Peer review Workshop 1 for Markus Alshraydeh and Daniel Hammerin

We feel that the diagram is overly complicated for a domain model as it should only show the basic concepts and the most basic associations[1]. The model does not include the most basic concepts such as “Boat” or “Berth” but instead has vague concepts such as “Reserve a mooring” or “Boat Management” associated to ”Member” with the name “service” which does not really explain the relation at all.

Register Boat etc. could easily be fitted into a concept of “Boat” instead of being its own concept, same goes for the Calendar bracket (list calendar events etc).

Berth does not exist as a concept which we consider an important part of the model. Berth booking list should be simplified to “Berth” as this is the concept we’re looking for.

The model does not explicitly show that a member OWNS a boat instead the member has associations to show that he registres/changes boats and books moorings. By this the member could easily be replaced by a secretary as it’s not clearly shown in the model that the member is the OWNER. I.E concept “Member”----owns----”Boat”.

It’s detailed but that is not good for the domain model (the analysis) as it’s too software focused which it should not be. Focus only on the simple concepts of reality and not on how it will be implemented in software. As an example Craig Larman uses concepts such as “Library”, “Book”, “Patron” which are very simplified concepts. [2]

We think that it can be simplified in a few ways, mainly to simplify the concept names themselves and also to show a simpler association between the concepts where it’s needed. If not needed it shouldn’t be included as only the most noteworthy ones should be shown.

As a developer would the model help you and why/why not?

No, the model is too unclear and does not present a simple domain model nor a detailed diagram which can be implemented into code easily. The attributes in some of the concepts are associations and not attributes. I.E “Allows members to review berths” is not an attribute, it’s more of an association or a description of the concept itself. Some of the associations do not explain how the concepts interact, I.E “Service” is not self-explanatory for a developer.

Do you think a domain expert (for example the Secretary) would understand the model why/why not?

No, it is not simple to read for a non-developer. The concepts are unnecessarily complicated I.E “Boat management” could easily just be “Boat”. A simpler concept and more understandable. The concepts included in Boat could just be listed as functions.

What are the strong points of the model, what do you think is really good and why?

We believe all functionality has been included and analyzed which means the requirements can be met.

- Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062 (1.4)
- Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062 (1.5)

What are the weaknesses of the model, what do you think should be changed and why?

The concepts for the functionality listed in the model aren’t there, we’re missing concepts like “Boat” and “Berth”. Because of this “Berth booking list” and “Boat Management” seem random as they are not tied down or linked to a concept.

Do you think the model has passed the grade 2 (passing grade) criteria?

Not as it is presented to us. We believe that all the requirements have been analyzed and taken into consideration, but has not been represented correctly in a domain model.

Adam Österlund, Kevin Amilund, Jonas Tornfors.

- Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062 (1.4)
- Larman C., Applying UML and Patterns 3rd Ed, 2005, ISBN: 0131489062 (1.5)