**System Design Document for Smart Home Energy Management System (SHEMS)**

**Introduction**

This document describes the system design options evaluated for the Smart Home Energy Management System (SHEMS) and the rationale behind selecting the final design. The evaluation focuses on criteria such as scalability, performance, cost, and ease of integration.

**Design Options**

**Option 1: Monolithic Architecture**

**Description:** A single, unified codebase that handles all aspects of the system, including data collection, processing, user interface, and control logic.

**Components:**

* Single Server
* Single Database
* IoT Devices (Sensors)
* User Interface

**Block Diagram:**

+----------------------+

| Monolithic |

| Application |

+----------------------+

| | |

+---------+ | +---------+

| | |

+-------v-----+ +-------v-----+ +-------v-------+
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+-------------+ +-------------+ +---------------+

**Evaluation Metrics:**

* **Scalability:** Limited, as the single server can become a bottleneck with increased load.
* **Performance:** Can be optimized but may degrade with more users and data.
* **Cost:** Lower initial cost but higher maintenance cost due to potential performance issues.
* **Ease of Integration:** Simple to develop initially but difficult to modify and scale.

**Option 2: Microservices Architecture**

**Description:** A distributed architecture where the system is divided into smaller, independent services that communicate over a network.

**Components:**

* Multiple Microservices
  + Data Collection Service
  + Data Processing Service
  + Control Service
  + Notification Service
  + User Interface Service
* Central Database
* IoT Devices (Sensors)
* API Gateway

**Block Diagram:**

+-------------------+
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+-------------------+

|

+--------+---------+-------------+-------------+--------------+

| | | | |
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|

+--------v---------+
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+--------v---------+
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+------------------+

**Evaluation Metrics:**

* **Scalability:** High, as each service can be scaled independently.
* **Performance:** Better performance due to distributed processing.
* **Cost:** Higher initial cost but lower maintenance cost due to modularity.
* **Ease of Integration:** Easier to develop, test, and deploy new features.

**Option 3: Serverless Architecture**

**Description:** A cloud-based architecture where the system components are deployed as functions that run in response to events.

**Components:**

* Serverless Functions
  + Data Collection Function
  + Data Processing Function
  + Control Function
  + Notification Function
  + User Interface Function
* Cloud Database
* IoT Devices (Sensors)
* API Gateway

**Block Diagram:**

+-------------------+

| API Gateway |

+-------------------+

|

+--------+---------+-------------+-------------+--------------+

| | | | |

| Data Collection | Data | Control | Notification |

| Function | Processing | Function | Function |
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+--------+---------+-------------+-------------+--------------+
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+--------v---------+
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+------------------+

**Evaluation Metrics:**

* **Scalability:** Very high, as functions scale automatically with demand.
* **Performance:** Excellent performance due to auto-scaling and optimized resource use.
* **Cost:** Pay-per-use model can be cost-effective, but high traffic may increase costs.
* **Ease of Integration:** Simplifies deployment and scaling but requires careful management of stateless functions.

**Option Evaluation**

1. **Scalability:**
   * **Monolithic:** Limited scalability; potential bottlenecks.
   * **Microservices:** High scalability; services scale independently.
   * **Serverless:** Very high scalability; automatic scaling with demand.
2. **Performance:**
   * **Monolithic:** Potential for performance degradation as load increases.
   * **Microservices:** Good performance; load distributed across services.
   * **Serverless:** Excellent performance; optimized resource usage.
3. **Cost:**
   * **Monolithic:** Lower initial cost; higher long-term maintenance.
   * **Microservices:** Higher initial cost; lower maintenance due to modularity.
   * **Serverless:** Pay-per-use; can be cost-effective but variable with high traffic.
4. **Ease of Integration:**
   * **Monolithic:** Simple initial development; difficult to modify and scale.
   * **Microservices:** Easier to develop, test, and deploy; more complex architecture.
   * **Serverless:** Simplified deployment and scaling; requires careful management of stateless functions.

**Option Choice**

**Final Decision: Microservices Architecture**

**Justification:** The microservices architecture was selected due to its balance of scalability, performance, and maintainability. While the initial development cost is higher than the monolithic approach, the modular nature of microservices allows for independent scaling of components, making it suitable for handling increased user demand without significant performance degradation. Additionally, the microservices approach offers better long-term maintainability and easier integration of new features, making it a robust and future-proof solution for the Smart Home Energy Management System.