

The power of dark silicon

Daniel Paredes

FH Dortmund,

Abstract. Sit amet mauris. Curabitur a quam. Aliquam neque. Nam nunc nunc, lacinia sed, varius quis, iaculis eget, ante. Nulla dictum justo eu lacus. Phasellus sit amet quam. Nullam sodales. Cras non magna eu est consectetur faucibus. Donec tempor lobortis turpis. Sed tellus velit, ullamcorper ac, fringilla vitae, sodales nec, purus. Morbi aliquet risus in mi.

Keywords: hope, luke, ewoks

1 Introduction

I need an introduction. . .

2 Using Argumentation to Explain Ambiguity in Requirements Elicitation Interviews

One of the major causes of ambiguities in elicitation interviews is the prescence of tacit knowlegde. In some cases ambiguities can't be always be explained as separated term, sometimes it is required to have a context. Even under these circunstances, the analyst must be able to identify and alleviate them in order to elicitate relevant information of the system. For this purpose it is necessary to provide the analyst with proper tools. In this paper Yehia Elrakaiby et al. [1] proposed a theorical framework to overcome ambiguity during interviews in the elicitation phase. The framework is based on the "Argumentation theory".

In that sense, Elrakaiby et al. focus on one type of ambiguities, the "acceptance unclarity". An acceptance unclarity occurs everytime the analyst is able to assign an interpretation or meaning to the speech fragment of the stakeholder, the interpretation matches the intended meaning of the stakeholder, but the interpretation is not acceptable or justified. It could be either because it seems to be inaccurate to comprehend the problem, or analysts identify inconsistencies with their current understanding of the problem or domain knowlegde. By using argumentation theory framework, statements and ambiguities can be characterized as "arguments" and "attacks" respectevly.

Argumentation theory models a type of human dialog based on arguments and conclusions. It makes explicit attacks between arguments and the argumentation flow that leads to conclusions. A basic model in this framework is a pair (A, D) , where A is a set of arguments and D is a set of attacks among those arguments. For example, a set A is defined as $A = \{A1, A2, A3\}$, and a possible set of attacks could be $D = \{(A1, A3)\}$. Which means that if A1 is realizable then A3 can't be realizable.

In the paper, Elrakaiby et al. models statements given by the stakeholders, analysts domain knowlegde and analysts inferences as arguments, and ambiguities between them as attacks. For example, let say the analyst listens the following statement *the professor will upload the task description within three days* (A1), but the analyst know (domain knowlegde) that *the professor may be on a business meeting* (A2), so the analyst think (inference) that *it may be possible that it will be take longer to upload the task description* (A3). In this scenario the set of attacks D is given by $D = \{(A1, A3)\}$. Thus, since there is an attack it is possible to ask for clarifications or details.

The theoretical framework proposed by Elrakaiby et al. allows analysts to detect and minimize ambiguities during elicitation interviews, while most of the methods that focus on ambiguities analyze written texts. On the other hand, this framework focuses in more complex ambiguities that cannot be view as single terms.

2.1 Conclusion

- oral communication (they think it is more important than written texts)

3 Final Words

Nec, sodales vitae, vehicula eget, ipsum. Sed nec tortor. Aenean malesuada. Nunc convallis, massa eu vestibulum commodo, quam mauris interdum arcu, at pellentesque diam metus ut nulla. Vestibulum eu dolor sit amet lacus varius fermentum. Morbi dolor enim, pulvinar eget, lobortis ac, fringilla ac, turpis. Duis ac erat. Etiam consequat. Integer sed est eu elit pellentesque dapibus. Duis venenatis magna feugiat nisi. Vestibulum et turpis. Maecenas a enim. Suspendisse ultricies ornare justo. Fusce sit amet nisi sed arcu condimentum venenatis. Vivamus dui. Nunc accumsan, quam a fermentum mattis, magna sapien iaculis pede, at porttitor quam odio at est.

4 What i ll focus

- Explain acceptance unclarity

- Explain Dung's framework
- Explain ASPIC+
- Inconsistencies
- It's highly influenced by the domain knowledge of the analyst

4.1 My idea

- knowledge domain has influence
- analyst domain knowledge is statistically relevant
- analyst training is even more relevant
- influence of tacit knowledge in interviews
- ambiguity in interviews - focus on interviewer must have domain knowledge
- what i want to do is : possible benefits in requirement elicitation is using two techniques based on the domain knowledge of the analyst, sometimes it is good to have an expert and an ignorant of a topic .
- limitations of the technique based on domain knowledge and tacit knowledge.
- how types of tacit knowledge may influence in the proposal theory
- how domain knowledge may influence in the proposal theory
- As an intro:
 - analyst domain knowledge is statistically relevant
 - analyst training is even more relevant
- focus on the technique from the perspective of knowledge and technique
- future of that technique to solve more complex problems, from the perspective of knowledge and technique

References

- [1] Y. Elrakaiby, A. Ferrari, P. Spoletini, S. Gnesi, and B. Nuseibeh, “Using argumentation to explain ambiguity in requirements elicitation interviews,” in *Requirements engineering conference (re), 2017 ieee 25th international*, 2017, pp. 51–60.