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[ Captioner standing by. ]

Hello everyone. We have had some technical challenges, but we are thankful that everyone is here and ready to learn a few things for some great people, Betsy, J, Jeff and robber. And our own John Sullivan. I am going to say welcome and turn this right over to John.

Good afternoon everybody. Thank you for your patience as we just went through that. If you remember, those of you who are with us in February, we started introduction to excessive performance reporting evaluation. In the February meeting we had members from the industry technology Council ITI, and they walked us through the training they are doing to train industries and companies are preparing VPAT . So today is going to be a workshop to actually look at a couple of different approaches to developing -- excuse me, evaluating VPAT. Not developing. We are not focusing on that today. As you all know, it is not an easy process to evaluate VPAT. Especially when you compare tranced -- VPATs and other performance report information based on the VPAT format. There is still art and science involved and different approaches. What we want to do here today in the two hours we have is, I want to have you witness four different agencies approaches to how they evaluate ACR and to the extent they have developed a repeatable process. The goal here is to have you learn how to develop your own process. What makes sense for your agency and how you do that. We also have an ulterior motive as we are developing online training resources. This is an area we know in the online procurement training course it speaks very high-level to how you do this process. Evaluate and make recommendations to the technical evaluation panel on an acquisition. We wanted to take this time to work through more of a workshop approach as best we can do virtually. As of yesterday, we were doing four breakouts. We are not doing that. We will walk everyone through the four approaches and guide along. But again, at the end of the day, we want to have people capable of understanding what they are doing to evaluate a VPAT in the ACR -- excuse me, I'm going back to VPAT language. You need to be able to speak or know how to design a process to get other people to be able to do this evaluation for the accessibility claims in order to represent them into your agency validation process. Obviously, we subscribe to the test, trust but verify model, in that you will in many cases need to be doing testing of accessibility claims. That is not, per se, what we're going to talk about here, but the first thing you do is get a couple of ACR from a couple of different competing vendors. There are lots of issues that come out of those that you will hear about. We will save that for a little bit later. But the first thing is what you take at face value, what do you not take at face value, how do you compare and whether or not you are in a preliminary market research process or you are actually in actual award process. Again, the magnitude and investment makes all the difference in the world of the level of scrutiny and testing you need to do. The other differentiator here is your buying products, or if you are actually buying development services. And you don't have anything -- there is no ACR. You're looking at what is my likelihood this company I'm about to enter into a contract relationship with going to actually deliver something successful. So you will hear some of that today. What we put together here today was I think some of the brain trust around ACRs. We will hear from Jeffrey Klein with the Texas Department of information resources , and he has a pretty sophisticated approach for doing ACR reviews. We have Jay white, the chief accessibility officer of the Minnesota State . He will talk about his approach. We have Robert Baker, part of the program and Department of Homeland Security. He will talk about some job aids and there is a nice video to share. And Betsy with NASA. That is a different take. They will be talking differently on how different needs and how the evaluation process happens. My goal here is not that if you don't know what we're talking about after two hours and you go do this yourself. The goal is for you to be able to start realizing you have to do some homework. You have to do a little research and develop a program that fits into your agency process. And that of course, it starts with whether you have access to your agency acquisition evaluation process. Do you know -- is accessibility taken as part of the evaluation for a procurement? If it is not, you have got bigger problems. So this makes the assumption here that you are doing accessibility conformance report evaluations in your process. You know how to make those fakes and or agencies, depends on your cycle management practices. With that said, we're going to go through our guest speakers here today. Were going to hear their approach. Do ask questions. We will pause at the end to asked the group opinion on how this process might work and your observation on how it may or may not work in your agency. And looking at -- my goal is to show you different approaches here. You can compare and contrast and fit something for your agency. With that, I will turn this over to Robert Baker from DHS. Thank you Betsy for the no. Yes, we are not evaluating VPATs. It is an old habit to get out of. A new language. I'm going to turn this over to Robert to start. He has a video for us, if it can play.

Thank you John. It is a pleasure to be here today. I'm going to start us off from the beginning with the perspective of a procurement official. This is someone who is responsible for doing market research, putting together requirements for solicitation. This person is probably not someone who has ever seen an ACR before or ever reviewed one. But oftentimes they are the ones being told to go get some five await information and take care of it in the procurement. The process I'm going to talk to is meant for that. It is a cursory process. A high level review that helps you read through the low hanging fruit. It leads to an expert review that can happen subsequently if there seems to be a need to do that.

I'm going to first try to share my screen. John, if you can tell me if you see a empty white box.

Yes. We see it.

I am going to hit play. Stop me if you don't hear audio. You should see captions because I embedded captions. This is a 10 minute video that will help us all get a basic review for some of us. This might be news have seen before, but this is the training video we use in DHS. It has an intro and an explanation on job aid we put together to evaluate ACRs. When it is done, I will walk through a live demonstration so you can see in a less can't format and get an understanding of how it works. With no further ado, let's go.

Can you hear it?

Yes. [ Playing captioned video ] In addition to the playbook, there is also the job aid, how to evaluate accessibility conformance reports. The job aid can guide and support your review of multiple products to ensure you evaluate the ACRs accurately. Let's step through how to use the job aid to help evaluate an ACR for Microsoft office 365. We will begin with step one where we identify the products being evaluated. Start by navigating to column B row 14. This is where the product name is entered. It is Microsoft office 365. Step two, help us work through how to determine if the ACR is complete. The first two questions in step two in column A row 17 and 18 are, is the ACR for the product and version you are buying and is the evaluation method identified. To answer the question, go to the first page of the ACR and verify that it is for the correct product we are researching, which is Microsoft word for office 365. Further down the ACR data

Robber, I'm sorry, can you remove the dialog box from the bottom of your screen. It is blocking the captions.

Here it is described as conformance to accessibility standards has been evaluated by external suppliers under the DHS trusted tester program. After verifying the ACR, is for the correct product in the evaluation method is listed, we can record the answer in the job aid. Navigate to cell B-17 and select the text click to answer and select yes to both questions. Next, four additional questions and column A Road 19 . Are remarks provided in the WC AG and section 5 await tables? If the product is web-based, the conformance claims provided for each W CAG criteria in the middle column. If a product is software for conformance claims provided for each W CAG criteria in each chapter 5 criteria in the middle column, if the product is hardware, are conformance claims provided for each chapter 4 criteria in the middle column? To answer these questions, will go to the bottom of the first page in the ACR and start scrolling through each page to review the content and the supporting features and remarks and explanations columns. You will need to evaluate the responses. In this ACR, we identified that remarks are provided for whenever the conformance claims states that it supports with exceptions, which is what should be expected. In addition, the conformance claims are provided in the supporting features section of all WC AG requirements and all software requirements chapter 5. Conformance claims are listed as for all hardware requirements. Back in the job aid record the answer by navigating to column B row 19 through 21. Select the text that reads click to answer and select yes to the first three questions and n/a for the final question. The next cell in the job aid, be 23, process -- prompts us to go to step 23. If the answer was No to any questions, the same cell would inform us that the ACR is incomplete. Do not proceed. Ask vendor to provide a complete ACR. In step three, we determine whether the ACR is based on a reliable evaluation method. Specifically, we are looking for whether a reliable testing method was used, such as the trusted tester process. The ACR might also refer to a manual testing method as code based inspection or hands-on keyboard testing, which is along the lines of what you are looking for. However, a word of caution. If all you find are words such as automated testing, automated scans or testing with assistive technologies, this does not count as a manual Section 508 testing method. We already identified that this ACR evaluation method is stated as conformance to accessibility standards has been evaluated by external suppliers under the DHS trusted tester program which meets our criteria. Now, we need to record the answer in the job aid. Navigate to sell be 27 and select the text that reads click to answer and select yes to the question. Manual section 5 await testing or DHS trusted tester. The next cell in the job aid, be 28, prompts us to go to step 4. If the answer was No, the job aid would display warning, the ACR claims to be unsupported. Proceed with caution or contact your Section 508 p.m. for assistance. Next, instant 4, we evaluate the ACR to determine if there are any showstopper issues. This section only applies if the technology is web-based. Start by scanning the WCAG charts in the ACR and find the responses to the following criteria. One point for point to audio control, to point one.to, no keyboard trap, 2.3.1, three flashes or below threshold, to point to point to, pause, stop, hide. To record your findings in the job aid, navigate to column B row 33 through 36 and select n/a to the first question and No to the remaining three questions. The job aid will prompt us to go to step five. If you ever find a response for the specific criteria that reads partially supports, does not support or not evaluated under the supporting features column, then a showstopper exists in this product and you will enter yes into the job aid. If the answer is yes to any of these questions, the job aid would state the ACR score is unsatisfactory, your review is complete. In the final step we will count the Section 508 conformance claims in the ACR to generate on overall summary score. Next, we scan through the ACR one more time and count the number of times we see the phrase does not support and look for the phrase partially supports. In this example, we found a phrase was not used. We go back to the job aid and navigate to cell B 42 and enter zero for the number of times the word partially supports is entered as a conformance claim. We navigate to cell B 43 and enter zero for the total number of times does not support is found as a conformance claim. The final section is the conclusion overall rating which provides these outcomes. After entering the requested data, in all five steps, the job a provides a risk adjective full score. The could be either superior, substantially meets applicable five await standards, satisfactory, meet some but not all applicable Section 508 standards, some read -- remediation may be required to support users who have disabilities, marginal meets view of the applicability Section 508 standards. Remediation or an alternative access solution may be required to support users who have disabilities, or unsatisfactory fails to sufficiently meet the applicable Section 508 standards or insufficient information provided. Remediation or alternative access solution may be required to support users who have disabilities. In this example, the n/a score for superior substantially meets applicable the Section 508 standards is provided in cell B 46 and a pass/fail score of pass is provided in cell B 47. You will repeat this process for all other product ACRs that you obtained during market research. The job a provides for the ability to evaluate and prepare risk scores for up to four -- five products. Utilizing the guidelines in place 5 of the DHS Section 508 playbook for evaluating ACRs and the job aid will help to guide and support your assessment of what products meet the Section 508 requirements. This concludes how to evaluate accessibility conformance reports video. If you have questions about how to address the Section 508 requirements during market research, contact the DHS accessibility help desk by email at accessibility@HQ.DHS.gov.

Okay. Enough of the video. Some of you may have been wondering, why did you say that wasn't acceptable or why did -- why didn't you ask this question? Whatever you are thinking is probably valid. We work for a very long time to come up with what we thought were the most high leverage questions to ask without asking everything that you want to review in ACR for the perspective we are already asking a procurement official to do a lot just by opening up an ACR and asking them to do even a cursory review. But let me show you that once a procurement official has done it once or twice, we have found the DHS that they have actually got it. Something connects. And they stopped going through ACRs really quickly. I would much rather teach the people doing the work out to fish that to make them come to me as a program manager and make me do the fishing for them. Always looking for something that will help equip the people we are trying to support to get the work done. I'm going to give you a non-perfect example to show you how quickly this can work out. On the right I had the job aid. In the first column I had the answers that we just recorded for Microsoft Office. Now I'm going to add another product. This one is called altar X. For fun we are going to pretend that the same kind of product as the Microsoft office because right now I am pretending that I am a procurement official. I would rather look at these -- I never looked at these before. First time we have seen them.. We found them on the wipes that on the website today. I have typed in the name of the product. Next question is the -- the answer is going to be yes. Is the valuation method identified. Have a brief description here that it is identified. I will not evaluate just to say yes I have something there.. Are remarks provided in the WCAG? I'm going to scroll down. That's the template. Are there really any remarks here? By golly, language can be changed by the user. That could be a remark, but I could technically say there are some remarks, but am I seen them throughout the document? The answer is No. If the product is web-based or conformance claims provided, in this is turning out to be a little more difficult to do in a split screen that I thought. My apologies. A quick review. I'm going to scroll. The answer is yes, they provided an answer in the WCAG tables. They provided an answer in the software table . It is not hardware, so it is n/a. What I am basically looking for is can I even proceed with my review? If the answer is yes, I can't, but since I'm saying there aren't that many comments, I'm just going to say the ACR is [ Indiscernible ] and I will go back and say will you give me an ACR that provides a more robust understanding of how you are supporting your conformance claims . So I am stomping this one. And we move onto the next one. Part of the misspelling. Is this the product I'm looking for? Yes. Next question. Is the evaluation method listed? Is says on page 1 testing is based on general product knowledge. Even though I don't like that answer, I will at least give them credit for having that part filled out. Next question, are remarks provided in the WCAG tables? I need to look at that. Okay. Looks like they have remarks here. Notice I am not reading them, I am just seeing that there are remarks there. so I'm going to click yes, there are remarks there. next I'm going to see if the product web-based conformance provided in the middle column. I'm scanning the middle column and see supports, not applicable. Yes, they provide something to evaluate. So I am going to say yes. Next to question of software or hardware. This is neither, so it is N/A for both. In this case I can go to the next step because at least I have a barely completed ACR in terms of having content to evaluate. Next question is, is the ACR based on manual five await testing or trusted tester? Going back to the homepage for the valuation method used and it says testing is based on general product knowledge. Heck no, it isn't based on a manual method. So I'm going to enter in No. And I'm going to get that warning message. But it doesn't tell me that I need to stop. So I'm going to go a little bit further. I'm going to look at the showstopper issues. Audio control, keyboard trap, three flashes or below. In the interest of time, I'm going to tell you if I went to those areas in the ACR, I would find that one of these was yes, there was a partially supports in one of those fields. That is enough to kick the ACR out for consideration. Is it a score of unsatisfactory because we made the statement if it has one of those issues, it is going to create problems. We don't want this product at the reading will always be unsatisfactory. We can stop the review. What about the third product? Fourth product, rather. The first question, is this the product I am looking for? I'm going to say yes. Next question, is the evaluation stated. The evaluation method is stated here, and it is described in quite some length. I'm going to say yes. The next question on the list, are remarks provided in the tables? Did they complete the tables? Let's see. I can already see right now there are a lot of comments provided to help explain their claim. I'm going to give them credit for yes. Next question, if the product is web-based, do they give me conformance claims? Level A table is complete and level AA table is complete. So the answer is yes, they have provided conformance claims. And so, not software. The answer to the software standards is N/A and since it is not hardware, the answer to that is N/A. Job a tells me I can go to step three. Next question, is the test method based on a manual section 5 await testing or DHS tested trusted testing method? I'm going to go to the homepage and look at the verbiage here and see they used up their party. They did manual testing, auditing. They provided the tools they used to to assist with that. Although I don't know much about the details of what they did, I can see they provided some kind of robust testing method. Even though I don't understand what that is, I can see they provided one. So I'm going to answer yes. This is a manual test method. Doesn't look like it is reliable. -- Does it look like it's reliable. I'm going to go to step four. I reviewed this before the meeting. There were nose showstoppers. Every single one of the criteria were supported in the job a. Now I'm going to go to a new section and count conformance claims. Because we have short time, I'm not going to scroll through the ACR so you can see every row. After all, it is an eight page document. But I took the one minute to see that there were nine instances where they had a claim it partially supports. The job aid is asking me to count those claims . It is not asking me to question them because, after all, I am a procurement official. I don't understand five away. I can take the ACR at face value and see what it tells me. That is all we're trying to do here. In this case, there are nine instances where the conformance claim was partially supported. There were zero instances for the conformance claim where it does not support. And I have a score. This score is superior, substantially meets applicable five await standards. Let scroll to the left. --

Rubber, we're running out of time.

I am not going to go through the next one. Okay. I just had a bug in my spreadsheet. Anyway. I'm going to get rid of the ACRs. Thanks for the heads up John. This is the Microsoft column. If I did not have the bug it would say superior here. It would match this. I reviewed four ACRs and have a score for three of them. The one I don't have a score for is because I said the ACR was incomplete and they need to go back and that is why it doesn't show. There you go. This one was incomplete. So we aren't even going to evaluate it. I have all my information right in front of me. I have 2B and E equally in support of the Section 508 standards at face value. I want to know one thing. The real key is steps one through four is just trying to assess if a bear amount of information is provided that would help me see whether this ACR is worth evaluating. By the time I get to step five, I am just telling with the vendor says at face value. If I was a five await SME doing this evaluation, I could read those conformance claims and change them if I thought they made a claim that was too high or that there remarks and explanations really didn't justify the rating they gave themselves. But at the end of the day, I come up with an adjusted number of claims that are either partially supported or does not support. I can count them up and get a rating. So the idea here is, if you wanted to continue doing more robust review after this, you have weeded out a lot to help focus your energy of doing a deeper dive where it would actually get you better information than trying to do a one-size-fits-all approach to everything. With that, I do want to let you know that this job aid is available in Max. We are not promoting it today, but we have a generic version available for anyone if you want to use it to tailor and create your own process. With that, I am going to stop my demo and handed over to Jay.

Thank you Robert . Jay, are you with us?

This is Jeff Klein. Are we going to hold questions until the end or do we have a minute for a couple of questions?

I will take that as a no no.

The plan was yes. Hang onto those and let's see if we can catch up on the time here.

Okay.

Jay?

Hi. Good afternoon. I am happy to stop for any questions if anybody has some. What I'm going to do is first share my screen. Then I will make some comments. We may have time for questions. If you're interested, I am from Minneapolis Minnesota. I work in St. Paul, the Twin City, and on my video I have [ Indiscernible ] say can see the beautiful city of Minneapolis.

We are not seeing your screen, Jay.

I am going to that now. I can't talk and do things at the same time. There we go. Okay. I am sharing my screen now. I hope you can see it. it is a PowerPoint slide deck that says ACRs and VPATs Minnesota. I will be very brief. First, I am like John and that I keep saying VPAT what I mean ACR. There has been dispute about what really constitutes an ACR. Does simply competing completing a VPAT mollify because if you look at the ITI documentation, they are VPAT templates. You have to do things like evaluation [ Indiscernible ] do not do that. Leave the evaluation method blank or it will fail. Sometimes we call it VPAT because that is all they are. Just a completed document. I can see why people go back and forth. The goals. A look at a situation where you have thousands of VPATs coming through with lots of acquisitions, procurements and things like that. How do you scale that? What we try to do in the state of Minnesota, we have several very large goals. We want to set of petitions for vendors. We want them to understand what they have to do. Unfortunately, still after many years they do not understand what a VPAT is or accessibility is or what we are talking about. That is very evident with what they do. They have to understand. The second goal, we want to obtain credible, usable information from vendors. Is this information credible? Also, something you really care about is to be consistent with a single procurement. All of you out there evaluating any of these ACRs are worrying less about, am I good at this, do I know what I am doing, and more about [ Indiscernible ] I think that is more important. Because you can get an idea. That is the main bar. And at least to the final goal, ideally, the should not be the only mechanism by which you have to determine accessibility. It should be part of an overall process. For example, but say you [ Indiscernible ] you have a contract. What should be in that contract? Ideally, the obligation is the vendor. The vendor [ Indiscernible ] what I deliver must match those claims. That is step one. Step two, whoever receives the product, whether it is a project manager or owner or whatever, there able to open the box and say I have the contract. To have the product on the other side. Do they line up? The contracted vendor claims. Not just accessibility. With security, data management, whatever. Do they match? If they don't, do we pay the vendor? No. So all the steps take place so when you evaluate, ideally, it should be part of an ideal system -- an ecosystem. Once you do that, once you pay them -- [ Indiscernible ]. Let's look at the rubric we use in Minnesota. Let's say you are going through the job aid. Now, hopefully [ Indiscernible ] number one is inaccessible. Number two is low accessibility. Number three, we get to the interesting point, we are looking at not so much as the product accessible, but rather, how much [ Indiscernible ] about the accessibility. The information about the product. However, there is not enough data to be confident in the product. Number four is good. The responders information indicates knowledge of how the product supports the criteria and [ Indiscernible ] so the question is, you are buying into a relationship and you have faith and trust that a vendor will support you throughout the life of the relationship and make continuous improvements in the product assess ability. That is what you want. Number five is exceptional. Responder demonstrates extensive knowledge of accessibility and is able to illustrate how the solution supports most or all criteria. Where the solution does not support criteria, they responder provides a documented roadmap. If you don't have it, you are out. Want to look at that in more detail. The next page. A lot of times the question is what am I evaluating. What am I looking at? Software or [ Indiscernible ] . So we have a rubric to understand the parts of the ACR and what to look at. That helps them break it all out. When looking at more detail, chapter 3. I want to talk about chapter 3 a little bit. We are looking at the quality of the remarks. We also want to look at the completeness, like Robert said. The product information and documentation information. So let's look at that. I'm going to show you the template we use for the rubric. We have the document here. It is in word right now. The final product -- it is still a draft. Word is not accessible. That is why a webpage or spreadsheet [ Indiscernible ] I compare them. You see the numbers and hear. I am going to scroll through. Okay. Here is Microsoft teams. Something to keep in mind. You are looking at Microsoft teams. They are not similar products. Teams is very different from Zoom. We are using Zoom today. It is a meeting product. Teams is a lot more than that. One thing to be aware of when you're looking at products. So you can see they identified the name of the product. They use a trusted program. We scroll through a look at the [ Indiscernible ] I want a war with vendors and that they believe, many vendors, if they say they support something, they do not need to provide remarks because the ITI document itself, the template for the VPAT, does not require remarks if they support it. only required for when you [ Indiscernible ] we say that on our documentation and our website. Because we want to know why, how do you support. We want that information. Unfortunately, [ Indiscernible ] that is extremely unfortunate because in this case some documents that may be very good like this one will not pass the rubric. We have criteria here and remarks blank. Because Microsoft teams is not applicable, almost all criteria, most of the document is blank. You can see the comments are all blank. Even though they say they support. So you see why I have a problem with us. Finally, contrast minimum, supported with exceptions. Various secondary texts in the UI is less than 4.521 contrast ratio against the background. That is all they say. There is no plan for the future. They are not making any statement. More supports and blinks. -- And blank. One remark, use control or region are heading navigation to move between major content of the application. Wonderful. Okay. That we continue on with more supports. That we have another exception. Focus gets lost after additional people into group chat. I think it is very helpful to have showstoppers because it helps people who may not know a lot about accessibility. The problem is, what if they do know something in the showstopper, but they show a plan. In other words, yes, we have the showstopper, here's our plan. Where does that go? Or were they claim support and made no comment. Can we trust them? How much do we trust them? That is one issue we have about showstoppers. So we continue with all these things. Now, we are getting to chapter 3. Chapter 3, if the vendor is trained to partially support to provide limited to know information in the WCAG, they can provide more information in chapter 3. That can make up for the fact they have limited information. The other way to use chapter 3 is that something way beyond [ Indiscernible ] like virtual-reality or something new and different. They can clarify more. Or I would like more information in chapter 3 specifically about how you support all accessibility. And they don't. All we see in chapter 3 is the questions, not the remarks. Chapter 4 is hardware hardware and not applicable. Chapter 5 -- I am sure I am running out of time here. Vendor is allowed to delete a section. You can get rid of chapter 4 if you don't have hardware. Here is chapter 5 map. Pretty much the same. Supported, and then a few exceptions. But not many. I'm going to skip along from here. You can see Microsoft do an excellent job of promoting their accessibility program. They have a great enterprise disability answer desk that we use all the time. They are very responsive to our issues. We have faith in Microsoft, but the VPATs I find problematic because other vendor say I can do it that way too and all the sudden we have other vendors with less credibility with similar presentations. That in my mind [ Indiscernible ] and I told him that. Let's go on to the other vendor with Zoom. Okay. The Zoom application. One of the first things I do when I open a document, PDF by the way is accessible. In this case it is reasonably accessible. There are some blank areas, but otherwise we have headings, text. The whole thing is readable more or less. It is basically automated tagging. Okay. They have a product description, evaluation method used. They use manual testing for keyboard. The use Microsoft accessibility. More or less passes criteria because of the keyboard. Now let's look at the remarks. Supports and remarks. This is an awesome document. They talk about how they support us. When I asked you -- [ Indiscernible ] we do have some similarity with the words because there are quality vendors [ Indiscernible ] and painted fish paste it into the remarks. What that means you see remarks, you have the criteria it supports and you have remarks. Or they have done a copy and paste. You want to make sure you're familiar with the language and be sure it is the vendors own unique language and not copied. When that happens, the score goes down because, yes, they left remarks, but the more remarks are not meaningful. In this case, these are the vendor remarks. I did take a look at them. So that is good. And look at what they don't support. Keyboard is a big problem. Keyboard accessibility is huge. We need keyboard accessibility. I have a problem here, but let's look at it. They identify where we have the pin video and request camera control features there are currently only assessable with the mouse. Zoom commits to making those functions keyboard accessible in the near future. That is a sign for the contract people. Near future. How near future are you talking about? You now have something you can use to make negotiations. That is important. You want to negotiate. That is why we look at the criteria for how many you support and don't support. I want to go beyond that and say when they make comments, how credible is their ability to say how they're going to get them. If they have a roadmap, that is what I care about. Great. Follow the roadmap and get something done. We have the same thing here. Moving along. We have Double A. Sorry I am making people dizzy. Here is chapter 3 again. Functional performance criteria. Supports with exceptions. But they identify where they failed to support. [ Indiscernible ] I really like it when the use chapter 3. Where the exceptions are, and then they talk about all the support. They identify again all the elements. That counts. Chapter 4, hard way -- hardware, the deleted it. they did not need to have it. chapter 5, software. Again, that's another problem. [ Indiscernible ] another about here on this area. Their missing information. Again, I know the reference they make is not there. One more very important thing. The demonstration of filling in the detail. The column that was all blank. The ITI website ask for not only information about the product and product documentation, we expect to see the vendor talk about the documentation in the WCAG section, especially if it is not web-based. If it is a PDF, we want that accessible. You don't know how many times you get a product end of the training or PDFs are accessible or the content. We can't use it. You really need information on that as well. You want to know about the accessibility of the product, the accessibility of the documentation, which is all in the WCAG. You need that information in there. we look for that. Let's go back to the scoring. You can see now why I scored the way I did. I gave Microsoft a 3. We have information, we believe it is fairly credible, but we don't have enough information. Zoom, the WCAG score is 5. I gave them a 4 for the five away. And I doubled the WCAG [ Indiscernible ] so the total is 4.67. So Zoom winds for this application.

Jay, we are tight on time. If you can help bring us to a close. I want to get in questions.

Absolutely. I stopped sharing the screen. I will hand it off now to Betsy, I believe.

Hello everyone. I play several roles that relate to what we are doing in I.T. accessibility. I have the honor of cochairing the Federal CIO Council Mac accessibility community of practice industry outreach program with John Sullivan, who kicked off this meeting. I also run the NASA agency working group comprised of Section 508 program managers from each of the NASA centers, and I lead the Section 508 program at the NASA space flight Center and support agency procurements as well. During the pandemic, our office transition from reporting to the chief information officers office to actually a newly stood up agency I.T. procurement office whose focus is to improve the procurement experience of I.T. across NASA. As part of this office, we also have within us the NASA program, which is an acquisition vehicle used by just about -- I think it is actually is every single federal agency. I have a lot of different perspectives to share from looking at the evaluation of an ACR, but even before that, the interaction with the industry and also with our customers. I consider everybody on this call a customer, whether or not you are an acquisition person, I.T. person or the customer who is trying to acquire I.T. in conformance with Section 508 of the rehab back. We are looking at how all in that ecosystem understand what this is and how it applies to them. What I would like to say is, I am thrilled to go after the gentleman who preceded me because they gave incredible insight into when you have this accessibility conformance report, this is what you do to evaluate it and see if this is credible information, if it is worth comparing to other products to move forward. I always call that step two. Maybe it is step three or four because in my opinion what we often see is that industry is saying they don't think this applies to them. They don't think they need to do a report. Now, they are not necessarily denying. Sometimes they are, but they are not necessarily denying that their product, especially software or hardware, is considered information and communication technology. They may have heard in a prior use case from a certain agency that there is a five away the exception that applies so this doesn't go to them. Or they could have been using an acquisition vehicle that gave them erroneous information at one point, and it could have been as long as 10 years ago that does not apply to this particular set of products. And even though we do what we can every day to shed light on that and to help and educate them, it is an uphill battle. So I want to say to those of you, even if you have an ACR, and I will. Friday's a great colleague, even if we have that, kudos for getting that report because it at least means that somebody along the chain acknowledged that one had to be provided. In the CO TS focus, and you have actually seen that in evaluating these conformance reports. These do not accept for an acquisition where you are looking for support services anywhere than requiring that they meet the technical standards versus a product that is developed in which you are evaluating how those standards for five weight have been met. Our focus right now will be COTS. We have not done thorough research to find out exactly what percentage of our acquisitions involved COTS across the government, but I would venture to say it is at least three quarters, if not higher, than custom development or other mechanisms for getting I.T. So I think this is really huge in our work we shared services Canada when we are gauging Microsoft. They recently reported that over 90% of their acquisitions are COTS. So they should be near and dear to your hearts. The COTS focus , the challenge in getting the ACR, why is this difficult? As I mentioned, there has been some inconsistent application, not just from agency to agency, but even within agencies. But a lot of it is, yes, let's cleanup this misunderstanding such as the terminology. ACR, VPAT. What are we talking about? What is exception or exemption? There are all these confusing things, and we do it to ourselves as well. What I want to import to you is that it is not you. If you are struggling and doing your best to ensure that the intent of Section 508 is met, which is promoting that federal agencies are to buy and build and use accessible I.T., anything that we do to get there is good. There are going to be a lot of struggles and with industry partnering with us, given if you believe what Canada says or believe what I say about the government, that the bulk of what we are doing is buying products that have been developed by industry, we want to leverage as much as we cannot getting them to understand and build their products toward these standards because they are good development practices and it gives them great marketshare because, guess what? They are reaching more people. Gardener and other groups have predicted that within the next couple of years now we're going to see an increase in the workforce by threefold of the number of people with disabilities using assistive technology. That is largely because what we are looking at is -- and I'm so sorry. I am trying to admit people and read the chat. I will stop distracting myself. That trend is very important to us because we want an inclusive workforce that enables diversity. And to me, diversity of thought comes in all shapes and sizes. Given that AI and the technologies available now allow people to engage in the workforce that could not before at a huge rate, and look at what we have done during the pandemic in terms of being able to be a remote workforce that can embrace these things. Five await is more important than ever. This is the melding of these two. What I believe is that because you are seeing that change and you are seeing that direction, companies are beginning to understand and embrace the fact that this development is not because the law is telling me to do this, but these are good practices to build products that more people will have access to. Now let's switch to the ACR, which is the focus here. Why would a company say -- I don't think I need to do one? One of the things we hear a lot about is, I worked for DOD and they say it is a national security exception. First of all, the product is nothing to do with DOD. And thank you so much Antonio, my partner at NASA and accessibility expert, I think you sharing. This is an example of a letter that came when we requested and accessibility conformance report. We have redacted everything, but the product was software that was being purchased. There you go. Look at this. First of all, it is referring to the non-revised standards, but it talks about its function is military and intelligence. It turns out this product had nothing to do with either of those, but even if it did, the claiming of the Section 508 exceptions, say DOD decided this product fell under a national security exception, and therefore, they told industry you do not need to provide an ACR. Those exceptions are meant to be determined by use case on a case-by-case basis. So there is no blanket exception. Let me just say, if you can take away one thing from this to really help you, whether it is your review of ACR or trying to obtain a valid want to review, industry can never claim an exception. Period. I'm not talking about that funky terminology that Microsoft is still using this is supports with exceptions. They mean they don't fully support the standard. And that is why it is called partially supports now. Anyway, an exception in five or eight, there are several delineated as part of the law. And there is no exemption. This is a big red flag. If you receive something from the company that is basically them trying to claim exceptions and go back to the law itself, they have failed to do a conformance report. You have to determine if the use for that product you are trying to buy does fit one of the exceptions that requires the report. Such a thing may be that if it is used fully by a support contractor and accomplishing the mission, then you may not need to get that report because there is an exception for that. This is a smaller scope, but it If is -- if it is the operable parts of a product located in a maintenance and monitoring space, you may not need to get that report. But by and large, and obvious national security is an exception to, but in the other cases you really need to get that report. What is critical about getting this report is that when your agency buys products that are not fully compliant, it still is on the hook to provide equivalent access to the information that that tool uses or gives an employee or the general public if that is part of your mission. So it is really important to understand where you are deficient. In the real world is that most of the products out there are not fully compliant. I am seeing over the past several years a lot of trends were industry is embracing this and I think things are getting better. It is not because of legal threat. It is because of what I mentioned earlier, that it is in their best interest as a company to get more market share. So why wouldn't you develop a product that is more accessible? So I am seeing positive trends. But if what are you are buying -- I will throw out a percentage. Maybe you're seeing that maybe half of your stuff is fully conforming and the other isn't. Knowing where your product only partially meets the standards is critical information so that you can enable your workforce or public with that. Here's another tip because I know we have so much to say to you and we are behind. Let me cut to the chase on some really important things here. I mentioned how it is not industry the claims an exception, it is you as the requirements official, as the procurement official, the I.T. person, the five await program manager. It is your job to look and see if there is a valid exception that doesn't require the report. After that. What are some tips for getting these. You will notice many companies have been generally accessible through their website. Some like Apple is an example, you need to request the conformance reports. But everyone does it slightly differently where you go about getting the report. I know in the accessibility community of practice we have all discussed and were looking into ways of creating a repository of known reports. The problem with that is, as versions change of a product, you have to check to make sure that is current because the company is on the hook for providing updated reports as the software or hardware solution changes. You just need to be sure you're looking at the latest and greatest on that. Ask your colleagues. What is another thing? I am very fortunate to be promoting this capability. Antonio, if you don't mind showing the page from the soup tool. The solutions for enterprise wide procurements. We are trying to promote this as a best practice and get our colleagues. Many other federal agencies offer pre-competed vehicles through GSA. What we try to do within NASA is embrace the fact that there are multiple agencies using this and multiple agencies have different policies. They all need to adhere to five await, but how they go about it is different. What they accept and don't accept. Instead of automatically putting the burden on every single product, reseller or developer that you need to provide the report, we made it very simple here, this is if you are going into NASA and you know the COTS product you want to buy and you are asking for a request to quote, what happens is anyone of the contract holder sees that request and fulfill it. guess what? We simplified this so you check this box , and what I am looking at on the screen is a screenshot of this tool you can request for a quote and there is a big red arrow pointing towards check one box that says, if you require the contract holder to provide an accessibility conformance report to address Section 508 of the rehabilitation act click here. So what happens is on the contract holder end, they have a tool. It displays for them that the ACR is required. That means at the time of quote, even before the customer has received up to 10 quotes and they are trying to take the cheapest or pick one that maybe has enhancements, whatever it is, they will have the ACRs there to compare. The contract holders are held accountable for providing that. In fact, if they failed to provide that, they can actually be pulled as a quote. That is how serious we take it. The cool thing about these companies, 80% of them are small businesses. They also generally offer through GSA, NIH and other vehicles. We are hoping our partners in other agencies do this too because it is about getting you the report. Make sure your agency has a policy for addressing these. If you don't have a specific agency policy that says that five await needs to be considered in your acquisitions, you may have hundreds of millions of dollars of I.T. spend going that is never checked for five await. So just make sure that if your role is one to administer one of these programs are to help with acquisitions to ensure we are meeting the law, that we do that. Right now we're going to look at an example really quickly of another report. This one was from LG electronics. This was available on their website. It is made of a local public. Here's an example of an ACR that doesn't exactly look like one. Now, here is that VPAT versus ACR. The voluntary product accessibility template , it is voluntary because the ITI, the I.T. industry Council, is an industry consortium and cannot require companies to use that particular template. However, there is so much value in using the template, especially the current one. But any VPAT that says to point X is going to refer to the technical standards of 2017. Not the original standards from 2001. I don't know about you, but technology does intend to say -- stay the same for 20 years, much less 20 minutes. And so, using the old standards right now, it is a starting point, but we need to encourage LG to update their reports to the revised Section 508 standard. So this is what you get when you're trying to buy one of these products listed. What is missing? You have heard earlier, I will not belabor the points. Are there version numbers. Are we looking at the appropriate thing? There is no mention as to how they evaluated these are what they did. In fact, they are going back to the old standard. Antonio, if you can scroll down. It is showing their making general statements about how they met the old standard. A lot of this could still be valid, but it doesn't capture all of the revised standards. Since this is largely hardware, there is more of a one for one to translate this to the new standards then if there was software because the revised Section 508 standards incorporate the WCAG guidelines for electronic content that generally apply to software. Hardware is going to be a little closer, but we see this and we are encouraged to reach out to the company to get an updated report. So this is an example of your agency policy would tell you or perhaps even if it is not fully documented other than you need to do a review for five await. You may within NASA, what we say is that if the information appears to be valid and they are using the old statement, depending on the time criticality and the scope of risk assessment we do, we may say it is okay to accept this. This one not so much because it doesn't really have whether or not -- you have to read it. A kind of does. But it would be up to your agency to accept this. But then we make the statement that we will not renew, we will not buy again until you update your report. But I feel like this has been during the transition. Enforcement only went into effect in 2018. Here we are in 2021 but still in the midst of a pandemic and everybody is struggling. Companies are struggling. So I think using this as a teaching opportunity. In our case we would accept this but asked them to update the report. Let me go through and see if there are any other key statements. I want to yield to my final -- my colleague and final presenter, Jeff, so he can get his perspective and expertise in the ACRs. Thank you very much.

This is John. It is now 3:24 PM. Should we pause to do a couple of questions? Any important ones from the first presentations. Everyone do a two minute break and come back and start with Jeff for the last half hour. I see a lot of questions that have been answered in the chat. Is there anything anyone wanted to bring up that has not been addressed in the chat you think is important for us to talk about? I am not hearing anybody. Let's go through the chat. A lot of questions if this is available . It is available through MA ask -- Max. Robert, how to establish the showstoppers? How does the tool account for variations in responses? That is one question out there.

He answered that in the chat.

Bruce Bailey is actually the one who told us about the showstoppers within Debussy AG -- WCAG. We would love to have more than that, but he said since we are looking at a bare minimum process, we figure we will at least follow suit with the WC 3. That being said, when we moved to WCAG silver, the idea of critical issues and noncritical issues is going to have a lot more attention. The struggle we have figuring out what is more important than something else, we think it will get a whole lot easier once silver gets to the point where we begin to start seeing some kind of reporting instrument around it. so I feel like anything we're doing right now is like an interim process based on what we got, and what we got ain't that great. It is never going to be perfect. If we start moving in the direction of at least conducting some kind of evaluation and some kind of consistent way other than just reviewer opinion, we end up with a process [ Indiscernible ] and that is my concern . I want to point that out here. With showstoppers, I can point to WCAG and say that is the authority. If I have someone make any other kind of claim that disagrees with the ACR, there is a big protest, somehow we have to support that, which means I need to make sure the person doing the review can support it in front of an administrative judge.

I think showstoppers, to me, not to go battle with the WC 3, but I think it is a slippery slope because now vendors may become aware of this and they start to work on those things because they know that is going to be the ones that are supposedly the most critical, but it could also eliminate or downplay some of the other criteria where different disabilities are involved. I mean, I have dealt with this which ones are the priority ever since I have been in accessibility. We have never really -- I have never really seen a good methodology for that. I don't know -- I think you have to proceed with caution with that because, especially responding to using a tool like yours, the vendors could know that maybe they try to either actually comply with those things or they embellish their documents, which we know they do in a lot of different ways. And they will get judged higher and it could leave some people with disabilities, some disability types, left behind.

There is no perfect answer.

There is not.

We can't publish methodology so vendors can see them. Whatever we would publish would be gained. The matter what we said or did. That is what has made this discussion hard to even have because we really don't want to tell the vendor you're going to be judged in this way because of two reasons. We don't want them to [ Indiscernible ] the system and we cannot guarantee they are using whatever the methodology is. It is going to do it the same way. Consistently. [ Multiple Speakers ]

Thank you Bruce.

I think covered the bulk of what we mentioned in the chat. Opinion in the chat is to move on. Jeff, if you are ready, we can move on.

Sure. Okay. I just wanted to pick up a little bit on some of the things that Betsy was talking about. The last one she flashed up there was the LG ACR that was based on the old criteria. If those are products that have been, that are recent products and you can set some kind of arbitrary date, but that is really to me not really an acceptable VPAT because for the most part it doesn't cover the WCAG criteria. I do get these things from time to time more often than I would like to see them. Those really should be rejected because if you are to me five away, the old five away it is not it. of the product has never been upgraded and you see a date on the thing that says 2017 or 2016 and that product has never been, has never been upgraded, than those are acceptable. But I would argue that if a product has not been updated in that amount of time, it has either gone end-of-life or been replaced and they have not done anything. I'm getting a prompt to start my video. I would just go ahead and share. I'm going to talk a little bit about ACRs . The one thing to me that speaks volumes, anytime you're looking at ACR, is the title page. The title block. That includes if the vendor has not deleted the 10 pages of instructions before that, that is a bit of a red flag. I have a whole list I want to talk about for a few minutes, but you can tell a lot just from the and what to expect, it sets the expectation of what is going to be in the tables. Do they have a real product version or some generic response for a family of products? How specific are they on the actual product because a lot of times it could be a family of products that are very similar, and so, why not include those but make sure they have them listed. The other thing is the product description helps me understand what that thing is that somebody is trying to buy or what it is. It could be that somebody puts in the description we make desks and tables and electrical outlets. In that case, VPAT is not even necessary. So it is important to understand that.

Just, I am sorry to interrupt you. Are you sharing your screen?

I have not shared anything yet.

Nevermind.

Put your camera on please.

You don't want me to do that. Let me see.

I do want you to do that.

How about that. I'm sharing a screen.

That's good.

Okay. I want to talk more about the title block. And the date. You look at that date. If it seems to be old for a product that should have been refreshed, that is an area of concern and making sure there is contact information and make sure the contact information matches up to the vendor or the manufacturer that that VPAT is coming from. You will see resellers put their names in there and all kinds of crazy things. And then the evaluation methods used. If it says based on general product knowledge you need to proceed with caution. I just want to say that all of these ACRs are for a preliminary assessment. It would be very difficult to make major procurement just based on what the ACR says because you have to ask for supplemental information, et cetera. The evaluation method used is like somebody says manual check on the evaluation or I would rather them say not evaluated. You really need to pay attention to that. Doesn't have things in there like we performed manual and automated testing with the following tools or done by a third party. A lot of times when they use a third-party they will actually, it will be on the third parties letterhead. For example, it might be done by level access. So the VPAT will show something done by them. If there is not any idea of who did the third-party, it is always a good idea to ask. The applicable standards, that is a no-brainer. I don't really pay much attention to that because they are supposed to be five away, which is WCAG and the other standards we all know and love. I have this one slide up here. What I really want to caution everybody and hopefully I am stating the obvious, but be skeptical because VPAT and ACRs may contain false, inaccurate or misleading information . When it is a procurement professional looking at this thing and they are not really trained deeply to look at these things, the tool that Robert has, that is a great tool to get you through that first phase until somebody who understands accessibility can start to look at things. But it is important to have somebody inaccessibility professional when you start to really dig into the details. This is a set of red flags I have identified. It is certainly not inclusive. I have seen other things and part of the job I do is Texas Department of information resources has a cooperative contracts program. What we do is evaluate hundreds and thousands of products that go into this cooperative contracts program. We are not buying anything, so we are not looking too deep. We're kind of doing what I would call a sniff test on the VPAT and ACRs. Do they really meet the smell test? I can pretty much look at a VPAT and within a minute tell you whether it meets the test are not. Hopefully as people get more experience they will be able to do this as well. But sometimes it is easier to look at the things that you, that are bad instead of what the things are you should be looking for. This is a list of the red flags in terms of if there is no VPAT when you clearly know it is applicable , they give you this flowery letter that they're going to meet all these accessibility standards or they might have a single VPAT that represents all the products in their portfolio and maybe that can be printers and displays. So you have to be careful about that. Missing and incomplete sections of the VPAT, that happens a lot. I've also seen a lot of VPAT when we deal with catalog vendors, sometimes if they can't obtain the VPATs from the manufacturers, maybe they are too lazy to try, they will actually create VPATs, which will most definitely misrepresent the manufacturers products. And then of course, information in the remarks section and using nonstandard information and all of those sections. And then, supports our N/A for all responses and the supporting features but they don't give any remarks. And things like the name and product information are missing. The other guys covered the VPATs pretty well. When you don't have a product or you are buying a development service, there is no VPAT. So how do you make a preliminary judgment on if a vendor is actually capable of producing accessible information technology for the website or whatever it is that you want to do. Let me just show you may be a good example. I have created for the state of Texas a form called VADSIR .

We see it.

Okay. It is open ended questions. It is not ABC and because this is a one-shot deal on a per vendor basis. We ask them six questions. And the first question is, describe provide documentation regarding your organizations key business processes and include accessibility activities, development, procurement, HR. So you expect to see this is kind of a good example. Let me see if I can bump it up a little bit. This is an example of a company that clearly has an understanding of accessibility and how to develop it. in the next one is describe the skills and training resources you use either internally or using third parties to develop your offerings, and then you will see some information on that. You're looking for keywords like we work with screen readers and you look around and talk about markup. So you can take a look at this and preliminarily you know this company would seem to know what they are talking about. Not always true because sometimes they can actually get someone to fill it out for them. I've seen that before. Then you get down more into the nitty-gritty. What are your development tools, test tools and see what kind of responses you get on that. If they give you a laundry list of web validation tools that don't have anything to do with accessibility, that is kind of an indication they really are trying to PS their way through the document. And then there are a couple of standard ones there. Tell us about your corrective actions process for accessibility and your tracking, et cetera and the fifth one is to have 800 numbers are what other alternate means of access can you provide if this thing goes live and you have accessibility issues. Number six is the telling one where we asked them to provide some examples of work they have done inaccessibility that they can point to that we can look at. And so, a lot of times they will provide links to websites they have done, which is great. Sometimes they are not as good as you would like to see them, but then you find out they deliver that to the customer a year ago and turned it over to them so that accessibility is starting to deteriorate. And the other thing I like to do is go out to the vendors home page and click on the home page and run a wave check on it to see if they are eating their own dog food. That is just another data point I like to use. I want to share a bad one -- and by the way come of this template is available. You can download it and do what you want with it. I'm going to share one more screen. Let's do a bad example. You have to read between the lines a little bit on it. Describe your key business processes. We follow the accessibility checklist, which is based on a compilation of practices and books and that is not a process. Those aren't process integrations. There giving you flowery words but they probably looked up on the web that day to figure out how to integrate it into the completeness form. In the training, they don't really talk anything about any kind of specific training requirements. This is all just very vague. The test tools and development processes. They talk about it depends on what our client wants to do. Once the functionality is understood, we checked those features. They're not giving you any valuable information on if they know how to develop a website. And then, corrective actions. Sometimes they can talk about how they track stuff. That's okay. And then they talk about describe alternate methods. This vendor said this is not applicable to the service we are proposing. While, that is not really true. And then, this is the one when you are asking for examples, they say we have not undertaken a client engagement. Okay. Well, you are not going to do one with us to cut your teeth on. Something like this. And once you get this form, you can compile a lot of questions. Okay, show me some examples of test cases you have done. What are your development tools. You didn't really answer that. So you sometimes give them a second chance to provide that additional detail. And when they do that, you can pretty much know if you're going to move forward with a vendor like that or put them out of the competition. I am going to show you one more slide and then open it up. When you put this all together, a lot of times what you see in the procurement is going to be a combination of -- apologize. I am going to share one more screen. Can everybody see that?

Yes.

Okay.

A lot of times end up in a procurement that has a combination of commercial shelf products and development services. And so, you have to kind of, what we do is use both of those things, the for the debt services and also look at the VPATs in addition to PDA a, product driven adoption for accessibility, which is a maturity model questionnaire we give the vendors, and we will score everything within that submission. If you can see this, if you look at number one, the VPATs is scoring, I rate a VPAT or even just a submission in its entirety the could have multiple products anywhere from 0 to 3. Zero is you were supposed to provide VPATs because he has stuff required but you did not do it to really lousy accessibility documents. There are a lot of questionable things in there and a good credible VPAT. When I talk about a good credible VPAT or ACR, that means what they have done is produced an accurate document . It doesn't mean the product is 100% compliant or any degree, it is just well documented that they have identified the areas where things are partially supported and not supported and they have got remarks in each one of those things. That is what I call a good VPAT because as most of you guys probably know by now, very few products in the world are commercial off the shelf and fully compliant. We have to live with that. And that each one of those ratings I assign points to. 040 and some increments in there to 100. And the VADSIR is really, by the time I get done with that, that will be a pass/fail. They can't be any in between. Somebody knows about accessibility to build to a website or application, no way. Will be pass or fail. 100 or zero. And then the PPA a questionnaire scores itself as somebody goes through to give it a score from 0 to 100. And then you look at the table across this top and it contains the summary of all that. In this particular entry, the vendor entry, they have a 2 rating for the VPAT. They were not great, but that was the thing. They passed the VADSIR and the PDA a a score because the policies in place in their company and have an organization structure and all the things that go into organizational maturity. They scored a 97. You can do an average of those. Take those scores, the 60 plus 100 with 97 and divided by three and you end up with an accessibility score result. This assumes all of those three things have equal weightings and you may want to weigh those differently depending on the importance of different elements of the bed. That I have comments section. The accessibility score is 85.67. Than you look all the way back down on the bottom and see where that falls in low, medium and high. Ago 71 to 100. It looks like a pretty high score. So the overall satisfaction rating is high. And then, if the accessibility criteria represents a certain percentage of the overall criteria for the bed, then you can factor that in. In the upper right-hand column of the slide you see the value in the bid is 15%, so 15% of that calculation of 85.67 is 12.85% of the total score, and that is going to include vendor track record, security, whatever the other requirements are for a big procurement. That is all I have. I left some time for questions. Hopefully we will get some. I would encourage everybody please don't be shy. This is the time to ask.

Thank you Jeff. And thank you all for staying with us here. What questions do we have? I noticed in the chat some discussion for when you're not buying COTS and your buying services and how you rate that . It is a whole different ballgame than when you buy a COTS product. Although I think it is important to know that they do more than the face image of the company.

It is important to not take any of those things at face value. I say the burden of proof is on the vendor. You can ask questions about their VPAT. Show me your test plan. Can you share your test records with me? What were the results and corrective action? A lot of times vendors may not be that willing to do that. You can offer up that you would do that under ACDA to get that information because you want to have a good degree of confidence that the documents they have provided you are pretty accurate. Were the most part, like the big guys, the Microsoft and oracles of the world, they do a pretty good job on those things because they know the implications of not doing a good job on them. It is the medium-sized smaller vendors that we all end up dealing with who can get us into trouble because if they give you a VPAT and you accept it at face value and start to have problems and somebody files a complaint , that VPAT will have misrepresented the product. That creates all kinds of contractual -- it gets very messy very quickly.

Before we go, event is sharing there is a survey we would like you to complete that she is putting in the chat right now. I want to go back to my opening comments, which were that there is no easy solution on how to evaluate accessibility conformance reports. There is a credible factor. Above that is when you're comparing apples and oranges. How you make that comparison. When you are comparing multiple companies, how do you do that in a fair and equitable manner. As Robert pointed out, there were some times that at the end of the day you don't want to put your agency at risk of protest. The goal here would actually be procurement decisions are made, art make or break on accessibility. That is a good thing, but then there is another level of risk when that comes into the equation. As Robert and Bruce are sharing, we can rely on, look for the external foundations you can rely on. Don't just go to the showstoppers and not look anywhere else. I think those are important. I think everyone here has offered what they have. I will add Robert has also put into max a host of other job aids, accessibility community of practice page. That is not public. It is government only. It is on the accessibility community of practice page on MAX. If you are not there, the notion of, we have to have a repository for information that we don't share publicly either on Section 508.gov or the access board or somewhere else. We need to have that repository, and we can do that. If you would like to reach out to anyone here, they are all available. I will point out that your time to reach Jeff as a government employee is limited. Jeff is retiring from government service --

Not Jeff, Robert.

Jeff is retiring. Yes. Jeff has announced his retirement. He will probably be doing other things that aren't in the space. Or are in the space. He will not disappear. He has some great resources. He is the author of a book or two. He might be a good resource. Hit him up while he is a government employee while you can.

Thanks John. I have a lot of institutional knowledge that I don't want to lose. I feel like I want to try to share as much of it as I can. I can't lie on the beach drinking margaritas forever. I am planning on trying to do a little bit of consulting here and there. I just want to share that with everybody. I could be available to help out with things as needed.

Other than that, everything else, the ship is rolling. A couple of things I want to ask Chris. Do the survey. Secondly, you know you do the biannual reporting, 508 reported. Our team has done the analysis, and we are about to bring that. The government wide analysis goes out to get shared with the a COP and OMB. Each agency gets back to yours, your CIO and five away person will get those reports. We are also making an effort to reach out to the federal council to make sure that they are aware of what we're talking about with web assess ability. There are some new sites on their. Secondly, you know there is an effort that we started that goes through the a COP to update and revise the strategic plan for improving the implementation of Section 508. Where working with OMB and just at the point of having the first draft of that ready. That will be discussed in a couple of venues. One of them through the ACOP. Remember each of you, each agency has two members of the ACOP. Please make a point to tap in and be part of the ACOP. On that note, a piece that came from Betsy and I was a call that I like we did with Microsoft and to look at the Microsoft teams product and accessibility, we want to start working, reaching out and really as the government comes together and talks to important companies that provide technologies and starting with those that were so important for telework and interorganizational collaboration. We got one volunteer. We need more. I will resurface that email and asked for more volunteers to come out. We want to make sure that we have [ Indiscernible ] because everyone is busy with their day jobs and these are all great ideas but we need to come together. The whole idea is bringing the government together to put our issues together and if there are just two or three of us we don't get the economy of scale or get the real breath of what the government issues are. On that, I want to thank everyone. I have worked with Jeff on an offer a number of years. It has been great. Thank you for being here and look up his background. He has done a lot for the state of Texas and for the industry before.

I wanted to also to take at least one thing away from here is to not be afraid. As long as you feel comfortable with it, you want to assess it and you can document what you were doing. Don't be scared. You can do it. We are trying to help make sure you have a comfort level of doing that.

Thank you. Thank you J, Jeff, Robert and Betsy for putting this together and thank you my team for the support on this. Each time we get a little better with the technology, though each time it bring some new challenges. And we find nuances of Zoom. We are continuing to look at the platform we use. I do think we have a little more functionality with Zoom webinar versus Zoom meeting. For not having everyone's cameras on, then we should probably use another product and look at some of the others as well because I understand with Zoom webinar you can have six or seven people pinned and you don't have to just have our interpreter or the presentation. He can have the speaker and the presentation. So we will get better without. Lastly, October is the inter-agency accessibility forum. We have a planning committee in play. The committee is meeting every other week. I believe it is next Wednesday that the accessibility planning committee meets. We leverage the national disability and disability employment awareness month at the Department of Labor. As soon as they set their vision for the year, our agenda aligns to that. For those who participated in the last several years of doing that, it is a great event. Come be a part of that with us. That is all I have. Thank you all. It is 80 degrees here in D.C. thank you all.

Thank you. [ Event concluded ]