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--- BEGIN CAPTIONED TEXT ---

Can you hear me? Okay good morning everyone and welcome, welcome, welcome to our accessibility program Manager's Meeting. A few things, bathrooms to your left, if you go this way they are all the way at the other end where the entrance is. If you go this way they are to the left. We are going to be ending a little early so if anyone would like to stay grab some lunch and network we have this room until about 3:00 so you can stay and hang out and network and do what you like. But we will be done before 1:00 P.M. May be a little earlier.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for coming I am John Sullivan. I think I know just about everybody here. This is a diversion from the normal format. There are people here standing talking to you but hopefully we are going to address a problem here. Mike Horton who has joined our team. You are at your year anniversary sometime this month? In 20 days, Mike has been with us for a year and he is going to lead most of the agenda today. So thank you, Mike. A couple things we have got going on. As I said before. Trying to not boil the ocean but what is our focus points? We have two things we primarily focus on. Increasing accessibility and solicitation through the procurement lifecycle and the second one is particularly around information on intranet and the website presents which covers a host of electronic content and official communication. One of the things that we do on the digital dashboard which you will see, we scan for low hanging fruit. We scan the front door of the agency, we manage the.gov domain and we scan for things and we have three simple measures of accessibility. So we like to set a challenge of let's make progress on these three little things and see what the puts into play fully recognizing you manage your whole agency website. And your web managers. And a big part of this is we as a accessibility community need to know who to reach out to and who else to work with. On the acquisition side, the people you work with and on the development side so that's what we are going to be talking about today and that is about all I have. Do we have the most folks on the line? Okay so we did try to accommodate those who came remote and for the remote folks make sure audio and sound individuals are working, let us know if not. Thank you for coming and I give you Mike.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Hello, thank you all for coming. I get to talk to you for a long time so I'm going to sit down while we chat. As John mentioned, the agenda today is, I should move my slides. It is built largely around the digital dashboard and so we wanted to talk about how to get access how to use it. We wanted to talk about some of the reporting that was based on that, May 31 there was a memorandum letter that went out to agency CFOs if you are non-CFO you did not get one. And the coordinators including data based on what comes from the dashboard so we will talk about that and answer questions about that. I will share information on the spring OMB program. Manage the self-assessment and the August reporting period that you should've received invitations about. So those are the things we will talk about related to metrics and reporting. The first part would be best, based on training theme developed within our partners so I will be using that largely to train on the digital dashboard. And then some question time has been built in afterward. Certainly if you have a question as you go along let me know but I would like to get through at least that training have more dialogue during the other sessions. The goal today is to provide an overview of the digital dashboard specifically accessibility module. There are a lot of other things in there for you and stakeholders but today we are focusing just on the accessibility module. We will talk about the audience limitations. Later on there will be a discussion about growing that and maturing that into something that matches what else we are doing internally as well. The training objectives today will be to describe that purpose, describe the benefits to you, some agencies do not have any automated tools to generate any metrics so these may be most important to them. These metrics may not help agencies that have more mature evaluation programs. So applications scanning tools. There is a balance we are trying to

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

And we want to make sure we are not harming anyone as we go along. Let's dive in a little bit more. We will talk about what it is scanning and looking for. How you can parse the data a little bit. There are probably other people out there that can look at the data and extract information out of that which is meaningful to your management. Everyone has a different approach to how they are doing stuff. My first question I would like to see hands in the air if you have already gone to and accessed the accessibility module in the digital dashboard. Five of us, six of us. Okay. Who received the CIO letter? Okay. The same group. That is good to know. So the purpose of the accessibility module is to perform a biweekly check. At the time of this we had 1005 domains, now we are down to 960, I believe. So that will vary across agencies but it is to do a biweekly check and you will hear this repeated several times we are just testing for three issues. Not the full sweep or standards that are capable through automated testing. This is governmentwide. Not just the agencies we reported out. And yes.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Inaudible Question ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Currently not correct? Just .gov. We have no authority over the .mil yet we don't manage that yet. So again to be clear that is just for the .gov domains that we manage within that group. The use of this is again not to show the full scope of defects that are occurring on your websites but it is a small sample. A tiny little sample of the types of issues that are impacting your website. It is only the top level page for that domain. We are not crawling any deeper so if we have 960 domains, assuming we have correctly weeded out any redirects which is what the tool is designed to do the goal would be 960 pages we are testing, one per domain. The notion is that if we are failing significantly on any of those then we are likely to have other issues on other failures that are probably more significant barriers to access than the ones we are testing for and we will get into those in more detail as we go along. So again for agencies that do not have an automated tool this can help you understand the level of conformance that's going on. You can use it to identify stakeholders for particular domains for the worst performers versus those that appear to have something well oiled. So we can go across component agencies. So the report as we will see is an agencywide level so we will take a large agency of like DHS there are a lot of components within that. The coordinators on those agencies will be able to see across DHS which is the way the tool is written. I will be demoing the tool today and I can see everybody's stuff and show everybody's stuff. One of the key concerns was that this type of information is publicly available and he requires authentication through an account, it is not available to the public. Probably the people who will use it will be ours community with Max accounts. So we are looking to find those patterns across the site. These three give a really good indication. If we cannot get these three right we are not doing well. So this slide I have included. I was going to take it out because we do present to people who are not program managers but I thought I will remind you guys. We all know why it's important. We don't want to leave out anyone getting access to information. So just a reminder if you did not get today knowing what we had to do. The audience. As I mentioned access is granted to anyone with a max account. I will mention for those using access tools working with and evaluating the home page, I think it's open. Excuse me, some folks are not able to see the presentation. Apparently the host has to respond to let these people in. Fund with technology. Okay. Now it's not going to show. Can we do this invisible? Here we go. Did that work? Okay. Crisis averted. So I tested the max home page, the login and the registration and in doing so noticed if you don't have a max account the registration button is not accessible via keyboard. So I have provided them with those test results and they are looking at remediation. If you don't have the ETA on that so if you have issues connecting or registering for Max let us know and we will get you in touch with the right people to help you create your account. Again is anyone with a max account so this can be your component PMs, the other resources within the office but it can also be the web content managers that are responsible for a particular domain. They can have access and they can look at and monitor their reports over time as well. So giving them the tools and the availability to have access without the coordinator being a roadblock would be helpful to them. Obviously anyone in the office or wherever your shop exists probably your CIO will not login and check on it but that information could be available to them. And again we use this information as part of any reporting we are obligated to do internally. To support our program which again is here to support you guys and help you build out your office. So this can and over time can help understand where challenges are with training related to that to better inform us and reinforce what you're telling us what we are getting through other reporting methods. Just one arrow in the quiver. Some of the limitations as I alluded to and will speak to multiple times the tool currently only scans for three standards. It will only scan for the home page of the domain, when it tests for color contrast is testing programmatic color contrast not where there is an image in the background and the text is in the foreground so it's only going to do where there is HTML or CSS, it will warn you I believe. It will not uncover errors with MDL tags so where you say it is ornamental because you have all equals in fact it is meaningful and it will not detect meaningful images and say you forgot to tag and will not evaluate the meaningfulness of the description. It will know programmatically is there a tag and then based on that again this is a tiny thing. A small part so you need to augment testing. If you have tools that are better than this then fantastic. So, using the accessibility module a little bit about how it works. The tool is based on the tally it is open source testing engine that has a number of rules that are available that align as they suggest with 508 and some other accessibility definitions in the goal for us is to make sure we have the right rules in place for us to scan. Will have a conversation about those rules later and how you guys might be able to help us make sure we have the right rules. Yes ma'am.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Inaudible Question ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yes, I have links later in the presentation with links to the rules. The question was are the rules available on GitHub. Thank you for keeping me honest. I will get my microphone guys here when there are more questions. I'm kidding. I'm kidding. I do want to note. Historically the scans have been run monthly and the goal is to increase that to biweekly. There is a change unrelated to the, to the way the accessibility scans are run but the way the tool works for Google and how it measures mobile friendliness I believe is the issue they are working around and Google changed the way they do that so they are looking to instrument that so there was a delay impacting a scan. They reverted back to the old code that Google supports for now. At some point in time Google will say we don't support that and hopefully by then they will figure out the challenge that they have on the coding site. The last cadence was only once but it was completed two days ago. It takes three days to run all of the domains. I will show you where within the tool you can find out when the date was so you can determine if it's the same stuff or something different. So we have talked about conformance issues that we test for so we will explain those in more detail here. So color contrast I alluded to earlier evaluating programmatic color contrast to determine where not enough color contrast between the foreground text and the background that it is on. Right now it is looking at the 4.5 Right now it is looking at the 4.52 1. We know the tag has, there is variable based on the font size. So like, I'm sorry? Like the Andy tool can evaluate for both depending on the font size itself programmatically we need to make sure our tool is capable of doing that same thing. The HTML attributes for evaluating anchor tags so that there is a descriptive attribute for that content supplied for example if you have an image with the anchor tag the tool is evaluating a method for conforming but not all the possible methods that are available under the testing baseline and the tester evaluations. We will talk about it later but any performing network is how do we make sure the tool is scanning and conforming with that baseline moving forward so we are eliminating as many false positives as possible. And then missing text descriptions to images. Again this is kind of easy if you're publishing typically, the template for the website will be fixed hopefully through the development cycle we will get the alt tags corrected but when we publish that is oftentimes where we can insert errors so this will be in for those images and largely perhaps a conversation between you and the web content manager and those that are publishing information. So again it's going to look for the missing tag and not meaningfulness of the description.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Inaudible Question ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The question was, if the missing description looking for the three different methods the answer is I will have to look into that. Honestly I have not been under the hood quite yet with the tool. There are some folks in the room that helped work on the predecessor to the tool called Pulse which has kind of moved under the dashboard. There are some other folks that we would like to pull in and have conversations about that. Perhaps more expert at that than me as they work on these tools before but it's important we get it right. The question is appropriate similar to the HML tag are we tagging all the possible ways I would doing that with images and color contrast and as we add things in tables and forms some important barriers does it all align. Ultimately what we would like to have is this complements or helps, let me rephrase. This can be one of the tools that aligns with the baseline giving us the data we need to provide for data-driven decisions by management and our own teams. So navigating to the accessibility module is the digital dashboard .gov and the screenshot is just a snapshot of that page. Highlighting the login in the upper right-hand corner and a series of modules in the body of the page where one of them is the accessibility module. So when you go in and have your account and login you will put in your credentials. You will return to this screen. You will navigate to the one module for accessibility. If you don't have access to that it will let you know and you can send a request to the administrator for access. Do know that all of the primary coordinators where the names were given to the administrators and those names were added you should be able to get in but any folks that you ask to gain access to the tool, whether it is a web content manager or someone in your team they have the extra step they will have to ask. The accessibility report system. Some of the screens will be mixed, some are governmentwide so I can support you guys where you have questions and see the data you're looking at, some of the screens will be the agencywide and I will do my best to point out the difference. This one although you cannot see it from where you are at is a set of bar charts and it lists out the issues identified for about 10 agencies. These are the top issues that have come up for the agencies. This data is old. We can certainly look at the new data and see where folks are at. Since the memo went out we have seen a drop in the number of issues so thank you in advance for that but we also have a goal to shoot for as we continue to reduce that. When you log into the accessibility report you will see something similar at the agency level but it would just be for your component agency wrapped up into your department or agency. Another aspect of the tool is a series of charts that are not accessible. I will work with the team to fix that. I'm saying that ahead of time because someone will let me know that they are not and I already know that. So we will be working on these charts but they will talk about the breakdown of issues overall. There was a question. Hold on a second.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

In respect to the accessibility report is that going to be something that will be under consideration by the CIO council or the federal CIO as to additional comments or reports back to the different agencies?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

You're asking about the report we sent to the CIO? Can you rephrase?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I am wondering are you going to anticipate some feedback at the CIO level at the council of CIOs.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Can you pass the microphone to John?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

We certainly welcome that discussion. Especially at the council but that is a good thing. Again, the goal of the digital dashboard is to self serve. You go in and routinely monitor. So the question is how many times can we pull out a full report and say you need to look at that. And how often do they want it? This one was done initially to draw attention to say we have some good data. Your web hosting, it is all there. This is, some of this will be used as this goes more toward the 21st-century idea act and the reporting called in there. We are working as much as possible to have automated scanning and get out of the self reporting game altogether, that's the goal for this. To me the question bringing attention to the accessibility side we have had zero feedback outside of people in this room on it but it is something we should be listening for in the next meeting so we need to monitor that reaction. Again the point of this is to help bring things to your attention and not to point out your flaws. That is all. It's a tough line we don't like when people point out our flaws.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I will add to that, if there is feedback, if there is data that's interested to be seen in any cadence we have for future reports I would love to know what they are interested in seeing. Is a helpful? Is it not for them? John is going to add another comment.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Question for you. We sent the letter out May 31 okay and what have we seen in improvement?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

5% reduction.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

5% reduction of errors.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay so we will see some of this, we will see some more of this hopefully on the screen large enough for you to look at more. We will have time for a demo with questions. This screen I am showing now I forgot to add my page numbers. Sorry John. Some of the menus available to us from the governmentwide side for us to select governmentwide or agency specific screens. This again gets into ratios governmentwide snapshot views of the types of issues we are having across the government. This one shows total number of color contrast issues at 4300, HTML attribute issues 4300 and images around 1200. That seems to be the breakdown but it does vary by agency. The agencywide accessibility report screen here. The main focus of the screen is a data table that lists the domains for the agency. It lists a number of websites that were scanned for the particular domain, at this point it is one, the tool is capable of doing more so we will have a discussion about when more is appropriate and helpful. And again column for the color contrast, HTML attributes and missing images issues. A couple things to point out on the screen. A couple items to point out on the screen. Two ways to export the data going out in a CSV file or Excel file. You can filter the data so if there is a particular agency you're looking for or a domain you can filter the list and it will quickly pull up. You can sort the result so you can see the domain, the largest number of issues for a particular test issue we are looking for and then you can drill further into a specific domain by selecting that domain name. The agency dashboard. This is a screenshot where six modules are showing up. This is more of the larger view John was talking about outside of the accessibility module. There is some information on mobile friendliness, HTTPS information. Whether you are using the DAP analytics and information based on that. Insecure protocol information. I don't even know what M 15, 13 and 1801 information is. That is probably from the intelligence committee. Security. There we go. I guessed right. Thank you, John.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Indiscernible - speaker away from microphone ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Laughter ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So again another screen on the domain level accessibility report with similar information. You can sort, export and filter by name. This screen I am showing now is an example of the accessibility scan. I will zoom in when we go to the regular tool. The first portion of the screen describes when that domain was added to the scans meaning when that particular domain was picked up at first was scanned. And has the ID, website name, the agency it is associated with and then it will last a scanned time midway through the statistics and this scan was for very 23rd 2019 at 12:20. As I said it takes about three days so each domain will have a different timestamp but hopefully within that three day window across your agency. It should not be more than a three day Delta and then it lists the number of issues you have for each issue numerically. The benefit of this particular screen is probably going to be most used for your development team. It provides for a detail for each error or issue identified in the scan. It provides the tag principal and guideline reference for what it tested. The selector, the HTML ID essentially or the selector for that element. It gives you sometimes truncated reference to the content itself. If it is an image you would see IMG source, the path, how it is in the code and then a description of where the error was. The HTML attribute provides one set of data. The color contrast issue actually does I believe suggest what you could adjust to make that color contrast issue conform so we will see that later in the tool. Do you have a question?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Inaudible Question ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Just by looking at your example I am not seeing ID issues with unordered list. I can see it says duplicate ID attributes for the menu on the webpage. Okay what what I look for is what I'm thinking.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

We would want the unique ID for the element so if there is a duplicate we would catch that. This goes to the question of at this snapshot how is the tool configured and what is it looking for. So we will get a better understanding of that and get it out to the community as well. Website accessible report, I'm going to skip this screen. Within the dashboard there is a page on accessibility guidance that does detail some of the information that I have here. What we test for, with the standard tests against and information on how to remediate that and we will update that as we add more test IDs and the nuances related to those. And that guidance we have published in two places, in the accessibility menu and in the FAQs how to improve accessibility services. So I'm going to jump into a demo of the tool and we can walk around a little bit. We are going to see everybody's data so don't be afraid. Again as John said this is intended to help, it is not intended to be something we are showing the worst of things. So I need to login to my max ID. I'm sorry let me back up. When I first went to the URL. Okay. The last meeting half it went on like that for an hour. When I first loaded up the digital dashboard in my browser and selected the accessibility panel I got to the access denied screen. Within there there is a login button and by selecting that I am taken to the max login methodology. I will use my PIV card to login. Of course I'm going to have trouble now. Going to put in my pin. Somewhere. And then for me, when I go to access the accessibility panel I am loading. It did it very fast, sometimes it is slow because I load essentially 1000 domains. So on the slide presentation this is similar to what we had. This is the current data for governmentwide sites. And it is listing Federal Trade Commission, GSA, Department of Commerce, Department of Energy, Health and Human Services, Justice, treasury, executive office of the president, office of the interior and U.S. Department of Agriculture on the several bar charts. And it lists them by the defect. For example FTC currently listed across all domains 424 color contrast issues. 68 HTML attribute issues and I believe that is 10 image issues. So certainly you can look at that and say our publishing folks are doing pretty good if we only have 10 issues on the page. It is not a huge chunk but 10 is pretty big for just one page so we could go ahead and address that. Again on the screen or the bar charts and pie charts that are difficult even for me to see on the screen. But it will list out some of the domains for that agency and the issues that go on for those domains. The first pie chart is the whole thing and then it breaks it down to the top to give you a snapshot of who you might want to look at. Scrolling further down the page you get more into what I think we will be using more, the raw data. At least I will be and so for here again I have governmentwide view so I can see all the agencies. I have the option to sort or pick a particular agency to look at. I would just do it random. So I selected the FDIC. They have six domains and if we sort them by color contrast. The FDIC.gov domain itself has 31 color contrast issues, two websites with one issue and three have zero. As a fibroid program manager that gives us an idea. Whoever owns FDIC they have the issue as a large one off but looking at the HTML and missing images they have six HTML issues and zero image issues. So you know you need to develop a method to the madness on how you triage. What relationships you have, what you don't have. You know who you could talk to in a few minutes in the hall and they will go address it and you also know. You know who you may need to develop a relationship with. One second we are getting the microphone to you.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you. I have a question for justices and descriptors. I was typing up a document and for certain agendas there is a particular image we put in the header but we have not developed the descriptor for the image and I know that we use it often. So if there are no plans to describe the image you know, what are the proper steps to ensure we can bring that number down but I just saw on the pie chart?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Is it a meaningful image or is it on a website?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

It's not on a website but when I sent out the agenda Jacqueline Turner was telling me this is not compliant but she helped me fix it but that particular image we do not have a descriptor. I don't know if it's on the website or not but does that mean we just have to pick a hit in that area or does our responsibility to get a descriptor for the image?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If it's meaningful and needs to be described.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Is just a picture of my building across from APS. It is a watermark essentially.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So we can talk about it. I would have to take a look but it could be that it is ornamental. Unless you are highlighting the building itself and there's something about the building that's meaningful if you don't have it do you lose information? We can talk about it but if we are on the website it would have to be tagged as an ornamental image if that's what it was.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

First my comment is we need this looped.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

It is.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Inaudible ] this tool, does it test for attachments as well and what's in the attachment or just the webpage?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Just an HTML markup.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Any word documents and PDFs it is not testing.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The home page of that domain.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Regarding the images, how accurate and, how meaningful are the results and are people taking it and relying on it? It really scares me, maybe because I have felt the salon images but this is getting a real impression that we know most images have lousy alternative text so for people to get a report that says only six and it does not say six of how many. Can you drill down to say six of how many images have problems or just six out of unknown?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unless people, here's the link, the image and the alternative text that is presented. Is this really superficial and not meaningful or how meaningful is it in practical terms for accessibility? Nonconformance but accessibility.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So again, it's not evaluating the meaningfulness of the text.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Most alt text is lousy.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Tools are not capable yet. They are not going to get an issue reported where there is an alt tag that has a value it's not going to report as an issue. It will report where you have the image and there is no alt tag at all.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Does it at least weed out those that are marked decorative?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If it is null then it should pass. The technology cannot determine whether the image defined as an ornamental image is in fact ornamental or not. That is something your publisher would determine. If they mark as ornamental and it's meaningful this tool will not be able to say that was incorrect. So you won't get the issue for a null tag or for the tag with a value. You will get the issue reported where there is no alt attribute attributed to the image tag does that help? Correct is a very small piece of the picture. That is why I used the word tiny three times.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I look at this, this is just an indicator that you need to look a little bit deeper. Again, the game plan is you will be the primary person looking at this and assuming you have other tools you have more sophisticated tools and as we all know with all tools they don't come up with the same answers. So the optics, that is the whole thing here. I get it, we are looking at a small tiny little subset of your web properties. And then looking at a couple little things. This is an indicator. Is it the attention grabber? We will talk later on about plans to expand it. Some agencies are using nothing and so there is a lowest common denominator effect and the conversation later is what happens, these results versus what you get from another commercial tool and how well do they compare?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Inaudible ] when we first released Pulse at GSA we had this conversation. No one to look at this tool as a normative assessment of 508 conformance in these areas. The tool is not going to be perfect even when it does what it is supposed to be doing correctly. You have to pick in the context of the coding environment there are a couple ways to skin the cat. Not necessarily doing things the way the tool is looking for. So whether the text is meaningful or not, that is one of many different reasons why it could be correct or incorrect. John used the word indicator. This is an example of the alternative is to do nothing. It is a push, it is providing some progress on measurements using a standard method across government and there in lays the value. In and of itself is not a declaration of 508 conformance at all. It is just a move to providing some measurement. If the tool is expanded then it will expand that but the issues you're talking about now will be there no matter what because that's what you get with automated tools. Until of course the automated rule set achieves perfection so most likely never.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I will leave it with this. How were the three criteria selected? Maybe what it comes down to is how is this marketed so we don't get executives misunderstanding and buying into it? How is it marketed so executives get this is what it is and this is not what it is so they get it to not run with it and to be misled or allow themselves to be misled because they wanted to be numbers.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I will take the easy half of the question. The easy half is how are those three selected? Because we had multiple agencies with actual testing capacity evaluate the results that came out of the initial tool and we decided for the ones that are accurate most often out of the other rule sets and that was at the time when 508 was still the law they had not migrated to the tag so we further constrained the risk to things that could be aligned with 508. Now that we have officially adopted the way tag we don't have the constraint but I expect whenever GSA expands the tool there will be at least one restricting the expanded rule set to the rules with the highest degree of accuracy based on a comprehensive evaluation approach.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Gary, you point out the pros and cons of having data. You know it gets attention, it may get the wrong attention. And it does call into order what have you been doing. On the other side what we are not talking about today is we have data showing us the rate of solicitations with associated language. It is poor. That immediately begs the question what have we been training people on for 20 years? Why is it so poor? So here, these came up in the best confidence relatively easy to go forward. This is in the framework of going public with this. So this is not going public but you know so how do we convey? We hope we explained it adequately in the cover letter that went with it but we all know they are not necessarily read by everyone. So it will spawn a discussion inside her agency that is why we are doing this. So you know to say everything you are saying. This is not the be all and all. Later we do want to extend, we did building tags for this thing. They have not been turned on but we need a UAT of people in this room and developers to sit down and figure out which ones we want to turn on and which ones have a high degree of confidence. Like everything else, is the data meaningful? The ability to give you something that is useful rather than something that paints a bad story because I don't want someone looking to say we have six errors at 606 and John is dumb. That's the worst thing that can happen here. And I have to step out for 30 minutes. I will be back.'s work thank you John. One of the things that strikes me. We are looking at a very specific report which is targeted for three specific assessed criteria. Let's be honest, across the 508 realm we have varying degrees of technical standards. So talking about HTML coding and everything whereas I understand the concept of color contrast, the bigger point John was eluding to is that as a government we have the responsibility under the law to provide access to members of the public and to fellow employees with disabilities. The way we do that is to provide accessible online content and accessible ICT, so this is a tool to say how are we doing that and what are we doing? Is it correct? Now let me put a bookmark on a thought for a moment. People come to us not only in government but also in the private sector and the private sector as some of you may have heard has suddenly discovered accessibility on websites. Because in the last year there have been thousands of lawsuits filed. The ADA allows for those of you not familiar with the concept, the ADA allows for attorney fees when you sue someone for violating provisions. So this is America land of free enterprise so enterprising people with mixed motives nevertheless they are calling out the private sector to say hey, guys you are offering services. You are conducting business on a website on a public facing website. Your website is not accessible, your public facing website is not accessible. All, my God. So my phone is ringing off the hook with ADA accessibility. This is all by way of giving you guys some context outside of the little government world the rest of the country is waking up and going what is this ADA stuff? What does it mean? How do I fix it? What are the tools? Hopefully that will translate to the vendors who when they are going to provide solicitation so now they can understand what accessibility is because they have heard about it and maybe they have heard about a lawsuit. The will gets accessible solicitations. Those of you and I include myself for whom this is interesting and I would like a little more plain language about this. I advise you to go to the website www.webaim.org . On the bottom link of the page. Joe Smith has posted 1 million page survey. What they did is they surveyed 1 million webpages across the world and they grouped these are the kinds of mistakes that keep coming up. Color contrast is right up there. Alt tags are right up there. So when you're asking Gary and another person why we pick those criteria just be aware there are other data that support the high incidence of those low hanging fruit errors. Remember there are varying degrees of detailed knowledge that we know about this stuff. As much as we say the tool is in development it's not perfect we have the opportunity to understand it so I'm offering this 1 million webpages check. Again www.webaim.org check it out and you will get an idea of the information that's out there.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Captioners transitioning ]John Robert, and I will ask to check with you about the looping looping as well. Check with Gary. He has a a question about looping. Okay, thank you, Abe.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Again, kind of picking up where we left off in the data table that sort by agencies, by domain, and provides issues. In order to get to the detailed information to determine, again, whether it's a false positive because it's not quite matured up to the new revised 508. Or whether it is a real issue that needs to be addressed, you can select the raw scan output COLA issue that needs to be addressed, you can select the raw scan output COLA in the link for that website. Again, this is the page I had shown in the I had shown in the slide. I will see if I can make it bigger for the room. That didn't work. I think this is big enough. This scan time here is when that scan was run. This was the 27th, four days ago, so this is kind of of the first start. Again, it mentions in this particular one there is the color contrast group, the HTML attribute, and there is 0 one there is the color contrast group, the HTML attribute, and there is 0 missing images. This was on the slide before. It showed the duplicate ID issue that Reva was looking at and we talked about. And here is an example of the color contrast findings. I should say they don't call them issues. They call them findings findings because it may not be an issue. One of the things that add for the color section is a recommendation. Again, this isn't what you should change it to. It's just staying if you changed the background to this text value, you would achieve that minimum 4.5 compliance. Again, this particular thing we need to look at to make sure it can evaluate based on font size and conformance of the tag and ICT baseline. So, that is largely the tool. Again, the data can be in this table. Of course I did that, back here. Go back into a domain. Go to a table here. The data can be exported either CSV or as an XML. On my screen over here on the top right of the table. I think I've done some data collection on that, and I just put it into a spreadsheet. This was easier. Certainly, we will work with when we build-out the standards, one of the things about that is we will work very hard to make sure we are evaluating based on the standards, and make sure that were strictly conforming with that. The other side is visual side, so we need to work with with Maria and her team to manage this tool on how that is displayed, and all of the other features we might like features we might like in that data. On how it's visualized, how it's presented so we get timelines where get timelines where we could do comparisons over time. Those would be very beneficial out-of-the-box rather than us having to download it and do things in a more rudimentary way. Gary has a question in the back. Gary get a microphone.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

It's coming.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thanks, I think you just started to touch on my question around yeah, what does it show over time? Is it just a snapshot of time an individual agencies would have to download the Agency?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Right met.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

How does one know from one scan to the next whether it is the same or a new issue? Now you have six new ones and you have to guess if seven of the six are the same?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

There may be limitations in the capability, the tool and how it collects the data. I personally think seeing trend i n -- trending natively is going to a program managers identify where they need to focus they're limited resources. Rather than you putting tabs together and doing math on a spreadsheet to create that t rending. Right now there is not that trending. And again, I should add it's not on the website. The website is in beta, which is where there is some shoring up to do. Tremendous amount of value. There are other -- that may be of value to other stakeholders as well. Thanks, Gary. I think that's kind of the tool, primarily. If there is something somebody would want to see. Yes, man? Lee, or event who has the microphone?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

-- Lee or you that, who has the microphone?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Jan said run.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Does GSA have an it's file a primary Point of Contact for each one of these sites that maintain, like a name and an e-mail address so that I do that I do not have to go and try to figure out who figure out who it is myself. And in the report too. Our people can't actually get to the site. I have to go through a back door.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay, you can't do it on the DoD data.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Right, right.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

We don't maintain that list. I do not know if Lee can help me. So, I don't think any information we have is going to be on who is the contact for that domain, so the registration of the domain, not necessarily the Web contact manager responsible for operating the website. I don't know that information would be helpful.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If it's just someone who bought the domain. It could be a generic Dev Ops as well, right. That is something I talk about later, but let's mention it now. Maybe that's a heavy lift. Maybe there is a big bell curve on that, a big lift in the beginning I want it's identified. But I also think that you have a lot of websites, a lot of domains. So, you're effort would be different than say BIC. Perhaps you can get folks in those different offices to help. I don't know if there is another dashboard or tracking method within the OCIO's office.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Indiscernible - low audio]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

No know. It will be an effort everyone has two go through, contact, what component domain lives in and more research to do.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I would like to follow on to the question with DoD as well. I see there is a way to export the report by CSC or XL. That might be an option to then reimport it internally into our own networks and dashboards and maybe just upload a file like that so that we would get access. Is it intricate enough, CSV and Excel file?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Pretty much what you see on the screen is what you will get in the XML file, and then I was show it.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Hold on a second.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

No, I did not want to do that.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Pause]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I sent it to my desktop.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Hang on a second.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Maybe I didn't.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Indiscernible - low audio]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Did you see it?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Indiscernible - low audio]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Which window? I am not a crumb user, thank you. I am not a crumb user. Technically handicapped. So, this is a spreadsheet. It's just the website. This column is useless. You can delete it. I mean, it's just kind of repeats things but here would be be all of the components. This is the global view but it would all be DoD, but could be some other things in their, some other different components. Actually, I wonder for you guys if let's see how that rolls up. Let's look at that real quick.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So by Agency -- [Pause]. So there are a bunch of .gov, IDL, .net go, MTF .gov. Okay, so let me get back to my slide and -- .

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Indiscernible - low audio]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

We will look.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Pause]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Only parts of the CIA are up there.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Just the public ones.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yeah, these are only public sites. There's nothing behind the firewall for somebody who is not Internet.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

It is not typing what I want it to do. Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Any others?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

No, okay.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[Indiscernible - low audio]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yes, can we get a microphone?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay, my question is, so is that you are showing us, how does it differ from some of the commercial tools out there that perform similar functions? Is it enhancing?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Can you bring the microphone closer so that closer so that I can hear?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Is this better?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay, this tool as you are showing it, so how does does it differ or enhance the commercial tools out there that may perform similar functions? Or do they perform similar functions? In other words, is this tool filling a gap that doesn't exist out in the commercial world or website scanning?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So, the question is how does this match up with the commercial tools that are out their capability wise. The first thing is there are a lot of agencies out there that do not have any automated tools. That is the first benefit. The difference between them though, each tool has a different way of evaluating. The hope is there is a consistent output of Pass or Fail. The rules on how they test can be done. I don't think it differs other than this big key, we are only testing three items based on the old 508 methodology, so we need to actually need to actually bring it up-to-date. The commercial tools are going to scan probably a lot more, more than likely a lot more issues, and they can probably do them better than this tool can do. Again, for those agencies that don't have the budget to have a scanning tool that is more robust, that is more capable, that may be able to provide better reporting, this tool is not going to augment that data. Robert has his hand raised and can probably speak to this very well.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Remember the consumer report output that said good, better, b est? Think of this report as good. Think about commercial tools as better, and manual testing as best. Even with -- testing you will not achieve 100% perfection, but it's going to be better than all of the other options combined. It's really a matter of Risk Management. Something is better than nothing, good. And it starts the process of 508 being asked questions, well, is this all we need to do? Actually we need to get funding for a commercial tool to really understand better where are do? Actually we need to get funding for a commercial tool to really understand better where are risk i s. We really need to augment that with manual testing for these reasons or what have you. That's the beginning of the story.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Lee I think as a question.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The gentleman in the blue shirt.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Mike, I apologized for missed it but did the tool tell you specifically where the error is located on the page?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

It will give you an indication of the description of the element and show you the tagging for that. In this case the way the output is it doesn't say what line of code it's on, but do know the codes right now are only testing the one homepage associated with that domain. It's going to be within that one page.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay. Another question is, I have a lot of Web content managers that are trying to replicate the errors as the tool is identify, for example with .gov the CIO and Program Managers says HTML was used to identify these areas. They are not able to able to replicate the same errors on some of the homepages for Department of Interior, so it's a challenge. I have told them to go into this tool and update the results from the tool, but they want to but they want to replicate it. They cannot do that using HTML. The narrative for the CIOs.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So, I'm wondering if it's possible that the scan in which the CIO report was based on was replaced by a subsequent scan where that issue was removed the whatever publication change was made. So, was the error that was described know longer there? In the scan in which they looked at the specific data? I am certainly happy to work with you and the Team to confirm that. So, that is one of the challenges who is timeliness, like this is a two-week scan. The more robust tools, automated tools -- to implement within their agencies you could scan a page every day if you wanted too. There is some timeliness to this, and from a publishing perspective if you are making changes on that homepage every day, it's possible that by the time that report gets to the stakeholder, that that issue doesn't exist anymore.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yeah, let's talk offline.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay, very good.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Lee has a question again.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay, I think you may have covered this already, so, are you going to be at some point incorporating Andy into this tool?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The The great question is are we going to incorporate Andy? Andy is used for -- and aligns with what is used for the trusted tester version five that is coming out this year, this summer, and the trusted tester is based on the ICP tested baseline. That is essentially a way to say that when you test these are the outputs of your testing tools. So, when you test your result should Pass or Fail in these cases. So, Andy was designed to do this for manual inspection, automated tools should be in this would include it along with that same ICT Testing baseline so that if we are capable of testing it through automated tools and we use Andy to test through a manual tool we're going we're going to get the same result. That is our goal. But Andy is a manual tool that we wouldn't use pick a dozen years Andy. It uses -- too evaluate. Does that clarify or do you still have questions?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yes, that clarifies.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

-- that one over here.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I wanted to mention a project I have been involved in that has been doing research with the Accessibility Tool where I am doing a comparison between the results that are coming out of the GSA report in terms of the tally, -- and comparing those results in terms of what is assessed and indicated by the Andy tool, and how those results are compared to the ICT baseline. And what I'm finding is the tally on the page's different does a really good job at looking at -- and how the W3C issue are assessed in terms of technical compliance pick if you are looking at ING tag, what does the W3C compliance say in terms of how that technical requirement is. And what I am finding is that HTML stiffer and the tally tool does a pretty good job at looking at exactly how that needs to work, but if you compare that to the IPT baseline, as you can see technical compliance is a little more stringent than what the ICT baseline allows and what you will find also in the Andy tool. What we are seeing is compliance being -- of being correct in terms of what the stiffer and -- to our finding, but it's only giving a narrow view of what the issue needs to be. The ICT baseline gives you a much in terms of what the stiffer and -- to our finding, but it's only giving a narrow view of what the issue needs to be. The ICT baseline gives you a much wider range of -- options in order to achieve compliance in terms of Web tag. So the W3C technical compliance that a CML, code sniffer and PAL reporting tool is direct, but you can have other remediation options. For example, a title attribute could also be the same a bbreviation, and what the GSA tool is saying has to be done by -- . What we are finding is this tool does to a really good job at finding the most stringent approach to compliance, but ICT baseline and ADA are additional ways you can achieve compliance and not just limited to that one option and report.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I have included some of that information you provided in some further slides so we can articulate your point.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Great.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I am going to wrap this up in about 10 minutes or seven minutes. Again, just a reminder, this is like John said, and indicator. We're looking at just three things. We want to make sure that we don't make this bigger than it is. It's just three things is an indicator. If you have a tool that looks at the bigger picture we will use that tool. As you go into it, if you don't have access, you are having trouble accessing hitting a master account, let us know and we will work with those folks over there. If you use a tool, if you have challenge with the tool let us know, and we will help you with that. You can contact us through our e-mail address section.508 at gsa.gov. We will help you with that.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ The event is on a 15 minute recess. The session will reconvene at 11:45 AM ET. Captioner on stand by ] a 15 minute recess. The session will reconvene at 11:45 AM ET. Captioner on stand by ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay everyone I want to respect your time and get started on the next section here.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

All right so we will get started on this next section it's about half an hour and then John will share some information on the upcoming interagency accessibility for him in October. So this next section is a conversation for us. We touched on it a little bit turning earlier sessions. So as I mentioned earlier the digital dashboard accessibility module uses an open source tool and you can get to it so for those that are not familiar with that terminology that is the accessibility, there are a lot of letters so they said there were a lot of letters between the A and the Y to spell accessibility. So that's where it comes from. So the website is PA11Y.org and that's where you get information on PA11Y and what it can do. It will use some code sticker rules and those rules are available for you to look at on GitHub. This presentation deck will go out as soon as I finish making it accessible. For the group that I needed it today. It is on GitHub. There is a long link I will just send it out to everyone but there is a set of rules, a large number of rules, in their they categorize for the 508 and again I think this is where we need to look at improving our scanning and my goal is when the testing base light that is in draft now is ratified and in place that we use this as that cornerstone for our testing and sensibly we would use it for any acquisition we have with the vendor. So if we are buying a tool someone else will scan for us we want to test to the way that we would use trusted tester based on the same thing so if we are all testing the same way with the same output for successful testing that's good. So that is the goal to leverage that as well. I think someone will correct me if I am wrong that the ICT testing baseline while may be similar, what do they call it Kathy? Accessibility conformance? A CT thank you. They may have some overlap with similarities between them but obviously 508 is a little bit different in some ways so the ICT testing baseline through the OCIO accessibility community of practice sponsors that so some information on that will be available again. As a reminder our version of the open source tool within the accessibility module on the dashboard is currently testing for color contrast, HP attributes and images. So we want to align with the ICT testing baseline as mentioned earlier he has done some extensive studying on issues and I am highlighting one of them here in this example where the tag test we are looking for is correct but it is one of several methods that the HTML evaluation could validate so there is an example I am showing here for the anchor tag with a title of that is blank with interest with a forward/back for the current folder. The anchor has an image. It is not hypertext it is a clickable image. The image source has a name and there is no text. There is no title, there is no alt tag on this so this is kind of the issue of how many different ways could you code this and still be conformant to the tester and the ICT baseline? Some of the examples that Alan provided show six different options, six or seven I think it is six. Yes six different options. Cancel option one would be for them to put an alt tag in the image excuse me an alt attribute. Option two would be for them to put a title in the anchor tag which would be conformant. Option three would be to put a label in the image or a label in the anchor. Option five is to put or add a spin for the link I believe and then option six would be to have a label in the anchor tag with this span of text as well. So you can see there are several different ways that trusted testers will allow us to validate but the current tool is looking at one best practice. Here is all of it together on the screen. The code example and then the different issues so they can bring them all together. So the goal that I would like to have is for us again to look at what we are currently testing and make sure those are aligned with the baseline. That once we are there your enterprise tool that you purchase from the private sector, when they align with the baseline and the output is such, this tool is going to do the same output. So the goal is that this tool again is an indicator that can be used by agencies that do not otherwise have a tool. Again we would certainly be using it to report on any obligations we have to report on so we are a key user in this as well. Again it is to help the community understand how it's going. Tim do you have a question? The microphone is coming.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

So my question and maybe I missed this at the beginning. What you are saying is in order to make this piece of code function properly to code it potentially six different ways but your point is that not all controls will treat all six as valid answers.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Certainly not out-of-the-box.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The question is when you use a particular tool what does a code as correct and what does a flag as an error?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Essentially that's what we are looking at. To get the rule set in place so that as best as possible it correctly identifies errors and does not create any false positives.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Okay, okay and again this comes up in the concept of automated testing right? So the scenario, because you are going to have people who really do not understand what's underneath they will say I ran the automated test [ Inaudible ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

One of the things in the conversation Alan and I had was the potential and maybe I'm speaking too soon. There could be a potential as PA11Y is open source we can work to create a set of rules and have a package for that. So we could share that. Rather than everyone having to take the time to develop rules for their own systems for their own version of PA11Y we could assure that . Now again different vendors test in different ways to get there output so that's why we want to call us on the facing test line so if you have a different method from the rules that are in PA11Y we have a common way to determine if that passes or not. So to that point and it certainly does not help with security restrictions internally but is there potentially an opportunity to install PA11Y inside the intranet, share the rules and where possible conduct some level of automated scanning? Because we cannot probably do manually testing internally but we can get an idea how the system is doing across the board. So that is a future potential when we get there. It is about harmonizing automated methods on the ICT baseline. Thank you, Tim. So again this is the dialogue this is the question. I know who worked on it before and I will be contacting them. But I want to make sure we have representation from agencies as we develop those. Are there experts within other programs that have worked on automated tools creating rules? Have worked on PA11Y specifically ? As a community we can benefit from this tool and I would love to create a working group with folks that have this experience. I have not been under the hood as I have knowledged with PA11Y. This is not something that can be done by one or two people. We need to do it as a community and their reasons for that. Not only expertise in identifying the rules to make sure they output correctly but one of the things we talked about is what information is of value? So is there risk management we want to put into this for what we select next? The reason we have these three rules is because they were the ones that were most consistently produce incorrect results. So that is certainly a key. There is inherent limitation that the tools will not be able to determine something. We talked about meaningful text descriptions we can know if the tag is there or not or if it's empty but we cannot tell you if the text you put in is image.jpg or something more meaningful. So what's next is the data tables. Are those easily programmatically tested in a very reliable way? Or is it a form field? What are the complexities? Is easier to test HTML 1.0 solutions or modern? Those are the questions that this group will ask and will ask of others and what is important. What are the barriers, what are the risks and how do we triage that? I will say in talking to Marina Fox who runs the project on this application, because it is in development they want to make sure there is a rollout that is not everything all at once. We want to make sure it works, we want to test it and as I mentioned earlier there is the visualization side for reporting over periods of time. How do we grow the tool? Not just what it's testing but grow the tool to make sure it's meaningful to everyone. So that is kind of my pitch. So, everybody, not everyone in the community is here today but is there anyone interested in helping with this group and would they be willing to raise their hand in front of everybody? Mr. King? Robert? She had her hand up. Kathy in the back so we have several. All right. So that is a good start but as I said this will benefit everybody and maybe there are some other rules for nondevelopers that can help support this or maybe we can look within the teams and within components. If there is someone in your team that's really good at development and really understands this perhaps they can help as well. I'm sorry? Her comment was we should get John from SSA to help out with this. We also know some people that are really good at things that are shy so we will approach them privately to see if they will get involved. There is more time for this than we thought but I don't want to keep you if we don't have to. Are there any questions? We have kind of covered limitations in the tool but immediately questions or comments about perhaps moving forward on this effort? If it's going to be long term, not only to the point to which we max out what PA11Y can do, maybe we can dig deeper into how far we go in the website not just what we are testing for to make it a little more robust but are there other opportunities or other challenges we might have? I'm looking at you Robert because you look like you might have some thoughts.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I have a thought, not worth much. Out of everything website accessibility is the easiest. You will probably get sued for electronic documents and applications being web-based so there is a lot of noise about website accessibility but at the end of the day the likelihood of that translating to someone not being able to get information and data and then forming a class-action legal action that will really drive CIO's attention, the model we are going down. I'm not saying it is bad but if we let this play out GSA sends a report to the CIO. Saying they want to make this better what are they going to do if I don't? What is OMB going to do if we don't make it better? Cut funding?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Laughter ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

You know they won't cut funding I guess it doesn't matter than. So you can go through really is this a problem that's going to get a suit? From the probability perspective you wander from the next reporting perspective the idea is great but can you get a report on the stuff that will get that attention if the answer is not we are going to cut your funding. So you have got scan for electronic documents but there are third-party tools that allow you to scan what is out there. Electronic forms, PDFs and what have you. You are likely to get legal activity around that. Not sure the document getting tools can go into functional PDFs yet but it is a thought. And then the other one where you have a high-value, high visibility digital service think application for benefit, application for citizenship or whatever. Where a lot of Americans have to use this thing. With and you cannot get that scanning tool of any kind but then I guess you can step back we are rolling out trusted testing and standard evaluation process. We are going on record by saying if you report against this criteria we will accept the report regardless of who wrote it so if you set up a certification model then we can expand thinking on how we get the independent results. Independent could be submit your trusted testing results for the top five agency digital services that are also being reported in idea. So everything I'm talking about is hard, none of it is easy but my fear is that we end up defining 508 as responding to an external website report and we lose momentum in the process focusing on the things that drive legal risk because this is easy and the other stuff is hard. So, publicly if anyone has thought about what to do bring them to the table because these are real issues and we need some creative thinking around what to do. We have been wrestling with how to get CIO attention's question for 15 years and despite all of the attempts to move the bar on that it is still an uphill battle. I am hoping that we do not end up at the end of this finding that we are all here to make external website scores better and that is kind of the main focus for what we get support for.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

That is a great point and that dovetails on the comment of complexity that you mentioned earlier. A lot of people do already think 508 is just websites so there is a risk that we continue to hammer that home. A great point. Pulling in other metrics does that help? I don't know. Some level scanning of PDFs, I don't know of anything for multimedia so that's hard. We need to make sure those are included in any reporting so thank you for that comment Robert. Unless there's anything on this topic I will reach out to folks that raised their hand. One moment let's get a microphone to you.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I was just thinking there are probably ways to see whether a video has captions unless it is hardcoded.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Right, depending upon how the video the multimedia video is provided. Maybe there is some way. Like images we have some level of insights and then not meaningful. That's it for me today. Again thank you very much. If you have questions about the dashboard, getting access, understanding the dashboard, I will have the deck out by Monday. And you know we will go from there. There will be a cadence on this and we will look at the technical issues and the strategic issues on expanding this and how we communicate the data that comes out of the tool. So thank you for that and I will turn it over to John to talk a little bit about the IAF in October and other things.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Applause ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you. Mike did a lot of work putting this together today so thank you, very helpful. But you know I want to build energy around the awareness month of October so October 7 and eighth we are doing our today for him. Posted on Independence Avenue at the HHS headquarters. The last two years it was here, before that Gary hosted it and before that it was at transportation. You were not there then. And before that it was eventually Gettysburg. But so this year we are going to do two days of it. My goal for this is to A, create excitement, as much as we can folks getting interest. This idea act teams we will leverage that to get attention to accessibility. We were happy to get accessibility left in the act. That is good but as we all know it contains zero dollars for anything. Is another effort we will leverage and we will roll that in. So the event is going to open up, Jennifer the director will open up and connect us to the theme of the month. Which is the right talent and the right now. So the whole notion is how are we supporting the workforce? And the right talent and that's going to be the theme there. And Shannon where did Shannon go? We are hoping to follow that with your guy, Shannon. Shannon needs a microphone. I have lost my page here. Deputy director of national intelligence. To follow that and she has a very good story to tell.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yes. Some of the folks in the room know but in January, Sue Gordon the principal Deputy Director of natural intelligence posted an off-site with her senior executives, deputy senior executives across the intelligence community and the chief information officers. They do this annually, at the off-site she challenged and committed to improving accessibility within the intelligence community. The story behind this is that prior to Clapper retiring as the director of national intelligence he was issued a medical device hearing aids. Well because he worked in a secure facility he cannot get his hearing aids approved by the Central intelligence agency into the building. So it never happened actually prior to his retirement but it opened up a broad discussion on accessibility, particularly security concerns and then reciprocity of medical devices across facilities. Even if I get approved for the medical device at DIA if I go to the meeting at CIA I don't have the same approval. The other challenge is there are mitigations in some facilities that will turn off your device. So obviously that causes a much larger challenge. So she committed and tasked them to improve accessibility. One focus has been on information technology accessibility so she identified a champion and I am it for the community. I actually briefed monthly to the deputy of the intelligence community on our progress and she is very much a hard charger on accessibility and maturity. So she would be a wonderful advocate to talk about if we can do it then you can do it. So I brought this up initially to my boss my CIO and he said, she is emailing you just ask her. He said she will do it. I sent the email last night and I hopefully have something in my inbox.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

We will follow-up with a formal invite. That sets the stage for the first day and then we will have a series of workshops. The first on the future of inclusive technology and where the AI influence technology will go. The notion is we will have speakers who are leading this inset of the government but also industry people. And this is the event where we invite exhibitors limited by the space provision in the building. So there are some concerns about using vendors on panels so we are working through that. But you know I hope to be able to do it. It happens in other venues and we can do that. So we will go through that and then the exact order, we have to talk about the baseline and the trusted tester program and then we will have panels around agency. What are you doing for testing protocol? How are you doing testing for discussion of tools? [ Inaudible ] that might be a good addition and then I wanted to do Family Feud on the VPAD issues . I am thinking family A are the industry people who have to write the things in the first place and B are those who evaluate the VPAD and then see where that goes. So just have the dialogue with the expectation. We will hear a lot everything from we don't have a clue how to do this, why should we? Have the agencies don't ask for them. To the I cannot afford to do this to everything we put into the conformance report requirements and etc. We expect teams of people to be reviewing those so that is where the sessions going to go and then we are going to get into taking some breaks for non-508 but the context of disability and employment. We are working on a few suggestions there and then we are going to close the first day around the idea act with a panel around the idea act. The next day we open up with former Congressman who [ Inaudible ] Senator Harkin of the ADA has agreed to come chair this and he tells about the event. He told an interesting story of he could not get White House clearance because he might have seizures and his storyline was at least I will have an excuse. I thought it was pretty interesting but I want to set the day and then we have, let me go back to my mouse. Anyone else can chime in who knows the agenda better than I did. Yes Tim.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Indiscernible - speaker away from microphone ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

There is going to be a panel on the acquisition process so we will have John Sullivan, Humphrey and [ Inaudible ] and they are going to be talking about how does the acquisition process work? How does 508 get put into place. What are the questions you need to ask yourself? Who is involved at the various stages of the process? Contends to be a fast-moving panel where each one of them will speak. Generally this is what happens in the process and then it will be this is the way that happens in our agency. So the three agencies will be GSA, NASA and IRS. That is the second day.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

After the keynote in the morning, the first day we talk about baseline and testing and what are the agents doing testing. At the moment there is one each day but that could vary. And then as Tim would say we go into discussion around the procurement cycle. Testing, procurement, development and the context for employment. And then I cannot use the touchpad I'm sorry. And then just discussion around, is Donna here? Putting together an internal workshop on how do you secure support internally into your agency. How do you do that? You know, so this is forming. Many in the room are part of the planning committee so thank you. If you want to be continue on. A question or comment.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Last year we had a lot of good presentations that some folks created slides for, some people had handouts. Are we going to have a way to capture even if it is a transcript for each one of the working sessions?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yes. That is a good point. We are looking for contributions from the agency. Jacqueline from justice has volunteered to follow the format they did to create at least a printed agenda which is very professionally done. We are working with their team. That will be for any slide deck or materials, that is all they have insisted. We are assuming cart service and interpreters in all of the sessions as well as the use, except for the federal relay piece in terms of the captioning. So that will be going on and then the council itself, some of that including the interpreters that will be in the room. What we still need someone to chime in and pay for is the braille printing. That is one option if you're looking to have a sponsorship here from a federal agency. And there are a couple things we can do but again the notion is the interagency forum, it is not a hosted event. You know the exhibitor space, I'm hoping we can get 30 or 40 visitors. We have a good sized room. The issue with the tables and all of that stuff but we have to cap by that. We have concern that this stuff is very open, everyone that we know of and the folks are going to email this out to the exhibitors and I think that gives good information on that and then individual leads are discussing who we want industry participation in each individual session. We will have to look across the board at all the sessions with participation to make sure we are giving them companies and we don't have one company into many places. Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Is the press coming to this event?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

They have not been invited yet but I'm thinking it's a good idea to invite press to this event. Take opinions on that for the committee.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

There is advanced notification that needs to be in place. I would have to confirm with the office. Three weeks.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

We have made no arrangements whatsoever to get the press. On that the exhibitor invites will go out hopefully tomorrow. The general attendee invites will go out next week. Pardon?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The general attendee invitation will probably go out between now and Monday. The exhibitor hopefully by the end of next week.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Next week. There is the notification we need to provide if the press is invited.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

What is the Pulse of the room? There is value in having them but there is a downside. Gary? Getting permission to go --

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

When you talk press are you talking like disability related press? Focused press or generic whatever?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Federal news radio probably. Government matters, Federal news radio, the Jason Miller's of the world.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

GCN and Federal news refuse the issue.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Then we don't want them.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I think that is important criteria. Probably a lot of good disability related press.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Let's talk it out. The details we have not addressed on if we do and if we don't want them there and make sure you know we just had a political boss attend something for us that was not such bad press with all the state senators. The press was there. And the prep work had to be scrambled. So that is very good insight. So in terms of permission presses accessibility RIT press it does not really matter. So if it's going to cut the membership we don't have to have them there. We can just plan to be after-the-fact. Plus having the press it's asking the hard questions and they get the attention and people will see the press articles. But people will quiet down when the press is in the room there is not the open conversation. Especially if it's being captioned and recorded. Captioning of the meetings [ Inaudible ] okay.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I don't know if this is outside of the scope. So the audience has said when they talk about bringing in potential outside press, have you considered inviting any disability organizations or is that going too far?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

In terms of exhibitors we are not opposed to it. You know I like to have a balance of some federal things, some nonprofits and not just all commercial vendors. So yes that makes sense. Who is going to be their are vendors of accessibility services, the suspects that we all know. I.T. vendors, the criteria is you have not had a significant attempt to make your product line accessible. So I am looking for filters to say no to people in case we get too many. Because for concerns we had to have fair and open invites and I am balancing ours and HHS with the advice coming out of HHS and the intergovernmental folks.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I was thinking there are some organizations within government actually that address disabilities. Deaf and hard of hearing government organizations over the years I have seen at various events.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Yes and I was just talking to Gary about the three blind mice group from NIH which is interesting employee let activity. Some good things but yes so should federal relay be there as provider of service? Should the cap program? I was at the GSA support smart pay conference a couple weeks ago and she really helped me in my presentation I was doing. Everyone wanted to talk to her. Because they give you free stuff. So anyway. The invites will go out. The other thing I want to do before is it cannot just be the accessibility community. Has to be web developers and procurement people. It has to be customer experience people. In terms of you sharing the word and getting it out you know the sooner the better but also help to bring in. We will go through the channels of the different lists that go out but I am thinking some kind of challenge of who comes in bringing the big cadre of diversified roles in your agency coming together and you do this thing together. How do we encourage and reward that somehow? All potential ideas, several of us here are part of this and everyone is welcome to give an idea. We do have to close out on at least the agenda could go into printing. We have like two weeks to finalize the agenda here. But then, the day of we will need a lot of volunteers to help work this thing. Everyone here is a potential volunteer.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

A quick question regarding the agenda. Since it is to make days will there be themes so we can help encourage? People only have one day. 27 with 27 offices and public communication liaisons. When you talk press I am thinking public information officers or the acquisition community. Will there be themes in a way we can encourage? If you can't do both take about one.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Captioners transitioning ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

It is pretty much split over both days. We will have to see how the panels come out but lining stuff up, you want to know what was said before you come on stage and speaking somewhere and is nothing worse saying everything you're going to say and now what am I going to say. I don't think we are going to be big enough to have themed tracks. We will see. As much as possible we can line that up. Once you go to the second day, people show up more and there is a bigger draw. Anything else?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I promised early I would bring up a question, if anyone is here who might be able to help [ Indiscernible ] with the question she has, this lady would love some help. Did I framed that right?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The situation right now I am dealing with is our agency is upgrading to a version of [ Indiscernible ] remedy that had been initially released in 2010 and tested with JAWS 11 . In order to address the situation for this particular user, we are taking the approach of doing JAWS scripting on this product because there aren't any plans to upgrade to anything more current. In fact the agency is talking about doing away with VMC and going to service now but that is a whole other discussion. I am working on my PWS right now and having to put together [ Indiscernible ] performance standards so if anyone has any thoughts on that, please share.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Great. Anything else we need to talk about? Thank you all for coming over and you get your afternoon off. Thank you. [ Applause ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ Event Concluded ]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_