category	mark weighting	Fail 0-39	III-level 40-49	II.2 level 50-59	I.1 level 60-69	Ist level 70-100
Description of application	15	The application does not seem to involve any form of AI capability.	It is not entirely clear what the application does, who provides it or who benefits from its use.	It is clear what the application does, but the role of any data in its operation is unclear and its high-risk categorisation is unclear..	A fairly clear description of the application, its use of data and AI capabilities and the benefits it claims to offer to users, though not all the beneficiaries may be clear.	The selected application is explained very clearly, detailing what it does, the AI capabilities employed, the role data and the benefits/value it provides, and to whom, who is subject to those capabilities and why it qualified as a high-risk applicaiton
Identification of Ethical Issues	50	No clear ethical issues are identified and neither the ethics canvas categories nor social responsibility categories have been used.	Some issues identified, but the impacted stakeholders are not clearly identified.	Identification using the ethic canvas blocks is clear, though the ethical issues are not clear in all cases or are poorly reasoned in places.	All the blocks of the ethics canvas are considered, with clear justification of whether they present ethical issues or not.	Ethical risks are very clearly and comprehensively described with harms to different stakeholders differentiated and well-reasoned assessments of the severity and likelihood the different risks.
Discussion of Mitigations Measures Ethical issues,	20	Mitigation measures are not explained, do not address a specific ethical issue.	A mitigation is proposed but the stakeholders involved and action required require to reduce harm are not explained.	A mitigation is proposed but its effectiveness as a means to handle the is not convincingly explained.	Mitigations for a specific risk is identified but some of the actions and the stakeholder that would undertaken them are not entirely clear.	Mitigation(s) for a specific issue are crystal clear, including the stakeholders involved and how they act to deliver the mitigation of harms. A clear understand of whether the mitigation uses GDPR measures.
Breakdown of work	5	missing	Work breakdown is vague	Work breakdown presented but the work contributed is not very clear	Work breakdown clear explained	Very clear and well structured breakdown that contributed to a good report
References	10	no references provided.	Few references provided or they do not seem relevant to the points or arguments presented.	The relevant of some references may be unclear and some important points lack the references needed to substantiate them.	references are relevant and support the points made in the report but some details missing form references.	The references are relevant, provide strong, explicitly support for the points made, are appropriately formatted and fully detailed, e.g. authors, title, with date for web page references.