ASSE Final Report

Our group (Fabio, Valentin, Phil, Atilla, Fabian) first met at event storming in the first week. It turned out that our group consisted of a diverse set of individuals, including a self-employed software engineer, one software engineer, two individuals with a business informatics background, and one individual with an economics background. This diversity in backgrounds and experience levels was both a challenge and a benefit for our group project.

One of the biggest challenges we faced was ensuring that everyone was able to contribute to the project and learn from one another, despite our varying levels of experience with programming. To address this, we split the workload according to our individual strengths and interests. Some of us focused more on tasks such as testing with JMeter or writing the documentations and ADRs, while others concentrated more on the coding aspects of the project. We also engaged in pair programming, which allowed us to help each other learn and improve our skills. For example, we made pair programming for the Cherrybot with W3C WoT Thing Descriptions and for parts of the executor-pool as well as the auction house. Through pair programming, we were able to share our knowledge and learn from one another, resulting in a better final product.

Then the plugfest was here, which was one of the highlights of this course. With pizza and beer, we developed our application and tried to connect with the other groups. In the beginning, all groups had difficulties, but slowly the first bids on the tasks came in. Our group had problems with the reception of the tasks, because our JSON representation was not quite correct. After redeploying, we were the first group to be able to bid on a task and then execute it on our end. This made us proud of course and it was a successful evening with delicious pizza.

In conclusion, our group's diverse backgrounds and experience levels presented both challenges and opportunities for learning and growth. Through collaboration and pair programming, we were able to overcome these challenges and produce a successful project. The learning curve for all of us was steep, and we enjoyed the experience of working on the project together.

In the following table, we list which people from the group have completed which tasks after exercise 5. As we have already handed in a table with the task distribution in exercise 5.

Fabio	- Refactoring tests, general improvements over break - Event-based Interaction with MQTT - Semantic Hypermedia Overlays (discussion with other groups) - The Constrained Web of Things - Constrained Devices with W3C WoT Thing Descriptions
Valentin	- Auction House integration (pair programming) and general improvements - Event-based Interaction with W3C WebSub - W3C WebSub vs. MQTT documentation - Semantic Hypermedia Overlays (discussion with other groups) - Hypermedia-based Discovery of Auction Houses - Collaborative Robots with W3C WoT Thing Descriptions (pair programming)
Phil	- Auction House integration (pair programming) - W3C WebSub vs. MQTT documentation - Semantic Hypermedia Overlays (discussion with other groups) - Collaborative Robots with W3C WoT Thing Descriptions (pair programming) - -Team reflection
Atilla	- Uniform Interaction with HTTP (meeting with other groups) - Semantic Hypermedia Overlays (discussion with other groups) - Collaborative Robots with W3C WoT Thing Descriptions (pair programming) - Final presentation
Fabian	- Semantic Hypermedia Overlays (discussion with other groups) - Decentralization documentation - Collaborative Robots with W3C WoT Thing Descriptions (pair programming) - Group Reflections Exercise 10 documentation - Switch and VM Admin

ADRs and architectural characteristics

We discussed our architecture decisions as a team and documented them in ADRs all team members were involved in this process.