~ In response to Email #3 (20190129_letterMiles).
~ Email received from David Barnes (D.J.Barnes@kent.ac.uk) on 2019/01/29 at 19:19.

Miles Roman writes:

Dear Jamie,

Thank you for your questions. I have tried my best to respond to each point below. Should you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to contact me in the usual way.

Sincerely,

Miles Roman
Director of Human Resources
Yuconz

On 29/01/2019 12:53, J.D.Ghoorbin wrote:
> **Please accept my apologies for the formatting error in the previous email.
>
> Dear Miles,
> We would like to ask some questions about a few points discussed in our
> recent meeting. The questions discussed were as follows:
> *General questions:*
> Why would directors and HR employees like to log in with lower
> privileges? What should directors be able to access in that case,
> considering they have no personal records of their own? We'd like to
> know in order to better test that case during development.

Directors still have their personal details recorded, such as address, emergency contact details, etc. If they wish to edit those they they would login with lower privileges.

> Can the HR director manage HR themselves or must they delegate to their
> employees? (Since currently they're just a director, so their only
> write-privilege is when reviewing and cannot amend records themselves)

When HR staff have to be reviewed then the HR Director (me!) reviews them along with another senior member of staff from a different department. The review process for my staff is the same as for all other employees.

>
> *New record types:*

> The use case scenarios provided indicate that the 'system records
> authentication attempts' in the "log in" use case as well as
> 'authorisation-check' in "authorisation check" and
> 'end-of-authentication' in "log out" also recording data in the system.
> Who can read this data and where should it be stored? What data should
> be stored in these records such as timestamps, username and so forth?
> Would we also need to give writing permission to anyone for this data?

Read access to this data is not part of our requirements, but the record
of it is. Date and time of each access should be recorded as well as who
accessed, using what access level and what the result was.

>
> *For the Use case diagrams:*
> "Authenticate" diagram: Isn't a manager a type of employee?

Yes, but it is their role as Manager that is significant, in this case
and not their role as an Employee.

> "Review" diagram: Should Authorisation check have an association
> pointing to HR Database? - our understanding is that authorization check
> records are stored in that database.

The authorization records and HR records are logically separate and that
is represented in the diagram. Whether they are physically separate is
an issue of implementation.

> "Authentication server" and "Authorisation" are also a new actors. Will
> their functionality be provided, or do we have to implement it ourselves?
>
>   * If they are provided, how will we interact with "Authorisation" and
>   the "Authentication server"?

That will be part of your implementation.

>
> *For the Use Case Scenarios:*
> For the "Log in" scenarios, what do you mean by "System has recorded an
> authentication attempt"? What information should this record?

As above.

> The "Login" scenario has an alternative flow saying, "authentication
> fails". What occurs after this?

The user is not logged in but a record has been made of the authentication attempt.

> "Perform review" and "Allocate reviewer" (among other use cases) say
> someone "is informed". Can you expand on how they should be informed?

That could be either internal to or external to your system.

> "Allocate reviewer" alternate flow says, "Allocation remains incomplete".
>
>   * Is it stored but not acted upon? - That sounds like it would clog up
>   the filesystem.
>   * Can they edit it after it fails and resubmit it?
>   * Can they cancel the action, so that it is not made?

It is an acknowledgement of what sometimes happens. HR goes to assign reviewers and kind find anyone. They will try again another time.

>
> According to Use Case Scenarios, Employee should be able to "Read review
> record", "Amend review record" and "Read past completed review record",
> but the associations are missing in the use case diagram. Which one
> should we follow?

Follow the scenarios in those cases.

> According to Use Case Scenarios, "Read past completed review record"
> does not include "Read review record", but the diagram shows that it
> does. Which one should we follow?

Follow the diagram.

> According to Use Case Scenarios, "Perform review" includes "Read past
> completed review records" and "Amend review record", but not in the use
> case diagram. Which one should we follow?

We see that part as primarily being a face-to-face meeting of the parties involved. However, as part of the meeting, the participants will certainly read and, possibly, amend the review documents.

> Participating actors for "allocate reviewer" in the scenarios include
> Manager and Director.
>

>   * Should these be generalised to the "Reviewer" actor?

No, because those only become a Reviewer as a result of the use case being completed. Otherwise, you would only ever be able to allocate perpetual reviewers.

>   * "Allocate reviewer" in the diagram does not include an association
>   with the Reviewer actor, nor the Manager and Director actors. Is
>   this intentional?

Yes, you can leave it as is.