Seminar: Security and Verification
First meeting 24.04.20
Aim of the Seminar

Learn about: (1) scientific writing (2) scientific presentations (3) your topic

- Good & interesting presentations
- Deepening discussions
- Find connections between topics and interesting research questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Armbruster</td>
<td>Security Automata</td>
<td>Tobias Meggendorfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukas Flesch</td>
<td>Attack Defense Trees</td>
<td>Julia Eisentraut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Hudoletnjak</td>
<td>Attack Fault Trees</td>
<td>Julia Eisentraut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duc Anh Le</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
<td>Maxi Weininger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondřej Šebek</td>
<td>Verifying Security Protocols</td>
<td>Pranav Ashok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Sol</td>
<td>Security Analysis of Smart Contracts</td>
<td>Julia Eisentraut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Taepper</td>
<td>Attack Defence Diagram</td>
<td>Julia Eisentraut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduard von Briesen</td>
<td>Attack Trees</td>
<td>Kush Grover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharina Wiegräbe</td>
<td>Attack Graphs</td>
<td>Stefanie Mühlberger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Grading - Transparent Criteria

Our goal: communicating clearly what we expect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length of presentation</td>
<td>within +/- 1 minute of allowed time</td>
<td>within +/- 2 minute of allowed time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within +/- 3 minute of allowed time</td>
<td>within +/- 5 minute of allowed time</td>
<td>not within +/- 5 minute of allowed time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grading - Written work (40%)

- **Length**: 2-4 pages

- **Aim**: inform about basic ideas and notation, arouse interest (Wikipedia article/extended abstract)

- **Criteria**: correctness & comprehensiveness, language
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  Why?

  Better presentation (since more time for cool things)  
  + good questions for discussion
Grading - Presentation (40%)

- **Length:** 20 minutes

- **Aim:** clearly present the most interesting points of your topic

- **Criteria:**
  - content (extensiveness & correctness),
  - structure/story (how you guide the audience through the presentation),
  - slides,
  - verbal skills,
  - nonverbal skills (tbd)
Grading - Discussion (20%)

- **Aim**: improve collective understanding, identify interesting connections and research questions

- **Criteria**:
  - participation,
  - quality of questions (pre-sent and during discussion)
  - (moderation as chair)
Schedule - Suggestion

- 05. June: Practice talks
- 17. July: Deadline for written work
- 31. July: Deadline questions for chairs
- 07. August: Final presentations
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- 05. June: Practice talks
- 17. July: Deadline for written work
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- 07. August: Final presentations

- Meetings with supervisor in between
- Getting papers:
  - dblp.uni-trier.de or scholar.google.de
  - Use e-access ub.tum.de/eaccess
  - Ask supervisor only in case of problems
Schedule - Discussion

- 05. June: Practice talks
- 17. July: Deadline for written work
- 31. July: Deadline questions for chairs
- TBD: Final presentations
Presentation vs. Video - Discussion

Con live presentation: Not sure about reliability of BBB and internet connections

Alternatives:
- Record videos
- Written discussion
- Further ideas?
Questions?