

**PART A (Group work [Outcome1])**

Criteria	Weight	Not done / Grossly insufficient 0-2	Towards Required competence 3-4	Competent 5-7	Exceeding expectations 8-10	Score /10	Weighted percentage
<b>Section 1: Problem identification (BSDM)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Write a clear problem statement</li> </ul>	6%	Problem statement was poorly addressed.	Problem statement not comprehensive/specific OR lacks coherence.	Problem identification and motivation completed on standard.	Problem Identification shows a deep grasp of interrelated factors that led to the problem. Strongly motivated.		
<b>Section 2: Objectives and Operational requirements (BSDM) &amp; (PM)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the business system's requirements               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>objectives &amp;</li> <li>system's operational drivers</li> </ul> </li> <li>Show what capabilities (functions) the system needs to have in place to achieve the stated objectives.</li> <li>Identify physical embodiments for the functions</li> <li>Validate the business system's needs</li> </ul>	15%	All four bullet points are poorly addressed or ignored. Somewhat incomplete knowledge or sloppily executed.	Stated bullet points were addressed though somewhat vague. It is clear that little thought went into these. Another issue is lack of coherence amongst these points.	Coherence amongst the bullet points is somewhat articulate and realistic.	Coherence amongst the bullet points and general motivational comments somewhat express a reasonable depth of knowledge.		
<b>Section 3: Market analysis (EDM)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define target market</li> <li>Complete a marketing map to identify gap</li> <li>Use Porter's 5 forces as framework to discuss competitive forces</li> <li>State your unique value proposition</li> </ul>	10%	Any one of the four elements are missing or sloppily executed.	All elements completed but there is a lack of coherence between elements or insufficient detail.	Target market defined in detail. Marketing map with relevant axes and at least 4 competitors mapped. Each of the 5 forces considered. Value proposition consistent with other elements.	Target market defined in detail. Marketing map with relevant axes and at least 4 competitors mapped. Each of the 5 forces considered. Value proposition consistent with other elements. In-depth market analysis evident with references as proof.		
<b>Section 4: Value chain design (BSDM)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe a high-level design for each of the primary and support activities in your value chain (1 paragraph each)</li> </ul>	9%	Any one of the primary or support activities are not discussed.	All activities discussed but some discussions are vague/ambiguous/shows a lack of insight.	All activities are described. Coherence between the value chain design and operational requirements.	All activities are described. Coherence between the value chain design and operational requirements. Competitive advantage of primary activities highlighted and coherent with value proposition.		
<b>Section 5: Overall project plan (based on PART B) (PM) &amp; (BSDM)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present a high-level network diagram that shows the critical path (minimum 15 tasks &amp; maximum 20 tasks)</li> <li>Systems thinking &amp; business structure integratedness</li> <li>Present a consolidated risk matrix with a brief description of a mitigation strategy for each.</li> <li>Business intelligence</li> </ul>	23%	Some elements are missing, incomplete OR more than 20 tasks OR less than 15 tasks were utilised; None, missing or poor attempt for systems thinking structural network and none, missing or poor attempt for business intelligence model.	All elements completed but errors in network diagram OR errors in risk matrix OR mitigation strategies are vague or non-sensical OR Incoherence between overall plan and the plans in Part Bs; Weak and non-coherent systems thinking network and partially sensible business intelligence model.	All elements are completed and correct. Risk mitigation makes sense. Coherence between overall plan and Part Bs; Functional and coherent systems thinking network based on the consolidation from Part Bs; and an operational business intelligence model.	All elements are completed and correct. Risk mitigation makes sense. Coherence between overall plan and Part Bs. Risk matrix and mitigation strategies shows evidence of market research; A validated, reliable and coherent systems thinking network based on the consolidation from Part Bs; and a validated business intelligence model.		
<b>Section 6: Overall project cash flow analysis (based on PART B) (EDM)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Present consolidated cash flow for first three years of operation</li> <li>Define and quantify worst case, best case and most likely cash flow projections</li> <li>Determine the MARR for this project with substantiation</li> <li>Conduct and NPV analysis and make recommendations regarding the financial feasibility of the project</li> </ul>	22%	Any of the elements incomplete or sloppily executed.	All elements executed. BUT Not coherent with Part B's OR Gross errors in determining the MARR or NPV OR Errors in recommendations	All elements executed. Coherence between overall plan and Part B's. Correct interpretations. Slight errors in calculations allowed.	All elements executed. Coherence between overall plan and Part B's. Correct interpretations. No visible errors. Market research to define the MARR is evident		
<b>Feedback on Peer review</b> Feedback completed for two assigned group members on or before the deadline of 18 <sup>th</sup> of May, 2025. Peer review instructions will be on ClickUp prior to the end of the project.	5%	A group member did not participate in the project or was mostly unavailable for meeting without a tangible excuse. <b>That individual may need to start up a new project from scratch with a new group if facts are authenticated.</b>	Competence 1 does not apply however, a weak peer review rating can result in this score...	Competence 2 does not apply however, a good peer review rating can result in this score.	An excellent peer review from group members can result in this score.		
<b>Professionalism</b> Part A max page limit: 15 pages (excl. Title page, project work declaration, executive summary, table of contents, list of figures, list of tables, list of acronyms, reference list, meeting minutes appendix). Minimum font size 11pt, minimum margins 1cm. Prescribed document structure available on clickUP.	10%	Page limit exceeded OR Very poor English OR Horrible formatting OR Disregard for prescribed document structure	Adhered to page limit. BUT Either document structure incomplete OR Poor academic English OR Incoherent report (i.e. sections seem copy-pasted together) OR Grainy graphics/figures	Adhered to page limit. Document structure adhered to. Good academic English. Coherent report. Clear graphics/figures.	Adhered to page limit. Document structure adhered to. Good academic English. Coherent report. Exceptional elements present.		
<b>Total for PART A</b>	<b>100%</b>						

Competence in module outcome 1: "Apply the basic techniques of business system design and management (BSDM), project management (PM) and economics decision making (EDM) as a member of a multidisciplinary group."

If PART A of the group project is not regarded as competent, the group will have to redo both PARTS A and B as stipulated in the study guide.

**NB: A student is deemed competent in this project outcome ONLY if the student is declared competent in BSDM, PM and EDM. These components of the project are assessed holistically.**