LCA success criteria:

1/6 – Some vague statements about plastic bags being better with very limited use of data from the table and not linked to helpful statements below. May include an attempt to counter the argument that plastic bags are better for the environment.

2/6 - Some statements about plastic bags being better with use of data from the table (at least 2 or 3 correct links. No, or limited, attempt to counter the argument that plastic bags are better for the environment.

3/6 – Some comparisons made for each type of bag using limited data from the table. No, or limited, attempt to counter the argument that plastic bags are better for the environment.

4/6 - Comparisons made for each type of bag using most of the data from the table. Attempt to counter the argument that plastic bags are better for the environment by saying what is good about paper bags (can still be vague).

5/6 – Logical comparisons made for each type of bag using all of the data from the table. Argument is logically countered with clear reference to wood being; renewable, uses CO2 when growing, biodegradable and the benefits of these points to support paper bags instead of plastic.

6/6 - Logical comparisons made for each type of bag using all of the data from the table. Argument is logically countered with clear reference to wood being; renewable, uses CO2 when growing, biodegradable and the benefits of these points to support paper bags instead of plastic. Agrees or disagrees with the argument from the question in light of the evidence they have put forward.

**Helpful statements:**

Accept converse in terms of plastic bags for all statements

•        Paper bags are made from a renewable resource

•        Plastic bags are made from a finite resource

•        Paper bags require more energy to manufacture

•        Paper bags produce more waste

•        Paper bags are biodegradable

•        Paper bags create more CO2

•        CO2 created by paper bags offset by photosynthesis in growing wood

•        Paper bag requires much more fresh water

•        Paper bags cannot be recycled

•        Agree because non-renewability less important than other factors **or** disagree because of converse **or** can’t say because data inconclusive / incomplete

Phytomining and sustainabilty success criteria:

1/6 – One or two discrete statements about phytomining being good or mining being bad with no links made.

2/6 – Three or more discrete statements about phytomining being good or mining being bad with no links made.

3/6 – One or two discrete statements about phytomining being good or mining being bad with attempts at links made.

4/6 – Three or more discrete statements about phytomining being good or mining being bad with attempts at links made.

5/6 – One or two logically linked statements about phytomining being good or mining being bad that are supported by sound subject knowledge and understanding.

6/6 – Three or more logically linked statements about phytomining being good or mining being bad that are supported by sound subject knowledge and understanding. Spelling of keywords is correct.

**Helpful statements:**

•        phytomining conserves supplies of ores

•        copper will be available for longer as at present rate of use copper ores will run out in about 35 years

•        phytomining conserves supplies of fossil fuels or energy

•        less fuel used at a lower cost

•        mining scars landscape or produces noise pollution

•        mining destroys wildlife habitats

•        with more phytomining less need to mine ores

•        with phytomining less habitat destroyed or less scarring of landscape

•        with phytomining less need to use landfill for waste

•        burning fossil fuels produces carbon dioxide / greenhouse gas

•        burning fossil fuels causes global warming or climate change

•        extraction from ores produces sulfur dioxide which causes acid rain