Feedback to The Architects

The report is extensive and provides a very insightful description of gambling systems. It is evident that a lot of considerations have been made for how this type of system could be realized. Additionally, the formal context diagram is very well made, especially focused on the technical understanding of the system. To improve the report further, the following points could be considered:

- Overall functionality
    - This section seems to be more like a pitch than a functionality description.
    - The informal diagram looks fine, it seems to describe the system well.
    - Your user interface screen shots explain detailed functionality. It can be discussed if we need them or not, but they are fine for understanding.
    - A bullet list of functionalities would have been helpful for a short overview.
    - The informal and formal diagrams have some inconsistencies. The formal describes the need for the user to make the bet themselves, at least their account at each betting site. What is the point if they need an account at all the betting sites?
- Architectural analysis
    - It would have been nice to see the list of stakeholders with a description, before the "Identification of Architectural Drivers" section.
    - You could consider if you have been a little biased in the first phase, as you have only included users and developers as stakeholders, and you are very interested in functionality for end users.
    - There are other important stakeholders, and you have identified these on your stakeholder list and in your architectural backlog, e.g owners/management of the company, Spilmyndigheden, Ludomani støtteforeninger. In your architectural backlog you discuss some stakeholder interests, and you could have included some of these stakeholders and considerations from the beginning and on the list of architectural drivers and in scenarios.
    - You have a list of partners and affiliates. Do you use the information and is it relevant? Are some of them stakeholders?
    - The report does not explicitly describe the Quality Attribute Workshop process used to derive the quality attribute scenarios. This could be a nice addition to improving reader comprehension of the system.
    - Screenshots to follow the process working with the Quality Attribute Workshop would have been good in the report, also the voting process.

- - o Under Usability Requirements, a couple of the descriptions are in Danish.
- Quality Attribute Scenarios
  - o As mentioned on Monday, regarding environment, you might want to consider whether the system should respond differently in some scenarios or if the respond always should be the same, whether it receiving high traffic or not (that is, do you expect different outcomes based on the environment of the system? Would you expect less or more under normal circumstances than at times with high traffic?) This occurs in scenarios Performance 1 and 3, and Availability 1.
  - o Performance: Are the 3 scenarios the same?
  - o Are Availability scenario 3 and Modifiability scenario 1 the same?
  - o Modifiability scenario 1: Is a response measure of completed integration within 5 developer days and less than 5% of the existing code base changed relevant?
  - o Modifiability: Can a stimulus be an Announcement of a new betting provider entering the market? Or can you be more concrete about what happens?
  - o Stimulus sources should be internal components and not external factors. In modifiability scenario 3 and all the safety scenarios the stimulus source are external actors.
  - o Security details could be expanded on, as this plays a significant role for almost all stakeholders. Otherwise, you should consider whether this is a driver you actually want to include as it only got 9 votes compared to some of the other drivers.
  - o Are some of the scenarios more functional requirements? E.g. Usability scenario 2 - Intuitive Filtering and Search?
- Architectural Backlog
  - o Consider a list format of the outstanding tasks that need to be done for the system.
  - o Less of the business considerations, although they are good to keep in mind, they are not completely relevant to the backlog.
  - o If you handle the money via your site, and bets are made through that, who would technically be making the bets? Would your system "act" as the user, using their login information? Is that even allowed?

Areas of Improvement:

- Functionality description should be revised (less user-oriented).
- Include quality attribute workshop (screenshots or discussion).
- Architectural backlog should be less elaborated.

- Consider using the formatting/structure provided.
- The report contains a lot of thoughts on profit for instance, which probably should not be in an architectural report, because it is a "management" issue and not a software issue. A wish from management to can be profit, but as an architect the "solution" could be to make a well working product with good performance.