

# 2.1 Infrastructure and material consequences: supported rehearsal

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Class: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ **Total: 6 marks**

## Objective

Supported preparation: Explain networks, AI and autonomous systems in context; Evaluate claims about access, expression and environmental impact. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

## 1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Network access depends on devices, power, connectivity and service providers. AI-based recommendations use patterns in training data; an autonomous system may also act. Evaluate a service through completed outcomes and failure conditions, including energy and maintenance.

### Original source / task evidence

Task: a fictional clinic registers 500 remote-consultation accounts but completes only 120 timely consultations. What follows?

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.  
Infrastructure and material consequences

Task: a fictional clinic registers 500 remote-consultation accounts but completes only 120 timely consultations. What follows?

Registration shows uptake at one stage, not effective healthcare access. Inspect failed connections, device sharing, staff availability, patient groups and existing alternatives. Compare completed timely consultations and relevant access barriers before and after implementation, with a suitable comparator where possible. Include privacy, power reliability and environmental costs.

## 2 Practice

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

---

---

---

---

## 3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Timely consultations rise mainly among people already well served. Has equitable access improved? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Solutions

---

**2.1** Registration shows uptake at one stage, not effective healthcare access. Inspect failed connections, device sharing, staff availability, patient groups and existing alternatives. Compare completed timely consultations and relevant access barriers before and after implementation, with a suitable comparator where possible. Include privacy, power reliability and environmental costs. Authored points for identifying relevant evidence, explaining a supported inference and a material limit.

**3.1** The overall count can rise without reducing exclusion. Compare completion and barriers for previously underserved users, using compatible definitions and periods. Evaluate alternatives, costs and unmet need before claiming equitable improvement. Authored points for a relevant judgement, reason tied to the case and justified qualification or method. Accept a supported alternative.