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| --- | --- | --- |
| **[Development Team Project: Risk Identification Report](https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/assign/view.php?id=687282" \o "Link to Assignment activity Development Team Project: Risk Identification Report)** |  | Knowledge and Understanding: A well demonstrated and good grasp of risk modelling techniques, good analysis of risks with explanations - distinction  Criticality: A good list of mitigations (with explanations) and a. good use of resources and selection of methodologies - distinction  Structure and Presentation: A well presented and formatted report BUT the referencing style is incorrect (don’t use at) and the references are mostly web sites/ blogs - you should be using a majority of refereed journals at this level - merit.  Summary: A very good, well thought out and well-presented report. Be careful with how you present your references - as well as the sources you use - refereed journals are always preferred. - distinction |
| [**Development Team Project: Executive Summary**](https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/assign/view.php?id=687317) |  | This was a strange report. It was generally well presented, but unfortunately completely missed the point of the exercise. It was mostly based on qualitative - not quantitative analysis - and as we discussed in the lecture casts, the reading, and in the seminars, merely assigning numbers to qualitative assessment does not make for a quantitative assessment.  In addition, the group utilised a limited selection of references (which may again explain your confusion?).  You provided a reasonable summary to the first part BUT you missed the overarching purpose of assessment 2 which was to use quantitative assessment techniques. As the analysis method was completely incorrect there was limited scope for marks here.  The DR section provided a reasonable discussion although there seemed to be some confusion around the cloud and how DRaaS works. For example, although Amazon, Azure, and GCP are indeed the leading cloud platform providers they do not generally provide turnkey solutions for small businesses - the actual business solution would need to be layered on top of the cloud offering. The DRaaS assumptions are also confused: zone to zone generally means within a set location or farm, which would be a relatively short distance apart but would not generally meet most people's requirements for DR.  The group provided some lock-in discussion (and again missed some of the more subtle issues) but provided no real solution to the problem.  In summary, the report was well presented, especially the tables in the initial parts of the report - if this was for assessment 1 (which dealt with qualitative assessments) it would have been very good - unfortunately it mostly missed the point of the second assessment - which was to use quantitative assessment techniques.  The DR section had a number of failings - and also seemed to use an unreferenced, potentially copyrighted diagram to illustrate DR - as this was not correctly attributed it cost you some marks on the academic integrity section. |