

Concordia University

SOEN 6471: ADVANCED SOFTWARE ARCHITECTURES

iCare



Zaid Abdulhadi : 25406897

Aravind Ashoka Reddy : 40103248

Saikiran Alagatham : 40103833

DVSP Hemanth : 40104864

Venkat Mani Deep Chandana : 40080924

Professor: Pankaj Kamthan

Repo : <https://github.com/ReddyAravindAru/SOEN6471-ICARE.git>

1 CHECK LIST FOR EVALUATION

Criteria	Questions/metrics	Importance	Review
Stakeholders	Are the stakeholders of the description defined and who are they.	5/6	Yes, stakeholders are defined clearly a number of additional stakeholders are added that could be out of scope of the project
Purpose	Is the purpose of the description defined in relation to the stakeholders?	5/6	The purpose of the project is defined within the stakeholders needs. However, no stakeholder description is provided.
Suitability for the stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the description provide the stakeholder with the desired knowledge? Does the description relate to problem? Is a practical reason for the information evident? 	2/3	"The description is clear overall. There are additional stakeholders mentioned that could be outside the intended proof of concept. Yes, there has been concerns added that brings questions from the stakeholder point of view."
Usage	Frequency of use, Number of users, Variety of users	5/5	"Description is used throughout the document. The description is intended for a large number of users. A variety of users with different backgrounds and functional areas will be users. There will be an understanding barrier of the description if not used properly. "
Scope and focus	Scope: Is it defined what part of reality will be described(e.g. only primary processes) Aspects: Is it defined what aspects will be described? The level of detail: Is it defined what level of detail	4/4	Primary processes and functions have been the focus. Suitable aspects and viewpoints selected and described. A high level of detail has been described in the documentation that answers many aspects in this literature.
Currency of EA description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the information reflect the current enterprise? Number and scope of architectural effects having projects carried out after the EA description have been produce 	3/3	Yes, it is very close to the current enterprise solutions and needs in the health sector. No changes have been made. The current literature is recent and updated

Criteria	Questions/metrics	Importance	Review
Currency of SA description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the information reflect the system? Have there been any changes in the system after the architecture description was produced? 	3/3	Yes, the information reflects the system to a great proximity. There have no changes produced after the architecture description was produced. Not applicable, since there has been no updates.
Correctness of Information	Verification of information: Is the information included in the description verified? Are there any incorrect arguments, or in-accurate or untrue reasoning?	3/3	In regards to the logical view, if the application will be hosted in the Cloud, not sure why there will be a FW and/or Load Balancer for deployment. It is not very clear what will be serviced by the Cloud hosting engine, and what will be intended for deployment. It is also mentioned that Amazon Web Services/MS Azure will be used.
Correctness of EA	"Substantive" errors/deficiencies after the EA description has been released.	4/4	There are no "substantive" errors/deficiencies in the literature document.
Correctness of SA	Correctness for stakeholders: Does the description present correctly the needs and concerns of stakeholders?	3/3	Yes, the description clearly explains the need and concerns of stakeholder. However there are additional stakeholders whose scope can't be justified w.r.t project. Yes the description is presented very well without ambiguity and it meets most but not all stake holders needs.
EA completeness	EA's coverage of business areas: The degree to which EA description addresses needs of each business area (e.g. subjective evaluation score 1-10)	2/2	Yes it has addressed all the business needs given
Sufficiency/Completeness	Completeness's coverage of required viewpoints: The degree to which description addresses each required architectural viewpoint (e.g. subjective evaluation score 1-10).	2/2	Yes it has addressed all the business needs given
Consistency	Description's coverage of required viewpoints: The degree to which description addresses each required architectural view-	3/3	Yes it has addressed all the business needs given

Criteria	Questions/metrics	Importance	Review
conformance to corporate standards	Does the presentation of the description conform to the corporate standards (if any) for such documents?.	3/3	The description follows the industrial standards of documentation.
Intuitiveness of the presentation	Does the description have an intuitive structure for the stakeholder?	3/4	The presentation is done in a way where it is easy to understand.
Definition of Notation and structure	Does the description have an intuitive structure for the stakeholder? What is this intuitive structure?	4/4	Glossary has been provided and everything is clearly explained regarding the notations
Clarity of vocabulary and standards	Are the terms and concepts used known by the stakeholder?	4/4	The vocabulary used is easy to understand and clarity is present in the concepts explained
Information complexity	Is there too much information included in the model?	3/4	The information provided is vague and there's some ambiguity.
Visual Complexity	Proximity: Are the related objects placed near to each other in a model?	4/4	Proximity: Yes the related entities are closed placed and connected. Closure: Yes similar objects are represented in same shapes like rectangles, oval shaped entities which is consistent through out the document which helps in readability. Similarity: Yes, actors are represented in the same way everywhere like wise modules, profiles, servers and the connections between entities. Common fate: All user functionality is clearly defined like wise to the other stake holders so it is clear that functionality is different from each other.
Maintenance of Documentation	Ownership, Maintenance practise, maintainability of documentation	7/10	The document can be easily updated but there is no format on revision or version dates specified. I feel with the inclusion of version formatting completes the document for better maintainability.
Cost effectiveness	Cost , Amount of Documentation	9/10	It takes very less time to update the views part or add models to the architecture as all the views and processes are clearly separated and easy to modify the parts.

Criteria	Questions/metrics	Importance	Review
Architectural frameworks and views	Architecture framework (for EA and for SA):	2/3	Yes, Examples have been provided but they don't encompass the whole/most relevant parts of the system
Tools support	Support for organisation's framework and viewpoints	5/6	Yes, the team has used git hub as there primary repository and for the purpose of communication google docs has been used

2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Criteria	Reviewers
Stakeholders, Purpose, Suitability for the stakeholders, Usage, Scope and focus	Zaid
Currency of EA description, Correctness of Information, Currency of SA description, Correctness of EA, Correctness of SA	Saikiran Alagatham
EA completeness, Sufficiency/completeness, Consistency, Conformance to corporate standards, Intuitiveness of the presentation	ManiDeep Chandana
Definition of the notation and structures, Clarity of the vocabulary and concepts, Information complexity, Visual complexity	DVSP Hemanth
Maintenance of documentation, Cost effectiveness, Architectural framework and views, Tools support	Aravind Reddy