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# Evaluation Strategy

Given the goal of this phase is to select a specific server technology that we will propose to use as a project backend, we opted to take an RFP-like approach, which we believe is a well‑known paradigm that anyone can easily relate to, thus providing clear grounds for the understanding of our decision making process.

First, we will try to list the most critical internal and external factors to evaluate, regarding each selected technology provider. Internal factors being essentially those related to the provider’s technology and external factors being those related to the business and financial environment where the provider moves.

Along with the above, we shall narrow the choices by defining some architecture aspects that we believe make sense, given both our understanding of the technology trends and other aspects we find relevant for the project development, namely, aspects that will save us time in the development, that contributes to a robust, performant and scalable application architecture and that have a costs curve in line with future business growth.

With this approach in mind, we will build a weighted criteria list, against which we will score all short-listed candidates and from there we shall pick our winner.

# Evaluation Criteria

“Mobile back end as a service has become a critical component of enterprise mobility. Mobile strategists and architects can choose from products that offer a variety of required mobile app services, including data hosting, integration and orchestration, location, and identity and access management”

(Richard Marshall, 2015, p. 1)

Clearly, what we need to have as a backend is the functionality that it is normally provided by the mBaaS. We can achieve this either by selecting directly an mBaaS to provide the service, or by selecting discrete parts of infrastructures and services and assemble our own infrastructure and make the required developments to provide the mBaaS functionality we need.

* In respect to suppliers:
  + We shall only short-list specific technologies linked to the core business of the respective supplier.
  + We shall short-list only technologies from suppliers with a solid track record and a large installed base of Clients of relevant Clients whose operation is largely dependent on those technologies.
  + We would prefer Cloud based solutions to minimize the setup, management and specific skills (ex. security) required to have a production solution deployed in the Internet.
* In respect to the technology:
  + Mandatory:
    - Data hosting, SQL or NoSQL (JSON);
    - Identity and access management, namely “OAuth 2.0” - integration with Facebook, Google and Twitter login;
    - REST API;
    - Low entry cost footprint;
  + Valuable:
    - Cloud based;
    - Location based services;
    - A comprehensive management console;
    - SDK for Android, IOs, and JavaScript;
    - Push notifications;
    - Free-tier services;

# Selection Short-List

Recently, we have all been caught by surprise by the unexpected Facebook decision to shut down “Parse” – a clear possible choice for our backend.

1. Amazon – AWS Mobile Services; <<https://aws.amazon.com/mobile/>>
2. Appcelerator - Appcelerator
3. Apache – BaasBox
4. built.io – built.io
5. Google – Firebase
6. Microsoft – Microsoft Azure Mobile Services
7. Oracle – Oracle Mobile Cloud Service
8. Red Hat – FeedHenry
9. StrongLoop – StrongLoop
10. MongoLab

# Comparison Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Requirement | Weigth | AWS | Appcelerator | BaasBox | built.io | Firebase | Azure | Oracle | FeedHenry | StrongLoop |
| Offer is part of core business | M | Y | Y | N | Y | N | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Service maturity (> 5 yrs) | M | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Customer base size | M | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevant mobile Apps using it | M | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DB Backend (SQL/NoSQL) | M | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IAM | M | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REST API | M | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entry Level Costs | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Free-tier | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Run code in the Cloud | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GeoLocation services | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management console | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SDKs | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Push notifications/sync services | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cloud/Hosted/OnPermises/Mix | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## AWS

IAM: AWS Cognito

DB Backend (NoSQL): AWS DynamoDb

Data storage: AWS Cognito + AWS S3

Code in the Cloud: AWS Lambda

Push notifications: AWS SNS

Geo Locations: Geo library
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# Technology Selection

This document includes the following annexes:

* Annex 1:
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