GOOD DESIGN AWARD 2016

Good Design Award 2016
Tutorial Book for Judges
Greetings and best wishes.

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate as a Good Design Award judge. The Good Design Award aims to serve as a catalyst in creating the society of the future through communicating to the world the thought and methodologies embodied in good designs while at the same time discovering and conveying the new possibilities that those designs inspire. We hope judges will play active roles not only in screening entries but also in various other activities organized by the Japan Institute of Design Promotion (JDP).

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to participate in the screening process and for your cooperation and understanding.
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The System and Schedule of the Good Design Award

Good Design Award is a comprehensive design commendation system organized by Japan Institute of Design Promotion (JDP) for the purpose of leading our lives, industry, and society at large to be better through selecting “Good Designs” from various events and commending them. The system leads to the creation of future society in cooperation with Applicants. The Good Design Award is a system not just to “select good designs” but to lead the creation of future society in cooperation with applicants through cycle of the three points below:

1. **Discover**
   - Discovering quality standards in contemporary society and possibilities for the society of the future, through screening entries to the Good Design Award.

2. **Innovation**
   - Awareness for next creation is generate
   - The share brings awareness for new creation and the awareness becomes the prompt for the next quality standards.

3. **Share**
   - Share discovers widely in society with G Mark
   - Convey and share the goodness of the design in society with award recipients and with the G Mark.

The system to accelerate creativity is the GOOD DESIGN AWARD

**Award Types and Statuses**

- **GOOD DESIGN AWARD**
- **GOOD DESIGN BEST 100**
- **GOOD DESIGN GOLD AWARD**
- **GOOD DESIGN GRAND AWARD**

**Good Design Special Award**
- [Design of Production Development]
- [Design for Community Development]
- [Design for the Future]
- [Disaster Recovery Design]

- Good designs which can be “future standards.”
- Advanced designs which can be “future viewpoints.”
- The top prizes selected by the judges
- A design symbolic of today, chosen by all participants

- Excellent designs by SMEs
- Excellent designs for community vitalization
- Excellent designs contributing to the creation of new industry
- Excellent designs contributing to disaster recovery
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2 Requests for Judges

- Screening for the Good Design Award (see pp. 7-15)
- Proposing candidates for Judges’ Recommendations (see p. 5)
- Screening for the Good Design Best 100 and Special Award (see pp. 12-14)
  ※Leaders and Focused Issues Directors only

- Screening entries and writing advisory comments (see p. 14)
- Presenting in the screening report meeting (see p. 15)
- Attending the ceremony and selection for the Grand Award (see p. 15)
- Writing recommendations for focused issues (see p. 15)
  ※Focused Issues Directors only

3 Focused Issue

Focused issues are guidelines for identifying new possibilities and indicators (recommendations) across the range of topics that society will need to address in the future. The focused issues will be discussed during the screening process and then each Focused Issues Director will summarize new discoveries as recommendations to be communicated to society.

2016 Focused Issues (9 issues)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical axis</th>
<th>Horizontal axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>Coexistence with the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and learning</td>
<td>Urban and social infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business models and ways of working</td>
<td>Community and locality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and ways of life</td>
<td>Technology and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine and health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tasks of Focused Issues Directors

- Writing keywords identifying contemporary trends and possibilities for each issue
- Writing recommendations on trends and future possibilities for each issue (2000 characters)
Judges’ Recommendation

This is a system that Judges recommend application to objects which have not been applied to the Good Design Award with their insights, in order to spread and promote the Good Design Award Activity in society.

[ Rules of Judges’ Recommendation ]

1. Objects which can be recommended

Those which have not been applied to the Good Design Award, but can be recommended as good design by a Judge with his or her insights. However, objects which are designed or consulted by a Judge cannot be recommended by the Judge himself or herself (self-nomination.) All Judges can make recommendation for all Judging Units.

2. Handling of recommended items

Recommended items will be considered in each relevant Screening Unit and the office will encourage entry of those judged by those Screening Units to be worthy of Judges’ Recommendations.

3. Screening of items entered through recommendation

Items entered through recommendation will be considered to have passed the first screening. Screening of such items will begin during the Second Screening Panel. Items entered through recommendation will be subject to the same secondary screening as other subject entries.

4. Costs

The second screening fee will be waived for items entered through recommendation.

[ Procedures of Judges’ Recommendation ]

Starting date of appointment

- Collecting candidates for recommendation
- Reviewing and narrowing down candidates
- Collecting additional candidates
- Final decision on recommendation
- Office encourages entry of recommended items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting date of appointment</th>
<th>Collecting candidates for recommendation</th>
<th>Reviewing and narrowing down candidates</th>
<th>Collecting additional candidates</th>
<th>Final decision on recommendation</th>
<th>Office encourages entry of recommended items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 / 3</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / 8</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / 17</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / 23</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 / 7</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judging Policy and Viewpoints

[Basic Screening Concepts]
1. The Good Design Award considers design to be the act of identifying objectives while thinking chiefly about human beings at all times and planning and realizing ways to achieve these objectives.
2. The most important consideration is whether the thought and methodologies embodied in a design are likely to serve as good examples for the society of the future.
3. Screening will include consideration of future developments and inherent possibilities for the purpose of promoting the progress of society.

[Screening Viewpoints]
Please conduct screening from a comprehensive perspective, examining subject entries from the four viewpoints of human, industrial, social, and time perspectives based on the above basic concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Whether due considerations, including usability, understandability, and friendliness, etc., are given to users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether various considerations, including safety, security, environment, physically weak persons, etc., are given to maintain the credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the design gains sympathy of users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the design has attractiveness and induces users’ creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Whether issues are skillfully solved by using new technology and materials or through creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item is reasonably designed or planned with appropriate technology, method, and quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item contributes to the creation of new industry or business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item contributes to the creation of new culture, such as a new method, lifestyle, communication, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item contributes to the realization of the sustainable society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item suggests new value, such as a new method, concept, style, etc. to society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item puts past contexts and accumulated achievements to propose new value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item proposes a highly sustainable solution from medium- and long-term perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whether the item represents continual improvements in accordance with the times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Screening Weights]
Good Design Award entries can be grouped into the two main categories of improved designs based on sufficient track record and completely new designs. Screening of improved designs stresses the appropriateness of the designs, while screening of new designs stresses possibilities for the future. However, new designs too are not eligible for being judged to be good designs if they lack quality as designs.
6 Screening Details

6-1. Basic Rules

1. Screening Units
   In screening the Good Design Award, Screening Units of four to five members each are formed to judge the subject entries assigned to them. Each Screening Unit has a Leader, appointed by the Chair and Vice-Chair.

2. Judges are Prohibited from Taking Part in Screening of Items with which they are Involved
   The Chair, Vice-Chair, and judges may not screen entries with which they themselves were involved in design or consulting. They are prohibited from any and all involvement in screening of such entries, including provision of information.

3. Confidentiality
   All judges must submit nondisclosure pledges to the organizers prior to the start of screening and must not leak to third parties any confidential information learned through screening, including confidential information concerning entries as well as information on the screening process.

6-2. First Screening

- Judge General Meeting
  This meeting is held to confirm general policies, specific screening methods, screening policies, and other matters for the year’s screening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishment of Screening Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the list of entries to be screened by your Unit and establish screening policies through discussions, with the Leader playing a central role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review of Judges’ Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the list of candidates for Judges’ Recommendations, select Judges’ Recommendations through discussions in which the Leader plays a central role, and consider additional Judges’ Recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Examination of objects to be moved to another unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the List of Subjects Eligible for Entry and at this stage, decide policy to move Subject Entries to another unit about Subject Entries which can be judged as “a Subject Entry which should be moved to another Judging Unit,” after consulting the Judging Unit to accept the Subject Entry. However, because the applied category is “announcement from Applicants about points to be focused on,” please esteem this will as much as possible. About the movement between units, please conduct it according to the standards below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. A Subject Entry whose contents or main point is apparently different from a domain of the unit concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A Subject Entry which is not expected to be highly valued but could be highly valued by another unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Web Screening

Web screening is a process of individual evaluation intended to carry out the First Screening Panel efficiently.

1. Entering evaluation (required)
   After checking the information on subject entries for which your Unit is responsible, enter either a circle (passed) or an “X” (failed) for each entry reflecting its evaluation based on the screening policies and viewpoints.

2. Entering comments (optional)
   Together with entering evaluation, enter under “Comments” any information about the entry you would like to communicate to other judges.

First Screening Panel

Passing or failing of Subject Entries is judged through this panel for the purpose of “selecting objects whose actual objects should be judged in the second screening.”

1. Decide Subject Entries which pass the First Screening
   Please judge in the first screening with a viewpoint of “whether or not to let the object pass” in principle.

2. Finalization of Judges’ Recommendations
   Finalize items to be encouraged to enter as Judges’ Recommendations, based on discussions.

3. Examine objects for which additional data or screening is required in the Second Screening Panel
   Some Subject Entries are judged to require special actions, such as presentations, On-site Screening, and checking additional data submitted in the form of videos etc. Please examine which object requires a special action.

Check the Application Sheets, and discuss and decide whether to pass the Subject Entry centering on a Unit Leader, based on the standards below. In case the Subject Entry needs to be moved to another unit, please deal with it in the same process as the Judge General Meeting.

[Standards to decide to fail a Subject Entry in First Screening]

1. The Subject Entry is deviant from Good Design Award Ideal.
   Please fail a Subject Entry when it is deviant from the five ideals of the Good Design Award.

2. The Subject Entry could be in contravention of application rules.
   Please fail a Subject Entry when it is obviously supposed not to be able to meet the application condition that “users can purchase or use the object by the end of March 2017.”

3. Subject Entries which can be seen to have obviously low value or quality.
   Please fail a Subject Entry if it has obviously low value or quality when seen from each viewpoint written in “S. Judging Policy and Viewpoints.”

Confirmation by the office of the results of screening

The office will confirm the validity of the results of the First Screening Panel.
If any matters require deliberation, finalize the results of screening through further discussions in each Screening Unit.
6 - 3. Second Screening

Second Screening Panel

This is a panel to judge whether to pass the Subject Entries while checking the actual objects which have passed the first screening and have been installed in the screening hall (or alternative objects when difficult to install).

1. Decide Subject Entries which pass the Second Screening

Subject Entries which have passed the Second Screening go through the Screening Confirmation Panel (described later) and win the Good Design Award. Please judge whether to pass a Subject Entry based on the actual object of the Subject Entry, an application sheet, and interactive screening (described later), while referring to the Good Design Award Recitals and Screening Viewpoints.

2. Select Best 100 candidates

The Good Design Award announces 100 award winning objects which are highly valued as “designs which suggest the future” to be the “Good Design Best 100” at the same time as announcement of award recipients. Please select approximately 10 objects which can be seen as “candidates for special awards” while giving them priorities.

3. Choosing Subjects of Advisory Comments

Advisory comments are communicated to applicants regardless of whether they pass or fail the screening process, as a means of helping raise awareness among applicants. Choose the subjects of advisory comments based on discussions in which the Leader plays a central role.

4. Assigning Responsibilities for Writing Advisory Comments and Evaluation Comments

The judges’ evaluation comments describing what was good about each design are released to the public for all winning items in the Good Design Award. Assign responsibilities for writing these together with the above advisory comments based on discussions in which the Leader plays a central role.

5. Verification of Candidates for the Best 100 (Leaders, Focused Issue Directors Only)

On the third day of the screening panel, the Chair, Vice-Chair, Screening Unit Leaders, and Focused Issue Directors will confirm candidates for the Best 100. Each leader is requested to explain the reasons for selection of the Best 100 candidates chosen by his or her own Unit.

In the Second Screening Panel, actual subject entries with widely varying properties will be set up. For this reason, the appropriate screening method will vary by Screening Unit. The Leader should play a central role in discussing screening methods and adopting methods that are appropriate. Also, judges should consult with each other in deciding which entries pass or fail. In addition, in principle one assistant will be assigned to each judge during the screening process. The screening method expected to be used in most cases is described below. Set up your own screening methods based on this method as a general rule.

1. Checking Subject Entries and Individual Voting

Each judge checks the actual entries or substitutes and their application sheets one by one, voting for those he or she considers to represent excellent designs.

2. Prior Arrangements for Screening Interviews

In preparation for the screening interviews held on the second day of screening, arrange matters such as points to check or ask questions about during the screening interviews through discussions in which the Leader plays a central role.

3. Interactive Hearing

Visit with each applicant at the specified time to ask questions and further deepen your understanding of the subject entry.
4. Deciding on Passed and Failed Entries through Mutual Discussion
   Decide on passed and failed entries through discussions in which the Leader plays a central role, reflecting the results of individual voting and the screening interviews.

5. Selection of Candidates for the Best 100
   Reflecting the results of the Second Screening Panel, choose candidates for the Good Design Best 100 through discussions in which the Leader plays a central role.

A variety of screening activities is conducted during the Second Screening Panel, suited to the characteristics of each subject entry. Feel free to employ methods other than those shown below as needed.

1. Interactive Hearing (Second Day of Screening)
   This screening involves asking applicants questions directly in order to deepen judges’ understanding of their entries. Screening interviews are conducted as requested by applicants. Applicants who request screening interviews will be waiting in front of their own entries at the times specified by the office. Make the rounds of these applicants in order and ask questions about their entries. The following rules apply to screening interviews:

   1. Screening time is three minutes per subject entry.
   2. Only one person may explain each subject entry.

   While the following time allotment is expected to be used for screening interviews, feel free to change this allotment as needed if you want to concentrate on certain matters or for other reasons:

   1. Explanation of key points of the design by its applicant (from 1 to 1.5 minutes in length)
   2. Questions and answers (from 1 to 1.5 minutes in length)

   The screening interview may serve as an opportunity to raise applicants’ awareness as well as playing a role in the screening process. Feel free to convey any points you may have noticed in the screening process to applicants directly.

2. Screening of Undisclosed Subject Entries (First Day of Screening)
   Products still under development at the time of the Second Screening Panel may be entered to the Good Design Award. In such a case, screening will take place in a separate, private room to prevent leakage of information. Applicants of undisclosed subject entries will display their entries in the separate room at the time specified by the office. Judges should go to the room at those times to screen the entries. In principle, the same rules as used in screening interviews apply to screening of undisclosed subject entries.

3. On-site Screening (Specified in Individual Cases)
   Sometimes a Screening Unit may decide that it would be better to visit the actual entry in person if it would be difficult to display the actual item. In such a case, the Screening Unit may ask the applicant to participate in an on-site screening and visit the actual item to screen it in person. On-site screening will take place after making the necessary arrangements with the applicant during the period of the Second Screening Panel.
1. Selecting Best 100 Candidates

Select Best 100 candidates by ranking entries based on the following rules and then filling out the necessary information on the Best 100 Candidates Notice and submitting it.

(Entering Information)
List candidates in order of their suitability to the Best 100, entering their screening nos. and titles. Also check the corresponding focused issue(s) for each candidate. Then, enter in red a cut-off line above which you believe all entries definitely should be included in the Best 100, to include no more than the three top-ranked entries. Next, enter in blue a cut-off line above which you would like to see all entries included in the Best 100 if possible, to include no more than the six top-ranked entries. Each Screening Unit may choose up to 10 Best 100 candidates.

(The meanings of the red and blue lines)
In the Good Design Best 100 Selection Meeting, the views of each Screening Unit will be respected as much as possible. Candidates ranked above the red line will be included in the Best 100 following review of their content and evaluation points in the Best 100 Selection Meeting as long as there are no objections. Those above the blue line will be eligible for voting in the first round of selection of the Best 100.

2. Checking Best 100 Candidates

Beginning in the afternoon of the third day of the Second Screening Panel the Chair and Vice-Chair, Leaders of all Screening Units, and Focused Issue Directors will make the rounds of Best 100 candidates displayed in the venue for the Second Screening Panel and check them. During this check, the Leader of the Screening Unit responsible for each candidate will described evaluation points in front of each displayed candidate, spending roughly 30 seconds on each candidate.

■ Confirmation by the office of the results of screening
The office will confirm the validity of the results of the First Screening Panel. If any matters require deliberation, finalize the results of screening through further discussions in each Screening Unit.

■ Final Screening Meeting (Leaders Only)
This meeting will choose the Good Design Best 100 based on the Best 100 candidates submitted by each Screening Unit during the Second Screening Panel.

1. Confirmation of Passing/Failed Entries in Second Screening
Check the results of choosing passing and failed entries in your Screening Unit to make sure there are no mistakes. Also take a look at the results from other Screening Units to make sure you do not object to any of them. If you do have an objection, meet with the Leader of the relevant Screening Unit to determine whether the entry should pass or fail. If a decision cannot be reached through such discussion, the Chair and Vice-Chair will make the final judgment. Final judgment on matters requiring deliberation as identified by the office will be handled in a similar manner.
Best 100 Selection Meeting (Leaders and Focused Issue Directors Only)

This meeting will choose the Good Design Best 100 based on the Best 100 candidates submitted by each Screening Unit during the Second Screening Panel.

1. Selection of the Good Design Best 100
   The Good Design Best 100 will be decided on through discussions among all participants, voting, and other means.

2. Presentations by Issue Directors
   Each Issue Director will make a presentation approximately three minutes long on the subjects of discoveries made through the screening process along with topics important today and future possibilities.

The Good Design Best 100 will be chosen through the following procedures.

1. Checking and Adjustment of Rankings in Each Screening Unit
   Prior to the start of the Best 100 Selection Meeting, the office will post on the walls of the meeting venue the Best 100 candidates chosen by each Screening Unit, in compliance with the rules on ranking and red and blue lines. The Leaders of Screening Units and Focused Issues Directors will check the Best 100 candidates posted on the walls and then check and correct the rankings and individual lines while also confirming overall balance.

2. Checking of Candidates Above the Red Lines and Preliminary Decision on the Best 100
   The Leader of each Screening Unit will spend about 30 seconds each explaining the points considered in evaluation of each Best 100 candidate above the red lines. After completion of explanation of all the candidates, a preliminary decision will be made on the Best 100. At this time, a judge who objects to any of the preliminary decisions on the Best 100 may raise his or her hand to discuss his or her objection. Following discussion, a decision on a candidate for which an objection has been lodged will be made through a show of hands. In the case of a tie, the decision will be made under the authority of the Chair. If one-half or more of members of the Best 100 Selection Meeting have not checked the displayed entries during the Second Screening Panel, for example in the case of an overseas Screening Unit, the length of time for explanation by the Leader of the Screening Unit shall be roughly two minutes.

3. First Voting and Preliminary Decision
   The first voting shall be conducted for all candidates above the blue lines, not including those subject to preliminary decisions as described under 2 above. In the first voting, the Leader of each Screening Unit and the Issues Directors will explain the key points regarding evaluation of each candidate for about 30 seconds each. After that, each judge will vote for up to 20 or so candidates. The Chair shall determine the precise maximum number of candidates for which each judge may vote at the time of the voting. The 30% or so of candidates receiving the highest numbers of votes (about 20 candidates) will be chosen for the Best 100 on a preliminary basis. The cutoff line for selection in this voting shall be proposed by the Chair in light of the overall differences in votes received and decided on through discussion among the judges.

4. Second Voting and Preliminary Decision on All of the Best 100
   Of the Best 100 candidates remaining, each Screening Unit Leader and Issues Director will choose those that he or she would like to recommend in particular and spend about one minute explaining the key points of this evaluation for each. After that, each judge will vote for up to 10 or so candidates. The precise maximum number of candidates for which each judge may vote in this case will be determined by the Chair in the same manner as described under 3 above.
   A total of 100 candidates receiving the most votes will be chosen on a preliminary basis. If at this time multiple candidates have received the same number of votes at the cutoff line, voting shall be repeated for the candidates at the cutoff line to select all of the Best 100. Alternates shall be chosen at this time too, in preparation for cases of withdrawal of entries or disqualification as a result of review of design rights. If a candidate chosen on a preliminary basis for the Best 100 is later disqualified, the highest-ranking alternate shall take its place.
Gold Award and Special Awards Panel (Leaders and Focused Issues Directors Only)

This meeting will select excellent designs deserving of special mention from among those selected to the Good Design Best 100.

1. Selection of the Good Design Gold Award Winners
   The winners of the Good Design Gold Award shall be chosen from among the Good Design Best 100 through voting and discussion.

2. Selection of the Good Design Grand Award Candidates
   Candidates for the Good Design Grand Award shall be chosen from among the Good Design Gold Award winners through voting and discussion.

3. Selection of the Good Design Special Award Winners
   The winners of the Good Design Special Awards shall be chosen from among the Good Design Best 100 other than those winning Gold Awards through voting and discussion.

4. Focused Issue Discussions
   These discussions shall concern keywords indicating contemporary trends and future possibilities for each focused issue.

Winners of the Good Design Gold Award and Special Awards and candidates for the Grand Award shall be selected through the procedures below.

1. Good Design Gold Award: First Voting
   Each judge will vote for up to 20 or so entries chosen from among the Good Design Best 100. The Chair shall determine the precise maximum number of entries for which each judge may vote at the time of the voting.
   (Selection Criteria)
   Entries recognized as the best of the best of contemporary design, combining advanced spirit and suitability to the needs of society in light of matters including concepts, technologies, and quality.

2. Preliminary Choices for the Good Design Gold Award and Selection of Entries Eligible for Second Voting
   Preliminary choices for the Gold Award shall be selected by inserting a cutoff line at an appropriate difference in numbers of votes received, aiming to separate the group of 10 or so entries that received the most votes. In addition, entries eligible for the second voting shall be selected by inserting a cutoff line at an appropriate difference in numbers of votes received aiming to separate the group of 30 or so entries that received the most votes. However, an entry may be included in those eligible for the second voting even if it received a low number of votes if the judges decide to do so through discussion.

3. Good Design Gold Award: Second Voting and Preliminary Decision
   Each judge will vote for up to 10 or so entries chosen from among those eligible for the second voting. The Chair shall determine the precise maximum number of entries for which each judge may vote at the time of the voting. The preliminary decision on the Gold Award shall be based on a cutoff line above which the top 20 entries receiving the most votes are eligible to win. In the case of a tie, judges shall discuss the relevant entries and then vote on which to include. Alternates shall be chosen at this time too, in preparation for cases of withdrawal of entries or disqualification as a result of review of design rights. If an entry chosen on a preliminary basis for the Gold Award is later disqualified, the highest-ranking alternate shall take its place.

4. Voting on Candidates for the Good Design Grand Award
   Each judge will vote for up to five or so entries chosen from among the winners of the Good Design Gold Award, based on the selection criteria described below. The Chair shall determine the precise maximum number of entries for which each judge may vote at the time of the voting.
   (Selection Criteria)
   Each candidate for the Good Design Grand Award must be one that the Judging Committee recognizes to be one that it would like to introduce most of all to society at large as one that speaks to the needs of this year (the contemporary period).
5. Preliminary Decision on Candidates for the Good Design Grand Award

Candidates for the Good Design Grand Award shall be selected by inserting a cutoff line at an appropriate difference in numbers of votes received, aiming to separate the group of five or so entries that received the most votes, subject to the approval of the Chair and the Vice-Chair. Alternates shall be chosen at this time too, in preparation for cases of withdrawal of entries or disqualification as a result of review of design rights. If an entry chosen on a preliminary basis for the Grand Award is later disqualified, the highest-ranking alternate shall take its place.

6. Selection of Candidates for Good Design Special Awards and Voting

The office will choose as candidates eligible for voting entries satisfying the conditions of each Special Award from among the Good Design Best 100, other than candidates for the Good Design Gold Award. Each judge will vote for up to five or so of these chosen entries, based on the criteria described below. The Chair shall determine the precise maximum number of entries for which each judge may vote at the time of the voting.

(Selection Criteria for Each Special Award)

Good Design Special Award [Design for the Future] :
Entries recognized as advanced, excellent designs contributing to the creation of new business domains or business models

Good Design Special Award [Design of Production Development] :
Entries recognized as particularly excellent designs by small and medium-sized enterprises involved in the manufacturing or information-services businesses

Good Design Special Award [Design for Community Development] :
Entries recognized to make particular contributions to economic development in Japan through enlivening community economies

Good Design Special Award [Disaster Recovery Design] :
Entries recognized as excellent designs contributing to disaster recovery

7. Preliminary Decisions on the Good Design Special Awards

Candidates for the Special Awards shall be selected by inserting a cutoff line at an appropriate difference in numbers of votes received, aiming to separate the group of three entries that received the most votes, subject to the approval of the Chair and the Vice-Chair. Alternates shall be chosen at this time too, in preparation for cases of withdrawal of entries or disqualification as a result of review of design rights. If an entry chosen on a preliminary basis for the Special Award is later disqualified, the highest-ranking alternate shall take its place.

6-4. Sharing (Announcement and Commendation)

Writing Advisory and Evaluation Comments

These comments on evaluation are intended to help raise awareness of applicants and consumers in general. Write comments on the subjects you were assigned in your Screening Unit during the Second Screening Panel.

1. Writing Advisory Comments

Login to the screening site and enter advisory comments of roughly 200 characters per subject. The comments you enter here will be communicated to the applicants only.

2. Writing Evaluation Comments

Login to the screening site and enter evaluation comments of roughly 200 characters per subject. Since most of the comments entered here will be used for publicity purposes by winning companies, for example by quoting them in press releases, choose your expressions and other content with care.
Screening Report Meetings (Held by Each Screening Unit)

These meetings will be held during the Good Design Award Exhibition (G Exhibition). They serve as an opportunity for raising awareness of applicants and consumers in general by communicating judges’ senses of the screening process and new discoveries.

1. Presenting to Screening Report Meetings
   Office staff will emcee these meetings, asking questions chiefly on subjects such as overall tendencies among entries in your Unit, perspectives stressed in the screening process, and discoveries made through the screening process. Please discuss your overall evaluation of the process. Also, discussion of specific examples and the kind of discussions that took place during the screening process can help the audience to understand the Award better.

Attending the Awards Ceremony and Selection for the Grand Award (Held by Each Screening Unit)

Commendation certificates are presented to the Good Design Award winners in this ceremony. At the same time, presentations are made by candidates for the Good Design Grand Award and voting is conducted to decide on the winner of the Grand Award.

1. Attending the Awards Ceremony
   Many award winners come to the awards ceremony, where they hope to chat with the judges and take photographs with them. The cooperation of judges is requested in attending this ceremony and actively offering words of congratulations, advice, and comments to winners, to help provide applicants with new ideas.

2. Voting on the Grand Award Winner
   Candidates for the Good Design Grand Award will make presentations of about five minutes in length per entry. Vote for the winner of the Grand Award after listening to these presentations. Information on voting methods, number of votes per judge, and other matters will be provided separately.

Writing Recommendations on Focused Issues (Focused Issues Directors Only)

These recommendations are intended to provide new ideas for the future to applicants and consumers in general, through describing matters such as possibilities and topics discovered in the process of screening on each issue.

1. Writing Keywords Identifying Contemporary Trends and Possibilities for Each Issue
   These are keywords that will help prepare for reading the recommendations. Include as keywords the most important concepts, approaches, and phenomena discussed in the recommendations. You may write any number of keywords.

2. Writing Recommendations on Trends and Future Possibilities for Each Issue (Approximately 2000 Characters)
   This is the main text of the recommendations. The award winning objects mentioned in the text will be listed and tagged separately.

6 - 5. Other Special Mentions

Other Special Mentions

1. Things which cannot be judged in a Judging Unit
   Various decision issues which arose in the process of screening are basically judged through discussion centering on the Unit Leader of the unit concerned. When the decision issue is difficult to judge here, the Chair and Vice Chair make a final judgment. In this case please follow their judgment.