

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS
INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
9:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2017
DXC TECHNOLOGY, 6TH FLOOR, 200 GRAHAM AVENUE

Present: Lisa Snider (Chairperson), Tanis Woodland, Jim Hounslow, Carol Bartmanovich, Doris Koop, Tony Sailor, Paul Knapp, John Wyndels (DIO)

Regrets: Allen Mankewich, Jeff Buhse

There has been a question of why educational and training institutions, libraries and school boards were specifically identified and parsed out in Sections 15 to 19 of the AODA ICS. According to Jutta Treviranus, it was because libraries and educational institutions were being asked to play an exemplary role and serve as a sector of leadership in developing more accessible methods of delivering information and communications.

January 24 is the day of the initial input session designed to provide persons with disabilities an opportunity to speak to the committee about the various barriers they encounter in interacting with forms of information and communications. This session will be exclusively focused on the disability community. There will be 8-10 round tables that will accommodate approximately 8-10 people. There will be facilitators and note-takers at each table. Lisa will provide a brief overview of the scope of the standard, including those areas to which the IC standard will not apply.

The committee discussed the questions that should serve as the basis of the input session. Being a preliminary consultation the questions chosen should be basic in nature and match the areas that the committee is exploring. The question/statement that was agreed up on was:

- Identify barriers you encounter when interacting with information and communication.

It was agreed that in the discussions, the public was likely to bring up future and current barriers, and that the generic question would also allow for this to happen. As well, the document given to the public included both the physical and digital, as well attitude was also taken into account in the barrier examples.

There was discussion about the importance of giving parameters, and these were clearly laid out in the public document. As well, the Committee felt a definition of Information and Communications was crucial, and in the public document the definitions used in the Committee's Terms of Reference were provided.

There were some comments regarding how the tables are set up and if the tables should be organized in a manner focussing on a particular area or whether he should consider barriers from a digital and physical standpoint. A meeting must be had with the facilitators to ensure we stay on focus.

The Chairperson developed a list of the major points we are addressing in Section 6 (Section 14 AODA) on the display board. A picture is attached, but all information in it is described below.

Below are a number of the major points to be addressed and reconciled.

Functional Performance Requirements

This would be a list of what to know about what people need. So, for example: when vision is needed, give an alternative, when hearing is needed, give an alternative, etc.

To meet these Functional Performance Requirements, use Alternative formats and communications supports for:

1. Content – text, audio, video, images that is either archived, legacy, current or new
2. Delivery of Content – brochures, print, websites, apps, kiosks, AI robots
3. Receipt of Content (send/receive) complaints, feedback user requests
4. Authoring - Software (creation tools and processes) includes Drupal, WordPress and Learning Management Systems.

Things that cover Number 1-3:

- Refers to print and digital
- It doesn't matter where it originates
- Obligated parties can only be responsible for what they control. For example, Facebook used as website-only control content.
- Procurement from 3rd party or people create things

NOTE: Procurement will be moved here as explained in the notes below and it may be called Purchasing, Procurement or Purchasing of 3rd party goods and services.

Areas to work on in terms of where they fit in or do we delete them?

- Emergency Plans
- Education/Training/Libraries (Sections 15-19)
- Training (currently only Section 16 Educators)
- Standards – How do they Fit?
- 'As requested' would apply to archived and legacy, not current or new
- Do we add 'health, safety, hazardous materials' and possibly call it "Emergency Plans and Public Safety"

The committee reviewed the display board and how the various sections would fit together. There was the question of how we fit the standards into the document, or are they contained in the guide?

Feedback and emergency plans were discussed. We looked at whether they should be separated, or do we fit them into numbers 1-4 (content, delivery, receipt, authoring)? Discussions took place about how content is consumed and not delivered. As well, we

need to make sure that the back and forth, or the sending and receiving, are accessible in the area of feedback. Feedback is the response and mechanism.

Authoring is the software end. That is the fourth element in the process. This would apply to both the physical and the digital. Although many people find the word “authoring” to be a confusing term, it applies to the creation of tools to power the delivery and receipt of content.

The Committee also discussed the areas of 1-4 (content, delivery, receipt and authoring) and the different facets of information and communications. It was agreed that there was a process, mechanism for receiving communications and information and content itself.

Standards were discussed in terms of how do we achieve functional performance requirements. We started with WCAG 2.0 because it can cover many things (this is how it was set out) and it is evolving and changing. Lisa referred to a new California bill that states that WCAG applies to the bill and ‘any subsequent versions’ of WCAG need to be used. This phrase was added so the evolution of the WCAG standard is noted. This is important, because WCAG 2.1 covers low vision, cognitive and touch devices.

The Committee decided that we should reference WCAG 2.0 AA in the Standard. However, it was agreed that it had to state that WCAG 2.0 AA **and subsequent versions** should be referenced so that newer updates could be included. This will mean that the public will use the current version at the time of creation or modification. The Committee considered this a minimum and that the alternative formats and communication supports are should include these Standards in some way.

The Committee also considered issues relating to new versions of Standards. For example, when WCAG 2.1 comes out, how long before the public has to use it if they put up something just before it officially gets released? There was no decision on this matter at this point.

It is important that we look at things from the individual standpoint rather than the standard which doesn’t necessarily apply to the individual. The challenge is to make small business understand what they have to do in a manner that is understandable to them.

The meeting adjourned shortly before 12:00 p.m. The next meeting of the committee will be Wednesday, January 10 at 9:30 a.m. at DXC Technology, 6th Floor, 200 Graham Avenue.