

1a. Most students did well on this question. Surprisingly, in case of question (i), although the answer could have easily been found in the paper, most students missed some domains. (ii) was very well solved.

1b. Generally well solved. The terminology used was not always on point but it was clear what was meant given the explanations/context.

1c. VoltDB was generally well understood but a number of students struggled to rethink its architecture when the storage was changed. Very few students achieved full marks on this question.

1d. Very well solved by all students. Sometimes marks were deducted for not mentioning the added complexity of user code for MongoDB as was asked.

2a. Overall the answers to this question were good, but some marks were lost in case an answer didn't focus on tail-latency and referred to other features of Dynamo such as weak consistency, quorums or availability.

2b. Some students lost marks here when they didn't explicitly refer to tail latency but rather to low latency in general.

2c. Most students did well on this question. Some marks were lost for minor mistakes.

2d. The provided answers were of good quality. For full marks, the answer had to carefully consider the latency impact of the proposed design while bulk loading. There was a diverse set of answers that received high or full marks, reflecting a range of acceptable designs.