

Reflections regarding group assignment phase 2.

Our work with the report started with a thorough study of the IoT Reference Architecture, and our work is based on our understanding of this work. I think that is a good way to start to work with a new application domain if a reference architecture is available. Otherwise, one needs to find other reference work or talk to people who work in that domain.

During the evaluation process, there has been two criticism points. The first is that we have not used personas. First, it was our choice because it was not mandatory in the assignment. I think that personas is a bit strange to work with. You have to create a person, and how can you create that? I think that a personas always will be influenced by yourself. In real life, I have always talked to the relevant persons when I have created a new application. I think personas should be useful, I think these must be created by someone else than those who are supposed to use them in the design process.

Because the lack of personas in our report was the only criticism point from the teaching staff, we have added a few to our report.

The second criticism point was that we did not have a central box in the home to communicate with our devices. Nevertheless, I think it is another way to make an application in the IoT domain. We have not found evidence that is a requirement so we have not changed our system in that direction.

The group assignment phase 2 has to “demonstrate a better understanding of the application domain” based on the design evaluation. I think that is very difficult to do that unless specific points have been pointed out during the process. The weakness of the construction of the evaluation process on this course is that you are dependent on the work of other groups. If the report of the group you have to evaluate is very weak, it makes the individual assignments very difficult, maybe even impossible, to fulfill. Moreover, if a report appears strong, it will be difficult for the evaluating group to point out areas where the report can be improved. I think that it makes the role of the teaching staff important in the evaluation process. If they do not point out criticism points, the phase 2 group assignment almost is meaningless.

Michael Poulin Mortensen