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**Executive Summary**

This document provides an ersión report for the AirNav-Logistics ersión. However, no substantial ersión was conducted since the individual tasks assigned did not require extensive evaluation.

**Revision Table**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Revision Number** | **Date** | **Description** |
| 1.0 | 19/02/2025 | Initial version of the report |
| 2.0 | 12/03/2025 | Update of the report with the análisis of the requirements of D02 |

**Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to present an analysis of the tasks performed in the AirNav-Logistics project. However, given that the assigned tasks were straightforward and did not require significant analytical work, no substantial analyses were necessary.

**Contents**

* 1. **analysis of the requirements of D01:**

No specific analysis records are included in this report as the individual tasks completed did not necessitate detailed requirement evaluations. Therefore, no requirement modifications or validations were needed.

* 1. **analysis of the requirements of D02**

Regarding requirements 3 and 4, it has been necessary to create two validators: one for the Identifier attribute to verify that the attribute's letters indeed correspond to the initials, and another for the lastNibble attribute to verify, in case it is not null, that its length is exactly 4.

With regard to the validation of the attributes, I have based my work on an Excel file that Mr. Rafael Corchuelo Gil published in response to one of the forum posts (<https://ev.us.es/webapps/discussionboard/do/message?conf_id=_426211_1&forum_id=_253522_1&course_id=_89154_1&action=list_messages&nav=discussion_board&message_id=_461165_1>)

Finally, the last analysis concerned the relationship between Booking and Passenger, which I initially thought would be a ManyToOne relationship from Passenger to Booking. However, after further analysis, I determined that it was a ManyToMany relationship. Consequently, an intermediate entity BookingRecord was created, establishing a ManyToOne relationship with each of the original entities, since a passenger can be associated with multiple bookings, and a booking can include multiple passengers. This setup reflects real-world scenarios where passengers can have multiple bookings and a single booking can involve several passengers

**Conclusions**

In conclusion, the analysis of the tasks performed for the AirNav-Logistics project revealed that most tasks were straightforward and did not require extensive modifications or validations. The validations implemented for the Identifier and lastNibble attributes were based on an existing Excel guide, ensuring that the attributes met the specified requirements. Additionally, the relationship between Booking and Passenger was redefined from an initial ManyToOne to a ManyToMany, resulting in the creation of the BookingRecord intermediate entity. This adjustment reflects the real-world scenario where passengers can be linked to multiple bookings, and bookings can involve multiple passengers. This analysis ensures that the system's data structure accurately models the domain requirements.
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