Team: TEAM BUILDER
Team members: Thien Liu, Neelam Pirbhai-Jetha
Marker: Dr Cathryn Peoples
Date: February 2022

Criteria	Comments
Knowledge and understanding of the topic / issues under consideration (30%)	Good evidence of the issues under consideration from the README, with the support of the design decisions through reference to relevant related academic literature. Effective reference made to the CIA triad. Security issues have been identified around the areas of login There may have been an opportunity to consider restricting the types of files which can be uploaded, helping to prevent the opportunity of uploading executable files. Restrictions also are not applied to the size of files which are uploaded. There are opportunities to restrict the number of login attempts being made. This could be from the perspective of login attempts from a specific IP address and/or login attempts made by a single user within an hour. Opportunity of applying try..except when a user is attempting to log in. In relation to session control, a time period has been assigned to a user once logged in. There may have opportunities to assign a token to a user once logged in. if the user wishes to extend their session, they could then be allocated a further token at this stage. This helps to give some attention to usability, while offering a secure session.
Application of knowledge & understanding (30%)	User IP address tracked – this shows a good attention to detail. User activity tracked according to normal and erroneous events – another nicely designed feature. Logged retained on a per user basis, ordered by time stamp. Ability to delete logs for a specific user, adhering to GDPR requirements.

	Files organised according to the user with which they are associated. Files sorted by date created. Checking that a file does not exist with the same filename – another good example of attention to detail. File hashed in storage. File hash used to check file integrity to ensure file content has not been modified. File insertion error flagged – good – this may possibly indicate an attack. Roles applied to control user access – admin, internal, external. Status applied to a user – created, active, inactive. A user is checked for being an admin or not on log in. Both users and admin use the same route, with the risk that the admin system could be exposed to external users – good awareness of potential problems. User given the ability to change their password. User password is hashed using Bcrypt, and is stored in its hashed form. Creation of user account is logged. Search activities are being logged, in the sense of finding users. This can also indicate suspicious behaviour, which shows good attention to detail. User deletion activity is restricted to admin user types. Error flagged if user does not exist. Encryption/decryption of documents downloaded not yet enabled. Session interval set. Regex applied to check the entry of email addresses. Good application of module knowledge. Secret keys generated to incorporate randomness.

	Possibly the opportunity to incorporate multi-factor authentication.
Structure & Presentation (30%)	There is possibly an opportunity to use a more explicit and obvious organisation of the code files – I had to pick my way through the files to find the different components and to understand operation of the system in its entirety.
Academic integrity (10%)	Good attention to referencing within the README file. The README has also been provided in great detail, helping the reader to understand the operation of your system. This has played an effective role in supporting the assessment of your work. Well done. Instructions to run the system are provided for both MAC and Windows environments, showing a good attention to detail.

Overall comments
Positives: • Excellent time management demonstrated during the presentation, which allowed a great opportunity to demonstrate the scope of the system and to respond to questions asked. • Excellent detail provided in your README document, guiding the reader through the operation of your system. • While a few aspects of your system are not fully implemented, I really like seeing the evidence of the investigations which you have committed to in attempting to resolve these challenges. • You have given excellent effort and attention to incorporating as many aspects of learning from the SSD module to the development of your code. This really comes through as I assess your work. Well done.
Points for development: • Try to pay attention to the presentation and organisation of the code files, and make it obvious to the reader where the different code components exist. This helps to support the marking process, but going beyond this development as a piece of assessment, good code organisation also helps to support further development through ease of maintenance.
Overall Grade: