

MAJOR PROJECT - Final Report – 55%

Student Name:	Ross Thomas
Title of Project:	Security home networks, utilising smart technologies
Supervisor:	Dr Kapilon Padmakrishnan
2nd marker:	Prof John Bees
Course:	BIT BusComp CIS <u>CNets</u> CSE Electrical Games Mobile TRE SE Web (please circle)
Project Type:	Survey Review <u>Experiment</u> Development (please circle)

	Mark %
<u>First Marker's General Comments and Original Mark</u> Could have been a better paper with better time management & more effort.	46.5
<u>Second Marker's General Comments and Original Mark</u>	
<u>Comment After Consultation With Other Marker & Final Agreed Mark</u>	45%

Signature: Date: 16/7/2018

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
1. Research-informed Literature				
Introduction	/5	/5	3 /5	/5
Literature Review	/20	/35	10 /20	/15

Comments: Intro clearly outlines the project background.
 Aims objectives were clearly stated.
 Lit. review covers all the bases → background of the project. Related work need to be more focused on smart technologies, rather on IoT devices, and smart home. Currently presented as mix of everything - bit difficult to follow.

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
2. Knowledge and Understanding of Subject				
Methodology	/5	/5	2.5 /5	/5
Survey Design	/15	-	-	-
Requirements/Design	-	-	-	/5

Comments:
 more generic, could do better with project specific.

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
3. Analysis				
Results & Discussions	/25	/25	10/25	/25
Conclusions and Recommendations	/10	/10	5/10	/10

Comments:

The Experiment was successful and showed the attack and outcome of the attack. with more tests this section could have been a better one.

Project conclusion is brief, the main reason was only just one test results were available. Discussed the problems encountered and how it was ~~was~~ dealt with.

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
4. Practical Application and Deployment				
Development	-	-	-	/15
Experimental Design	-	-	4/15	-

Comments:

The testing was done using metasploit. This does not match project aims objectives. ~~but~~ no smart devices or technology was tested. There is no connection between Experiment done and what was supposed to be done.

More than one attack would have added some strength to the project

	Survey	Review	Experiment	Development
5. Skills for Professional Practice				
Reflection	/10	/10	6 /10	/10
Quality of Report	/10	/10	6 /10	/10
Comments: Good structure report. very well presented, good reference style & inclusion of project meeting forms and gantt chart is good practice.				
TOTAL:	/100	/100	46.5/100	/100