| Name: | Company: |
|-----------|-----------------|
| Position: | Specialization: |

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

USE Questionnaire: Usefulness, Satisfaction, and Ease of use

Based on: Lund, A.M. (2001) Measuring Usability with the USE Questionnaire. STC Usability SIG Newsletter, 8:2.

Name of System: GOODLAND E-SAWOD:AN ARDUINO-BASED RAINWATER CATCHMENT MONITORING SYSTEM WITH DATA ANALYTICS

Instruction: Please rate the system on how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by placing a check mark in the appropriate box.

Legend:

1 - Strongly Disagree

2 - Disagree

3 - Neither agree nor disagree 4 - Agree

5 - Strongly Agree

| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the total Library files on | | | | | |
| the dashboard? | | | | | |
| 2. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the total Website visitors | | | | | |
| on the dashboard? | | | | | |
| 3. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the total Events on the | | | | | |
| dashboard? | | | | | |
| 4. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the total of Returning on | | | | | |
| the dashboard? | | | | | |
| 5. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the total of New messages | | | | | |
| on the dashboard? | | | | | |
| 6. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the total of Total projects | | | | | |
| on the dashboard? | | | | | |
| 7. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the data of Water catchment | | | | | |
| on the dashboard? | | | | | |
| 8. How functional is our system in terms | | | | | |
| of displaying the total of System users | | | | | |

| on the dashboard? | | |
|---|--|--|
| 9. How functional is our systems in terms | | |
| of updating the system users? | | |
| 10. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of updating the library files? | | |
| 11. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of updating the new projects? | | |
| 12. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of updating the upcoming Event? | | |
| terms or updating the upcoming Event: | | |
| 13. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of deleting the events? | | |
| 14. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of deleting files in the library | | |
| files? | | |
| 15. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of deleting the projects? | | |
| terms or defecting the projects: | | |
| 16. How functional is our systems in | | |
| _ | | |
| terms of deleting the system users? | | |
| | | |
| 17. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of adding the files in library | | |
| files? | | |
| 18. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of adding the new projects in the | | |
| dashboard? | | |
| | | |
| 19. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of adding the new events in the | | |
| dashboard? | | |
| 20. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of creating the system users ? | | |
| 21. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of creating the new events and | | |
| displaying on the users dashboard? | | |
| 22. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of creating new projects that | | |
| displays in user dashboard? | | |
| 23. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of managing and displaying in user | | |
| dashboard ? | | |
| 24. How functional is our systems in | | |
| terms of managing and displaying | | |
| messages notifications of users? | | |
| | | |

| List | the | most | negative | aspect(s) | : | | | | |
|------|-----|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------------|-----------|------|---------|--------|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| List | the | most | positive | aspect(s) | : | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Signature | ower | nrinted | |
| | | | | | | Signature | over | princed | Trance |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | I | EXPERT EV | ALUATION U | SING ISC | /IEC 250 | 10 | | |
| | | | SC | OFTWARE QU | ALITY MO | DEL | | | |
| Name | • | | | | Company: | | | | |
| Posi | | : <u></u> | | | Company. Speciali | | | | |

Direction: Listed below are the characteristics of a Software or Product as based on **ISO/IEC 25010 Software Quality Model.**

Each of the items is provided with five options. Please read each item carefully and **check** (/) the box that closely represents your choice.

Rating Scale:

[5] Very Good [4] Good [3] Average [2] Fair [1] Poor

How would you rate the developed system, "GOODLAND E-SAWOD: AN ARDUINO-BASED RAINWATER CATCHMENT MONITORING SYSTEM WITH DATA ANALYTICS" in terms of the following software criteria:

| Functional Suitability | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| the degree to which a product or system provides functions that meet stated and implied needs when used under specified conditions | | | | | |
| • Functional completeness. Degree to which the set of functions covers all the specified tasks and user objectives. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| • Functional correctness. Degree to which a product or system provides the correct results with the needed degree of precision. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| • Functional appropriateness. Degree to which the functions facilitate the accomplishment of specified tasks and objectives. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| Performance efficiency | | | | | |
| the performance relative to the amount of resources used under stated conditions | | | | | |
| • Time behavior. Degree to which the response and processing times and throughput rates of a product or system, when performing its functions, meet requirements. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| • Resource utilization. Degree to which the amounts and types of resources used by a product or system, when performing its functions, meet requirements. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| Capacity. Degree to which the | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |

| 1 1 1 6 1 | | | | | |
|--|-------|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| maximum limits of a product or | | | | | |
| system parameter meet | | | | | |
| requirements. | | | | | |
| Compatibility | | | | | |
| Degree to which a product, system or | | | | | |
| component can exchange information | | | | | |
| with other products, systems or | | | | | |
| components, and/or perform its | | | | | |
| required functions, while sharing the | | | | | |
| same hardware or software environment. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| • Co-existence. Degree to which a | | | | | |
| product can perform its required | | | | | |
| functions efficiently while | | | | | |
| sharing a common environment and | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| resources with other products, | [[-] | [-] | [0] | [-] | [0] |
| without detrimental impact on any | | | | | |
| other product. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Interoperability. Degree to which | | | | | |
| two or more systems, products or | | | | | |
| components can exchange | | | | | |
| information and use the | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| information that has been | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [2] |
| | | | | | |
| exchanged. | | | | | |
| Appropriateness | | | | | |
| recognizably. Degree to which | | | | | |
| users can recognize whether a | | | | | |
| product or system is appropriate | | | | | |
| for their needs. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| Tot cheff heeds. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Learnability. degree to which a | | | | | |
| product or system can be used by | | | | | |
| specified users to achieve | | | | | |
| specified goals of learning to | _ | | | | |
| use the product or system with | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| effectiveness, efficiency, | | | | | |
| freedom from risk and | | | | | |
| satisfaction in a specified | | | | | |
| context of use. | | | | | |
| Operability. Degree to which a | | | | | |
| product or system has attributes | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| that make it easy to operate and | , | . , | 2 - 4 | | |
| control. | | | | | |
| • User error protection. Degree to | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| | | | | | |

| which a system protects users | | | | | |
|--|-------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
| against making errors. | | | | | |
| • User interface aesthetics. Degree | | | | | |
| to which a user interface enables | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| pleasing and satisfying | | | | | |
| interaction for the user. | | | | | |
| Accessibility. Degree to which a | | | | | |
| product or system can be used by | | | | | |
| people with the widest range of | | | | | |
| characteristics and capabilities | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| _ | | | | | |
| to achieve a specified goal in a | | | | | |
| specified context of use. | | | | | |
| Reliability | | | | | |
| Degree to which a system, product or | | | | | |
| component performs specified functions | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| under specified conditions for a | | | | | |
| specified period of time | | | | | |
| Maturity. Degree to which a | | | | | |
| system, product or component | [1] | | [2] | [3] | [4] |
| meets needs for reliability under | | | [5] | | |
| normal operation. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Availability. Degree to which a | | | | | |
| system, product or component is | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| operational and accessible when | | | | | |
| required for use. | | | | | |
| Fault tolerance. Degree to which | | | | | |
| a system, product or component | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| operates as intended despite the | [[] | [2] | [2] | [4] | [3] |
| presence of hardware or software | | | | | |
| faults. | | | | | |
| • Recoverability. Degree to which, | | | | | |
| in the event of an interruption | | | | | |
| or a failure, a product or system | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| can recover the data directly | | | | | |
| affected and re-establish the | | | | | |
| desired state of the system. | | | | | |
| Security | | | | | |
| _ | | | | | |
| Degree to which a product or system | | | | | |
| protects information and data so that | | | | | |
| persons or other products or systems | | | | | |
| have the degree of data access | | | | | |
| appropriate to their types and levels | | | | | |
| of authorization. | | | | | |
| or authorization. | | | | | |
| Confidentiality. Degree to which | | | | | |
| a product or system ensures that | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
| data are accessible only to those | '-' | 1 | r = 1 | r - 1 | r = 1 |
| authorized to have access. | | | | | |
| 345110111104 00 114V0 400000. | | | | | |

| • Integrity. Degree to which a system, product or component prevents unauthorized access to, or modification of, computer programs or data. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| • Non-repudiation. Degree to which actions or events can be proven to have taken place, so that the events or actions cannot be repudiated later. | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] |

Signature over printed name