




**Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma**


Branch:	UAE/Dubai		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 5/10/94	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 22/03/2017	Age: 22	
Title of Paper:	FLY-BY-WIRELESS		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	ANADIKA PAUL BAGHEL		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	Nicklas DAHLSTROM		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 15 mins	Taken:	mins

ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments: Seemed to be ok.	4 / 5
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments: Good introduction – got the attention. Less researched but clearer structure. At same level.	6 / 10
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments: A bit fast. Using notes is a no-no. Programmed – well done, but overly rehearsed.	7 / 10
Engagement with audience – Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest Comments: More active, but no refs to audience, still better.	4 / 5
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments: Good use of visuals, one of the better I seen.	5 / 5
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments: Prepared numbers? A bit rehearsed here to. Still reasonably well done. More to point please.	7 / 10
General – Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments: Innovative idea. Got Swissair wrong. Error with some other terminology. Not original idea though, but new to me. Should have stopped at Quantum.	11 / 15
TOTAL SCORE	49 / 60
Additional Comments: A more lively and animated appearance, slightly less on substance.	
Judge's Name & Signature: Dr. Nicklas Dahlstrom 	



**Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma**

Branch:	UAE/Dubai		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 5/10/94	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 12 MAR 17	Age: 22	
Title of Paper:	WIRELESS AIRCRAFT		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	ANADIKA PAUL BAGHEL		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	ELIAS NIKOLAIDI		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 15 mins	Taken: 14	mins

ASSESSMENT		SCORE
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.		
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments: 14 minutes		4.5/5
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments: Well structure and easy to follow presentation		8/10
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments: HIGH SPEED delivery at nice tone		6/10
Engagement with audience – Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest Comments: Keep attention and good interest		3/5
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments: easy to read with adequate gobs/figures		3.5/5
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments: Able to adequate address questions		8/10
General – Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments: Very original subject which was presented with ease and simplicity		11/15
TOTAL SCORE		44/60
Additional Comments:		
Judge's Name & Signature: ELIAS NIKOLAIDIS 		

1834/5
1834

BICKERTON



**ROYAL
AERONAUTICAL
SOCIETY**

APPENDIX 1

FLY BY
WIRELESS

**Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma**

Branch:	UAE / Dubai		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 5/10/94	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 22/3/17	Age: 22	
Title of Paper:	FLY-BY-WIRELESS		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	ANADIKA PAUL BAGHEL		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	DAVID BICKERTON		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 15 mins	Taken:	mins

ASSESSMENT		SCORE
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.		
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments:	15 MINS	15 5
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments:	STRUCTURE GOOD, SLIGHTLY RUSHED. USED NOTES / GOOD OBJECTIVE	10 9 ✓
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments:	NOTES, PORNALS NOT NEEDED. THIN ARGUMENTS	10 7
Engagement with audience – Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest Comments:	Good.	15 4 ✓
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments:	TO MUCH INFORMATION, TOO MANY SLIDES. NOT ENOUGH EXPLANATION	15 4 ✓
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments:	NOT SUFFICIENT DEPTH. RUSHED. DOS.	10 7
General – Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments:	GOOD CONCEPT. INTERESTING IDEA	15 11
TOTAL SCORE		160
Additional Comments:		
Judge's Name & Signature:		

Good intro + story

HARNED SELF CHECKS REARBITRAYS

BACK UP SAFETY!

2000/149
B787
CHECK NOT.