We have used the PDF version of the book which you can find on the following link.

[**https://aanimesh.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/applying-uml-and-patterns-3rd.pdf**](https://aanimesh.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/applying-uml-and-patterns-3rd.pdf)

**As a developer, would the model help you? Why/why not?**

Yes, this model would be of great support whilst working against the requirements. The model gives an overall design view for the system to be implemented.

**Do you think a domain expert (For example, the secretary), would understand the model? Why/Why not?**

We feel like the secretary will be able to understand his/her work tasks since the associations are overall well put. The only confusing part is the association lines between the conceptual classes secretary and member, which interlocks and shares the boat.

**What are the strong points of the model?**

As previously mentioned we feel like the domain model gives an understanding and how the real world objects should collaborate. There are appropriate verb(s) on the association lines, which does not consist of redundant wording, just like Larman displays [1, p246] on figure 9.11. Alongside with the descriptive verbs, there are appropriate arrows that points out the reading direction.

**What are the weak points of the model?**

One notation that we feel is missing from your diagram is the *multiplicity notation*. According to Larman [1, p249] *multiplicity defines how many instances of a class A can be associated with instance of a class B* (For example, *see figure 9.13*). This would make the model even easier to understand.

**Do you think the model has passed the grade 2 (Passing Grade) Criteria?**

Yes. We feel like your domain model has been worked through whilst disregarding redundant information, still retaining valid and relevant key points.
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