

Some Possible Issues

Much of the value of the requirements analysis is to flag issues, inconsistencies, ambiguities and the like. In addition, they may sometimes spot potential for genuine process improvements, which then allow the organisation to work in a different way (sometimes as a result of the introduction of systems: The fabled IT enabled change). Here are some possible issues in the insurance description.

Note also, that the process models and the accompanying descriptions must be consistent. For example, if one chooses to show credit check as just an action, then an explanation must be provided.

System: Purist approaches would attempt to first describe the 'essence of' the process without the system. That is, creation of work for a supervisor.

Later variations (as one moves towards specification) might include systems roles, such that they then map to the use case (though might well use more specific names relating to aspects of the system envisaged).

The routing of the work-item is said to depend on the agency reference number (and this would suggest inflexible rules). It might make sense to query this, or to suggest some more dynamic (again perhaps work load based) approach.

To check workloads at any time may require a separate (parallel) thread on both the checking and checked role.

The Supervisor taking the work of a clerk does not have an impact on the RAD. It merely means that the Supervisor (person) will take on the role of a clerk. This highlights the need to separate out the role from the resource.

It's not clear who allocates work to the Underwriter (or how). In addition, the description does not make it clear whether the assessment of credit worthiness (by a clerk) and of health (by the underwriter) are in sequence. That is, if one is literal one would assume that they are in parallel. However, in terms of cost, the credit worthiness is trivial in comparison to the medical. Therefore, it would make sense to carry that out first.

In a related fashion, though this is described as a true interaction, the reality of current credit checking mechanisms, is that the organisation just have a sign up to one (or two) of the credit reference agencies, and bring up the customer details on screen. (Logically this might even be considered as an action).

Clearly this has a bearing upon the final acceptance. Note that as described again the mail room clerk accepts clerk and underwriter applications in parallel.

Finally, the roles here may not be best. For example, is dealing with incoming mail (Mail Room Clerk), and dealing with sending applications (Mail Room Clerk) necessarily served best by the same role?