ATAM Document

1 Introduction

Our group: A10
Names:

1. Sindre Haaland
2. Marius Ekerholt
3. Ole Jørgen Seeland
4. Lars Smørås Høysæter
5. Olav Lende

Timekeeper: Lars
Process observer: Marius
Process enforcer: Olav
Questioner: Sindre
Secretary: Sindre
Evaluation leader: Ole Jørgen

Who is evaluated: Group A11

1. Martin Ellefsrød
2. Muhsin Günaydin
3. Sondre Mannsverk
4. Henrik Knutsen
5. Jaspreet Singh

A11 focus:

- Modifiability
- Usability (secondary)

Group number, names, who is evaluated, what is the focus of the evaluated groups project (attribute).

2 Attribute utility tree

Like in the book with prioritizing (importance and difficulty). For instance a table looking something like this:

Attribute	Scenario	Priority	Details
Modifiability	Add power-ups	(L)	8 hours for simple power-ups
Modifiability	Add maps	(M)	15 hours medium sized map
Usability	Undo wall placement	(H)	1 hour
Usability	Alter number of players	(M)	20 hours
Usability	Choosing maps at start	(L)	4 hours
Usability	End game	(H)	1 hour

3 Analysis of architectural approach

Analysis of the relevant scenarios. Use a table like this one (from the template):

Scenario #: 3	Scenario: Undo wall placement			
Attribute(s): Usability Stimulus: Miss-click or altering tactic Response/response measure: 1 hour				
Architectural Decisions	Sensitivity	Tradeoff	Risk	Non-risk
MVC Android patterns	S1, S2 S3	T1	R1, R2 R3	 N1
Reasoning: Because easy to misplace the wall because of the small screen				
Architectural diagram: We feel this is self explanatory				

Scenario #: 6	Scenario: End game			
Attribute(s): Usability Stimulus: Wanting to end the game Response/response measure: 1 hour				
Architectural Decisions	Sensitivity	Tradeoff	Risk	Non-risk
MVC Android patterns State stack	S1, S2 S3	T1 T2	R1, R2 R3 R4	 N1
Reasoning: Because easy to misplace the wall because of the small screen				
Architectural diagram: We feel this is self explanatory				

4 Sensitivity points

A simple table showing the different sensitivity points.

S1	MVC affects modifiability positively
S2	MVC affects the performance negatively.
S3	Android patterns gives the best performance on the android platform.

5 Tradeoff points

A simple table showing the different tradeoff points.

T1	MVC offers cleaner code but performance is worse.
T2	SS gives faster response time but less performance because of multiple active states

6 Risks and Non-risks

A table listing the risks and non-risks:

R1	This tactic may cause the user to remove a wall unwillingly
R2	This tactic can cause problems in communication between the modules
N1	Compatibility
R3	This tactic is a lot harder then Sheep or other half-fabricate patterns.
R4	Hard to implement with android patterns

7 Own Experiences from using ATAM

We felt that the time could be used differently and that ATAM was not that useful in our example. We think it would be more beneficial in a larger scale project where we know the technology. Since this is our first Android application we do not know the technology well enough to give good comments.

We tried to follow the process. We feel that the steps are necessary. It is good for analysing scenarios but does not give a complete overview of the architecture.

8 Problems and Issues

We do not have a good enough understanding of what non-risks, risks and sensitivity points affect each architectural decision.

We also have no experience with ATAMS and felt the consequences of this. Though it will be a lot easier next time thanks to this!

9 Change log

05.03.2012	Document created