1. Question set name: Reviewing choice of framework and viewpoints				
2. Purpose: Use this question set to assess the choice of viewpoints, frameworks, and associated modeling practices to be used in the AD for their suitability for capturing stakeholders' concerns				
3. Stakeholders and concerns: Architects, who specify and then use the frameworks, viewpoints, and modeling practices. Stakeholders who can confirm or refute that the chosen viewpoints and modeling approaches are able to frame their concerns adequately				
4. Questions	4a. Respondents	4b. Real answers (D1 - Team 13)	4b. Real answers (D2 - Team 8)	4c. Critically
1. Do the selected viewpoints and their prescribed models, languages, techniques, evaluation criteria, correspondence rules, and so on, frame the concerns of the stakeholders?	2 developers, 2 analysts and one SPM	No views were available	Yes	Questions are most critical that address areas of high risk: • architectural viewpoints have not been selected •architectural viewpoints not well-defined •stakeholder concerns that cannot be captured using the representational resources of the selected viewpoints • viewpoints that are not achievable due to resource or tool constraints
2. Is the framework consistent with the developing organization's required practices and mandated standards?		The framework was not completed	Yes	
3. Is the framework consistent with the client's required practices and mandated standards?		^	Yes	
4. Does the project have the necessary resources (tools, technologies,		Yes	Yes	

methods, and skilled people) to plan and carry out the creation of the AD according to the framework ?				
5. Is every viewpoint required by the chosen framework(s) included in the AD?		No	Yes	
6. Are the concerns that are covered by the framework well-aligned with the concerns of the stakeholders?		No as no views made yet	Yes	
7. Does the framework include concerns that are not concerns of your stakeholders?		No	No	
8. Do the viewpoints frame the stakeholder concerns?		Not yet	Yes	
9. For each viewpoint, are its models clear and well-defined? Do the models provide enough information for determining whether the		No	Yes	

concerns framed by the viewpoint have been satisfied?				
10. For each model, are there appropriate tools, notations, experience /training, documentation, and techniques in place within the architecture team for applying the model?		No	Yes	
11. What correspondences exist between models in the same viewpoint or across different viewpoints?		No correspondence as none to compare in AD	Yes they did correspond	
12. Are all concerns addressed either by one or more models or by one or more correspondences among models?		No	Yes	
13. Is there a smaller set of viewpoints, models, and correspondences that would also cover all of the stakeholder		Not possible to determine at this point	No there is not a smaller set	

concerns? 14. Is it feasible that the views drawing upon these models, viewpoints, and framework(s), can be constructed with the available tools, techniques, and people, within the time and funding available? 15. Is there rationale captured for the choice of framework, viewpoints, models, and correspondences 16. State your stakeholder role. List the set of concerns you have that pertain to the ar-chitecture whose AD is being reviewed 17. Record all concerns you have that are not listed as being covered in either the AD or any framework being used or that are listed in an unclear fashion.		Yes No Yes Developer: want module and C&C views Analyst wants: module, C&C views and allocation views	Yes Yes Need all the viewpoints - Yes Complete the view mapping	

For each, state the impact of this omission or misunderstanding on project success	All Stakeholders	No views, modules are made yet		
18. State how you know that the architecture satisfies the concerns of the missing stakeholders and where this information can be found in the AD		No	Yes - all views are present	
19. Can you determine which units require development (and integration and test) resources?		No	Yes	
20. Can you determine development dependencies between implementation units?		No	Yes	
21. Does the AD identify opportunities for parallel development? Can you identify units that can be implemented in parallel?		No	Yes - working on database and triage system, notification system and user interface	
22. Is there a mapping between decisions and	Software Manager	No	Yes	

requirements?				
23. Is there a process or method for establishing and maintaining traceability from business goals, requirements, and decisions?		No	No - see contributions on wiki	
24. Do the customers/ acquirers have the right information to understand the key decision and how that decision meets the system requirements and constrains the design and implementation of the system?	Acquirer's and analysts	No	Yes - seen under each of the views	

5. Advice: Experience with SEI ATAM-based evaluation exercises, SEI Quality Attribute Workshops (QAWs), and other assessments suggests that looking at stakeholders, concerns, and viewpoints provides a high return on investment (ROI). When performed early, a framework review focuses the architectural work; and when done later, it helps bring misguided/off-track efforts back on-track by focusing effort on the most critical concerns and viewpoints/models.
   A framework review can be undertaken before the AD and its views are completed, or even begun, to determine how useful selected viewpoints and modeling resources are in framing stakeholders' concerns. Because constructing and modeling views can be time consuming and expensive, it is practical to ascertain that you have the right questions, before spending significant resources answering them.

   A framework review may be a good antidote to organizations that have a one-size-fits-all ("we always use these six viewpoints!") approach to architecture documentation to detect mismatches between the models the architect is expending effort on and the prevailing architectural concerns for the system.

   It is also very helpful to capture (a priori) the evaluation criteria for models, viewpoints, or frameworks. Again that's a good thing to know before you spend a lot of time working with a representation. Architecture products captured in PowerPoint may be effective as communications vehicles but are not

very analyze

Notes:

-