Report from Dagstuhl Seminar 11013

Seminar Sample

Edited by

John Q. Open[1] and Joan R. Access[2]

1 Dummy University Computing Laboratory, Dummy Country
`open@dummyuni.org`
2 Department of Informatics, Dummy College Address, Country
`access@dummycollege.org`

Abstract

This report documents the program and the outcomes of Dagstuhl Seminar 11013 "Seminar Sample". For a real abstract, one should write a little bit more here.

1 Executive Summary

John Q. Open (Dummy University Computing Laboratory, DC, open@dummyuni.org)
Joan R. Access (Department of Informatics, Dummy College Address, DC, access@dummycollege.org)

This summary summarizes the outcomes of our seminar. The seminar focused on
- important issues,
- relevant problems, and
- adequate solutions.

As a major result from the seminar, the following problems have been identified:
1. The problem of writing a brief, but concise executive summary.
2. The problem of collecting all abstracts from talks.
3. The problem of preparing summaries from working groups, open problem sessions, and panel discussions.

2   Table of Contents

3 Overview of Talks

3.1 A sample talk

John Doe (Somewhere University – Somewhere City, DC, john@doe.org)

Providing a documentation for a Dagstuhl Seminar is mandatory. We focus on talk abstracts and show that a talk abstract can be tagged with co-authors appearing in the joint-work-of-field. Furthermore, a talk abstract can state one main reference on which the talk is based.

Details are given in [1] and [2].

References

1 Schloss Dagstuhl – Editorial Office,*The dagrep-v2018 class.* Schloss Dagstuhl, Germany, 2011.
2 John Q. Open; Joan R. Access, *Seminar Sample*, Dagstuhl Reports, 1:1, 1–8, 2011.

4 Working Groups

4.1 Working Group on Preparing an issue for Dagstuhl Reports

John Q. Open (Dummy University Computing Laboratory, DC, open@dummyuni.org)
Jane Doe (Somewhere University – Somewhere City, DC, jane@doe.org)

This working group focused on how to prepare an working group summary for an issue of Dagstuhl Reports.

4.1.1 Discussed Problems

- The authorship problem: Who was involved in the working group and who should act as author for this summary.
- Further problems.

4.1.2 Possible Approaches

For the authorship problem we found that naming all people involved in the working group is adequate.

4.1.3 Conclusions

The authorship problem occurs frequently, but it can be solved pragmatically.

5   Open Problems

5.1   A very open problem

Joan R. Access (Dummy Affilliation, DC, access@dummycollege.org)
Jane Doe (Somewhere University – Somewhere City, DC, jane@doe.org)

There may be some open problems with preparing an issue for Dagstuhl Reports. One possible solution is to contact Dagstuhl's editorial office at `reports@dagstuhl.de`. Details are given in [1] and [2].

References
1   Schloss Dagstuhl – Editorial Office,*The dagrep-v2018 class.* Schloss Dagstuhl, Germany, 2011.
2   John Q. Open; Joan R. Access, *Seminar Sample*, Dagstuhl Reports, 1:1, 1–8, 2011.

6   Panel Discussions

6.1   Panel Discussion on "LaTeX Environments for Dagstuhl Reports"

6.1.1   Panelists

- Joan R. Access (Dummy Affilliation, DC)
- Jane Doe (Somewhere University, DC)
- John Q. Open (Dummy University Computing Laboratory, DC)

6.1.2   Statements

6.1.2.1   Joan R. Access

This is the statement of Joan R. Access.

6.1.2.2   Jane Doe

And this is the statement of Jane Doe.

6.1.2.3   John Q. Open

John Q. Open – believe it or not – also gave a statement.

6.1.3   Discussion

The statements have been heavily discussed. Next time, John Doe should join the panelists.

◼ Participants

- Joan R. Access
Dummy Affilliation, DC
- Jane Doe
Somewhere University, DC
- John Doe
Somewhere University, DC
- John Q. Open
Dummy University Computing
Laboratory, DC