Architecture Presentation	Software Architecture
Semester 1, 2025	Richard Thomas & Guangdong Bai

Summary

In this assessment, you will deliver a presentation about the software architecture of your team's capstone project. Your task is to explain the design decisions made, critically evaluate your architecture, compare it with viable alternatives, and demonstrate awareness of architectural trade-offs.

This assessment item is designed to showcase your skills to solve problems as a software architect. You should demonstrate

1. a clear understanding of software architecture principles,

2. the ability to evaluate and defend architectural choices, and

3. effective communication of complex architectural concepts.

1 Introduction

Software architecture forms the foundation of every software system. Whether you are designing a cloud-based service, a data processing platform, or a mobile application, software architecture defines how well the software system meets its goals such as scalability, maintainability, and security.

As part of your capstone project, you have collaboratively developed the architecture of your team's software system. In this assessment activity, you will conduct a deep analysis of the architecture. You will provide not only a description of your architecture, but a critical evaluation of how well your architecture meets its intended goals.

Each team is allocated a time slot for your presentation. During your team's presentation, each member will focus on a specific architectural concern, such as architectural design, detailed design, design rationale and trade-offs, alternative patterns, and security. You will be **assessed individually**.

2 Presentation

2.1 Presentation Scheduling

- Each team will be allocated **35 minutes** during **Week 13** to deliver their presentations. This time includes setup, individual presentations, and a brief Q&A discussion.

- The teaching team will provide a list of available time slots. These will primarily take place during the scheduled lecture, case study, and practical sessions in week 13.

- Your team must **collaboratively choose a single time slot** for which all team members are available. The course coordinators may proactively allocate your team a time slot in a session in which all team members are enrolled. **All team members are required to be present during the allocated session**. This includes being available to present your individual topic, being present for your teammates' presentations, and being available to answer questions regarding your project. You may be asked a question about *any* topic related to the presentation, not just the one on which you spoke.

- Please inform the course coordinators of any constraints you may have regarding presentation time *before* 9 May 2025.

2.2   Presentation Content

Each team member is free to structure their presentation however they wish, though the team together needs to cover the following content.

Title Slide Name of the software project, and names and student numbers of team members in the order in which they will present.

Introduction and Context Describe the software project, explaining its key functionality and target users, and provide an overview of the software system's context and its external dependencies.

Architecture Describe the software's architecture, and the Architecturally Significant Requirements (ASR) of most importance to the project.

Detailed Design Describe the internals of key components or subsystems.

Critique Analyse the software's architecture, describing how well it delivers its ASRs.

Comparison Compare your architecture with chosen viable alternatives.

Security Describe the security concerns and your mitigation mechanisms in your architecture.

Conclusion Highlight the key points of your team's presentation.

2.3   Presentation Guidelines

2.3.1   Presenter #1 (6.5 minutes): Title Slide, Introduction and Context, Architecture

Your presentation should start with the introduction of your team's capstone project **within 1.5 mins**. Give an elevator pitch style summary of what problem the project solves and its key features.

Describe the project's software architecture using appropriate views [1]. You must use the C4 modelling notation [1] [2] to describe the software architecture. You may supplement the C4 diagrams with other diagrams to help describe the architecture. For example, you may use UML use case, class, or sequence diagrams [1] [3] to describe system requirements or details of how the architectural design works. Other diagrams may also be used, if they clarify aspects of your C4 model. Any diagrams obtained from other sources must be cited.

Your description of the software architecture should cover all of its important aspects. You are not expected to get down to the level of describing the detailed design of the software, which will be done by **Presenter #2**, nor the design trade-offs, which will be done by **Presenter #3**. You should not need to provide class or dynamic diagrams for the entire system.

Your audience is other students in this course and the course teaching staff. You may assume the audience has knowledge of the course content, though you should not assume they are familiar with the project you are describing.

2.3.2   Presenter #2 (5 minutes): Critique

Your presentation should deliver a **critical evaluation of your software architecture**, focusing on how well it addresses the ASRs and supports the overall project goals.

Begin by describing which ASRs and, in particular, the quality attributes you think are most important for the project, and why. Then, assess how well the architecture you have designed satisfies those attributes. Your presentation is advised to be specific to particular design choices or structures, and to discuss how they contribute to or potentially hinder your quality goals.

You should also highlight any limitations, trade-offs, or compromises that were made.

2.3.3   Presenter #3 (5 minutes): Detailed Design

Your presentation should focus on the **detailed design** of **one or two key parts** of your capstone project. The goal is to show how the lower level details of the design implement important parts of the architecture and adhere to the principles embodied in your architectural decisions. You also need to show how key components work together to fulfil the system's ASRs and quality attributes.

Select only **one or two** significant components, services, or subsystems. Your selected one(s) should be central to the system's functionality. Describe their internal structure, key interfaces, and important interactions with other parts of the system.

You should use appropriate UML diagrams to support your explanation. Depending on what you are describing, these may include:

- *Class diagrams* to show internal structure and relationships.

- *Sequence diagrams* to show interactions between components.

- *State diagrams* if the component involves complex state transitions.

- *Activity diagrams* for workflow or process modelling.

Explain any design patterns, principles, or trade-offs applied in your detailed design. For example, if you've used an adapter, explain why, and how it contributes to quality attributes.

You are not expected to describe the full system in detail. Focus on the parts that are most important or interesting from an architectural perspective.

Assume your audience is not familiar with the inner workings of your project. You are expected to clearly communicate how your detailed design brings the architecture to life.

2.3.4   Presenters #4 and #5 (5 minutes *each*): Comparison

Each presenter is to compare your team's chosen software architecture with *one* viable alternative. This means each presenter must use a *different* alternative for comparison.

Your presentation is advised to begin by clearly identifying the alternative architecture. This could be an alternative style (e.g. microservices vs. event-driven), or even a fundamentally different design philosophy.

Explain what makes this alternative a **credible** option for your project. What trade-offs would it involve? What problems might it solve better? What new challenges would it introduce? Then, compare your chosen architecture and the alternative along key dimensions such as: support for ASRs, complexity, and team expertise.

You may use diagrams, tables, or summaries where appropriate to make your comparison clear and visual.

2.3.5   Presenter #6 (5.5 minutes): Security, Conclusion

Your presentation should focus on the security aspects of your software architecture. Discuss the key security concerns specific to your project and how the architecture is designed to address them.

Start by identifying the primary security threats or risks your system faces, such as unauthorised access, data breaches, or Denial of Service (DoS).

Explain the security mechanisms built into your architecture to mitigate these threats, such as authentication and authorisation strategies, and data protection measures. You are advised to use security design patterns (e.g. secure-by-design, defence-in-depth).

Highlight any remaining security challenges or areas where future improvements could be made.

2.4 Citations & References

You may use references in your presentation to support points you are making. These must be cited and referenced using the IEEE referencing style[1]. The final slide(s) of your presentation should include the references to any cited material. You should display the reference slide(s) for about 3 seconds at the end of your presentation. You are not required to speak to the reference slides, aside from possibly thanking your audience for listening and stating these are your references.

2.5 Time Limits

If your presentation exceeds the designated minutes, the marker will ask you to stop your presentation. If there is a presenter to follow you, they will be asked to step forward and start their section of the presentation. No content of your presentation past the point at which you were asked to stop will be marked.

2.6 Presentation Hints

As a presenter, you should not read a script. You may wish to write a script to prepare for the presentation but should not read it during the presentation. You may make use of notes during the presentation but you should only quickly glance at your notes to keep yourself on track. You should not be constantly referring to notes. You should try to maintain eye contact with your audience, rather than focussing on your notes or slides.

3 Identity Verification

The presentation is an identity verified assignment. You must make your presentation in-person. At the start of your presentation you must show your UQ student card to one of the markers at your session. Like in an exam situation, if you have lost your student card you must obtain a temporary identity verification document from the UQ student centre *before* your presentation.

4 Submission

There are two components that make up your assessable content for the presentation. The slides you use for your presentation and the presentation itself.

4.1 Slides

The slides for your presentation are to be submitted as a PDF file to a link provided on BlackBoard. Your slides are due at 11:00am on 26 May 2025. Late submission of your slides will result in a penalty of 1 grade per 24 hour period that they are late. Regardless of any penalty applied to the presentation, *even* if the penalty is a failing grade, you **must** still make your presentation in your allocated timeslot.

4.2 Presentation

Your presentation is to use the slides you submit to BlackBoard. If you do not deliver your presentation, your final grade will be capped at a failing grade. If you are unable to attend your session to give your presentation due to exceptional circumstances, you may apply to defer your presentation to another date. You are not able to defer a deferred presentation. Please find more information in the course profile[2].

---

[1] https://libraryguides.vu.edu.au/ieeereferencing/gettingstarted
[2] https://course-profiles.uq.edu.au/course-profiles/CSSE6400-21553-7520

5   Academic Integrity

As this is a higher-level course, you are expected to be familiar with the importance of academic integrity in general, and the details of UQ's rules. If you need a reminder, review the Academic Integrity Modules[3]. Submissions will be checked to ensure that the work submitted is not plagiarised. If you have quoted or paraphrased any material from another source, it must be correctly cited and referenced[4]. Use the IEEE referencing style[5] for citations and your bibliography.

Note that text generated by an AI tool, such as ChatGPT, is based on text from the Internet. Consequently all text, whether written on slides or spoken during a presentation, that was generated by an AI tool must be cited.

Uncited or unreferenced material will be treated as not being your own work. Extensive quotation or minor rephrasing of material from cited sources should be avoided. Significant amounts of cited material from other sources, even if paraphrased, will be considered to be of no academic merit. In all cases, any material that you cite must support the arguments and points that you are making in your presentation.

References

[1] R. Thomas and B. Webb, "Architectural views," February 2023. `https://csse6400.uqcloud.net/handouts/views.pdf`.

[2] S. Brown, *The C4 Model for Visualising Software Architecture*. Leanpub, Feb 2023. `https://leanpub.com/visualising-software-architecture`.

[3] *Unified Modeling Language*. OMG, 2.5.1 ed., December 2017. `https://www.uml.org/`.

---

[3]`https://web.library.uq.edu.au/library-services/it/learnuq-blackboard-help/academic-integrity-modules`

[4]`https://guides.library.uq.edu.au/referencing`

[5]`https://libraryguides.vu.edu.au/ieeereferencing/gettingstarted`

Marking Criteria: Common Part (20%)

All team members will be awarded the same result for the Title Slide, Introduction and Context (by **Presenter #1**), ASRs (by **Presenter #2**), and Conclusion (by **Presenter #6**).

Criteria	Standard						
	Exceptional (7)	**Advanced (6)**	**Proficient (5)**	**Functional (4)**	**Developing (3)**	**Little Evidence (2)**	**No Evidence (1)**
Context 5%	Project is introduced clearly and well situated within its context, providing an excellent starting point to understand the system.	Project is introduced clearly with good contextual information, providing a good starting point to understand the system.	Project is introduced well with a good overview of its context, providing a clear but basic overview of the system.	Project is introduced fairly well with some contextual information, providing a comprehensible overview of the system.	Project scope & general context are fairly clear, providing a general overview of the system.	Project scope & context are not clear, providing a poor overview of the system.	Project scope & context are confusing, providing an inaccurate overview of the system.
ASRs 10%	ASRs are clearly described, well justified, clearly of high importance, and all will influence architecture decisions.	ASRs are clearly described, fairly well justified, seemingly of high importance, and all are likely to influence architecture decisions.	Most ASRs are well described but a few justifications are a little weak. Most are important and likely to influence architecture decisions.	Some ASRs are well described but a few justifications are weak. Most are important and likely to influence architecture decisions.	Some ASRs are fairly well described but some justifications are weak. Some are important and likely to influence architecture decisions.	Most ASRs are poorly described or poorly justified. Few are important or likely to influence architecture decisions.	Most ASRs are poorly described and poorly justified. Very few are important or likely to influence architecture decisions.
Conclusion 5%	Conclusion provides a clear, well-structured summary of all key architectural points and offers insightful reflection on lessons learnt.	Conclusion clearly summarises most key architectural points, and includes thoughtful reflection.	Conclusion summarises main points clearly and includes some useful reflection.	Conclusion presents a reasonable summary, though some points may be underdeveloped.	Conclusion attempts to summarise key points but is vague or superficial.	Conclusion is unclear or disorganised, with poor summarisation.	Conclusion is confusing or missing.

Marking Criteria: Individual Part (80%)

Presentation #1 Title Slide, Introduction and Context, Architecture

Criteria	Standard						
	Exceptional (7)	Advanced (6)	Proficient (5)	Functional (4)	Developing (3)	Little Evidence (2)	No Evidence (1)
Architecture Completeness 25%	Description is clear, complete, concise, and informative, resulting in an excellent and coherent understanding of the overall architecture and its major components.	Description is clear, almost complete, and informative, resulting in a good and coherent understanding of the system's architecture and structure.	Description is mostly clear and informative, resulting in a good understanding of the system's architectural structure.	Description is mostly clear and informative, though some architectural elements may be missing or underexplained.	At times the description lacks clarity, leading to a vague or partial overview of the system's architecture.	Description is unclear or incomplete, omitting important architectural elements or structure, leading to a poor understanding of the architecture.	Description is confusing, severely incomplete, resulting in an incorrect or misleading understanding of the architecture.
Architecture Clarity and Consistency 20%	Architectural structure is communicated with excellent clarity, logical flow, consistency and at an appropriate level of abstraction. Relationships and responsibilities between components are well explained and coherent.	Structure is clearly presented and mostly consistent. Component responsibilities and relationships are explained well.	Architecture is mostly clear and consistent, though some relationships or responsibilities may be weakly described. Description is understandable but may lack cohesion, with minor inconsistencies or unclear relationships.	Description is understandable but may lack cohesion, with minor inconsistencies or unclear relationships.	Architectural explanation is somewhat disorganised or inconsistent, weakening the overall coherence.	Explanation is unclear or inconsistent, making it difficult to follow architectural relationships.	Explanation is highly inconsistent or incoherent, obscuring the system's architecture entirely.
Design Diagrams 25%	All diagrams are easy to comprehend, convey important information, and enhance the presentation.	Most diagrams are easy to comprehend, convey important information, and are used well in the presentation.	Most diagrams are comprehensible, convey useful information, and are used well in the presentation.	Most diagrams are comprehensible, convey useful information, and are connected to the presentation.	Most diagrams are comprehensible, convey some useful information, and are mostly connected to the presentation.	Some diagrams are incomprehensible, do not convey useful information, or are disconnected from the presentation.	Most diagrams are incomprehensible, do not convey useful information, or are disconnected from the presentation.
Presentation 10%	Presentation is well paced and delivered fluently. Information is logically sequenced, with clear objectives making it very easy to follow.	Presentation is well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with some clear objectives making it easy to follow.	Presentation is mostly well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with signposting guiding audience through presentation.	Presentation pace is a little inconsistent or delivery is occasionally unclear. Information is logically sequenced allowing audience to follow presentation fairly well.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is sometimes unclear. Information is not always logically sequenced, distracting audience from presentation flow.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is unclear. Information is not logically sequenced, and planned progression was not clear to audience.	Presentation pace is inconsistent and delivery is unclear. Information is poorly sequenced, confusing audience.

Presentation #2 Critique

Criteria	Standard						
	Exceptional (7)	Advanced (6)	Proficient (5)	Functional (4)	Developing (3)	Little Evidence (2)	No Evidence (1)
Depth 30%	Provides a thorough, critical analysis of the architecture, addressing key strengths, weaknesses, and how well it meets the ASRs and quality attributes. The critique is insightful, balanced, and well-supported by evidence.	Provides a comprehensive critique with clear analysis of the architecture's strengths, weaknesses, and how it addresses ASRs and quality attributes. Some evidence supports the critique.	Critique is generally well-developed, covering major strengths and weaknesses, though it may lack some depth or specific evidence.	Critique is adequate but lacks depth, with only superficial analysis of strengths, weaknesses, and ASRs.	Critique is somewhat vague, with limited analysis of the architecture's strengths and weaknesses.	Critique lacks meaningful analysis or focuses only on minor or irrelevant points.	No meaningful critique is provided, or it fails to identify any strengths or weaknesses of the architecture.
Relevance 25%	Critique is closely aligned with the ASRs and quality attributes, offering a clear and detailed explanation of how well the architecture meets them.	Critique is mostly aligned with ASRs and quality attributes, discussing their impact on the architecture effectively.	Critique references ASRs and quality attributes, but the connection is not always clear or well-supported.	Critique mentions ASRs and quality attributes, but the connection to the architecture is weak or unclear.	Critique makes limited or superficial reference to ASRs or quality attributes.	Critique mentions ASRs and quality attributes but fails to connect them to the architecture.	Critique is entirely disconnected from the ASRs and quality attributes.
Balanced Evaluation 15%	Provides a well-balanced critique, discussing both strengths and weaknesses in a fair, objective, and constructive manner.	Provides a fairly balanced critique, discussing both strengths and weaknesses, but may focus slightly more on one side.	Critique discusses strengths and weaknesses, but the evaluation may be unbalanced, focusing more on one aspect than the other.	Critique covers strengths and weaknesses, but may not be sufficiently balanced or may favor one aspect too much.	Critique lacks balance, focusing more on weaknesses or strengths, without giving adequate attention to the other side.	Critique is unbalanced, only discussing strengths or weaknesses in detail with little consideration of the other side.	Critique is entirely one-sided or overly negative without recognizing any positive aspects of the architecture.
Presentation 10%	Presentation is well paced and delivered fluently. Information is logically sequenced, with clear objectives making it very easy to follow.	Presentation is well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with some clear objectives making it easy to follow.	Presentation is mostly well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with signposting guiding audience through presentation.	Presentation pace is a little inconsistent or delivery is occasionally unclear. Information is logically sequenced allowing audience to follow presentation fairly well.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is sometimes unclear. Information is not always logically sequenced, distracting audience from presentation flow.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is unclear. Information is not logically sequenced, and planned progression was not clear to audience.	Presentation pace is inconsistent and delivery is unclear. Information is poorly sequenced, confusing audience.

Presentation #3 Detailed Design

Criteria	Standard						
	Exceptional (7)	Advanced (6)	Proficient (5)	Functional (4)	Developing (3)	Little Evidence (2)	No Evidence (1)
Selection of Design Focus 15%	An important and significant part of the system was selected, showing excellent judgement.	A relevant and fairly significant part of the system was selected, which reflects key design complexity or importance.	A reasonable part of the system was selected to present in detail.	Design focus is acceptable, but may not show the most relevant or complex aspect of the system.	Design focus is only partially appropriate.	Focus is weak or only marginally relevant to understanding the detailed design.	Design focus is inappropriate, trivial, or disconnected from the system.
Design Clarity and Completeness 30%	Detailed design is presented clearly and comprehensively, with excellent coverage of component responsibilities and interactions.	Detailed design is mostly clear and complete, effectively showing how components interact and function.	Design is generally clear, with most responsibilities and flows explained; minor gaps may exist.	Design is presented in an understandable way, though some areas are underdeveloped or unclear.	Design presentation lacks detail or clarity in key parts, limiting understanding.	Design is hard to follow or significantly incomplete.	Design is confusing, vague, or missing critical information.
Design Diagrams 25%	All diagrams are easy to comprehend, convey important information, and enhance the presentation.	Most diagrams are easy to comprehend, convey important information, and are used well in the presentation.	Most diagrams are comprehensible, convey useful information, and are used well in the presentation.	Most diagrams are comprehensible, convey useful information, and are connected to the presentation.	Most diagrams are comprehensible, convey some useful information, and are mostly connected to the presentation.	Some diagrams are incomprehensible, do not convey useful information, or are disconnected from the presentation.	Most diagrams are incomprehensible, do not convey useful information, or are disconnected from the presentation.
Presentation 10%	Presentation is well paced and delivered fluently. Information is logically sequenced, with clear objectives making it very easy to follow.	Presentation is well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with some clear objectives making it easy to follow.	Presentation is mostly well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with signposting guiding audience through presentation.	Presentation pace is a little inconsistent or delivery is occasionally unclear. Information is logically sequenced allowing audience to follow presentation fairly well.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is sometimes unclear. Information is not always logically sequenced, distracting audience from presentation flow.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is unclear. Information is not logically sequenced, and planned progression was not clear to audience.	Presentation pace is inconsistent and delivery is unclear. Information is poorly sequenced, confusing audience.

Presentations #4 and #5 Comparison

Criteria	Standard						
	Exceptional (7)	Advanced (6)	Proficient (5)	Functional (4)	Developing (3)	Little Evidence (2)	No Evidence (1)
Alternative Selection 15%	Clearly identifies a relevant and credible alternative architecture, with strong justification for its suitability for the project.	Identifies a relevant alternative architecture with a good, but not thorough, justification.	Identifies a plausible alternative architecture but justification of its suitability is a little weak.	Identifies a plausible alternative architecture but with minimal justification or clarity of why it's viable.	Identifies an alternative, but the choice may be weak or poorly explained.	Identifies an alternative that is irrelevant or unclear.	Does not identify any meaningful alternative architecture or design philosophy.
Comparison 30%	Provides a highly detailed and insightful comparison of the chosen architecture and alternative, covering key dimensions. Clearly explains which architecture is more suitable and why.	Provides an informative and clear comparison, covering key dimensions, with good reasoning behind the preference for the chosen architecture.	Provides a good comparison, touching on the main aspects, though the explanation may lack depth or full clarity in some areas.	Comparison addresses key aspects, but it lacks depth in areas such as complexity or the impact on ASRs.	Comparison is basic and lacks clarity.	Provides only superficial comparisons, missing key aspects of the architectures or failing to explain their impact on the system.	Comparison is poorly developed or nonexistent, providing minimal or no insights into how the two architectures compare.
Trade-off Analysis 25%	Provides a thorough analysis of the trade-offs involved in choosing the alternative, detailing both its strengths and weaknesses, and how these trade-offs might impact the overall system.	Provides a strong analysis of trade-offs, with a clear explanation of how the alternative would affect the system's quality attributes.	Identifies major trade-offs but lacks a detailed explanation of how they would impact the project's quality attributes.	Provides a basic analysis of trade-offs, but lacks depth in understanding their potential impact on the project.	Mentions trade-offs but provides limited insight into their impact on the overall system, or the trade-offs are unclear.	Provides minimal analysis of trade-offs, with little connection to system goals or project needs.	No trade-off analysis is provided, or it is wholly inadequate or unsubstantiated.
Presentation 10%	Presentation is well paced and delivered fluently. Information is logically sequenced, with clear objectives making it very easy to follow.	Presentation is well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with some clear objectives making it easy to follow.	Presentation is mostly well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with signposting guiding audience through presentation.	Presentation pace is a little inconsistent or delivery is occasionally unclear. Information is logically sequenced allowing audience to follow presentation fairly well.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is sometimes unclear. Information is not always logically sequenced, distracting audience from presentation flow.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is unclear. Information is not logically sequenced, and planned progression was not clear to audience.	Presentation pace is inconsistent and delivery is unclear. Information is poorly sequenced, confusing audience.

Presentation #6 Security

Criteria	Standard						
	Exceptional (7)	Advanced (6)	Proficient (5)	Functional (4)	Developing (3)	Little Evidence (2)	No Evidence (1)
Security Threats 30%	Clearly and comprehensively identifies all security threats specific to the system, with a deep understanding of their potential impact.	Identifies key security threats and risks, with a good understanding of their potential impact.	Identifies several security threats, though some may be less relevant or insufficiently detailed.	Identifies a few key security threats but misses some major ones or provides insufficient detail.	Identifies only a limited range of security threats, missing major threats that could impact the system.	Provides an incomplete or unclear identification of security threats, omitting critical issues.	Fails to identify or improperly identifies the security threats.
Mitigations 30%	Thoroughly explains the security mechanisms used to mitigate the identified threats, and how they are integrated into the architecture. Mechanisms are clearly linked to specific threats.	Explains the security mechanisms effectively, and links them to the identified threats and risks, with minor gaps in explanation.	Provides a good explanation of security mechanisms, but some parts lack clarity or details of how they address specific threats.	Provides an explanation of security mechanisms, but with vague or incomplete descriptions of how they mitigate the risks.	Provides a minimal explanation of security mechanisms, leaving out key details or failing to fully connect them to identified threats.	The explanation of security mechanisms is unclear or disconnected from the identified threats, with many important aspects missing.	Does not explain the security mechanisms or fails to show how they address the identified threats.
Remaining Challenges 10%	Thoroughly identifies any remaining security challenges or risks in the architecture and suggests thoughtful, feasible improvements.	Identifies remaining security challenges with a good explanation of potential future improvements and strategies to address them.	Acknowledges some remaining security challenges but does not offer concrete or comprehensive strategies for improvement.	Identifies some challenges but does not offer specific or actionable recommendations for future improvements.	Mentions remaining security issues, but provides no or very weak suggestions for improvement.	Superficial identification of remaining security challenges or improvement opportunities.	Fails to identify remaining security challenges or improvement opportunities, or completely overlooks the topic.
Presentation 10%	Presentation is well paced and delivered fluently. Information is logically sequenced, with clear objectives making it very easy to follow.	Presentation is well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with some clear objectives making it easy to follow.	Presentation is mostly well paced and delivered clearly. Information is logically sequenced, with signposting guiding audience through presentation.	Presentation pace is a little inconsistent or delivery is occasionally unclear. Information is logically sequenced allowing audience to follow presentation fairly well.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is sometimes unclear. Information is not always logically sequenced, distracting audience from presentation flow.	Presentation pace is inconsistent or delivery is unclear. Information is not logically sequenced, and planned progression was not clear to audience.	Presentation pace is inconsistent and delivery is unclear. Information is poorly sequenced, confusing audience.