

Document type: Reference

Trial plan for a WARP Filtered Warnings Service

(V1.0) June 2004

Keywords

[WARP, Filtered Warning Service,
Trial]

Version control

This document may be made available in more than one electronic version or in print. In a case of existing or perceived difference in contents between such versions, the reference version is the version available for download from the WARP Toolbox site <http://www.warp.gov.uk>

If you find errors in the current document, please send your comment to editor@warp.gov.uk

Disclaimer

Reference to any specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark manufacturer, or otherwise, does not constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favouring by NISCC. The views and opinions of authors expressed within this document shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes. NISCC shall also accept no responsibility for any errors or omissions contained within this document. In particular, NISCC shall not be liable for any loss or damage whatsoever, arising from the usage of information contained in this document.

Copyright notification

The copyright and the foregoing restrictions, extend to reproduction in all media. The rights to modify and reproduce are described in the WARP Toolbox terms and conditions described on the WARP Toolbox site.

Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Aims of the trial	2
3.	Scope of the trial	2
3.1.	WARP member (user) aspects	3
3.2.	WARP team (operational) aspects	3
4.	Phases of the trial	3
4.1	Phase 1 – System acceptance testing	3
4.2	Phase 2 – User acceptance testing	4
4.3	Phase 3 – User and Operational trial	4
5	Feedback	4
6	Risks and dependencies	4
	History	5

1. Introduction

This Filtered Warning Service trial plan describes the activities required by the WARP team and WARP members who take part in a trial of the Filtered Warning Service.

The basic concept of the Filtered Warning Service is that WARP members will complete an on-line 'secure' tick-list, which identifies their areas of interest. Warnings and Advisories from a number of sources, including UNIRAS and the WARP itself, will be filtered against the tick-list criteria for relevance and urgency and disseminated via email in a timely manner.

This filtering will be done by the WARP team using a bespoke application where information received from various sources is categorised against the same tick-list as completed by members. The application will then automatically send the resulting Warnings and Advisories to those members where there is a tick-list match.

The emphasis on the design of the tick-list application is that it must be easy to complete and maintain if it is going to add real value to the members. The trial will include an assessment on the functionality, usability and performance associated with completing this tick-list, as well as an assessment of the tick-list categorisation itself.

2. Aims of the trial

The purpose of the trial is to ensure that the Filtered Warning Service application, the systems installed for the WARP and the operational processes put in place, provide results that meet the needs of the WARP members. The feedback from WARP members obtained during the trial will be used to refine the application, prompt any necessary changes to the system and amend processes where required.

3. Scope of the trial

The trial will address a variety of measures associated with the Filtered Warning Service application, and will include an assessment from both the WARP operational team and WARP members. This trial will also attempt to gauge the operational value of the filtered warnings and advisories, although it is recognised that to do this effectively it could take longer than the time allocated for the trial.

Participants in the trial will be required to provide written feedback for the various service aspects addressing the following headings:

Functionality – does the Filtered Warning Service do what you want it to do?

Usability – is it easy to use, set-up and maintain?

Performance – is it responsive, allowing things to be done in an efficient manner?

Security – are you happy with the security measures taken, where applicable?

3.1. WARP member (user) aspects

The following aspects of the Filtered Warning Service should be assessed by the WARP members, (the users):

- a) Registration process
- b) Access to the on-line tick-list
- c) Completion of the tick-list user profile
- d) Maintenance of the tick-list user profile
- e) Relevance and structure of tick-list categories, from a user perspective
- f) Format, content and timeliness of resulting emails

It is envisaged that at least ten WARP members should be identified to take part in assessing these aspects of the Filtered Warning Service, although it would be preferred if Phase 3 could involve additional members. It is important to identify the roles/responsibilities of the users taking part in the trial, to facilitate analysis of the feedback.

3.2. WARP team (operational) aspects

The following aspects of the Filtered Warning Service should be assessed by the WARP operational team:

- a) Registration process
- b) Management of registered users
- c) Operational completion of tick-list for source data
- d) Management of resulting email Warnings/Advisories
- e) Maintenance of tick-list categorisation changes
- f) Relevance and structure of tick-list categories, from an operational perspective
- g) General application management, system statistics etc.

It is envisaged that the full time WARP member(s) should be actively involved with assessing these aspects of the Filtered Warning Service.

4. Phases of the trial

The trial should be conducted over a three-month period, with three separate phases:

4.1 Phase 1 – System acceptance testing

This phase of the trial tests the application on the target server using the WARP operational team, both from an operational and user perspective. The aim of this phase is to remove any bugs/anomalies resulting from deployment in an operational scenario – e.g.

test remote access. It will also provide training for the WARP operational team so they can support the users in the next phase. It is envisaged this phase could be completed in 1 week. This phase must be signed off by the WARP operational team, before proceeding to the next phase.

4.2 Phase 2 – User acceptance testing

This phase will involve 3 or 4 users who have been briefed thoroughly on the application and processes such as registration. All aspects of the service will be tested by users who have committed to providing a high level of involvement. These users will also be given a high level of pro-active support from the WARP operational team. The aim of this phase is to iron out any process/training issues prior to opening up the trial to the larger group. It is envisaged this phase could be completed in 2 weeks. This phase must be signed off by the WARP operational team, before proceeding to the next phase.

4.3 Phase 3 – User and operational trial

This phase will involve all participants and all aspects of the trial as described in section 3. It is envisaged this phase should last 8 weeks, over which time a help-desk should be manned to provide advice and assistance to the users. This will not be a proactive help-desk, unlike the previous phase, but a reactive support function. The aim of this phase is described in section 2, and will include an assessment of the level of support needed for new users of the Filtered Warning Service. During this phase the tick-list categories should be changed two or three times, from user feedback, so as to judge the resulting effect on the operation of the application.

5 Feedback

Participants in the trial will be required to provide written feedback for the various service aspects described previously. Some users prefer to use a proforma for responses whilst others prefer to provide feedback as free field text. The use of a proforma is preferred from the trial viewpoint as it would aid analysis, but it is important not to dissuade users from providing feedback.

It is therefore recommended that users should be approached and asked if they would commit to completing a proforma questionnaire on their experiences of using the Filtered Warning Service. If they are prepared to undertake this, then the proforma can be generated from the contents of this trial plan. This would include general headings for free field input but also, where possible, quantitative questions should be asked such as how long did it take you to complete the tick-list?

6 Risks and dependencies

The two most critical dependencies of this trial are the availability of the WARP operational team and getting the commitment from WARP members to allocate time and resources to actively use the Filtered Warning Service.

For the trial to be a success, it is important that the trial has a clear owner who takes responsibility for resolving any issues arising from the three phases of the trial. These actions may require feedback to the software supplier to address technical problems, or providing suitable training/documentation for users. It is recommended that this owner is one of the full-time WARP team.

The owner must be responsible for monitoring and managing the trial, collating the feedback and producing the trial report at the end of the 3 months, as well as regular reports to the WARP Project Review Board.

History

Version	Date	Description
V1.0	June 2004	First issue