

	Exceptional	Strong/Good		Passable/ Adequate	Deficient/ Inadequate	Not Attempted/ Unacceptable
Introduction	Generates interest and clearly summarises the problem statement and solution from	Clearly summarises the problem statement and solution from D1.		Summarises D1 but in an unclear manner.	There is no summary of D1 or it is not readily understandable.	
	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>3 Marks</b>		<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	
3.1. Vision statement	A clear, concise and <i>compelling</i> "vision statement" for the business that links to making the world a better place is provided.	A clear and concise "vision statement" for the business is provided.		An unclear, verbose or just plain generic "vision statement" is provided.	A vision statement is not provided.	
	<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>		<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	
3.2. Industry analysis (0 marks if firm analysis)	The industry is stated and relevant. The 5 forces analysis is backed up with research. An insightful evaluation of the overall attractiveness of the industry is provided - with appropriate examples.	The industry is stated and relevant. Most (3 – 4) of the 5 forces analysis is competent. An insightful evaluation of the overall attractiveness of the industry is provided – with appropriate examples.		Only 2 of the 5 forces analysis is competent. An evaluation of the attractiveness of the industry is provided.	Only 1 of the 5 forces analysis is competent. An evaluation of the attractiveness of the industry is provided, but is unclear.	The 5 forces analysis is not done <b>OR</b> a firm analysis is performed instead of an industry analysis <b>OR</b> the industry is so broad as to be meaningless <b>OR</b> there are insufficient references for the analysis.
	<b>16 Marks</b>	<b>12 Marks</b>	<b>9 Marks</b>	<b>6 Marks</b>	<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
3.3. Potential customers and their needs?	The target group of customers has been identified. Their needs have been insightfully assessed backed up with research.	The target group of customers has been correctly identified and their needs adequately assessed.		The target group of customers has been identified and their needs assessed but obvious customers or needs are overlooked.	The target group of customers and their needs have been attempted, but obvious customers or needs are overlooked.	The target group of customers has not been identified <b>OR</b> their needs have not been assessed <b>OR</b> there are insufficient references for identifying customers and their needs.
	<b>8 Marks</b>	<b>6 Marks</b>		<b>4 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
3.4. The product and/or service	There is a convincing explanation of how the product/service offered satisfies the needs identified in the previous section.	There is an explanation of how the product/service offered satisfies the needs identified in the previous section.		There is an explanation of how the product/service offered satisfies the needs identified in the previous section but you are left with questions.	There is an attempt to explain how the product/service offered satisfies the needs but it is mostly unclear.	The explanation offered is totally unconvincing.
	<b>8 Marks</b>	<b>6 Marks</b>		<b>4 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>

<b>3.5. Potential suppliers and partners</b>	At least 2 suppliers and 2 partners are identified and clearly differentiated with specific examples.	At least 2 suppliers and partners are identified and differentiated.		Suppliers and partners are identified but not explained or only 1 of each is provided.	There is an attempt to identify suppliers and partners but the explanations are not clear or convincing.	Suppliers and partners are not identified OR there are insufficient references for identifying suppliers and partners.
	<b>8 Marks</b>	<b>6 Marks</b>		<b>4 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>3.6. Porter's generic strategy</b>	One of Porter's Generic strategies is used and justified using the correct Competitive Scope and Source of Competitive Advantage.	There is a problem with the strategy name, the Competitive Scope or the Source of Competitive Advantage.		The wrong strategy is chosen but at least one of the justifications is correct.	A potentially correct strategy is chosen, but the justifications for Source of Competitive Advantage and Competitive Scope	One of Porter's Generic strategies is not used or the justification is totally wrong.
	<b>7 Marks</b>	<b>4 Marks</b>		<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>3.7. Porter's value chain activity (VCA)</b>	An important VCA is chosen and justified by convincingly linking in to the vision and strategy.	An important VCA is chosen and justified by linking in to the vision and/or strategy.		An important VCA is chosen and justified in some other way.	A VCA is chosen and justified but it is obviously not the most important.	A VCA is chosen but no attempt is made at justification.
	<b>8 Marks</b>	<b>6 Marks</b>		<b>4 Marks</b>	<b>2 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>3.8. Key Business Processes</b>	A relevant (links to the key VCA) key business process is clearly and insightfully explained. It is supported by an error free, clear and logical model illustrating at least one department and system associated with the business process.	A relevant (links to the key VCA) key business process is explained. It is supported by an error free and logical model illustrating at least one department and system associated with the business process.		A relevant (links to the key VCA) key business process is explained. It is supported by a logical model with minor errors; and illustrating at least one department and/or system associated with the business process.	A key business process has been identified, BUT it is not part of the value chain activity identified above and/or not supported with an explanation and/or the model provided has major errors and missing components.	A key business process is not identified/modelled or explained.
<b>3.8.1. Business Process 1</b>	<b>12 Marks</b>	<b>10 Marks</b>	<b>8 Marks</b>	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>2 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>3.8.2. Business Process 2</b>	<b>12 Marks</b>	<b>10 Marks</b>	<b>8 Marks</b>	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>2 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>3.9. Functionalities</b>	2 most relevant functionalities needed to support the key processes are clearly and accurately stated.	2 functionalities needed to support the key processes are stated.		1 accurate functionality needed to support the key processes is stated.	Functionalities needed to support the key processes are not stated <b>OR</b> are incorrect.	
<b>3.9.1. Functionalities for BP1</b>	<b>4 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>		<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	
<b>3.9.2. Functionalities for BP2</b>	<b>4 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>		<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	

<b>3.10. Systems</b>	A relevant system is identified. The explanation convincingly and insightfully shows how the system incorporates the functionalities above to support the vision of the organisation.	A relevant system is identified. The explanation mostly shows how the system incorporates the functionalities above to support the vision of the organisation.	A system is identified. The explanation shows how the system incorporates the functionalities above.	A system is identified. The explanation fails to outline how the system incorporates the functionalities above.	No system is identified/explained <b>OR</b> a generic text book system definition is provided.
<b>System 1: Name</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 1: Description</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 1: Business Focus</b>	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 1: Technical Focus</b>	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 1: Broad System Type</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 2: Name</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 2: Description</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 2: Business Focus</b>	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 2: Technical Focus</b>	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>System 2: Broad System Type</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>2 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	A strong and convincing conclusion that reiterates the overall business idea, and summarises the value of IS/IT in the organisation.		A convincing conclusion is provided, briefly discussing the value of IS/IT in the organisation.	A conclusion is provided, but does not discuss the value of IS/IT in the organisation.	There is no conclusion.
	<b>5 Marks</b>		<b>3 Marks</b>	<b>1 Mark</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>Overall Impression (Academic honesty/ Referencing, and Word limit.)</b>	The assignment provides a professional, convincing explanation that demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the task. The assignment flows seamlessly from section to section.	The assignment clearly addresses the task in a convincing manner. May cover too much in too little detail. The assignment flows from section to section.	The assignment demonstrates a basic understanding of the task AND/OR addresses it in a superficial manner. Some inconsistencies exist within AND/OR between sections. Some minor errors in the referencing, citation, paraphrasing, or quotation of all sources used. At least 3 QUALITY references are provided. More than 2000 words.	The assignment does not persuade the reader that the task is understood or meaningfully addressed. There may be a lack of professionalism as well. Many inconsistencies exist within and/or between sections. Some missing sections. At least 3 QUALITY REFERENCES are provided. More than 2100 words.	The assignment has no redeeming qualities whatsoever.
	No errors in the referencing, citation, paraphrasing, or quotation of all sources used. At least 5 QUALITY references are provided. Less than 1900 words (i.e. 1800+100)	Almost no errors in the referencing, citation, paraphrasing or quotation of all sources used. At least 5 QUALITY references are provided. 1900 to 2000 words.			Serious errors in the referencing: no in-text citations or no end of text reference list, or no attempt has been made to reference. More than 2200 words.
	<b>20 Marks</b>	<b>15 Marks</b>	<b>10 Marks</b>	<b>5 Marks</b>	<b>0 Marks</b>
<b>TOTAL MARKS FOR DELIVERABLE 02: 150</b>					