

MHI326408/MHI325614 – Cloud Platform Development Marks

STUDENT NAME		Date :	
---------------------	--	---------------	--

PROJECT REPORT SUMMARY		Mark
Resource creation with Boto3 and Cloud Formation	20	
Audio file upload to S3 and Lambda trigger from SQS	10	
Sentiment Analysis with Transcribe and Comprehend	20	
Database update and SMS notification	20	
Report-Description of the problem and a cost-optimised solution	10	
Report- Description of security features for the application and testing	10	
Video Recording of Project Demo – 5 mins	10	
COURSEWORK MARK	(100)	

Element	Poss. Marks	Poor (0-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-100%)	Mark (20)
RESOURCE CREATION WITH BOTO3 AND CLOUDFORMATION (20%)	20	0 - 7.9	8.0 – 9.9	10.0 – 11.9	12.0 – 13.9	14.0 – 20.0	
		<p>No or poor quality of Boto3 code provided to create S3 bucket and SQS queue.</p> <p>No or poor quality of CloudFormation template to create DynamoDB table.</p>	<p>Satisfactory quality of Boto3 code to create S3 bucket and SQS queue.</p> <p>Satisfactory quality of CloudFormation template to create DynamoDB table.</p>	<p>Good quality of Boto3 code to create S3 bucket and SQS queue. Adequate structure with few comments.</p> <p>Good quality of CloudFormation template to create DynamoDB table.</p>	<p>Very good quality of Boto3 code to create S3 bucket and SQS queue. Clear structure of code with some comments and error checks.</p> <p>Very good quality of CloudFormation template to create DynamoDB table.</p>	<p>Excellent quality and clarity of Boto3 code to create S3 bucket and SQS queue. Very well structured code, comments and checks for return values and error conditions.</p> <p>Excellent quality and clarity of CloudFormation template to create DynamoDB table.</p>	
Comments:							

Element	Poss. Marks	Poor (0-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-100%)	Mark (10)
AUDIO UPLOAD TO S3 AND LAMBDA TRIGGER FROM SQS (10%)	10	0 - 3.9	4.0 – 4.9	5 – 5.9	6.0 – 6.9	7.0 – 10.0	
		<p>No or poor quality of the Boto3 code provided to upload the audio files.</p> <p>No or poor evidence of S3 bucket configuration for SQS notification, trigger and access policy of Lambda for SQS.</p>	<p>Satisfactory quality of Boto3 code provided to upload the audio files.</p> <p>Weak evidence of S3 bucket configuration for SQS notification, trigger and access policy of Lambda for SQS.</p>	<p>Good quality of the code provided to upload the audio files. Adequate structure with few comments.</p> <p>Adequate evidence of S3 bucket configuration for SQS notification, trigger and access policy of Lambda for SQS.</p>	<p>Very good quality of the code to upload the audio files. Clear structure of code with some comments and error checks.</p> <p>Clear evidence of S3 bucket configuration for SQS notification, trigger and access policy of Lambda for SQS.</p>	<p>Excellent quality and clarity of the code to upload the audio files.</p> <p>Very well structured code, comments and checks for return values and error conditions.</p> <p>Very clear evidence of S3 queue configuration for SQS notification, trigger and access policy of Lambda for SQS.</p>	
Comments:							

Element	Poss. Marks	Poor (0-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-100%)	Mark (20)
SENTIMENT ANALYSIS WITH TRANSCRIBE AND COMPREHEND (20%)	20	0 - 7.9	8.0 – 9.9	10.0 – 11.9	12.0 – 13.9	14.0 – 20.0	
		No or poor quality code to extract the SQS message details.	Satisfactory quality of code to extract the SQS message details.	Good quality of code to extract the SQS message details with some comments.	Very good quality of code to extract the SQS message details with clear comments and error handling.	Excellent quality of code to extract the SQS message details with very clear comments and error handling.	
		No or poor quality of a call to the Transcribe service.	Satisfactory quality code to call the Transcribe service.	Good quality code to call the Transcribe service.	Very good quality code to call the Transcribe service.	Excellent quality code to call the Transcribe service.	
		No or poor quality of a call to the Comprehend service.	Weak evidence of Lambda access to some of the required services.	Adequate evidence of Lambda access to most of the required services.	Clear evidence of Lambda access to most of the required services.	Very clear evidence of Lambda access to all the required services.	
		No or poor evidence of Lambda access to the required services.	Satisfactory quality code to call the Comprehend service.	Good quality code to call the Comprehend service.	Very good quality code to call the Comprehend service.	Excellent quality code to call the Comprehend service.	
Comments:							

Element	Poss. Marks	Poor (0-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-100%)	Mark (20)
DATABASE UPDATES AND SMS (20%)	20	0 - 7.9	8.0 – 9.9	10.0 – 11.9	12.0 – 13.9	14.0 – 20.0	
		<p>No or poor code for extracting data from the Comprehend response.</p> <p>No or poor evidence of Lambda access to DynamoDB. No or poor data insertion to the DynamoDB table.</p> <p>No or poor code for SMS message using SNS service.</p>	<p>Limited code for extracting data from the Comprehend response.</p> <p>Weak evidence of Lambda access to DynamoDB. Data insertion to the DynamoDB table does not meet specification.</p> <p>Limited code for SMS message using SNS service.</p>	<p>Good code for extracting data from the Comprehend response.</p> <p>Satisfactory evidence of Lambda access to DynamoDB. Data insertion to the DynamoDB table meets some specification.</p> <p>Good code for SMS message using SNS service.</p>	<p>Very good code for extracting data from the Comprehend response.</p> <p>Clear evidence of Lambda access to DynamoDB. Appropriate data insertion to the DynamoDB table meeting the specification.</p> <p>Very good code for SMS message using SNS service.</p>	<p>Excellent code for extracting data from the Comprehend response.</p> <p>Very clear evidence of Lambda access to DynamoDB. Very appropriate data insertion to the DynamoDB table fully meeting the specification.</p> <p>Excellent code for SMS message using SNS service.</p>	
Comments:							

Element	Poss. Marks	Poor (0-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-100%)	Mark (10)
REPORT-PROBLEM AND COST-OPTIMISED SOLUTION (10%)	10	0 - 3.9	4.0 – 4.9	5 – 5.9	6.0 – 6.9	7.0 – 10.0	
		<p>Poor or no description of the problem and intended solution.</p> <p>Poor or no description of cost optimisation approaches.</p>	<p>Limited description of the problem and some justification of the approach.</p> <p>Limited description of cost optimisation approaches.</p>	<p>Good description of the problem and adequate justification of the approach.</p> <p>Good description of cost optimisation approaches that are relevant.</p>	<p>Very good description of the problem and a clear justification of the approach are provided.</p> <p>Very good description of cost optimisation approaches that are applicable to the application and justified.</p>	<p>Excellent description of the problem and very clear justification of the approach have been provided.</p> <p>Very clear set of effective cost optimisation approaches covering all aspects of the application with full justification.</p>	
Comments:							

Element	Poss. Marks	Poor (0-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-100%)	Mark (10)
REPORT-SECURITY FEATURES AND TESTING (10%)	10	0 - 3.9	4.0 – 4.9	5 – 5.9	6.0 – 6.9	7.0 – 10.0	
		Poor or no description of the security features. Poor or no description of testing.	Limited description of the security features. Limited description and presentation of testing results.	Good description of the security features with some relevance. Good description and presentation of testing.	Very good description of the security features that are applicable to the application. Very good description and presentation of testing covering most cases.	Excellent description of the security features which are very well related and applicable to the application. Excellent description and presentation of testing covering all cases and well supported by screenshots.	
Comments:							

Element	Poss. Marks	Poor (0-39%)	Satisfactory (40-49%)	Good (50-59%)	Very Good (60-69%)	Excellent (70-100%)	Mark (10)
PROJECT DEMO - VIDEO (10%)	10	0 - 3.9	4.0 – 4.9	5 – 5.9	6.0 – 6.9	7.0 – 10.0	
		Poor or no introduction to the application. Poor or no demonstration of the application functionality. Poor or no description of the project testing and evaluation.	Satisfactory introduction to the application. Satisfactory demonstration of the application functionality. Satisfactory description of the project testing and evaluation.	Good introduction to the application. Good demonstration of the application functionality. Good description of the project testing and evaluation.	Very good introduction to the application. Very good demonstration of the application functionality. Very good description of the project testing and evaluation.	Excellent introduction to the application. Excellent demonstration of the application functionality. Excellent description of the project testing and evaluation.	
Comments:							