WikiWinWin Shaper training

A. Set up WinWin Negotiation Context

- See assignment instruction
  [http://greenbay.usc.edu/csci577/fall2009/site/assignments/index.html](http://greenbay.usc.edu/csci577/fall2009/site/assignments/index.html)

B. Enter and discuss win conditions, issues and options

- Responsibilities of Shaper and Knowledge Contributor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Shaper</th>
<th>Knowledge Contributor (KC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify win conditions</td>
<td>A lot of ideas, concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brainstorm; input win condition ideas (in each category)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converge on win conditions</td>
<td>a clean set of win conditions with shared understanding</td>
<td>Create win condition topic for ideas that worth of further evaluation; Remove ambiguity and duplication; Suggest final wording (if necessary); categorize using taxonomy</td>
<td>Review and edit win condition topic (clarify meaning, add detail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify point of agreement or conflict</td>
<td>Some “Agreed” win conditions, and some “open” issues</td>
<td>Create issue topic according to stakeholders’ comments. If no stakeholder raised disagreement within the specified timeframe, this win condition will be set agreed by shaper. If a statement (win condition or option) is partially agreed upon, split it into point of agreement and issue.</td>
<td>comment on win condition page (signify agree or disagree); if disagree, provide reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide options</td>
<td>Some candidate options for resolving issue</td>
<td>Create option topic according to stakeholders’ comments. Comment on issue page with descriptions of possible solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve agreement</td>
<td>Some WinWin agreement</td>
<td>Update status of win condition, issue, option; Check WinWin equilibrium</td>
<td>Identify the most acceptable option for an “open” issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Iterative negotiation
  - Past experiences showed that teams using iterative approach tended to achieve better results than following sequential steps:
“If the process was more iterative then the teams ended up with a medium to very high LCO grade. The teams who started passing agreements somewhat earlier did also end up with higher grades, even though they need revisit passed agreements and re-vote then later on” [Boehm].

- Use iterative approach
  - Stakeholders don’t need to identify all win conditions before identifying issues
  - Stakeholders don’t need to identify all issues before providing options
  - Steps for reaching agreement on one win condition:
    - Evaluate statement
    - Identify point of agreement or conflict
    - Provide options
    - Identify most acceptable solution

C. Shaper facilitate WinWin Negotiation:

- Create new topic page for win condition, issue, option
- Remove duplication
- Categorize using taxonomy
- Link between win condition and issue, between issue and option
- Update status of win condition, issue, option
- Check WinWin equilibrium
- Capture glossary
- Other: suggest final wording, identify missing links, etc.

**Create new topic page for win condition, issue, option**

**Input from KC:**

**Output from shaper:**
Remove duplication

Input from KC:

Add Win Condition Ideas

Examples:
- Administrator can assign users to different groups (AuthorizeUsers)
- System should be easy to use (EasOfUse)
- User permission must be compatible with our existing system (Compatibility)
- System admin can assign users to different groups, different user groups will have different access privilege (AuthorizeUsers)
- another idea.

Output from shaper:
Another example:
(before: two duplicate topics)

All win conditions

Categorize using taxonomy

Link between win condition and issue, between issue and option
To link between issue and involved win conditions, add issue name to win condition page.

What you do:

To link between issue and relevant options, add option name to issue page.

What you do:
Identify options/ Discussion

- Use the most suitable COTS
- NoCOTSUse: no COTS will be used
- CostOfCOTS: find a suitable COTS, no more than $200 (Agreed)

What you get:

- NoFreeCOTS (Agreed)
  - win condition: UseCOTS (Agreed)
  - win condition: ZeroMonetaryBudget (Open)
  - option: CostOfCOTS (Agreed)
  - option: NoCOTSUse (Agreed)

❖ Update status of win condition, issue, option

WinWin model and simplified artifact status used in WikiWinWin:

Figure 1: WinWin Artifact Relationships and Taxonomy

Lean version of artifacts and their state:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Win Condition</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If there is an agreed option, update issue status as “Closed”

Before updating the status of a win condition, need to check if the win condition raises a single issue or multiple issues. This can be done by search on the “WinWinEquilibrium” page.
  - If raises a single issue, update win condition status as “Agreed” once the single issue is “Closed”.
  - If raises multiple issues, update win condition status as “Agreed” once all relevant issues are “Closed”.

**Check WinWin equilibrium**

**Check consistency**
  - There is no conflict among agreed win conditions and options
  - Any agreed win condition has no open issue
  - Any closed issue has at least one agreed option

**Check completeness**
  - All win conditions are agreed

**Capture glossary**
**COTS**

Commercial off-the-shelf.

as an example, Joomla.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WebTopicForm</th>
<th>TopicClassification</th>
<th>Glossary</th>
<th>TopicStatus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>