Learn from the mistakes of others...

...you won't live long enough to make all of them yourself.



Alison Lloyd

Introduction

About me

- Aims of the talk
 - Case studies
 - Slides will be simple (mostly)

- Please ask questions!
 - Technical discussions welcome in the bar

Study 1: Oral Rehydration Salts (ORS)



Disease statistics

- Diarrhoea kills approximately 580,000 children per year, world-wide – 9% on average (Unicef)
- Before 2000, over 1.2m deaths per year in under-5s



Oral Rehydration Salts (ORS)

- Basically a mixture of salt and sugar to be added to water
- Used as treatment for people suffering severe dehydration
- Based on research in the 60s:
 - Glucose-sodium co-transport mechanism
- Entered wide usage in the 70s

Disease statistics

- Only 30% to 40% of children under 5 with diarrhoea treated with ORS
- Improvement in numbers has stalled since 2000
- Better coverage in urban areas
- Better coverage among wealthy





Percentage of under-5s with diarrhoea treated with ORS

Improvements...

- Very successful program in Bangladesh
 - Used women to go out into rural areas
 - "...Good water, a litre, pinch of salt with a fistful of gur..." -Bangladeshi postmark, 1993

• Using the Coca-cola distribution network

Unicef numbers show some improvements recently

Thoughts

- Sometimes clever, qualified people get it wrong
- Learn from what works
 - Bad practice or ignorance?
- Consider the whole problem
 - No such thing as a simple problem
- "Take the science to the problem"

Study 2: Altimeters



Internal workings



Analogue altimeters

- 'Modern' 3-needle altimeter introduced around 1935
 - Early versions in aviation use around 1913
- Electronic versions using servos in use in 60s
- Accurate to within +/- 80 feet
- ...but UX has stayed roughly the same throughout
 - Various attempts to make them harder to misread
 - Still prone to misreading, especially under stress

What happens when altimeters are misread?

- Maybe nothing...
- United Airlines flight 389, 16 August 1965, Lake Michigan – no survivors, 30 fatalities
- BOAC G-AOVD, 24 December 1958, Dorset 3 survivors, 9 fatalities

'Human factors' / Controlled Flight Into Terrain (CFIT)

So what can we do?

- Addition of cross-hatch area
- Addition of rotating numerals
- Updated procedures to require cross-checks of altitudes
- Require 2 pilots for (commercial) IFR operations
- Train pilots to beware of errors



Improve the UI!



AW139 Primary Flight Display (PFD)

Improved UI – A320 PFD

Thoughts

• UI matters!

- Consider the users of your system (Please, please, please...)
- Consider the worst case scenario your system will be used in

Study 3: Early commercial helicopter ops



Helicopters at work

- First commercial operations in late 1940s
 - Crop dusting, whaling, ferrying
- Most pilots were ex-military, trained in WW2

- Vietnam war (1955 1975) first major use of attack helicopters
- Boom in commercial operations in '70s on back of demobbing pilots

Risk factors

- Military flying is very different from commercial flying
- Many helicopter operations were in remote areas
 - Logging in Canada
 - Whaling / tuna boats
- 'Getting the job done'
- Commercial pressures



What went wrong?

- *"Rule 43: If you do something stupid and it works, it's still stupid and you're lucky."* Howard Taylor, Schlock Mercenary
- Swiss cheese theory of accident causation
- Ignoring the risk factors because "everyone knows..." or "he did it and was ok..."
- Rebels without a clue

 Modern operational safety required a change in mindset

Thoughts

- Humans are really bad at risk assessment
- People are better at risk assessment when they understand the risks
- It's not enough to design safe systems, you have to allow for human operators

 In technology, the human aspect is at least as important as the technical ones

More about people and stats



I heard this song...

- What do you expect to happen when you press 'shuffle' on a music player?
 - Actually random vs. 'perceptively' random
- Fisher-Yates algorithm



Spotify

- People are bad at stats...
- ...but very good at pattern recognition
- Also not bad at making stuff up
- Spotify adjusted their shuffle algorithm in 2014 to produce a more 'human-friendly' random shuffle

Study 4: UI part 2 - changes

What happens when UI changes?

- Users complain
- Some users will leave
 - ... if they can
- Most people care more about what changed than why it changed
- Two case studies:
 - MS Office (ribbon UI)
 - Firefox (Australis)

MS Office ribbon



То



MS Office ribbon

- In many ways, a good example of change
- Changed for the right reasons
 - Users had problems finding stuff, found the UI overwhelming
- Lots of user research and serious thought and effort went into the redesign
 - Multiple trials and discarded possibilities

MS Office ribbon - results

- New users are fine
- 'Basic' and casual users generally happier, once they get used to new design
- Power users generally unhappy
 - ... until they get used to it
- Hard to get a clear idea of number of users, but MS suggest 1 in 7 computer users now use Office, with numbers continuing to increase

Firefox

- Release 29 made numerous changes to browser look (Australis UI)
- Many changes were minor, but some major
- Many previously-available settings and customisations no longer available
- Much wailing and gnashing of teeth

Firefox post-release

- Plug-in to return most aspect of UI to old look was made available
- Public clashes and general snottyness
- Many users felt forced into the changes
- "It took me an hour to fix this..."
- Most reactions were emotional rather than intellectual

Firefox Australis - results

- Continued loss of market share
 - Approximately 1% drop with v29
- Anecdotal evidence that many people disabled automatic updates
- General negativity surrounding Firefox community

Thoughts

- Change is hard
 - Users grow attached to the familiar
- When changing UI, be prepared for emotional fall-out
- Gradual vs. sweeping change

• Here be dragons...

Other UI change examples

- Windows 8 Metro
 - Changing UI for wrong reasons?
- Every time Facebook changes something...

• ...or Google does...

• ...etc...

Study 5: Getting the engineering right



Concorde

- Developed by joint French British team
- Amazing feat of engineering
- First commercial aviation use of:
 - Fly-by-wire engines
 - Digital computer control of critical systems
 - Carbon brakes
 - Hybrid circuits
- "…an absolute delight to fly, it handled beautifully." John Hutchinson, Concorde Captain

Engineering problems solved

- Very fine control required on engine intake
 - Digital processors controlling intake ramp
- Heating issues
 - Novel heat sinking (fuel), reflective paint, testing, visor
- Possible radiation due to altitude
- Visibility at landing and take-off
 - Droop nose

Outcome

- Concorde proved an economic loss
- Retired in 2003 after 27 years of commercial operations
- Uneconomical to maintain
- Higher fuel costs, 11 September 2001 downturn
- Competition from subsonic airliners in first class
- Big advances in numerous fields as a result of Concorde program

Thoughts

- With sufficient effort (and money), solutions can be found to almost any problem
- ...but really good engineering isn't enough on its own
- Projects have to be technically AND commercially successful
 - ...and one doesn't guarantee the other

Ultimately...

It's all about people!



"Nothing is truly idiot proof because idiots are so ingenious" - unknown

The decompressing dive computer





Health and safety at work

