

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/65528/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Nieva de la Hidalga, Abraham , Hardisty, Alex and Jones, Andrew 2016. SCRAM-CK: applying a collaborative requirements engineering process for designing a web based e-science toolkit. *Requirements Engineering* 21 , pp. 107-129. 10.1007/s00766-014-0212-0

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00766-014-0212-0>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



# Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/66019/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Nieva De Hidalgo, Abraham, Hardisty, Alex and Jones, Andrew Clifford SCRAM-CK: applying a collaborative requirements engineering process for designing a web based e-science toolkit. Requirements Engineering 10.1007/s00766-014-0212-0 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00766-014-0212-0> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00766-014-0212-0>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



# Requirements Engineering

## SCRAM-CK: A collaborative requirements engineering process for designing a web based e-science toolkit

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	REJ507R2
<b>Full Title:</b>	SCRAM-CK: A collaborative requirements engineering process for designing a web based e-science toolkit
<b>Article Type:</b>	Original Research
<b>Keywords:</b>	requirements elicitation; requirements capture; user centered requirements engineering; Requirements evolution; collaborative design; design evolution; CK Theory; SCRAM
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Abraham Nieva de la Hidalga, PhD Cardiff University Cardiff, South Glamorgan UNITED KINGDOM
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	Cardiff University
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Abraham Nieva de la Hidalga, PhD
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Abraham Nieva de la Hidalga, PhD Alex R Hardisty Andrew C Jones, Dr
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	

# **SCRAM-CK: A collaborative requirements engineering process for designing a web based e-science toolkit**

Abraham Nieva de la Hidalga

Research Associate; School of Computer Science & Informatics, Cardiff University, Queen's Buildings, 5 The Parade, Roath, Cardiff, CF24 3AA, Wales, UK; Tel. +44(0)2920 870 321  
a.nieva@cs.cardiff.ac.uk

Alex Hardisty

Director of Informatics Projects; School of Computer Science and Informatics, Cardiff University, Queen's Buildings, 5 The Parade, Roath, Cardiff, CF24 3AA, Wales, UK; Tel. +44(0)2920 874 761  
HardistyAR@cardiff.ac.uk

Andrew Jones

Senior Lecturer; School of Computer Science and Informatics, Cardiff University, Queen's Buildings, 5 The Parade, Roath, Cardiff, CF24 3AA, Wales, UK; Tel. +44(0)2920 875 537  
Andrew.C.Jones@cs.cardiff.ac.uk

## **Abstract**

This paper presents SCRAM-CK, a method to elicit requirements by means of strong user involvement supported by prototyping activities. The method integrates two existing approaches, SCRAM and CK Theory. SCRAM provides the framework for requirements management while CK Theory provides a framework for reasoning about design and its evolution. The method is demonstrated with the definition and refining of requirements for the BioVeL web toolkit. The objective of BioVeL is to allow scientists to understand, run, modify, and construct workflows for data analysis with minimal training using a web based interface. The proposed method is supported by prototyping activities for gathering user feedback, and refining requirements and design proposals. Using this method, the prototypes evolved from simple workflow execution enablers to include more complex functionalities for reviewing, modifying, and building workflows in later versions. This paper presents a contribution to the application of techniques for requirements engineering. SCRAM-CK is an amalgamated method that combines a user-centred continuous refinement approach with support for design evolution through prototyping. The paper also shows the influence of the requirements engineering process in the evolution of design proposals.

**Keywords:** requirements elicitation; requirements capture; user centered requirements engineering; requirements evolution; collaborative design; design evolution; CK Theory; SCRAM

# SCRAM-CK: applying a collaborative requirements engineering process for designing a web based e-science toolkit

This paper presents SCRAM-CK, a method to elicit requirements by means of strong user involvement supported by prototyping activities. The method integrates two existing approaches, SCRAM and CK Theory. SCRAM provides the framework for requirements management while CK Theory provides a framework for reasoning about design and its evolution. The method is demonstrated with the definition and refining of requirements for the BioVeL web toolkit. The objective of BioVeL is to allow scientists to understand, run, modify, and construct workflows for data analysis with minimal training using a web based interface. The proposed method is supported by prototyping activities for gathering user feedback, and refining requirements and design proposals. Using this method, the prototypes evolved from simple workflow execution enablers to include more complex functionalities for reviewing, modifying, and building workflows in later versions. This paper presents a contribution to the application of techniques for requirements engineering. SCRAM-CK is an amalgamated method that combines a user-centred continuous refinement approach with support for design evolution through prototyping. The paper also shows the influence of the requirements engineering process in the evolution of design proposals.

**Keywords:** requirements elicitation; requirements capture; user centered requirements engineering; requirements evolution; collaborative design; design evolution; CK Theory; SCRAM; prototyping

## 1 Introduction

The Biodiversity Virtual e-Laboratory (BioVeL) is intended to meet the needs of the Biodiversity research community with tools for data analysis that will help understanding biodiversity in a rapidly changing environment. To achieve this, BioVeL customises, deploys and supports the <sup>my</sup>Grid Software Family (Taverna, <sup>my</sup>Experiment, BioCatalogue [13, 26, 35, 41]). BioVeL is particularly concerned with developing a sustainable infrastructure for supporting biodiversity e-Science, especially by fostering the development and reuse of scientific workflows. BioVeL aims to make these developments available to as wide a range of biodiversity scientists as possible, meeting their individual needs in an easy-to-use manner. However, the definition of workflows and their execution in environments like Taverna often demands a degree of computer literacy that does not match with the skills or interests of scientists [11, 12]. Moreover, the results of a previous project in the health domain indicated that user-centered design and genuine interdisciplinary approaches are essential to

1 create solutions that are fit for purpose, sustainable and address the real needs of all stakeholders  
2 [29].  
3

4 Given these concerns, a Requirements Engineering (RE) process to allow the participation of  
5 biodiversity scientists as co-designers was seen as the best strategy. The main characteristics of such  
6 an RE process are that it is user-centered, continuous, and supportive of design evolution and  
7 prototyping which is compatible with the agile development approach adopted for the BioVeL  
8 project. The RE process must be user-centered, including the biodiversity scientists as part of the  
9 design team to produce a system that matches their requirements closely. The RE process must be  
10 continuous because the matching between the requirements and the design must be reviewed  
11 constantly as the project progresses and new requirements are discovered or priorities change. The  
12 RE process needs to support design evolution because requirements and designs are expected to  
13 change as a result of the project findings and in response to prototype evaluation. Finally, the RE  
14 process needs to support prototyping activities because prototypes will be used as the means for  
15 practical evaluation of design decisions and also to stimulate exploration of new possibilities.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 The SCRAM-CK RE process was developed to address these needs. SCRAM was selected because it  
27 is a user-centered requirements engineering method [36, 38] and we had some previous knowledge  
28 of its application to other projects. However, SCRAM is not specifically designed to monitor the  
29 evolution of designs or to foster the direct participation of users as co-designers. SCRAM expects  
30 designs to evolve in response to requirements refinements as an activity that happens in parallel [36].  
31 In contrast, CK Theory provides a collaborative design method that supports the evolution of designs  
32 and encourages the collaboration of users and designers [15, 16, 34]. CK can be used to map the  
33 evolution of designs in response to changes in requirements, complementing SCRAM.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 This article presents the SCRAM-CK process and describes how it has been used during the design,  
42 development and continuous refinement of the BioVeL workflow web toolkit. The paper is  
43 structured as follows. The theory backing SCRAM-CK is presented in Section 2. The application of  
44 SCRAM-CK in the development of the BioVeL workflow web toolkit is presented in Section 3,  
45 covering each stage of the process. Section 4 evaluates the results obtained by applying the method  
46 in practice. Section 5 provides a deeper analysis and discussion of the main issues discovered while  
47 implementing and using the method. Finally section 6 presents the conclusions and opportunities for  
48 future research.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 2 SCRAM-CK

The primary measure of success of a software system is the degree to which it meets the purpose for which it was intended [24]. Requirements engineering is the process by which the requirements to meet that purpose are determined [6]. The main tasks of the requirements engineering process are: elicitation, modelling, analysis, validation/verification, and management.

Requirement elicitation involves understanding the needs of stakeholders and the contexts in which the to-be-developed software will be used. Requirement modelling involves creating representations of the requirements that are used to communicate and negotiate. Analysis involves determining the needs or conditions to meet for a new or altered product, taking account of the possibly conflicting requirements of the various stakeholders. Requirements validation and verification involves checking that a system meets requirements and specifications to fulfil its intended purpose. Requirements management is the process that organises the requirements engineering process, managing change, communicating and negotiating decisions with stakeholders [6].

Modern requirements engineering processes need to be interwoven into the software lifecycle from design and planning through to development, deployment and decommissioning [17, 37, 39]. The interweaving addresses changes in technology and changes in the nature of requirements. A robust and realistic software development process allows requirements engineers, designers, system architects, and developers to work concurrently and iteratively to describe the artefacts they wish to produce. Such a process allows developers to better understand problems through consideration of architectural constraints, so they can develop and adapt architectures based on requirements [25]. Development processes that facilitate fast, incremental delivery are essential for software systems that need to be developed quickly, with progressively shorter times-to-market [25].

The problem lies in selecting the adequate requirements engineering methodologies from amongst the many proposed in the literature. A comprehensive review of requirements engineering technologies found over 60 methods, techniques, and approaches supporting the different phases and activities of the requirements engineering process [28]. This abundance complicates selecting appropriate methodologies to apply to a particular problem. An alternative suggested in the literature is to select a method or combination of methods based on the characteristics of the project and the system being developed [2, 36].

The main factor to consider when selecting the requirements engineering method is that it should be appropriate to the type of system under development, and the expected discovery contexts. For interactive software such as the BioVeL web toolkit, the most commonly used techniques are based

1 on scenarios and prototyping. Prototypes and scenarios are techniques that can be used to discover  
2 and describe tacit requirements and knowledge (See [2] for further discussion of the factors and  
3 techniques mentioned here). The use of scenarios facilitates requirements analysis and validation,  
4 and allows the inclusion of the target user group from an early stage in the development process.  
5 Scenario-based models are easiest for practitioners and non-technical stakeholders to use [6].  
6  
7

8  
9 The Scenario Requirements Analysis Method (SCRAM) is one such approach designed to cover the  
10 entire requirements engineering process [36, 38]. SCRAM is designed as an agile method for user  
11 centered requirements which promotes the participation of users during the entire requirements  
12 engineering process. SCRAM, however, needs to be extended to facilitate the monitoring of the  
13 evolution of designs and to support an extended process that covers the entire software lifecycle, i.e.  
14 it is not confined to a single stage at the beginning of the project. Additionally, the participation of  
15 the user as a designer is not considered amongst the user roles in SCRAM. For these reasons a  
16 methodology that supported reasoning about design evolution with the inclusion of users as co-  
17 designers was required as a complement to SCRAM. CK Theory can be used to bridge this gap. CK  
18 Theory provides a framework for reasoning about design, the design process and the evolution of  
19 design proposals. Moreover, CK Theory encourages the collaboration of users as designers [15, 16,  
20 34], thus appearing as a good candidate to complement SCRAM.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 **2.1 SCRAM – Scenario Requirements Analysis Method**

33 SCRAM uses a combination of prototypes, scenario scripts, and design rationale to elicit and validate  
34 user requirements [36]. Prototypes and concept demonstrators provide a designed artefact that users  
35 can react to. Scenarios are used to situate the designed artefact in a context of use, thereby helping  
36 users relate the design to their work/task context. The designer's reasoning is deliberately exposed to  
37 the user to encourage user participation in the decision process. The requirements are summarised on  
38 a whiteboard to identify dependencies and priorities.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 SCRAM facilitates the management of the requirements engineering process by dividing the  
47 activities in four stages (Figure 1): (1) Initial Requirements Capture and Domain Familiarisation, (2)  
48 Storyboarding Design, (3) Requirements Exploration, and (4) Prototyping Requirements Validation.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65




Figure 1 The SCRAM method (based on the diagram that appears in [36, 38])

Initial requirements capture is focused on the domain familiarisation activities. This stage is conducted by conventional interviewing and fact-finding techniques to gain sufficient information to develop a first concept demonstrator. In practice this takes 1-2 sessions with stakeholders.

Storyboarding and design visioning creates early visions of the required system that are explained to users in storyboard walkthroughs to get feedback on feasibility of the different designs being demonstrated.

Requirements exploration uses concept demonstrators and early prototypes to present more detailed designs to users in scenario-driven and semi-interactive demonstrations. This facilitates the analysis of the design and requirements validation activities.

Prototyping and requirements validation develops more fully functional prototypes and continues refining requirements until a prototype is agreed to be acceptable by the users.

## 2.2 CK Theory - Concept-Knowledge Theory

CK Theory is a framework for reasoning about design [15, 16]. CK Theory provides a definition of design that is independent from the domain in which it is used, integrating creative thinking and innovation [18]. CK Theory models the design process through iterative interactions and expansions of a concept space and a knowledge space.

The knowledge (K) space contains propositions that have a logical status for the designer. Having a logical status means that the designer assigns a degree of confidence to the logical status of a proposition (true, false or un-decidable) [15]. The concept (C) space contains propositions which do not have a logical status in K. This means that when a concept is formulated it is not possible to prove that it belongs to K. That is, the designer lacks evidence to judge if a given proposition can be incorporated into K [15].

CK Theory defines design as the processes by which a concept generates other concepts or is transformed into a knowledge proposition in K. CK Theory also defines the set of transformations that can occur for generating new concepts and deriving knowledge propositions from them. Design is viewed as the process mapping the expansions on the C-K spaces. There are four operations that describe these expansions: conjunction ( $C \rightarrow K$ ), disjunction ( $K \rightarrow C$ ), partition ( $C \rightarrow C$ ), and expansion ( $K \rightarrow K$ ). The following figure shows the dynamic behaviour of the operators.




Figure 2 Dynamics of the design process according to CK Theory (derived from the “CK dynamics” diagram in [15, 18])

The design process begins by collecting the knowledge propositions around the design problem at hand, building K. Then disjunction is applied to identify the concepts which are contained in that knowledge, creating C. This is followed by further partitioning of C by subdividing, grouping, and organising the concepts. The next step involves trying to incorporate the new concepts in propositions of K, applying conjunction. This will cause the further expansion of the knowledge space. This expansion of C and K spaces continues throughout the design process.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Conjunction expands the knowledge space when different concepts are combined and rationalised to form new knowledge statements. The inverse operation is disjunction, where new concepts are derived from existing knowledge statements.

### 2.3 *Integration of SCRAM-CK*

The SCRAM-CK RE process was proposed to explore user preferences for light-weight web-based interfaces for executing, modifying and running workflows. The main drivers for the integration of SCRAM and CK theory were: (1) to allow the participation of users in the design process and (2) to drive the evolution of design. In this process SCRAM provides the framework for requirements management while CK theory deals with the uncertainties of design (why designs evolve). When a design process starts, the design team knows little in the way of concrete facts (K) but may have lots of ideas, assumptions and guesses about what the design should look like (C). CK is about pushing the design forward and making it evolve through a complete framework for reasoning about design.

Following SCRAM, the SCRAM-CK RE process is organized in four stages. These stages are described as follows.

1. **Initial requirements capture:** the activities during this stage are centered on domain familiarisation. Following the SCRAM method, at this stage conventional interviewing and fact-finding techniques are used to acquire sufficient information to develop an initial requirements list and to focus the design propositions. During this stage the CK Spaces are defined from domain knowledge. Users are not consulted directly for opinions but observed and interviewed about the domain.
2. **Storyboarding and design visioning:** the activities of this stage are geared towards the initial analysis of the requirements and a set of design alternatives, as advised by SCRAM. Different materials including: tutorials, walkthroughs, and mock-ups are used in an interactive session based on design games derived from CK Theory to facilitate explaining and discussing different aspects of the design alternatives. This facilitates the further expansion of the initial design space. During this stage the user is expected to take a more active role in the design process, particularly in the selection of design alternatives and in the ranking of requirements.
3. **Requirements exploration:** this stage requires the use of more advanced demonstrations to further validate and refine the requirements set. As suggested in SCRAM, more functional prototypes can be used as a concept demonstrator for discussing further design details with users in scenario-driven, semi-interactive demonstrations. CK theory will

1 support making explicit the mappings between the requirements set and the design  
2 decisions taken to fulfil those requirements. The users will participate in the validation of  
3 requirements and discussing how well they are served by the selected designs.  
4

- 5 4. **Prototyping and requirements validation:** this is the final stage of SCRAM. This stage  
6 lasts longer than the previous stages and facilitates the seamless transition to production.  
7 The prototypes will be continuously updated to incorporate more functions in parallel  
8 with the continuous process of requirements refinement and validation. The prototypes  
9 are seen as the embodiment of the design space. The users will be required to participate  
10 in different roles as testers, validators and designers.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 The application of the approach should be flexible, allowing regression to earlier stages if new  
18 features need to be explored further. For instance, if a new feature or an alternative interface needs to  
19 be analysed, story boards of alternative interfaces or simple demonstrators to explore new ideas can  
20 be implemented.  
21  
22

23  
24 This process will continue until the end of the project, verifying requirements and usability cyclically  
25 with users. The expected final products from this process are a design document and advanced  
26 prototypes of the software – in our case, the BioVeL workflow web toolkit.  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **3 Application of SCRAM-CK**

32  
33

34 SCRAM-CK has been applied in the design and prototyping of the BioVeL web toolkit. This section  
35 describes the application of SCRAM-CK, outlining at each stage how the methodologies  
36 complemented each other and showing the evolution of the designs and requirements during the  
37 process.  
38  
39  
40

41 The chronological presentation follows the staged application of the SCRAM-CK RE process. The  
42 participation of the users at every stage is reviewed to determine the actual role played in the process.  
43 This is also complemented by a summary of how the designs were evaluated and/or improved with  
44 the participation of the users.  
45  
46  
47  
48

#### 49 **3.1 Initial Requirements Capture**

50  
51

52 In this stage the design context is provided by the domain of application and the expected user base.  
53 The initial scenarios describe how the expected user-base will interact with the BioVeL software and  
54 the types of software provided, which is the perspective of the project sponsors and administrators.  
55 The scenarios were then validated by observing the work of actual users in the development of  
56 workflows and with initial interviews. At this stage, the only tools available for the users to inspect,  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 edit and modify workflows were the <sup>my</sup>Grid software family (Taverna, <sup>my</sup>Experiment, and  
2 BioCatalogue). The effort needed for learning to use these tools requires a considerable investment  
3 of time from users.  
4  
5

### 6 **3.1.1 Scenarios**

7  
8 BioVeL's expected user base is divided into three groups: (1) workflow experts, (2) workflow re-  
9 modellers, and (3) workflow consumers. This classification provides the initial scenarios:  
10

- 11  
12 • Workflow Experts typically need expressive, flexible tools for developing libraries of  
13 workflows that can be used by others. Such users' needs are satisfied directly by the <sup>my</sup>Grid  
14 software family (Taverna, <sup>my</sup>Experiment, and BioCatalogue). For this user group, BioVeL is  
15 adapting and customising the <sup>my</sup>Grid software family by promoting the creation of plugins  
16 and new services.  
17
- 18 • Workflow Re-Modellers typically develop their own workflows, e.g., as variants of existing  
19 ones or based on libraries of workflow templates. These users do not need the full flexibility  
20 and complexity of a sophisticated workflow management system such as the Taverna  
21 Workbench. For this user group, BioVeL is deploying Taverna Lite, a web based application  
22 to simply assemble and adapt workflows using pre-defined templates, pre-existing workflows  
23 and components.  
24
- 25 • Workflow Consumers typically use "pre-cooked, quality controlled" workflows through  
26 simple and sometimes data specific interfaces. For this user group, BioVeL is deploying  
27 Taverna Player and BioVeL Portal, web based applications for executing workflows and  
28 retrieving results.  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **3.1.2 Design Proposals**

34  
35 The application of SCRAM-CK in BioVeL is focused on addressing the needs of consumer and re-  
36 modeller users. For these user groups BioVeL aims to provide easy-to-use tools that make BioVeL  
37 services and workflows for data analysis and modelling readily accessible. The three applications  
38 that will cater for these users are the BioVeL Portal, Taverna Player, and Taverna Lite (Figure 3).  
39 These three applications form the core of the BioVeL web toolkit.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65




Figure 3 High Level Diagram of BioVeL Web Toolkit

### 3.1.3 Design Problems

The challenges associated with the introduction of scientific workflows to a research domain can be organised in four categories: facilitating the understanding of workflows, facilitating the use of the workflows, facilitating the adaptation of workflows for different needs and facilitating the construction of new workflows.

Understanding the design and operation of a workflow is a barrier for its use. Research suggests that workflow annotations help in describing the functionality of the workflows to reach a broader audience of potential users. Annotations also facilitate searching for workflows [10]. Workflow management systems (WFMS) facilitate the use of workflows. However, the complexity of WFMS is overwhelming and unintuitive for most new users [5]. WFMS also facilitate workflow construction and modification through graphical user interfaces. However, new users find the visual programming methods unfamiliar and complicated [42].

### 3.1.4 Design Space

The design proposals and the design problems for the adoption of workflows described above are represented using the CK diagram shown in Figure 4. The upper part of the diagram contains the knowledge propositions belonging to the Knowledge Space and the lower part of the diagram contains the corresponding propositions of the Concept Space.

1 The initial concept space can be expanded by applying partition ( $C \rightarrow C$ ). In this case the different  
2 concepts evoke different methods for facilitating or overcoming each of the perceived barriers to  
3 workflow reuse. The first concept space contained five concepts ( $C_1$  to  $C_5$ ); further analysis of the  
4 documentation for the project objectives provided some ideas for the further expansion ( $C_6$  to  $C_{15}$ ).  
5

6  
7 The diagram shows the expansion of the initial concept space. Following CK theory, the next step  
8 involves trying to incorporate these new concepts in propositions of  $K$ , (conjunction operation  
9 explained in 2.2). This will cause the further expansion of the knowledge space. The propositions in  
10  $K$  can then be mapped to requirements statements. For instance the proposition: “the WFMS must  
11 support displaying the workflow documentation to facilitate its understanding” is mapped to the  
12 requirement “Support improving workflow annotation”. However, the generation of knowledge  
13 statements such as these must be made in consultation with users, as discussed in the following sub-  
14 section.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65




Figure 4 Stage 1 Domain Familiarisation. Initial Concept and Knowledge Spaces

### 3.1.5 Evolution of Design Space

Actual users' needs have to be compared to those envisioned by the mission statements for the project to separate real from perceived barriers for adoption. In the context of BioVeL, activities designed to allow this comparison are listed as follows.

- Analysing the work of the teams responsible for developing workflows.
- Reviewing the workflow building methods in BioVeL
- Observing online and face-to-face working sessions of the workflow building teams.

The most relevant issues when designing a workflow are those related to the input data formats, the expected transformations to be applied to that data and the expected outputs. Another relevant issue is the possibility of inspecting intermediate results when the analysis is not proceeding as expected,

or in order to make choices about the next steps. The scientist may not have time or need for learning to configure a complex tool every time an analysis task is performed. From the scientist's perspective, the WFMS is mainly a tool for analysing data, rather than a workflow building tool. These concerns are reflected in the partition of the concept space presented expanding the branch from C<sub>2</sub>. Figure 5 shows the derived concepts and the new set of knowledge propositions.




Figure 5 Stage 1 Domain Familiarisation and User Observation. Expansion of the Concept and Knowledge Spaces by Partition and Conjunction.

### 3.1.6 User Participation

The interpretation, observation and consultation activities helped focusing the initial stage of the requirements engineering process. The most revealing activities were those involving observing real users at work in three different settings. Firstly, users are observed indirectly by reviewing their work products and the tools they use in their day to day work. Secondly, they are observed as they participate in discussion between different service teams. Finally, they are observed and interviewed when working in online and face-to-face sessions. It was observed that BioVeL users have adopted several techniques for their workflow building process from specification, to design, building, testing, documenting and publishing. At this stage, the participation of the user is passive, users have not articulated their actual needs or discussed the possible solutions.

### 3.1.7 Requirements

The requirements gathered during the initial requirements capture and domain familiarisation stage suggest implementing a system that: emphasises the relevance of experimental data; describes the analyses that can be performed with a workflow clearly; and allows customisation of inputs. The most important features at this stage are those supporting understanding and running workflows.

1. Supporting understanding workflows
  - a. Describe the analysis being performed
  - b. Describe the required input and expected output data
  - c. Describe intermediate processing of data
2. Support running workflows
  - a. Facilitate finding a workflow
  - b. Facilitate providing input data and retrieving results
3. Support modifying workflows (allow different input formats)
4. Support building workflows

## 3.2 Storyboarding and Design Visioning

The second stage of SCRAM deals with the further refinement of the requirements and requires greater user involvement. A focus group session was organised to explore different scenarios overcoming the perceived barriers to scientific workflow adoption (3.1.3 above). The objective of the focus group session was to analyse scientific workflow composition and usage scenarios with users.

### 3.2.1 Workflow Usage Scenarios

Seven scenarios were designed for displaying alternatives for workflow use ranging from complex workflow management systems to simple interfaces that only allow the selection and execution of a workflow (Table 1).

**Table 1 Workflow usage scenarios**

Scenario	Demonstrator	Emphasis
<b>Development:</b> Designed to show how a complex management system supports building, modifying and testing new workflows.	Used a modified version of the workflow development tutorial <sup>1</sup> for Taverna Workbench [13, 26, 35, 41]	Execution, building, and modification
<b>Remodelling:</b> Designed to show how social networking tools for sharing workflows and services can speed up the work of scientists by facilitating reuse of existing workflows as examples.	Used a modified version of the workflow development tutorial <sup>2</sup> to demonstrate searching for workflows, testing and modifying using Taverna and <sup>my</sup> Experiment [13, 26, 35, 41]	Learning, execution and modification
<b>Execution:</b> Designed to demonstrate the reuse of workflows via a user interface that hides the complexity of the underlying execution system.	MetFlow <sup>3</sup> portal and the Taverna Server Demonstrator <sup>4</sup> were used to show workflows published ready for execution with little or no configuration needed for running them.	Learning and execution
<b>Data Centric:</b> Designed to demonstrate how data analyses are performed by applying predefined functions and how the modifications are recorded for automatically building a workflow.	Demonstrated with the Galaxy 101 tutorial to show how workflow creation can be driven by data analysis [14]	Learning, execution, and building
<b>Template:</b> Designed to demonstrate assisted workflow composition. Users build a workflow by selecting services to fill activity slots on a workflow template	Demonstrated with the User Assisted Composition Tool [22, 23]	Building and modification
<b>Example:</b> Designed to demonstrate selection of workflows from a controlled repository and assisting in their execution and modification	Story Board supported with a mock-up application, a variation of the template approach [22, 23]	Learning, execution, and modification
<b>Wizard:</b> Designed to demonstrate the assisted step by step building of the workflow from a repository of workflow components	Story Board supported with a mock-up application, a variation of the template approach [22, 23]	Learning, execution, building and modification

<sup>1</sup> Original tutorial can be found at <http://www.taverna.org.uk/documentation/taverna-2-x/tutorials/>

<sup>2</sup> Original tutorial can be found at <http://www.taverna.org.uk/documentation/taverna-2-x/tutorials/>

<sup>3</sup> Metflow was a test project that enabled a simple web interface for running workflows. Source forge still has some references at: <http://sourceforge.net/apps/mediawiki/metware/index.php?title=MetFlow>, but the site <http://msbi.ipb-halle.de/MetFlow/> used in May 2012 has now been decommissioned.

<sup>4</sup> The Taverna Server Demonstrator was a small web application used to demonstrate Taverna server up to version 2.3. GitHub still hosts the code at: <https://github.com/myGrid/Taverna-Server-Demonstrator-Interface>

1 The first four scenarios represent proposals to use/adapt existing software while the remaining three  
2 are new alternatives aimed at facilitating workflow building, reuse, and customisation.  
3

### 4 **3.2.2 Usage Design Proposals**

5  
6  
7 The seven scenarios provide alternatives aimed at meeting the requirements gathered during the  
8 initial stage of SCRAM-CK. Some can deal with all the requirements while others just address some  
9 subset. The coverage of the requirements is highlighted in the last column of Table 1.  
10

### 11 **3.2.3 Usage Design Problems**


12  
13  
14 The users who participated have been mostly using the Taverna WFMS to run workflows developed  
15 by other people. However, they expressed interest in learning to adapt and modify the workflows  
16 themselves. Thinking about the requirements for the development of the BioVeL web toolkit, a list  
17 of important features was produced and partitioned into two groups: current Taverna features to  
18 safeguard and features to improve.  
19  
20

21  
22  
23 The most important features to safeguard in the web toolkit are: flexibility, transparency, re-use and  
24 libraries. The group agreed that the flexibility for including different types of sources and analysis  
25 tools in workflows makes the WFMS an appealing research tool. For the user group, transparency  
26 means being able to "drill down" to inspect full details of workflows and "runs" as and when needed.  
27 For the users, the idea of reusing not only scientific results but also the tools for obtaining those  
28 results is a major selling point. Finally, having libraries of workflows and services that can be  
29 adapted to suit the user needs was highlighted as an incentive for using the web toolkit. The features  
30 that the users would like to see improved in the web toolkit include: error reporting and error  
31 handling, supporting the use of large data sets, run-time feedback, allowing some workflow  
32 customisation, improved output presentation, and simplified workflow execution.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

### 44 **3.2.4 Evolution of the Design Space**

45  
46  
47 In this stage, most of the earlier requirements were confirmed as significant for the users. However,  
48 some new issues were also discovered. For this reason the design space needed was updated as  
49 shown in Figure 6.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



**Figure 6 Stage 1 Domain Familiarisation and User Observation and Stage 2 Requirements Refinement. Third Expansion of the Concept and Knowledge Spaces by Partition and Conjunction.**

The diagram in Figure 6 enables analysis of the entire structure of the design spaces and illustrates the interplay of CK and SCRAM. The diagram shows the evolution of the concept and knowledge spaces within the stages of the SCRAM-CK process, as is the case between the two expansions reported on stage one. Using this type of diagram also highlights the evolution of design across the stages of SCRAM.

**3.2.5 User Participation**

The participation of users during this stage was increased with the focus group session. The users who participated in the focus group session had already been using Taverna to run workflows

developed in collaboration with their IT partners. The analysis of scenarios helped to facilitate their participation. The first two scenarios served as the catalyst for voicing their concerns, particularly those related to workflow execution and implementation. The remaining scenarios helped to introduce different alternatives with different levels of support for inspecting, executing, modifying and building. However, users expressed interest in learning to adapt and modify the workflows themselves, but stressed that the main issues to solve were those related to execution.

### 3.2.6 Refined Requirements List

The initial list of requirements was enriched with the results from this session. The ideas that were generated during the session were compiled and organised as the additional requirements for providing an easy-to-use web-based interface to learn, execute, build and modify workflows (Table 2).

**Table 2 Refined requirements**

Requirement	Learn	Execute	Build	Modify
Simplified workflow execution		X		
Presentation of results		X		
Downloading Results		X		
User management	X	X		
Workflow execution feedback	X	X		
Workflow execution statistics	X	X		
Implement connectivity with <sup>my</sup> Experiment	X	X		
Allow uploading sample input sets	X	X		
Allow downloading workflows	X	X		X
Implement error handling	X	X		
Customise inputs		X		X
Customise outputs		X		X
Implement template based customisation		X	X	X

Table 2 presents the requirements in the order of priority assigned by the users who participated in the focus group session (highest priority first). Users were informed that the intention of the session was to produce a requirements list to guide the implementation of the BioVeL workflow web toolkit. Although all the selected features integrate with each other for supporting the development of a web based WFMS, the group placed the highest value on supporting execution and facilitating documenting of the workflows for others to use.

### 3.3 Requirements Exploration

The third stage of SCRAM is aimed at further refining and validating the requirements for the BioVeL web toolkit. To accomplish this, three activities were carried out: an online survey on

1 usability of Taverna, the development of a basic prototype to incorporate the first set of  
2 requirements, and the initial evaluation of the prototype by users.  
3

### 4 **3.3.1 Exploratory Scenario**

5  
6  
7 The scenario for this stage matches the requirements derived during the second stage. In this case the  
8 prototype is presented as a potential solution for facilitating publishing and running workflows  
9 online. The main features to stress here are: ease of use, no need to configure any software, the  
10 possibility of downloading workflows for further inspection and the possibility of storing and  
11 managing results.  
12  
13  
14  
15

### 16 **3.3.2 Exploratory Design**

17  
18  
19 The priorities of the requirements list derived from the focus group session (Table 2 above) indicated  
20 the urgent need for a simple workflow execution tool. This was also supported by the feedback  
21 obtained from the responses to the usability survey. A prototype interface for running workflows was  
22 developed to further test the validity of the requirements and their importance to other users.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 The prototype (Figure 7) was derived from a modified version of the Taverna Server Demonstrator<sup>5</sup>  
28 (TSD). The prototype included extended capabilities to manage users, upload workflows, preserve  
29 run results for longer than their expiry time on the server, and storing server credentials.  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **3.3.3 Prototype Evaluation**

34  
35  
36 The basic functionality was exposed to a larger number of BioVeL partners during the annual project  
37 meeting. The demonstration was attended by scientists and IT technicians, partners of the BioVeL  
38 project. The prototype was demonstrated running actual BioVeL workflows. The observations from  
39 the participants coincided with the requirements previously discovered.  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 The users suggested new potential uses for the prototype in different scenarios such as facilitating  
45 training sessions with new workflow users; facilitating the presentation to third parties; an alternative  
46 for running and testing workflows; and as a tool for introducing students to use workflows. Enabling  
47 these scenarios required deployment of an improved version of the prototype online.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58  
59 

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://github.com/myGrid/Taverna-Server-Demonstrator-Interface>  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

The image shows the BioVeL Taverna Lite Prototype 0.0.1 interface. At the top, there is a green header with the title "BioVeL Taverna Lite Prototype 0.0.1" and a logo on the right. Below the header is a navigation menu with buttons for "Home", "Workflows", "Runs", and "Logout". The main content area is titled "Listing workflows" and contains a table with two rows of workflow information. Below the table is a "New Workflow" button. At the bottom, there is a green footer with logos for "CAPACITIES" and "e infrastructure", and text stating "BioVeL is funded by the European Commission 7th Framework Programme (FP7), through the grant agreement number 283359."

Title	Author	Workflow file	Operations			
Stage Matrix Generation 1	Maria Paula Balcázar Vargas Jonathan P. Giddy	workflow1.t2flow	Show	Edit	Destroy	Run
Stage Matrix Generation 2	Maria Paula Balcázar Vargas Jonathan P. Giddy	workflow2.t2flow	Show	Edit	Destroy	Run

Figure 7 BioVeL Portal Prototype 0.0.1

### 3.3.4 Evolution of the Design Space

Most of the ideas brought forward during the exploratory evaluation session correspond to new concepts not contemplated before. These ideas are integrated into the design space as shown in Figure 8.



### 3.3.5 User Participation

The users' role as designers was more prominent at this stage. This is evidenced by the new scenarios proposed by users which had not been contemplated before. Additionally, users participated in making a crucial design decision by requesting the deployment of the portal prototype. This design decision also influenced the prioritisation of the prototyping activities for the different components of the BioVeL web toolkit, to make them match the requirements priorities.

### 3.3.6 Revision of Requirements

During this stage only one requirement was added to the list from the previous stage, the deployment of the portal (Table 3). The ideas that were generated during the session were compiled and organised as the initial requirements for providing an easy-to-use web-based interface to learn, execute, build and modify workflows.

**Table 3 Requirements Prioritisation and Mapping to Web Toolkit Components**

Requirement	BioVeL Portal	Taverna Player	Taverna Lite
Simplified workflow execution		X	
Presentation of results		X	
Downloading Results	X		
User management	X		
Deployment of Prototype	X	X	
Workflow execution feedback		X	
Workflow execution statistics	X	X	
Implement connectivity with <sup>my</sup> Experiment	X		
Allow downloading workflows	X		
Implement Error Handling	X	X	X
Allow uploading sample input and outputs		X	X
Customise inputs			X
Customise outputs			X
Implement template based customisation			X

### 3.4 Prototyping and Requirements Validation

The prototyping and requirements validation phase was the longest of all the stages in the application of SCRAM-CK. This stage started with the deployment of Prototype 0.0.1 in October 2012 and concluded in January 2014, with the deployment of the last prototype in the series. During this period the versions of the prototype evolved from an easy to use interface for running Taverna workflows to an easy to use interface that included some workflow customisation and building functionalities. Each prototype in this series was deployed, evaluated and used constantly for demonstrations, workshops, training sessions, conferences and advance reviews.

### 3.4.1 Prototyping Scenarios

The deployment of the prototype and its successive refinements has facilitated the testing and evaluation using scenarios defined by BioVeL and scientists and IT experts. The four user defined scenarios are demonstration, outreach, development, and teaching.

**Demonstration Scenario:** the portal can be used to demonstrate the advances in the development of BioVeL workflows. This scenario has been used for formal reviews of the progress of the project.

**Outreach Scenario:** the portal can be used as an example of BioVeL working practices in presentations to third parties which are interested in collaborations with BioVeL.

**Development Scenario:** the portal can be used to facilitate testing and validation of workflows being developed within BioVeL.

**Teaching Scenario:** the portal can be used in training sessions and workshops with potential new users.

### 3.4.2 Influence on the Design of Prototypes

The implementation of features scheduled in the previous stage (Table 3) has been carried out in parallel with the evaluation and use of the prototypes in the scenarios described above. These demonstrations have generated valuable feedback in the form of recommendations for usability improvements, new features to implement, and remarks on priorities for better supporting Biodiversity research (Appendix A).

### 3.4.3 Evolution of Design Space

The diagrams for representing the expansion of the Concept and Knowledge spaces have worked well for tracking the changes in the previous stages. However, the expansion of the design spaces is harder to monitor at this stage because the spaces grow faster and the increased number of concepts is harder to accommodate in simple diagrams. At this point a better tool for monitoring the evolution of the concept space and visualising it is required. Some type of notation could also be developed or adapted to cope with this.

### 3.4.4 User Participation

During this stage, the participation of users was more natural and spontaneous. User participation was monitored and demonstrated from the feedback, testing, usage, and demonstrating activities, many of which were started by their own initiative. At this stage, the project had become increasingly user-centered and user-driven. As a result, users participated more actively in reviewing

1 the needs for the implementation of the new version of the BioVeL portal that eventually replaced  
2 the previous prototypes.

## 3 4 5 **4 Evaluation**

6  
7 The goals of a RE method can be used as the frame to evaluate the method [3]. This type of  
8 evaluation is qualitative, not statistical nor experimental. The results of the evaluation help to  
9 determine how well the RE process meets the wider criteria in the RE domain and how well the RE  
10 process meets its own objectives [3].  
11  
12  
13

### 14 15 16 **4.1 Structuring the Evaluation**

17 The evaluation of SCRAM-CK is structured around domain specific and general RE objectives. The  
18 evaluation process involves selecting the scope of the evaluation, identifying the main objectives to  
19 be evaluated, prioritising the criteria to be analysed, defining the data to be analysed, and comparing  
20 the results of applying the process to the target problem against other methodologies.  
21  
22  
23  
24

#### 25 26 27 **4.1.1 Scope of the Evaluation**

28 It would be extremely complex to try to analyse all general aspects of SCRAM-CK as a RE method.  
29 Additionally, the main objectives of implementing SCRAM-CK have themselves a high degree of  
30 complexity. Accordingly, the evaluation presented here focuses mainly on whether SCRAM-CK has  
31 met the needs for BioVeL; that is, requirements gathering and enabling co-design supported by  
32 prototyping activities. Structuring the evaluation in this way focuses on the method and its  
33 contribution to support the RE process in the context of the BioVeL project. Additional issues, such  
34 as tool support, notation for requirements description, or production of design documents are not  
35 included because they are parallel activities which do not impact directly upon the evaluation of the  
36 method nor interfere/conflict with the methodologies being applied in the development and  
37 prototyping activities.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 48 49 **4.1.2 Evaluation Criteria**

50 This evaluation of SCRAM-CK is structured in three stages. The first stage considers whether it  
51 covered the needs of the RE envisaged for BioVeL. As explained earlier, the ideal RE method for  
52 BioVeL needed a continuous process to facilitate user participation, design evolution, and  
53 prototyping. The second stage of the evaluation considers the extent to which SCRAM-CK covers  
54 the more general objectives of RE methodologies. These objectives include Pertinence, Correctness,  
55 Traceability, and Understandability [3]. Finally, the evaluation covers the comparison against other  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 methods using the previously established domain specific and general criteria of the two previous  
2 evaluation exercises.

### 3 4 **4.1.3 Prioritisation of Objectives**

5  
6  
7 In addition to the scale for measuring the achievement of each method, it is also necessary to  
8 determine the priorities of each of the domain specific and general objectives with which the method  
9 is evaluated. In this case there are two groups of objectives: the domain specific objectives that  
10 motivated the development and use of SCRAM-CK and the general RE objectives which any RE  
11 method must aim to fulfil. From the viewpoint of the BioVeL project, the weight of the first set of  
12 objectives is greater because the main goal of implementing SCRAM-CK is to support a specific set  
13 of goals. From the viewpoint of RE practice, the general RE objectives are crucial to determine if the  
14 new method offers some form of advantage to other practitioners over existing methods.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **4.1.4 Data Sets**

23  
24  
25 The data to be interpreted is composed of the feedback from users testing, using and reporting bugs  
26 or problems with the different prototypes. The data is interpreted by the researchers and then grouped  
27 according to the objectives being evaluated. There is a risk of biasing the study as the users will  
28 focus more on the issues that are immediately urgent for their own needs while neglecting the ones  
29 that they deem secondary.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 **4.2 Evaluation in Line with BioVeL Objectives**

36  
37 The evaluation of SCRAM-CK needs to consider whether it achieved the initial prerequisites of a  
38 continuous RE process to facilitate user participation, design evolution, and prototyping.  
39  
40  
41

### 42 **4.2.1 User-Participation**

43  
44 In the context of producing useful tools for a scientific community, the users have participated in the  
45 design of the BioVeL web toolkit as designers. The prioritisation of requirements and the selection of  
46 most suitable interfaces was user-led. Users participated as designers by guiding the production of  
47 prototypes, selecting the functionalities to be supported and suggesting additional functionalities that  
48 the technical people had not considered or presented as options. Users have also been very clear  
49 when pointing out the most important shortcomings of the existing technologies from their point of  
50 view, and they also suggested similar tools to use as examples.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 There are three key points supporting the assertion that the SCRAM-CK is user-centered:  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23
- a) Prototyping and release of the applications making up the BioVeL web toolkit was delivered and user tested earlier than expected. This was a direct response to early demonstrations in which users requested a simple method for showcasing their advances in Workflow building.
  - b) Testing prototypes occurred in settings that pushed the software capabilities to their limits very rapidly. This fostered the revision of the underlying structures supporting the prototypes, from the kind of machines selected for deployment to the considerations and decisions about the distribution of supporting software (servers, applications and supporting services).
  - c) The prototypes served to promote the BioVeL toolkit with third parties outside the project. The opinions and needs of those third parties were also incorporated, when possible, into the requirements set, given that they represented the needs of the wider biodiversity community, beyond the limits of the project's consortium.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

In the first case, the prototyping activities for Taverna Player and the BioVeL portal were brought forward six and twelve months respectively. This accelerated the refinement both of the tools and of their integration into prototypes that evolved through seven design-develop-test-deploy iterations. These prototypes reached a level of maturity that facilitated their use as design models for the actual construction of the Player and Portal Applications. This process has helped far more than if we had just delivered the requirements list and written design specifications.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

In the second case, users have participated as testers of the prototypes, using workflows relevant to their respective research specialities. Testing has promoted the inclusion of functionalities not contemplated in the early stages of the requirements engineering process. The prototypes turned out to be a very useful tool for testing and demonstrating new workflows. This validates the initial request for easier means to run workflows as a high priority.

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

Finally, the users have been scheduling separate workshops to showcase their workflows using the prototypes. This was done with the intention of disseminating their work amongst peers, but has had an additional positive effect as a source of further third party testing in new scenarios. The users have been reporting the results of those workshops and bringing back new sets of requirements based on actual demands of their respective biodiversity specialities.

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The Requirements Engineering process reported here ran for twenty two months, from April 2012 to February 2014, i.e. until the end of the prototyping cycle. Different documenting and monitoring activities tracked the evolution of the requirements process and also the evolution of design

1 propositions. Throughout this process, the requirements list was not considered an immutable set of  
2 clauses that needed to be abided to but guidelines that were enhanced in response to the needs of the  
3 users and developers.  
4  
5

## 6 **4.2.2 Evolution of Requirements and Designs**

7  
8 The mapping between requirements and design decisions can be traced using the CK diagrams. In  
9 this project the requirements fall within the concept space and the design decisions in the knowledge  
10 space. This shows that although many requirements have been discovered, the prototyping activities  
11 only implement those requirements that are part of design decisions. The design evaluation process  
12 also evolved from paper prototypes and mock-ups, to functioning prototypes up to advanced  
13 prototypes deployed using Amazon Web Services<sup>6</sup>. The different stages in which the method was  
14 applied, and the diagrams showing the expansion of the design space, provide a wider view of the  
15 support that SCRAM-CK provides for the interweaving in the evolution of design and requirements.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **4.2.3 Prototyping**

25  
26 Rapid software prototyping can be viewed as an evolutionary process in which early prototypes are  
27 continuously refined to adequately define and validate user requirements [27]. In addition to being a  
28 medium for requirements refinement and validation, early prototyping activities provide added value  
29 as a medium that facilitates user engagement, exploring emerging opportunities, negotiating the  
30 reconfiguration of roles and resources and early identification of emerging problems that could  
31 impact usability [40]. These effects were observed to different degrees within the requirements  
32 gathering process carried out as part of the BioVeL research into the development of easier user  
33 interfaces for online execution and modification of scientific workflows.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 The series of prototypes provided users with a solid base for discussion not only of initial  
43 requirements but also of relevant usability issues. There were more than 15 online sessions (“Play  
44 Days”) in which the evolving prototypes were the medium for demonstration and discussion.  
45 Usability is an important non-functional requirement [20]. In addition to usability, the use of  
46 SCRAM-CK facilitated the discussion of other non-functional requirements (NFR) such as  
47 reliability, speed, responsiveness and dependability of the system at an early stage. For instance,  
48 users quickly pointed out to the use and placement of buttons to facilitate data input and control,  
49 suggesting not only color schemes but also the relocation of buttons on the page to improve user  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

---

58  
59 <sup>6</sup> This was the platform where the BioVeL web toolkit was first deployed (<http://aws.amazon.com/>)  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 experience. Users also discovered the need for improving the response time after submitting a job  
2 and the use of state messages to reassure the user that the job was being processed.  
3

4 The prototypes also served as an early integration test for the components – a test which otherwise  
5 would have been made later in the project. The late detection of integration issues had the potential  
6 of affecting target dates and delaying dissemination activities. In this sense, early testing of  
7 scalability and resourcing was beneficial. For instance, the resources needed for multiuser execution  
8 pointed out to the need for restructuring the underlying infrastructure, leading to a revised  
9 infrastructure dependent on diverse server programs such as Google Refine, R Server, Taverna  
10 Server, WebDav and Atom. For the initial prototypes the small AWS machines were sufficient for  
11 single user testing but once the number of users started to increase, so did the problems of limited  
12 hardware; which prompted early identification of the need to improve the underlying resourcing  
13 architecture, providing a more robust architecture for the deployment platform.  
14  
15

16 In terms of usability testing, the users coped well with the limitations of the prototypes, but also  
17 identified several significant shortcomings. As a result, they came up with examples and suggestions  
18 that made possible the redefinition of the user interface to better support their needs.  
19  
20

21 For these reasons, we may conclude that the experience of applying SCRAM-CK to the design and  
22 prototyping activities for delivering easier user interfaces for online workflow execution and  
23 modification was not an added cost to the project, but an essential activity which benefited the whole  
24 project in more than one way, and which avoided higher re-work costs later in the project. However,  
25 the findings about NFR must be taken into consideration in future applications of the model,  
26 especially if the prototype is expected to evolve into a fully-fledged production system.  
27  
28

### 29 **4.3 Evaluation against RE Objectives**

30 The evaluation of SCRAM-CK as a general purpose RE method needs to consider whether it  
31 achieved the goals that most RE methods aim to cover. These goals, as mentioned before, are  
32 pertinence, correctness, traceability and understandability.  
33  
34

#### 35 **4.3.1 Pertinence**

36 Pertinence is a major RE objective and it refers to the avoidance of redundant requirements [3].  
37 Using CK diagrams allowed structuring the design space in a way that made visible the relationships  
38 between the concepts in the design space and the statements that supported the requirements lists.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 This helped avoid the presence of redundant requirements. For this reason this RE objective is  
2 deemed to be fully achieved in this case.  
3

#### 4 **4.3.2 Correctness**

5  
6  
7 Correctness is an RE objective that refers to the completeness, consistency and validity of the  
8 requirements produced [3]. The requirements for the production of easier user interfaces for  
9 executing, inspecting and modifying workflows were derived iteratively from several interactions  
10 with users and developers. The requirements appear to be complete as they cover most of the needs  
11 of users. However, measuring completeness is not straightforward, as different users have different  
12 requirements. They reached a general consensus on the main features but each pressed for different  
13 aspects that favoured their work. For instance, while most of the users did agree on the need for an  
14 easier medium to run workflows for testing, validating and demonstration purposes, not all agreed on  
15 the urgency of advanced features for modifying workflows. This also affected consistency and  
16 validity directly since the priorities assigned to different requirements sometimes clashed with user  
17 expectations. Within the constraints of the project this objective was partially fulfilled but there is no  
18 reason to believe that the method cannot completely fulfil this objective in other circumstances.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

#### 29 **4.3.3 Traceability**

30  
31  
32 Traceability involves tracking the relationships between requirements and their sources to clearly  
33 identify the origin of the requirements in order to manage requirements easily [3]. Traceability was  
34 used to rank and to validate the requirements at each stage. If a requirement was common to a greater  
35 group of users, then the ranking was higher and similarly, the requirements that had less demand  
36 were pushed down in the priorities list. The use of interviews, meetings, and the project's bug  
37 tracking system facilitated the direct identification of the user groups that were behind specific  
38 requirements. This helped in always being able to identify the source and rationale for each  
39 requirement. This objective is fully achieved.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 **4.3.4 Understandability**

49  
50 Understandability is an important RE objective in all life cycle of the requirements that facilitates the  
51 discussion of requirements with all stakeholders [3]. In this case, requirements were expressed in  
52 simple terms as statements in a ranked list. The paper prototypes, prototype interfaces, interview  
53 reports, video, and responses to surveys were used to clarify the details of the requirements. This  
54 helped not only to keep the requirements list clear and concise, but also to minimise the amount of  
55 documentation produced. The staged implementation of requirements and the agile development  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 techniques applied also helped in keeping the requirements fresh and understandable to all  
2 stakeholders. This objective can therefore be considered to be fully achieved  
3

#### 4 **4.4 Alternative Theories**

5  
6  
7 The existence of several alternative RE methods leads to the question: is it appropriate to propose yet  
8 another method? First, it should be noted that any method selected would have had to be adapted to  
9 match the specific goals of BioVeL. After considering various alternatives, four other RE methods  
10 were considered good candidates to address the requirements for BioVeL: GORE, COSMOD-RE,  
11 ScenIC, and ARID. This section describes these methods and provides a brief comparison to  
12 SCRAM-CK in terms of their coverage of the RE process envisaged for BioVeL. The coverage of  
13 general RE objectives is not analysed here because that would have required more experience with  
14 using each of the methods.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

##### 22 **4.4.1 COSMOD-RE**

23  
24  
25 COSMOD-RE (sCenario and gOal based System develOpment methoD) [30] advocates co-design  
26 which is defined as mixing of requirements and architecture design. In the COSMOD-RE process  
27 goals, scenarios, and architecture are continuously refined. COSMOD-RE is structured in five stages.  
28 However, the user participates in the initial stage for requirements specifications. The remaining  
29 stages involve making adjustments to reconcile requirements and architectural needs, with little  
30 participation from users. COSMOD-RE organisation mirrors the organisation of a layered  
31 architecture. The concerns of users are mostly addressed in the design of the interface layer and then  
32 mapped down through the different layers through to the hardware level.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

##### 40 **4.4.2 GORE**

41  
42  
43 Scenarios and Goal-Oriented Requirements Engineering (GORE) can be used to achieve a stable set  
44 of requirements [9]. There are several approaches that aim at combining GORE methods with  
45 scenarios in requirements engineering. Goal decomposition guides the discovery of requirements by  
46 means of continuous decomposition of higher order goals into more specific ones. GORE techniques  
47 do not address the active role of users in the design process and therefore GORE is not, in itself, a  
48 suitable methodology for projects where co-design is an important element.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

##### 54 **4.4.3 ScenIC**

55  
56  
57 ScenIC is a requirements engineering method for evolving systems [31]. ScenIC was derived from  
58 the Inquiry Cycle [34] model of requirements refinement and uses goal refinement and scenario  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 analysis as its primary methodological strategies. This method can be used during the entire  
2 requirements process to analyse and validate requirements. The problem is that it does not provide a  
3 structure for conducting the process itself, suggesting just a constant repetition of the verification  
4 cycle. ScenIC does not address the changing nature of requirements as the project progresses and it  
5 does not envision the use of different strategies at different stages. Users are interviewed and  
6 observed for requirements elicitation but they do not take an active role in the process.  
7  
8  
9

#### 10 11 **4.4.4 ARID**

12 Active Reviews for Intermediate Designs (ARID) [7], is a method developed for evaluating a portion  
13 of a system, for instance the user-interface. ARID is a hybrid method that allows reviewing a design  
14 in its pre-release stages. ARID provides early insight into the design's viability, and would allow for  
15 discovery of errors, inconsistencies, or inadequacies. It is user centered, allowing users to participate  
16 not only in the evaluation of an artefact but also in the specification of the success criteria. However,  
17 ARID does not address analysis of the actual design alternatives or the evolution of the design,  
18 leaving them as additional activities after the evaluation process.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **5 Discussion and Conclusions**

29 It would be inaccurate to claim that all the positive results achieved have been the product of the  
30 SCRAM-CK process. The process has also been helped by the continuous exposure of the scientists  
31 to other design/development processes in the project. Firstly, they have received training on  
32 workflow building, which has made them aware of many of the needs for clearly designing and  
33 describing a procedure that requires automation. Secondly they have participated in the definition,  
34 selection and/or design of many of the processing steps that are integrated in their workflows.  
35 Thirdly they collaborate closely with developers that have been helping them in designing and  
36 building workflows for their respective research areas. These activities have been more rigorous  
37 because one of the objectives of BioVeL is to produce repositories of high quality workflows. As a  
38 result, the scientist users within BioVeL have demonstrated a better grasp of the concepts related to  
39 software design and development than one might normally expect of end-users. This section will  
40 elaborate on some of the main issues found during the RE exercise applying SCRAM-CK. An  
41 extended discussion about the prototyping activities is also included.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

### 55 **5.1 Main Issues**

56 The use of SCRAM-CK has supported the development of the BioVeL web toolkit. SCRAM  
57 provided the general structures for the requirements engineering activities, while CK Theory has  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 provided the logical underpinnings to map the evolution of design in different stages of the process.  
2 However, there are issues related to the actual mechanisms for monitoring evolution, documentation  
3 of changes and implementation time that need to be addressed in future if the approach is used again.  
4  
5

6 The documentation required for the application of SCRAM-CK is minimal. Apart from the diagrams  
7 and the requirements lists, the issues were easily recorded by users themselves in the project issue  
8 tracking system (JIRA). This facilitated a fast turnaround whilst also providing sufficient  
9 documentation of issues and their solutions. The analysis of (JIRA) issues helped in determining  
10 whether an issue reported was a new feature, a request for improvement, or a bug.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 The diagrams for representing the expansion of the concept and knowledge spaces work well for  
17 small design tasks. The diagrams are presented in this article together in the different figures in order  
18 to illustrate the evolution of the design space. However, as the presentation of stages advances, the  
19 diagram complexity increases rapidly; complicating the building and maintenance of the diagrams.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

When viewed as a whole they are hard to follow and maintain. However, they can be kept separated  
by stages, types of concerns addressed or design session, to help readability and to facilitate  
interpretation.

Time constraints were particularly challenging. The initial proposal of the method and its early  
implementation in practice were carried out within four months. Similarly, the prototyping phase  
started from month five. More time is required to incorporate and apply the methods with support  
tools and notations for verifying requirements consistency and completeness. Nevertheless, the  
application of SCRAM and CK Theory method integrated easily with the agile development  
practices already in place within the project.

Another issue related to time constraints is the speed with which the proposed process was  
implemented and executed. This leaves room for questioning the selection of methods and theories.  
However, we based our selection on previous experience in similar projects and on sound guidance  
for selecting requirements engineering methodologies [2, 6, 9, 17, 24, 25, 28, 29, 39, 43]. The  
complementary review of technologies suggested that our candidate methods were a good match to  
the requirements of the project and the practical application confirms this.

The constant maintenance and implementation of the requirements list has been used as the  
foundation for the implementation strategy. The simple requirements list is not the optimal tool for  
describing the requirements in full. However, design decisions and requirements can be mapped  
using the CK diagrams in combination with this list. To complement this, the development teams

1 have actively used the BioVeL project's issue tracking system (JIRA) where features are logged as  
2 improvements to the products under development.  
3

## 4 **5.2 Conclusions and future work**

6  
7 Virtual e-Science platforms (or Virtual Research Environments) are intended to support scientific  
8 discovery by enabling the cooperative work of diverse users over long periods of time, and bringing  
9 together of distributed resources [43]. The development of such platforms requires scalable methods  
10 of requirements analysis that: document the needs of vastly different user groups; continue to  
11 document changing needs over time; coordinate investigation at multiple sites of use; design for  
12 large distributed entities; and absorb transformative changes in practice [43]. An agile requirements  
13 engineering process, coupled with strong user engagement that can adapt to changing circumstances  
14 as project and users' needs unfold, is key to meeting these challenges [35]. The SCRAM-CK process  
15 presented in this paper is an approach that may be used to face those challenges.  
16  
17

18  
19 The BioVeL project has implemented a requirements review process that is intertwined not only in  
20 the design and development processes of the software products, but also into the wider scientific  
21 support activities of the project. The requirements review process fostered the inclusion and  
22 engagement of end users in the design processes in a way that allowed them to take ownership of the  
23 resulting product and steer its design and development activities. This is a particularly important  
24 factor in fostering the uptake of new technologies that have the potential to change working  
25 practices.  
26  
27

28  
29 The prototypes of the BioVeL web toolkit were developed using the SCRAM-CK process. This  
30 process produced working prototypes, which were effective tools for discussing and enhancing the  
31 requirements as these were implemented as features. The activities showed BioVeL as a viable e-  
32 Science platform, meeting the need for a tool for workflow inspection, execution and modification.  
33 The current version of the BioVeL workflow web toolkit is a set of Ruby on Rails applications  
34 deployed at <http://portal.biovel.eu>. The source code is openly available on github<sup>7 8 9</sup>. BioVeL also  
35 provides an Ansible<sup>10</sup> configuration management module to facilitate the rapid deployment portal  
36 instances.  
37  
38

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://github.com/BioVeL/portal>

56 <sup>8</sup> <https://github.com/myGrid/taverna-player>

57 <sup>9</sup> <https://github.com/myGrid/taverna-lite>

58 <sup>10</sup> <https://github.com/BioVeL/ansible-playbooks>  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 The prototyping phase ended in February 2014. The prototypes evolved in controlled stages  
2 increasing functionalities. Each new version of the prototype supported more complex workflow  
3 manipulation operations. The last prototype delivered included the ability to modify workflows  
4 through Taverna Lite..  
5  
6

7 As a result of this controlled evolution, the software became increasingly robust, due to the fast  
8 feedback loop and the debugging and testing activities. At present the prototype versions have been  
9 decommissioned and a new version of the portal is being supported. This version is stronger from the  
10 beginning thanks to feedback and design insights gained through the development, deployment, and  
11 use of the prototypes supported by the SCRAM-CK approach.  
12  
13

14 In future evaluation exercises, the mapping of the expansions to the concept and knowledge spaces  
15 needs to be refined to better support the derivation of requirements. It will be interesting to analyse  
16 further the applicability of design games for scenario evaluation, particularly when different levels of  
17 customisation need to be implemented; as well as trying to apply alternative workshop facilitation  
18 techniques [4] and design review methods [7].  
19  
20

21 The application of SCRAM-CK suggests that the use of prototypes can also help in fleshing out other  
22 NFR at an early stage. This is an alternative to the approaches that promote determining the NFR  
23 after the functional requirements are defined [19, 33]. In this case using an ontology based NFR  
24 elicitation framework, such as ElicitO [1], in combination with SCRAM-CK could provide a more  
25 complete set of requirements. This would be an important enhancement with the potential of easing  
26 the transition from prototyping to development of high quality production applications.  
27  
28

## 29 **6 Acknowledgements**

30 The BioVeL project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework  
31 Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no.  
32 283359. More information at <http://www.biovel.eu>.  
33  
34

35 The authors would like to thank the members of BioVeL who have actively participated in the  
36 requirements review activities reported in this paper, including our scientific partners: María Paula  
37 Balcazar Vargas, Sarah Bourlat, Päivi Lyytikäinen-Saarenmaa, Matthias Obst, Gerard Oostermeijer,  
38 Elisabeth Paymal, Hannu Saarenmaa, and Saverio Vicario; and our technical partners: Jonathan  
39 Giddy, Carole Goble, Robert Haines, Vera Hernandez, Robert Kulawik, Cherian Mathew, and Alan  
40 Williams.  
41  
42

1 The authors would also like to thank all the participants in the different training and dissemination  
2 activities, who have provided invaluable comments and feedback.

3  
4 The authors also thank the anonymous reviewers for their feedback that helped to improve the  
5 overall quality of the manuscript.  
6

## 7 **References**

- 11 1. Al Balushi, T. H., Sampaio, P. R. F., Loucopoulos, P. (2013). Eliciting and prioritizing quality  
12 requirements supported by ontologies: a case study using the ElicitO framework and tool. *Expert*  
13 *Systems*, 30(2), 129-151.
- 14 2. Alexander I., Beus-Dukic, L. (2009) *Discovering requirements: how to specify products and services*.  
15 Chichester : Wiley, 2009. 457 p.
- 16 3. Al-Subaie, H. S. F., Maibaum, T. S. E. (2006). Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Goal-Oriented  
17 Requirements Engineering Method. Fourth International Workshop on Comparative Evaluation in  
18 Requirements Engineering (CERE), September 2006. Pages 8-19. DOI: 10.1109/CERE.2006.3
- 19 4. Azadegan, A., Papamichail, N., Sampaio, P. (2013). Applying collaborative process design to user  
20 requirements elicitation: A case study. *Computers in Industry*, In Press.  
21 doi:10.1016/j.compind.2013.05.001
- 22 5. Bhagwanani, S. (2005). *An Evaluation of End-User Interfaces of Scientific Workflow Management*  
23 *Systems*. Master Thesis. North Carolina State University.
- 24 6. Cheng, B. H. C., Atlee, J. M., Joanne, M. (2007). Research Directions in Requirements Engineering  
25 Research Directions in Requirements Engineering. *Proceeding FOSE '07 Future of Software Engineering*  
26 (pp. 285–303). Minneapolis, MN: IEEE Computer Society Washington.
- 27 7. Clements, P. C. (2000). *Active Reviews for Intermediate Designs (CMU/SEI-2000-TN-009)*. (pp. 1–25).  
28 Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University. Retrieved from  
29 <http://www.sei.cmu.edu/library/abstracts/reports/00tn009.cfm>
- 30 8. Davis, F. D. (1989) Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information  
31 Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13:3, 319-340. (<http://hcibib.org/perlman/question.cgi?form=PUEU>)
- 32 9. Delnooz, C., Vrijnsen, L. (2003). Experiences with scenarios and Goal-Oriented RE. *LACS2003*,  
33 *Landelijk Architectuur Congres*.
- 34 10. Garijo, D., Alper, P., Belhajjame, K., Corcho, O., Gil, Y., Goble, C. (2012). Common motifs in scientific  
35 workflows: An empirical analysis. *2012 IEEE 8th International Conference on E-Science*, 1–8.  
36 doi:10.1109/eScience.2012.6404427
- 37 11. Gil, Y., Deelman, E., Ellisman, M., Fahringer, T., Fox, G. (2007). Examining the challenges of scientific  
38 workflows. *Computer*.
- 39 12. Goble, C., De Roure, D. (2009). The impact of workflow tools on data-centric research. *Data Intensive*  
40 *Computing: The Fourth Paradigm of Scientific Discovery*, Microsoft Research, 2009

13. Goble, C., Wroe, C., Stevens, R. (2003). The myGrid project: services, architecture and demonstrator Grid Services and Architect-. In S. Cox (Ed.), Proceedings of UK e-Science All Hands Meeting 2003 (p. 8). Southampton: University of Southampton.
14. Goecks, J., Nekrutenko, A., Taylor, J. (2010). Galaxy: a comprehensive approach for supporting accessible, reproducible, and transparent computational research in the life sciences. *Genome biology*, 11(8), R86. doi:10.1186/gb-2010-11-8-r86
15. Hatchuel A., Le Masson P. Weil B. (2004), CK Theory in Practice: Lessons from Industrial Applications, 8th International Design Conference, D. Marjanovic, (Ed.), Dubrovnik, 18th-21st May 2004: 245–257.
16. Hatchuel, A and Weil, B (2003), A new approach of innovative design: an introduction to CK Theory. Proceedings of the international conference on engineering design (ICED'03), Stockholm, Sweden, pp 109–124
17. Jarke, M., Loucopoulos, P., Lyytinen, K., Mylopoulos, J., Robinson, W. (2011). The brave new world of design requirements. *Information Systems*, 36(7), 992–1008. doi:10.1016/j.is.2011.04.003
18. Le Masson, P., Hatchuel, A., Weil, B. (2009). Design Theory and Collective Creativity: A Theoretical Framework to Evaluate KCP Process. Proceedings of ICED 09, the 17th International Conference on Engineering Design, Vol. 6, Design Methods and Tools (pt. 2), Palo Alto, CA, USA, 24.-27.08.2009 (277-288)
19. López, C., Codocedo, V., Astudillo, H., Cysneiros, L. M. (2012). Bridging the gap between software architecture rationale formalisms and actual architecture documents: An ontology-driven approach. *Science of Computer Programming*, 77(1), 66-80.
20. Loucopoulos, P., Sun, J., Zhao, L., Heidari, F. (2013). A Systematic Classification and Analysis of NFRs.
21. Marx, V. (2013). Biology: The big challenges of big data. *Nature*, 498, 255–260.
22. Mehandjiev, N., Lecue, F., Wajid, U., Namoun, A. (2010). Assisted Service Composition for End Users. 2010 Eighth IEEE European Conference on Web Services (pp. 131–138). IEEE. doi:10.1109/ECOWS.2010.30
23. Mehandjiev, N., Namoune, A., Wajid, U., Macaulay, L., Sutcliffe, A. (2010). End User Service Composition: Perceptions and Requirements. 2010 Eighth IEEE European Conference on Web Services (pp. 139–146). IEEE. doi:10.1109/ECOWS.2010.29
24. Nuseibeh, B., Easterbrook, S. (2000). Requirements Engineering : A Roadmap. In C. Ghezz, M. Jazayeri, A. L. Wolf (Eds.), Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on on Software Engineering, ICSE 2000 (Vol. 1, pp. 35–46). Limerick Ireland.
25. Nuseibeh, B. (2001). Weaving Together Requirements and Architectures. *Computer*, 34(3), 115–119.
26. Oinn, T., Li, P., Kell, D. B., Goble, C., Goderis, A., Hull, D., Stevens, R., et al. (2007). Taverna / my Grid : Aligning a Workflow System with the Life Sciences Community. In I. J. Taylor, E. Deelman, D. B. Gannon, M. Shields (Eds.), *Workflows for e-Science* (pp. 300–319). London: Springer London. doi:10.1007/978-1-84628-757-2

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
27. S. P. Overmyer (1991). Revolutionary vs. Evolutionary Rapid Prototyping: Balancing Software Productivity and HCI Design Concerns. Center of Excellence in Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence (C3I), George Mason University, 4400 University Drive, Fairfax, Virginia 1991.
28. Parviainen, P., Tihinen, M. (2007). A survey of existing requirements engineering technologies and their coverage ". International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering, 17(6), 827–850.
29. Peirce, S. C., Hardisty, A. R., Preece, A. D., Elwyn, G. (2011). Designing and implementing telemonitoring for early detection of deterioration in chronic disease: defining the requirements. Health informatics journal, 17(3), 173–90. doi:10.1177/1460458211409717
30. Pohl, K., Sikora, E. (2007). COSMOD-RE: Supporting the Co-Design of Requirements and Architectural Artifacts. 15th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE 2007) (pp. 258–261). Ieee. doi:10.1109/RE.2007.25
31. Potts, C. (1999). ScenIC: a strategy for inquiry-driven requirements determination. Proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Requirements Engineering (pp. 58–65). IEEE Comput. Soc. doi:10.1109/ISRE.1999.777985
32. Potts C., Takahashi K., Anton A. (1994). Inquiry based requirements analysis. IEEE Software, March 1994, 21-32.
33. Rago, A., Marcos, C., Diaz-Pace, J. A. (2014). Assisting requirements analysts to find latent concerns with REAssistant. Automated Software Engineering, 1-34.
34. Segrestin, B. (2009). Collaborative innovation capabilities: developing platforms through design games, International Product Development Conference (Enschede).
35. Stevens, R. D., Robinson, A. J., Goble, C. A. (2003). myGrid: personalised bioinformatics on the information grid. Bioinformatics, 19(Suppl 1), i302–i304. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btg1041
36. Sutcliffe, A. G. (2002), User-Centered Requirements Engineering. Springer-Verlag London.
37. Sutcliffe, A. G. (2009). On the Inevitable Intertwining of Requirements and Architecture. (K. Lyytinen, P. Loucopoulos, J. Mylopoulos, B. Robinson, Eds.)Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing, 14(Design Requirements Engineering: A Ten-Year Perspective), 168–185.
38. Sutcliffe A. G., Ryan M. (1998). Experience with SCRAM, a SCenario Requirements Analysis Method, ICRE 1998, 164
39. Swartout, W., Baker, R. (1982). On the Inevitable Intertwining of Specification and Implementation. Communications of the ACM, 25(7), 438–440.
40. Ure J., Rakebrandt F. , Lloyd S., Khanban A., Procter R., Anderson S., Hanley J., Hartswood M., Pagliari C., Mckinstry B., Tarling A., Kidd G., Corscadden P. (2009). Giving Them Something to Hate: Using Prototypes as a Vehicle for Early Engagement in Virtual Organizations Social Science Computer Review November 2009 27: 569-582, first published on June 12, 2009
41. Wolstencroft, K., Haines, R., Fellows, D., Williams, A., Withers, D., Owen, S., Soiland-Reyes, S., et al. (2013). The Taverna workflow suite: designing and executing workflows of Web Services on the

desktop, web or in the cloud. *Nucleic acids research*, 41(Web Server issue), W557–61.

doi:10.1093/nar/gkt328

42. Yeltayeva, K. (2012). Usability Study of the Taverna Scientific Workflow Workbench. Master Thesis. University of Manchester.

43. Zimmerman, A., Nardi, B. A. (2006). Whither or Whether HCI : Requirements Analysis for Multi-Sited Cyber-infrastructures. *Conf. Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '06 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, (pp. 1601–1606). ACM Press.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 8 Appendix A: Further Enhancements

User feedback has been taken into account for the further enhancement of the BioVeL toolkit. Table 4 shows the mapping of the deployed versions of the toolkit along with the review events where they have been presented. The first column indicates the version number and the date of deployment. The second column lists the review events, including location and date. The third column indicates features incorporated in the version being used at each event.

**Table 4 Prototype Progress and Dissemination**

Version	Review event	Main features
Prototype 0.0.1 05/09/2012	Annual Project Meeting, Aix-en-Provence, France, 05/09/2012 Demonstration for researchers from the Humboldt Institute of Colombia, Cardiff University, 16/10/2012	Added a Homepage Handle User-Sessions Workflow Management (add, delete, etc.) Run Management (add, delete, etc.) Add Server Credentials
Beta 0.3.1 04/11/2012	EC Review, Brussels, 08/11/2012 Online Demonstration for Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, 14/11/2012	Deployed on Amazon cloud server Get details from workflow file Connectivity to R-Server Submit files as inputs Improved formatting of results
Beta 0.3.2 15/11/2012	Service team meeting demonstrations during November – December 2012 and January 2013	Improved run management Enabled workflow interaction Link to <sup>my</sup> Experiment Added announcements
Beta 0.3.3 28/11/2012	Play Day 2 – Testing BioVeL Portal DRW and ENM 30/01/2013 Play Day 3 – Testing BioVeL Portal DRW and ENM 31/01/2013	Improved workflow upload Improved workspace separation Enabled cancelling runs Added result descriptions
Beta 0.3.4 31/01/2013	Play Day 4 – Testing BioVeL Portal DRW and POPMOD 26/02/2013 Population Modelling Workshop 07/03/2013 to 08/03/2013	Enabled anonymous running Improved look and feel
Beta 0.3.5 05/03/2013	Play Day 5 – ENM Training at Gothenburg, 15/03/2013	Connection to <sup>my</sup> Experiment Improve user management Improve presentation of tables and tabs Improve results formatting Enabled workflow download
Beta 0.3.6 07/03/2013	Presentation on the Biodiversity Informatics Group Seminar, Cardiff, 28/03/2013 Play Day 12 – Browser and Stress Test of BioVeL Portal, 13/05/2013 to 17/05/2013 Play Day 13 – Functional Test BioVeL Portal, 21/05/2013	Annotation of code
Beta 0.3.7 30/05/2013	Play Day 14 – Biome-BGC Test on BioVeL Portal, 31/05/2013 Biome-BGC workshop, Budapest, 06/06/2013 to 07/06/2013	Customisation of input examples Customisation of output examples Customisation of error messages

The more advanced versions of the prototype were implemented, deployed and demonstrated to users, but they were not released for further testing and validation. Instead of this, the functionalities will be implemented into the final production version of the portal when and if required.

## ***8.1 Review of Prototype Versions***

The prototype has been used and evaluated during different review events, which can be grouped according to the scenarios described in section 3.4.1.

In the demonstration scenario context, the portal has been used to demonstrate the advances of the project and its different products on two occasions. The first demonstration occurred during the presentation of advances to the member of BioVeL during the second annual project meeting. The second demonstration was performed during a formal EC review of project progress.

In the outreach scenario context, the portal has been demonstrated to scientists from different British, European and American Institutions to showcase BioVeL products and to promote and support the adoption of virtual research environments in the Biodiversity research community.

In the workflow development scenario, the prototype has gradually become the medium for testing advances on workflow development in scheduled “play-days”. The play-days are online working sessions in which a workflow is tested by different users and developers. Previously, these involved the use of the Taverna workbench but now they are mostly carried out on the Portal. This prompted the further strengthening of the toolkit features for supporting different users and managing run results.

In the teaching scenario, the portal has been used in training sessions and workshops. In addition to this the prototype has also been used in Workshops for population modelling, niche modelling and ecosystems functioning.

In addition to these scenarios, the portal has been increasingly used by BioVeL partners for their day to day use, supporting the production of research papers and reports for environmental agencies.

## ***8.2 Requirements Review***

The implementation of the features addressing the requirements gathered during different stages of the SCRAM-CK process has been interleaved with the activities for validation and refinement of those same requirements. This has facilitated providing a useful test platform that has allowed further enhancement of the toolkit thanks to actual feedback from workflow developers and users. Table 5 shows the mapping of the requirements to the deployed and planned versions of the toolkit. The final columns indicate the components of the BioVeL Workflow Web Toolkit that were modified for the implementation of each feature.

**Table 5 Requirements Implementation Roadmap**

Features	Version	Status	BioVeL Portal	Taverna Player	Taverna Lite
Simplified workflow execution	Prototype 0.0.1	Released		X	
Presentation of results	Prototype 0.0.1	Released		X	
Downloading Results	Prototype 0.0.1	Released	X		
User management	Prototype 0.0.1	Released	X		
Workflow execution feedback	Beta 0.3.2	Released		X	
Workflow execution statistics	Beta 0.3.2	Released	X	X	
Implement connectivity with <sup>my</sup> Experiment	Beta 0.3.5	Released	X		
Allow downloading workflows	Beta 0.3.6	Released	X		
Error Handling	Beta 0.3.7	Released	X	X	X
Allow uploading sample input and outputs	Beta 0.3.7	Released		X	X
Customise inputs	Beta 0.4.2	Deployed			X
Customise outputs	Beta 0.4.3	Deployed			X
Component View of Work Flow Structure	Beta 0.5.1	Deployed			X
Select Intermediate outputs	Beta 0.5.2	Deployed			X
Implement Component Swapping	Beta 0.5.3	Deployed			X
Workflow Template View	Beta 0.6.1	Deployed			X
Template based customisation	Beta 0.6.2	Deployed			X
Save workflows to <sup>my</sup> Experiment	Beta 0.6.3	Pending	X		X

Figure 1 The SCRAM method  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2 Dynamics of the design process according to CK Theory  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3 High Level Diagram of BioVeL Web Toolkit  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4 Stage 1 Domain Familiarisation.  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5 Stage 1 Domain Familiarisation and User Observation  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 6 Stage 1 and Stage 2  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 7 BioVeL Portal Prototype 0.0.1  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



# BioVeL Taverna Lite Prototype 0.0.1



[Home](#) [Workflows](#) [Runs](#) [Logout](#)

## Listing workflows

Title	Author	Workflow file	Operations			
Stage Matrix Generation 1	Maria Paula Balcázar Vargas Jonathan P. Giddy	workflow1.t2flow	Show	Edit	Destroy	Run
Stage Matrix Generation 2	Maria Paula Balcázar Vargas Jonathan P. Giddy	workflow2.t2flow	Show	Edit	Destroy	Run

New Workflow



BioVeL is funded by the European Commission 7th Framework Programme (FP7), through the grant agreement number 283359.

