially via the AITeC VIII 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung website (<https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id>).
4. Meet the specified requirements, namely:
 - a. The participant is a prospective finalist resulting from internal selection at their respective Higher Education Institution, as evidenced by Minutes of Meeting signed by the Head of the Higher Education Institution.
 - b. Registered participants have permission evidenced by an Assignment Letter from their respective Higher Education Institution.
 - c. Participants must comply with all applicable rules of conduct during the organization of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
 - d. Participants must attend the Technical Meeting before the competition is held.
 - e. Participants must pay the AITeC VIII 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung participation contribution.
5. Complete re-registration upon arrival at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.

4.2 Participant Code of Conduct

In order to create a safe and conducive event atmosphere, every AITeC VIII Politeknik Negeri Lampung participant must comply with the participant code of conduct, including:

1. Participants must uphold the good name of their respective institution or Higher Education Institution throughout AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
2. Participants must uphold the good name of Politeknik Negeri Lampung as the host with respect to activities carried out outside the Politeknik Negeri Lampung campus.
3. Participants must attend the entire series of events of the 8th Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (AITeC VIII 2026) at Politeknik Negeri Lampung in 2026 in accordance with the specified schedule.
4. Participants must attend the Technical Meeting, rehearsal, opening ceremony, and closing ceremony of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
5. Participants must wear the participant t-shirt and/or almamater jacket and identification (ID card) during AITeC VIII 2026 activities at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
6. *The ID card is the responsibility of each participant, and transferring the ID card to another person is prohibited.*
7. Participants must wear their almamater jacket and shoes during the rehearsal, opening ceremony, and closing ceremony of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.

8. Each delegation from their respective institution or Higher Education Institution is required to bring their institution's/Higher Education Institution's flag during the parade at the AITeC VIII 2026 opening ceremony at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
9. Participants are responsible for the security of their own belongings or equipment, both while at their lodging and during the competition. Loss of participants' belongings or equipment is not the responsibility of the AITeC VIII 2026 committee at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
10. Participants must bring their own personal medications needed during the activity.
11. Participants must maintain cleanliness throughout the activity, both at Politeknik Negeri Lampung and at their lodging.
12. All participants must comply with all rules for the organization of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung enforced by the committee and lodging management.
13. Participants are prohibited from engaging in any act or action containing elements of SARA (ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group relations), pornography, or other matters contrary to the ethics, norms, and laws in effect in Indonesia.

4.3 Participant Contribution

The amount of the contribution to be paid at the (offline) final round is:

1. Participant (Student)

The contribution amount for participants is IDR 1,500,000.00 (One million five hundred thousand rupiah per person).

2. Accompanying Manager / Expert Staff / Leader (Director/Deputy Director)

The contribution amount for Accompanying Manager / Expert Staff / Leader (Director/Deputy Director) is IDR 1,500,000.00 (One million five hundred thousand rupiah per person).

The contribution payment process for participants, accompanying managers/expert staff, and leaders may be paid no later than H-7 (7 days) before the implementation of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung. Account number information will be provided further via an official circular letter from the AITeC VIII 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung committee.

4.4 Participant Facilities

The facilities to be received during the organization of AITeC VIII 2026 at Politeknik Negeri Lampung are as follows:

1. Participant (Student)

- Event attributes (participant t-shirt and ID card).
- Lodging accommodation for 4 days 3 nights (3-4 students per room).
- Pick-up and drop-off transportation to Radin Inten II airport according to the specified schedule.
- Local transportation from the lodging to the location/venue and back for all destinations according to the AITeC VIII 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung activity schedule.
- Snacks and meals throughout the AITeC VIII 2026 Politeknik Negeri Lampung activity series.
- Participant certificate, either an e-certificate or a physical certificate.

2. Accompanying Manager / Expert Staff / Leader (Director/Deputy Director) -

- Event attributes (participant t-shirt and ID card).

- Pick-up and drop-off transportation to Radin Inten II airport according to the specified schedule.
- Local transportation from the lodging to the location/venue and back for all destinations according to the AITeC VIII 2026 activity schedule at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
- Snacks and meals throughout the AITeC VIII 2026 activity series at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
- Certificate of participation in the form of an e-certificate.

3. Judges

- Event attributes (participant t-shirt and ID card).
- Lodging accommodation for 4 days 3 nights (2 judges per room).
- Pick-up and drop-off transportation to Radin Inten II airport according to the specified schedule.
- Local transportation from the lodging to the location/venue and back for all destinations according to the AITeC VIII 2026 activity schedule at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
- Snacks and meals throughout the AITeC VIII 2026 activity series at Politeknik Negeri Lampung.
- Judge certificate in the form of an e-certificate.

Based on the description above, the following costs are the responsibility of each respective institution/Higher Education Institution:

1. Round-trip transportation for participants, accompanying managers/expert staff, and leaders is the responsibility of each respective institution/Higher Education Institution.
2. Lodging accommodation for accompanying managers/expert staff and leaders is the responsibility of each respective institution/Higher Education Institution.
3. Round-trip transportation for judges is the responsibility of each respective sending institution/Higher Education Institution, while lodging accommodation, meals, and judge honoraria are covered by the committee.

CHAPTER V. GENERAL INFORMATION

5.1 AITeC VIII 2026 Committee Structure

Organizing Committee Structure
8th Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (AITeC VIII 2026)
Politeknik Negeri Lampung, 2026

Person in Charge	: Dr. Dwi Puji Hartono, S.Pi.,M.Si. (Director)
Advisor	: Didik Kuswadi, S.Tp.,M.Si. (Deputy Director I)
	: Iskandar Zulkarnain. (Deputy Director II)
	: Agung AdI Candra, S.KH., M.Si. (Deputy Director III)
	: Eko Win Kenali, S.Kom., M.Cs. (Deputy Director IV)
	: Zahermanto, S.P., M.H. (Head of Finance and General Affairs)
	: Kasmir, S.Sos. (Head of Academic Affairs)
Chairperson	: Riko Noviadi, S.Pt., M.P.
Secretary	: Intan Andya Bellapama, S.P., M.P.
Treasurer	: Sri Handayani, S.E.
General Competition Coordinator	: Dr. Ghoffar Husnu, S.Pt., M.Si.
Judges Team Coordinator	: Dr. Drh. Dwi Desmiyeni Putri, M.Si.
Event Coordinator	: Mustika Adzania Lestari, S.P., M.P.
Secretariat Coordinator	: Dede Tiara, S.P., M.Si.
Participant Registration Coordinator	: Ir. Rikardo Silaban, S.Pt., M.Si., IPM
Accommodation Coordinator	: Hadori Rosadi, S.E., M.Par.
Transportation Coordinator	: Enggar Dwi Cahyo, S.Par., M.Arch.
Consumption Coordinator	: Melia Afnida Santi, S.Pt., M.Si.
Partnership Coordinator	: Ir. Ailsa Azalia, S.T.P., M.T.P.
General, Security and Equipment Coordinator	: Ali Imron, S.Kom.
Public Relations and Publications Coordinator	: Adi Widodo, S.P., M.T.I
IT and Website Coordinator	: Halim Fathoni, S.T.,M.Si.,Ph.D.
Liaison Officer (LO) Coordinator	: Yudhanto Saputra, S.Tr.Pt., M.Tr.Pt.
Event Venue Coordinator	: Supriyanto, S.P., M.Si.
Health Coordinator	: dr. Siti Amalya Ilmyasri

Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition Coordinator, Smart and Precision Farming sub-category	: Dr. Septafiansyah Dwi Putra, S.T., M.T.
Competition Coordinator: 1. Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition Coordinator, Appropriate Technology sub-category 2. Plant Grafting Technique	: Dr. Ir. Desi Maulida, S.P., M.Si., IPM.
Competition Coordinator: 1. Coffee Bean Sorting, 2. Barista (Brew V60)	: Dimas Prakoswo Widiyani, S.P., M.P.
Competition Coordinator: 1. Chicken Carcass Processing Technique 2. Chicken Blood Sampling Technique 3. Livestock Feed Formulation	: Anjar Sofiana, S.Pt., M.Si.
Competition Coordinator: 1. Fish Feed Formulation 2. <i>Fish Seed Packing</i>	: Pindo Witoko, S.Pi., M.P.
Competition Coordinator: 1. Fish Meatballs 2. Fish Filleting Technique 3. Agricultural Tool & Machine Design with AutoCAD	: Kurnia Rimadhanti Ningtyas, S.TP., M.Sc
Competition Coordinator: Land Mapping Survey	: Ir. Kelik Istanto, S.T., M.T.
Competition Coordinator: 1. Agricultural Extension 2. Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC) 3. Agricultural Photography Competition 4. Agricultural Videography Competition	: Marlinda Apriyani, S.P., M.P.

5.2 Secretariat, Information Media, and Contact Persons

1. Secretariat

Politeknik Negeri Lampung Campus – Academic Building
Jl. Soekarno-Hatta No. 10 Rajabasa Raya, Rajabasa District, Bandar Lampung City,
Lampung Province – Postal Code 35141

Phone (0721) 703995, Fax (0721) 7873309

2. Social Media Pages

Website : <https://aitec-lampung.polinela.ac.id/>

Instagram : @aitec8polinela

3. Contact Persons (Phone/WhatsApp)

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| 1) Intan Andya Bellapama, S.P., M.P. (Secretary) | : 082183153815 |
| 2) Mustika Adzania Lestari (Event Coordinator) | : 082182139595 |
| 3) Ir. Rikardo Silaban, S.Pt., M.Si., IPM. (Registration) | : 082273471351 |
| 4) Hadori Rosadi, S.E., M.Par. (Accommodation) | : 08127909023 |
| 5) Enggar Dwi Cahyo (Transportation) | : 085878948248 |
| 6) Ir. Ailsa Azalia, S.T.P., M.T.P. (Partnership) | : 081273792826 |
| 7) Halim Fathoni, S.T.,M.Si.,Ph.D. (IT & Website) | : 085369633003 |

CHAPTER VI. CLOSING

6.1 Overview of Politeknik Negeri Lampung

Politeknik Negeri Lampung was initially known as Politeknik Pertanian Negeri Lampung and officially began organizing higher education independently, becoming one of the State Higher Education Institutions (PTN) in Lampung Province since 7 April 2001, based on Decree of the Minister of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia No. 036/O/2001. Politeknik Negeri Lampung, abbreviated as (POLINELA), is a state higher education institution under the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia.

In addition to organizing higher education activities, the existence of Polytechnics in the era of regional autonomy is expected to serve as a motivator, dynamizer, and accelerator of regional development. In this regard, the Polytechnic continues to develop its academic activities and facilities by expanding its fields of study in order to produce professional workers in a number of specialized fields of knowledge. Since 2 August 2004, Politeknik Pertanian Negeri Lampung officially changed its name to Politeknik Negeri Lampung, due to the Polytechnic's future development plans, in which the fields of study offered are no longer limited to agriculture.

Politeknik Negeri Lampung is mandated to carry out Vocational Education, namely higher education that prepares students to have employment and professionalism with certain applied skills, at a maximum level equivalent to a bachelor's degree program. Therefore, education at Politeknik Negeri Lampung is more directed toward professional learning supported by teaching staff (lecturers), technicians, administrative staff, and supporting facilities for the teaching and learning process that support this learning system.

The Polytechnic's philosophy is: (1) Alignment and compatibility between the curriculum and industry needs oriented toward customer satisfaction; (2) Organizing competency-based education; (3) Continuous quality improvement; (4) Learning by doing; (5) Developing modern organization and management oriented toward quality, professionalism, and openness, and able to compete nationally and regionally; and (6) Professionalism with noble character.

Currently, Politeknik Negeri Lampung has 8 Departments and 43 Study Programs organizing vocational education in Lampung Province at the diploma, applied bachelor's, and applied master's levels, producing associate degree, applied bachelor's, and applied master's graduates, with the motto “Noble Character, Discipline, Skilled, and Independent”. [Source: POLINELA official website: www.polinela.ac.id]

6.2 Overview of Lampung Province

Lampung Province was established on 18 March 1964 with the enactment of Government Regulation Number 3 of 1964, which later became Law Number 14 of 1964.

Prior to that, Lampung Province was a Residency joined with South Sumatra Province. Although Lampung Province was still administratively part of South Sumatra Province before 18 March 1964, this region had already shown great potential and its own distinctive cultural character long before Indonesian independence, which enriches the cultural heritage of this beloved archipelago. Therefore, during the VOC era, the Lampung region was not spared from Dutch colonial ambitions.

Lampung Province is located at the southern tip of the island of Sumatra, in the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. The provincial capital is located in the city of Bandar Lampung. This province has 2 cities, namely Bandar Lampung City and Metro City, as well as 13 regencies. Geographically, Lampung Province is bordered by the Indian Ocean to the west, the Java Sea to the east, South Sumatra Province and Bengkulu Province to the north, and the Sunda Strait to the south.

Lampung Province has major ports, namely Panjang International Port and Bakauheni Ferry Port. The main airport is Radin Inten II International Airport, located 28 km from the provincial capital, while the major Tanjung Karang train station is located in the center of the provincial capital. In 2022, the population of Lampung Province was 9,176,546 people, with a density of 270 people/km².

Tapis cloth is women's clothing of the Lampung ethnic group, usually worn from the waist down in the form of a sarong made of woven cotton thread with motifs or decorations of sugi material, silver thread, or gold thread using an embroidery system. Lampung Tapis is considered a traditional craft because the equipment used to make the base fabric and its decorative motifs is still simple and done by craftspeople. This craft is made by women, both housewives and young women (*muli-muli*), originally to fill leisure time with the aim of fulfilling customary demands considered sacred. Tapis cloth is now produced by craftspeople in various decorative designs as a commodity item with fairly high economic value.

“Sai Bumi Ruwa Jurai” is the motto of Lampung Province, formed from two phrases: “sai bumi” (one land) and “ruwa jurai” (two branches/two souls). Sai Bumi Ruwa Jurai has a philosophical meaning related to unity. This motto refers to the two indigenous communities inhabiting Lampung, namely the Pepadun and Saibatin clans. Although both are native to Lampung, these two ethnic groups have fairly distinct differences, both in language and other customs. The motto Sai Bumi Ruwa Jurai signifies the harmonious coexistence of the two indigenous communities in Lampung despite their many differences.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Proposal Requirements for the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (*Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition*)

COMPETITION PROPOSAL FORMAT

The Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition proposal is written using Times New Roman font size 12 with 1.5 line spacing on A4 paper, with a left margin of 4 cm, and right, top, and bottom margins of 3 cm each, with a maximum of 10 pages from the Introduction to the References. The Cover Page through the Table of Contents are numbered with lowercase Roman numerals: i, ii, iii,.. etc. placed in the bottom right corner, while the main pages, starting from the Introduction through the Appendix pages, are numbered with Arabic numerals: 1, 2, 3, ...etc. placed in the top right corner. The writing format follows this structure:

COVER PAGE (Appendix 1.1)

APPROVAL PAGE (Appendix 1.2)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, describe the process of identifying the problem in the field of agricultural innovation study for which a solution will be sought, referring to various literature sources and brief views from other researchers who have previously discussed related topics. Describe quantitatively the picture, profile, condition, and potential in terms of physical, social, economic, and environmental aspects relevant to the proposed Agricultural Technology Innovation.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, describe the general environmental conditions that give rise to the important idea of carrying out the Agricultural Technology Innovation. Describe the literature related to the science and technology to be applied. Also indicate the existence of technology products that support the proposed KITBP (Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition) idea. This section must describe how the proposed technological innovation aspect is believed to increase added value, for example improving product quality, improving the production process, waste processing, quality assurance systems, etc., or management aspects covering marketing, bookkeeping, or business status.

CHAPTER 3. IMPLEMENTATION METHOD/IMPLEMENTATION STAGES

In this chapter, describe in full the techniques and methods of program implementation (education, consultation, training, technical engineering, social engineering, mentoring, quality testing, etc.), and the stages of work in solving the problem while achieving the objectives of the proposed Agricultural Technology Innovation being competed.

CHAPTER 4. COST AND TIME FOR TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT

The cost budget and time for developing the technology innovation are prepared according to the needs of materials and equipment as well as the time required for the technology innovation development. The maximum activity cost is IDR 7,500,000.00 and the maximum implementation time is 2 months.

REFERENCES

References are arranged based on the name and year system, in alphabetical order by author's name, year, title, and source, using the Harvard Style. Only references cited in the Agricultural Technology Innovation Proposal are included in the reference list.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Signed Biodata of the Team Leader, Members, and Supervising Lecturer (Appendix 1.3)

Appendix 2. Activity Budget Justification (Appendix 1.4)

Appendix 3. Team Organizational Structure and Division of Tasks (Appendix 1.5)

Appendix 4. Statement Letter from the Activity Team Leader (Appendix 1.6)

Appendix 5. Description of the Technology Innovation to be Developed and Applied

Appendix 1.1 Cover Page of the Proposal for the Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition

LOGO COLLEGE ORIGIN	
Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition	
PROPOSAL TITLE	
Proposed by:	
Name of Chairman	NIM
Member Name	NIM
COLLEGE OF ORIGIN 2026	

Appendix 1.2. Proposal Ratification Page; Agricultural Innovation Technology

VERIFICATION PAGE Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition

1. Title :
2. Chairman :
 - Name :
 - NIM :
 - Majors :
 - College :
 - E-mail :
 - No. Hp :
3. Member 1 :
 - Name :
 - NIM :
 - Majors :
4. Member 2 :
 - Name :
 - NIM :
 - Majors :
5. Supervisor :
 - Name :
 - NIDN :
 - E-mail :
 - No. Hp :

Place, Date, Month, Year

Supervisor

Chief Proposer

Name
NIDN

Name
NIM

Deputy Director
Student Affairs

Name
NIDN

Appendix 1.3 Biodata of Chair, Team Members and Supervisors

A. Self-Identity

1	Full Name	
2	Gender	Male/Female
3	Study Programs	
4	NIM	
5	Place and Date of Birth	
6	Email Address	
7	Phone/Mobile Number	

B. Student Activities That Are Moderate/Participated in

No	Types of Activities	Status in Activity	Time and Place
1			
2			
3			

C. Awards Received

No	Types of Activities	Award Winners	Year
1			
2			
3			

All the data that I fill in and list in this biodata is true and can be legally accounted for. If in the future it turns out that there is a discrepancy with reality, I am willing to accept sanctions.

Thus, I made this bio actually to meet one of the requirements in the submission of the Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition

Place, Date, Month, Year
Leader/Team Member

Name
NIM

Appendix 1.3 Biodata of the Supervisor

A. Self-Identity

1	Full Name	
2	Gender	
3	Study Programs	
4	NIP/NIDN	
5	Place and Date of Birth	
6	E-mail Address	
7	Phone/Mobile number	

B. Education History

No	Levels	Fields of Science	Institutions	Year of Graduation
1	Bachelor (S1)			
2	Master (S2)			
3	Doctor (S3)			

C. Track Record of Tri Dharma PT (in the last 5 years) Education/Teaching

No	Courses	Required/Optional	Credits
1			
etc.			

D. Research

No	Research Title	Funders	Year
1			
etc.			

E. Community Service

No	Title of Community Service	Funders	Year
1			
etc.			

All the data that I fill in and list in this bio is true and can be legally accounted for. If in the future it turns out that there is a discrepancy with reality, I am willing to receive sanctions.

Thus I made this bio actually to meet one of the requirements in the submission of the Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition.

Place, Date of the month of the year
Supervisor

Name
NIM

Appendix 1.4 Budget Justification

No	Production Type	Volume	Unit Price(Rp)	Total (Rp)
1	Material Spending (max. 60%)			
SUB TOTAL				
2	Rental Expenditure (max. 15%)			
SUB TOTAL				
3	Local travel (max.30%)			
SUB TOTAL				
4	Miscellaneous (max. 15%)			
SUB TOTAL				
GROSS TOTAL				
GRAND TOTAL COUNTED (.....)				

Appendix 1.5 Organizational Structure of Activity Teams and Division of Tasks

No	Name/NIM	Study Programs	Fields of Science	Time Allocation (Hours/Week)	Job Description
1					
2					
3					
4					

Appendix 1.6 Statement Letter of the Chief Executive of the Activity

STATEMENT LETTER FROM THE HEAD OF THE PROPOSING TEAM

The undersigned:

Team Leader Name :
 Student Identification Number :
 Study Programs :
 Name of Supervisor :
 College :

It is hereby stated that my proposal with the title "....." proposed for the 2025 Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition is:

1. Original works of ours that have never been proposed in the previous year's Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition and were not made using artificial intelligence (AI).
2. We are committed to carrying out the Agricultural Technology Innovation Competition activities in earnest until it is completed.

If in the future it is found that there is a discrepancy with this statement, then I am willing to be prosecuted and processed in accordance with the applicable provisions.

Thus, this statement is made truly and truly.

Place, Date month year
 Which states,

Stamp worth IDR 10,000
 Signature (original wet TT*)

Team Leader Name
 NIM

Appendix 2. Administrative Proposal Assessment Sheet (Desk Evaluation)
Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition)

DESK EVALUATION ASSESSMENT SHEET
AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION

Title:

Name / Team Name / :

Team Leader Name

Institution of Origin :

No.	Assessment Aspect	Result
1	The proposal begins with the Cover Page.	
2	Full name/Student ID/Cohort. Team membership is recommended to consist of at least two different cohorts (not mandatory).	
3	Title of maximum 20 words.	
4	Individual or team (2–4 people including the Leader).	
5	Maximum number of main pages is 10 pages (CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION through REFERENCES).	
6	A4 paper size with margins: left 4 cm, right 3 cm, top 3 cm, and bottom 3 cm.	
7	Font 12 Times New Roman with 1.5 spacing.	
8	Main page numbering (starting from CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION through the Appendix) is written with Arabic numerals (1,2,...) positioned in the top right corner.	
9	The proposal already supports the application of 4.0 technology.	
10	Approval Page, Table of Contents (including List of Tables and List of Figures if any) page numbers use lowercase Roman numerals starting from i or iii, positioned in the bottom right corner.	
11	CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	
12	CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW: contains at least:	

	a. Actual condition of the problem object (can be obtained from official and relevant written materials,	
	interviews, or independent observation). b. Idea related to a previously implemented related problem. c. Complete discussion of the proposed idea. Supporting visual media for the idea will greatly help in the assessment. d. Supported by relevant literature review. e. Written using the Harvard Style.	
13	CHAPTER 3. IMPLEMENTATION METHOD / IMPLEMENTATION STAGES	
14	CHAPTER 4. COST AND ACTIVITY SCHEDULE	
	a. Maximum cost of 7.5 million (the total amount must match Appendix 1.4).	
	b. Maximum implementation time of 2 months.	
15	REFERENCES	
	References cited in the main body must be listed in the REFERENCES section, and vice versa.	
	1 spacing within a reference and 1.5 spacing between references.	
16	Appendix 1. Biodata of the Leader, Members, and Supervising Lecturer	
	a. The format must comply with the AITeC VIII 2026 Guidebook and be signed.	
	b. The date the biodata is signed must match the proposal submission period.	
17	Appendix 2. Activity Budget Justification (maximum 7.5 million) The total amount of funds proposed must match the amount stated in CHAPTER 4.	
18	Appendix 3. Team Organizational Structure and Division of Tasks	
19	Appendix 4. Statement Letter from the Team Leader Must use a wet-ink signature, revenue stamp (materai), and institutional seal (as authorized)	

20	Appendix 5. Description of the technology to be applied/developed	
----	---	--

****Assessment Notes: ****

1. Each aspect assessed must be filled in with the evaluation result, whether "Complete" or "Incomplete".
2. For any incompleteness that does not meet the requirements, a note or comment from the evaluator is required.
3. Proposals that receive a "Complete" result on all aspects will proceed to the next selection stage.

Evaluator Guidelines:

1. ****Complete****: Meets all specified requirements.
2. ****Incomplete****: Does not meet one or more specified requirements, with notes on the deficiencies.

Appendix 3. Rubric and Assessment Sheet for Video and Poster Assessment of the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition)

Appendix 3.1 Progress Video Assessment Sheet for the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition

PROGRESS VIDEO ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION

Title :

Name / Team Name / :

Team Leader Name

Institution of Origin :

Requirements:

1. Script scenario with a duration of at least 10 up to a maximum of 15 minutes, with a 16:9 ratio, and a minimum resolution of 720p;
2. Content may be a video containing images, photos, or animation, video clips, short films, music, or a combination thereof;
3. Selection pattern based on:
 - a. Systematics and clarity of the line of thought;
 - b. Mastery of the topic and creativity of the proposed solution;
 - c. Dynamics and quality of content visualization;
 - d. Duration of 10 - 15 minutes.

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Systematics and clarity of the line of thought	15		
2	Mastery of the topic and creativity of the proposed solution	50		
3	Dynamics and quality of content visualization	25		
4	Maximum duration of 15 minutes	10		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....
.....

(City Name), 2026

Panel of Judges
()

Appendix 3.2 Video and Poster Assessment Sheet for the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (Final Round)

VIDEO AND POSTER ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION (FINAL ROUND)

Title :

Name / Team Name / :

Team Leader Name :

Institution of Origin :

Requirements:

1. Script scenario with a duration of at least 10 up to a maximum of 15 minutes, with a 16:9 ratio, and a minimum resolution of 720p;
2. Content may be a video containing images, photos, or animation, video clips, short films, music, or a combination thereof;
3. Selection pattern based on:
 - a. Systematics and clarity of the line of thought;
 - b. Mastery of the topic and creativity of the proposed solution;
 - c. Dynamics and quality of content visualization;
 - d. Duration of 10 - 15 minutes.
4. Poster must be displayed (banner)

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Systematics and clarity of the line of thought	15		
2	Mastery of the topic and creativity of the proposed solution	40		
3	Dynamics and quality of content visualization	20		
4	Maximum duration of 15 minutes	10		
5	Poster (<i>banner</i>)	15		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score : 0 – 100

Value : Score x Weight

Assessor's Comments:

.....
.....

Bandar Lampung, 2026
Panel of Judges

()

Appendix 3.2 Video and Poster Assessment Rubric for the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (Final Round)

VIDEO AND POSTER ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR THE AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION (FINAL ROUND)

Component Assessment	0-25	25-50	50-75	75-100
Systematics and clarity of the line of thought	The line of thought is unsystematic and very unclear.	The line of thought is less systematic and somewhat confusing.	The line of thought is fairly systematic and clear.	The line of thought is very systematic and clear.
Mastery of the topic and creativity of the proposed solution	Mastery of the topic is very poor and the solution is not creative.	Mastery of the topic is poor and the solution is not very creative.	Mastery of the topic is fairly good and the solution is fairly creative.	Mastery of the topic is very good and the solution is very creative.
Dynamics and quality of content visualization	Content visualization is very poor and unattractive.	Content visualization is less attractive and not dynamic.	Content visualization is fairly attractive and dynamic.	Content visualization is very attractive and dynamic.
Maximum duration of 15 minutes	Duration of more than 20 minutes.	Duration of 16-20 minutes.	Duration of 13-15 minutes.	Duration exactly 15 minutes or less.
Poster (banner)	No poster, or a very uninformative poster.	Poster present but less informative and attractive.	Poster fairly informative and attractive.	Poster very informative and attractive.

Appendix 4. Rubric and Assessment Sheet for the Final Round of the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition)

Appendix 4.1 Final Round Assessment Sheet for the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition

ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION (FINAL ROUND)

Title :

Name / Team Name / :

Team Leader Name

Institution of Origin :

Requirements:

1. The presentation includes a brief explanation of the background and objectives of the project, and an explanation of the method used in carrying out the project.
2. The final round presentation duration is a maximum of 15 minutes, followed by a 10-minute question-and-answer session.
3. Participants must demonstrate commitment and discipline in following the entire series of final round activities.
4. Participants must arrive on time for the final round and comply with all rules set by the committee.

No.	Component	Sub-Component	Weight	Score	Value
1	Presentation (20%)	SK 1.1 Ability to explain the problem and solution	20%		
		SK 1.2 Accuracy of sentence usage and word structure	20%		
		SK 1.3 Clarity of speech articulation	20%		
		SK 1.4 Posture, gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions	20%		
		SK 1.5 Aids / tools in the presentation of display materials (e.g., animation, video, 3D, PowerPoint, etc.)	20%		
Total Presentation Score			100%		
2	Idea (35%)	SK 2.1 Background and problem	25%		

		SK 2.2 Benefits of the proposed idea	25%		
		SK 2.3 Clarity of data and references used as a basis	25%		
		SK 2.4 Clarity of the method for implementing the idea	25%		
Total Idea Score			100%		
3	Work Implementation (45%)	SK 3.1 Implementation of the resulting innovation concept	15%		
		SK 3.2 Level of complexity of the innovation (hardware, software, or other prototype)	45%		
		SK 3.3 Testing of the produced work	15%		
		SK 3.4 Achievement of the work's implementation	15%		
		SK 3.5 Added value impact on the community/users from the resulting work	10%		
Total Work Implementation Score			100%		

Notes:

Score : 0 – 100

Value : Score x Weight

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
 Panel of Judges

2026

()

FINAL SCORE RECAPITULATION SHEET FOR THE AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION

Title :

Name / Team Name / :

Team Leader Name

Institution of Origin :

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score	Value
1	Presentation	20%		
2	Idea	35%		
3	Work Implementation	45%		
Total		100%		

Notes:

Score : 0 – 100

Value : Score x Weight

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 4.2 Final Round Assessment Rubric for the Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition (Agricultural Innovation Technology Competition)

**FINAL ROUND ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
AGRICULTURAL INNOVATION TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION**

Assessment Component	0-25	25-50	50-75	75-100
Ability to explain the problem and solution	The problem and solution are not explained or are very unclear.	The problem and solution are explained with some confusion or lack of clarity.	The problem and solution are explained fairly well, but some parts lack detail.	The problem and solution are explained very clearly, in detail, and are easy to understand.
Accuracy of sentence usage and word structure	The sentences and word structure are very inaccurate and confusing.	The sentences and word structure are inaccurate and often confusing.	The sentences and word structure are fairly accurate, but there are some errors.	The sentences and word structure are very accurate and precise.
Clarity of speech articulation	Articulation is unclear and difficult to understand.	Articulation is somewhat clear, but some parts are confusing.	Articulation is fairly clear, mostly easy to understand.	Articulation is very clear and easy to understand.
Posture, gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions	Posture, gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions are very poor.	Posture, gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions are lacking.	Posture, gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions are fairly good.	Posture, gestures, eye contact, and facial expressions are very good.
Aids / tools in the presentation of display materials (e.g., animation, video, 3D, PowerPoint, etc.)	Aids/tools are not used, or used very poorly.	Aids/tools are used but not effectively.	Aids/tools are used fairly effectively.	Aids/tools are used very effectively.

Background and problem	The background and problem are not explained.	The background and problem are explained with some lack of clarity.	The background and problem are explained fairly well.	The background and problem are explained very well.
Benefits of the proposed idea	Benefits of the idea are not explained or are very unclear.	Benefits of the idea are explained but are not very clear.	Benefits of the idea are explained fairly well.	Benefits of the idea are explained very well.
Clarity of data and references used as a basis	Data and references are unclear or absent.	Data and references are explained but incomplete.	Data and references are fairly clear and complete.	Data and references are very clear and complete.
Clarity of the method for implementing the idea	The method is unclear or not explained.	The method is explained but with some lack of clarity.	The method are explained fairly well.	The method are explained very well.
Implementation of the resulting innovation concept	The innovation concept is unclear or not implemented.	The innovation concept is explained but not well implemented.	The innovation concept is fairly clear and implemented.	The innovation concept is very clear and well implemented.
Level of complexity of the innovation (hardware, software, or other prototype)	Innovation complexity is absent or very low.	Innovation complexity is low.	Innovation complexity is fairly good.	Innovation complexity is very good.
Testing of the produced work	Testing was not carried out or is very unclear.	Testing was carried out but is unclear.	Testing was carried out fairly clearly.	Testing was carried out very clearly.
Achievement of the work's implementation	Work implementation is very poorly achieved.	Work implementation is achieved but with many shortcomings.	Work implementation is fairly well achieved.	Work implementation is very well achieved.
Added value impact on the community/users from the resulting work	Added value impact is absent or very low.	Added value impact is low.	Added value impact is fairly good.	Added value impact is very good.

Appendix 5. Rubric and Assessment Sheet for the Agricultural Vocation Skill Contest (Agricultural Vocation Skill Contest)

Appendix 5.1 Plant Grafting Technique Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC PLANT GRAFTING TECHNIQUE

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
1.	Suitability of Materials and Tools	1 = poor	There are ≥ 8 tools or materials that do not meet the specified requirements.
		2 = very lacking	There are $5 \geq$ and ≤ 7 tools or materials that do not meet the specified requirements.
		3 = lacking	There are $3 \geq$ and ≤ 5 tools or materials that do not meet the specified requirements.
		5 = adequate	There are 2 tools or materials that do not meet the specified requirements.
		6 = good	There is 1 tool or material that does not meet the specified requirements.
		7 = excellent	All tools and materials meet the standards and requirements set by the committee.
2.	Accuracy in Making the Grafting Window	1 = poor	The shape of the rootstock incision does not match the chosen grafting method, and the grafting incision is very deep, injuring the wood.
		2 = very lacking	The shape of the rootstock incision does not match the chosen grafting method; the incision is not too deep but injures part of the wood.
		3 = lacking	The shape of the rootstock incision matches the chosen grafting method, but the incision is very deep, injuring the wood.
		5 = adequate	The shape of the rootstock incision does not match the chosen grafting method, but the incision is not too deep and does not injure the wood.
		6 = good	The shape of the rootstock incision matches the chosen grafting method, and the incision is not too deep, but part of the wood is injured.
		7 = excellent	The shape of the rootstock incision matches the chosen grafting method, and the incision is not too deep and does not injure the wood, since injury could cause graft failure.

3.	Technique of Taking the Bud	1 = poor	a. The cut above the bud and below the bud toward the first cut is more than 1 cm. b. The bud is punctured, meaning the bud has
			been damaged, causing the new shoot not to grow.
		2 = very lacking	a. The cut above the bud and below the bud toward the first cut is more than 1 cm. b. The wood attached to the bud is very thick.
		3 = lacking	a. The cut above the bud and below the bud toward the first cut is more than 1 cm. b. The wood attached to the bud is thin and the bud is still attached, but its vascular cambium is damaged.
		5 = adequate	a. The cut above the bud and below the bud toward the first cut is less than 1 cm. b. The wood attached to the bud is fairly thick, but the bud remains attached and its vascular cambium is not damaged.
		6 = good	a. The cut starts 1 cm above the bud, then continues 1 cm below the bud. b. The wood attached to the bud is thin and the bud remains attached, but its vascular cambium is not damaged.
		7 = excellent	a. The cut starts 1 cm above the bud, then continues 1 cm below the bud toward the first cut. b. The wood attached to the bud is thin; the bud and its vascular cambium are not damaged.
4.	Technique of Attaching or Inserting the Bud	1 = poor	Bud
		2 = very lacking	The obtained bud is inserted or attached to the grafting window carelessly, damaging the cambium. Cleanliness of the cambium is not maintained, resulting in poor bud attachment.

		3 = lacking	The obtained bud is inserted or attached to the grafting window carelessly, although the cambium is not damaged. Cleanliness of the cambium is not maintained, resulting in poor bud attachment. The obtained bud is inserted or attached to the grafting window carelessly, although the cambium is not damaged.
		5 = adequate	Cleanliness of the cambium is maintained.

			The obtained bud is inserted or attached to the grafting window made on the rootstock. Attachment is done carefully, but there is still some cambium damage.
		6 = good	Cleanliness of the cambium is not maintained, resulting in poor bud attachment.
		7 = excellent	The obtained bud is inserted or attached to the grafting window made on the rootstock. Attachment is done carefully so as not to damage the cambium, but cleanliness of the cambium is not maintained, resulting in poor bud attachment.
The obtained bud is inserted or attached to the grafting window made on the rootstock. Attachment is done carefully so as not to damage the	5.	1 = poor	Graft Tying Technique
		2 = very lacking	The graft is tied using plastic that does not match the specified material. The tying is done in a haphazard manner, and the bud is bound very tightly.
		3 = lacking	The graft is tied using plastic that does not match the specified material. The tying uses a shingle (overlapping) system from top to bottom, and the bud is not tied very tightly.

cambium. Cleanliness of the cambium is maintained, since it could otherwise disrupt the union of the graft.		5 = adequate	The graft is tied using plastic matching the specified material, with a tie approximately 20 cm long, 1.5 cm wide, and 0.1 mm thick. The tying uses a shingle system from top to bottom, but the bud is tied very tightly.
		6 = good	The graft is tied using plastic matching the specified material, with a tie approximately 20 cm long, 1.5 cm wide, and 0.1 mm thick. The tying uses a shingle system from bottom to top, but the bud is tied very tightly.
		7 = excellent	The graft is tied using plastic matching the specified material, with a tie approximately 20 cm long, 1.5 cm wide, and 0.1 mm thick. The tying
			is done using a shingle system from bottom to top. The bud is not tied too tightly, since this could damage it.
6.	Speed	1 = poor	Working longer than the allotted time and the result is very untidy and does not meet the standard.
		2 = very lacking	Working longer than the allotted time, and the result is untidy, although it meets the standard.
		3 = lacking	Working within or less than the allotted time, but the result is untidy and does not meet the standard.
		5 = adequate	Working within or less than the allotted time, but the result is untidy, although it meets the standard.
		6 = good	Working longer than the allotted time, but the result is neat and meets the standard.
		7 = excellent	Working within or less than the allotted time, and the result is very neat and meets the standard.
7.	Number of Successfully Grafted Plants	1 = poor	Only 1 plant was grafted, and the grafting technique was inaccurate.
		2 = very lacking	Able to graft 1 plant with the correct and accurate technique within 10 minutes.

		3 = lacking	Able to graft 2 plants with the correct and accurate technique within 10 minutes.
		5 = adequate	Able to graft 3 plants with the correct and accurate technique within 10 minutes.
		6 = good	Able to graft 4 plants with the correct and accurate technique within 10 minutes.
		7 = excellent	Able to graft 5 plants with the correct and accurate technique within 10 minutes or less.

Appendix 5.2 Plant Grafting Technique Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET PLANT GRAFTING TECHNIQUE

Name : Student
ID :
Institution of Origin :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Suitability of materials and tools a. Sharp grafting knife b. Cutting shears c. <i>Dormant, healthy, and fresh scion, cylindrical in shape, sized 1.5 – 2.5 cm</i> d. <i>Rootstock aged 7-12 months with a minimum diameter of 2 cm</i> e. Clear plastic (1.5 cm) f. Alcohol (70%)	10		
2	Accuracy in making the grafting window	25		
3	Technique of taking the bud	25		
4	Technique of attaching or inserting the bud	10		
5	Graft tying technique	10		
6	Speed	10		
7	Number of successfully grafted plants	10		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent) Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.3 Coffee Bean Sorting Assessment Rubric

COFFEE BEAN SORTING ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Term	Definition
coffee	bean of the <i>Coffea</i> spp plant, in unhusked and unroasted form
black bean	a coffee bean whose outer surface is half or more black, whether glossy or wrinkled
partial black bean	a coffee bean whose outer surface is less than half black, or has one bluish-black spot but no hole, or a hole is found with a black color larger than the hole itself
broken black bean	a black coffee bean that is not whole, sized equal to or less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole bean, or a partial black bean that is broken
whole dried coffee cherry	a dried coffee fruit still wrapped in its compound skin, either whole or with a size equal to or greater than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole compound skin
brown bean	a coffee bean whose outer surface is half or more brown, older than the general population, whether glossy or wrinkled. A broken brown bean is counted as a broken bean
large coffee husk	the compound skin (pericarp) of a whole dried coffee cherry, with or without the silver skin and parchment inside it, sized larger than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole compound skin
medium coffee husk	the compound skin of a whole dried coffee cherry, with or without the silver skin and parchment inside it, sized $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole compound skin
small coffee husk	the compound skin of a whole dried coffee cherry, with or without the silver skin and parchment inside it, sized less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of a whole compound skin
parchment-covered bean	a coffee bean still wrapped in parchment, covering the bean either whole or with a size equal to or greater than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole parchment skin
large parchment skin	parchment skin, whether detached or not from the coffee bean, sized larger than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole parchment skin
medium parchment skin	parchment skin, whether detached or not from the coffee bean, sized $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole parchment skin
small parchment skin	parchment skin detached from the coffee bean, sized less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of a whole parchment skin

broken bean	a coffee bean that is not whole, sized equal to or less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a whole bean
-------------	--

immature bean	a coffee bean that is small and wrinkled over its entire outer surface
single-holed bean	a coffee bean with a single hole caused by insect attack
multi-holed bean	a coffee bean with more than one hole caused by insect attack
spotted bean	a coffee bean that is spotted on $\frac{1}{2}$ (half) or more of its outer surface this provision applies only to coffee processed using the wet processing method
large-sized twigs, soil, or stones	twigs, soil, or stones with a length or diameter greater than 10 mm
medium-sized twigs, soil, or stones	twigs, soil, or stones with a length or diameter of 5 mm -10 mm
small-sized twigs, soil, or stones	twigs, soil, or stones with a length or diameter less than 5 mm
defect value	the value assigned to each type of defect

Coffee Bean Quality Assessment Based on the Defect Value System

1. Coffee bean quality classification requirements

Quality	Requirements
Quality 1	Maximum total defect value of 11
Quality 2	Total defect value 12 to 25
Quality 3	Total defect value 26 to 44
Quality 4a	Total defect value 45 to 60
Quality 4b	Total defect value 61 to 80
Quality 5	Total defect value 81 to 150
Quality 6	Total defect value 151 to 225
No quality grade	Total defect value more than 225

2. Determination of coffee bean defect values

No.	Defect Type	Defect Value
1	1 (one) black bean	1 (one)
2	1 (one) partial black bean	½ (half)
3	1 (one) broken black bean	½ (half)
4	1 (one) whole dried coffee cherry	1 (one)
5	1 (one) brown bean	¼ (quarter)
6	1 (one) large coffee husk	1 (one)
7	1 (one) medium coffee husk	½ (half)
8	1 (one) small coffee husk	1/5 (one-fifth)
9	1 (one) parchment-covered bean	½ (half)
10	1 (one) large parchment skin	½ (half)
11	1 (one) medium parchment skin	1/5 (one-fifth)
12	1 (one) small parchment skin	1/10 (one-tenth)
13	1 (one) broken bean	1/5 (one-fifth)
14	1 (one) immature bean	1/5 (one-fifth)
15	1 (one) single-holed bean	1/10 (one-tenth)
16	1 (one) multi-holed bean	1/5 (one-fifth)
17	1 (one) spotted bean	1/10 (one-tenth)
18	1 (one) large-sized twig, soil, or stone	5 (five)
19	1 (one) medium-sized twig, soil, or stone	2 (two)
20	1 (one) small-sized twig, soil, or stone	1 (one)

NOTE: The total defect value is calculated from a test sample weighing 300 g. If one coffee bean has more than one defect value, the determination is based on the largest defect weight.

Test Method for Determining Defect Value and Coffee Bean Impurity

Content Principle:

1. Physical separation of defective beans and impurities and calculation of the defect value;
2. Input data into the entry form.

Procedure:

1. Weigh a 300 g test sample and spread it on a sheet of paper. Select and separate the defective beans and impurities present in the sample. Place each group of coffee beans separately in a watch glass or aluminum dish and calculate its defect value;
2. Similarly, impurities such as twigs, soil, stones, and other foreign objects are collected in separate containers, and their defect value is then calculated.

Presentation of Test Results:

If one coffee bean has more than one type of defect, only one type of defect is assessed, namely the type with the highest defect value.

To simplify the calculation, a table is made for each sample; enter the number of defects in the appropriate column.

Defect Value Determination Form

No.	Defect Type	Defect Value	Number of Defects	Total Defect Value
1	1 (one) black bean	1 (one)		
2	1 (one) partial black bean	½ (half)		
3	1 (one) broken black bean	½ (half)		
4	1 (one) whole dried coffee cherry	1 (one)		
5	1 (one) brown bean	¼ (quarter)		
6	1 (one) large coffee husk	1 (one)		
7	1 (one) medium coffee husk	½ (half)		
8	1 (one) small coffee husk	1/5 (one-fifth)		
9	1 (one) parchment-covered bean	½ (half)		
10	1 (one) large parchment skin	½ (half)		
11	1 (one) medium parchment skin	1/5 (one-fifth)		
12	1 (one) small parchment skin	1/10 (one-tenth)		
13	1 (one) broken bean	1/5 (one-fifth)		
14	1 (one) immature bean	1/5 (one-fifth)		
15	1 (one) single-holed bean	1/10 (one-tenth)		
16	1 (one) multi-holed bean	1/5 (one-fifth)		
17	1 (one) spotted bean	1/10 (one-tenth)		
18	1 (one) large-sized twig, soil, or stone	5 (five)		
19	1 (one) medium-sized twig, soil, or stone	2 (two)		
20	1 (one) small-sized twig, soil, or stone	1 (one)		
TOTAL DEFECT VALUE:				

**The time required to test quality (minutes) is filled in by the committee when the participant submits the answer sheet.*

Coffee Bean Quality Test Answer Sheet

Name :

Institution of

Origin :

Time :

No.	Defect Type	Defect Value	Number of Defects	Total Defect Value
1	1 (one) black bean	1 (one)		
2	1 (one) partial black bean	½ (half)		
3	1 (one) broken black bean	½ (half)		
4	1 (one) whole dried coffee cherry	1 (one)		
5	1 (one) brown bean	¼ (quarter)		
6	1 (one) large coffee husk	1 (one)		
7	1 (one) medium coffee husk	½ (half)		
8	1 (one) small coffee husk	1/5 (one-fifth)		
9	1 (one) parchment-covered bean	½ (half)		
10	1 (one) large parchment skin	½ (half)		
11	1 (one) medium parchment skin	1/5 (one-fifth)		
12	1 (one) small parchment skin	1/10 (one-tenth)		
13	1 (one) broken bean	1/5 (one-fifth)		
14	1 (one) immature bean	1/5 (one-fifth)		
15	1 (one) single-holed bean	1/10 (one-tenth)		
16	1 (one) multi-holed bean	1/5 (one-fifth)		
17	1 (one) spotted bean	1/10 (one-tenth)		
18	1 (one) large-sized twig, soil, or stone	5 (five)		
19	1 (one) medium-sized twig, soil, or stone	2 (two)		
20	1 (one) small-sized twig, soil, or stone	1 (one)		
TOTAL DEFECT VALUE:				
QUALITY GRADE:				

**The time required to test quality (minutes) is filled in by the committee when the participant submits the answer sheet.*

Appendix 5.4 Coffee Bean Sorting Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET COFFEE BEAN SORTING

Name : Student

ID : Institution

Name : Time :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Accuracy of the sample according to SNI	30		
2	Speed in completing the selection	30		
3	Selection of the selection method	20		
4	Accuracy in drawing conclusions about coffee bean quality	20		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.5 Chicken Carcass Processing Technique Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC CHICKEN CARCASS PROCESSING TECHNIQUE

A. 8-PIECE CARCASS CUT**I. Speed/Time/Duration Criteria**

Score	Evisceration and Cutting Time
7	Less than 5 minutes
6	5-7 minutes
5	8-10 minutes
3	11 - 13 minutes
2	14 - 16 minutes
1	more than 16 minutes

Note: Time is calculated as the cumulative process for 2 (two) carcasses.

II. Criteria for Accuracy of Cutting the Carcass Into 8 Pieces**Several criteria used:**

1. The carcass is cut into 8 pieces.
2. The right shank (leg) is cut at the femur-carpus joint boundary, forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
3. The left shank (leg) is cut at the femur-carpus joint boundary, forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
4. Observation of the lower right thigh (drumstick): the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
5. Observation of the lower left thigh (drumstick): the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
6. Observation of the upper right thigh: the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
7. Observation of the upper left thigh: the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.

Score	Criteria
7	Meets 7 criteria
6	Meets 6 criteria
5	Meets 5 criteria
3	Meets 4 criteria
2	Meets 3 criteria
1	Meets fewer than 3 criteria

III. Accuracy of Evisceration

Several criteria used:

1. The intestine is whole and not cut.
2. The liver is whole and undamaged.
3. The gallbladder is not ruptured.
4. The esophagus is not detached from the crop.
5. The crop is not detached from the proventriculus.
6. The esophagus, crop, proventriculus, gizzard, small intestine, large intestine, caecum, and vent are not separated into pieces, remaining as one connected series.

Score	Criteria
7	Meets 6 criteria
6	Meets 5 criteria
5	Meets 4 criteria
3	Meets 3 criteria
2	Meets 2 criteria
1	Meets fewer than 2 criteria

IV. Final Result of Cutting the Carcass Into 8 Pieces

Several criteria used:

1. The right and left breast cut proportions are balanced.
2. The right and left wing cut proportions are balanced.
3. The right and left upper thigh cut proportions are balanced.
4. The right breast skin covers the meat cut properly.
5. The left breast skin covers the meat cut properly.
6. The right upper thigh skin covers the meat cut properly.
7. The left upper thigh skin covers the meat cut properly.
8. The right drumstick skin covers the meat cut properly.
9. The left drumstick skin covers the meat cut properly.
10. Arranging the cut results according to Figure 1, Carcass Divided into 8 Parts (SNI 3924:2009).



Figure 1. Carcass divided into 8 parts

Score	Criteria
7	Meets 9-10 criteria
6	Meets 7-8 criteria
5	Meets 5-6 criteria
3	Meets 3-4 criteria
2	Meets 2 criteria
1	Meets fewer than 2 criteria

B. 9-PIECE CARCASS CUT

I. Speed/Time/Duration Criteria

The assessment is already accumulated over 2 (two) carcasses.

II. Criteria for Accuracy of Cutting the Carcass Into 9 Pieces

Several criteria used:

1. The carcass is cut into 9 pieces.
2. The right shank (leg) is cut at the femur-carpus joint boundary, forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
3. The left shank (leg) is cut at the femur-carpus joint boundary, forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
4. Observation of the lower right thigh (drumstick): the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
5. Observation of the lower left thigh (drumstick): the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
6. Observation of the upper right thigh: the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.
7. Observation of the upper left thigh: the upper and lower thigh joint is cut forming a figure-8 shape, smoothly without scratches.

Score	Criteria
7	Meets 7 criteria
6	Meets 6 criteria
5	Meets 5 criteria
3	Meets 4 criteria
2	Meets 3 criteria
1	Meets fewer than 3 criteria

III. Accuracy of Evisceration

Several criteria used (same as the 8-piece cut):

1. The intestine is whole and not cut.

2. The liver is whole and undamaged.
3. The gallbladder is not ruptured.
4. The esophagus is not detached from the crop.
5. The crop is not detached from the proventriculus.
6. The esophagus, crop, proventriculus, gizzard, small intestine, large intestine, caecum, and vent are not separated into pieces, remaining as one connected series.

Score	Criteria
7	Meets 6 criteria
6	Meets 5 criteria
5	Meets 4 criteria
3	Meets 3 criteria
2	Meets 2 criteria
1	Meets fewer than 2 criteria

IV. Final Result of Cutting the Carcass Into 9 Pieces

Several criteria used:

1. The right and left wing cut proportions are balanced.
2. The right and left upper thigh cut proportions are balanced.
3. The right and left back cut proportions are balanced.
4. The breast skin covers the meat cut properly.
5. The right upper thigh skin covers the meat cut properly.
6. The left upper thigh skin covers the meat cut properly.
7. The right drumstick skin covers the meat cut properly.
8. The left drumstick skin covers the meat cut properly.
9. Arranging the cut results according to Figure 2, Carcass Divided into 9 Parts (SNI 3924:2009).



Figure 2. Carcass divided into 9 parts

Score	Criteria
7	Meets 9 criteria
6	Meets 7-8 criteria
5	Meets 5-6 criteria
3	Meets 3-4 criteria
2	Meets 2 criteria
1	Meets fewer than 2 criteria

Appendix 5.6 Chicken Carcass Processing Technique Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET CHICKEN CARCASS PROCESSING TECHNIQUE

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Speed/time/duration	20		
2	Neatness and cleanliness of the carcass	30		
3	Accuracy in	30		
4	Final result	20		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung, 2026
 Panel of Judges

()

Appendix 5.7 Chicken Blood Sampling Technique Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC CHICKEN BLOOD SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

1. Preparing Tools and Materials

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score (1–5)	Criteria
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Accuracy of Tool and Material Preparation Materials	50	1	Preparation of tools and materials taking > 2 minutes
			2	Preparation of tools and materials taking > 1 minute up to 2 minutes
			3	Preparation of tools and materials taking 30 seconds up to 1 minute
			6	Preparation of tools and materials taking < 30 seconds
2	Completeness of Tools and Materials	50	1	More than 4 items of tools/materials missing
			2	4 items of tools/materials missing
			3	3 items of tools/materials missing
			5	2 items of tools/materials missing
			6	1 item of tools/materials missing
			7	Tools and materials complete
	Total	100		

2. Handling

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score (1–5)	Criteria
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Accuracy of Handling Technique	50	1	<i>Handling does not follow the requested method, taking > 2 minutes</i>
			2	<i>Handling does not follow the requested method, taking 1 minute up to 2 minutes</i>

			3	<i>Handling does not follow the requested method, taking < 1 minute</i>
			5	<i>Handling follows the requested method, taking > 2 minutes</i>
			6	<i>Handling follows the requested method, taking 1 minute up to 2 minutes</i>
			7	<i>Handling follows the requested method, taking < 1 minute</i>
2	Feasibility of Results, Safety, and Animal Welfare	50	1	The chicken dies during the handling process
			2	The chicken escapes during the handling process
			4	The chicken is not well controlled, but does not escape during the handling process
			6	The chicken is well controlled during the handling process
	Total	100		

3. Procedural Accuracy

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score (1–5)	Criteria
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Procedural Accuracy (blood sample collection, preparation of thin blood smear, and preparation of the syringe for obtaining serum)	35	1	Blood is not drawn from the requested location (blood vessel)
			2	Working time > 5 minutes
			3	Working time > 4 minutes up to 5 minutes
			5	Working time > 3 minutes up to 4 minutes
			6	Working time > 2 minutes up to 3 minutes
			7	Working time ≤ 2 minutes
2	Success of blood collection based on the collection site	30	3	Blood collection succeeded after trying 2 locations/veins
			5	Blood collection succeeded from 1 location/vein, but required 2 syringes

			7	Blood collection succeeded from 1 location/vein, requiring only 1 syringe
3	Safety and Animal Welfare	35	1	The chicken dies during the blood collection process
			2	Bleeding outside the body and hematoma
			3	Bleeding outside the body or hematoma
			5	No bleeding outside the body and no hematoma
	Total	100		

4. Accuracy of Results

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score (1–5)	Criteria
1	Serum Quality	50	1	No serum obtained
			2	Serum is dark red
			3	Serum is pink
			6	Serum is clear with a blood clot sediment
			7	Serum is clear without a blood clot sediment
2	Quality of the Thin Blood Smear Preparation	50	1	Not performed due to damage to tools or materials caused by participant carelessness
			2	No thin area with separated blood cells is formed
			4	A thin smear is formed where the blood cells are separated outside the middle 1/3 area of the length of the object glass area
			7	A thin smear is formed where the blood cells are separated within the middle 1/3 area of the length of the object glass area
	Total	100		

Appendix 5.8 Chicken Blood Sampling Technique Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET CHICKEN BLOOD SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

Name :

Student ID:

Institution Name

:

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1-7)	Value
<i>A</i>	<i>Preparing Tools and Materials</i>			
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Procedural Accuracy of Tool and Material Preparation	50		
2	Completeness of Tools and Materials	50		
Total		100		
<i>B</i>	<i>Handling</i>			
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Accuracy of Handling Technique	50		
2	Feasibility of Results, Safety, and Animal Welfare	50		
Total		100		
<i>C</i>	<i>Procedural Accuracy</i>			
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Procedural Accuracy (blood sample collection, preparation of thin blood smear, and preparation of the syringe for obtaining serum)	35		
2	Success of blood collection based on the collection site	30		
3	<i>Safety and Animal Welfare</i>	35		

Total		100		
<i>D</i>	<i>Accuracy of Results</i>			
1	Serum quality	50		
2	Thin blood smear preparation quality	50		
Total		100		
Grand Total				

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
 Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.9 Livestock Feed Formulation Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC LIVESTOCK FEED FORMULATION

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Speed/time/duration	1 = poor	Did not complete the feed formulation fully within 45 minutes
		2 = very lacking	Time to fully prepare the ration takes more than 45 minutes
		3 = lacking	Time to fully prepare the ration takes 45 minutes
		5 = adequate	Time to fully prepare the ration takes 40 - 44 minutes
		6 = good	Time to fully prepare the ration takes 35 - 44 minutes
		7 = excellent	Time to fully prepare the ration takes less than 35 minutes
2	Accuracy in selecting feed ingredients	1 = poor	Very few feed ingredients selected; there are ingredients containing anti-nutrients, and the crude fiber content is above the maximum limit
		2 = very lacking	A small number of feed ingredients selected; there are ingredients containing anti-nutrients, and the crude fiber content is above the maximum limit
		3 = lacking	A fairly large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is fairly above the maximum limit
		5 = adequate	A fairly large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is slightly above the maximum limit
		6 = good	A large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is still within the maximum limit

		7 = excellent	A very large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is low
3	Nutritional balance of the ration	1 = poor	The formulation result is very inconsistent with the feed standard
		2 = very lacking	The formulation result is far from the feed standard
		3 = lacking	The formulation result is below the feed standard
		5 = adequate	The formulation result exceeds the feed standard
		6 = good	The formulation result slightly exceeds the feed standard
		7 = excellent	The formulation result matches the feed standard
4	Compliance with nutritional requirements	1 = poor	The formulation result is very inconsistent with the feed standard
		2 = very lacking	The formulation result is far from the feed standard
		3 = lacking	The formulation result is below the feed standard
		5 = adequate	The formulation result exceeds the feed standard
		6 = good	The formulation result slightly exceeds the feed standard
		7 = excellent	The formulation result matches the feed standard
5	Efficiency (price)	1 = poor	Feed price calculation is more than IDR 10,000/kg
		2 = very lacking	Feed price calculation reaches IDR 10,000/kg
		3 = lacking	Feed price calculation is between $\geq$ IDR 9,000/kg to $<$ IDR 10,000/kg
		5 = adequate	Feed price calculation is between $>$ IDR 8,000/kg to $<$ IDR 9,000/kg
		6 = good	Feed price calculation is between IDR 7,000 – 8,000/kg
		7 = excellent	Feed price calculation is less than IDR 7,000/kg

Appendix 5.10 Livestock Feed Formulation Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET LIVESTOCK FEED FORMULATION

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Speed/time/duration	10		
2	Accuracy in selecting feed ingredients	25		
3	Nutritional balance of the ration	20		
4	Compliance with nutritional requirements	20		
5	Efficiency (price)	25		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.11 Fish Feed Formulation Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
FISH FEED FORMULATION

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Speed/time/duration	1 = poor	Did not complete the feed formulation fully within 45 minutes
		2 = very lacking	Time to fully prepare the ration takes more than 45 minutes
		3 = lacking	Time to fully prepare the ration takes 45 minutes
		5 = adequate	Time to fully prepare the ration takes 40 - 44 minutes
		6 = good	Time to fully prepare the ration takes 35 - 44 minutes
		7 = excellent	Time to fully prepare the ration takes less than 35 minutes
2	Accuracy in selecting feed ingredients	1 = poor	Very few feed ingredients selected; there are ingredients containing anti-nutrients, and the crude fiber content is above the maximum limit
		2 = very lacking	A small number of feed ingredients selected; there are ingredients containing anti-nutrients, and the crude fiber content is above the maximum limit
		3 = lacking	A fairly large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is fairly above the maximum limit
		5 = adequate	A fairly large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is slightly above the maximum limit
		6 = good	A large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is still within the maximum limit

		7 = excellent	A very large number of feed ingredients selected, no ingredients containing anti-nutrients used, and the crude fiber content is low
3	Nutritional balance of the ration	1 = poor	The formulation result is very inconsistent with the feed standard
		2 = very lacking	The formulation result is far from the feed standard
		3 = lacking	The formulation result is below the feed standard
		5 = adequate	The formulation result exceeds the feed standard
		6 = good	The formulation result slightly exceeds the feed standard
		7 = excellent	The formulation result matches the feed standard
4	Compliance with nutritional requirements	1 = poor	The formulation result is very inconsistent with the feed standard
		2 = very lacking	The formulation result is far from the feed standard
		3 = lacking	The formulation result is below the feed standard
		5 = adequate	The formulation result exceeds the feed standard
		6 = good	The formulation result slightly exceeds the feed standard
		7 = excellent	The formulation result matches the feed standard
5	Efficiency (price)	1 = poor	Feed price calculation is more than IDR 10,000/kg
		2 = very lacking	Feed price calculation reaches IDR 10,000/kg
		3 = lacking	Feed price calculation is between $\geq$ IDR 9,000/kg to $<$ IDR 10,000/kg
		5 = adequate	Feed price calculation is between $>$ IDR 8,000/kg to $<$ IDR 9,000/kg
		6 = good	Feed price calculation is between IDR 7,000 – 8,000/kg
		7 = excellent	Feed price calculation is less than IDR 7,000/kg

Appendix 5.12 Fish Feed Formulation Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET FISH FEED FORMULATION

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Speed/time/duration	15		
2	Accuracy in selecting feed ingredients	25		
3	Nutritional balance of the ration	20		
4	Compliance with nutritional requirements	15		
5	Efficiency (price)	25		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.13 Fish Seed Packing Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
FISH SEED PACKING

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
A. Packing Process			
1	Speed	1	The packing process is very slow, far from the time target.
		2	The packing process is very slow, not reaching the time target.
		3	Packing speed is still below the time target.
		5	<i>Packing proceeds fairly quickly, in line with the time target.</i>
		6	<i>Packing proceeds quickly, in line with the time target.</i>
		7	The packing process is very quick, successfully reaching the time target well.
2	Accuracy	1	No accuracy or precision in any step; the result is very inaccurate.
		2	Lack of accuracy and precision; the result is often inaccurate.
		3	Accuracy and precision need improvement; some errors still occur.
		5	Accuracy and precision in each step are fairly good.
		6	Accuracy and precision are very good; the result is accurate and consistent.
		7	Accuracy and precision are outstanding; the result is accurate and consistent in all aspects.
3	Technical skill	1	No understanding of the tools and materials used.
		2	Understanding of the tools and materials is still very limited.
		3	Has a basic understanding of the tools and materials used.
		5	Has a fairly good understanding of the tools and materials.
		6	Has a deep understanding of the tools and materials, able to explain them well.

		7	Has an outstanding understanding of the tools and materials, able to give a deep and detailed explanation.
--	--	---	--

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
B. Packing Quality			
1	Cleanliness	1	The work area is very messy and disorganized.
		2	The work area is disorganized, with a lot of clutter.
		3	The work area is fairly organized, but still has some clutter.
		5	The work area is organized and clean.
		6	The work area is very organized and clean.
		7	The work area is very neat and clean, reflecting professionalism.
2	Packing density	1	The packing density is very inappropriate, causing damage or loss of seeds.
		2	The packing density is less appropriate; some seeds are damaged or missing.
		3	Most of the packing has an appropriate density, but there is still some damage or loss.
		5	The packing density matches the expected standard.
		6	The packing density is very appropriate, with almost no damage or loss.
		7	All packing has an outstandingly appropriate density, with no damage or loss.
3	Stress protection	1	No stress protection measures are taken; the seeds are very vulnerable to stress.
		2	Stress protection measures are taken to a limited extent; some seeds are still exposed to stress.
		3	Some stress protection measures are taken, but still need improvement.
		5	Stress protection measures are fairly good; most seeds are protected.
		6	Stress protection measures are done well; the seeds are well protected.

		7	Stress protection measures are excellent; the seeds are protected from various stress factors.
4	Water and oxygen quality	1	No measures are taken to maintain water and oxygen quality; the fish seeds are exposed to poor conditions.
		2	Measures to maintain water and oxygen quality are limited; there is still a risk of poor conditions.
		3	Some measures are taken, but still need improvement to maintain good quality.
		5	Measures to maintain water and oxygen quality are done well; the risk of poor conditions is minimal.
		6	Measures to maintain water and oxygen quality are very good; conditions are optimal for the fish seeds.
		7	Measures to maintain water and oxygen quality are outstanding; water and oxygen quality are maintained at the best level.
5	Health and vitality of the fish seeds	1	Handling of the fish seeds is very rough, causing severe damage to the seeds.
		2	Handling of the fish seeds is careless, causing significant damage.
		3	Some fish seeds are handled carefully, but there is still some damage.
		5	Most fish seeds are handled carefully; minimal damage.
		6	All fish seeds are handled very carefully, with no damage.
		7	All fish seeds are handled with outstanding care and perfection.

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
C. Overall Appearance			
1	Proportionality	1	The packaging and arrangement of the fish seeds is very untidy.
		2	The packaging and arrangement of the fish seeds is untidy.
		3	Some parts of the packaging and arrangement of the fish seeds are neat, but there are still inconsistencies.
		5	The packaging and arrangement of the fish seeds is neat.
		6	The packaging and arrangement of the fish seeds is very neat.

		7	The packaging and arrangement of the fish seeds is very neat and well organized.
2	Creativity	1	No effort to create a creative design or concept; the packing is very simple and unattractive.
		2	The packing design and concept are very limited, unattractive, and lacking innovation.
		3	The packing design and concept have some creative elements, but still need further development.
		5	The packing design and concept are fairly creative, with some attractive elements.
		6	The packing design and concept are fairly creative, successfully attracting attention with a good idea.
		7	The packing design and concept are outstandingly creative, creating a unique and impressive visual experience.

Appendix 5.14 Fish Seed Packing Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET FISH SEED PACKING

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
A	Packing Process			
1	Speed	5		
2	Accuracy	10		
3	Technical skill	15		
B	Packing Quality			
1	Cleanliness	10		
2	Packing density	10		
3	Stress protection	10		
4	Water and oxygen quality	10		
5	Health and vitality of the fish seeds	10		
C	Overall Appearance			
1	Proportionality	10		
2	Creativity	10		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....
.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.15 Fish Filleting Technique Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FISH FILLETING TECHNIQUE

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
1.	Suitability of materials and tools	1 = poor	The participant's ability to prepare materials and tools according to the filleting method is below 50%.
		2 = very lacking	The participant's ability to prepare materials and tools according to the filleting method is below 60%.
		3 = lacking	The participant's ability to prepare materials and tools according to the filleting method is below 70%.
		5 = adequate	The participant's ability to prepare materials and tools according to the filleting method is below 80%.
		6 = good	The participant's ability to prepare materials and tools according to the filleting method is below 90%.
		7 = excellent	The participant's ability to prepare materials and tools according to the filleting method is above 90%.
2.	Speed fish filleting process	1 = poor	Unable to properly carry out the fish filleting process through to packaging.
		2 = very lacking	Unable to carry out the fish filleting process, but packaging is good.
		3 = lacking	Able to carry out part of the fish filleting process, but packaging is not good.
		5 = adequate	Able to carry out part of the fish filleting process and part of the fillet packaging.
		6 = good	Able to carry out the fish filleting process well, but packaging is less than perfect.
		7 = excellent	Able to properly carry out the fish filleting process through to packaging.
3.	Slice accuracy (shape)	1 = does not conform	The cut does not conform to the standard type well (Skin off Fillet, Skinless Fillet, Skin Fillet, and Butterfly Fillet).

		7 = conforms	The cut conforms to the standard type well (Skin off Fillet, Skinless Fillet, Skin Fillet, and Butterfly Fillet).
--	--	--------------	---

4.	Slice accuracy (size)	1 = poor	The resulting fillet yield is < 40%.
		2 = very lacking	The resulting fillet yield is 41 – 50%.
		3 = lacking	The resulting fillet yield is 51 – 60%.
		5 = adequate	The resulting fillet yield is 61 – 70%.
		6 = good	The resulting fillet yield is 71 – 80%.
		7 = excellent	The resulting fillet yield is > 81%.
The obtained bud is inserted or attached to the grafting window made on the rootstock. Attachment is done carefully so as not to damage the cambium. Cleanliness of the cambium is maintained, since it could otherwise disrupt the union of the graft.	Number of bones	1 = poor	More than 10 bones present.
		2 = very lacking	9 – 10 bones present.
		3 = lacking	7 – 8 bones present.
		5 = adequate	5 – 6 bones present.
		6 = good	Fewer than 5 bones present.
		7 = excellent	No bones present.
6.	Completeness	1 = poor	Untidy and defective.
		2 = very lacking	Untidy with < 20% defects.
		3 = lacking	Neat with 20% defects.
		5 = adequate	Neat with 10% defects.

		6 = good	Neat with 5% defects.
		7 = excellent	Neat with no defects.
7.	Yield	1 = poor	Yield < 30%.
		2 = very lacking	High yield 31 – 40%.
		3 = lacking	High yield 41 – 50%.
		5 = adequate	High yield 51 – 60%.
		6 = good	High yield 61 – 80%.
		7 = excellent	High yield > 81%.
8	Sanitation and hygiene	1 = poor	Poor sanitation and hygiene, with > 4 physical contaminants.
		2 = very lacking	Poor sanitation and hygiene, but with 4 – 2 physical contaminants.
		3 = lacking	Poor sanitation and hygiene, but with 2 – 0 physical contaminants.
		5 = adequate	Good sanitation and hygiene, but with > 4 physical contaminants.
		6 = good	Good sanitation and hygiene, but with < 2 physical contaminants.
		7 = excellent	Proper and good sanitation and hygiene, no physical contaminants.
9	Presentation / appearance	1 = poor	Presentation/appearance unattractive and packaging untidy.
		2 = very lacking	Presentation/appearance unattractive and packaging neat.
		3 = lacking	Presentation/appearance attractive and packaging untidy.
		5 = adequate	Presentation/appearance fairly attractive and packaging fairly neat.
		6 = good	Presentation/appearance attractive and packaging fairly neat.
		7 = excellent	Presentation/appearance attractive and packaging neat and taut.

Appendix 5.16 Fish Filleting Technique Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET FISH FILLETING TECHNIQUE

Name:

Student ID:

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Standard fish fillet quality characteristics			
	a. Slice accuracy (shape)	5		
	b. Size accuracy	10		
	c. Completeness	5		
	d. Number of bones	10		
2	Suitability of materials and tools	10		
3	Speed	10		
4	Yield	20		
5	Sanitation and hygiene	15		
6	Presentation/appearance	15		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....
.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.17 Fish Meatball Making Technique Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FISH MEATBALL MAKING TECHNIQUE

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Time (duration) of making the fish meatballs	1 = poor	Fish meatball making duration more than 60 minutes
		2 = very lacking	Fish meatball making duration between 51-60 minutes
		3 = lacking	Fish meatball making duration between 46-50 minutes
		5 = adequate	Fish meatball making duration between 36-45 minutes
		6 = good	Fish meatball making duration between 31-35 minutes
		7 = excellent	Fish meatball making duration maximum 30 minutes
2	Sanitation and hygiene of the processing	1 = poor	Ingredients, tools, place, and worker are not hygienic
		2 = very lacking	Ingredients, tools, place, and worker are < 50% hygienic
		3 = lacking	Ingredients, tools, place, and worker are 50-75% hygienic
		5 = adequate	Ingredients, tools, place, and worker are up to 80% hygienic
		6 = good	Ingredients, tools, place, and worker are up to 90% hygienic
		7 = excellent	Ingredients, tools, place, and worker are perfectly hygienic
3	Uniformity of size and shape	1 = poor	Uniformity of shape and size < 25%
		2 = very lacking	Uniformity of shape and size 26-50%
		3 = lacking	Uniformity of shape and size 50%
		5 = adequate	Uniformity of shape and size 51-75%
		6 = good	Uniformity of shape and size 76-90%
		7 = excellent	Uniformity of shape and size > 90%
4	Color	1 = poor	Dull cream color
		2 = very lacking	Dull white-to-cream color
		3 = lacking	Bright white-to-cream color
		5 = adequate	Somewhat bright white color
		6 = good	Bright white color
		7 = excellent	Very bright white color
5	Taste and aroma	1 = poor	No distinctive fish taste/aroma and no distinctive fish-meatball seasonings

		2 = very lacking	Very little distinctive fish taste/aroma and distinctive fish-meatball seasonings
		3 = lacking	Weak distinctive fish taste/aroma and distinctive fish-meatball seasonings
		5 = adequate	Somewhat strong distinctive fish taste/aroma and distinctive fish-meatball seasonings
		6 = good	Strong distinctive fish taste/aroma and distinctive fish-meatball seasonings

		7 = excellent	Very strong distinctive fish taste/aroma and distinctive fish-meatball seasonings
6	Texture and slicing ability	1 = poor	The fish meatball texture is very dense and hard; fish bones are still found. Too tough when sliced, and very many cavities are found.
		2 = very lacking	The fish meatball texture is dense and somewhat hard; fish bones are still present. Somewhat tough when sliced; many cavities found.
		3 = lacking	The fish meatball texture is somewhat hard; no fish bones present. Slightly tough when sliced, and cavities are still found.
		5 = adequate	The fish meatball texture is somewhat soft and elastic; fish bones are still present. Can be sliced easily, and no cavities are found.
		6 = good	The fish meatball texture is soft and elastic; no fish bones present. Can be sliced easily, fairly smooth, and no cavities are found.
		7 = excellent	The fish meatball texture is very soft and elastic; no fish bones present. Can be sliced easily, smooth, and no cavities are found.
7	Presentation material	1 = poor	<i>Plating is untidy, presentation is halting, and language is non-standard.</i>
		2 = very lacking	<i>Plating is untidy, presentation is halting, and standard language is used.</i>
		3 = lacking	<i>Plating is somewhat neat, presentation is halting, and standard language is used.</i>
		5 = adequate	<i>Plating is neat, presentation is fluent, and standard language is used.</i>
		6 = good	<i>Plating is neat and somewhat attractive, presentation is fluent, and standard language is used.</i>

		7 = excellent	<i>Plating is neat and attractive, presentation is fluent, and standard language is used</i>
8	Accuracy in answering questions	1 = poor	Questions answered < 40%
		2 = very lacking	Questions answered 41-50%
		3 = lacking	Questions answered 51-60%
		5 = adequate	Questions answered 61-70%
		6 = good	Questions answered 71-80%
		7 = excellent	Questions answered > 80%

Appendix 5.18 Fish Meatball Making Technique Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET FISH MEATBALL MAKING TECHNIQUE

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Meatball making process			
	a. Time (duration) of meatball making	10		
	b. Sanitation and hygiene of the processing	10		
	c. Uniformity of size and shape	10		
2	Effectiveness of message delivery			
	a. Color	15		
	b. Taste and aroma	15		
	c. Texture and slicing ability	20		
3	Presentation and mastery of material			
	a. Presentation material	10		
	b. Accuracy in answering questions	10		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....
.....

Bandar Lampung, 2026
Panel of Judges

()

Appendix 5.19 Land Mapping Survey Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC LAND MAPPING SURVEY

5. Setting Up / Preparing Equipment

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score (1–5)	Criteria
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Procedural Accuracy	50	1	Setting up/preparing equipment does not follow the requested method, taking > 10 minutes
			2	Setting up/preparing equipment follows the requested method, taking 8 – 10 minutes
			3	Setting up/preparing equipment follows the requested method, taking 5 – 8 minutes
			4	Setting up/preparing equipment follows the requested method, taking 2 – 5 minutes
			5	Setting up/preparing equipment follows the requested method, taking < 2 minutes
2	Accuracy of Results	30	1	The tubular level and circular level are not centered, and the measurement stake is not visible
			2	The tubular level and circular level are almost centered, and the measurement stake is not exactly centered
			3	The tubular level is centered, the circular level is almost centered, and the measurement stake is not exactly centered
			4	The tubular level is centered, the circular level is almost centered, and the measurement stake is exactly centered
			5	The tubular level and circular level are exactly centered, and the measurement stake is exactly centered
3	<i>Equipment Safety and Teamwork</i>	20	1	Poor task/role division, the telescope is too high/too low, and the equipment is unsafe (removed before being fully secured)
			2	Good task/role division (well-coordinated), telescope height does not match eye level, and the equipment is unsafe (removed before being fully secured)

			3	Good task/role division (well-coordinated), telescope height matches eye level, but the equipment is unsafe (removed before being fully secured)
			4	Good task/role division (well-coordinated), telescope height does not match eye level, but the equipment is safe (not removed before being fully secured)
			5	Good task/role division (well-coordinated), telescope height matches eye level, and the equipment is safe (not removed before being fully secured)
	Total	100		

6. Measuring

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score (1–5)	Criteria
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Procedural Accuracy	50	1	Measuring does not follow the requested method
			2	Measuring follows the requested method, taking > 8 minutes
			3	Measuring follows the requested method, taking 5 – 8 minutes
			4	Measuring follows the requested method, taking 3 – 5 minutes
			5	Measuring follows the requested method, taking < 3 minutes
2	Accuracy of Results	30	1	Reading of the staff, horizontal angle, and vertical angle is not completed
			2	Staff reading accuracy > 10 mm, horizontal and vertical angle reading accuracy > 30'
			3	Staff reading accuracy 2-10 mm, horizontal and vertical angle reading accuracy 1'-30'
			4	Staff reading accuracy 2-10 mm, horizontal and vertical angle reading accuracy 5"-1'

			5	Staff reading accuracy < 2 mm, horizontal and vertical angle reading accuracy < 5"
3	<i>Equipment Safety and Teamwork</i>	20	1	Poor task/role division; the equipment is unprotected and gets bumped, changing its setting
			2	Poor task/role division; the equipment is protected but gets bumped, changing its setting
			3	Good task/role division; the equipment is protected but gets bumped, changing its setting
			4	Good task/role division; the equipment is unprotected but not bumped, and its setting does not change
			5	Good task/role division; the equipment is protected and not bumped, and its setting does not change
	Total	100		

7. Processing Measurement Data

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight	Score (1–5)	Criteria
1	Speed/Time/Duration and Procedural Accuracy	50	1	Calculating does not follow the requested method, taking
			2	Calculating follows the requested method, taking > 8 minutes
			3	Calculating follows the requested method, taking 5 – 8 minutes
			4	Calculating follows the requested method, taking 3 – 5 minutes
			5	Calculating follows the requested method, taking < 3 minutes
2	Accuracy of Results	40	1	Data processing not completed
			2	Data processing result error > 10 m2
			3	Data processing result error 5-10 m2
			4	Data processing result error 1-5 m2

			5	Data processing result error < 1 m2
3	<i>Teamwork</i>	10	1	Poor task/role division
			3	Good task/role division
			5	Very good task/role division
	Total	100		

Appendix 5.20 Land Mapping Survey Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET LAND MAPPING SURVEY

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

Setting Up / Preparing Equipment

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1-5)	Value
1	Speed/Time/Duration	30		
2	Procedural accuracy	20		
3	Accuracy of setup	30		
4	<i>Equipment safety</i>	10		
5	<i>Teamwork</i>	10		
Total		100		

1. Measuring

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1-5)	Value
1	Speed/Time/Duration	30		
2	Procedural accuracy	20		
3	Accuracy of setup	30		
4	<i>Equipment safety</i>	10		
5	<i>Teamwork</i>	10		
Total		100		

2. Processing Measurement Data

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score (1-5)	Value
1	Speed/Time/Duration	30		
2	Procedural accuracy	20		
3	Accuracy of setup	30		
4	<i>Equipment safety</i>	10		
5	<i>Teamwork</i>	10		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

FINAL SCORE RECAPITULATION SHEET LAND MAPPING SURVEY COMPETITION

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Aspect	Value
Area Measurement with Theodolite		
1	Setting up/Preparing the equipment	
2	Measuring	
3	Processing the measurement result data	
Grand Total		
Average		

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung, 2026
 Panel of Judges

()

Appendix 5.21 Agricultural Tool and Machine Design with AutoCAD Assessment Rubric

AGRICULTURAL TOOL AND MACHINE DESIGN WITH AutoCAD ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Accuracy/precision	1 = poor	The shape and dimension accuracy between the drawing and the work object is less than 30%.
		2 = very lacking	The shape and dimension accuracy between the drawing and the work object is up to 40%.
		3 = lacking	The shape and dimension accuracy between the drawing and the work object is up to 50%.
		5 = adequate	The shape and dimension accuracy between the drawing and the work object is up to 65%.
		6 = good	The shape and dimension accuracy between the drawing and the work object is up to 80%.
		7 = excellent	The shape and dimension accuracy between the drawing and the work object is more than 80%.
2	Working speed	1 = poor	Unable to create the drawing within the specified time period.
		2 = very lacking	Unable to complete the drawing within the specified time period.
		3 = lacking	Able to complete the drawing without its accompanying elements within the specified time period.
		5 = adequate	Able to complete the drawing and some of its accompanying elements within the specified time period.
		6 = good	Able to complete the drawing and all its accompanying elements within the specified time period.
		7 = excellent	Able to complete the drawing and its accompanying elements in less than the specified time period.
3	Skill in using the features available in <i>AutoCAD software</i>	1 = poor	Only able to run basic commands in AutoCAD 3D.
		2 = very lacking	Able to fulfill criterion 1 and able to run modification commands in AutoCAD 3D.

		3 = lacking	Able to fulfill criteria 1 and 2, plus able to give attributes (dimensions and text) to the AutoCAD 3D drawing that has been made.
		5 = adequate	Able to fulfill criteria 1 through 3, plus able to change the viewpoint of the AutoCAD 3D drawing.
		6 = good	Able to fulfill criteria 1 through 4, plus able to apply materials and perform the rendering process on the AutoCAD 3D drawing.
		7 = excellent	Able to fulfill criteria 1 through 5, plus able to print the drawing on the specified work sheet.
4	Compliance with technical drawing rules	1 = poor	The drawing is not finished.
		2 = very lacking	The drawing is not equipped with dimensions, a drawing header, or drawing notes.
		3 = lacking	The drawing is only equipped with one of: dimensions, notes, or a drawing header.
		5 = adequate	The drawing is complete, but the dimensions, notes, and drawing header do not meet the standard.
		6 = good	The drawing is complete, but one of the dimensions, notes, or drawing header does not meet the standard.
		7 = excellent	The drawing is equipped with dimensions, notes, and a drawing header that meet the standard.

Appendix 5.22 Agricultural Tool and Machine Design with AutoCAD Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRICULTURAL TOOL AND MACHINE DESIGN WITH AutoCAD

Name:

Student ID:

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Accuracy/precision	35		
2	Working speed	25		
3	Skill in using the features available in AutoCAD software	20		
4	Compliance with technical drawing rules	20		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.23 Agricultural Extension Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Message design and extension media	1 = poor	The correlation between the topic, title, introduction, content, and closing of the presentation is unclear; The outline sequence is unsystematic; There is no statement of the problem, objective, or presentation focus; there is no conclusion; There is no appeal in the delivery of the presentation
		2 = very lacking	The correlation between the topic, title, introduction, content, and closing of the presentation is unclear; The outline sequence is not very systematic; There is a statement of the problem, objective, or presentation focus, but it is unclear; Weak concluding statement; There is no appeal in the delivery of the presentation
		3 = lacking	Weak correlation between the topic, title, introduction, content, and closing of the presentation; The outline sequence is not very systematic; There is a statement of the problem, objective, or presentation focus, but it is not very clear; Weak concluding statement; Lacking appeal in the delivery of the presentation
		5 = adequate	Fair correlation between the topic, title, introduction, content, and closing of the presentation; The outline sequence is fairly systematic; There is a fairly clear statement of the problem, objective, or presentation focus; A fairly attention-grabbing concluding statement; fairly appealing presentation delivery with proportional use of media
		6 = good	Strong and logical correlation between the topic, title, introduction, content, and closing of the presentation; Systematic outline sequence; An adequate statement of the problem, objective, or presentation focus that matches the current needs of the audience; An attention-grabbing concluding statement; appealing presentation delivery with proportional use of media
		7 = excellent	Strong and logical organization and correlation

			between the topic, title, introduction, content, and closing of the presentation; Systematic outline sequence; A clear statement of the problem, objective, or presentation focus that matches the current needs of the audience; A strong and attention-grabbing concluding statement; Smart presentation delivery with proportional use of media that invites curiosity
2	Verbal and non-verbal communication ability	1 = poor	Poor costume appearance that does not support the extension topic; Unable to control tone of voice, clarity, and volume; Nervous and unable to convey and show interest in the topic
		2 = very lacking	Costume appearance does not support the extension topic; Able to control tone of voice, but lacking clarity in intonation and volume; Somewhat nervous
		3 = lacking	Costume appearance supports the extension topic; Able to control tone of voice, but lacking clarity in intonation and volume; Not nervous
		5 = adequate	Costume appearance supports the extension topic; Able to control tone of voice, fairly clear in intonation and volume; Not nervous
		6 = good	Costume appearance supports the extension topic; Able to control tone of voice, fairly clear in intonation and volume; Able to control emotions and be expressive

		7 = excellent	Costume appearance supports the extension topic; Able to control tone of voice, clear in intonation and volume; Proportional use of body gestures, logically reinforcing the verbal message conveyed
3	Extension communication	1 = poor	Unclear speech, frequent use of double meanings; No use of values in the delivery of

	technique		the message; Unable to convey information using audience-appropriate language proportionally; Unclear use of any of the causal, narrative, or other message delivery methods; No real examples given; No use of feedback to confirm the information has been received
		2 = very lacking	Somewhat unclear speech, with double meanings; Little use of values in the delivery of the message; Limited ability to convey information using audience-appropriate language proportionally; Unclear use of any of the causal, narrative, or other message delivery methods; Few real examples given; Minimal use of feedback to confirm the information has been received
		3 = lacking	Somewhat unclear speech, with double meanings; Use of values in the delivery of the message; Conveying information using audience-appropriate language proportionally; Unclear use of any of the methods causal, narrative, or other message delivery methods; Few real examples given; Limited ability to use feedback to confirm the information has been received

		5 = adequate	Clear speech, no double meanings; Use of values in the delivery of the message; Conveying information using audience-appropriate language proportionally; Somewhat unclear use of any of the causal, narrative, or other message delivery methods; Real examples given; Fairly able to control noise; Limited ability to use feedback to confirm the information has been received
		6 = good	Clear speech, no double meanings; Use of values in the delivery of the message; Conveying information using audience-appropriate language proportionally; Somewhat unclear use of any of the causal, narrative, or other message delivery methods; Real examples given; Able to control noise; Fairly able to use feedback to confirm the information has been received
		7 = excellent	Clear speech, no double meanings; Use of values in the delivery of the message; Conveying information using audience-appropriate language proportionally; Clear use of one of the causal, narrative, or other message delivery methods; Real examples given, presenting themselves as a direct model; Able to control noise; able to appreciate audience members who can be used as a source of learning or illustration; Able to use feedback to confirm the information has been received

No.	Assessment Aspect	Score	Criteria
4	Time utilization	1 = poor	Communication objective not achieved; Use of the introduction, content, and closing of the extension presentation is not proportional; Deviates by 4 minutes or more from the specified time
		2 = very lacking	Communication objective not achieved; Use of the introduction, content, and closing of the extension presentation is not proportional; Deviates by 3 to less than 4 minutes from the specified time

		3 = lacking	Communication objective not well achieved; Use of the introduction, content, and closing of the extension presentation is not very proportional; Deviates by 2 to less than 3 minutes from the specified time
		5 = adequate	Communication objective fairly achieved; Use of the introduction, content, and closing of the extension presentation is fairly proportional; Deviates by 1 to less than 2 minutes from the specified time
		6 = good	Communication objective fairly achieved; Use of the introduction, content, and closing of the extension presentation is proportional; Deviates by less than 1 minute from the specified time
		7 = excellent	Communication objective achieved; Use of the introduction, content, and closing of the extension presentation is proportional; Exactly on the specified time

5	Mastery of material	1 = poor	The title has no relevance to the audience's needs regarding the chosen topic; No information supports the presentation; The presenter has little understanding of the topic; No problem is clearly formulated, and there is no clear solution; The material presented does not match the theme
		2 = very lacking	The title has no relevance to the audience's needs regarding the chosen topic; Minimal information supports the presentation; The presenter has little understanding of the topic; There is a problem that is not clearly formulated, and there is no clear solution; The material is presented shallowly
		3 = lacking	The title has little relevance to the needs of the audience regarding the chosen topic; Basic or shallow information supports the presentation; The presenter has little understanding of the topic; There is a problem and solution formulated, but they are not very clear; The material is presented without much depth

		5 = adequate	The title is fairly relevant to the audience's needs regarding the chosen topic; Fairly adequate information supports the presentation; The presenter has a fair understanding of the topic; There is a clearly formulated problem, but the solution is not very clear; The material is presented with fair depth
		6 = good	The title is relevant to the audience's needs regarding the chosen topic; Adequate information supports the presentation; the presenter understands the topic and is interactive with the audience; There is a clearly formulated problem and solution; The material is presented with fair depth
		7 = excellent	The title is very relevant to the audience's needs regarding the chosen topic; Information that reinforces and supports the presentation; the presenter understands the topic, with informative content and illustrative experience as feedback material for the audience; There is a clearly formulated problem and solution that are logical and easy to implement; the material is presented in depth.
	6 Audience engagement	1 = poor	Unable to make eye contact with the audience; Unable to present physical bearing; No awareness of natural facial expression
		2 = very lacking	Unable to make eye contact with the audience; Unable to present physical bearing; awareness of facial expression is weak and not proportional
		3 = lacking	Able to make eye contact with the audience, but sporadically; Limited ability to present physical bearing; Lacking awareness of facial expression and not very proportional
		5 = adequate	Able to make eye contact with most of the audience; Fairly able to present physical bearing; Fair awareness of facial expression and proportional
		6 = good	Able to make eye contact with most of the audience; Good and able to present physical bearing; Proportional awareness of facial expression

		7 = excellent	Able to make very good eye contact throughout the presentation with the entire audience; Good and able to present physical bearing; Awareness of facial expression and interactive with a relevant touch of humor, and able to control emotions;
7	Compliance with the theme	1 = poor	The overall title, outline, and illustrations of the presentation material and the oral delivery do not match the theme
		2 = very lacking	The overall outline and illustrations of the presentation material and the oral delivery do not match the theme
		3 = lacking	The delivery sequence and illustrations in the oral presentation do not match the theme very well
		5 = adequate	The delivery sequence and illustrations in the oral presentation fairly match the theme
		6 = good	The delivery of illustrations and drawing of conclusions in the oral presentation is good and matches the theme
		7 = excellent	The delivery of the sequence, illustrations, and drawing of conclusions in the oral presentation is very good and reinforces its match with the theme

Appendix 5.24 Agricultural Extension Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

Name :

Student ID :

Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Message design and extension media	15		
2	Verbal and non-verbal communication ability	15		
3	Extension communication technique	25		
4	Time utilization	5		
5	Mastery of material	10		
6	Audience engagement	20		
7	Compliance with the theme	10		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....
.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.25 Barista (Manual Brew V60) Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC BARISTA (MANUAL BREW V60)

No	Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Coffee Weight	Score 7 (Excellent)	SCA ratio very accurate and precise
		Score 6 (Good)	Matches ratio with slight deviation
		Score 5 (Adequate)	Close to the ratio
		Score 3 (Lacking)	Far from the ratio
		Score 2 (Very Lacking)	Very inconsistent
		Score 1 (Poor)	No understanding of the ratio concept
2	Grind Size	Score 7 (Excellent)	Very uniform, appropriate for V60
		Score 6 (Good)	Uniform
		Score 5 (Adequate)	Fairly uniform
		Score 3 (Lacking)	Not very appropriate
		Score 2 (Very Lacking)	Inconsistent
		Score 1 (Poor)	Very inconsistent
3	Water Temperature	Score 7 (Excellent)	90–96°C and stable
		Score 6 (Good)	Slight deviation
		Score 5 (Adequate)	Fairly appropriate
		Score 3 (Lacking)	Not very appropriate
		Score 2 (Very Lacking)	Very inconsistent
		Score 1 (Poor)	Outside standard
4	Brewing Technique	Score 7 (Excellent)	Accurate blooming, consistent pouring pattern, ideal brewing time (<3 minutes), very good work sequence
		Score 6 (Good)	Good technique with minor shortcomings
		Score 5 (Adequate)	Adequate technique
		Score 3 (Lacking)	Technique not very accurate
		Score 2 (Very Lacking)	Many errors
		Score 1 (Poor)	Does not follow procedure
5	Cleanliness & Tidiness	Score 7 (Excellent)	Work area, tools, and participant are very clean and tidy from start to finish
		Score 6 (Good)	Clean and tidy
		Score 5 (Adequate)	Fairly clean
		Score 3 (Lacking)	Not very tidy
		Score 2 (Very Lacking)	Dirty
		Score 1 (Poor)	Very dirty and unhygienic

Appendix 5.24 Barista (Manual Brew V60) Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET BARISTA (MANUAL BREW V60)

Name:
Student ID:

Institution Name :

No	Assessment Criteria	Weight	Score	Value
1	Compliance of Coffee Weight with the SCA Ratio	20		
2	Grind Size and Medium Consistency	20		
3	Water Temperature	15		
4	Brewing Technique (Bloom, Pouring, Overall Brewing)	30		
5	Cleanliness and Tidiness	15		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7

(1 = poor, 2 = very lacking, 3 = lacking, 5 = adequate, 6 = good, 7 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5.25 Proposal Format for the Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC)

Maximum number of pages: 20 pages (excluding appendices)

Font: Times New Roman 12

Spacing: 1.5

Paper size: A4

Margins: Left 4 cm, Top 3 cm, Right 3 cm, Bottom 3 cm

COVER PAGE

Contains:

- 1) Teaching Factory Title
- 2) Name of Higher Education Institution
- 3) Higher Education Institution Logo
- 4) Team Leader's Name
- 5) Members' Names
- 6) Supervising Lecturer's Name
- 7) Year

APPROVAL PAGE

Contains:

- 1) Team Leader
- 2) Supervising Lecturer
- 3) Head of Study Program
- 4) Director/Deputy Director/Head of Department (as applicable)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I TEACHING FACTORY PROFILE

1.1 General Overview

Explains:

1. Teaching Factory Name
2. Business Field
3. Year Established
4. Location
5. Purpose of Establishment

1.2 Background

Explains:

1. the need for the Teaching Factory
2. relationship to vocational learning
3. potential being developed

1.3 Teaching Factory Objectives

1.4 Organizational Structure

Explains:

1. manager
2. lecturers
3. students
4. technicians
5. partners

CHAPTER II TEACHING FACTORY IMPLEMENTATION

2.1 Production Process

Explains:

1. production flow or service flow
2. include a flowchart.

2.2 Student Involvement

Explains:

1. number of students
2. integrated courses
3. student activities

2.3 Product or Service

Explains:

1. main product
2. supporting product
3. specifications
4. advantages
5. include a photo.

2.4 Innovation

Explains innovation in:

1. technology
2. process
3. product
4. digitalization

CHAPTER III BUSINESS MODEL CANVAS

The Business Model Canvas (BMC) describes the business model through 9 main elements:

1. Customer Segment – who the target customers are.
2. Value Proposition – the value or benefit offered.
3. Customer Relationship – how to build relationships with customers.
4. Channels – media or channels to reach customers.
5. Revenue Stream – the business's sources of income.
6. Key Activities – the main activities in running the business.
7. Key Resources – the resources needed.
8. Key Partnership – the main partners supporting the business.
9. Cost Structure – the main costs in running the business.

Presented on one page using the Business Model Canvas template.

CHAPTER IV INDUSTRY COLLABORATION

4.1 Industry Partners

Explains:

1. industry name
2. form of cooperation
3. duration of cooperation

4.2 Form of Collaboration

For example:

1. internship
2. teaching industry
3. joint production
4. marketing
5. certification
6. curriculum synchronization
7. guest lecturer

4.3 Benefits of Collaboration

For:

1. students
2. the Teaching Factory
3. the industry

CHAPTER V SUSTAINABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT

5.1 Sustainability

Explains:

1. sustainability strategy
2. student regeneration
3. facility maintenance

5.2 Development Plan

For example

1. product development
2. market development
3. digitalization
4. downstream development
5. certification
6. expansion of cooperation

CHAPTER VI ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACT

Explains the achievements during the Teaching Factory's operation.

For example

Education Field

1. number of students
2. courses
3. competencies

Production Field

1. product types
2. production capacity

Downstream Development Field

- ☐ products already used by the community
- ☐ industry cooperation

Achievement Field

1. awards
2. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)
3. patents
4. publications
5. certification

CHAPTER VII CLOSING

Contains

1. conclusion
2. hopes for Teaching Factory development

APPENDICES

1. Business Model Canvas
2. Activity documentation
3. Product documentation
4. Production process documentation
5. Learning documentation
6. Industry Collaboration Documents:
 - MoU
 - MoA
 - Cooperation Agreement
 - Letter of Intent
 - or other evidence of cooperation
7. Certificate/IPR/Patent (if any)
8. Product brochure
9. Profile Video Link
10. Team Profile

Appendix 5.26 Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC) Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC AGRITECH BUSINESS AND TEACHING FACTORY SHOWCASE COMPETITION (ABTSC)

No	Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Teaching Factory Implementation	Score 4 (Excellent)	The Teaching Factory is running well, integrated into learning, actively involves students, and has a sustainable production process.
		Score 3 (Good)	The Teaching Factory is running well, but its integration or sustainability can still be improved.
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Implementation is still limited to a few activities.
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Does not yet show clear Teaching Factory implementation.
2	Product/Service Innovation	Score 4 (Excellent)	The product or service is very innovative, has a competitive advantage, and meets user or industry needs.
		Score 3 (Good)	The product or service is innovative with some advantages.
		Score 2 (Adequate)	The product is a development of an existing one.
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Shows no element of innovation.
3	Business Model Canvas	Score 4 (Excellent)	All nine BMC elements are fully arranged, realistic, mutually integrated, and show a clear development strategy.
		Score 3 (Good)	The BMC is fairly complete and feasible to implement.
		Score 2 (Adequate)	The BMC is still simple and needs refinement.
		Score 1 (Lacking)	The BMC is not well arranged.
4	Industry Collaboration	Score 4 (Excellent)	Has active, sustainable cooperation that provides a real impact on the Teaching Factory's learning, production, or marketing.

		Score 3 (Good)	Has cooperation with industry, but its scope is still limited.
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Cooperation is incidental and has not yet had a significant impact.
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Does not yet have cooperation with industry, or cannot show evidence of collaboration.
5	Teaching Factory Sustainability	Score 4 (Excellent)	The Teaching Factory has a good management system, continues to develop, and has a clear development plan.
		Score 3 (Good)	The program's sustainability is fairly good but still needs strengthening.
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Sustainability is still limited.
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Does not yet show program sustainability.
6	Presentation and Question & Answer	Score 4 (Excellent)	The delivery is very systematic, communicative, supported by data, and able to answer all questions accurately and convincingly.
		Score 3 (Good)	The delivery is good and able to answer most questions.
		Score 2 (Adequate)	The delivery is fairly clear but lacks depth.
		Score 1 (Lacking)	The delivery is unsystematic and unable to answer questions well.

Appendix 5.27 Agritech Business and Teaching Factory Showcase Competition (ABTSC) Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRITECH BUSINESS AND TEACHING FACTORY SHOWCASE COMPETITION (ABTSC)

Name:
Student ID:

Institution Name :

Proposal Assessment

No	Component	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Teaching Factory Implementation	20		
2	Product/Service Innovation	20		
3	Business Model Canvas	15		
4	Industry Collaboration	15		
5	Teaching Factory Sustainability	15		
6	Proposal Quality	10		
7	Profile Video	5		
Total		100		

Online Selection Assessment

No	Assessment Aspect	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Teaching Factory Implementation	20		
2	Business Model Canvas (BMC)	15		
3	Product/Service Innovation	20		
4	Industry Collaboration	15		
5	Teaching Factory Sustainability	15		
6	Proposal	10		
7	Profile Video	5		
Total		100		

Offline Final Assessment

No	Assessment Aspect	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Presentation	15		
2	Mastery of Material	10		
3	Teaching Factory Implementation	20		
4	<i>Business Model Canvas</i>	10		
5	Product/Service Innovation	15		

6	<i>Industry Collaboration</i>	15		
7	Sustainability and Development Potential (Scale-up)	5		
8	Product/Service Demonstration	5		
9	<i>Product Booth/Display</i>	2.5		
10	Question and Answer	2.5		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 4 (1 = lacking, 2 = adequate, 3 = good, 4 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Final Score

The participant's final score is calculated based on the following composition:

- Online Selection Score = 40%
- Offline Final Score = 60%

Final Score = (40% × Online Selection Score) + (60% × Offline Final Score)

Assessor's Comments:

.....

Bandar Lampung, 2026
 Panel of Judges

()

Appendix 5.28 Agricultural Photography Competition Rubric and Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRICULTURAL PHOTOGRAPHY COMPETITION

Name:
Student ID:
Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Criteria	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Coherence and depth of the photo's visualization in relation to the theme elements - Suitability and continuity between the theme and the format of the submitted photo	25		
2	Creativity and Originality - The participant's mindset or idea conveyed through the photo - Originality of the idea	25		
3	Photo composition - Aesthetics - Use of elements - Camera angle - Color composition	20		
4	Technical ability / Photography technique - Photo sharpness - Focus - Contrast - Lighting	15		
5	The degree of emotional impact the photo can evoke (inspiring)	10		
6	Storytelling/presentation	5		
Total		100		

Notes:

Score: 0 to 100

Value = weight ×

score Assessor's

Comments:

.....
.....

Bandar Lampung,
Panel of Judges

2026

()

Appendix 5. 29 Agricultural Videography Competition Assessment Rubric

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC AGRICULTURAL VIDEOGRAPHY COMPETITION

No	Aspect	Score	Criteria
1	Theme Relevance & Depth	Score 4 (Excellent)	Very strong, in-depth, and able to represent agriculture, innovation, vocational education, and sustainability
		Score 3 (Good)	Matches the theme and has a clear message
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Matches the theme, but depth is still limited
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Shows no clear connection to the theme
2	Creativity & Originality	Score 4 (Excellent)	Idea is very creative, unique, original, and has a strong point of view
		Score 3 (Good)	Idea is creative and fairly original
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Idea is fairly common
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Shows no meaningful creativity
3	Cinematography & Composition	Score 4 (Excellent)	Composition, framing, angle, lighting, movement, and shot variety are very good
		Score 3 (Good)	Cinematography is good with slight shortcomings
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Cinematography is adequate but has some weaknesses
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Composition and filming are not very good
4	Technical Production Ability	Score 4 (Excellent)	Camera control, focus, exposure, stability, and production technique are very good
		Score 3 (Good)	Technical control is good
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Technical control is adequate
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Many technical errors

5	Audio & Editing	Score 4 (Excellent)	Audio is very clear; editing is smooth, rhythmic, consistent, and supports the story
		Score 3 (Good)	Audio and editing are good with slight shortcomings
		Score 2 (Adequate)	Audio or editing still has some weaknesses
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Audio/editing disrupts the delivery of the work
6	Inspirational Power & Impact	Score 4 (Excellent)	Very inspiring, raises awareness, and leaves a strong impact on the viewer
		Score 3 (Good)	Inspiring and has a clear message
		Score 2 (Adequate)	The message is adequate, but its impact is limited
		Score 1 (Lacking)	Provides no clear impact or message
7	Storytelling	Score 4 (Excellent)	The narrative flow is very strong, coherent, engaging, and able to convey the story as a whole
		Score 3 (Good)	The narrative flow is good and easy to understand
		Score 2 (Adequate)	The narrative flow is adequate but not very strong
		Score 1 (Lacking)	The narrative flow is unclear and difficult to understand

Appendix 5.30 Agricultural Videography Competition Assessment Sheet

ASSESSMENT SHEET AGRICULTURAL VIDEOGRAPHY COMPETITION

Name :
Student ID :
Institution Name :

No.	Assessment Aspect	Weight (%)	Score	Value
1	Coherence and Depth of Visualization in Relation to the Theme	20		
2	Creativity and Originality	15		
3	Cinematography and Visual Composition	20		
4	Technical Production Ability	15		
5	Audio Quality and Editing	10		
6	Inspirational Power and Message Impact	10		
7	Storytelling	10		
TOTAL		100		

Notes:

Score: 1, 2, 3, 4 (1 = lacking, 2 = adequate, 3 = good, 4 = excellent)

Value = weight × score

Assessor's

Comments:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Bandar Lampung, 2026
Panel of Judges

()