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Evaluation Report of Proposal Mobile Charging Cap

**Introduction**

This report is the corresponding evaluation report of the proposal “mobile charging cap” (Anon, 2016) pertaining to the assignment request of HW0188. This evaluation report examines the quality of excellence of the proposal for grading purposes.

**Description**

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

**Objective**

This evaluation report has been conducted with the following criteria:

1. Clarity of the explanation of product functions
2. Cost-effectiveness of the product
3. Usefulness and user experience
4. Language correctness

**Evaluation**

1. Firstly, the author’s proposal contains significant ambiguities. The author has given no explanation about the design of the charging cap. The evaluator has restricted 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 hasn’t given any estimation about the time consumption of charging. According to IFIHome (2016), the average charging time of a mobile battery by solar cell exceeds 10 hours. A prolonged duration of completion of charging would be associated with the author’s solution, restricting the benefits that the author proposed.

1. Secondly, the cost that the author proposed was only the addition of raw materials. The author ignored the cost of research and development and the cost of manufacturing the products, which significantly underestimated the cost of the mobile charging cap.

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

1. Thirdly, the proposal shows author’s lack of consideration for users, and there exist severe limitations in the product, which could undermine the popularity of the product. There was no estimation of the weight of the semiconductor, and since the cap only costs 5 dollars, the heat dissipation system would be disappointing, especially for users under strong sunlight. Another limitation is the cap can only function under sunlight, which makes it useless when the sun sets. 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 exceed 20, showing the unprofessional nature of the author.

**Conclusion**

Due to the ambiguities of design, poor cost-effectiveness and competitiveness, and lack of consideration of user experience, the evaluator determines that the proposal not qualified, and recommends not to accept this proposal.
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