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Evaluation Report of Proposal Mobile Charging Cap

**Introduction**

This report evaluates the proposal “Mobile Charging Cap” submitted to the Technoprenuership Competition. This evaluation report examines the quality the proposal for selection purposes.

**Description**

The proposal was written by a student from the School of Material Science and Engineering, Nanyang Technological University. The author identified the disadvantages of the portable chargers and proposed the mobile charging cap, an integration of the solar cell and a cap, which produces electricity by consuming daylight.

**Objective**

This evaluation report was conducted with the following criteria to examine whether the proposal should be shortlisted for competition. The criteria are:

1. Clarity of writing:

Check if the necessary explanation of functions and design are thorough.

1. Cost-effectiveness of the product:

Determine the marketability of the product by comparing it to similar solutions.

1. Usefulness:

Examine the user experience and analyse the limitations of the product.

1. Language correctness:

Check the grammar mistakes in the proposal.

**Evaluation**

1. Firstly, the proposal contains significant ambiguities. The author has given no explanation about the design of the product. The evaluator has limited information about how to integrate a stabilizer circuit inside a cap and connect the semiconductor to mobile phones. The lack of design information is detrimental to the credibility of the proposal.

Besides, the author didn’t give any estimation about the charging time. According to IFIHome (2016), charging a standard mobile phone battery consumes approximately 10 hours. A prolonged duration of completion of charging would be associated with the author’s solution, restricting the benefits that he proposed.

1. Secondly, the cost that the author proposed undermines its marketability. He ignored the cost of research and development and the cost of manufacture, which significantly underestimated the cost of the product.

Furthermore, even the underestimated cost reveals poor competitiveness compared to the existing portable chargers. The author’s proposed cost was 56 US dollars, which is equivalent to the price of the best quality portable chargers, and four times the price of normal chargers (Matt Malmlund, 2017). The products’ high costs could hardly compete with existing solutions.

1. Thirdly, the product lacks consideration for users, and there exist crucial limitations in the product, undermining the popularity of the product. There was no estimation of the weight of the semiconductor. Since the cap only costs 5 dollars, the heat dissipation system would be disappointing, especially for users under strong sunlight. Another limitation is that the cap cannot function properly in night time. All these factors would worsen the experiences of users.
2. Lastly, the proposal was filled with grammar errors, including lack of subject-verb agreement and missing necessary verbs and articles. To name a few, “…**an** electronic device that **are**…”, “…a user-friendly device that **(is)** able to…”. The total number of grammar errors exceeds 20, making the proposal unprofessional and less credible.

**Conclusion**

Due to the ambiguities of design, poor competitiveness, and lack of consideration of user experience, the evaluator recommends that the proposal should not be shortlisted for the competition.
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