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1 (a) Accept any four additional suitable points – resists water, hygienic, easy access for items, matches bathroom style, sections labelled, acts as seat, etc.  
   \[ 1 \times 4 \times 4 \] 

(b) Accept drawings of any two suitable ways – timber, halving, through/stopped housing, butt, dowel, fabric, shelves, etc.  
   \[ 2 \times 2 \times 4 \] 

2 (a) Accept any four additional suitable points – appealing to customers, reflects ‘laundry’, stable, colourful, lightweight/easy to carry, folds up for storage, etc.  
   \[ 1 \times 4 \times 4 \] 

(b) Accept drawings of any two flexible joints – scored, tape, rings, comb, cord, plastic hinge, etc.  
   \[ 2 \times 2 \times 4 \] 

3 (a) Accept any four additional suitable points – does not dirty clothes, weatherproof, easy/simple to operate, cannot catch fingers in mechanism, easy to reach, etc.  
   \[ 1 \times 4 \times 4 \] 

(b) Accept any two mechanisms – pulley system, gear train, chain and sprocket, ratchet, winding drum, etc.  
   \[ 2 \times 2 \times 4 \] 

Questions 1, 2 and 3

(c) Any suitable ideas. At least three different ideas for maximum marks. Pro rata if fewer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple drawings displaying a low standard or limited range of techniques</td>
<td>0–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear drawings displaying a good standard and a range of techniques – shading/colour/annotation etc.</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality drawings using a wide range of techniques with clear annotation and detail</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplistic designs showing outlines only</td>
<td>0–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather more detail, sensible solutions that could work</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate solutions, good fitness for purpose, detailed construction</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Evaluation of each of the ideas. At least 3 evaluations up to 2 marks each  
   \[ 0–6 \] 

Selection and justification (1 + 1)  
   \[ 2 \times 8 \]
(e) Quality of drawing
- Poor line quality, proportions, little detail  1
- Good line work, use of colour, proportions, some detail  2–3
- High standard throughout with a range of techniques that show clearly all detail  4

Dimensions
- 2 or 3 overall dimensions only (1)  2
- Additional detail dimensions (1)  2

Construction details
- A simplistic approach showing little or no detail of construction to be used  0–2
- Most constructional detail may be obvious from overall views or with some annotation  3–4
- All constructional detail will be clear with good annotation and additional detail drawings as necessary  5–6  [12]

(f) Suitable specific materials stated. (1 + 1)  2
- Appropriate reasons for choice (1 + 1)  2  [4]

(g) Suitable method stated  1
- Good detailed description of: processes  3
  tools  2  [6]
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