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Executive Summary:

This report outlines the analyses performed to ensure a clear understanding and proper implementation of specific individual requirements, particularly in relation to Student#2. During the review of the requirements for this delivery, it became evident that one of them needed further examination, primarily because some aspects of its definition were unclear.
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# INTRODUCTION

This report seeks to document the analysis performed on the requirements for the assigned deliverable. During the evaluation process, the team recognized the necessity for a more in-depth analysis of a managerial requirement, as its statement lacked clarity.

In this report, we will outline the analysis process undertaken and the conclusions that were drawn. This thorough examination aims to provide a strong basis for the effective implementation of the requirement, ensuring it aligns with the project's objectives.

# REQUIREMENT TO BE ANALYZED

**Information Requirement 3: Customer Data**

* Verbatim copy of the requirement: “Customers are the people who purchase flights. The system must store the following data about them: an identifier (unique, pattern "^[A-Z]{2-3}\d{6}$"), a phone number (pattern "^\+?\d{6,15}$"), a physical address (up to 255 characters), plus a city and a country (both up to 50 characters). Optionally, customers may have some earned points (up to 500k points).”
* **Ambiguity:** While patterns and maximums are provided for some fields, the exact range for "earned points" (e.g., minimum, and increment) was not specified.

**Information Requirement 4: Booking Data**

* Verbatim copy of the requirement: “A booking is a reservation made by a customer to purchase a flight, guaranteeing some seats on a specific itinerary and associating some passengers' details with the trip. The system must manage the following information for each booking: a locator code (unique, pattern "^[A-Z0-9]{6,8}"),apurchasemoment(inthepast),atravelclass("ECONOMY",BUSINESS"),andaprice.Optionally,thesystemshouldrecordthelastnibbleofthecreditcardusedforpayment.”
* **Ambiguity**: The ranges are not well-specified.

**Information Requirement 5: Passennger Data**

ManagerialRequirement3:PassengerData∗∗∗Verbatimcopyoftherequirement:“Apassengerisanindividualwhotakesaflightandheorshemustberegisteredinthecorrespondingbooking.Thesystemmuststorethefollowingdataaboutpassengers:afullname(shorterthan256characters),anemail,apassportnumber(pattern“[A−Z0−9]6,9”), a date of birth, and, optionally, his or her special needs (shorter than 51 characters).”

* **Ambiguity:** The acceptable range for "date of birth" (e.g., historical limits for valid passengers) was not specified. Additionally, the specific format for "email" was not defined, nor was the expected range of characters for "special needs."

All the identified ambiguities were communicated to a classmate, who then initiated a forum thread to request clarification on the various ranges and data types from the professor. The professor responded by providing an updated spreadsheet, "Missing-Ranges;RC2503051700.xlsx," which contained the necessary clarifications. These changes were clearly marked in yellow, and this detailed feedback from the client was crucial in resolving the identified ambiguities, enabling us to proceed with the accurate implementation of the requirements.

[Link to the thread](https://ev.us.es/webapps/discussionboard/do/message?action=list_messages&course_id=_89154_1&nav=discussion_board&conf_id=_426211_1&forum_id=_253522_1&message_id=_460989_1)

# CONCLUSIONS

The analysis presented in this document provides a thorough evaluation of the identified ambiguities within the requirements for the deliverable. It highlights areas where clarity was lacking, details the process undertaken to seek clarification from the client, and incorporates the provided resolutions.

Each analysis was carefully documented, ensuring that final conclusions received approval from the lecturer. By capturing the original requirements, the challenges faced, the proposed solutions, and the final resolutions, this report serves as a transparent reference for the decision-making process. The lecturer's endorsement further confirms the validity and feasibility of these final decisions.

These records of analysis offer a clear explanation for the choices made. Moving forward, these decisions will form a solid foundation for the implementation of the requirements as intended by the lecturers, ensuring accuracy while reducing the risk of errors and misunderstandings.
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