0:0:0.0 --> 0:0:1.330  
Speaker 1  
I'm uh.

0:0:1.340 --> 0:0:6.520  
Speaker 1  
I'm like, do you want to drive the the?

0:0:8.630 --> 0:0:10.140  
Speaker 1  
Interview or shall I?

0:0:11.530 --> 0:0:13.220  
Speaker 2  
Uh, you can do yours.

0:0:13.230 --> 0:0:17.750  
Speaker 2  
I OK, maybe now it's better that you can can start it then.

0:0:20.750 --> 0:0:22.420  
Speaker 1  
Yes, and.

0:0:26.370 --> 0:0:27.940  
Speaker 1  
OK, we should have.

0:0:34.960 --> 0:0:36.420  
Speaker 1  
Just light somewhere.

0:0:39.470 --> 0:0:40.70  
Speaker 1  
Umm.

0:0:45.380 --> 0:0:46.290  
Speaker 1  
Where did that go?

0:0:58.980 --> 0:1:1.930  
Speaker 1  
Yes, you're they are OK so.

0:1:4.370 --> 0:1:17.740  
Speaker 1  
Umm, so we let's say and that our previous a pre study meeting.

0:1:20.950 --> 0:1:34.120  
Speaker 1  
With this or we're with this discussion about the the process that brought us to identify some challenges and requirements for the UM continuous conformance.

0:1:37.910 --> 0:1:40.100  
Speaker 1  
Checking, let's say, and then.

0:1:45.870 --> 0:1:46.10  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

0:1:40.110 --> 0:1:46.90  
Speaker 1  
Uh, yeah, we say that basically based on can you see the right screen by the way and?

0:1:45.910 --> 0:1:49.500  
Speaker 3  
I see architecting with continuous compliance checking demo.

0:1:48.970 --> 0:1:49.680  
Speaker 1  
Yeah. OK.

0:1:49.870 --> 0:1:54.430  
Speaker 1  
Uh, because I I saw a strange uh, I I thought I was sharing the wrong screen.

0:1:55.370 --> 0:1:56.680  
Speaker 1  
Umm, so, uh.

0:1:56.690 --> 0:2:7.10  
Speaker 1  
Then what we did is that we developed this this tool and which embodies the uh definition of or.

0:2:7.180 --> 0:2:11.230  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, definition of continuous conformance along with the process that we envisioned.

0:2:11.240 --> 0:2:17.270  
Speaker 1  
So in this discussion, what we would like to do is to show you some possible usage of the tool.

0:2:17.960 --> 0:2:31.100  
Speaker 1  
And yeah, have your opinion whether or not this is something that meet the and it requirements and the challenge that we talk about in the previous meeting.

0:2:32.440 --> 0:2:33.610  
Speaker 1  
So in the first slide.

0:2:35.590 --> 0:2:38.920  
Speaker 1  
Or where in the first video you can see basically.

0:2:41.110 --> 0:2:45.0  
Speaker 1  
I will stop now and then to express so you even see the.

0:2:45.70 --> 0:2:48.60  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, the view of the, the the front end of the tool.

0:2:48.310 --> 0:3:4.240  
Speaker 1  
So the first thing you notice is that basically the user can select something from the from from the left, and this something can be an reference architectural style or whatever thing you already developed and have in your repository.

0:3:4.590 --> 0:3:12.50  
Speaker 1  
Once you select it, you will have the graphical representation of this tile in this, let's say view.

0:3:12.100 --> 0:3:29.750  
Speaker 1  
So in this selected reference architecture view and after that, yeah, what you can, uh, do is that, uh, you can start by you can start let's say defining your actual let's say software architecture.

0:3:30.630 --> 0:3:32.620  
Speaker 1  
Uh, and you do this?

0:3:32.710 --> 0:3:33.500  
Speaker 1  
Umm.

0:3:33.550 --> 0:3:41.300  
Speaker 1  
In a in a textual manner, uh, writing down this simple, let's say instruction in this view.

0:3:41.310 --> 0:3:43.180  
Speaker 1  
In this composer architecture view.

0:3:43.430 --> 0:3:58.200  
Speaker 1  
So here, as we discussed previously, what you do is it's simply like you specify the name of a component and then a mapping between this component of the software of the concrete architecture to the most to the more abstract one.

0:3:58.210 --> 0:3:58.880  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:3:59.150 --> 0:4:4.850  
Speaker 1  
And each time you do this and save you on top of everything this textual, let's say.

0:4:6.210 --> 0:4:7.300  
Speaker 1  
Representation.

0:4:7.310 --> 0:4:23.610  
Speaker 1  
You will have the graphical representation over a year updated, so here you can see that we introduced the component B1 and then this the component this yeah graphically depicted and uh, uh.

0:4:24.90 --> 0:4:27.170  
Speaker 1  
Of course the this is 1 possible view.

0:4:27.180 --> 0:4:29.10  
Speaker 1  
This is a component and connector view.

0:4:29.10 --> 0:4:32.430  
Speaker 1  
Or you can you can have different views of the architecture.

0:4:32.970 --> 0:5:9.30  
Speaker 1  
Uh, depending on your needs and in addition of specifying the, let's say the architecture based on the reference architecture or style, or a more general architecture, you can also add the farther let's say constraint and this constraint can be of basically any kind and these constraints are added in this view over here where we wrote validation script and then discussed training can be any kind of logical strain that you can apply on this.

0:5:9.70 --> 0:5:10.940  
Speaker 1  
Uh starting uh, let's say.

0:5:10.950 --> 0:5:18.790  
Speaker 1  
Uh model and this allows this provides on the one end provides an additional view over the.

0:5:18.800 --> 0:5:28.460  
Speaker 1  
Of course the architecture, but also provides a way of customizing and tailoring architecture to specific needs.

0:5:29.470 --> 0:5:40.110  
Speaker 1  
And yeah, as you can see, each time that you basically you save the your architecture along with the graphical representation in this.

0:5:41.70 --> 0:5:42.480  
Speaker 1  
Uh, you are very.

0:5:42.490 --> 0:6:1.100  
Speaker 1  
Are you also get the uh conformance view updated so you have that the the the function the distant function that measures the conformance of this let's say a specific architecture to the reference architecture is updated and is presented graphically.

0:6:1.530 --> 0:6:10.20  
Speaker 1  
So here you can see in this case, for reasons that we purposely introduce, introduce some violations which are captured and displayed to you.

0:6:10.760 --> 0:6:29.350  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, in the console via this messages, but also displayed graphically using this rather chart where you see that basically the red, the red, yeah, areas or areas, sorry represent clearly nonconformant nonconformant situation.

0:6:29.780 --> 0:6:37.700  
Speaker 1  
And more specifically, you can also see which components and connects or connectors are not not conformant.

0:6:38.0 --> 0:6:40.350  
Speaker 1  
Uh, in this case.

0:6:42.860 --> 0:6:59.150  
Speaker 1  
And uh, yeah, this is would be the first case and then what you do is that in this case, the problem was that we linked with specified our connector between B&C, which is not allowed from the reference architecture.

0:6:59.160 --> 0:7:11.730  
Speaker 1  
So by removing that connector or by fixing that connector, we got the green completely green, let's say diagram signifying that the architecture is conformant.

0:7:11.740 --> 0:7:16.910  
Speaker 1  
Basically, so this is the first uh, the first usage.

0:7:16.980 --> 0:7:28.360  
Speaker 1  
Uh that we, uh, I mean the basic, uh, let's say uhm usage that that we have and already here we can collect some feedback.

0:7:34.150 --> 0:7:34.350  
Speaker 3  
Yeah.

0:7:28.550 --> 0:7:37.190  
Speaker 1  
If you have umm don't but.

0:7:34.870 --> 0:7:40.230  
Speaker 3  
Uh, but is there anything in particular you would want some feedback on or?

0:7:39.770 --> 0:7:42.650  
Speaker 1  
No, and now basically what we wanted.

0:7:42.660 --> 0:7:50.940  
Speaker 1  
I mean, yes, there in particular, we wanted to to, to check with you whether we were in European Union, of course.

0:7:50.950 --> 0:8:7.850  
Speaker 1  
And given your experience, there are successful in addressing the requirements that we and and the challenge that we didn't defied in the in the in the, in the in, in the elicitation stage which maybe you don't remember by heart.

0:8:9.450 --> 0:8:10.820  
Speaker 3  
No, no, no, that's that's fine.

0:8:7.860 --> 0:8:11.550  
Speaker 1  
But I can I can. OK.

0:8:11.350 --> 0:8:17.520  
Speaker 3  
I mean I I think I have the same stance as I had last time that I think this is in general good.

0:8:17.940 --> 0:8:18.60  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:8:18.0 --> 0:8:22.380  
Speaker 3  
I like the implementation and the views you have shown and sort of how it flows together.

0:8:22.450 --> 0:8:23.940  
Speaker 3  
I think it looks quite.

0:8:24.530 --> 0:8:26.800  
Speaker 3  
I mean already at this stage it looks quite nice.

0:8:31.910 --> 0:8:32.90  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:8:26.950 --> 0:8:33.750  
Speaker 3  
I can definitely see the use and how it has some sort of thinking behind the usage for the actual individual requirements.

0:8:33.760 --> 0:8:51.980  
Speaker 3  
I I guess it would be nice to go through the one by one at some point for the evaluation, but my overall I guess feedback on this summary is that I think it's going in the right direction and I don't think there's any real deviations from my last feedback, which I generally I don't remember exactly, but I thought it was, you know, in general good.

0:8:52.750 --> 0:9:1.400  
Speaker 3  
But I also see that sort of the requirements, if I remember correctly that I was less interested in also seemed to me maybe not that focused in the presentation.

0:9:1.410 --> 0:9:6.250  
Speaker 3  
So I mean, of course that means that you focused on the things that I I liked, which is also good.

0:9:7.630 --> 0:9:11.570  
Speaker 3  
It's not sort of a good enough summary from my end, or do you want to discuss them?

0:9:15.890 --> 0:9:16.200  
Speaker 3  
Hmm.

0:9:11.250 --> 0:9:18.240  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, we we can also I can also we can show some other uh, that's the cases.

0:9:18.250 --> 0:9:23.480  
Speaker 1  
And then as you said, we can maybe, uh we.

0:9:23.540 --> 0:9:31.230  
Speaker 1  
Can maybe wrote back to the to the requirements and and have like more driven discussion.

0:9:31.540 --> 0:9:48.830  
Speaker 1  
So these other these other case I mean OK in general now we would like to to to discuss 2 cases that are let let's say important in in the context of continuous conformance or continuous architecting now.

0:10:8.940 --> 0:10:9.140  
Speaker 2  
Thank.

0:10:9.210 --> 0:10:9.890  
Speaker 1  
The in between.

0:10:11.420 --> 0:10:15.90  
Speaker 1  
Let's see reference architecture and the concrete architecture in.

0:10:15.100 --> 0:10:27.60  
Speaker 1  
In the general scenario where you have one architecture that is more, let's say abstract and one architecture that is more concrete and somehow related to to this other one. So.

0:10:27.710 --> 0:10:32.290  
Speaker 1  
Uh, the the the one of this.

0:10:32.300 --> 0:10:36.170  
Speaker 1  
The the first case that we would like to to discuss, of course, is this, yeah.

0:10:37.670 --> 0:10:45.180  
Speaker 1  
Case where you where we call the partial compliance or conformance checking which exactly what it means is that.

0:10:46.940 --> 0:10:58.700  
Speaker 1  
Suppose that you have a a starting uh uh reference architecture or more general architecture that you want to use to to to derive a more concrete architecture.

0:10:58.780 --> 0:11:5.80  
Speaker 1  
Then, because in different stages you may not be interested in the whole, let's say entire architecture.

0:11:5.90 --> 0:11:6.660  
Speaker 1  
Of course, in this case is trivial.

0:11:7.490 --> 0:11:22.970  
Speaker 1  
We will develop this, let's say approach in a way that if you don't specify, basically if you don't map they're element to the the element of the more concrete architecture to the elements of the more general architecture.

0:11:23.140 --> 0:11:26.790  
Speaker 1  
The conformance checking doesn't take this.

0:11:26.840 --> 0:11:34.400  
Speaker 1  
Let's say element into account, which means that you basically can realize a conformance check only on partial.

0:11:36.800 --> 0:11:48.680  
Speaker 1  
On on sets of the starting reference architecture, and this also means that uh yeah, uh in general and this is another case, you can have a more.

0:11:49.910 --> 0:11:51.240  
Speaker 1  
And let's say uh.

0:11:53.410 --> 0:11:55.170  
Speaker 1  
Uh, adjustable.

0:11:55.180 --> 0:12:2.450  
Speaker 1  
We can say approach where you can decide to restrict or or have a conformance check that is more restrictive.

0:12:3.50 --> 0:12:17.390  
Speaker 1  
And for some cases or in some stages of the development and this, the and this is in, in this case we exemplify this scenario by adding the farther valid.

0:12:17.530 --> 0:12:31.830  
Speaker 1  
Further, let's say constraints using the validation script view that we introduce in the first video where basically we had this this constrained to to have a conformance check more restrictive.

0:12:32.430 --> 0:12:43.290  
Speaker 1  
Uh, because maybe you are in the later stages of the development and you want to have a more again, more strict check rather than more.

0:12:46.30 --> 0:12:47.560  
Speaker 1  
General check and.

0:12:50.130 --> 0:12:53.780  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, this is also something that we we wanted to show and discuss.

0:12:53.790 --> 0:12:54.580  
Speaker 1  
Uh.

0:12:54.590 --> 0:13:32.140  
Speaker 1  
With respect this, let's say this uh, requirements and challenges of evolving architecture that we we discuss in the in the earlier interview and yeah again here the question would be do you think that I mean do you do you see rather like any possible misuse of this this concept or any scenarios where maybe the things that we yeah showed to you may not be and applicable or effective in a way yeah.

0:13:33.120 --> 0:13:55.470  
Speaker 3  
No, I think what you just showed is really interesting and probably one of the, let's say highlights I would say about will like this in my context because I I really think that this kind of approach to this partial and restrictive thing you have shown is really I think a necessity for me to use it in my context because in the end I'm working on out with that.

0:13:55.480 --> 0:14:0.730  
Speaker 3  
They I'm automations maybe it's the right word of different, let's say architectural standards.

0:14:0.740 --> 0:14:22.150  
Speaker 3  
Let's say you're references and particularly, I am working in the intersection of a lot of different domain architectures, and in that case I think this could be a nice way to solve some of that issue that you say that all but this architecture is looking at two different, let's say stakeholder concerns somehow and maybe then we could have a bit less formal architecture.

0:14:22.160 --> 0:14:24.920  
Speaker 3  
That's still you can check if it complies to this reference.

0:14:24.930 --> 0:14:32.660  
Speaker 3  
I think that would be a very powerful way, particularly maybe as a first draft or something like a, you know, an interface architecture or something like this.

0:14:33.570 --> 0:14:37.520  
Speaker 3  
So to me I I think that this is the opposite of what you you're concerned about.

0:14:37.530 --> 0:14:44.580  
Speaker 3  
I think this is really powerful and and really a a good thing and also that you can allow some.

0:14:44.630 --> 0:14:47.860  
Speaker 3  
Let's say you know, but you know this part over here.

0:14:47.870 --> 0:14:48.230  
Speaker 3  
I don't.

0:14:53.970 --> 0:14:54.170  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:14:48.240 --> 0:14:56.540  
Speaker 3  
I know already it will not be compliant, but it's not important because it's over here that I'm interested at this stage to this particular reference.

0:14:56.550 --> 0:14:59.650  
Speaker 3  
So I think it's it's, it's good.

0:15:0.10 --> 0:15:0.730  
Speaker 3  
I like it.

0:15:0.740 --> 0:15:2.220  
Speaker 3  
I think this is a a good thing.

0:15:3.90 --> 0:15:3.740  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:15:3.750 --> 0:15:17.640  
Speaker 1  
And uh, so regarding the the the requirements I because we let's say we we refine a little bit the requirements with respect I mean based on the on the discussion that we had of course.

0:15:17.650 --> 0:15:24.440  
Speaker 1  
So I will show you directly here the basically it's it's faster and so we can discuss a little bit.

0:15:24.450 --> 0:15:43.0  
Speaker 1  
So now also what we did is that first I mean we and we started with some general we called challenges now so that we we found out being like a not addressed yet from current literature.

0:15:43.490 --> 0:16:3.700  
Speaker 1  
So and one this did the first, which lack of formalization of conformance, which in turns would let's say enable our process that could support the conformance between evolving architecture as we discussed and process that could be, uh, automated clearly.

0:16:4.810 --> 0:16:9.630  
Speaker 1  
And we'd also this notion of, let's say, different strictness.

0:16:9.640 --> 0:16:10.530  
Speaker 1  
Uh.

0:16:10.570 --> 0:16:14.550  
Speaker 1  
Of of the yeah, of the of of the conformance check.

0:16:14.850 --> 0:16:53.830  
Speaker 1  
So in general those are, let's say, the challenges that we also try to address, not primarily with the tool, but without overall process that the we can also see here describe a little bit in this figure that in general, but we already did, we already did talk about this in general you have an architecture that can evolve over time, uh, so you have different evolution of this architecture, different version but also uh that can conform to other more abstract architecture as you as you move in the in the development process.

0:16:54.0 --> 0:17:4.430  
Speaker 1  
So in general you can have this notion of conformance between different abstraction and let's say notion of evolution between, yeah, different.

0:17:4.680 --> 0:17:15.350  
Speaker 1  
And in general, we see that you have this come the continuous conformance can basically UM, the peak, uh, this process?

0:17:16.20 --> 0:17:17.640  
Speaker 1  
Uhm, quite?

0:17:17.680 --> 0:17:18.390  
Speaker 1  
Uh.

0:17:18.400 --> 0:17:31.770  
Speaker 1  
Quite effectively, and of course, then we developed the this tool based that we also show that embodies this process and also uh try to address the requirements that we discussed already.

0:17:32.150 --> 0:17:43.790  
Speaker 1  
And so we actually removed some of the requirement that as you said, were not relevant or were deemed less relevant from you and other of course practitioner.

0:17:44.100 --> 0:17:45.990  
Speaker 1  
So you have different.

0:17:46.380 --> 0:17:56.380  
Speaker 1  
I mean, you have a smaller set of requirement and I think that some of these are we already discussed because the first basically three requirements.

0:17:56.700 --> 0:18:14.690  
Speaker 1  
So the fact that we have we enable conformance checking in a for evolving architecture and automatic way is of course let's say we already discussed and then we have this other requirements that are related to the nonblocking measure.

0:18:14.700 --> 0:18:16.430  
Speaker 1  
So you don't stop the process.

0:18:16.940 --> 0:18:41.120  
Speaker 1  
The knowledge base in the sense that we one thing that we didn't discuss, but we entered in a way is that yeah, as we said, the possibility here once you develop umm let's say architecture or styles or whatever to save what you develop in this repository that will become available to the community in general now.

0:18:41.130 --> 0:18:44.480  
Speaker 1  
So uh and uh. What else?

0:18:44.490 --> 0:18:44.820  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:18:44.830 --> 0:18:45.260  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:18:45.270 --> 0:19:12.430  
Speaker 1  
And the multi view and the possibility of extending the tool with different views which now in this case we presented this two different views, 1 textual and one graphical, let's say component that net or plus umm in a way this this textual constraints that allows for specification of further design decision.

0:19:12.440 --> 0:19:17.750  
Speaker 1  
But in general here we could add whatever view we like.

0:19:17.920 --> 0:19:29.90  
Speaker 1  
For instance, I remember that in your case you spoke about hardware and at the need for hardware view or coupling between order and and and and software.

0:19:29.100 --> 0:19:52.520  
Speaker 1  
Which of course is also something that is is is possible of course so and yeah, so the last basically uh com and maybe uh for you is uh like now that you see all these requirements, uh if we again missed anything or you would like to comment further.

0:19:54.430 --> 0:20:4.670  
Speaker 3  
Uh, yeah, I I agree with you that I think that especially when you taking into consideration the challenges that they look a lot more compact than complete in some sense.

0:20:4.680 --> 0:20:15.40  
Speaker 3  
I really like the challenges you showed earlier because those are, I mean I I can resonate with all of them when I when I work, these are sort of typical things I encounter when when working with architecture.

0:20:15.830 --> 0:20:18.440  
Speaker 3  
So I think those are very, very nice in a sense.

0:20:18.450 --> 0:20:21.690  
Speaker 3  
And and I I think it's good that you formulate them as you do.

0:20:23.300 --> 0:20:27.490  
Speaker 3  
Uh, I, of course don't work that strictly with conformance, let's say.

0:20:27.570 --> 0:20:27.730  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:20:27.500 --> 0:20:29.270  
Speaker 3  
But, but that's not a term we use.

0:20:29.340 --> 0:20:30.450  
Speaker 3  
I don't know if it is.

0:20:30.520 --> 0:20:37.880  
Speaker 3  
You know, I work with similar things, but I understand what you mean and I think it makes a lot of sense for the requirements themselves.

0:20:37.890 --> 0:20:41.270  
Speaker 3  
I agree with you that sort of the I remember I had a few requirements.

0:20:41.280 --> 0:20:51.340  
Speaker 3  
I didn't see why the sort of need for and most of them seem to be missing, so I guess that maybe had the similar feedback from other people that sort of this this type of requirements you saw. For example.

0:20:51.350 --> 0:20:53.830  
Speaker 3  
I don't see this web saying or the real time thing.

0:21:0.250 --> 0:21:0.600  
Speaker 2  
OK.

0:21:0.140 --> 0:21:0.910  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, exactly.

0:20:53.840 --> 0:21:2.890  
Speaker 3  
I guess maybe those things sort of fell off because yeah, to me the, the those weren't, let's say, as important as the rest and the requirements sort of I see.

0:21:2.900 --> 0:21:6.660  
Speaker 3  
Now I I like the way they're formulated and when I read them.

0:21:6.670 --> 0:21:9.940  
Speaker 3  
Now when you went briefly through them, I think they make a lot of sense.

0:21:10.430 --> 0:21:13.540  
Speaker 3  
I'm sure there will be more case specific requirements.

0:21:13.550 --> 0:21:22.500  
Speaker 3  
For example, in my case, like you mentioned, the hardware and software, but as a general, let's say view, I think this makes a lot of, you know, I think they're quite complete.

0:21:22.510 --> 0:21:25.830  
Speaker 3  
I think I can apply them for all of the context I work with and they should.

0:21:25.840 --> 0:21:29.540  
Speaker 3  
You know, in general capture, let's say the need for a tool like this.

0:21:29.610 --> 0:21:33.420  
Speaker 3  
So in general, I don't think I have any major points.

0:21:34.440 --> 0:21:38.620  
Speaker 3  
I I think that overall it's it's really capturing what I would see as the need.

0:21:39.770 --> 0:21:44.20  
Speaker 3  
This is why I don't think there's anything really missing or something we should take away.

0:21:50.720 --> 0:21:50.900  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:21:44.990 --> 0:21:55.520  
Speaker 3  
I guess that if I wanted to highlight it because Scroll down a bit so I can see the last one also umm because I remember you told me this last time.

0:21:55.530 --> 0:22:8.570  
Speaker 3  
If I would give sort of a highlight to a few of them, I think that in my case, if I would say let's say what are the most important at this stage, it's definitely the 7th is one of them and then six.

0:22:8.580 --> 0:22:22.10  
Speaker 3  
I also think that having some like you say knowledge base or way of capturing sort of this knowledge, so that again I think they feed into each other seven or six, but you need a way to store maybe different knowledge so that you can use them in different views.

0:22:22.20 --> 0:22:23.270  
Speaker 3  
I think that's quite logical.

0:22:23.530 --> 0:22:23.670  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:22:24.200 --> 0:22:35.710  
Speaker 3  
And then apart from that, I think that the first, let's say four are a bit more, you know, functional in a sense that without them, I don't think you can have the tool which you know of course they are there.

0:22:36.250 --> 0:22:43.290  
Speaker 3  
But for me, really the last three are sort of I think a very good addition to these functional ones to really make it applicable.

0:22:43.300 --> 0:22:46.500  
Speaker 3  
In my case, you know really this non blocking thing.

0:22:46.510 --> 0:22:49.380  
Speaker 3  
I know it's very important in my case as well.

0:22:49.500 --> 0:23:0.730  
Speaker 3  
For example, I I'm working mostly and trying to introduce formal notations, the and really introducing this formal notations is quite difficult, so it's good to have them as an opt in instead of.

0:23:0.740 --> 0:23:7.690  
Speaker 3  
Really, you must now use this, otherwise you don't have that option and I'm guessing you might have the same sort of experience, but with this with this technology.

0:23:8.260 --> 0:23:8.460  
Speaker 1  
Yeah.

0:23:9.980 --> 0:23:10.290  
Speaker 3  
So.

0:23:10.300 --> 0:23:21.660  
Speaker 3  
So I really think if you divide them into the first four and last three, I think it's a really good sort of mix of, let's say the the the essential ones and then the ones that really capture your let's say, adaption of the solution.

0:23:22.700 --> 0:23:27.270  
Speaker 3  
Since I don't have any issues, they negatives and I think all seven of those are really critical.

0:23:27.360 --> 0:23:30.910  
Speaker 3  
But if I would pick one, let's say it would probably be the last one.

0:23:31.180 --> 0:23:31.560  
Speaker 1  
OK.

0:23:31.300 --> 0:23:32.720  
Speaker 3  
I think that's most important for me.

0:23:32.330 --> 0:23:33.880  
Speaker 1  
Yeah, the most to you.

0:23:35.910 --> 0:23:36.190  
Speaker 2  
OK.

0:23:34.550 --> 0:23:37.160  
Speaker 1  
OK, I don't know.

0:23:37.170 --> 0:23:37.700  
Speaker 1  
I'm loading.

0:23:38.490 --> 0:23:40.600  
Speaker 2  
No, no, no, daughter.

0:23:37.710 --> 0:23:40.660  
Speaker 1  
If you want to add there anything otherwise I think.

0:23:40.760 --> 0:23:42.940  
Speaker 1  
And yeah, free your time.

0:23:46.470 --> 0:23:46.630  
Speaker 3  
Yeah.