Criteria	Excellent (5 points)*	Good (3 points)	Fair (1 point)	Poor (0 points)
Introduction	Introduction is engaging and clearly states the purpose of the SRS document	The introduction is clear	It is somewhat unclear	Extremely vague
Overall description	All necessary product requirements were clear and concise and unambiguous	Most necessary requirements were mostly clear and unambiguous	Some necessary requirements were missing	Many necessary requirements were missing
Functional requirements* (x 2 points) (10)	Requirements were technically feasible and aligned with existing technology	Most requirements were technically feasible and aligned with existing technology	Some requirements were technically infeasible or not aligned with existing technology	Many requirements were technically infeasible or not aligned with existing technology
Non-functional requirements * (x2 points) (10)	All areas were identified and explained	Most areas were identified and explained	Some areas were identified	Little or None were identified
Writing style, grammar and conclusion	The document is exceptionally written, with no grammar errors and the conclusion summarizes the key points	The document is well written with minor grammar errors , punctuation and spelling errors	The document is somewhat unclear, has a few grammatical errors, spelling and punctuation errors that are noticeable	Major grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors that detracts from the flow of the document

USE CASE and other diagrams

Criteria	Excellent (5 points)*	Good (3 points)	Fair (1 point)	Poor (0 points)
Completeness	All the necessary USE cases AND Actors have been identified, and properly associated	Most USE cases and Actors have been identified and properly associated	Some necessary USE cases and actors are missing or are unclear, and are not associated correctly	Many USE cases are missing
Clarity	Diagram is easy to read and understand	Mostly easy to read and navigate	Difficult to read , complex descriptions of USE cases and actors	Extremely difficult to read and navigate
Correctness	Accurately represents the system requirements and is technically feasible and realistic	Mostly accurate in representing the system requirements	Some USE cases are technically infeasible or incorrect and does not represent the system requirements	Many USE cases are technically infeasible or incorrect and deviates from the system requirements
Layout and Design * (10)	Visually appealing, well organised and uses the correct notation	Mostly appealing, utilizes mostly standard notation and conventions	Cluttered, and disorganised and somewhat uses the standard notation	Extremely cluttered, disorganized and does not use the correct notation
Overall impression	Exceptional	Good	Satisfactory	Extremely poor