

Workshops and Doctoral Symposium at RE'13: The Results

Presentation Session of New Ideas for Researchers and Practitioners Who Weren't There

Oliver Creighton
Corporate Technology
Siemens AG
Munich, Germany
re13@creighton.de

Marcos Borges
Department of Computer Science
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
mborges@dcc.ufrj.br

Abstract—This paper describes the workshops held in conjunction with RE'13 and its corresponding presentation of results during the main conference. This paper presents the contents, structure, and format of the “Results” event: A slide show is followed by a poster session. This paper concludes with a complete list of all colocated workshops and their descriptions.

The audience members of this session can expect a highly dynamic, interactive discussion of what went on during the workshops. All the interesting, new, controversial, and pioneering ideas of these exciting preceding events can be absorbed in a memorable, enjoyable and fun way.

Index Terms — Workshop organization, Conference Interaction, Feedback from Participants, RE artifacts

I. INTRODUCTION

A series of workshops is held in conjunction with RE'13 to facilitate the creation and exchange of ideas between academia, industry, and government participants. Workshops shall provide a setting for presenting challenges to researchers and practitioners of requirements engineering as well as working together with experts in the field to overcome those challenges.

In an effort to increase the interaction between the main RE conference and its colocated workshops, we decided to organize a presentation session by organizers and participants of the workshops as well as the doctoral symposium.

The main goal of this presentation is to transfer the new ideas that were developed during the workshops or doctoral symposium to researchers and practitioners who were not able to participate in any of these preceding events.

In order to avoid a boring sequence of all too abstract summary presentations, the session is organized around a few new artifacts in a new format, a highly dynamic session:

- **First**, representatives from all workshops and the doctoral symposium will be given a chance to highlight new ideas and challenging research questions using *slides*.
- **Second**, and planned as the largest block, a discussion between presenters and audience will be facilitated around the given presentations and the prepared *posters*.
- **Third**, an awards ceremony for Best Workshop Poster and Best Doctoral Poster will be the crowning finale for “The Results event”.

In the following sections, we describe the detailed plan for the Results event and the employed RE artifacts. At the end, in section V, basic information and descriptions for all the colocated workshops at RE'13 is provided for completeness.

II. FEEDBACK FROM THE PARTICIPANTS

During and immediately after the workshops, all participants will be asked to provide their feedback to the workshop organizers. A selection of key statements from this feedback will also be included in the slide and poster presentation. Typical feedback questions that may be asked are:

1. Keep (what worked well) / Change (what to do differently)
 - Research Topic (presentation, research approach/area)
 - Interactive Sessions (flow, material, effectiveness)
 - Future of the Workshop Series (topics, format, schedule)
2. Most brilliant idea
3. Highest innovation potential
4. Boldest statement of opinion (direct quote, if possible)
5. Most controversial thought

The collected feedback will be integrated as appropriate in the new RE artifacts, either the slides, the posters, or both!

III. SLIDE PRESENTATION

All representatives will give a strictly time-limited slide show presentation. Each slide will be shown for roughly 20 seconds. The projector will automatically advance the slide show and also ensure that speaker hand-over is achieved within this restricted timeframe.

The slide presentation will be fashioned to show the current and next speaker at all times. This way, speakers will get a count-down for when they are up to speak. The audience can also see who is currently talking, so speakers can go straight to their points instead of spending time introducing themselves. Figure 1 illustrates how such a presentation would be prepared in the case of just three speakers who contributed three slides each.

Current Speaker: ALICE Slide 1 Next Speaker (in 3): BOB	Current Speaker: ALICE Slide 2 Next Speaker (in 2): BOB	Current Speaker: ALICE Slide 3 Next Speaker (in 1): BOB
Current Speaker: BOB Slide 4 Next Speaker (in 3): EVE	Current Speaker: BOB Slide 5 Next Speaker (in 2): EVE	Current Speaker: BOB Slide 6 Next Speaker (in 1): EVE
Current Speaker: EVE Slide 7 Next Speaker (in 3): ...	Current Speaker: EVE Slide 8 Next Speaker (in 2): ...	Current Speaker: EVE Slide 9 Next Speaker (in 1): ...

Fig. 1. Slide presentation set-up prepared for fast speaker switches

Due to the time limitation, the contents of the slides will have to be concise, illustrative, and to the point. The main ideas need to be represented in a memorable way; details shall be deferred to the poster presentation that immediately follows the slide presentation.

The exact number of representatives and consequently the number of slides per presenter is not predetermined: The invitation to present individual views on the presented workshops or to present a collective view by all participants can be decided during the workshop. The session moderator will ensure a fair distribution of time for all workshops and that at least one representative per workshop will participate.

IV. POSTER PRESENTATION

Workshop organizers and doctoral students are invited to prepare a poster in advance, ideally during the workshop itself, together with all the workshop participants. The workshop posters, a newly devised RE artifact for RE'13, will be on public display before the Results event starts. That way, presenters can point out highlights during their talk and invite the audience to come visit them at their poster during or maybe even after the event.

The posters will be set up so that a larger group of audience members can gather in front of each poster. This will be used as a "voting with their feet" mechanism: First, the session moderator asks one question about what the audience thinks about the individual workshops, for example:

1. Which workshop would you like to attend at RE'14?
2. Which workshop was likely to have had
 - the most discussion?
 - the most visionary ideas?
 - the strongest industry participation?
 - the most cultural diversity?
3. Which poster is most attractive?
4. Which slides did you find most informative?

The audience members shall then gather in front of the poster of the workshop that they choose. When everybody has found their place, the moderator asks a few random individuals about the reasons for their choice to better understand and discuss the voting results.

When all the relevant points have been collected, the moderator proceeds to ask the next question. This continues for as long as time permits.

V. WORKSHOP DESCRIPTIONS

In this section, you can find the basic information and descriptions for all workshops that were colocated with RE'13. They include a more detailed discussion of the anticipated outcomes of the workshop (e.g., open research problems to pursue, validation objectives, empirical studies, etc.).

This year, we particularly focused on workshops that:

- have a strong appeal to RE practitioners
- establish and sustain an active community around the workshop theme
- deliver tangible results (presentable during the main conference)
- facilitate working together with experts in the field

To achieve this, the responsibilities of the Workshop Selection Committee included:

- giving high quality feedback on workshop proposals (what is good and bad about a suggested workshop?)
- suggesting fun ways to make the workshops innovative, result-oriented, and interactive
- inviting people to submit workshop proposals and/or submitting one yourself;^)
- shaping and promoting the workshop program of RE'13 (e.g. merging two workshops with similar themes)

A. MoDRE

1) **Title:** *3rd International Model-Driven Requirements Engineering Workshop*

2) **Organizers:** *Gunter Mussbacher, Pablo Sanchez, Joao Araujo, Ana Moreira and Nelly Bencomo*

3) **URL:** *<http://cserg0.site.uottawa.ca/modre2013/>*

The 3rd International Model-Driven Requirements Engineering (MoDRE) workshop continues to provide a forum to discuss the challenges of Model-Driven Development (MDD) for Requirements Engineering (RE). Building on the success of MDD for design and implementation, RE may benefit from MDD techniques when properly balancing flexibility for capturing varied user needs with formal rigidity required for model transformations as well as high-level abstraction with information richness. Reuse of requirements models becomes a distinct possibility with MDD and model transformations. Furthermore, requirements models may be used at runtime to govern system execution. This workshop intends to identify new challenges, discuss on-going work and potential solutions, analyze the strengths and weaknesses of

MDD approaches for RE, foster stimulating discussions on the topic, and provide opportunities to apply MDD approaches for RE. In this new edition of the workshop, we want to emphasize the topics requirements reuse and requirements at runtime.

B. RE4SuSy

1) **Title:** *Requirements Engineering for Sustainable Systems*

2) **Organizers:** Birgit Penzenstadler, Martin Mahaux and Camille Salinesi

3) **URL:** <http://www4.in.tum.de/~penzenst/re4susy/2013/>

Research has started investigating the support of sustainability within systems and software engineering. Yet there are few workshops that explore the topic, and there is only one so far in requirements engineering: RE4SuSy. The 1st International Workshop on Requirements Engineering for Sustainable Systems (RE4SuSy) was held at REFSQ in 2012. In 2013 we will hold the second edition at RE 2013.

We plan an interactive workshop that engages with authors well before the deadlines and that produces new results already during the workshop and will promote them throughout the conference. This is also the take-off point for new collaborations between participants.

C. EmpiRE (incl. GRRIP)

1) **Main Title:** *Workshop on Empirical Requirements Engineering*

2) **Organizers:** Maya Daneva, Tayana Conte, Sabrina Marczak, Alessandro Marchetto and Oscar Pastor

3) **URL:** <http://salab.fbk.eu/empire2013>

Requirements Engineering (RE) has become a well-established discipline where a wide range of approaches, techniques and tools have been proposed. Systematic attempts to evaluate and compare usefulness, effectiveness and usability of such proposals resulted in a growing attention to methods for empirical assessment. Empirical Software Engineering (ESE) aims at applying the empirical research methodologies to the software engineering field. In other terms, it aims at studying and proposing qualitative and quantitative methods to collect and analyze evidence that helps evaluating software engineering approaches, techniques and tools. Experiments, surveys, case studies, action research studies, hence, become indispensable and valuable ways to check ideas and proposals with respect to the reality, thus allowing to understand their actual value, cost and benefits in particular contexts. The objective of the Workshop on Empirical Requirements Engineering (EmpiRE) is to increase the cross-fertilization of ESE methods and RE by actively encouraging the exchange of ideas to understand why and how the empirical methods from ESE can help to assess and improve existing or new approaches in RE. The targeted outcomes of this workshop include the identification of open research problems and the possible solutions to these problems regarding:

(i) which aspects and properties of RE approaches can be evaluated;

(ii) what factors, criteria, and metrics are appropriate;

(iii) what experiments can be conducted;

(iv) how experiments can be replicated;

(v) what is the role of the user.

Originally planned as an individual workshop, the GRRIP paper contribution will be integrated into an industry research session of the EmpiRE program.

4) **Session Title:** *Gaps between Requirements Research and Industrial Practices*

5) **Session Organizers:** Smita Ghaisas, Walid Maalej, Klaas Sikkels and R. Venkatesh

6) **URL:** <https://sites.google.com/site/grripworkshop/>

GRRIP'13 focuses on analysing reasons for the gap that exists between requirements engineering research and application of these research findings to industrial problems. The analysis will result in identify new topics in requirements engineering that need to be researched, revisit the current research topics to understand the extent of their reach into the practitioners' community and where required give it a new direction, examine barriers to adopt research contributions and evolve approaches that would improve the applicability of research to real-world problems. Furthermore, the workshop will provide a dedicated interactive exchange platform for the two communities to continue to increase the rate of adoption of research outputs by the industry. GRIPP'13 is different from the Industrial Papers track in that it emphasizes an explicit study of and comparison between research and practice; unlike industry track papers that focus on sharing experiences in applying certain concepts or ideas in an industrial setting.

D. RePa (incl. REPOS)

1) **Main Title:** *The Third International Workshop on Requirements Patterns*

2) **Organizers:** Lawrence Chung, Lin Liu, James Naish, Barbara Paech, Sam Supakkul, and Liping Zhao

3) **URL:** <http://www.utdallas.edu/~supakkul/repal3>

Getting requirements right is oftentimes challenging and in need of a large amount of knowledge and experience. "Patterns" have been used to capture knowledge of software engineering, concerning software architectures, component designs and programs, and more recently requirements engineering. This workshop provides an open forum for researchers and practitioners to exchange ideas and experience, regarding pattern-based approaches to capturing, organizing, and reusing of all requirements engineering knowledge.

Originally planned as an individual workshop, REPOS will be organized as a special session within the RePa workshop.

4) **Session Title:** *Requirements Engineering Practices On Software Product Line Engineering and Reuse*

5) **Session Organizers:** Emilio Insfran, Gary Chastek, Patrick Donohoe and John McGregor

6) **URL:** <http://www.dsic.upv.es/workshops/repos2013/>

Many attempts have been made to increase the productivity and quality of software products based on software reuse. A well-established approach for reuse is the Software Product Line practice, which focuses on developing a family of products which have a majority of features in common. In this context, Requirements Engineering (RE) processes and

techniques are used to identify and characterize product line requirements and potential member products based upon their commonality and variability.

The focus of this edition of the workshop will be on current requirements reuse practices for developing complex software systems including, but not restricted to, software product lines. Some issues of particular importance when dealing with requirements reuse are the level of detail for requirements and the mechanisms used for variability and traceability. These issues will have a direct impact on the techniques to be used, the evolution to be supported, the analysis of impact for changes, etc. In addition, when to evaluate the quality of the requirements and how to operate a cost-effective and value-driven process for these activities are also open issues in the software development community.

The aim of the workshop is to bring together professionals from academia and industry to exchange ideas, experiences, identify current obstacles and introduce new concepts in the area of requirements engineering for reuse.

E. CMA@RE

1) **Title:** *3rd International Comparing *Requirements* Modeling Approaches Workshop*

2) **Organizers:** *Gunter Mussbacher, Geri Georg and Ana Moreira*

3) **URL:** *<http://cserg0.site.uottawa.ca/cma2013re/>*

The 3rd International Comparing *Requirements* Modeling Approaches (CMA@RE) workshop builds on the results of the first two CMA workshops and the two recent Bellairs workshops. The Bellairs workshops produced the bCMS case study based on the Crisis Management System case study and a collection of criteria to compare modeling approaches from different paradigms (e.g., aspect-oriented, object-oriented, service-oriented, feature-oriented). The CMA'11 workshop produced assessments against these criteria for six different modeling approaches and the CMA'12 workshop increased this number to 19 assessments. While the first two editions of CMA were held at the MODELS conference, the 2013 edition is held at the RE conference for the first time. Hence, it focuses on (i) increasing the number of represented modeling approaches for requirements engineering, (ii) further improving the existing comparison criteria, and (iii) reflecting on the existing assessments of modeling approaches. We aim to bring together researchers and practitioners of different modeling approaches and use the existing and new assessments to propose and evaluate end-to-end methodologies.

F. TwinPeaks

1) **Title:** *Third International Workshop on the Twin Peaks of Requirements and Architecture*

2) **Organizers:** *Janet Burge, Jane Cleland-Huang, Xavier Franch, Matthias Galster, Mehdi Mirakhorli, Roshanak Roshandel and Carla Silva*

3) **URL:** *<http://re.cs.depaul.edu/twinpeaks/RE13/>*

This workshop is motivated by the thesis that requirements engineering (RE) and software architecture (SA) design are

two highly related disciplines that significantly impact each other (cf. the Twin Peaks model). Requirements are constrained by what is technically feasible and also by time and budget restrictions. On the other hand, feedback from the software architects leads to renegotiating architecturally significant requirements with stakeholders. This workshop aims at exploring the state of the art in research and practice, identifying key issues and emerging trends, and defining challenges related to the transition and the relationship between RE and SA.

G. RELAW

1) **Title:** *Sixth International Workshop on Requirements Engineering and Law*

2) **Organizers:** *Daniel Amyot, Annie Antón, Travis Breaux, Aaron Massey and Peter Swire*

3) **URL:** *<http://gaius.isri.cmu.edu/relaw/2013/>*

The objective of the RELAW workshop is to foster the discussion related to requirements engineering triggered by any legal regulation or law. The theme this year is "Keeping Compliance on Track". This open workshop will bring together practitioners and researchers from auditing, accounting, law, software and requirements engineering. The goals of this workshop include, but are not limited to:

- Developing methods for monitoring regulatory compliance requirements;
- Identifying and managing sources of uncertainty in legal compliance;
- Standardizing vocabulary, terms and modeling concepts from multiple disciplines;
- Refining objectives and identifying unsolved industry and research problems; and
- Finding agreement on validation objectives for proposed solutions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to the Workshop Selection Committee for IEEE RE'13, who really took a mentor's perspective, and without whose hard work the organization of the workshops would not have been possible:

A big thank you to Thomas Alspaugh, Daniel Amyot, Mikio Aoyama, Joao Araujo, Luciano Baresi, Bernd Bruegge, David Callele, José H. Canós, Jane Cleland-Huang, Samuel Fricker, Karol Fruehauf, Jochen Kaepfel, Martin Mahaux, Paulo Masiero, Ana Moreira, Nan Niu, Sergio Ochoa, Anitha PC, Naveen Prakash, Camille Salinesi, Kurt Schneider, Florian Schneider, Bjoern Uhrig, Alexandre Vasconcelos, and Thorsten Weyer!

Oliver Creighton would like to personally thank his employer, Corporate Technology of Siemens AG, without whose continuing support for both, the topic of Requirements Engineering as well as his engagement in the academic community, he could not have contributed anything to RE'13.