

More than Requirements: Applying Requirements Engineering Techniques to the Challenge of Setting Corporate Intellectual Policy, An Experience Report

David Callele
Department of Computer Science
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatchewan, Canada
callele@cs.usask.ca

Krzysztof Wnuk
Department of Computer Science
Lund University
Lund, Sweden
Krzysztof.Wnuk@cs.lth.se

Abstract—Creation and adoption of corporate policies requires significant commitment of scarce senior management resources. In the absence of processes and tools, convergence upon final policy and may not be achieved in a timely manner. Significant similarities between policy and requirements documents suggest that requirements engineering techniques could be used to generate policy. However, neither evidence of feasibility of this approach nor theoretical investigation is present in the research literature. This paper reports upon our experience from an exploratory study where well-established requirements engineering methodologies were applied to generate corporate intellectual property policy. Interview, brainstorming and survey techniques were used to successfully apply structure and process to the task, generating a new corporate intellectual property policy that met or exceeded all stakeholder goals. The materials gathered during stakeholder surveys not only provided functional guidance for the policy itself, but also non-functional guidance with respect to the diversity of stakeholder opinions and the strength with which opinions were held. ALLOWED US TO ACT AS MEDIATORS This knowledge greatly facilitated the creation of draft policy: this insider knowledge increased our expectation of stakeholder acceptance and also facilitated subsequent negotiation efforts. The feasibility of applying RE techniques to crafting corporate policy has been demonstrated and the results show sufficient promise that further investigation is warranted.

Keywords: Requirements elicitation, negotiation, corporate policy, intellectual property.

I. COMMENTS TO ADDRESS

The following are comments from the reviewers and, sometimes, my comments in response.

Only 6 statements, trivial number of requirements. Challenge is in the negotiation process, goal is to express in the minimum number of statements. One is best, six is acceptable. Many, many more clauses. Initial number was over 50. Initial policy had 3 classes of external IP, 2 classes of internal IP, 4 classes of client stakeholders, 4 classes of funding stakeholders.

Believes that ARM was used. Restate to show that the process was ARM-like. Process used was that approved by management within the extant corporate culture, not necessarily the best process but one that was deemed most likely to meet the least resistance.

This is an experience report, not a research project.

Clearly identify the number of respondents, number of survey questions.

If possible, expand upon use-case contradictions

Add visual org-chart to identify the participants.

Add a chart to identify the types of stakeholders.

Add a chart to identify the types of IP.

In Section 2, why is it so hard to convert these statements into policy? Over 20 years of different business approach. Vested interests in maintaining the status quo (power-base), resisting/fearing change, philosophic disagreement as to the proper form of the new direction.

Why elicit first then propose drafts rather than propose drafts? Experience within the management team identified significant divergence of opinion. Elicited first in an attempt to solicit buy-in, my opinion was considered before the first draft rather than “a draft was composed (and imposed) before my opinion was solicited and considered”

What about traceability? To the person: semi-anonymous submissions. To the business value (proposition): original IP policy was crafted to meet the needs of the original business model. Intermediate business model, an extended transition phase where the original IP model was identified by customers as a significant impediment to future business. New business model proposed and approved by Board. New IP policy to reflect new direction as well as maintain traditional IP legacy.

Value proposition to change: (1) Prior unacceptable, must have new policy to continue operations. (2) Mandate changed from revenue generation from technology licensing to members of consortia to facilitating technology commercialization by consortia members.

II. INTRODUCTION

The creation and adoption of corporate policies requires significant commitment of senior management resources. Senior management must address their attentions to identifying the stakeholders and their needs and formulating a policy proposal in response. Discussion and negotiation occur among the team members, principally focusing on the

effects of the policy upon business-case scenarios. Over the course of these iterations, convergence occurs and the final policy is formulated.

This sequence of events is quite similar to a typical requirements engineering process: it appears that the output (policy *vs.* requirements artifact) may be the principal difference between the two efforts. And, just as in typical requirements engineering efforts, the rigor and efficiency used in policy generation can vary widely.

These similarities lead us to posit that requirements engineering techniques can be used to address capturing and representing corporate policies, applying structure to what may otherwise be an *ad hoc* process. This topic has not been addressed in the prior work and we report herein upon our experience crafting an Intellectual Property (IP) policy using techniques from the RE practice. The resulting IP policy was developed in a timely manner, met the stakeholder's needs, and the RE techniques employed resulted in the development of a greater breadth of use-cases and validation scenarios than expected.

In Section III we review the related work and in Section IV we describe the case company. In Section V we present a description of the methodology then report upon the RE techniques used in Section VI. The survey used is discussed in Section VII and our experimental observations are reported in Section VIII. Section IX presents the final IP policy and discussion. Section X presents conclusions and directions for future work.

III. RELATED WORK

Requirements engineering is recognized as a key component of successful software development [3]. A requirements engineering effort identifies and endeavors to understand stakeholder needs, then elicits and manages requirements as necessary [7]. These efforts are complicated when the stakeholders are geographically distributed [9], [8], [6] as in the current work.

Breaux and Anton [5] investigate the interaction of requirements with privacy policies through the use of semantic models to extract goals from policy statements. As such, this work is aligned with the current work, at least in intent.

The application of requirements engineering techniques to the task of setting corporate policy for Digital Rights Management is suggested by Morin and Pawlak [12] in their future work, stating that "requirements engineering techniques could prove to be particularly useful in initial phases of defining and formalizing policies from unstructured heterogeneous sources [p.196]". Suh *et al.* [13] identify IP practices (and, by implication, IP policies) in South Korean firms and investigate correlations between these practices and the financial performance and perceived economic health of these firms. The study is interesting in intent but the reported results only indicate that financial performance is weakly correlated with IP policy; the number of potential

confounding factors in their underlying data sets appear to restrain them from drawing stronger conclusions. Nevertheless, the work does show some support for considering IP policy as a key element of corporate guidance.

Barney *et al.* [4] address prioritization of aspects of intellectual capital within an organization. They propose a weighted voting scheme with strong stakeholder participation. In the context of the current work, one could argue that a similar techniques could be used to formulate IP policy at the highest level. Alternatively, it could be argued that the prioritization process should be a logical consequence of extant IP policies.

Alspaugh *et al.* [1] investigate IP rights and responsibilities and how IP licenses can have unexpected or unintended effects upon an organization. Their work identifies the need to proactively consider the effects of IP licenses upon corporate planning, particularly in the area of software product development. They propose considering IP rights and responsibilities as a new class of non-functional requirement and investigate mechanisms (such as tool support) for managing and resolving potential conflicts. The issues investigated in their work are the logical consequence of the issues investigated in the current work. Their work does not address the application of RE techniques to the elicitation, negotiation, and formulation of IP policies. Rather, they investigate the consequences of the IP policies *upon other organizations*, an issue that (in retrospect) the case company could have given greater consideration.

IV. THE CASE COMPANY

The subject company, referred to hereafter as CASECO, is a 25 year old Information and Communications Technology (ICT) sector company with five locations, in five different cities, spread across 3 jurisdictions. Each location has permanent employees, contract employees and interns (both student and professional). The management structure is hierarchical on the organization chart but is relatively flat in practice – senior management and junior management interact in an informal manner.

CASECO is a not-for-profit economic development organization. Their mission is to "enhance industry through ICT innovation" which translates, in practice, into accelerating the technological and business growth of Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs) throughout the operating region. This growth is achieved by making in-kind investments of highly-skilled manpower on specific projects done in partnership between CASECO and the project company (referred to hereafter as PROJECTCO).

The senior management team is composed of the President, four Vice-Presidents (with authority along jurisdictional boundaries), and the most senior Site Manager (by years of experience within the firm). Senior management does not have a financial interest in corporate outcomes but they are personal stakeholders as corporate policies

affect their ability to deliver upon their personal performance metrics. The stakeholders with a direct financial interest exert influence via corporate guidance from the Board of Directors. One financial stakeholder also seconds a senior manager into one of the Vice-President positions, providing a greater degree of support to the company while ensuring that their interests are appropriately represented.

Each Vice-President is charged not only with performing the tasks associated with their positions but also with representing jurisdictional interests. As a result, the Vice-Presidents are cautious to ensure that all of their responsibilities are discharged appropriately. Management decisions are gently guided by the President but require significant consensus building within the senior management team. As stakeholder representatives, senior management is often asked to simultaneously represent multiple stakeholder interests – interests that can be conflicting and which may not represent the personal position of the representative.

A. The Task

CASECO received Board of Directors guidance to undergo a substantial change in business direction. While CASECO was to remain focused on the ICT sector, how it participated in that sector was to change significantly. As a result, corporate policies and procedures required significant revision.

The current senior management team had inherited their processes from prior senior management; few of the the existing processes were developed by current management. The overall mindset was still on “delivery under prior guidance”, no-one knew what the new rules would be so adaptation efforts were stalled. When efforts were made to begin development of the new policies, there was a tendency to develop policies that readily meet business goals but in a way that were infeasible in practice: the suggestions were usually too resource-intensive to implement. This *ad hoc* approach to developing policy was inefficient and, to accelerate the effort, the first author was tasked with leading the development of a new IP policy, subject to the following conditions.

- 1) Ensure that the stakeholders are adequately represented.
- 2) Meet the guidance of the Board of Directors, as expressed via the Business Plan.
- 3) The final IP policy must be readily expressed, communicated, and understood.
- 4) The final IP policy must be implementable as part of daily operations within existing resource constraints.

Permission was received to pursue task delivery using requirements engineering methodologies and to treat the effort as an empirical case study (for publication in this work), subject to constraints that, when necessary, business needs must come before study needs. Neither author is a member of the CASECO senior management team.

B. IP Policy Guidance

Initial guidance for the IP policy was drawn from the CASECO business plan, parts of which are presented here. Of necessity, certain elements have been redacted or paraphrased to protect commercial interests but the authors have done their best to present the intent of the guidance in an intact manner.

The intent of the IP policy is to ensure that daily operations delivers projects that meet the guidance provided in the business plan for IP ownership, stated as follows.

- 1) All IP created via work with an external partner, where the external partner is funding at least 50% of the R&D costs, is owned by the external partner.
- 2) All IP created via work with an external partner, where the external partner is funding less than 50% of the R&D costs, is owned by CASECO. CASECO is incited to support all external partner efforts to commercialize technology and have the external partner own this technology. *This statement implies that CASECO does not want to own project IP.*
- 3) All ownership claims to prior IP must be declared before a project begins and negotiated with the external partner upon initiation of a new project. This allows for appropriate protection of the external partner and provides greater clarity for other potential participants to consider investment in the project.
- 4) Inventors must be protected and rewarded for their IP or they will have no incentive to participate in the process. Any model must protect IP for benefit in the jurisdiction and clarify the business relationship with the inventor.
- 5) IP must be transitioned to industry without encumbrance. This is a fundamental requirement for any venture capital firm to consider investment.

V. METHODOLOGY DESCRIPTION

In this section we look first at the manner in which the empirical case study was guided and performed then we review the requirements engineering techniques used to develop the new IP policy.

As we pursued this empirical investigation, we were guided by the following questions. Given the mandate to deliver the IP policy subject to business constraints, the investigation could not be structured as a strict research effort. As such, these questions should be considered motivating, rather than definitive, guidance to this initial exploration of the domain.

- 1) Is it possible to generate a corporate IP policy using requirements engineering techniques?
- 2) Did the application of the techniques result in the production of the required artifact (the corporate policy)?
- 3) Did the artifact meet the needs of the stakeholders and how do we evaluate the results?

This study took a pragmatist stance, employing mixed methods to achieve our goals. The results were qualitative rather than quantitative: the small number of stakeholders and the mandatory requirement to produce results precluded, for example, controlled experiment methodologies. At its core, this was an action research study; a real-world problem had to be solved and the first author was a direct contributor to the solution. The first author studied the experience of developing the solution using, as much as practical, an exploratory case study approach but industrial constraints dictated that the research question(s) were broader than we would have preferred.

The first author, as an integral member of the process was obliged, at times, to identify requirements that had been missed by other members of the senior management team. The first author was responsible for formulating drafts of the policy and for performing some of the business-case validations. As a result, the first author could also be viewed as providing a degree of quality-control on the process that may have biased the results. We note that this same criticism can be made of any RE practitioner, on any project – it is the nature of requirements engineering to be as interventionist as necessary, but no more.

A combination of oral and written survey techniques were used to gather the requirements. During the study, the first author had significant concerns about introducing bias in the written survey instruments and affecting internal validity. It may be as a result of this concern that the survey questions were considered by some respondents to be too vague “*I don’t know the context within which to answer the question...*” and may have led to inferences regarding requirements, motivations and rationale during analysis by the first author that were not accurate.

Ethnographic techniques were used in a subjective evaluation of the participant’s responses to the survey instruments. Responses were analyzed to identify divergent opinions, to evaluate the degree of divergence, and to evaluate the strength of the held beliefs and opinions. This effort was performed to provide a form of scope analysis, developing an estimate of the anticipated effort required to achieve convergence upon the final policy.

VI. REQUIREMENTS ENGINEERING TECHNIQUES USED

The geographic dispersion of the participants constrained the range of elicitation techniques that could be employed to those that could be used at a distance: to telephone and videoconference interviews and brainstorming sessions, and oral and written survey instruments. How those tools and techniques were guided into achieving the goal is the subject of this section.

The overall process was adapted from the Accelerated Requirements Method (ARM) by Hubbard *et al* [10]. ARM is described as a three-phase facilitated requirements elicitation and description activity: a Preparation Phase is followed by

a Facilitated Session Phase and the work is completed via a Deliverable Closure Phase.

The principle goal was set by the President at the start of the preparation phase: to deliver a new IP policy for CASECO, an IP policy that would meet the direction set by the new business plan. The new IP policy would also have to be acceptable to the President and to the key stakeholders identified in Section IV. The remainder of the preparation phase consisted of the first author reviewing prior IP policies at CASECO and reviewing the business plan for guidance toward the new IP policies. Initial telephone sessions were held with all stakeholders to describe the process and the expected deliverables.

The facilitated session phase was structured as survey distribution to, and completion by, the stakeholders. The authors analyzed the survey responses and the first author held follow-up interviews and discussions with stakeholders as necessary. The response analysis was summarized for the President and the remaining issues were identified.

The response analysis presented to the President reported upon the discussions and positions espoused by the stakeholders. This analysis was a form of critical discourse analysis [2], constrained by the aggressive delivery schedule to identifying the bias(es) exhibited by each stakeholder and the strength of these biases. CASECO is undergoing a significant change in business direction and estimating the level of commitment to, or resistance to, the new direction was a desired outcome of the policy generation process. Further, wording of the draft IP policy took into consideration the insights provided by this analysis. Validating our interpretations of the stakeholder positions was performed by observing stakeholder responses to policy proposals.

The President then directed that a draft IP policy document be created, using best efforts to resolve the outstanding issues in a manner consistent with business constraints. This draft IP policy was then circulated for discussion. After a period of approximately two weeks, characterized by email exchanges, one-on-one discussions and group brainstorming sessions, a revised policy was formulated.

The revised policy was circulated then discussed in an in-person discussion and negotiation session. This face-to-face meeting was explicitly *not* in the original planning. However, the meeting was enabled by other business requirements and the stakeholders took advantage of the opportunity to greatly reduce the time required to achieve closure on the final form of the IP policy.

In the closure phase, the final IP policy was formulated and delivered to the stakeholders for final approval. The final policy was accepted with minor grammatical changes. Related information on the revision process is also presented in Section VIII.

VII. SURVEY

There were 22 questions in the survey instrument; for confidentiality reasons we can present only two of the main questions here. The survey questions were principally related to identifying the operations constraints within which the IP policy must function, probing the respondents for how they believed the IP policy should be interpreted. From another perspective, the survey generated many of the business cases for which the IP policy must be used to provide guidance. This is similar to use-case and scenario exploration in requirements engineering for software artifacts. In all cases, whenever deemed necessary the survey instrument was supplemented by interviews with the respondents.

- 1) Does our IP Policy leave the project in an investable state?
 - a) What are the characteristics of an investable Project?
 - b) If our IP Policy does not leave the project in an investable state, what do we need to change, and how can we make these changes?
- 2) If we are proposing investments in the range of 50% to 90% of total project costs and we own the IP under any project in which we invest, what is the process whereby the SME regains control or ownership of the IP?

A. Sample Survey Responses

We present here some sample survey responses to the two sample questions. The responses are set in *italics* and our comments complete each paragraph. The responses can all be considered to be operations requirements. As such, each response represents a use-case or operational scenario for which the IP policy must provide guidance. The survey proved effective at identifying many of these operations requirements that had not been addressed within the business plan.

Some of these requirements are functional (*e.g.* detach CASECO from the University IP ownership policy) and others are non-functional (*e.g.* the difficulties associated with determining the actual value of a contribution constrain the utility of policy guidance in this regard). The survey responses provided useful feedback for both types of requirements.

Clean up the IP ownership rules to reduce ambiguity and risk, detach CASECO from the University IP ownership policy. Historically, there have been numerous projects carried out between CASECO and regional Universities. The complexities of managing the multitude of IP policies, and their interactions, was making it very difficult for CASECO to function in an effective manner.

The ownership of IP based on a 50% contribution is effectively arbitrary and open to disagreement (what is the actual value of a contribution, did it turn out to be 49%

and not 50%, etc.). And since most of the subsidization is being quoted as 50-90%, it sounds like most/all of the work will not be owned by the industry from the initial phases. One of the respondents has identified a range of use-cases identified in the business plan that are contradictory. The derived requirements must resolve these contradictions. THE EXAMPLE CASES IN THIS CLAUSE SEEM TO STATE THAT THE IP WILL NOT BE OWNED BY INDUSTRY, YET THE BASIC POLICY PRINCIPLE IS THAT WE WILL NOT OWN IP.

Rather than the arbitrary 50% level, it should be set as always owned by industry BUT with CASECO having an encumbrance (e.g. IOU) against the IP of the value of the subsidization (plus some reasonable multiplier factor?). Thus the company/investor can always buy out CASECO interest for a known and fair amount. We do NOT want ongoing licensing agreements of x% of sales. A different respondent has identified another issue with the 50% threshold, and an issue with ongoing management of the IP asset(s), both of which must be resolved in the requirements specification.

In the case where an IP is not pursued and CASECO has an interest, would want to have a mechanism where CASECO could try and farm out the IP to a third party. In this case the original company contribution could be viewed as an encumbrance (if they still exist) but this may add an unacceptable (to CASECO) level of complexity – it may be more cost effective for CASECO to simply insist that IP ownership reverts to CASECO if the IP is abandoned. This respondent goes even further into operational issues associated with the IP policy but also provides reflective comments on the complications associated with the requirements.

We will have some internal R&D projects which we are using to keep our team technologically current and on the bleeding edge. These projects may not be investable in the short term but they should spawn future projects with our industry partners that will be investable. In these situations, CASECO will need a selection criteria matrix and a review process to ensure that the rationale for the R&D project is sound and the probability for future investable projects is high. While this response appears to address long-term operational planning, it is also indicative of a desire to maintain the status quo (CASECO has a substantial track record in successful delivery of applied research projects).

VIII. EXPERIMENTAL OBSERVATIONS

In section VI, the observations did not feel at all related to the paper topic. They seem to be observations about the policies themselves and creating them vs. observations that relate this to RE. Perhaps tweaking them with that view makes them more relevant to the paper.

At the end I was looking for 2 things - what was the total man-effort on this. That would be very interesting to see flat out, but also as a

comparison to anything similar from RE. And then perhaps some discussion about whether that was a reasonable effort or not. My first thought is this was a very heavy process for eliciting policies...that it could be done much faster and simpler, but I don't know. FIGHTING SIGNIFICANT INTERNAL RESISTANCE

Perhaps the only other suggestions it make a stronger obvious connection to this and RE - call out side-by-side process comparisons maybe.

The survey responses were analyzed and the following observations were made.

- 1) None of the responses explicitly referred back to the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) by which CASECO's performance is measured. When making these responses, we expected that the respondents would refer to how the IP policy would meet the needs of the KPI deliverables.
- 2) There is significant historical momentum in the thought processes and opinions. Everyone has a different opinion as to how much of a change is occurring at CASECO, how quickly that change can or must occur, and what that change really means.
- 3) There is still a significant bias toward the perception that CASECO is synonymous with applied research.
- 4) There is enough diversity in the replies that an effort should be made to unify the vision across the team before making the decisions.
- 5) Respondents identified use-case contradictions.
- 6) There are challenges when creating a survey instrument, efforts to remove bias can lead to perceptions of vagueness.
- 7) The respondents tended strongly to respond in terms of operations issues, set in their own contexts. This is to be expected, the survey instrument was constructed in this manner. However, we expected to see greater emphasis on policy, over operations, in the responses.
- 8) There is some evidence of resistance to change due to implementation challenges: policy change is acceptable but can not be delivered due to resource constraints therefore I will resist such change to protect myself.
- 9) Resource constraints, such as travel constraints, prolonged the data gathering and resolution phases.

Also of interest to the RE community is the manner in which the stakeholders approached the formulation of the IP policy. All of the stakeholders have extensive, formal training in engineering or related disciplines. Some also have formal training in business schools, others have extensive practical business experience. We observed that the participants each carefully articulated their perspectives on the problem, then gave their (expert) opinion as to how to best resolve the issue, often including (at least elements of) the

arguments they would use to support their position. The observed behavior is stereotypical of that in Issue-Based Information Systems (IBIS) [11].

The substantial questions regarding practical issues of valuation presented in Section VII-A led to another round of analysis and the following questions were put to the President.

- 1) Does CASECO need to recover their investment in a project?
- 2) If CASECO does not need to recover their investment in a project, how does this affect your direction on IP policy?
- 3) If CASECO does need to recover their investment in a project, *[REDACTED. Numerous follow-on questions were present in the report.]*

In response, the President provided answers and directed the preparation of a draft IP policy to focus discussion on the remaining issues. That policy was drafted and circulated to the senior management team.

IX. FINAL IP POLICY

As noted earlier, the opportunity to have an in-person meeting, shortly after the revised IP policy was circulated, helped the team to reach closure more quickly than predicted by our analysis of the survey responses. However, the knowledge obtained from this analysis facilitated resolution more quickly than if the positions of the parties were only discovered during the meeting. During this meeting, the concept that policy is *not* operations, just as requirements are not design or architecture was firmly agreed to and supported for the crafting of the final policy.

For example, operations guidance, as derived from the IP policy may be expressed (in part) as follows.

- 1) Establish prior knowledge for all parties.
- 2) Establish prior art, not from project participants.
- 3) Identify scope of work, domain of interest, and anticipated IP.
- 4) Identify terms under which PROJECTCO gains control of IP.
- 5) Identify terms under which PROJECTCO loses control of IP.
- 6) All IP owned by CASECO for duration of project.
- 7) Upon PROJECTCO meeting control terms, transfer IP ownership from CASECO to PROJECTCO.

We observe, in retrospect, that most of the Policy Guidance in Section IV-B is actually operations guidance.

The final IP policy, presented here, is more abstract – it must guide operations decisions as opposed to define operational practices. Of necessity, the details have been paraphrased for publication purposes.

FINAL IP POLICY

CASECO is directed to generate project-related IP in partnership with PROJECTCO. CASECO shall not own project-related IP except under the following conditions:

- 1) For the duration of a project, CASECO shall own all IP, said IP ownership transferring to PROJECTCO upon project completion.
- 2) If PROJECTCO defaults under the terms of the contract with CASECO, ownership of all project-related IP transfers to CASECO.

CASECO shall generate non-project-related IP only under the express direction of the President.

The final IP policy may appear to be rather short to the reader. The study participants were also somewhat surprised to realize that they were able to state the policy so succinctly. The breadth of validation cases afforded by the requirements gathering process was felt to contribute to the ability to remove unnecessary policy elements.

X. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We report here on our experiences while applying requirements engineering techniques to the task of creating and defining corporate policies. We conclude that interview, brainstorming and survey techniques have been effective at gathering the information needed to support the development of a corporate intellectual property policy and we have seen no evidence that would indicate that the techniques would not be applicable to other types of corporate policies.

We were able to use interviews, brainstorming and survey techniques to effectively elicit the operational guidance and constraints to inform the policy definition process in an appropriate manner. The resulting intellectual property policy met or exceeded all goals set at the beginning of the study.

Practitioners should remain aware that the process used in this work does not directly generate the IP policy. The output of the requirements process was a body of knowledge regarding the operational requirements and operational constraints within which any practical IP policy must function. This body of knowledge, combined with guidance from the business plan and senior management, led to the formulation of the IP policy. The IP policy was then validated against the use-cases, business cases, and operations scenarios generated by the requirements process, a validation suite far larger than anticipated at the start of the study. As such, we expect that the resulting IP policy will prove to meet the needs of CASECO at this time.

The effort expended on analyzing the emotional position of each participant was useful, even if the timetable estimates were not used due to the serendipitous in-person meeting opportunity. The first author felt that the 'inside knowledge' that it afforded helped to reduce stress levels during negotiations at that meeting and allowed the team to expose and address hidden agendas in an expeditious manner.

This work reports on a single case, developing IP Policy; the resulting observations and data will allow us to focus the work more closely in the future. More research is needed to fully understand the degree of applicability of requirements engineering techniques for the general task of creating arbitrary corporate policies. Further policy cases are under investigation at this time and our expectation is that we will be able to compare the results to support more generalized direction for practitioners.

REFERENCES

- [1] T.A. Alspaugh, H.U. Asuncion, and W. Scacchi. Intellectual property rights requirements for heterogeneously-licensed systems. In *Requirements Engineering Conference, 2009. RE '09. 17th IEEE International*, pages 24–33, 31 2009-sept. 4 2009.
- [2] R. Alvarez. Discourse analysis of requirements and knowledge elicitation interviews. *Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 8:255, 2002.
- [3] Aybke Aurum and Claes Wohlin. Requirements engineering: Setting the context. In Aybke Aurum and Claes Wohlin, editors, *Engineering and Managing Software Requirements*, pages 1–15. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. 10.1007/3-540-28244-0_1.
- [4] S. Barney, A. Aurum, and C. Wohlin. The relative importance of aspects of intellectual capital for software companies. In *Software Engineering and Advanced Applications, 2009. SEAA '09. 35th Euromicro Conference on*, pages 313–320, aug. 2009.
- [5] Travis D. Breaux and Annie I. Anton. Analyzing goal semantics for rights, permissions, and obligations. In *RE'05: Proceedings of the 13th IEEE International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE'05)*, pages 177–186, Washington, DC, USA, August 2005. IEEE Computer Society.
- [6] Richard Burton and Borge Obel. *Strategic Organizational Diagnosis and Design*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998.
- [7] D. Condon. *Software Product Management: Managing Software Development from Idea to Product to Marketing to Sales*. Aspatore Books, 2002.
- [8] Daniela E. Damian, Filippo Lanubile, and Teresa Mallardo. The role of asynchronous discussions in increasing the effectiveness of remote synchronous requirements negotiations. In *ICSE*, pages 917–920, 2006.
- [9] Daniela E. Damian and Didar Zowghi. RE challenges in multi-site software development organisations. *Requirements Engineering*, 8:149–160, 2003. 10.1007/s00766-003-0173-1.
- [10] Rick Hubbard, Charles N. Schroeder, and Nancy R. Mead. An assessment of the relative efficiency of a facilitator-driven requirements collection process with respect to the conventional interview method. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Requirements Engineering (ICRE'00)*, ICRE '00, pages 178–186, Washington, DC, USA, 2000. IEEE Computer Society.

- [11] Werner Kunz, Horst W. J. Rittel, We Messrs, H. Dehlinger, T. Mann, and J. J. Protzen. Issues as elements of information systems. Technical report, Georgia Tech, 1970.
- [12] Jean-Henry Morin and Michel Pawlak. *Towards a Global Framework for Corporate and Enterprise Digital Policy Management*, pages 189–197. Advanced Systems Group, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland, 2006.
- [13] D. Suh, J. Hwang, and D. Oh. Do software intellectual property rights affect the performance of firms? case study of south korea. In *Software Engineering Advances, 2008. ICSEA '08. The Third International Conference on*, pages 307 –312, oct. 2008.