

# Creativity and Innovation in Requirements Engineering

Luc Boillat, Jan von der Assen

# Introduction

- ▶ What is creativity?
- ▶ How does it fit into requirements elicitation?

# Current state in research and practice

- ▶ Traditional techniques
- ▶ Problem analysis
- ▶ i\*, KAOS and RUP
- ▶ Innovation management

# Background

- ▶ Creative process
- ▶ Future
- ▶ Innovation in the long term
- ▶ “Invention is part of the design process”

# Background

- ▶ Restriction of design to the design phase.
- ▶ Knowledge of individuals.
- ▶ Requirements are an abstraction of ideas.

# Background

- ▶ To conclude: **Creative requirements engineering techniques and idea gathering are important for the innovation of a product, project or company. The biggest issues are lack of available methods, awareness and risk-aversity.**

# RESCUE

## Background

- ▶ Creativity theory
- ▶ Concurrent engineering process with different modelling and analysis techniques
- ▶ System goal and use-case modelling

# RESCUE

## Principles

- ▶ Based on creativity workshops to support three different models from creativity theory
1. Divergence and convergence
  2. Exploratory, combinatorial and transformational
  3. Preparation, Incubation, Illumination and Verification.



# RESCUE

## Experience

- ▶ Six iterations
- ▶ 200 ideas
- ▶ Refinements
- ▶ Use-cases
- ▶ Brain storming, Constraint identification and removal
- ▶ Analogical mappings
- ▶ Visualization

# RESCUE

## Experience

### Findings:

- ▶ First iteration
- ▶ 200 ideas by 20 people
- ▶ Learnings and improvements
- ▶ Existing creativity theories are not sufficient

# RESCUE

## Experience

### Findings:

- ▶ Last iteration
- ▶ Brainstorming vs analogical reasoning
- ▶ Combining ideas during storyboard development
- ▶ Removing constraints
- ▶ Timing
- ▶ One-day workshops

# Star Search

## Background

- ▶ Today, short-term income often seems more important than long-term success
- ▶ This leads to incoming requirements concentrate around current projects
- ▶ However, it is necessary to look forward (especially in software companies) to achieve long-term success

# Star Search

## Idea

- ▶ Companies use their employees' capability for innovation because the development organization must have a deeper domain-understanding than a customer that usually uses a company's products in a single domain.
- ▶ Making innovation a part of day-to-day business
- ▶ More effective than traditional "Idea Generation"

# Star Search

## Requirements for such a System

- ▶ Focus on long-term Requirements
- ▶ Inputs from entire organization (devs, sales, etc.)
- ▶ Cost effective
- ▶ Produces quality material that managements can base their decisions on

# Star Search

## Process (4 Steps)

1. Call for Innovation
2. Audition (Value Case)
3. Preparation (Business Case)
4. Decision (Business Case)

# Star Search

## Step 1: Call for Innovation

- ▶ Made by Audition Group (AG) chair
- ▶ Can be directed towards a certain product line or process
- ▶ Make form and information available to all people
- ▶ People/Groups with ideas sign up



# Star Search

## Step 2: Audition

- ▶ Informal setting with AG
- ▶ Flexible presentation/discussion style
- ▶ Important to give feedback to contender
- ▶ If case is dismissed, give reasons and publish case with reasoning
- ▶ Create Value Case (light version of a business case)

# Star Search

## Step 3: Case Preparation and Screening

- ▶ AG passes value cases from auditions to the Case Preparation Group (CPG)
- ▶ CPG focuses on further refining the case into a in-depth business case
- ▶ Contender my be consulted
- ▶ Consult with experts to assess feasibility and long-term impact
- ▶ Should a case be dismissed at this stage, the same “rules” apply as in the Audition Step

# Star Search

## Step 4: Case Decision

- ▶ CPG passes business cases to the company's Case Decision Group (CDG)
- ▶ CDG already exists in all software development companies
- ▶ Bring Star Search cases into requirements selection and prioritization in addition to regular business cases

# Star Search

## Results and Conclusions

- ▶ Authors ran Star Search for 1 year at different organizations
- ▶ Generally positive results
- ▶ Face-to-face meetings are favored by employees, compared to static/passive techniques of innovation
- ▶ Fast feedback and immediate discussion of ideas considered more important than thorough evaluation

## Company 1

- ▶ 25% increase in innovation candidates on roadmap
- ▶ 25% of items in development-pipeline are from Star Search cases

## Company 2

- ▶ 1 innovation candidate per 10 employees
- ▶ 5% of all innovation candidates make it to market

## Comparison and Conclusion of the two Processes

# Comparison of RESCUE and Star Search

## When

- ▶ RESCUE is performed after the project's scope and goals have been defined
- ▶ The ideas are supposed to occur during the workshops
- ▶
- ▶ Star Search can be applied to already existing products and processes, as well as products that are still in their planning phase (long-term focus)
- ▶ Ideas occur during day-to-day work and are presented when a call for innovation was made

# Comparison of RESCUE and Star Search

## How

- ▶ RESCUE is based on workshops where the initial goal is to find as much ideas possible due to the techniques used that encourage open mindedness
- ▶
- ▶ Star Search is centered around interaction and feedback between the employee(s) that submit ideas and the employees that screen ideas (AG, CPG, CDG)
- ▶ This enables a filtering of ideas during the process

# Comparison of RESCUE and Star Search

## Inputs and Outputs

- ▶ RESCUE starts with a rough use case
- ▶ Produces an operation specification sheet for the project
- ▶
- ▶ Star Search starts with a call for innovation in a certain field
- ▶ Successful ideas get transformed into a business case for future requirements



# Questions