Team Defense in Depth (3)
Team members: Djordje Savanovic, Roberto Cappiello, Nicolas Haas, Mohammad Atieh
Tutor: Dr Cathryn Peoples
Date: June 2022

Criteria	Level	Comments
Knowledge and understanding of the topic / issues under consideration (30%)	Excellent – Distinction	In your presentation, I really liked the way in which you communicated the organisation of the system security features using the analogy of a layered onion – this is akin to the 'clean' architecture - https://betterprogramming.pub/the-clean-architecture-beginners-guide-e4b7058c1165. When it comes to organising your code, I feel that there is an opportunity to use a similar approach – not necessarily the onion, but even a MVC/MVP. This may help to provide a more intuitive understanding of your organisation, particularly for independent readers of your code, which ultimately supports longer-term maintainability. Good range of knowledge and understanding of the topics/issues under consideration for your domain, through the range of security mechanisms implemented (discussed below).
Application of knowledge & understanding (30%)	Excellent – Distinction	Firebase products were used to support the development. This was effectively achieved, with functionalities of your system including: • User creation • Role-based control – Super Admin, Cyber Specialist Good range of security features implemented, including: • 2FA applied through harnessing of Google Identity Platform capability. • Reports can be generated which are either public or private. • Private routes have been implemented through the code. • Database encryption. • SSL certificate. These features of security help to verify the attention to the security of data and the system both at rest and in operation/transit.
Structure & Presentation (30%)	Excellent – Distinction	Excellent organisation of the supporting documentation in GitHub. I really like the feature of providing a video demonstration of the app, which allows us to return to verify our understanding of the system operation.

		I would have liked to have seen the specific tests presented more explicitly alongside the test output. This would help to position the test output in more context, with a reader having to search around to read about the tests in code.
Academic integrity (10%)	Merit	Good attention to academic integrity. There is an opportunity to add greater commenting at the beginning of each code file to explain exactly what is being achieved and how. Remember to comment for an independent reader of your code i.e., someone not involved in the development.

Overall comments

Positives:

- An excellent range of security-related capabilities have been deployed, and are verified as being operational through the automated testing applied.

Points for development:

- I feel there is greater opportunity to prepare your code for an independent person, in the sense of someone who has not been involved in the development of it. In this, I am referring to both the organisation of the code when named and packaged into folders, the naming of the files, and the commenting applied through the scripts. When executing useEffect() in Navbar.js for example, this could instead be described as use*This*Effect() to help to make it more explicit.

Overall Grade: Excellent - Distinction

Presentation: While the presentation in itself does not contribute to your overall grade for Assessment 2, I want to commend you on the high level of performance during it. The code was effectively discussed, and questions were answered in a manner which demonstrates great familiarity and understanding of the development. All members of the team were present during the session (there may have been greater sharing of the presentation communication between team members). Excellent demonstration of time management, which comes through effective preparation and planning. Well done, Team 3.