	Excellent (A)	Good (B)	Pass (C)	Fail (D)
Aims and Objectives (15%)	All project aims and objectives and clearly identified and described, and are challenging at MSc level.	Project aims, objectives and challenges are clearly identified and described, appropriate for advanced MSc level.	Some description of project aims, objectives and challenges although vague and/or incomplete.	Aims, objectives and challenges are extremely vague or missing. It is not clear what will be achieved.
Requirements (20%)	List of requirements is challenging and clearly linked to the aims and objectives, appropriately separated into essential, recommended and optional.	Realistic list of requirements appropriately separated into essential, recommended and optional.	Some requirements are included although they are vague and/or incomplete.	Requirements do not clearly align with the proposed project. It is not clear what will be achieved.
Technical Specification (5%)	In-depth consideration of the tools and techniques required is provided, including details of the languages, platforms, APIs and libraries that will be required to successfully complete the project as appropriate.	Details of appropriate languages, platforms, APIs and libraries that will be required to successfully complete the project are provided.	Some related discussion of tools and techniques is included, but it is not clear how they relate to meeting the aims and objectives.	No technical specification provided.
Requirements Evaluation Plan (10%)	Extensive consideration given to the criteria to be used to evaluate the system/experimental results.	Student has made a meaningful attempt at defining criteria to be used to evaluate the system/experimental results.	Some consideration given to the criteria to be used to evaluate the system/experimental results, but it has been approached in a superficial way.	No meaningful approach to requirements evaluation has been considered.
Background Research and Reading List (10%)	A good deal of relevant background material is identified, well-reviewed and summarized.	Some relevant background material is identified, however, it is not very well connected to the project. It seems more a (reasonable) list of arguments/ literature/ related work that is the result of some reading/searching activity.	The background material presented is not really relevant and not reviewed or summarized.	No or little background material/literature was identified or researched.
Time-plan and Risk Plan (20%)	An excellent, feasible, well-written plan describes how the project objectives will be achieved. Appropriate tools (such as Gantt charts) used to convey the plan.	Overall, the student did a good job defining the project and describing their plan for doing it. However, the plan could still be improved.	The plan is reasonable, but requires refinement to ensure it can be realistically followed.	There is no project plan at all or there is a vague or ill-thought plan. It is not clear what the student will do.
Overall Impression (20%)	Overall, the student did an excellent job defining the project and describing their plan for completing it.	Overall, the work is of good quality. However, it could have been better organised and/or provided deeper analysis of the core aspects of the project	One can understand what the project is about and roughly how the student will work on it, although lots of details are missing and the general impression is that the report was not well thought out and prepared.	No submission or little to no attempt to address the task. Virtually no mention of anything related to the project, related work or references/information resources. No planning and no time-scales.