



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

9239/12

Paper 1 Written Examination

May/June 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **21** printed pages.

**PUBLISHED****Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**PUBLISHED****Social Science-Specific Marking Principles  
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require  $n$  reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- f** DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However, spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

**2 Presentation of mark scheme:**

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.

**3 Annotation:**

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

**Annotations**

As noted, scripts must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. Scripts are marked on RM Assessor and these on-screen annotations are available. They should be used as required by the mark scheme and guidance.

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
	<b>Correct, creditworthy point.</b> Used in Question 1 only.
	<b>Incorrect point.</b> Used in Question 1 or for clear error elsewhere. Also used to show no creditable material – the equivalent of L0.
	<b>Unclear/confused point</b>
<b>ND</b>	<b>Needs developing.</b> When used alone <b>simply</b> identifies a point made without development. Used in both Question 2 and 3.
<b>ND+ or ND-</b>	<b>Partially developed strength (ND+) or weakness (ND-).</b> Used for <b>general</b> , supported points in Question 2. [ND and + or – added separately]
<b>+ or -</b>	<b>Fully developed strength or weakness.</b> Used for <b>fully</b> supported points in Question 2.
<b>ND EVAL</b>	<b>Partially Developed Evaluation.</b> Used in Question 3 to show where <b>general</b> points are made.
<b>EVAL</b>	<b>Fully Developed Evaluation.</b> Explanation and illustration, <b>fully</b> supporting points in Question 3.
<b>C</b>	<b>Comparison of content.</b> Used in Question 3 when <b>no evaluation</b> ; <b>simply</b> comparison of documents
<b>J</b>	<b>Judgement.</b> Used alone as <b>J</b> to show <b>full</b> judgement, or as <b>ND J</b> , to show <b>partial</b> judgement. Especially used in Question 3.
	<b>Not answering the question.</b> For example, when introducing own knowledge.
	<b>Repetition.</b> When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
<b>L1 L2 L3</b>	<b>Level 1, 2 or 3 response.</b> Used in Question 2 and Question 3 to allocate a level for <b>each criterion</b> in the levels tables. They can be used together, like <b>L3/L2 to show a split grade</b> . Used alone to give overall level for the question. (See guidance on last 4 pages)
	<b>On Page Comment.</b> Used where necessary to clarify a decision.

Please follow the guidance within the mark scheme on how to annotate each question.

**Note**

The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

- a Mark grids describe the top of each level.
- b **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
- c **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Award mark</b>
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

**Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives**

<b>AO1</b> <b>Research, analysis and evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based</li><li>• analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain</li><li>• synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives</li><li>• critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives</li><li>• critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives</li><li>• use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives</li></ul>
--	---

**Coverage of Assessment Objectives:**

<b>1.a</b>	Q1 (a), Q1 (b), Q2, Q3
<b>1.b</b>	Q2, Q3
<b>1.c</b>	Q2, Q3
<b>1.d</b>	Q2, Q3
<b>1.e</b>	Q2, Q3
<b>1.f</b>	Q2, Q3

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p data-bbox="327 244 1946 284"><b>Identify <u>two</u> countries that have national space mining laws according to the author of Document 1.</b></p> <div data-bbox="327 316 1946 419" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p data-bbox="338 331 1912 403">RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct identification. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.</p> </div> <p data-bbox="327 491 981 523"><b>Credit 1 mark</b> for each correctly identified country</p> <ul data-bbox="327 560 568 663" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="327 560 568 592">• U.S. /America</li> <li data-bbox="327 632 551 663">• Luxembourg</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="327 699 591 730"><b>Credit 0 marks for:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="327 767 936 1110" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="327 767 936 903">• <b>opponents</b> of single country space mining <i>Russia</i> <i>Brazil</i> <i>Belgium</i></li> <li data-bbox="327 943 936 1038">• <b>answers that do not state a country e.g.</b> <i>U.S Department of State claims.....</i> <i>President Obama signed a law...</i></li> <li data-bbox="327 1078 882 1110">• answers with no creditworthy material.</li> </ul>	2

## PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Explain <u>two</u> different interpretations of the Outer Space Treaty in relation to space mining, as given by the author of Document 1.</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct explanation. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.</p> </div> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> for one correctly stated interpretation (This can be directly copied from the document) and a <b>second mark</b> where this is correctly explained (using the candidate’s own words or paraphrasing the author’s words) <b>Maximum of two marks for each interpretation.</b> If there is no simple statement then an appropriate, copied quote (in italics in the brackets) can be used instead. Examples are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OST allows national /unilateral space mining / OST permits commercial exploitation [1] (Stated)</b> because: using what is mined is not the same as appropriation of the asteroid (<i>using materials collected from an asteroid would not mean appropriation.</i>) (Explained) [1] <b>Or</b> anyone has a right to gather materials as a right of global commons (<i>similar to the status of the high seas as ‘global commons’.</i>) (Explained) [1] <b>Or</b> it is similar to the right to catch fish in the high seas but not colonising these seas. (<i>no state may colonize the ocean, yet anyone can catch its fish</i>) (Explained) [1]</li> <li>• <b>OST does not allow national/unilateral space mining / gathering raw materials from an asteroid comes into conflict with the treaty. [1] (Stated)</b> because the resources of outer space together with its resources belong to everyone (<i>because outer space belongs to everyone, the resources belong to everyone</i>) (Explained) [1] <b>Or</b> as the OST bans ‘national appropriation’ of celestial bodies mining should not be allowed as it might lead to colonisation</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for correct explanations <b>wholly taken from the text</b> without synthesis/additional explanation /illustration e.g. <i>Using materials collected from an asteroid would not mean appropriation, which the OST bans. Von der Dunk adds that these supporters view the OST ban similarly to the status of the high seas as ‘global commons’.</i></li> </ul>	4

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Credit 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for giving <b>what the treaty says</b> rather than an interpretation of it e.g. <i>forbids the nearly 100 states that have signed it from colonising objects in outer space or using them for military operations.</i></li> <li>• for <b>non-specific claims</b> e.g. <i>Developing countries... see similarities of rich colonialists in the past invading foreign countries and exploiting their resources.</i> <i>The treaty doesn't provide much guidance about the extraction of resources.</i></li> <li>• for a <b>second explanation of the same interpretation</b> e.g. both <i>global commons</i> and <i>mining not being the same as appropriation</i></li> <li>• for answers with no creditworthy material.</li> </ul> <p><b>An explanation does not require the answer to develop the text from the candidate's own understanding. However, it does require using the text rather than just quoting it. This might involve correct paraphrase, correct precis, or correct synthesis of parts of the text.</b></p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence that the author gives to support their argument in Document 1.</b></p> <p><b>Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.</b> No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b> The author uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>relevant evidence to support the argument</b> – gives precise details of what the OST covers and conflicting interpretations/claims <i>Opponents of unilateral space mining ... and supporters interpret the OST ban</i>. This, together with evidence of reactions to the <i>Moon Agreement</i> gives some support to his argument that space law needs to catch up and find agreement... <i>companies and regulators will have to find a healthy balance among many interests</i>.</li> <li>• <b>some balance of evidence</b> – gives the claims made both for and against space mining by individual nations – <i>asteroid mining supporters interpret the OST ban as similar to the status of the high seas as ‘global commons’, versus Opponents of unilateral space mining claim that ‘because outer space belongs to everyone, the resources belong to everyone</i>.</li> <li>• <b>relevant examples to illustrate the claims/views</b> – e.g. <i>Russia, Brazil and Belgium</i> as examples to clarify which countries oppose <i>single country space mining</i>; <i>US and Luxemburg</i> as examples of <i>some governments have welcomed this permissive interpretation</i>.</li> <li>• <b>clear, relevant parallels/similarities to aid understanding of the claims/views:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>supporters interpret the OST ban as similar to the status of the high seas as ‘global commons</i> explaining why the OST ban can be seen as allowing space mining by individual countries.</li> <li>– <i>It reminds them of rich colonialists’ history of invading foreign territories and exploiting their resources</i>, as a similarity explaining why the OST should be seen as banning space mining by individual countries on grounds of exploitation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>geographical breadth of evidence</b> – mentions the different perspectives / stances of <i>Russia, Brazil, Belgium</i>, about space mining.</li> <li>• <b>evidence with dispassionate language</b> – uses evidence, example and parallels (as above) in a logical, academic way to support their argument, which gives it authority.</li> <li>• <b>academic evidence</b> – with authority from experts in the field who should have the relevant insight to make informed judgements e.g. <i>Brian Israel – Planetary Resources chief lawyer; Frans von der Dunk – a space law professor at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln, US; Joanne Gabrynowicz – former editor in chief of the Journal of Space Law, University of Mississippi US</i>.</li> <li>• <b>Author’s provenance</b> – as a senior academic with SAFE the author has a background in research and science/technology which enables them to choose appropriate evidence and be the source of their own argument.</li> </ul>	10

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b> The following weaknesses of evidence undermine the author’s argument and serve to weaken it:</p> <p>The author uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>vague numerical references</b> – planned for the <i>late 2020s, nearly 100 states have signed it</i>, which weakens the significance / support for the reasoning about the imminence of mining operations, the extent of the support for the treaty.</li> <li>• <b>a key parallel that may not be relevant</b> – the evidence of ‘<i>global commons</i>’: <i>no state may colonize the oceans yet anyone can catch its fish</i>, may not be relevant as fish are a renewable resource, whereas space mined materials are non-renewables.</li> <li>• <b>a possible outdated appeal to history / unsupported claim</b> – <i>prospects for a new international framework appear grim</i> – A key claim which either has no support which reduces its authority – or it is linked to the evidence of little support for <i>the Moon Treaty</i>, which is weakened if circumstances have changed and countries now desire a treaty because of the benefits of space mining.</li> <li>• <b>several unsupported claims</b> – <i>It seems certain someone will succeed...; Exploration has not always been a positive thing...; We’ve got this opportunity right now to do better</i>. Simply asserting these claims without expansion or evidence weakens the end to his argument.</li> <li>• <b>a limited geographical perspective of sources</b> – all the sources are from the US which limits the geographical perspectives given and possibly skews their views – <i>John Lewis chief scientist for Deep Space Industries US; Brian Israel US Government Planetary Resources chief lawyer, Frans von der Dunk a space law professor at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln, US, Joanne Gabrynowicz former editor in chief of the Journal of Space Law, University of Mississippi US</i>.</li> <li>• <b>vague references to sources</b> – <i>Brian Israel and others argue; Some governments have welcomed; Opponents of unilateral space mining claim that</i> – which limit the authority of the claims as evidence.</li> <li>• <b>possible bias of author in selecting evidence</b> – <i>Dr Jesse Dunietz, as a senior academic for SAFE, which aims to reduce the US dependence on oil</i>, may have a bias in selecting more evidence for the supporters of ventures which furthers the aim.</li> </ul> <p>There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.</p>	

## PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>The authors of Documents 1 and 2 present arguments about international law on space mining.</b></p> <p><b>How far is the authors' argument in Document 2 stronger than that of the author in Document 1?</b></p> <p><b>Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.</b> No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>Stronger (because provides):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>greater explanation of the present context</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) explain why and how space exploration is changing with many now interested Musk, SpaceX, Ispace, Klaos Space, Nasa and JAXA given <i>technological innovation</i>, so the imminent need for Space Law agreement; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) limits mining interest to <i>two private US companies</i>.</li> <li>• <b>stronger supporting evidence for the conclusion</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc 2) present findings from UNCOPUS to support the conclusion <i>a lot of hope for an international space agreement</i>; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) simply theorises about the future of mining succeeding eventually and asserts that <i>when that happens, companies and regulators will have to find a healthy balance among many interests</i>.</li> <li>• <b>more in-depth analysis of the inadequacies/loopholes of 2 space treaties</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) examine both OST and the Moon Agreement for limitations/<i>legal loopholes</i>; OST <i>does not provide clear regulations for newer space activities</i>, Moon Agreement <i>doesn't cover private industry</i>; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1)'s analysis is limited to differing interpretations of only one treaty – OST <i>permissive interpretation</i> and <i>Opponents of unilateral space mining claim</i>.</li> <li>• <b>more precise numerical evidence</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc 2) use specific figures from NASA, <i>USD700 quintillion, USD95 billion data and only 18 nations ratified this agreement</i> to support claims; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) uses vague numerical references ... <i>planned for the late 2020s, nearly 100 states have signed it</i> .</li> <li>• <b>a more practical argument</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc 2) pose questions that need to be answered <i>Can anyone simply venture into outer space with a flag and stake a claim?</i> and give a solution <i>using existing laws Priyank Doshi... create an international space authority to regulate asteroid mining</i>; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) ends with an empty assertion <i>We've got this opportunity right now to do better</i> without support or explanation.</li> <li>• <b>greater range of perspectives</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc 2) provide evidence from NASA, an <i>attorney, space lawyer, author</i> in the field of <i>regulation</i> giving more varied perspectives; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) provides evidence from university academics.</li> <li>• <b>a more up to date perspective</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) were writing in 2019 drawing conclusions from a recent <i>2018 COPUOS meeting where all agreed the need for regulation</i>; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) was writing in 2017 using evidence from <i>2015 and 1979</i> which was less positive on agreement and perhaps not as up to date on the recent climate of opinion.</li> </ul>	14

## PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Weaker (because provides):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>fewer parallels/similarities</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) and Dunietz (Doc 1) use the similarity of maritime law/colonise the ocean; but Dunietz (Doc 1) also gives the similarity with rich colonialists' history of invading foreign territories and exploiting their resources which aids understanding of the exploitation that space mining risks.</li> <li>• <b>less balance</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) present in a more general way the inadequacy of existing space laws and the need for an agreed new international space agreement without giving an alternative perspective; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) looks at opposing interpretations of existing laws <i>this permissive interpretation</i> and <i>Opponents of unilateral space mining claim...</i> to illustrate the inadequacy and need for regulation.</li> <li>• <b>fewer sources with specified academic credentials</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) use Priyank Doshi, author in the field, Michael Listner, attorney in space law, an unnamed space lawyer and NASA; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) uses sources with possibly more relevant and academic/space industry expertise to be able to interpret the situation e.g. <i>Planetary Resources chief lawyer Brian Israel, Frans von der Dunk a space law professor, Joanne Gabrynowicz, former editor in chief of the Journal of Space Law, University of Mississippi US.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Neither stronger nor weaker</b></p> <p><b>because different:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Different aims/perspectives</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) examine the limitations/ <i>loopholes</i> of two international agreements OST and the <i>Moon Agreement</i>, highlighting the need for <i>regulation</i>; whereas Dunietz (Doc 1) presents two conflicting interpretations of OST highlighting the need for <i>agreement</i>. These different approaches could support each other.</li> </ul> <p><b>because similar:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both have well-structured arguments</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) explain the present need for space law, various <i>loopholes</i> of existing laws, a solution towards <i>regulation</i> and the willingness to search for agreement; Dunietz (Doc 1) presents conflicting <i>interpretations</i> of OST to demonstrate the need to reach international agreement.</li> <li>• <b>Both use a clear range of relevant background evidence</b> – from which to draw conclusions – Both refer to existing agreements <i>OST, the Moon Treaty</i>, national legislation <i>US and Luxemburg</i> and the reasoning behind <i>global commons</i>.</li> <li>• <b>Both have the perspective of hope</b> – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) use the outcome of the 2018 Copuou meeting to support <i>This gives a lot of hope for an international space agreement...</i> Dunietz (Doc 1) presents the need for agreement as a driver to reaching agreement – <i>companies and regulators will have to find a healthy balance among many interests</i> and presents <i>this opportunity right now to do better</i>. <b>[OVER]</b></li> <li>• <b>Both have authorial experience in space law</b> – to select and interpret the evidence – Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) <i>Mallick a Law Researcher in Outer Space law at the High Court of Delhi</i> and <i>Rajagopalan is Technical Adviser to the UN Group of Governmental Experts on Prevention of Arms Race in Outer Space</i>. Dunietz (Doc 1) is a senior academic for SAFE.</li> </ul>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<p><b>Judgement</b></p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement. In doing this they might conclude:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that overall Mallick, Rajagopalan (Doc2) despite presenting a less balanced argument with fewer specified academic sources, do have a more practical argument with a plausible solution and a better supported conclusion.</li> <li>• that Dunietz (Doc 1) even though his conclusion is assertive and theoretical, includes more academic sources and clearly sets out the different interpretations of the treaties with parallels to explain difficult concepts.</li> <li>• that both arguments are equally strong because of well-structured arguments, supported with clear illustrations and either academic or a wide range of relevant sources to support different perspectives on the problems of space mining.</li> </ul> <p>There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.</p>	

**PUBLISHED****Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 10 marks****Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:**

- (a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed (simplistic),
- (b) ND+ or ND- when a strength or weakness has been partially developed (generalised) and
- (c) + or – for a fully developed and explained point of strength or weakness of the evidence used by the author. (detailed) **[Point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document to show impact of the evidence.]**

**Use the levels table and the guidance to determine an appropriate level and mark:**

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is <b>sustained, and a judgement is reached</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weakness, although <b>both</b> are present/identified.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weakness of evidence with little explanation.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is relevant but <b>generalised, not always linked</b> to specific claims.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little</b> or <b>no</b> assessment of evidence.</li> <li>• Assessment, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• Evidence may be <b>identified</b>, and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b> – response may be <b> cursory</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</li> </ul>
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>

- In Question 2 there are 4 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
  - How much assessment there is
  - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment
  - How the evidence is linked to the author's claims
  - Effectiveness of communication
- In simple terms the levels are:
  - Level 3 – detailed and sustained
  - Level 2 – generalised and lacking some assessment/explanation

**PUBLISHED**

- Level 1 – simplistic or descriptive
- Level 0 – have no creditable material (Mark X)

- **You are required to make a judgement of the level that is the best fit for each bullet point. This can include split levels. These will then inform the overall level and mark within it as illustrated below. The notes for awarding marks on page 3 of the mark scheme are for general guidance that reflect the more detailed approach below.**

- These should be listed at the bottom of the answer in the correct order.

- e.g.           L3     L2     L2     L2

This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the L2 criteria and has one in L3. It is, however, only just in L3 so would be at the bottom of the level and be awarded 8 marks out of 10.

- In the right-hand margin (away from the other 4 level marks) please insert the overall level, in this case L3, then add the mark (8) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.

- Other examples:

- e.g.                   L3     L3     L3     L3     Overall Level 3 – Mark 10

This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3. This **must** be awarded 10 marks.

- e.g.                   L2     L1     L2     L1     Overall Level 2 – Mark 5

This is a low middle L2 as the L2 criteria have only been partially met.

- e.g.                   L2     L1     L1     L1     Overall Level 2 – Mark 4

This is a low L2 so the mark is at the bottom of the range.

- e.g.                   L2     L3/L2   L3/L2   L2     Overall Level 3 – Mark 8

Split grades are allowed where the best fit is a combination of the criteria for two different levels. Treat the L3/L2 as low L3 so overall this would just reach L3 at 8.

- e.g.                   L1     X       L1     L1     Overall Level 1 – Mark 2

Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

- **In level 2 there is a range of 4 marks so use all 4 criteria to make your judgement.**

**PUBLISHED**

- **In Level 3 and level 1 there is a range of 3 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 3 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**

**PUBLISHED****Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 14 marks****Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:**

- a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed,
- b) ND EVAL when a point of evaluation has been partially developed (e.g. may make a valid point but without appropriately referencing the documents)
- c) EVAL for a fully developed point that looks at documents and perspectives and uses illustration (perhaps with a quote) from the authors  
**(Evaluation point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document as explicit reference.)**
- d) C for a direct descriptive comparison of the documents that contains no evaluation. (e.g. X said ‘this’ and Y said ‘that’)
- e) ? for an unclear or confused answer
- f) J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning are <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• <b>One perspective</b> may be focused upon for assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation is present but may <b>not relate to key</b> issues.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning are <b>generally accurate</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported</b> or <b>superficial</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment</li> <li>• Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic/undeveloped</b>. Answers may <b>describe</b> a few points comparing the two documents.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul>
X	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>

**PUBLISHED**

- In Question 3 there are 5 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
  - The level of judgement (i.e. how convincing is one document over the other, if at all)
  - Level of perspective (i.e. different viewpoints based on argument, evidence and assumptions within a context)
  - Evaluation
  - Explanation and reasoning
  - Communication
  
- In simple terms the levels are:
  - Level 3 – Sustained, explicit, highly effective
  - Level 2 – Generalised, generally accurate, less focussed on perspectives and evaluation than L3
  - Level 1 – Superficial, simplistic/undeveloped, descriptive
  - Level 0 – No creditable material. Use X as the annotation for this.
  
- Judgement can be covered throughout the answer with direct evaluation between the documents but can also be achieved by evaluation of the documents separately with a thorough judgement paragraph at the end.
  
- As in Question 2, put the levels for the 5 bullet points at the end of the answer:
  - e.g. L2 L3 L2 L2 L2  
This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the criteria for L2 and has one L3. This puts it at the bottom of the L3 range of marks – 10.
- Other examples:
  - e.g. L2 L2 L2 L2 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 9  
Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (9 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met. It **must** be given 9 marks. There should be no subjective judgement.
  - e.g. L2 L2 L1 L1 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 7  
Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades bringing it to a mid L2 i.e. 7
  
- Split grades are allowed e.g. L2/L1 or L1/X when the answer does not exactly fit the level descriptors. Treat them as low level, so L2/L1 would be a low level 2 when deciding on the overall level and mark.

**PUBLISHED**

- **In level 2 and level 3 there is a range of 5 marks so use all 5 criteria to make your judgement.**
- **In level 1 there is a range of 4 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 4 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**