

		Excellent		Admirable		Acceptable		Barely Adequate		Score
<b>Scope and Relevance</b>	<b>Enhances stakeholder ability to make decisions</b>	Problem statement, rationale, process and outputs of the product clearly support decision making at the farm level.	4	Problem, rationale and processes are clear, but the relationship of the outputs to stakeholder decision making is not well established.	3	Specific problem is not clear, rationale and processes are vague and/or the relevance to farmer decision making is not well established.	2	Information provided by the product is superficial and not clearly tied to farmers decision making.	1	/4
	<b>Relevance to managing change</b>	Decision theme clearly links stakeholder activities with ability to manage climate and/or farming system variability and change, including markets, trade etc. Explicitly considers uncertainty of information.	4	Decision theme links stakeholder activities with ability to manage climate and/or farming system variability and change, including markets, trade etc.	3	Link to climate change, but the relevance of the product in managing climate and/or farming system variability and change, including markets, trade etc is not well established.	2	No clear link between the decision theme and ability to manage climate and/or farming system variability and change, including markets, trade etc.	1	/4
	<b>Use of data</b>	Combines multiple data sources and adds value to them through data fusion or analysis.	4	Uses multiple data sources to enable basic analysis.	3	Uses multiple datasets, but limited to no additional analysis.	2	Uses one dataset and nothing else.	1	/4
<b>Use of Information</b>	<b>Information integration</b>	Combines CGIAR and external datasets and adds value to the data through data fusion or analysis.	4	Uses a combination of CGIAR and external datasets with basic analysis.	3	Uses multiple data sources, but limited to no additional analysis.	2	Uses a single data source.	1	/4
<b>Design and Implementation</b>	<b>Scalability</b>	Product design has the potential to support a large user base, would require minimal to no support at the end-user level, and balances client-side and server-side processing requirements.	4	Design has potential to support a large user base but would require extensive end user support and/or significant expansion of necessary computational infrastructure.	3	Design may support a large audience, but is not compatible with existing infrastructure or levels of knowledge among the intended audience.	2	Design is limited to supporting a very small audience, either due to the relevance of the problem or limitations associated with either the complexity of the implementation or the infrastructure requirements.	1	/4
	<b>Usability</b>	Interface is well designed and specific to the problem, the data and procedure for use are well documented, and the code base is well documented.	4	Interface is well designed, documentation of data or procedure is lacking in one or more areas, code is clear and sufficiently well documented.	3	Interface supports the stated problem, but data and/or procedures are only superficially documented, code contains limited supporting information.	2	Interface is poorly designed or not specific to the problem, procedures are poorly documented, code contains only superficial documentation.	1	/4
	<b>Pitch</b>	Pitch clearly ties into the problem, is compelling, well organized and convincing. Excellent use of graphics, supporting facts and figures.	4	Pitch is interesting, uses supporting facts, figures and graphics, but lacks motivation or focus.	3	Pitch is related to the problem but is not convincing or is otherwise lacking in organization. Supporting materials only add marginal support.	2	Pitch is not convincing, poorly organized, lacks supporting materials or fails to adequately address the problem.	1	/4
<b>Pitch and Demo</b>	<b>Demonstration</b>	Demonstration is flawless, well executed and clearly illustrates the relationship of the product to the problem.	4	Demonstration is good, but with problems either with the product or in the relationship of the product to the problem.	3	Demonstration is acceptable, but superficial. Problems with product. Usability in relation to problem not convincing.	2	Demonstration does not work, or requires significant intervention. Relationship of product to problem not clear. General usability of the product is lacking.	1	/4
<b>Maintenance and Sustainability</b>	<b>Maintenance</b>	Narrative clearly indicates hardware, software, human resources required to install/maintain/run the product, and good documentation is provided.	4	Adequate description of hardware, software, human resources required to install/maintain/run the product, and documentation, but some questions remain.	3	Description of hardware, software, human resources required to install/maintain/run the product, and documentation sub-par.	2	Missing or very poor description of hardware, software, human resources required to install/maintain/run the product, and documentation sub-par.	1	/4
	<b>Sustainability</b>	Well-considered, compelling, and realistic argument for sustaining product included in narrative.	4	Adequate argument for sustaining product included in narrative.	3	Acceptable narrative for sustaining product, but raises questions regarding implementation.	2	Narrative for sustaining product missing or unacceptable from the perspective of being fully implementable.	1	/4
<b>TOTAL</b>										<b>/40</b>