

Reviewer

Name: Amanda Limiac

Email: montgom8@purdue.edu

EPICS Design Review Evaluation

Team: _____ Project: India Irrigation
Type of review: Project Design Delivery

1 = needs considerable improvement, 2 = needs improvement, 3 = adequate, 4 = good, 5 = excellent

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Rank of the overall quality of the project given its stage in the design process. Is the design or concept on track to be technically sound and feasible? Does the level of detail demonstrate an excellent understanding of the design issues, challenges, and constraints for the stage of the design? Are safety, maintenance, and service issues being adequately addressed or planned for in the design? Will the project be aesthetically pleasing?				X	
Rank the team's demonstration of the design process. Are user-centered issues such as safety, usability, maintenance, and service being considered throughout design and not afterthoughts? Does the team narrow alternative designs in systematic way? Are decisions based on an appropriate amount of information? Does the team demonstrate appropriate flexibility in thinking about the design?				X	
Rank the designers' ability to explain the project and answer questions. Did the team communicate the context and the scope of the project effectively and appropriately? Were they able to explain the design clearly and succinctly? Did they listen to and answer your questions?				X	
Rank the supporting documentation. Was it clear and complete? <i>did not receive any</i>					NA
Rank of the quality of the design review presentation. Did the team communicate the design clearly and succinctly? Was information communicated visually when possible and appropriate? Did the presentation facilitate constructive feedback from reviewers?					X

IF DELIVERY REVIEW: Do you have concerns about the project being delivered? Yes No
If yes, please address below.

COMMENTS:

Good work so far.

Some details left out/ mentioned too late:

Soil type

crop → how it is planted/harvested

→ crop water requirement (include others for comparison)

precip rate

need to add a bit more about safety/maintenance once some key decisions have been made

like the idea of providing farmers with resources/manual to continue effectiveness of practice after end of project
* this is very important in international work

- presentation was good, plenty of visuals, minimal text

- look forward to seeing pictures from the field trip!

EPICS Design Review Evaluation

Reviewer
 Name: Maosheng Ge
 Email: ge 48 @ purdue.edu

Team: Pump Project: _____
 Type of review: Project Design Delivery

1 = needs considerable improvement, 2 = needs improvement, 3 = adequate, 4 = good, 5 = excellent

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Rank of the overall quality of the project given its stage in the design process. Is the design or concept on track to be technically sound and feasible? Does the level of detail demonstrate an excellent understanding of the design issues, challenges, and constraints for the stage of the design? Are safety, maintenance, and service issues being adequately addressed or planned for in the design? Will the project be aesthetically pleasing?				✓	
Rank the team's demonstration of the design process. Are user-centered issues such as safety, usability, maintenance, and service being considered throughout design and not afterthoughts? Does the team narrow alternative designs in systematic way? Are decisions based on an appropriate amount of information? Does the team demonstrate appropriate flexibility in thinking about the design?				✓	
Rank the designers' ability to explain the project and answer questions. Did the team communicate the context and the scope of the project effectively and appropriately? Were they able to explain the design clearly and succinctly? Did they listen to and answer your questions?				✓	
Rank the supporting documentation. Was it clear and complete?				✓	
Rank of the quality of the design review presentation. Did the team communicate the design clearly and succinctly? Was information communicated visually when possible and appropriate? Did the presentation facilitate constructive feedback from reviewers?				✓	

IF DELIVERY REVIEW: Do you have concerns about the project being delivered? Yes No
 If yes, please address below.

COMMENTS:

Pipe System hydraulic calculation should be accurate since it provides fundamental parameters ~~for the~~ such like flow rate, velocity. That's important for pump selection. Pay special attention ~~the~~ to the most negative situation of your system which helps you to select the system capacity.

Irrigation schedule should be made considering crop types, soil, meteorological conditions as these will also bring help in your pump selection.

Pump efficiency should be carefully guaranteed, in case it will bring your operating cost into a high level.

Reviewer

Name: Maosheng Ge

Email: ge48@purdue.edu

EPICS Design Review Evaluation

Team: Water Project: _____
Type of review: Project Design Delivery

1 = needs considerable improvement, 2 = needs improvement, 3 = adequate, 4 = good, 5 = excellent

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Rank of the overall quality of the project given its stage in the design process. Is the design or concept on track to be technically sound and feasible? Does the level of detail demonstrate an excellent understanding of the design issues, challenges, and constraints for the stage of the design? Are safety, maintenance, and service issues being adequately addressed or planned for in the design? Will the project be aesthetically pleasing?				✓	
Rank the team's demonstration of the design process. Are user-centered issues such as safety, usability, maintenance, and service being considered throughout design and not afterthoughts? Does the team narrow alternative designs in systematic way? Are decisions based on an appropriate amount of information? Does the team demonstrate appropriate flexibility in thinking about the design?				✓	
Rank the designers' ability to explain the project and answer questions. Did the team communicate the context and the scope of the project effectively and appropriately? Were they able to explain the design clearly and succinctly? Did they listen to and answer your questions?				✓	
Rank the supporting documentation. Was it clear and complete?				✓	
Rank of the quality of the design review presentation. Did the team communicate the design clearly and succinctly? Was information communicated visually when possible and appropriate? Did the presentation facilitate constructive feedback from reviewers?				✓	

IF DELIVERY REVIEW: Do you have concerns about the project being delivered? Yes No
If yes, please address below.

COMMENTS:

If you want to implement your system on the farm. One biggest issue need to be considered is to ~~persuade~~ persuade the farmer and arouse their willingness to adopt them.

Remember. most of them care MONEY the most.

The second - labor saving.

Once you win trust from the farmers, the project will be promoted more smoothly.

Reviewer

Name: CHANDAN DASGUPTA

Email: cdasgupt@purdue.edu

EPICS Design Review Evaluation

Team: WATER Project: INDIA

Type of review: Project Design Delivery

1 = needs considerable improvement, 2 = needs improvement, 3 = adequate, 4 = good, 5 = excellent

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Rank of the overall quality of the project given its stage in the design process. Is the design or concept on track to be technically sound and feasible? Does the level of detail demonstrate an excellent understanding of the design issues, challenges, and constraints for the stage of the design? Are safety, maintenance, and service issues being adequately addressed or planned for in the design? Will the project be aesthetically pleasing?				✓	
Rank the team's demonstration of the design process. Are user-centered issues such as safety, usability, maintenance, and service being considered throughout design and not afterthoughts? Does the team narrow alternative designs in systematic way? Are decisions based on an appropriate amount of information? Does the team demonstrate appropriate flexibility in thinking about the design?					✓
Rank the designers' ability to explain the project and answer questions. Did the team communicate the context and the scope of the project effectively and appropriately? Were they able to explain the design clearly and succinctly? Did they listen to and answer your questions?					✓
Rank the supporting documentation. Was it clear and complete?					✓
Rank of the quality of the design review presentation. Did the team communicate the design clearly and succinctly? Was information communicated visually when possible and appropriate? Did the presentation facilitate constructive feedback from reviewers?					✓

IF DELIVERY REVIEW: Do you have concerns about the project being delivered? Yes No
If yes, please address below.

COMMENTS:

1. Would more piping due to drip irrigation make the system prone to more breakdown? (accidental damage to the piping etc.)
2. Not sure why/how the storage tank fits in / is useful.
3. Good focus on the actual stakeholder - farmers.
4. ~~By~~ Any plans for testing the prototype during Spring break trip?
5. Different crops will have different water needs. Will the drip system be able to handle multiple crops.
6. Removal of pipes? Will it be above the ground? It seems like a cumbersome process for a big farm & make the system prone to damage
7. Elevation

Reviewer

Name: CHANDAN DASGUPTA

Email: cdasgupt@purdue.edu

EPICS Design Review Evaluation

Team: PUMP Project: INDIA

Type of review: Project Design Delivery

1 = needs considerable improvement, 2 = needs improvement, 3 = adequate, 4 = good, 5 = excellent

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Rank of the overall quality of the project given its stage in the design process. Is the design or concept on track to be technically sound and feasible? Does the level of detail demonstrate an excellent understanding of the design issues, challenges, and constraints for the stage of the design? Are safety, maintenance, and service issues being adequately addressed or planned for in the design? Will the project be aesthetically pleasing?				✓	
Rank the team's demonstration of the design process. Are user-centered issues such as safety, usability, maintenance, and service being considered throughout design and not afterthoughts? Does the team narrow alternative designs in systematic way? Are decisions based on an appropriate amount of information? Does the team demonstrate appropriate flexibility in thinking about the design?					✓
Rank the designers' ability to explain the project and answer questions. Did the team communicate the context and the scope of the project effectively and appropriately? Were they able to explain the design clearly and succinctly? Did they listen to and answer your questions?					✓
Rank the supporting documentation. Was it clear and complete?					✓
Rank of the quality of the design review presentation. Did the team communicate the design clearly and succinctly? Was information communicated visually when possible and appropriate? Did the presentation facilitate constructive feedback from reviewers?					✓

IF DELIVERY REVIEW: Do you have concerns about the project being delivered? Yes No

If yes, please address below.

COMMENTS:

1. Farmers will have to pay for the electricity used by the pump. Are they ok?
2. Currently using diesel pumps. - why? Even when there's a concession on electricity. Something to investigate