Maturity of preliminary design information self-assessment by information producer		Information Matury beeing assessed: (part name/number/unique identifier)		Information produced and assessed by:		Date of assessment:
	Parameter Value	4	3	2	1	0
-	Coverage How well is everything in place that I know has to be there?	n/a (The parameter either is defined or not)				
	Depth How fine-tuned is the information (are all aspects detailed or do rough placeholders exist)?	The parameter value is worked out until the finest level of detail (e.g. decimal points)		The parameter value is worked out until a moderate level of detail (e.g. decimal points)		The parameter value rough (e.g. decimal points)
	Procedural Completeness What is the information's formal or informal status?	n/a (all imaginable/reasonable tests related to this parameter value having to be executed to turn it into a "deliverable" have to be based on the document or CAD-file that the parameter is used in; these are not part of the parameter in itself)				
CLARITY Maturity relating to presentation of the preliminary information	Nomenclature Nomenclature Nomenclature How rigorously are suitable units, symbols and definitions provided?	All units ([m]vs. [inch]) and details such as material definitions, tolerances, origo, scale are available and checked.		Most units ([m]vs.[inch]) and details such as material definitions, tolerances, origo, scale are available and roughly checked.		Units ([m]vs.[inch]) and details are given in different values such as material definitions, tolerances, origo, scale not all are available and, if so not checked.
	Conciseness How confident am I that the lack of waffle/unnecessary repetition was	No unnecessary significant figures (e.g. 5.0000000) are given for this parameter value.		Some unnecessary significant figures (e.g. 5.0000000) are given for this parameter value.		Many unnecessary significant figures (e.g. 5.0000000) are given for this parameter value.
	Vagueness How confident am I that there is no room for interpretation?	The reference point (of measure) for this parameter is clearly defined.		The reference point (of measure) for this parameter is somewhat clearly defined.		The reference reference (of measure) for this parameter is not clearly defined.
CONSISTENCY Maturity relating to meshing of the preliminary information within itself and with relevant context and Ambiguity.	Compatibility How well is the infromation meshing with its environment or other information?	n/a (as a parameter value is not abstract enough to justify considerations about its meshing with the environment)				
	Coherence Well is the data meshing well within itself?	n/a (as a parameter value is not abstract enough to justify considerations about meshing within itself)				
	Ambiguity Am I confident in the mental model of the content?	n/a (considerations about Ambiguity are on the other end of the spectrum of sophistication)				
DYNAMISM Maturity relating to anticipated future change in the preliminary information	Change Extent How significant do I expect the information to change?	No change in the parameter-value is expected.		Only minor changes in the parameter-value are expected.		Substantial changes in the parameter-value are expected.
	Stability How often do I expect the information to change?	No change in the parameter-value is expected.		Only infrequent changes in the parameter-value are expected.		Frequent changes in the parameter-value are expected.
	Predictability How well-known is the overall target and the related size of the problem to be overcome?	n/a (as a parameter value is not abstract enough to justify Predictability considerations)				
PREREQUISITES Maturity relating to the inputs used for producing the preliminary information	Availability How significant were the assumptions required to proceed?	All inputs leading to this parameter-value were available.		Most inputs leading to this parameter-value were available.		Almost no inputs leading to this parameter-value were available.
	Traceability How well can I trace back the source of the information I used as an input?	The one source of this parameter value is easily traceable.		The one source of this parameter value is traceable with some effort.		There is no way to trace back the source of this parameter value.
	Credibility How confident am I that the inputs are credible?	This parameter value matches all my expectations (based on expert knowledge) and, therefore, seems reasonable/credible, or it stems from a person I trust.		This parameter value roughly matches my expectations (based on expert knowledge) and, therefore, seems mostly reasonable/credible, or it stems from a person I somewhat trust.		I don't find this value reasonable at all as it significantly differs from my expectations or stems from an untrustworthy source.
PROCESS Maturity relating to the method used to produce the preliminary information	Rigour How rigorously did I apply the method?	I used the most sophisticated method to arrive at this parameter-value.		I had to take some shortcuts to arrive at this parameter-value.		This parameter-value is just a rough guess based on gut-feeling.
	Suitability How confident am I that the method used to create the information was appropriate?	The method used to produce this parameter-value seems appropriate given the overall progress.		The method used to produce this parameter-value seems a bit too (little) sophisticated given the overall progress.		The method used to produce this parameter-value seems not to match the overall progress.