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Executive Summary:

This report is intended to contain the analysis made on certain individual requirements assigned to the Student #4. The reason for this analysis to be carried out is to have a clear understanding of what the requirement is asking to implement. In this deliverable, several requirements have been found to be unclear and as a consequence, in need of clarification
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# INTRODUCTION

In this document you will find the results of the analysis carried out on the requirements demanded for this deliverable. The need for this analysis raised during the process of completing the task, due to a lack of information on some specific requirement.

In this report, the requirements itself are presented along with a justification of why we thought it needed clarification. Furthermore, it also contains the lecturer validation

# REQUIREMENT TO BE ANALYZED

## Information Requirement 4

**Verbatim copy of the requirement:**

*“A* ***claim*** *is a formal request or complain made by a passenger or customer due to a problem or inconvenience experienced during a flight. They are registered by the* ***assistance agents****, and the data to store when registering a* ***claim*** *is the following: the* ***registration moment*** *(in the past), the* ***passenger email****, a* ***description*** *(up to 255 characters), a* ***type*** *(“FLIGHT ISSUES”, “LUGGAGE ISSUES”, “SECURITY INCIDENT”, “OTHER ISSUES”) and an* ***indicator*** *of whether the claim is accepted or not”*

As the requirement specifies, it is demanded to implement claims in our project. And although almost every attribute is very clearly specified. Some doubts arose when tackling the indicator attribute.

The two options that were evaluated for implementation were:

* Option 1

Implement *indicator* as a Boolean, where true meant that the claim was accepted, and false meant that the claim was rejected.

* Option 2

Implement *indicator* as an enumerated type. This would allow us to express whether the claim was accepted, rejected or pending.

The option adopted was the second one, because it seemed that it would be more clarifying and specific for the customer. Giving a more detailed information about the status of the claim.

On the follow up this doubt was presented to the lecturer. Also, after the next requirement analysis, there is a link to a thread which, obviously explains the course of action for the next requirement, but also clarifies the reason I opted for the second option in this one.

## Information Requirement 5

**Verbatim copy of the requirement:**

*“Claims need to be tracked through* ***tracking logs****. A tracking log records each step in the procedure followed to resolve or reject a claim, ensuring that all actions and decisions are documented. The system must store the following data about* ***tracking logs****: the* ***last update moment****, the* ***step*** *undergoing (up to 50 characters), a* ***resolution percentage****, and an* ***indicator*** *on whether the claim was finally accepted or not. When a claim is accepted or rejected, the system must store its* ***resolution*** *indicating the reason why was rejected or the compensation to offer (up to 255 characters).”*

As the requirement specifies, it is demanded to implement tracking logs in our project. And although almost every attribute is very clearly specified. Some doubts arose when tackling the indicator attribute, again.

The two options I was thinking of implementing were:

* Option 1

Implement *indicator* as a Boolean, where true meant that the claim was accepted, and false meant that the claim was rejected.

* Option 2

Implement *indicator* as an enumerated type. This would allow us to express whether the claim was accepted, rejected or pending.

As in the previous case, the second option was the one finally chosen. This was implemented because: the entire course of the acceptation or rejection of a claim can be seen in several tracking logs. This is very important because, although several tracking logs refer to one claim, only the last one (the one with resolution percentage equal to 100%) will reflect whether the claim was accepted or not.

This fact shows the need for a different state in the middle tracking logs. A Boolean clearly is not able to fulfill this purpose.

Here it is provided a link to a thread posted by other student, with the lecturer’s validation for this option to be adopted.

[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=_461194_1)

# CONCLUSIONS

To sum up the outcome of this analysis can be considered as successful because, if the analysis had not been carried out, maybe the requirement would not be considered satisfied. This could have affected the grade of the deliverable negatively.

In addition, the direct approval from the lecturer ensures the validity of the analysis.
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