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

Yes, out of a developer’s perspective this model would help. However, our first impression of this model was that it might be a bit too technical and rich of software-related details, which could make it harder to visualize “the bigger picture” [1, Part 3, Chapter 9.2].

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

As previously mentioned, the model is very detailed and contains things such as data types, which might confuse someone not familiar with these concepts.

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

The strongest points of this particular model are the clear and and well-organized associations made between the different classes. The associations helps a great deal in understanding the connections in the domain and follows the examples given by Larman [1, Fig. 9.17, Chapter 9.15].

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

The weaknesses of the model could be the slightly over detailed class attributes, for instance the “Berth”. Another thing that might make the model easier to visualize in practise could be to have less classes, and instead for instance have the class “Member” with attribute “Information” instead of having them both in separate classes [1, Part 3, Chapter 9.12].

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

Yes. Even though the model might be a bit too technical than we expected, the classes and associations makes good sense and provides an understanding of the domain.
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