



EuSEC Author Meeting

Stockholm, Sweden
May 23, 2010

Meeting Objectives

1. Understand state of SEBoK 0.25 (including case studies) and GRCSE 0.25 – strengths and weaknesses
2. Decide on mid-course decisions and adjustments necessary for a successful BKCASE Workshop III on July 7-8 in Chicago
3. Draft “gate” criteria for release of SEBoK 0.25

Because meeting is only 4 hours long (+1 hour for lunch) and because attendance is limited, these are ambitious objectives.

Meeting Rules

1. Entirely in plenary session
2. Everyone has a voice
3. Record decisions and major points in real-time on slides that all can see
4. Strive for consensus on all substantive matters
5. Expect courtesy and professional behavior at all times
6. Record minutes and publish them after this meeting

Proposed Game Plan for SEBoK

1. Core team will accept additional input from authors through Sunday, June 20 – no late submissions accepted; authors should focus primarily on improving content, not on addressing inconsistencies across chapters
2. Core team will spend Monday, June 21 through Thursday, July 1 creating a clean draft of version 0.25 – editing will eliminate redundancy, improve consistency, readability, clean up references, etc. *Editing will be substantial.*
3. On Friday, July 2, Core Team will email draft Version 0.25 to all authors. Email will also describe state of the draft in the opinion of the Core Team.
4. Workshop III will finalize release criteria, review draft with respect to those criteria, and decide what remains to be done to satisfy release criteria

More Proposed Game Plan for SEBoK

5. Authors will revise chapters to satisfy release criteria per assignments made at Workshop III.
6. Tech editor will improve document for readability and consistency.
7. Core Team will do one more edit of document.
8. Core Team will email Version 0.25 to reviewers sometime between August 31 and September 15 for 90 day review period
9. Workshop IV in October will discuss strengths and shortfalls of Version 0.25 and develop approach to Version 0.5

Positives about Current State of SEBoK V0.25

1. Authors have become incredibly engaged.
2. Lots and lots of great material submitted for discussion today.
3. Expertise of the author team is apparent.
4. We have the majority of the material needed for Version 0.25 – but in rough form

Discussion Points for Today

1. Lots of overlap across chapters (totally expected)
2. Some authors have included substantial history of their KAs, others have not
3. # of references and heavy reliance on the same references or own references
4. Prescriptive vs. descriptive information
5. Heavily government/contractor-oriented at many points
6. Should we have a summary description of each reference
7. Many inconsistencies in terminology and probably in concepts
8. Degree of specificity in examples; e.g., reference to EADS
9. Structure of knowledge not visually represented (trees)
10. Inclusion of figures from outside sources

1. Off to a great start using GSwE2009 as the template
2. Author team going through section by section and updating material appropriately for SE rather than software engineering
3. Some question among authors about scope. Should we include bachelor degree guidance?
 - ANSWER: No. Bachelor degrees are out of scope.

Topics

1. Overview of BKCASE – SEBoK and GRCSE – Art and Dave
2. GRCSE more in-depth walk through including report from survey of universities – Alice and Dave
3. Principles of SE - Rick
4. Concepts of systems and systems thinking – Bud and/or Alice
5. Specialty engineering – Cihan
6. Organization – Hillary and possibly Barry
7. Organizing technical knowledge – Jean Claude/Snoderly
8. Workforce development/Competency – Brian Wells
9. Relationship with PM and SwE – Art and Barry – perhaps Ricardo
10. BKCASE informing the emerging SE research agenda - Dave
 - All panels except 1, which is just presentations + normal Q/A

Release Criteria

1. All authors have signed copyright transfer
2. All figures we have right to use or right to use is in process
3. Intro, Systems, and SE chapters are reasonably mature
4. Chapter organization/topics is reasonably mature, “obvious” material is included, and statement of maturity of other areas is included
5. OK to have a relatively blank chapter for up to 2 chapters
6. Core Team happy with technical editing and readability
7. Most-critical overlaps in material are fixed; major overlaps not yet fixed are identified
8. Most-critical inconsistencies are fixed; major inconsistencies not yet fixed are identified
9. Most-critical gaps are noted and characterized
10. Assuming authors agree we have a reasonable draft in Chicago, then Core Team has authority to release version 0.25 based on their best judgment