RRE D A

RUSSIA RENEWABLE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

RENEWABLE ENERGY FOR OUR PLANET 2026

All-Russian Contest for Students, Postgraduates, and Young Scientists with International Participation

GUIDELINE

Moscow, 2026

1. General provisions.

1.1. The All-Russian Contest with International Participation "RENEWABLE ENERGY FOR OUR PLANET – 2026" is an annual contest for students, postgraduates, and young scientists organized by the Russia Renewable Energy Development Association (RREDA). Contest partners include member companies and partners of RREDA, as well as leading universities of the Russian Federation (Skoltech, Bauman Moscow State Technical University, and the Higher School of Economics).

1.2. The contest aims to advance youth science, identify new talented researchers, and uncover solutions and developments in the fields of renewable and hydrogen energy, as well as environmental protection — areas that open new horizons for building low-carbon energy systems and advancing the global climate agenda.

1.3. Contest objectives:

1) identification of new projects and talented teams of young scientists, undergraduate and postgraduate students;

2) support for the implementation of innovative projects in the field of renewable energy on global markets;

3) promotion of renewable energy, hydrogen energy, ecology, and environmental protection.

1.4. Students, postgraduates, young scientists from higher educational institutions in Russia, CIS, and foreign countries, as well as leading industry specialists not older than 30 years are invited to participate in the contest.

1.5. Scientific works and case solutions completed independently or by teams of up to 5 people may be submitted for the contest.

2. Contest tracks

2.1. The following types of scientific articles may be submitted for the contest, organized by track:

-RES technologies and technical solutions for the energy transition — this track considers technological solutions for electricity and heat generation based on renewable energy sources: solar energy, wind energy, hydro energy, tidal and wave energy, geothermal energy, low-potential thermal energy, biomass energy (including plants specially grown for energy generation), biogas, and landfill gas, etc.;

-Solutions for enhancing power system flexibility as a driver for increasing the share of RES generation — this track considers key technological methods of electricity demand management that can be integrated alongside the development of RES: energy storage systems (various types of batteries), charging infrastructure for electric vehicles, heat pumps, and smart electricity grids;

-Investment support mechanisms for the energy transition — this track considers the following directions: the use of "green" financial instruments, stimulation of demand for "green" energy, the use of "green" certificates, free bilateral agreements,

investment agreements, and energy service contracts to develop the RES investment environment;

-Social and environmental initiatives for promoting the energy transition — this track considers proposals for stimulating public participation in the transition to sustainable development: educational campaigns, environmental events, corporate initiatives, volunteer programs, cultural and creative projects.

2.2. Practice-oriented case solutions on topics related to the energy transition and renewable energy development may also be submitted. The conditions and parameters for the case solutions are published by the organizers.

2.3. Scientific papers are evaluated according to a rating system using the following criteria:

Criterion №1: Novelty of the obtained information/data	**Points**
New facts or regularities are fully proven. New technology or system is proposed. A new problem/challenge is identified with a science-based solution proposal.	5
A significant, fundamental improvement of already known theories and methods, technologies, etc. is implemented.	4
Known theories, methods, technologies, etc., are applied to solve new problems, an optimization to the well-known problem solution methodology is proposed.	3
A new solution to an actual problem is discovered, however, it does not give an advantage over the old one.	2
The information is already available in public sources, no novelty.	1

Criterion №2: The relevance of the result for the industry development	**Points**
The practical significance of the scientific research (the possibility to apply the results to solve specific problems) is proven by presented facts and analyses. The result of the work provides a theoretical innovative basis for the development of new methods/mechanisms/technologies for practical use (theoretical significance). The results are reliable and have been fully proven.	5
The result has significant practical implications for the industry or represents a theoretical innovative basis for the development of methods/mechanisms/technologies that can be applied in practice. However, there are gaps in the documentation, and further research is needed.	4
The work addresses a significant issue for the industry development, but the suggested solution is challenging to implement. Nevertheless, the author provides reasonable recommendations for improvement in the conclusions.	3
The result of the work is directly related to the industry but has no practical relevance.	2

The result of the work is practically irrelevant for the industry.	1

Criterion №3: Interpretation of the results	**Points**
Intensive and critical analysis of the results and of the possibility of using the results for scaling purposes is obtained. Needs for additional measures to ensure future implementation are analyzed.	5
A thorough analysis of the results, with clear and professional conclusions was conducted, however, further work is needed. The limitations of the findings have been acknowledged and discussed.	4
A critical analysis of the results has been carried out, but the conclusions are incomplete or erroneous. Incorrect arguments. Only a limited comparison with similar results from other sources.	3
A cursory analysis. The results discussion section does not provide additional insights.	2
There is no critical analysis of the results or comparison with other studies' findings.	1

Criterion №4: Compliance with formal design requirements	**Points**
The formal requirements have been fully complied with formal requirements (see section 4).	5
The formal requirements are met by at least 80%.	4
The formal requirements are met by at least 60%.	3
The formal requirements are met by at least 50%.	2
The formal requirements are not fulfilled (no table of contents, list of abbreviations, references, citations, etc).	1

Criterion №5: Structure of the paper	**Points**
The classical structure of the paper is fully observed: table of contents, introduction, main body (topic/problem, object/subject, purpose, hypotheses, tasks, methods, results), conclusion, and references. The individual sections are logically connected, without contradictions.	5
The classical structure is mostly followed. However, minor logical errors are found in the structure.	4
Incomplete compliance with structural criteria, shortcomings in terms of systematics and links between individual sections.	3
The work does not have a classical structure. It is hard to trace the systematicity, consistency, and the relationship between individual sections.	2

The work lacks clear structure and coherence, with significant gaps in logic which are unacceptable.	1

Criterion №6: Presentation and design of the paper	**Points**
Consistent and accurate layout design according to formal criteria. Clear and correct labeling of images and their contents (axes, symbols, units, etc.). Very high-quality illustrations (ready for printing). The visualization is self-explanatory.	5
Consistent and accurate layout design according to formal criteria. Clear and correct labeling of images and their contents (axes, symbols, units, etc.). Good quality illustrations.	4
Graphic elements are correctly used to display text content, but they are subject to significant editing.	3
Lack of uniform layout. Illustrations and tables are present, but their quality is poor (copying from other sources), and the tables are incomplete. The text content and illustrations/tables do not match each other.	2
The presentation of the results is unacceptable. Illustrations and tables are missing or do not contribute to understanding the work.	1

Criterion №7: Spelling, punctuation, expression and style	**Points**
Compliance with all spelling and punctuation rules. The use of specific scientific terminology.	5
A small number of errors are made. The unified scientific style of writing is retained. The text is mostly easy to read.	4
Spelling errors are made. The presentation style is inconsistent. The glossary has not been adhered to.	3
There are numerous spelling mistakes. The illustrations are not connected to the text properly. There is no glossary.	2
The text content is incomprehensible.	1

When evaluating scientific works, members of the Expert Council assign scores from 1 to 5 to each of the seven criteria in accordance with the presented system. Each criterion is then multiplied by the assigned weight and summed to determine the overall evaluation of the work:

№	**Criterion**	**Score**	**Weight**	**Final score**
1	Novelty of the obtained data		20	
2	The relevance of the result for the industry development		20	
3	Interpretation of results		20	
4	Compliance with formal design		10	

	requirements			
5	Structure of the work		10	
6	Presentation and design of the work		10	
7	Spelling, punctuation, expression, and style		10	
Weighted average project assessment:				

The overall score is determined by the sum of the assessments of all the experts.

2.4. Case solutions are evaluated according to a rating system using the following criteria:

Criterion №1: Justification of the proposed solution and quality of argumentation	**Points**
The justification for the proposed solution is presented, well-argued, and supported by quality data analysis.	5
The justification for the proposed solution is presented, argued, and supported by basic calculations.	4
The justification for the proposed solution is presented and argued, but not supported by calculations.	3
The justification for the proposed solution is presented, but the quality of argumentation is low.	2
No justification for the proposed solution or argumentation is presented.	1

Criterion №2: Structure and quality of the presentation design	**Points**
Consistent and accurate layout design according to formal criteria. Clear and correct labeling of images and their contents (axes, symbols, units, etc.). Very high-quality illustrations (ready for printing). The visualization is self-explanatory.	5
Consistent and accurate layout design according to formal criteria. Clear and correct labeling of images and their contents (axes, symbols, units, etc.). Good quality illustrations. The visualization requires some explanation.	4
Graphic elements are correctly used to display text content, but they are subject to significant editing.	3
Lack of uniform layout. Illustrations and tables are present, but their quality is poor (copying from other sources), and the tables are incomplete. The text content and illustrations/tables do not match each other.	2
The presentation of the results is unacceptable. Illustrations and tables are missing or do not contribute to understanding the work.	1

Criterion №3: Structure of the presentation	**Points**
The presentation structure logically develops and substantiates the case solution. Slides contain all key talking points. Key points are presented with references to data sources. All points are supported by visual elements (charts, diagrams, illustrations, photos). No extraneous visual elements (the presentation is not overloaded with unnecessary information).	5
The presentation structure logically develops and substantiates the case solution. Slides contain all key talking points. Key points are presented with references to data sources (where data is required). However, not all points are supported by visual elements (charts, diagrams, illustrations, photos), or extraneous visual elements are present.	4
The presentation structure logically develops and substantiates the case solution. Slides contain all key talking points. Some key points (requiring data support) are presented without references to data sources.	3
The presentation structure logically develops and substantiates the case solution. However, slides do not contain all key talking points.	2
The presentation has no clear logical structure.	1

Criterion №4: Performance of the team and answers to the questions	**Points**
The presentation: - was well-structured and synchronized with the slides; - kept to the allotted time; - allowed the audience to focus on key points; - contained accurate answers to questions; - demonstrated the engagement of all team members.	5
The presentation: - was well-structured and synchronized with the slides - kept to the allotted time; - allowed the audience to focus on key points; - contained accurate answers to questions. However, not all team members demonstrated engagement.	4
The presentation: - was well-structured and synchronized with the slides; - kept to the allotted time. However, not all questions were answered accurately and/or the audience's attention was not consistently directed to key points.	3
The presentation was well-structured but did not keep to the allotted time.	2
The presentation was poorly structured and/or not synchronized with	1

the slides.	

Criterion №5: Relevance of the proposed solution for the industry and potential for application	**Points**
The practical significance of the scientific research (the possibility to apply the results to solve specific problems) is proven by presented facts and analyses. The result of the work provides a theoretical innovative basis for the development of new methods/mechanisms/technologies for practical use (theoretical significance). The results are reliable and have been fully proven.	5
The result has significant practical implications for the industry or represents a theoretical innovative basis for the development of methods/mechanisms/technologies that can be applied in practice. However, there are gaps in the documentation, and further research is needed.	4
The work addresses a significant issue for the industry development, but the suggested solution is challenging to implement. Nevertheless, the author provides reasonable recommendations for improvement in the conclusions.	3
The result of the work is directly related to the industry, but has no practical relevance.	2
The result of the work is practically irrelevant for the industry.	1

When evaluating case solutions, members of the Expert Council assign scores from 1 to 5 to each of the seven criteria in accordance with the presented system. Each criterion is then multiplied by the assigned weight and summed to determine the overall evaluation of the work

№	**Criterion**	**Score**	**Weight**	**Final score**
1	Justification of the proposed solution and quality of argumentation		30	
2	Quality of the presentation design		10	
3	Presentation structure		20	
4	Team presentation and responses to questions		20	
5	Relevance of the proposed solution for the industry and potential for application		20	
Weighted average project assessment:				

3. Dates of the contest

The All-Russian Contest with International Participation "RENEWABLE ENERGY FOR OUR PLANET 2026" is held in two stages.

3.1 Stage one (Applications submission)

Deadline: **by September 20, 2026.**

At the end of the first stage, all submitted works will be reviewed by experts, and candidates for advancement to the second stage will be identified.

3.2 Stage two (Projects evaluation)

Dates: **September 21 – October 5, 2026.**

At the second stage, expert evaluation will be carried out on the reports and video presentations submitted by the finalist contestants. The contest laureates will be determined based on these results.

3.3 The award ceremony.

The award ceremony is scheduled to take place during the 9th International Forum "Russian Energy Week" in October 2026.

4 Procedure for Submitting Projects and Design Requirements.

4.1. Works completed in the tracks and on the cases presented in Section 2 of these Regulations are submitted for the contest.

4.2. The volume of the text portion of the work should not exceed 20 typed pages (Times New Roman font, 14 pt., 1.5 line spacing). Works are accepted in PDF format in Russian. Participants from other countries are permitted to submit works written in English.

4.3. The explanatory note must include: a title page, an abstract (up to ½ page), a table of contents, an introduction, the main body, a conclusion, and a list of sources used. If appropriate, calculation models in MS Excel format (in electronic format) may be attached to the work.

4.4. The scientific project may be accompanied by acts on the implementation of its results, copies of patents, and scientific articles.

4.5. Along with the scientific work, the author submits:

1) Consent to the processing of personal data;
2) An application containing a brief description of the work and information about the authors in the form of Appendix A;
3) A presentation of the work in PDF format, up to 10 slides;
4) A video presentation of the project for the second stage, briefly outlining the essence of the work (up to 5 minutes in length);
5) A supervisor's review (if the authors are jointly representing a university).

4.6. Applications containing a complete set of documents and projects (rar or zip format is allowed) are sent to the organizers via a special form posted on the official contest website: https://rreda.ru/talents/.

5 Projects assessment and awards

5.1. The projects are evaluated by the Expert Council, which includes:

-heads and leading specialists from universities;

-Russia Renewable Energy Development Association (RREDA) experts;

-top managers of leading companies in the RES sector;

-experts in the field of renewable energy.

5.2. Contest winners and laureates:

-will be honored with special diplomas;

-will be awarded gift certificates for online courses of their choice up to 50,000 rubles and other prizes from member companies and partners of the Association;

-will be entitled to internships at leading companies in the RES industry;

-will have the right to publish their works in the journals and information resources of RREDA and partner universities.

5.3. The award ceremony will be attended by RREDA Expert Council members (RREDA director, heads of companies), as well as leading industry experts, representatives from government agencies, and partner companies of the award.

5.4. The Expert Council has the right not to appoint winners in a nomination if the projects do not gain the required number of points on the evaluation scale.

6 Information campaign

6.1. Information support of the contest will be provided by the information resources of universities and RREDA (social networks, official website, corporate publications).

6.2 The announcement of the contest, information about its course, and results will be published on the website of the Russia Renewable Energy Development Association as well as on the websites of the contest partners.

7. Final remarks

7.1. The contest organizers reserve the right not to disclose information about the evaluation of the Expert Council and not to provide reasons for the rejection of an award.

7.2. The organizers of the contest may use any information related to the results of the scientific activities of contest winners, as well as materials from reports for promotional purposes (print media, television broadcasts, social media posts, etc.).

8. Contact information

Contest website: https://rreda.ru/activity/contests/vozobnovlyaemaya-energiya-planety/

E-mail: talents@rreda.org

Phone number: +7 (495) 115-10-34

Appendix A

APPLICATION

1. Full name and position of the author(s)
2. Full name and position of the scientific supervisor
3. Contact information (phone number, e-mail)
4. Organization (university, company), course, unit
5. Title of scientific work
6. Abstract of work
7. Keywords
8. Work classification (fundamental, exploratory, applied, research)
9. Contest track (from Section 2 of the Regulations)