Peer Review Workshop 1

For the domain model made by Joakim Holmevi (jh222qr)

Daniel Vedin (dv222bk)
2015-09-16

As a developer, I feel this domain model definitely adds understanding of the iteration's task. The domain model is easy to understand and follows design guidelines proposed by Larman, such as thinking like a map maker [1, p145]. The domain model focuses on the real world problem and not the implementation [1, p135]. You have also gone beyond Larman's guidelines by adding graphical elements to your domain model that makes it easier to understand, such as adding a special border around the primary actors. Because of this I also believe that the secretary or other domain experts would be able to understand your domain model.

Regarding UML notation I found a minimal error and a, I feel, major error. The minimal: at the top between "Calendar" and "CalendarEvent", the association "Contains" is using a reading direction arrow which could be omitted as it does not add anything to the overall readability of the domain model as the convention states that you read associations from left to right [1, p152].

The major: The association between "Member" and "Boat" does not show all the required requirements. It shows that a member can own one or more boats, but it does not show that the member is the one providing the information about the boat. According to the requirements, the member should be able to register ownership of a boat, change an existing registration and remove a registered boat. This could, for example, be fixed with multiple associations [1, p155] or, if you prefer to keep things clean and simple, with another better describing association name.

I also spotted a quite tricky relationship between "Boat" and "Berth" which I found fascinating the more I thought about it. Since you are using sidenotes, I would perhaps add a sidenote explaining that all existing berths need to be accounted for, no matter if a boat is docked at it or not. Otherwise, a 0 boat 1 berth association might be considered a bit weird.

A minimal attribute error I can find is that the "totalAmount" attribute in the conceptual class "Payment" is not marked as a derived attribute. It should be marked that way since it uses information from other conceptual classes [1, p160].

A thing I feel is omitted from the domain model is the relationship between the actor Member and Calendar. According to the requirements, a member is supposed to be able to view the calendar and the calendar events it contains. This is not shown in your domain model.

Another thing you should consider is to explain the attributes a bit further. For example: Is the boatSize a numeric value and if so, in which measure of weight? According to Larman, this can be solved in two ways. Either create an attribute type for the attribute or create a new conceptual class. It depends on the model [1, p164].

Other than that I feel that your domain model is quite good. Your conceptual classes and associations makes sense. The vocabulary used feels closely tied to the territory [1, p145], which is great. The domain model is easy to read and omits information which is not necessary in the domain model (such as, for example, a "description" attribute in CalendarEvent, which I feel was not really needed) [1, p158]. I do however feel that as it is, your domain model does not meet the requirements for the grade 2, since it does not include all the required requirements. The other errors are all, I feel, minor and should not impact your grade significantly.

References:

1. Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062