



Minutes of Paper Trial Court

On ArchEvol: Versioning Architectural-Implementation Relation

22nd of May 2007

Version: 1.1
Date: 24 May 2007
Participant : Elefelious Belay
Johan Piet
Jorge Lopez

Version history

Date	Version	Description
22-05-2007	1.0	Initial version
23-05-2007	1.1	Updated some texts

General information

Date: 22nd of May 2007
Time: 10:00
Location: S203
Duration: 25 minutes
Subject: Discussion on ArchEvol: Versioning Architectural-
Implementation Relationship
Present: Jorge Lopez Present the Paper
Elefelious G. Defend the paper
Johan Piet Attack the paper
SCM Students
SCM Lecturers

Absent: -

Writer: Elefelious Getachew, Johan Piet

Discussed Points

These are the main points raised against and on favor of the paper:

Against

- It proposed solution seems only useful for very simple architectures. If the architecture is too fine grained the SVN map will explode. Branches and tags per component will take a lot of space and the paper does not mention anything about this.

On favor

- The intention of the paper is just to introduce the explicit approach to versioning in terms of architecture implementation relationship. Even though the paper shows how the SVN handles components, and by doing so provides a means of storing them, it is not the key issue.

Against

- There is not enough separation between the tasks of the architect and developer in their view. They expect one person to be responsible for both the architecture and the development. This is most of the time of course not the case. They even mention having both ArchStudio and Eclipse running at the same time.

On favor

- No, we don't need to mix the tasks. In the paper it is mentioned that the architecture and the individual component can be developed in parallel and the common information between the two can be synchronized at certain points in time. So we don't need to run the Archstudio and Eclipse at the same time. If both Environments brought up together then the synchronization will be completed.

Against

- So that mean if they didn't brought up together there will be a possibility of inconsistency but the paper doesn't mention that extensively.

On favor

- Of course, the paper mentioned there will be inconsistency but this issue left open for research.

Conclusion

- After the debate, both the parties agree, in this area it needs extensive research to answer some of the question that pop up.
- SCM students and Lectures Vote against and on favor the paper. And two persons vote against the paper and the rest vote goes on favor of the paper.