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User-centeredness is a fundamental principle in the design of artifacts that truly support their users in performing a given task and achieving their goals.

We consider it in our products, services, furniture, experiences, interfaces... why not in our contracts?
Case study

In the Fimecc UXUS project, we have been developing and testing a prototype of user-friendlier, visualized contract together with Ruukki.

PHASE 1: interviews & co-design workshops. A team of different professionals were involved from the early stages.

PHASE 2: re-drafting. Ruukki Legal considerably shortened the original agreement, based on research results.

PHASE 3: producing visualizations to be included in the framework agreement
6. DELIVERY TERMS
The term of delivery for the material from Purchaser to the Supplier shall be DAP (Espoo) Incoterms 2010.

The term of delivery for the processed material from Supplier to the Purchaser shall be FCA (Espoo) Incoterms 2010.

7. LIQUIDATED DAMAGES FOR DELAY
Liquidated damages for delay shall be two (2.0) percent of the total value of the respective order (without value added tax) for each consecutive week of delay, however, not exceeding ten (10.0) percent of the total value of the respective order.

8. CONFIDENTIALITY
The Parties have concluded a separate confidentiality agreement, which has been appended to the Agreement as Appendix 8.

9. VALIDITY
This Agreement shall be valid from the date of signing until 31.12.2015 after which it shall continue to be in force (unless terminated by either Party) until further notice with a notice period of three (3) months. The notice to terminate shall be given in writing.

During the period of notice, the Supplier shall be liable to deliver the Services to the Purchaser in compliance with the prices in force at the time of giving the notice.

10. CONTRACT DOCUMENTS
The following documents form this contract entity in the priority order listed below:

- Framework Agreement
- Appendix 1 Terms and conditions
- Appendix 2 Description of the Services, prices and delivery times
- Appendix 3 Contact persons
- Appendix 4 List of approved subcontractors
- Appendix 5 Confidentiality agreement

The Parties may amend the above Appendices from time to time by written agreement, in which case the amended Appendices shall automatically replace previous Appendices and become a part of the Agreement.

The Parties agree not to incorporate any other terms and conditions, including general conditions of either Party, to this Agreement or the orders/order acknowledgements; attempt to do so will be void.

11. SIGNATURES
The Parties have signed this Agreement in two (2) identical copies, one for each Party.

Helsinki, 16. 01, 2012

[Signature]

[Signature]
8. Confidentiality

The Parties have concluded a separate confidentiality agreement, which has been append-
ed to the Agreement as Appendix 5.

9. Validity

This Agreement shall be valid from the date of signing until 31.12.2015 after which it shall
continue to be in force (unless terminated by either Party) until further notice with a notice
period of three (3) months. The notice to terminate shall be given in writing.

The following documents form this contract entity in the priority order listed below:

1) Framework Agreement
2) Appendix 1 Terms and conditions
3) Appendix 2 Description of the Services, prices and delivery times
4) Appendix 3 Contact persons
5) Appendix 4 List of approved subcontractors

The Parties may amend the above Appendices from time to time by written agreement, in
which case the amended Appendices shall automatically replace previous Appendices and
become a part of the Agreement.

The Parties agree not to incorporate any other terms and condition, including general
conditions of either Party, to this Agreement or the orders/order acknowledgements;
attempt to do so will be void.

11. Signatures

The Parties have signed this Agreement in two (2) identical copies, one for each Party.

Place:                 Date:
Evaluation

We then proceed to test with users if visual contracts are more usable and provide a better user experience.

PROCEDURE
- We tested with users from 3 departments: sourcing, legal, and sales.
- A contract was to be used to answer to comprehension questions.
- The testers had to browse the contract, find and understand the information, and give the answer.
- Half of the participants used a visual contracts, half the traditional one.
- The content of the contract was the same, but the appearance differed.
## Test results

**improved usability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRECT ANSWERS</th>
<th>TIME TAKEN PER ANSWER</th>
<th>SKIPPED QUESTIONS (FORFAIT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual version</td>
<td>Visual version</td>
<td>Visual version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.9 %</td>
<td>146.26 seconds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual version</td>
<td>Textual version</td>
<td>Textual version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>224.15 seconds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

less misunderstanding • faster to read & understand
The users expect to have less difficulties in using a visual contract.

The expectations are confirmed after using the contract, and visual contracts are perceived even slightly easier to use than expected!
Test results
improved user experience

USERS SAY:

“[The contract] became more interesting to look at”
“ I don’t have to read difficult points more than once”
“It is more inviting”
“It is more readable”
“It is easier to find [answers]”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Visual version</th>
<th>Textual version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall appearance of the document</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of visualizations</td>
<td>90 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of the layout</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of the table of content</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>32 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of the paragraph headings</td>
<td>63 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of the tables</td>
<td>63 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to read and skim through</td>
<td>86 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test results

improved brand image

USERS SAY:

“It’s much easier to start a discussion with new persons”

“Good marketing tools, they can help sales”

“We could be the first to use visual contracts”

“We could show that we are a top company also through contracts”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect: what idea do you get about the company that drafted this contract?</th>
<th>Visual version</th>
<th>Textual version</th>
<th>Both versions</th>
<th>None of the versions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative, quality-oriented</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy, reliable partner</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truly open to collaboration</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truly makes an effort to communicate with the reader</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A company that values honesty and clarity in business</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A company that respects its contractors</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A company that aims to efficiency</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A company that aims to effectiveness</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusions

1) This approach suggest a way to better manage knowledge transfer and avoid costly misunderstandings.

2) Visualization helps reducing the typical frustration that many readers experience when working with complex contracts. We expect employees to experience more confidence and work satisfaction when working with user-centric contracts.

3) The scope of clearer contracts is not only “avoiding errors”. The value provided to the end customer depends on the supply network: better contracts can make a difference, and become a source of competitive advantage.
Thanks for your attention and feedback!

Questions? Comments?

Stefania Passera, stefania.passera@aalto.fi
Helena Haapio, helena.haapio@lexpert.com
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