

# Upload Interviews - Key Insights

Stakeholder interviews 2023/2024

## Roles - Who Uploads?

- GOAL:
  - Anybody; researchers or scientists (non-technical) (4 people)
  - Uploader-specific app (Multi-Center type studies) for non-technical persons
  - CRO
  - Low Level non-technical folks
  - Imaging Tech
- Today: Data Manager, Core Lab Manager, Technical team members, imaging scientist varies highly
- Uploaders are only sometimes familiar with FW. (3 people)

## Needs - What do they need to do their job effectively?

- Drag and Drop from hierarchy level to hierarchy level (3 people)
- Clear way for external teams to provide data vs. internal teams - permissions (like our portal direction we've been discussing from Clinical lens) (3 people)
- Users are not technical (5 people)
- Usable way to upload, user-friendly, non-technical/no code (5 people)
- More significant support in upload sizes (5 people)
- Ability to preview the ingest. "This is what it will look like once ingested" visual. (3 people)
- Consider all the ways people upload: Zip files, single zip, multiple archives, and unzipped data. Think through all ways of import. (1 person)
- Permissions/Role specific - Particular workflow just for Uploaders (3 people)
  - Only give them access to what they need. Don't show them anything else in FW.
- Set user expectations on the UI (5 people)
  - Notifications (4 people)
  - Visibility into what's happening (5 people)
  - Provide helpful erroring only when necessary (3 person)
- Auto Categorizing/Organizing Files
  - Ability to upload DICOM and non-dicom at the same time (2 people)
    - Don't necessarily need the ability to do these at the same time but can choose what type and when (2 people)
  - Ability to auto-sort with DICOM files (5 people)
  - Ability to use the hierarchy/file structure organization (name/file type) to automatically attempt to categorize non-dicom images (3 people)
- Auto detector for file type with ability to update/change it (2 people)
- Ability to tag at the time of upload (1 person)
- Ability to upload more than one project at a time (1 person)

- Not in one action necessarily, no (2 people)
- Communication
  - NEED Notifications (4 people)
  - Ability to message between uploader, project admin, and overall coordinator (multi-center studies) (2 people)
    - Keep it simple at upload/import level to start
  - Ability to @ specific people (1 person)
- Metrics
  - Confirmation of upload (4 people)
  - Visual Queue of progress (4 people)
  - Total # of subjects/sessions/acquisitions/files (2 people)
  - Failed QC / What has failed? (4 people)
  - Ability to pull an audit trail or “proof” of upload (3 people)
  - Upload Rate (4 people)
  - Estimated time to upload (2 person)

## Pain Points - What are the primary pain points for the users?

- Today's experience is too fragile & error-prone (5 people)
  - Continuous timeouts (2 people)
  - With no way to address errors or any direction on what might be wrong. (3 person)
- Need technical expertise today. Shouldn't need to be technical to upload files. (5 people)
- No documentation (2 people)
- Lack of user-friendliness (5 people)
- Lack of ample file size support (4 person)
- Trust Issues - Users are always questioning if it uploaded or not, no confirmation (5 people)
- Inconsistencies between CLI and GUI (2 people)
- Cannot attach an archive/zip file in DICOM Uploader today (1 person)
- Not simple or easy to use today
- No notifications. We need to be proactive.

## Most crucial thing Product should keep in mind

Definitive (all) said SIMPLICITY and USER FRIENDLY. EASY.