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**First Impressions**

**It was truly pleasant for me to read your proposal for the analysis of the problem of accessibility and affordability of housing for the UBC community. Obviously, the problem is considerable for a great number of people and you clearly described it. The accessibility and affordability of accommodations for groups with low-income rate, such as students are, is an essential problem and you proposed good ways to ameliorate this issue. I reviewed your proposal and hope given suggestions are worthwhile and help refine the proposal.**

**Organization**

The proposal is well-organized and described logically. All the headings are entitled appropriately using a bold font. Two improving would be possible to add:

* Renaming the assignment. As you called it “Memo” and it took me a bit of time to understand that it is actually the report.
* Adding “Qualification” section for better understanding how you affiliate with this problem and what experience do you have in this field.

**Introduction and Statement of Problem**

The sections clearly state the scale of the problem and on what the report will focus on. It seems, that you have a body of knowledge and possess up-to-date information.to solve this issue. However, the proposal describes the problem in general and does not give the information why this topic was chosen. I would consider to characterize the acuteness of the subject in a more detailed manner.

**Proposed Solutions**

The given solutions are multitudinous and reasonable. However, the scope of proposed solutions is out of the possibilities of the report and they are generally directed. It would be better if you choose precisely to whom address the report, as the main goal of it is to provide the recommendations to people in positions or administrators.

**Scope**

I suggest this section is well organized and questions to elucidate are well-expressed. The proposed areas of investigations cover the main questions, which you need to analyze to get the recommendations for improving house affordability and availability.

**Methods**

There are two main ways of research, by which you would try to solve the issue. However, the clear dividing of your methods would be beneficial for readers.

**Grammar**

In general, the amount of the information that you provided and concise style of every section is well-readable and straightforward. Although, in different sections some expression mistakes making your ideas indistinct. For example, the next sentence is not easy to understand “This will be the base source to look at to see the recommendations and roll out of the programs to see if it is relevant to needs on campus via interviews”. It seems to me that some of your ideas could be divided into shorter sentences or rephrasing for better understanding.

**Final Thoughts**

After all, you have performed a great job describing the problem of affordable accommodation for the UBC community and possible ways to refine it in the proposal. Some aforementioned suggestions would make your proposal. If you have any questions about the review, do not hesitate to contact me at [tshyp@alumni.ubc.ca](mailto:tshyp@alumni.ubc.ca).