**Evaluation of Mobile Charging Cap Proposal**

**Introduction**

This report evaluates the proposal ‘Mobile Charging Cap’ authored by a student from Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

**Description**

The Mobile Charging Cap proposal introduces a wearable mobile charging cap. The cap incorporates a solar cell which enables it to charge the phone provided there is sunlight. This innovative approach solves the problem associated with the current portable charger, which becomes useless once its power runs out.

**Objective**

This report thoroughly evaluates the proposal with three criteria to determine if it should be shortlisted for the technopreneurship competition. The first criterion, clarity of writing, is based on the clarity and accuracy of expressions. The second criterion, persuasiveness, examines the strength of arguments, feasibility of the proposal and reliability of its references. The final criterion is marketability, focusing on the user-friendliness of the product.

**Evaluation**

a). Clarity of Writing

The insufficient clarity of the writing of this proposal causes confusion to its readers. This extracted sentence from line 23 to 24 reads ‘DC electricity… charge…electronic device…just by standing or walking…’. The phrase ‘just by standing or walking’ is misleading for two reasons. One is that its subject is missing, which is ‘the user wearing the hat’. As a result, this sentence conveys a wrong message to the readers that it is the ‘DC electricity’ that stands and walks. The other reason is the fact that the charging cap only works under the sunlight, however, (two subjects in one sentence) is not mentioned in this sentence, thus adding on to its inaccuracy.

b). Persuasiveness

The proposal is unpersuasive. Firstly, the argument that ‘comparing to…portable charger, it’s…easier to be used’ is not substantiated with evidence. Specific instructions on how to use the charger such as where the user’s phone should be placed while being charged is not mentioned. Due to this, it cannot be demonstrated whether the gadget is easy to use. Secondly, the feasibility of the proposal is critically hindered by the severe lack of elaboration of the product itself and implementation. Sketches of the charging cap and detailed drawings of its structure drawing are notably absent. In addition, the implementation part is too general. The author states that the team will improve the device but fails to show clearly the concrete result they want to achieve. Finally, one of the references of this proposal is from Wikipedia, which creates a sense of unprofessionalism and undermines its overall reliability.

c). Marketability

The proposed product has come up short in marketability. The cap is chosen to be the carrier of the solar-powered charger. This is not appropriate as caps are not frequently worn by most people. Moreover, solar cells will generate heat during operation and this could compromise the comfort level of the cap. In consequence, the mobile charging cap is not user-friendly, which significantly diminishes its marketability.

**Conclusion**

To summarize, this proposal is feeble in the clarity of writing, persuasiveness, and marketability. Therefore, it is inadequate and the committee recommends that it should not be shortlisted for the competition.
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