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

As a developer the model would be somewhat helpful – it is quite easily readable and contains a lot of detail ready for implementation, including operations and a detailed class diagram. However, there are some confusing elements present which will be further discussed below.

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

A domain expert would probably have some issues understanding the model due to the number of concepts presented that are outside of the reality the domain model should depict. For example, the boat club does not currently have “users” – a concept which is tied exclusively to the system. Nor does it have a “MooringManager” or “Meetings,” the latter of which is named as an “Event” in the requirements,

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

* The basic detail required in the model is present making it ultimately understandable for implementation and development purposes.
* For the most part the UML notation is good and easily readable.
* The model is clean and uncluttered, featuring less unnecessary detail than some.

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

* The user and authentication concepts are unnecessary since they exist only within the system and not the reality which should be described by the domain model.
* The inclusion of operations also seems to lend too much focus to the system aspect over reality and as such they could probably be omitted.
* The accountant role seems largely unnecessary as it contributes nothing to the model, and thus the entire concept of roles could likely be omitted too for the sake of simplicity and readability.
* Many associations have weak names, such as “uses” and “has” – these could be replaced with stronger associations or removed entirely.
* Some small elements of the UML notation are confusing or unclear, these include:
  + An association between “Member” and “MooringManager” which has no name and is incorrectly specified.
  + The precise nature of the “Role” component which “Views” a “MemberRegister” and is “Used” by “AuthenticationService.” It also seems unusual that a user can have between zero and three roles.

**Do you think the model has passed the grade 3 criteria?**

While the model focuses excessively on the system aspect over reality and contains many arguably unnecessary details, all the information required is present. There are many unnecessary complications and some confusing aspects, but overall, this model appears to meet the requirements for passing the grade 3 criteria.