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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]. Because of this I also believe that the secretary or other domain experts would be able to understand your domain model.

Excellent UML notations. I have no comments here, it all looks good. Correct usage of reading direction arrows that adds to the understanding to the model instead of just taking up space [1, p152]. Great and space efficient layout and as I wrote before: good use of the “thinking like a map maker” technique.

I respect your choice of making “Size” and “Unit” into conceptual classes instead of attribute classes [1, p164]. I do however feel that it might have been more appropriate to make an attribute class instead, since this would remove two conceptual classes that perhaps is not so important in the domain model. It is not wrong however, so you do not need to change it if you do not feel like it.

There is also a case to be made for making “membersFee” an attribute of “member” to cut down the number of conceptual classes. As Larman says: “If we do not think of some conceptual class X as a number or text in the real world, X is probably a conceptual class, not an attribute” [1, p146]. I at least think of “MembersFee” as a number, so perhaps it should be an attribute instead of a conceptual class. Perhaps it needs more information such as “tax”, “currency” and so on, which could easily be added as a “Money” attribute class [1, p164]. Just a thought though!

The, as you said, omitted boat type could also be added as an attribute class. It all depends on the domain though. With the info given, it might be OK to omit it. In a real world situation though I would probably contact the domain expert before doing it, since it might be important to know the boat type for berth assignment.

I feel like your conceptual classes makes sense though even though I gave the above comments. The vocabulary used feels closely tied to the territory [1, p145], which is great. I feel that your domain model fills all the required requirements for grade 2. Everything I’ve commented on is just suggestions and not necessarily better than what you have already done. As Larman says: “There is no such thing as a single correct domain model” [1, p168].
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