

Personal reflection – Rasmus Løbner Christensen

My personal reflection will be split into two parts. A reflection about designing the to begin with, followed by a reflection concerning the evaluation part.

Designing an architecture

Initially we made a dozen of user stories and scenarios. These naturally fostered a very good discussion in the group, and were the baseline for our understanding of what components a Smart Home architecture should hold. The interesting part about designing the architecture, was in my opinion the numerous discussion which we had in the group. Starting with a feeling that we could comprehend the total solution/architecture, to slowly realize that we had to narrow it down, in order to actually meet the deadline. The IoT reference architecture gave us a tool to understand how to categorize and group the different aspects of the desired solution, and iterating over these groups, gave us the much needed understanding, on how we actually wanted to structure our architecture. When we finally had decided to some components of our solution, we could begin thinking about the different processes which the system/solution should offer. This made the whole modelling part with SOA, and the 4+1 views, a lot more approachable. If we had more time, and this perhaps had been a bigger project, I think actually documenting the different design decisions is key in order to get a successful project (and in this way architecture). We made our documentation later on in the process, which perhaps was a mistake, since some of the details might have been left out.

I think that we followed a well thought path in order to come up with our solution for a Smart Home architecture. The main tasks from the assignment description was also layered in this direction, which I think made a lot of sense.

Lastly I want to point out that getting feedback from another group, was I really learning full experience. I was *not* part of the evaluation evening, but even then, reading the feedback from the counter group, was a really interesting experience, and I feel like they had a lot of good points concerning our architecture.

Evaluating an architecture

The given architectural description (from our counter group) seemed to be inadequate of basic service descriptions, which, as an evaluator, makes it difficult to actually understand how the system is thought out to be realized. Furthermore a description of how the actual IoT reference architecture (given in the course literature) was used would also benefit the entire architectural description. I used the ATAM model for evaluating the other group's architecture. I like the whole idea of being able to evaluate the given project (proposed architecture) at any given time, further, that the evaluation method focusses on risks rather than quality attribute behavior. Obviously being part of the presentation (the evaluation evening), is required in order to actually fulfill such kind of evaluation, since discussing with the team being evaluated is key in the understanding of the entire architecture. Since I was *not* part of this evaluation evening, I left out on some key experiences in the evaluation process. My experience was that the actual report/architecture which we were given to evaluate was a bit inadequate, and talking with the group members could perhaps answered a lot of the question which I had, in order to create an even better understanding of the architecture - and this way a better evaluation. I am sure that the group have been doing a lot of thinking about their architecture/solution, but might not been able to put these thoughts on paper.