

06/02/19 myNHS - Nottingham

date	06 Feb 2019
phase	Private Beta
service	myNHS
sprint	8
user	NHS Employers (Variety of ages and scheme in)
contact	Lizzie Lineker
location	Nottingham
type	F2F
digital inclusion	91,74, 100, 80, 86
no tested	5
minutes observed	300
researcher	Dominic Hurst
objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Understand how user experience differ using real HTML prototype• Understand if the scenario journey path(s) are still valid (with the additional verify pages)• Understand the need to select scenarios• Understand the next steps post modeler• Understand the need to return• Understand the need to share

What we tested with

Version 2 of HTML prototype [Prototypes](#)

Observed by

Gareth Joyce – Remotely, lots of connectivity issues in the Nottingham office meant the observation was patchy.



Overview of findings

Verify not a blocker

Limited awareness of Verify, but not a blocker. We need to balance access against the removal of **username/ passwords as they are problematic** when using service once a year *"Passwords are complicated, new numbers and symbols"*

One stop shop

Missing older scheme estimates is becoming more a concern *"defeats the purpose of a one-stop shop"*, *"Can't see where pension (estimate) is for 1995"*, *"Expect to see figures for 95/ 08 schemes"*. Some concern over **extra (off service) activity**, *"is this as well as TRS?"*, *"I would expect to see all values, defeats the object, Why go to TRS?"*

Some other related information is missing, *"Use to seeing lump sum"* (on 95/ 08 scheme). *"Expect calculator for my scheme"* (95 on the home page)

Sharing a need, but security a concern

Sharing pension details is a **need** (unrealized for some), *"give access to accountant... good idea"*, *"share with next of kin"* (access when I'm not here) but users want something that is **secure** *"Am I sharing personal information?"*, with **consent** *"you would have to name them"* and with the option on what to show. Notification to the member to see if they have accepted a bonus.

Validation

Contribution history (aka employment history) mentioned again as a sign 'this is me', *"Except to see (my) length of service"*. **Employment history** (the term) was mentioned when explaining what they expect *"started working, started contributing..."*, *"Date you started working"* The caveat is *"do n't show if it's wrong"*. Suggestions also included time/ date vs scheme, also contribution amounts per time period, roles...

Disclaimer

T&C needs adding, specifically on the modeler pages to avoid unrealistic expectation *"People will think this is what they will get"*, but also explaining possible tax-free elements *"Should show max tax-free amount"*.

Model without context

Several participants didn't have 2015 scheme so to see a link to 2015 calculator on the homepage was **irrelevant**. *"Expect calculator for my scheme"* (95 on the home page). Equally, for some who did (and bypassed the schemes page) they were left out of **out of context** *"is this all of my pension"*

Actions

Fed back to the team

- ☐ Review journey and back options (breadcrumb vs in-page links)
- ☐ Create scheme specific version (eg 95 only, 2015 only, 2015/ 1995 and 2015/2008)
- ☐ Add disclaimers (not sure what page)
- ☐ Remove modeler from the homepage
- ☐ Build "your access"
- ☐ See if we can set up [Dominic Hurst](#) with a local prototype – [Gareth Joyce](#)

Created Hypothesis:

- Users will understand modeling disclaimers
- Users want pension estimates in one place