

out of 10 in the table below.

Your Group No.	1B	Date	21/1/11
----------------	----	------	---------

Grp No.	Comments	Mark/10
1A	Some good ideas, but not thorough enough. Not properly considered issues, e.g. pets in home. Costings very vague and sound like random guesses. Presentation not v. strong either - reading off sheet.	6

out of 10 in the table below.

Your Group No.	B	Date	21/1/2011
----------------	---	------	-----------

Grp No.	Comments	Mark/10
A	- costing was not accurate - Stakeholders not considered. - Pets not considered with Infra-red! - lack of detail - inaccurate costs. - comparative costs not considered - Some good ideas. - Too technical - not developed	5.5 5 6

out of 10 in the table below.

Your Group No.	1B	Date	21/01/2011
----------------	----	------	------------

Grp No.	Comments	Mark/10
A	• <del>was</del> inaccurate costs eg. signal processing • good ideas, yet could be a bit more substantiated and developed • very technical <del>with</del> <del>and</del> pet, perhaps losing sight of objectives	6

For the group that you review, please give a brief comment on their overall presentation/design/solution and a grade out of 10 in the table below.

Your Group No.	1B	Date	21/1/11
----------------	----	------	---------

Grp No.	Comments	Mark/10
1A	costings weren't accurate lots of good ideas but none were thought through thoroughly enough. Realistically this system couldn't be installed without a great deal more of work on it. Does use lots of readily available components which is an advantage.	6