Criterion	7	6	5	4	3	2-1
The Standard Report Sections (10 Marks)	The report is thoroughly professional and addresses each of the listed requirements in detail and with only occasional errors of grammar or structure. The technical discussion is of a high standard, concisely describing the architecture and implementation of the system. Appropriate use is made of diagrams and small code fragments to enhance understanding. The test plan is consistent with the requirements and exhibits a suitable number of test cases for the application.	The report is reasonably professional and addresses most listed requirements. Errors of grammar or structure may be more common. The technical issues are covered in the report but the discussion lacks some precision or depth. Diagrams and perhaps code fragments are present but they could be better chosen. The test plan is consistent with the requirements but there may be some exceptions.	The report addresses most listed requirements, but is not as well organized. Errors of grammar or structure are more common. Technical issues are covered but the approach often lacks depth, Diagrams and code fragment may not be well chosen. The test plan is consistent with the requirements but the coverage may be more limited.	The report is adequate, but is deficient in a number of the listed requirements. Grammar and structure are variable. The technical discussion is weak and superficial. Important aspects are missed or covered poorly and the diagrams and code fragments may not be present at all. The test plan is present but inadequate. There are insufficient test cases.	The report is adequate in some sections, but is deficient in many of the requirements. Grammar and structure are of variable quality. Technical discussion is inadequate or missing. There is no architecture diagram or use of code fragments. The test plan is poor or not present at all.	The report is flawed and doesn't meet the requirements. There may be whole sections missing or poorly covered and the structure is not coherent.
Analysis of your application with respect to Vendor Lock In. **The criteria are applied to the responses for each of the APIs and for the Cloud persistence service.** **(6 Marks)**	The response demonstrates a professional understanding of API and cloud persistence services in a modern environment and a clear analysis of the technical and domain characteristics of the services used in the mashup and the risks inherent in those choices.	The response demonstrates a professional understanding of API and cloud persistence services in a modern environment. There is a good analysis of the technical and domain characteristics of the services used in the mashup and the risks inherent in those choices, but not all of this discussion is at a professional standard.	The response demonstrates a near professional understanding of API and cloud persistence services in a modern environment. There is a reasonable analysis of the technical and domain characteristics and risks of the services used, but some of this is limited and superficial.	The response demonstrates some understanding of API and cloud persistence services, but the coverage is often superficial or unconvincing, and may be incomplete.	The analysis is superficial and unconvincing. There is little evidence of an understanding of API and cloud persistence services, and there is only limited relevance to the mashup submitted.	The analysis is deeply flawed or not attempted.
Analysis of container based deployment of your application. **(4 Marks)**	The response demonstrates a professional understanding of container and VM based deployment and the trade-offs inherent in these choices and how they apply at this scale. There is a cogent analysis of persistence in small scale cloud applications and how these principles apply in the present context.	The response demonstrates a strong understanding of container and VM based deployment and the trade-offs inherent in these choices and how they apply at this scale. There is a very good analysis of persistence in small scale cloud applications and how these principles apply in the present context.	The response demonstrates a good understanding of container and VM based deployment, but there may be some limitations in the analysis. There is a good analysis of persistence in small scale cloud applications but their application in the present context may not be clear. .	The response demonstrates some understanding of container and VM based deployment, but the analysis is limited and superficial. The analysis of persistence is superficial and does not align with the context.	The response does not demonstrate an understanding of the technical issues of deployment or persistence, and/or fails to relate these principles to the application. .	The analysis is deeply flawed or not provided.
Marks (20)						