GEP. Evaluation

Deliverable 1: Context and scope of the project

		Excellent (4)	Expected level (3)	Poor (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Content	Context	There is an excellent introduction (context) that defines the terms and concepts of the subject under study. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are fully specified.	There is a brief introduction to the problem under study, in which terms and concepts are defined. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are specified.	The introduction that defines the terms and concepts of the subject under study is totally inadequate, and should be extended and improved. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are specified (but not clearly enough or in enough detail).	There is no appropriate introduction (context) that defines the terms and concepts of the subject under study. Stakeholders (target audience, users and beneficiaries) are not specified.
	State-of-the-art	There is an excellent literature review on the subject under study: previous studies are cited, summarised and discussed. It is possible to identify the gap in the literature that this project addresses. Thus, this project is fully supported by the literature.	There is an appropriate literature review on the subject under study: previous studies are cited and summarised. It is possible to figure out the gap in the literature that this project addresses. Thus, this project is somewhat supported by the literature.	The literature review on the subject under study is limited: few previous studies are cited and not all of them are adequately summarised. It is difficult to figure out the gap in the literature that this project addresses.	The literature review is incomplete: very few previous studies are cited and most of them are not summarised. It is difficult to figure out the gap in the literature that this project addresses.
	Quality of information sources	Information is abundant and complete. The information sources that are used are accurate, verified and of good quality.	Information is abundant. Not all of the information sources that are used are accurate, verified and of good quality.	Few sources of information have been used. The relevance of some of these sources is questionable.	There are no references to previous studies or research works. Hence, both the quantity and the quality of the information sources are insufficient.
	Format of references	Citations of references appear in the correct place in the text, and support the content. The citation style is uniform. All references are listed at the end of the text using the same style.	Citations of references appear in the correct place in the text, and support the content. However, the citation style varies. Almost all references are listed at the end of the text using the same style.	There are few citations of references in the text. The citation style varies. A list of references is included at the end of the text. However it is incomplete and the style that is used varies.	There are no citations of references in the text. A full list of information sources is provided at the end of the document. The citation style that is used varies.

Content	Formulation of the problem	The objectives of the project are clear and well-specified. The proposed project is significant enough to be considered a TFG.	The objectives of the project are clear and adequately specified. The proposed project is significant enough to be considered a TFG.	The objectives of the project are specified (but not clearly enough). The significance of the proposed project is questionable.	The objectives of the project are not specified, and/or the proposed project is not significant enough to be considered a TFG.
	Scope	The scope of the project is well-defined. Possible obstacles that may hinder the execution of the project are clearly stated.	The scope of the project is defined. Possible obstacles that may hinder the execution of the project are briefly stated.	There are some problems in the definition of the scope of the project and/or potential obstacles that may hinder the execution of the problem. Some relevant information is missing.	The scope of the project and potential obstacles are extremely incomplete or not defined.
	Methodology and rigor	The document perfectly describes the methodology that will be followed. Tools to monitor the evolution of the project are clearly stated.	The document describes the methodology that will be followed. Information on tools to monitor the evolution of the project is incomplete.	The document roughly describes the methodology that will be followed. Information on tools to monitor the evolution of the project is missing.	There is no information on the methodology that will be followed, or on tools to monitor the evolution of the project.
Structure and style	Organisation	The document is logical in structure. The different sections are well-connected, which makes it easy to read.	The document is fairly well-structured. Sections are differentiated, however some are disconnected.	The document is fairly well-organised. However, some important aspects need to be improved (badly-connected sections, missing headings, headings in different styles, overlong paragraphs and/or sentences, etc.).	The document does not follow a logical structure. There is no rigor in presenting the different sections and arguments. Many aspects need to be improved (badly connected sections, missing headings, headings in different styles, overlong paragraphs and/or sentences, etc.).
	Clarity	The content is very clear and ideas flow logically. There is no need to read a paragraph twice, because the writing style is very precise.	The content is clear and ideas flow logically. Despite minor problems, the document is readable.	Ideas do not flow logically. It is difficult to figure out what the text is saying. Some paragraphs need to be read twice to understand their meaning.	It is very difficult to understand the content. Ideas do not flow logically. Most of the paragraphs need to be read twice to figure out what they mean.
	Writing	The document is free of grammar and spelling mistakes.	Few grammar and spelling mistakes.	Some grammar and spelling mistakes.	The document is full of grammar and spelling mistakes.

GEP. Evaluation
Deliverable 1: Context and scope of the project
GLOBAL COMMENTS

My warmest congratulations on your document.

Content	Context				
	State-of-the-art				
	Quality of the sources of information				
	Format of references				
	Formulation of the problem				
	Scope				
	Methodology and rigor				
Structure and style	Organisation				
	Clarity	Nevertheless It seems to me - excuse me if I'm wrong, I'm economist - that there are some statements with contradictory meanings; for instance last paragraph of 2.1.2 Timeout's section.				