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5. Way Forward
Agile Software Development

• Agile Software Development is an engineering approach
• Work is divided into sprints, facilitating incremental completion of capabilities
• HSI plays an active role in Agile Software Development
  – Continuously evaluating designs and completed interfaces with users
  – Documenting user feedback
  – Submitting tickets
  – Prioritizing tickets
HSI Agile Development Process

S1 Demo | S2 Plan Review | Sprint 2 Execution | S2 Demo | S3 Plan Review

Execution:
- S1 HSI Demo Feedback
- HSI Issues for S2
- Weekly UI Meetings (HSI-Developer)
- HSI-Developer Implementation

Planning:
- HSI Issues for S3
- Weekly Sprint 3 Pre-Planning
- S3 HSI User Stories

Ongoing Processes:
- Working Group
  - Held monthly
  - Address capabilities, designs, and workflow
- User Assessment
  - Held every 4-6 mo.
  - Task-based usability and utility assessment
- Conduct User Analysis
- Generate User Stories
- Verify with System
- Prioritize & Trade-off
- Adjudicate with Stakeholders
- Design Mockups
Prioritization of tickets is a key activity required to successfully balance stakeholder needs during each sprint and over the course of development.

- Emphasis on balancing the distribution of developmental resources, temporal considerations, and operational necessity.

During each sprint, system stakeholders generate and prioritize tickets related to:

- Requirements/Testing
- Architecture
- Information Assurance
- Software Development Tasking
- Human Systems Integration (HSI)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical issue</td>
<td>If not addressed, will result in performance failure, high workload, or inconsistent workflow. Critical user/usability need. Workaround is ineffective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must be addressed</td>
<td>Addressing will result in significant improvement of performance, workload, or workflow. Workaround is unreliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>Performance, workload, or workflow will benefit from improvement. Workaround exists but is inefficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Performance, workload, or workflow are not substantially impacted. Improvement will result in enhanced performance, workflow, and consistency. Cosmetic improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice to have</td>
<td>Future capability; not necessary for primary user group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Catch 22 of Ticket Prioritization

• During development, high priority tickets are typically addressed before lower priority tickets
  – Additional high priority tickets are generated through system review and user feedback
  – Potential for continuous influx of higher priority tickets without addressing mid and low priority tickets
  – Results in uneven distribution of tickets across priority levels

• Clusters of lower priority tickets may exist, leading to high priority issues
  – Clusters of tickets across priorities may result in negative effects on user performance, usability, and user acceptance
  – Clusters can exist within a single UI, across all UIs, and may be associated with a user task
Cluster Analysis:
Application to HSI in Agile

• Cluster Analysis is a method for identifying patterns and relationships between items that might not otherwise be apparent

• The HSI Cluster Analysis method evaluates HSI tickets to identify clusters of lower-priority tickets that may result in a higher priority user issue
  – Data-driven approach
  – Assess frequency of tickets across UIs and priorities
  – Qualitatively categorize and evaluate tickets
HSI Cluster Analysis Method

1. Verify and validate tickets and their priorities
2. Categorize impact to user if the ticket is addressed
3. Categorize development Level of Effort (LOE)
4. Qualitatively review ticket content to identify user tasks associated with the clusters
5. Analyze Impact Clusters
HSI Cluster Analysis:  
1. Ticket V&V

- Verify and validate tickets and their priorities
  - Ensure tickets are still valid
  - Engage system stakeholders to validate assigned HSI priority (e.g., Program Office, Type Command, etc.)
  - Eliminate duplicate or overlapping tickets

- Outcome:
  - Current backlog
  - Stakeholder consensus on ticket priorities
  - Frequency distribution of tickets across UIs and priorities
  - Context for subsequent qualitative analysis
HSI Cluster Analysis:
2. User Impact Categorization

- Categorize impact to user if the ticket is addressed
  - In rough order of severity (most to least severe):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Impact to User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Lessen potential for user error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Improve user understanding of UI or data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>Reduce user workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td>Enhance workflow efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Increase consistency within and with other UIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Improve the look of the UI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>Addition of new capability; impact cannot be categorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Outcome:
  - Identifies impact to the user’s performance
  - Provides context for subsequent analysis of task clusters
HSI Cluster Analysis:
3. Development LOE Categorization

- Categorize development Level of Effort (LOE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Development LOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Cosmetic edits to display (e.g., button alignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality</td>
<td>Enhancement to existing capability (e.g., improve selection of data on UI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>Addition of entirely new functionality, data, or service (e.g., alerting service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Outcome:**
  - Provides rough estimate of time-frame required for the ticket to be addressed
  - Facilitates estimate of ROI for Program and development teams
HSI Cluster Analysis:
4. Qualitative Ticket Review

• Qualitatively review ticket content as it relates to common user tasks

• Outcome:
  – Operationally-relevant impact emerges
  – Frequency of impacted tasks can help evaluate ROI
  – Provides additional context for prioritization trade offs with stakeholders
  – Identification of system requirements based on high priority capability tickets
HSI Cluster Analysis: 5. Combination Analysis

- Analyze combinations of UI frequency, priority, development LOE, and impact focusing on:
  - Mid-low priority tickets (i.e., priorities 3 & 4)
  - Display and functionality LOE categories (increased likelihood of near-term completion)
  - Error, understanding, workload, and workflow impacts
  - High-frequency or critical tasks

- Outcome:
  - Clusters emerge, helping to scope and prioritize future development
  - HSI risk to the system is mitigated
  - Enhanced utility and usability for users
Use Case: NITES-Next

- Naval Integrated Tactical Environmental System – Next generation (NITES-Next)
  - An Information Technology Streamlining Program (ITSP) that uses Agile Software Development
  - Under Program Executive Officer (PEO) Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I)

- NITES-Next is a meteorological and oceanographic program of record

- Emphasis on eliminating high-priority tickets from HSI backlog in the final 3 sprints of capability release 1 to mitigate HSI Program risk
Use Case: Tickets Frequency by UI

- 3 UIs emerged as having the highest frequency of tickets in the HSI backlog.
Use Case: Ticket Priority by UI

- HSI backlog contained only priorities 3-5 at the time of analysis
- 3 UIs identified as having the highest frequency of priority 3 tickets
- 4 UIs identified as having the highest combined frequency of priority 3 & 4 tickets
Use Case: User Impact by UI

- 4 previously identified UIs had high frequency of more severe user impact categories
Use Case: Development LOE by UI

- 4 previously identified UIs had high frequency of tickets in the functionality and notification categories
  - Capability tickets were out of the scope for near-term development
  - Display category had relatively low number of tickets
### Use Case: Task Assessment

- 6 task clusters emerged from assessment of ticket content
  - 7 UIs involved in tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>3D Map</th>
<th>MAW</th>
<th>PIM Editor</th>
<th>PST</th>
<th>Layer Styler</th>
<th>MEA</th>
<th>OWF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interact with Map</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present &amp; Select Annotations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIM Waypoint Interaction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Env. Analyses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate Product</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ticket V&V
2. User Impact
3. Development LOE
4. Task Assessment
5. Analyze Impact Clusters
Use Case: Summary of Findings

- Clusters of tickets in 6 UIs emerged through analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UI</th>
<th>Total # of Tickets</th>
<th>Ticket Priority</th>
<th>User Impact</th>
<th>LOE</th>
<th>Impact to Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3D Map</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METOC Annotation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIM Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Selection</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer Styler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METOC Env. Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use Case: Outcome

• 16 HSI tickets were proposed for near-term completion
• Trade-offs occurred during sprint pre-planning meetings
• 8 of 16 proposed tickets were addressed prior to completion of system’s first capability release
• Usability ratings increased after addressing identified clusters
• Final user feedback for the first capability release indicated the system meets or exceeds user needs while being highly usable
Summary

• Clustering of lower priority tickets may be additive, impacting user performance, workload, and workflow.

• The HSI Cluster Analysis Method provides a framework for identifying and evaluating the emergent impact of multiple, mid-low priority tickets.
Next Steps

• Apply HSI Cluster Analysis Method in support of additional Agile Software Development programs

• Continue to refine impact categories
  – Impact to users
  – Development level of effort

• Evaluate impact of particular combinations impacts
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