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### About the EA Review

The EA Review is an architectural review focusing on identifying issues, ranking them and proposing actions to take and also describing consequences if no action is taken. The EA Review is looking at the situation at the time of the review. The purpose is to identify issues and propose actions forward. The identified issues and proposed actions must be seen in the context of the architectural status at the time of the review.

### Review Objectives

The review has been requested by Håkan Nilsson, Head Architect of SDU DVP. Reason for requesting this review is maintenance to be fully moved to ITS.

The review scope is RDM.

### Review Outcome

The issues are classified according to level of concern from HIGH to LOW.

See appendix for details.

# Issues

|  |
| --- |
| **HIGH** |

**Issue**

Non-standard components and technology used according to VIAP

(Nginx Webserver 1.6, Pivotal RabbitMQ Server 3.4,Redis Server, Coffe Script, Ruby)

**Proposed Action**

Rewrite the application using any of the Volvo reference architectures for Java or .NET with an evolutionary approach instead of big-bang.

**It’s strongly recommended to involve a Volvo internal architect/developer in this work.**

**Consequence if no Action taken**

Operational risks when components or code fails since the knowledge about the components and the coding language is limited to few people (2 at the moment).

The application can’t be maintained according to ARTS (Application Runtime IT Service) since it’s not compliant at all. This leads to extra cost since the maintenance team needs to provide all support for the components and coding language. This also makes it very hard to monitor the solution using standard monitoring components.

**Issue**

Non-compliant integration methods and technology

**Proposed Action**

Rewrite the application using any of the Volvo reference architectures for Java or .NET with compliant integration methods and technologies and an evolutionary approach instead of big-bang.

**It’s strongly recommended to involve a Volvo internal architect/developer in this work.**

**Consequence if no Action taken**

Operational risks when components or code fails since the knowledge about the components and the coding language is limited to few people (2 at the moment).

The application can’t be maintained according to ARTS (Application Runtime IT Service) since it’s not compliant at all. This leads to extra cost since the maint team need to have all support for the components and coding language.

**Issue**

Non-compliant solution development process

The process used does not comply with any of these principles as defined at Volvo:

* Agile / Lean-principles
* ADF - Application Development Framework
* Scrum /Kanban

**Proposed Action**

Provide education about ways of working according to the appointed Solution Development Processes at Volvo.

**It’s strongly recommended to involve a Volvo internal architect/developer in this work. It’s also recommended to use coaching from SITS DRS.**

**Consequence if no Action taken**

Continued risk for Service delivery disturbances due to people dependent setup

|  |
| --- |
| **MEDIUM** |

**Issue**

*xxx*

xxx

**Proposed Action**

xxx

**Consequence if no Action taken**

xxx

|  |
| --- |
| **LOW** |

**Issue**

*xxx*

xxx

**Proposed Action**

xxx

**Consequence if no Action taken**

xxx

# Appendix

# The three concern levels

### HIGH

* Issue of high impact on quality and/or total cost of ownership
* Issue is likely to/will negatively affect the solution
* Should be addressed immediately

### MEDIUM

* Issue of medium impact on quality and/or total cost of ownership
* May grow into high impact issue unless addressed
* Should be planned into the activities of the next phase

### LOW

* Issue of minor impact on quality and/or total cost of ownership
* Address when convenient