|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feasibility Criteria:** | **Weight:** | **Candidate 1** | **Candidate 2** | **Candidate 3** |
| Operational Feasibility: | 10 | The system in place is working but requires a lot of physical items in order to continue operations. Could be more user friendly and effective. | Would support all requirements specified, would also improve efficiency as well as save costs. | Same as candidate 2. |
|  |  | **Score: 60** | **Score: 95** | **Score:95** |
| Cultural Feasibility: | 10 | The users often complain about waiting times and the lack of flow. | The users would be happy with this change, as they can book tickets and seats from the comfort of their home and simply show up with their ticket-code. | Same as candidate 2. |
|  |  | **Score:70** | **Score:90** | **Score:90** |
| Technical Feasibility: | 20 | The system in place requires a lot of physical-related materials in order to function. Which in the long run could cause storage and be too disorganized. | The system would be easy to work with and maintain. Would provide the adequate number of features. | Same as candidate 2.  Except the cost of buying, maintaining and using a server would increase. |
|  |  | **Score:70** | **Score:95** | **Score:85** |
| Risk Feasibility: | 20 | The only real risk involved would be in the case a fire breaks out and destroys all records of data. | Minimal risk. Only in the case of malicious attacks, power outages or gross mismanagement would the system not function as intended. Backups of data are easy to make. | Same as candidate 2.  With the added risk of system shutdown in the case(s) of disaster. |
|  |  | **Score:85** | **Score:80** | **Score:70** |
| Economic Feasibility: | 20 | The repeated purchase and printing of tickets will be a constant cost. | The system would not be expensive to design and maintain. It would also remove the cost of physical materials. | Same as candidate 2.  The addition of a server would require more maintenance (the appointment of a database manager) and technicalities. |
|  |  | **Score:65** | **Score:90** | **Score:80** |
| Schedule Feasibility: | 10 | N/A. | Due to the non-complex nature of the system, if proper scheduling is done and executed, there ought to be no problems | Same as candidate 2.  The server would require more time to implement and integrate into the system. Which would require a change in scheduling in order to accommodate. |
|  |  | **Score:100** | **Score:95** | **Score:85** |
| Legal Feasibility: | 10 | N/A. | N/A. | N/A. |
|  |  | **Score:100** | **Score:100** | **Score:100** |
| **Weighted Score:** | 100 | **Score:78** | **Score:91** | **Score:86** |