BeSSt Working Group Goals

- **Motivation**
  - ❖ Requirements define and scope our systems. Latent defects in requirements are the most expensive to fix.
    - They therefore represent our greatest cost savings opportunities.
  - ❖ Requirements engineering practices remain relatively stagnant.
  - ❖ What we teach in school about requirements is rarely reflected in practice.

- **Can we do better than "shall statements" in requirements engineering?**

Working Group Format

- **Sample Topics for Discussion**
  - How can we move **beyond English-language sentences** to capture requirements?
  - How can we **harmonize our approaches** to requirements engineering with modern techniques for architecture, implementation, and testing?
  - Should we continue to **separate requirements engineering** from design, or try to integrate them more closely?
  - Should we adopt **agile or fluid methodologies**, where requirements evolve along with the system, rather than being developed all-at-once up front? What are the implications for development and contracting models?
  - How should we **train the next generation** of engineers?
  - How many requirements is **too many, or too few**?

BeSSt Invited Presenters/Panelists

- Professor Richard N. Taylor, UC Irvine
  - Classical requirements engineering practice has failed to deliver. A way forward exists, based upon software architecture.
- Bal An-Ani, UC Irvine
  - Current requirements engineering approaches are inherently hubris: they do not take into account the target users' context and environment.
- John Farley, Lockheed-Martin
  - Why do we focus only on the "easy" requirements?
- Jorge Seidel, Aerospace Corporation
  - Why do we use fixed, document-based requirements in a world of hyper-exponential change?

BeSSt Invited Presenters/Panelists

- Andrea Richards, Raytheon
  - Why do we lack a strong feedback loop from test and verification back to requirements development for the next generation of systems?
- Dale Robinson, Raytheon
  - The number of requirements should be as few as possible: this allows for a wider trade space.
- Emil White, Lockheed-Martin
  - Why do we continue to develop requirements without regard for how they will be verified, when this causes trouble for us all the time?