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--- BEGIN CAPTIONED TEXT ---

[ Please stand by for realtime realtime captions. ]

[ Captioner standing by. ]

Welcome everyone to them meet first meeting of the year and before I move forward I want to give a PSA and I'm sorry, my name is Yvette Gibson and I am the IT accessibility training and outreach director for Gen. services administration. Before we move on I want to share a little PSA. As we continue to redo outreach and work together especially now with so much emphasis being placed on virtual meetings and you heard the dialogue that went forth reference to zoom and captioning, we want to make sure it is possible for everyone to join. If you don't mind, shoot us a quick email at section 508., shoot us a quick e-mail@section508.GSA.gov or actually put this in the chat and what we like to know is your agency, what virtual meeting platform your agency allows and what meeting platform your agency blocks. That will help us try to better serve you as we go forward with meetings and other events we plan. Thank you so much for your help and as we move forward, I want to briefly say something about change. How do you see change? I see it is an edible and anything that is worth anything or has worth has to change and to be asked successful change must be thought of positively. You cannot think of change is a negative piece of what you're going to do. It must be intentional, it must be addressed with an end goal and mind. And it should be something done to them. As our team and as a group, let's focus on change. It doesn't have to be a big change, something small. May be taking the time to make your word document successful for all. Let's think about small changes we can do moving forward and with small changes they will result in big changes. Work -- welcome to the first accessibility meeting 2021. Let's go! I will now turn the meeting over to Miss Avis.

Good morning team and happy new year. I name is Avis and I'm the assistant to the training director who is the great event Gibson and today will take a couple minutes and you and icebreaker. What I want you to do is find someone with the same first letter as your name and I want you to send a message by check to that person and the message will be a phrase or a word relating to accessibility. Again send a message in the chat and find someone with the first letter is your name and a phrase or word relating to accessibility. I'll give you a couple minutes and then I will ask five people who received the chat to share if they don't mind. Let's go.

[ Captioner standing by. ]

Avis can you type instructions in the chat?

Yes I can do that now.

[ Captioner standing by. ]

Nico and [ Inaudible ] can you exchange since you are the only one with the letter and and F. if that is okay?

Cerda, I will exchange with you. Since I did not check for any Y's. okay?

I will give everyone a couple more minutes. Maybe four or five minutes. Then we will share.

Another minute sure -- should be good.

Basher is -- that sure is. Thank you.

Okay, time up. Who would like to be the first one to share their message? I will start. This is Avis. And Angela, I mean Augustine sent me a message to say accessibility requirements will. And who would be next?

This is Yvette. I didn't have a Y but I did like what Atkinson said, who knew that the first letter name could pose us accessibility challenge? So even with that this was a challenge.

This is Sam Evans and Stacy Holden sent to me WC HA, accessibility guidelines.

I sent a message to Alex saying [ Inaudible ].

Another message?

Carolyn did you go yet?

I need one more person.

I sent a message to just [ Indiscernible - low volume ]

Thank you all for sharing. This is interesting to see with names what everyone starts with accessibility and thank you Yvette for allowing me to do this exercise with everyone. Not sure who is on next. Thank you Angela. Yvette, you can take it away.

Yvette was challenge and I was talking and I forgot I was on mute. We are going to now turn this over to my wonderful supervisor the great John Solomon and he will kick off refining ACR and V pack. He will introduce his time -- team and we will move on from there.

Is Michelle [ Inaudible ] on the line yet?

Michelle go ahead and open up and turn your video on as well.

Chris and my driving this slide?

Can you queue me with next or whatever is easiest for you?

I woke you you. Stay on that I will kill you. I am John Solomon with GSA and thank you Yvette and team for getting the team here today and today, Chris slide number two.

Today we will go to focus on accessible [ Indiscernible - low volume ]

All familiar with challenges and relying on VPAT to understand and success ability of potential information and communication technology products or services. We don't need to rehash that here this morning. We know what you are buying, products or software that makes a difference when you compare and beyond the quality of VPAT when they're good and reliable still a matter of how you compare and contrast one that has three or four against a different one that has partial needs and how do you actually do this and that's what we start to explore. First we hear from the guest representing information technology in the Council and how they work with the membership to improve quality of the VPAT . Michelle then senior accessibility program manager will speak to ITI effort to develop training for industry members and Erika Thomas and Sam Hewlett-Packard will be guest glistening for the discussion and for the record this is not a federal only discussion today that the deviation from normal run so everyone be aware of that. Secondly we would do a quick round-robin on approaches across different agencies on how ECR are evaluated. I will speak for two of the state allies that cannot be with us today J Wyatt the chief administrative officer and Jeff Klein of the Texas state i.e. are data eat IR accessibility program. I will speak to those. Rubber Baker will speak to the DHS approach is with the compliance director within DHS office of accessible systems and technology. Following Robert is Betsy cirque will speak to the Nassau approach of the 508 evaluation. And 508 program manager Goddard space light center. And following this discussion Betsy and I as the community of practice and industry outreach community cochairs, we like to wrap this up with a review of the activities and for you to join us in the activities and we have lost a share here this morning and we will ask you to hold questions to the end. The goal is to start the conversation and look at all the information and I ask you to take this home and study it and follow links from the slides and come back April 6 and continue the dialogue and hopefully have a more informed conversation then and we ask you to bring in your approach of the end result we went to [ Inaudible ] best practices ECR valuation and this will be at least a two-part series and probably longer and all this will find its way into training material that we GSA put out for the federal agency. To get us started what's going on with ITI, Chris go to slide number three. And Michelle, and she is a senior executive ability program manager with Oracle. She started with 2001 and a member of the T tech committee and industry member of the editorial working group for the report. Within ITI she filled Rose with the chair and vice chair accessibility committee and served as the ad hoc committee expense [ Inaudible ] as we know VPAT is a trademark of ITI . I turn you over to Michelle and Chris to slide number three.

Thank you John. One clarification the last name is [ Inaudible ]. There are two letter owes. -- To o'S. We completed this work in progress but transcribed for captions at this point. The goal of the training was to focus on what does it mean to write a good ACR and provide instructions for how to read one so we can have quality reports that you enter in use in your procurement process. We did not want training to go into how to test for training and where to get training because there are vendors that can do that and we didn't list any because we know we would miss somebody so we wanted to focus on stuff we can control which is the VPAT and how to improve the results you get.

This was not as simple set of instructions and we have broken it down into eight separate modules. Some we hoped to be standalone but as we develop we realize they are one depending on another in module number one is the introduction to what is a VPAT and ACR . Module number two goes into preparing to write the ECR because as you know if you don't have testing results and all that information in advance in your product being designed, for accessibility you cannot start writing your ACR. So often we get people that at the end they want to know how do I write this and get it out of the way and that's why we want them to go back and know what does it mean to prepare the information to be able to write the ECR. Module number three talks about the WCAG . Because all the other standards build on that you need to know how to fill out the WCAG criteria. If you thought a section 5 what how do you do that, module number five goes into if the customers are asking for ACR for the EN 301549 we go into details on how to do that. Module number six looking at what makes a good ACR, most of the information how you put it into the appropriate places and module number seven is you haven't filled out and what you do with it and how do you get it to the customer? Reminders, you need to make it accessible in the process to get it accessible. When model number eight is, I'm not a product developer but a vendor that needs to read these things and what should I look for? Unfortunately still need to do modules number one and two before you do module number eight, but the focus of that was how do you read these things and what should you be looking for and what are flags that this is not a quality ACR and the fact that you push back and say try again and this is not complete or too old and all that type of information. We have resources and where do you find all this? If you go to ITI see.org/policy/accessibility/V PAT, that's where we have leaves were not only different additions of the VPAT file but a change log to show you how the different additions and versions have evolved over time. Also going to be in the future, a link to the training in they will be posted on YouTube which if you go to YouTube and do a search on information technology and industry Council you then find all their videos and all the training will be put in that location. We eventually have a direct link from the ITI VPAT page but it's not there yet . We ask for feedback on VPAT and ways to improve stuff and you can send email to info @ITI see dot org or you can call us, the IT office at one 202 120-2737 1-202-737-8888. That is my last slide.

We all appreciate ITI's effort to go out and help train industry companies and your membership on how to [ Inaudible ] VPAT and we have the option to listen in and watch them test the training and asking all the questions [ Indiscernible - low volume ]

And put a good thing together.

I will go over to approaches. Remind everyone we have very good partnerships with the state government [ Inaudible ] J Wyant is a chief information accessible officer and as we compare this today you will see there is simple and complex and approaches that in the next part approach is working towards assuming acquisition person and nothing about accessibility. Next slide. J put together the challenges that I think we are all familiar with and credible and usable information. The government agency [ Inaudible ] for the vendors and encouraging improve best practices and the buyers and basic understanding in the contract people and acquisition people in the level of accessibility is generally going to be [ Inaudible ] in his goals are to improve the process workflow and increasing of boilerplate that will aid in simplification of the process and at the same time to train a host accessibility coordinators to be evaluated with ACR's. What Jay and the Minnesota looks at developing [ Inaudible ] plate languages for how you handle CO2 yes and SAAS, development services, Web application development, custom development, client-based software, and other category as well as separately electronic documents. And developing these templates which may be of interest to us and across all he wants to hear from the vendors to describe the staff encountered to have knowledge and skills to ensure materials accessible within the scope of the project being asked to respond to and that's both on the government side in expectation on the vendor slide and to describe and ensure the staff and everyone has the skills to actually do this. During evaluating the company is much as you evaluate the product and he asked for product examples in the workflow to show how accessibility is managed the lifecycle. And he asked for links to copies and trust to verify he wants to see the proof. This is a simple example. Minnesota folks put together and it comes down to this six point scale. It is from zero and not enough information provided in inaccessible while average good exceptional and when comparing different companies they bring in these numerical scores to actually aid and I don't think there is any notion that the numbers tell a whole story but gives something to start with in being able to compare and contrast the different responses that they might have in a particular acquisition and what is good is simple and anyone can understand and the tricky part would be differentiating the different grades. These are probably not all mutually exclusive and it can be a subjective take on how [ Inaudible ]. This is what you're taking and on one site they put something out there a few years ago in more detail and about the following link in the side before this about to go out and show where they have to take a more simple approach for recognition in the people that are reviewing these things are not going to [ Inaudible ] experts and so make it simple for them but also build a category of expert reviewers. That is one approach coming out of the Minnesota government.

The next is Jeff Klein, the program director, Jeff is a lot of history and a good person to know. He worked with Francis Wes at IBM for a number of years and is taking that into the government side and developing a program.

Next slide. The Texas approach, defines things three ways and [ Indiscernible - low volume ] to accommodate. For the OTS, a scoring mechanism basically [ Inaudible ] score in four this is simple 03 and a four-point scale. And they should have refined -- provided and didn't provided and the documentation that was provided is the second category questionable and complete and the trustworthiness of and third it does appear to be a credible [ Inaudible ] documentation and for all or most of the [ Inaudible ] in the big process and for non-CO2 yes it's a pass fail. -- Non- COTSit evaluates the [ Inaudible ] in the production lifecycle management and how well [ Inaudible ] and as a company and the company is the PDA eight which is available [ Inaudible ] and this is more for definitely you have nothing to evaluate. Is the company going to build the accessible product based on the past performance. Do you have an overall culture accessibility and in the programs that actually develop software and whatever it may be an electronic content and if you look at the next slide, number 17, there's a defined process of coming up with scores. And depending on what is part of the package whether it's based on and the PDA so basically a component that includes COTS and nine, this is a nice approach and it's good and it can be considered complex and like everything else that you do you can't over enjoy the analysis based on the data and some subjective input into this and the day till and calculations and you have to take that with [ Inaudible ] and understanding so there still has to be a very subjective look at the products that you are comparing in order to have equity and fairness into what you are doing. This today is probably the most complex but I encourage you to go off and look at it.

Can I ask you speak a little water because some people can't hear you.

When they are questionable its agency to default as question in specific were ACR and it gets to the heart of the matter with what tools and methods used to test and complete the ACR and what client platforms are operating systems and assist technology and the actual test results not just one and what issues were found and take corrective actions and for non-COTS development services they want to see supporting documentation invalidate that very base basically the company's ability and culture to actually create accessible products. And it is a rule that the vendor the ACR cannot or will not provide supplemental information if it is caught and assume product is not compliant and technical standards and risk assessment part of that decision process. If you assume noncompliant and still go ahead and buy it, which against accessibility law and sometimes that happens you have to come in with risk assessment approach which I believe he details in his links and you still can trust it for non-[ Inaudible ] development and recognitions do not award and go look at other vendors. You can already see the contrast in the level of detail and granularity of what they provide in the direction they provide to the agencies.

Looking at the questions to ask. It's a good list of questions that are useful. It is icy language and procurement documents for COTS . It's with the agency. We don't the requirements in the procurement and don't password and you will not get it. And is accessible to engage Trenton used in negotiation and that is on the agency side and we need to know that US and [ Inaudible ] 18 have a role and reviewing RFPs and for some agencies that is a challenge. Therefore you rely with the information such as the SRT which it gets posted to SAM.gov daily and we have the information to say [ Inaudible ] in the RFP or RFQ but otherwise that is part of our guidance to every agency that you have to be involved in your agent -- agency and find [ Inaudible ] culture to how you do that. Secondly you have accessibility criteria for all phases of your lifecycle? Early on versus different when you do different approaches and development, certainly adds to lifecycles and does make a difference on how [ Inaudible ] a plan in place and requirements designed to test corrective actions in place and do you have the school resources and provide training and for the development and you have defined and tested at unit level during development of validation as part of the UAT phases and this is good advice to do and if you follow the technology of accessibility playbook by the EC LP you will get to a lot of the same questions. Here is a thorough approach that Jeff got in Texas. The goal is I have both of the gentlemen April 6 two talk specifically more what we do.

This is where we turn it over to Robert.

John can you hear me?

And I loud enough for the group?

I am projecting the video but not sure you can see it.

Roberts, everyone can hear you.

I don't see my video is coming through. I have firewall challenges. Thank you John for the opportunity to speak to everyone's [ Inaudible ] about pots we had about how to evaluate ACR and Jeff cleanse approach has been out for a while and it has been out for a couple years and it's very well thought out approach and comprehensive. It requires a significant amount of sectional weight -- Section 508 compliance and refer to it as the gold standard. I will take you down a slightly different path but I will talk about this, not the gold standard but more of the reality standard. Talk about [ Inaudible ] ACR and talk about the score non-caught which ACR don't cover. We can do that on April 6.

One thing we can agree to and talk about ACR is we want to have accessible products. The result is the product is accessible important to focus on the end goal. How big is the challenge? Your 21 government IT budget is not is $91 billion a quarter to the federal IT dashboard and the agency supported has approximately seven of that 91 billion. Across the federal government we have approximately 258 [ Inaudible ] including the backups which averages out to about 400 and $420 million in IT spend so I want to ask you how many ACR's is each by void program manager reviewing each year to cover the spending? Market research you will look at multiple products. Which means multiple ACR's. And technical valuation process when you decide who will get an award you also look at multiple ACR's and I don't have a good guess how many. But it is a lot. If you're one of those 50 AP managers then I ask you are you able to cover all the spending and acquisitions? Which brings us to [ Inaudible ].

How can each by void program manager ensure that COTS are reviewed and scored in comparing to the performance to help acquisition process select the most accessible products available? That is a big riddle. Next slide. When are we using today? Each one of us has a hodgepodge of consuming and complicated procedures. Evaluating ACR's and [ Inaudible ] industry to evaluate ACR. One thing we have if nothing else is inconsistent process from agency to agency and that alone is a big detriment to effectively implement by void across the federal government. What do we need? A simple scale and risk based process. Every acquisition is the same. Small acquisitions and we have big acquisitions. We are products that will be released to a small number of people in products that are going to be released to a large number of people. Should we apply the same process to all? Perhaps some of them does warrant an in-depth approach that Jeff Klein is recommending. What about the rest? That's what I will talk about today. That is the majority of our ACR heating to evaluate and simple scale and more approach for all of us to use. In the past two years maybe trying to solve that riddle, come up with what is the most simple approach we can come up with to provide at least a review of ACR and with the people who usually make the decisions i.e. procurement officials. Who aren't final experts. With help from Kathy and Bruce Bailey, we come up with I step process, ACR complete, is the valuation method adequate? Are there any WCAG showstoppers? Count the conformance claims. And bear with me I was explain more in a bit. Generating score. It can be used to compare ACR to ACR apples to apples. It will be a quick demonstration how we implement this concept. We created a basic XL based job aid in the goal is anyone who can read and pick up ACR in the process and at least come up with a rudimentary score that they can use to assess whether something is compliant. The process can be used by someone who is a 508 expert as well because it provides with judgment in the way they answer the questions. But it's not required. Step number one, verify the product. The spreadsheet includes an opportunity to lay out byproducts at a time. Step number to determine the ACR is complete and if it is not complete and then we should use it. I lost audio, MI back yet?

-- Am I back yet?

We can hear you.

We try to identify what is the bare minimum information we need to determine whether we can use the ACR or not so it came up with the following, yes no questions. Is it the actual product diversion you are buying? ACR or multiple products it once more versions and what we want at least is ACR that matches what we look to evaluate. Number two are they identifying the evaluation method? Bright or has something in it. Just to see if it is complete. Are there any remarks in the tables? To support the claim and just a binary yes or no. And three questions about our the correct tables populated with something and web-based [ Inaudible ] completed and for software [ Inaudible ] chapter number five which area addressed and for hardware chapter number four addressed? What we say is is there information in the ACR to evaluate? And an example for product number one I answer yes and for product number two yes or N/A or product number three answer no or incomplete web-based product ACR and say is incomplete because they didn't complete it [ Inaudible ] maybe level a and not little -- level AA. It's incomplete, don't use it. Next slide. Now I will start to figure out how ISS the information. Step number three is asking is the evaluation method based on some kind of mangled testing or beach S -- or VHS tested method. We estimate to evaluate the evaluation method and if you don't have by void expense you don't know [ Inaudible ] so we try to border and balance of the simple things can come up with that is recognized by more users than not when looking at the report. So simply looking for a yes or no. The example to the right, the answer is no. We assure the warning this is a claims may be unsupported. So this is saying not that they are wrong but maybe supporting and proceed with caution and ask for help. Step number four. Past that simple question then we look at whether the ACR has [ Inaudible ] in this only applies for where [ Inaudible ] is applicable. Bruce identified these as we are fixed dose stoppers and we go with this and what we do with the instructions as we show them where to find a table where one.for.to is listed and we ask doesn't have a rating of partially support or does not support? Asking to interpret is that what the claim is and if the answer is no to all four questions they can keep going. But if it is yes, on the right-hand side says ACR score is unsatisfactory in the review is complete. Conceptually review ACR and get to this point in five minutes or less. But if it looks like it is worth perceiving, to the last slide. Step number five. Count the claims. What we have done is we look at a process of limitation approach and take conformance claims at face value. We assessed whether they are comments or tables are complete and now we look for number of times that the revers sees the word partially supported and does not support. And an algorithm behind this that spits out a rating, superior, satisfactory, marginal, unsatisfactory and correlates to a pass fail score and we recognize in the acquisition process try one time operating evaluation method or pass fail and so we try to support both. Not asking the average procurement to interpret partially support rating is supported or not because they don't have the expertise and will have the expertise to do that however if the risk is high they can ask for 508 subject matter expert to perform this review and they assess whether a support is partially supports. And just this reading before the entering the total the spreadsheet so it has scalability to the overall process and in summary when I try to say is we do need something that is scalable and a method that is complicated and requires subject matter expertise is not scalable across the government. If you want ACR to be part of the acquisition process we need to approach the problem from the perspective of the people that are doing the work and coming up with something that is sustainable and repeatable and systematic and risk based so we are part of the appropriate level knowledge and where the risk is highest. That's all I have to say and we will talk more about this during April 16. We are piloting this concept and not final. But I want to share it with you today and glad we had an opportunity to share it with you.

Betsy you are up.

Turn on your volume

Thank you very much. Good morning everyone. Very happy to be here today to talk about this exciting topic, accessibility conformance reports and I am not being totally tongue-in-cheek but when I said 508 is challenging as Mike he weird and sharing it with my B colleague Bruce from the access Board we know that this is an uphill battle and we are doing the best we can. I went to key off of something that Robert said before delving into this and will have a couple slides to stay on schedule so we can cover everything. It really is important that we do our best to try and drive towards consistency and across the federal government. Not only how we obtain and require the accessibility conformance reports but of course how we review and evaluate. This is especially important for industry because often we hear there are mixed messages coming out of different agencies or at times even from within the same agency depending on within you speak. Giving messaging about what is required for five weight and how we get there and how we use it and how we evaluate is important. I think sessions are very valuable to drive us towards that and as John mentioned I chair [ Inaudible ] program managers from the 10+ necessary to installations and I also serve as the Section 508 program manager of NASA's largest center in Greenbelt Maryland with also locations in New York and in Virginia and West Virginia. We see the rubber hit the road a lot and I also happen to sit within the NASA suit program management office and soup is solutions for enterprise white procurement. It is a 10+ billion dollar a year acquisition vehicle that drives customers from all of the government to procure COTS solutions for their organizations and we get a C of seeing it all. An industry perspective and multi-federal government perspective and we want to share little bit about what we do. The last thing is when I am done, on this topic, John and I will talk to you about exciting stuff we are doing with the federal CIO Council accessibility community of practice industry outreach program. Yes I said that without taking a breath and that was a challenge. But we are excited to share that. By the way I want to introduce behind the scenes Antonio who is an IT accessibility expert and specialist who works on my NASA team. He helps with just about any of the presentations or facilitate sessions for us in the interagency accessibility team form. I'm excited to have NASA supported full-time that it does look at accessibility. The acquisition will review want to share is this is a message and a theme that I put together and now collaborating with John Sullivan on this and I call it the acquisition and 508 roadshow. My mission has been let's get out there and not only talk about the acquisition people in the IT people in federal government but let's promote the collaboration among all those and look for opportunities to talk about the nuances and incorporating accessibility early in the lifecycle is the way to go. The we would like to course about to talk about acquisition and the different touch points of 508 is it really, the key areas in which we insert 508 because when you do something internally like custom development your software or websites or what have you, you need to have the agency process in place to ensure that you are follow the technical standards and being evaluated and you have the tools to do the job. Nothing better than an acquisition process and negate if you will like security considerations or supply chain risk management or [ Inaudible ] etc. and what about 508? This is a great ;-) opportunity to ensure the goals of 508 are met regardless of what you are buying. There are two main general types of acquisitions and solicitations that include ICT products and services and actually creating a statement of work of performance work statements and not like you are asking for a particular developed product. That you are ensuring the appropriate ICT accessibility requirements are actually included in that statement of work practices were something like the art tool that was referred to earlier is good because it gives you tips and this is the Section 508.gov resources and allows you to incorporate wording and clauses and accessibility statements that point more specifically to the relevant language instead of making a like it statement that 508 applies. The next important thing that you consider in a solicitation is informed the vendors and industries and governments will be evaluating proposals for this and not just an ancillary thing that is stuck. I've been on plenty of Seabees source evaluation boards and actually lead a couple and we have subject matter experts that are reviewing what a company proposes or bids in this area so please make them aware of that and that is another way to drive importance. Another thing I say we see at least well more than half the traffic and NASA has to do with traffic off-the-shelf products in here I don't just say evaluate a Sears but obtain a Sears and that is still a challenge. Especially revised standards and 17 and made it effective in 2010 and still seeing industry particular the smaller size businesses that have not dedicated the resources to update this. And part of the training that Michelle talked about earlier with ITI and everything else were doing to try and promote awareness five weight has to do with making the companies understand this is a win-win situation for them to address. Generally the company that develops the product and they are the ones with the intimate knowledge that are doing the accessibility conformance reports but also resellers and partner companies that specialize with 508 expertise that can evaluate and work with companies to help produce that report. We don't care where it comes from as long as it is valid in can get it evaluated. NASA processes build it in whether using a purchase credit card purchase of a small item and micro process exception and one was in effect for the first five years in the early 2000's but it is now IT that falls within the scope and those processes as well as buying large systems that are integrated and have about every aspect of ICT this also includes mission based procurements and systems as long as they have an ICT component that meets the definition. Procurement process we strive to make sure the reviews are done in 508 is considered just as all the other CIO focus reviews go on.

Sorry for those who are able to go through all of this in a lot of content but try to keep it as distinct as possible and when you focus on COTS, it's important US the vendor to provide you this again you know the product and you know what you want to buy. Asked them to provide you the accessibility conformance report and also give them a template in the voluntary product accessibility template and the latest for 508 that captures US government 508 is 2.4. Any 2.4 X version relates to the five with standards. Informed the vendor and allow them to have this template if you see they are either confused or producing something that is based on the original standard of 2001. We really want to drive them towards the revised fibroid standard. We do that is different than many organizations is because of my industry outreach role which John Sullivan and sitting the national super we have access to 140+ contract holders who represent hundreds of companies who literally sell thousands of products, we can get at these people and we require them to provide the 508 information through ACR. We actually help the businesses where we see ACR that comes in that is not accessible acceptable and what is the different than when you have three a Sears you are reviewing? A lot of the cases there is only one. We try and do is see is it adequate, acceptable? And if so there are various exceptions apply and we would get to those in the second but also like a triage to see first do you need that and what is the use of the product and it's important if market research does have to be conducted because what you see is not fully conformant that you have all the pieces together as you try to help your customers enable the mission but also drive towards accessibility. I did want to say that it's not just governmentwide acquisitions like necessary but any other type of GSA schedules and existing contracts solutions. What is important is those solutions help facilitate getting the ACR and NASA soup is the only one that has built into the soup tool and what happens as a customer comes in and if they want to buy a mission based system, maybe CAD or oscilloscope with some other things but maybe just a plain everyday workstation and software, at the time they go into NASA, this one box to say please provide performance report and I don't we just default to that and make people do it? It should be on customer request because there are several exceptions that we get to that mean the customer and again this is every single agency across the government and everyone does it a little differently but there could be some exceptions that apply and they could indicate the report is not needed. That is why we do put the onus on the customer to request. If a customer didn't realize and they forget, using NASA SWEP , they can get it afterwards. Whether it's another vehicle, we try to drive all them to make it easier for customers to get the ACR so the evaluation can be done. What do I mean about, the exceptions that I've talked about a couple times? A 508 exceptions are there because the requirement that needs to be fulfilled is king in 508 and 508 and the offers of the law -- authors of the law understand you don't have to change a requirement if there is no commercially available fully accessible solution and however you are on the hook as the agency to provide equivalent access to the tools that your people need to use or that the date needs depending on the mission. This is part of how do you enable your missions and understand where fibroid can apply. I will focus on a couple things here what we do with NASA and we have a lot of support contractors who are actually acquiring IT that is being incidental to the contract and in those cases you do not need to provide conformance reports but however you ensure all the deliverables that are given to the government and products that come out of use of the tools are in fact conformant. An undue burden is different in my opinion than fundamental operation but they are bundled together an undue burden is that at the agency or department level there's not enough resources to make this whatever it is fully compliant versus fundamental duration which is stating some of the functionality inherently cannot be made fully accessible. For example if you need for visualization software for component functionality then maybe the rest of the functionality of the product can be made compliant but perhaps there are certain things that cannot be. That is something that throwing money at it will not solve it but again you need to see if this is a relevant exception to claim and after consulting with the requiring official and seeing how it's used and by whom it is used and where is used and you do the relevant exception. Best needs talks about market research and this is where the product that NASA wants to buy is not full informant so we ensure that there are other products they are considered what we find in the cases of especially scientific or [ Inaudible ] type of equipment that having an ACR, the message in industry and ACR really gives you a leg up because there is something to consider to evaluate. If you are the only one in the field that is providing that conformance report, by definition you are going to be the one that best meets. The note I want to make at the end is that the applicability of the exceptions is never determined by the vendors. If you get a statement saying we don't need to do an ACR because of best meets or federal contract then that's not valid. Only determined by the government and on a case-by-case basis. More inconsistent messaging to industry saying they sold software to the government time and time again and not been asked for an ACR and that's because perhaps one of the exceptions applied an agency or perhaps as Robert pointed out with a number of IT resources versus acquisition and number of Section 508 program managers is a big disconnect to be able to see everything and many reasons but the key take away is it's up to the government to determine the exceptions and not the vendor.

That's what I had for talking about NASA and now I would like to welcome back my colleague John Sullivan and John did you want to have me address the overview? Or would you like to take it away?

You talk to the first two and I will talk to the last one.

In our industry outreach program as John mentioned earlier we are one of the three subcommittees with the federal CIO Council accessibility community of practice and John and I cochair this and I was honored to be asked to join. But our main purpose is to promote the governmentwide collaboration and also the collaboration between the government and industry to promote performance was Section 508 and in terms of accomplishments we had a focus area of small businesses in doing small business outreach and this is because we find many of the companies that are part of the IT industry Council that Michelle represented, there are very well resourced and have focused programs on accessibility were some of the smaller companies do not have that many resources nor do they dedicate the resources they have to this. Over the past three years we've been holding small business focus groups and run into a lot of companies with technical conferences and have done outreach when we find they are not producing the ACR and they have questions but either way the focus groups tend to be anywhere from 46 companies at a time and we have structured ways of obtaining feedback on developing ACR. We'll really wanted to do this especially with a relative of the revised standard because a, we find the small business actually has and did the address fibroid before or are they thinking perhaps incorrectly that they are somehow accepted from this or exempt from the Senate does not apply. So either way we engage with them. We either do one-on-one companies and held the small business focus groups ensure the information with ITI and also collaborated with ITI to develop the training. We ask that the training on the ACR is using the VPAT , whether it be mystifying, it's important in thrilled that the training is rolling out. And we also do the outreach to major industry and government audiences in conferences and symposiums in the national contract managers Association, we were able to share information about acquisition and 508 for the first time like two or three years ago and every year since we provided updates and what's important, it's a mix of customers, CIO and CFO and CAO and chief procurement people as well as IT professionals and procurement professionals and again customers. And we presented and recorded a presentation for the season California State University at Northridge Assistant technology conference and we were going to give this presentation but the pandemic hit and glad to be able to promote that. In the act executive leadership conference is a great community that looks at best practices in procurement and the fact that we put together 508 and accessibility on the radar screen is very important. We also presented about this topic at the United States access board webinar series. We presented and facilitated and moderated at the interagency forms and also SWEP requires program managers to have conferences of the PMs and it's not insignificant committees but 300 industry company leaders and what's great here is SWEP has over 80% as many within INH and over 80% or small businesses and disadvantaged businesses so this is a great way only to require the do this but asked to pull the quote. The really get a training and understanding of why this is important. Next slide and I will turn it over to my partner John.

We have a lot more over here and then we will leave a moment for questions.

The plans are to continue what we have going on and we started a nice dialogue and Microsoft around our teams. It was that everyone went virtual and a lot of people have problem with teams and we try to come in and organize that. [ Indiscernible - low volume ]

We didn't have 20 agencies knocking on the door and get to the parties and put together like to do that with others. What we like to do is to get a group of people together, what are the issues that we still need to resolve such as the one that Gary brought up in the very beginning. And what are the types of things you need to do for this virtual reality and focus on a short list of companies that we need to talk to and bring together and consolidate government approach and have that dialogue with them and I thought the request to do that for some of the event scheduling software companies and obviously each of the virtual platforms and know whether you have clients installed or using the web rather person -- version or the meeting version than the webinar version, it works differently so we want to take our focus issue to focus on that. I want to thank everyone here, our speakers and we are 35 slides in 60 minutes and we are a minute over right now so if there is any pressing questions especially for Michelle as our guest here, and let's have that and quickly and asking in the chest and I don't think [ Inaudible ] I don't see anymore. And like I said there's a follow-up on April 6, not [ Inaudible ] we have another one of these meetings and continue the conversation and we would like you to come in with your ideas and if your agency has a documented [ Inaudible ] evaluation, what us evaluate and our goal is to adjust the training material for the folder agencies and sort through the best of the best and figure out what is a consistent approach and as Benji mentioned the ITI callings, the industry here is different request for different agencies and we need to go ahead with making as consistent approach as possible with the federal government. I don't know the June I don't know the June 8. Can anyone, what is the June date?

I will put it in the chat. I want to thank everyone here. It's been a great start to the conversation and this is just the beginning and we will continue this on. Thank you everyone and thank you to Michelle, Erica and Sam in the industry and counsel. We appreciate them and we certainly appreciate IPI's effort to trial educate the companies to work for us. With that I think we can close this session and turn it back to the vet to introduce our next speaker and topic.

Thank you John and Michelle and Betsy. We are going to take a 10 minute break. We will go on break now and return at We will go on break now and return at 11:05 AM were we were here from -- where we will hear from Samantha Evans. Everyone, please go off and do we need to do and be back at 1105. Everyone, please go off and do we need to do and be back at 11:05 AM.

[ Captioner standing by. ]

Thank you John. We should be ready to start. I lost two minutes because I was answering questions in the chat. Right now, everyone welcome back. We are going to hear from Samantha Evans who is with I IAP and Samantha has a wonderful bio but I'm going to let her tell you a little bit about herself. Samantha we will turn it over to you.

Thank you so much event. I'm Samantha Evans in the certification manager and deploy IP international Association of accessibility professionals. We are a professional society or membership organization that serves practitioners and professionals that work in digital accessibility and built environment. We focus on education awareness and certification in networking for accessibility professionals just like you. We had a great pleasure to work with both John Sullivan and Robert Baker for a number of years and my background is in the nonprofit world and certification credentialing and also accessibility and inclusion in both personal and professional life as an advocate. I do BP -- I double AP [ Inaudible ] but just for brief overview IAP is a division of ICT which is a global initiative for inclusive ICT and I AAP is to define and promote the accessibility professionals globally through certification education and networking and in order to enable creation products and content services and environments in the slide also displays the trans-women logo -- IAAP logo .

We had a great, ITI at IAAP as well and I really enjoyed learning about background and training in the programs and what, Robert I like your rubric you presented so I look forward to how works and IAAP is focused on creating a community of accessibility professionals so we can work to build accessible future and I was asked to share information with you about how professional certifications in the accessibility world can fit your work and roles and goals within your accessibility communities and programs you manage or contribute to. Little bit of background about what professional certifications are, professional certifications are granted by an organization that have a certification commission or committee and not tied to a training course or educational program. Certifications are valid for a fixed period of time. They require ongoing professional development and Summit and education and ready types and certifications can be renewed if you met those ongoing development education requirements and certifications worked to establish a standard of expectations of skills or knowledge for roles and responsibilities related to the certification and a framework for shared understanding of concepts and standards. A lot of the terms and concepts that John presented and the colleague were based on shared understandings of concepts and standards with the built environment many times ISO or local and regional holding standards. They also worked to improve consistent work processes with an organization and I think Robert's presentation about the rubric in scoring is that consistent work process. I think it's a nice complement to the discussion we had earlier today. Certification also offer the ability to the financial holder and illustrate expectations for those that work in a profession and industry or trade. What you may encounter as someone in your team is reviewing a bid from vendors you may find some of those vendors are going to illustrate they have certifications and technical backgrounds or broad overviews of understanding disabilities and accessibility and inclusion. IAAP offers five credentials and spread across four different certification programs and I will take a few minutes to explain what they are and how they work towards things. Contents of ACR and VPAT having to do with understanding WCAG success criteria and all of those are built on having core understandings. Types of disabilities and barriers that people encounter for WCAG in the digital space . You have to have a good understanding so CPA CC is the first displayed in all badges have a blue circle with IW AP at the top certified in the middle and credential in the third level of text. Each credential has its own color, external ring and CPA CC is the color red and the first in the color logo and is the certified professional accessibility core competencies. So it is a broad overview of types of disabilities challenges and assisted technology. That will include things like the radical models of disability and understanding barriers both with digital and physical world for types of disabilities and understanding appropriate technologies and adaptive strategies and understanding about demographics and disability etiquette. Then moves into [ Inaudible ] individual or universal design or more usable accessible services that meet the needs of the wide range of individuals with diverse ability. Also understand the benefits of accessibility and brief bit of information about WCAG in CPACC because we want them to understand the concepts of perceivable operable and robust PR and also a section of this that talks about applying accessible to principals with a built environment universal design and design for learning. The third section is talking about standards laws and management strategies to understand international declarations and conventions on disability rights and human and disability rates in people with disabilities and also national and provincial instruments. For the US there will be information on EDA and more specific domain specific laws and perfume it was that reference back content that Robert and John and your NASA colleague spoke to earlier but also how you apply standards and regulations to ICT and integrate accessible information to medication technology across an organization. So CPACC will talk about traits and letters but that's a broad-based foundation and strong for anyone in accessibility programs no matter what their role. The second program is WAS which is features of blue external circle and in the middle of the top row of three digital badges. WAIS is the accessibility digital specialist in intermediate technical program that is for people that live and work in the technical back and or under pinning of digital accessibility. But WAIS talks about first premises with accessible web solutions and that's understanding guidelines and techniques and having good programming knowledge and at a conceptual level and [ Inaudible ] coding practices on people versus writing specific code elements. Accessibility quality assurance and supported technologies including a variety of assistive technologies and features and how they engage in what is best practices in choosing technology for digital applications. Gets into details about gender controls and what single page applications might have as opposed to large more robust programs and strategies with disabilities use when they try to navigate web solutions including a variety of types of assistive technologies in browsers and operating system differences. The second component of WAIS -- WAS including wake and how the guidelines and principles affect normative witches the data or non-[ Inaudible ] which is the user focus information. And it also requires expense with usability and accessibility with a variety of technologies including the most common but also across different browsers and operating systems and testing for the user impact on the person. Across different types of disability and testing tools both automated and manual in understanding the short and challenges of shortcomings and automated processes allow and how manual testing supplements act in the third part is remediating issues with accessibility like level of severity and pressurization issues and recommending strategies or techniques in which to solve for first. So those are the first two of the three on the top line. The CPWAthird is the third credential when they earn CPACC and WAS someone who has a strong core background in disability knowledge and technical experience at an intermediate level. On the lower line of the two is CPABE it has an orange external ring around it in it is about the built environment and built environment spaces buildings and how we engage with actual physical world that people live in. This is a new program but it has three levels, advanced expert and [ Inaudible ] and actual auditing assessments around environment spaces along with a variety of types of built in primitive spaces. It talks about auditing built environment with assessment of accessibility program in the plan and innovations in pre-and post-occupancy audit so it's not just a one and done and it can be amended as things change. We finding and working with persons with disabilities across different types of spaces and built environment programs and understanding fire and life safety requirements and accessible [ Inaudible ] and egress evacuation plans and how to use tools to create assessments and understanding standards and codes and international [ Inaudible ] and it is built on ISO standards international in a complement to local or national provincial regulations specific to building codes in the local area and focuses on benchmarks that are based on ISO, the Sunday worked in and [ Inaudible ] reports and settled all the goals so based on premise of universal designs for built environment spaces. Then the third part is recommending and recommended patient reports requirements with disabilities and design concepts and how the frameworks come together for built environment recommendations and being effective medications with oral written formats and understanding rational to prioritize recommendations around environment. That is specifically for built environment and [ Inaudible ] space. Newest program is featured in the lower right of the second line and it is ADS a social document system and for people who work in creating or remediating documents of any type and it is focus on product specific but on wordprocessing and spreadsheets, presentations and desktops and both in with authoring format and final format. The accessible document specialist is in intermediate technical program for someone who has been working in documents for 1 to 2 years. The primary focus on the work is creating electronic documents accessible in writing inclusive content and design in remediating electronic documents and understanding all text correction structures and final formats and OCR process and test character recognition OCR being optical character recognition not office of civil rights. Also auditing and testing with automated processes in the main processes implement that in understanding planning and training so there can be guidance on how we plan and train for accessible document workflow and finally policy promotion advocacy in advising. Those are five programs that we offer. All of the certification programs are valid for three years. When you are in your credential your three years to earn the required continuing accessible education credits or professional development. Also sharing knowledge is in option outside the key of work. The question in chess is what certification is the one that would be most government entities need? It depends on the role Christina. [ Inaudible ] is applicable for everyone in accessibility programs or in services or direct services or help shape policies and process. How is it different from trusted tester? Trusted tester is a methodology program that teaches people how to audit, review components within a specific process for testing and web accessibility. And WAIS is not about methodology or a specific product but about understanding the underlying code which is not always included in methodology because it's not about the process. So much understanding that in using us just assess ability and understanding cross platform cross tools in a variety of assistive technology testing tools not just one. Also understanding impact on the person and in writing recommendations. Definitely a complement to the trusted tester but not one or the other. Trusted tester is more methodology and WAIS is broader. Understanding [ Inaudible ] is a success criterion and why something succeeds or doesn't. That's a little bit of a deeper dive on some of those components. I believe it gets tension on the testing program. We see a lot of people that have trusted tester and they are strong candidates for understanding and doing audit deviation and guiding teams. Carolyn, we have requirements for areas of expertise and understanding of those are posted on that. The CPACC has was talk more about the traits on what these programs look like. How does CPACC core competencies shape the accessible future? They have a great understanding and knowledge of disabilities in understanding the models and strengthen weaknesses and understanding adept strategies used by people with disabilities and understanding assistive technologies as a accommodations how they are used in understand new universal design and universal design for learning and tenets of accessibility and have a good grasp of laws and [ Inaudible ] and hope to advise on how to integrate accessibility into an organization structure culture, and plans processes and policies. So CPACC is a core of understanding and they find themselves crafting a lot of conversations and being called on to help guide conversations from concept to development and so as colleagues are being awful about inclusion and accessibility to help people understand what to consider from the design and concept process to design and implementation. So CPACC helps with HR and program services and project management and technical components and marketing communications and policy. Web accessibility specials we talk about those the intermediate technical program that has components of creating web solution understanding the underlying code elements being able to identify code elements in the wild and know what would happen if that code were to render if someone selected or selected a button in understanding the impact of accessibility for people that rely on web solutions. Also identify those which means accessibility and usability testing which are not the same thing but they do happen together oftentimes and with a variety of types of assistive technologies across a variety of types of automated testing solutions and understanding limitations of the automated testing solutions plus value of manual testing and understanding how to supplement automated testing is a best practice. When you do write an audit of a site or product or tool to identify issues in the web solutions and level of similarity and what to prioritize. When we talked earlier about stoppers, what are the stoppers first and what are the next following priorities and how do you incorporate those strategies into your accessibility program? We talked about CPACC and WAIS, if someone earned both when they earn the second of the two credentials, the are granted the credential and renewal window will be advanced to the new session and if you earn CPACC and the second and they together would work for a new three-year session but if you combine the understanding of accessibility and best practices in technical and women digital understanding disabilities and other components, see PWA will shape and bring in a foundational knowledge are wrong with components of design and web accessibility to integrate intermediate technical web skills and accessibility core competencies to understand with experience in both of these peoples and help advised teams to integrate best practices and design policy in technical areas. [ Captioners transitioning ]

They graduated 95 CPACC they have graduated across the system. It will be about 10 hours of pre-recorded video content and 100 questions with a sample exam at the end that is relatively close to what the exam will be light. That will be offered at no cause for IAAP members and add a high rate for nonmembers for CPACC. DQ is an organization that does assess ability, and there is other ways for new information. Can we go to the next slide? I'm not sure how many people here are involved in built environment assess ability because I believe the focus today is on the digital world, but these professionals help audit to include the digital components of space and structures and [indiscernible] with the requirements for assess ability. They have best practices and universal design which will include the smart technology and understanding the local and other codes for built spaces and being able to present those findings so that people can understand the relevance of assess ability and start removing those barriers in the physical space. This is the question that somebody asked a few minutes ago in chat. Someone asked about the assessable document specialist, and you do not have to be a member of IAAP to pursue our certifications, and certifications do not make you a member . A question about the built environment. It is built on ISO standards and universal design. It is applicable in any area that would be a complement to the local building structure guidelines and requirements. Yes that would be for U.S. and international programs as well. There was a question about assessable document specialist. They are the people that will help shape creating assessable documents in office format, depending on what your office suite is and no matter what brand the standards are still in place and the are checkers of various and pack three Matt is often found in government requirements and is a format checking tool. Understanding how to create documents in the office format so that you are using best practices so they can be exported to a final format and retained or simply add and what other tax or structures you might need in your format. Understanding how to mediate documents in a variety of formats and the audit tests for assess ability but to save you do in digital components. Understanding the limitations of automated document test is really important and those of us who work with assessable documents do this quite a bit. I ran it to the checker and it was fine but it doesn't mean that the automated testing tools that we use catch all the pieces that we use for usability for everyone. Document training and planning for document best practices, somebody who is an ADS will have a good understanding, and help establish the best practices for a lake -- electric documents and progress. That is a little bit about the traits about each of the programs. Can we go to the next slide? One of the things that we have worked on, and the program earlier today was speaking to procurement and those acquisition processes. I am really excited about the process that ITI and GSA will make thanks to the NASA team and the training they are working on. Procurement is a challenge. We understand, understanding digital assess ability and those components, why it is so important. But the process of building and the other responsibility of including assess ability to a procurement officer's role, that is where we have a lot of work to do community wise, not just with GSA but in general. We are going to be working on building some educational components in IAAP about procurement processes and standards and taking best practices from the government agencies that was mentioned here today. The Minnesota and Texas teams are active contributors to our work there as well. We will be adding a procurement education and training programs, and it is possible in some time we may be able to build that into a certification or a credential as well. That will take a bit of time for us to work with procurement officers across the board is a yes, we think this is something that every procurement officer should understand, and that will come with time. All of the certifications, and Charisse asked can I do just W.A.S. are can I do CPACC first? There is no prerequisite of one certification before the other for any of these programs that we have today. If you was a technical person and you live in the cold elements and criteria's, then by all means W.A.S. may be the perfect credential for you. As long as you have the usability testing in the background, then, and I encourage you to take a look because there is a body of knowledge for each program which is that content that I spoke to, but the body of knowledge gets to learning and study objectives for each program and that is where the exam questions are written from. Claudia asked if they was permanent? No, all of our certifications are valid for three years and require ongoing professional development to renew. When [indiscernible] switches to silver we may have an update because that is eight new evaluation for how assessable things are but that will be several years out. What qualifies for our continuing education credits, it is tied to a program and the outline is related to what is on the exam or the certification. The CPACC is broad , and a meet up an organizational relay and they want to have people engaged and it doesn't require to be a paid program or service. Sharing your knowledge as assessable to credits does require to be something else out of your primary job role in which you are paid. So if you have the opportunity to go to a conference you can probably take care of a whole years worth of credit in a short time but you can do it in small bite-size pieces with our have long webinars. Our goal is to help establish some benchmark and standards to build an assessable future for people who are practitioners and professionals in the accessibility arena. The certified assess ability professionals are going to be providing guidance and advice and services to make the world a more assessable place and demonstrating commitment to the assess ability profession. It will be great one day if somebody says what he -- what you do but I do assess ability and they know what that means. The assess ability professionals are bashing the roles and possibilities of assess ability professionals by using skills and knowledge and establishing benchmarks and standards for assess ability professionals and practitioners in the world. Also increasing awareness and recognition for the assess building profession and highlighting and distinguishing organizations integration of assess ability into your at those. We are seeing some exciting work for teams who are making this a part of their codevelopment team to give W.A.S. to move on to things, and we are seeing agencies requiring their sales and frontline team members to require a CPACC so they know that people know what they are talking about when they are having conversations and from our communications and sales understanding that when they are asked questions about assess ability, and we mentioned before to asked the vendor for X, Y, Z, the people know what that means. If you are reviewing a bid or a quote get a feel for what not might be quite right. Just missed -- just because somebody sends in a [indiscernible], it doesn't mean it is valid and they support any assess ability features. It takes a little bit of knowledge about assess ability and disability and the success criteria to understand what it means. There is no required certification at the time and I don't believe there is any requirement. I think there may be team members who are encouraging this as a knowledge base and professional opportunity, and we are happy to work with each of you if that is something that you are interested in. Can we go to the next screen? On this slide is questions. You can visit our main certification webpage that has a quick guide to the IAAP certifications and you can contact me by email. We have drop-in sessions on Wednesday once in the morning and once in the evening to answer questions about the process around certification. I may have run through this a little faster than I thought and I hope I didn't speak too quickly. What question can I answer for the group that was not asked while we was talking? So what is the best way to study for an exam? Ideally the best way to study for the exam and each program have a prepare for page. The best way is to go to the content outline, which is, it is like a table of contents, the main one, go to the content outline for each program and evaluate how familiar you are with the topics and content and information. Then open the body of knowledge which is a document and do a deep dive into the study and learning objectives for each program so that you can determine that if I need to spend more time in this or review other resources, and map out your path, how you choose to study, whether or not you want to use the resources in the body of knowledge and use the prep course to supplement your studies but all of your study should be based in the body of knowledge. Identify areas where you have great confidence and background and other areas where you you need to learn more and plan how you want to tackle those and evaluate and get familiar with those programs. The link for the drop in session is an RSVP form and we will send out the contact details for each program with the zoom information. There was a question about, there is a question here, and the exams are available in a variety of formats. You are right. There is a big challenge with test delivery platforms across the board as number the programs have a fully assessable platform, and some have a successful delivery agent but you cannot schedule. Criteria and on my remote antenna centers offer exams. If you don't have administrative rights to your machine or if you don't want to install security software we offer an assessable version of the exam with the same keystrokes and characters but offered in a assessable format either with a volunteer Proctor who say somebody in your world can do it as a volunteer or staff members will be able to offer by zoom with screen sharing and remote to do online exams as well. That allows everybody the greatest flexibility and safety. Occasionally in different parts of the world there is in person events where we would host an event in person and obviously not much of that is happening today. I think that answers the questions. So the general assess ability certification CPACC is that broad core competencies and assess ability and best practices and understanding. We do find the highest level of participation is within the IT and finance and healthcare government for CPACC but is picking up a lot in education and arts and museum and tours as well. So the lake that is displayed on the screen is a RSVP and applicants are not often denied. If somebody doesn't have any working experience in assess ability want to have a further conversation with them because it is a certified professional designation and not designed for somebody [indiscernible], but maybe personal experience or advocacy, but if there is not experience in working time in but we will ask some additional questions. We have denied a few applications for those reasons where somebody says I want to learn about assess ability and I want to have this, and this is an designed to be a my learning first step in but more toward people who have experienced or knowledge. We talked about earlier the pass rate is around 89% for CPACC and it is around 63% for W.A.S.. But W.A.S. is an intermediate technical program and there is 13 areas that we have as prescreening questions and it does require hands-on personal experience. If somebody doesn't have experience with at least 10 out of those 13 components on the application essay respond we will ask additional questions. Do they understand why these are components? Occasionally, and if somebody doesn't have any experience of assess ability like I haven't done any work on their own, then we are not going to advance their application. We asked people to be honest but that 63% pass rate is about 40% of the people who apply for W.A.S. don't have more than one year of expansion web assess ability. It is actually how do you apply this? What are working examples and scenarios. It takes time and usually you are passionate on your own or you are doing this for work. So DQ does have training courses, and they should be supplements to the program, and not a basis for your study. The W.A.S. prep I think is maybe 14 or 15 modules. It is pretty time intensive but an introduction to each of the components in the web assess ability. We do have team members and there are certification study group and if you are on assess ability [indiscernible], there is a certification channel, so there is lots of ways to meet and greet with people. The certification varies depending on if you are a IAAP member or not. W.A.S. is 534 nonmembers and 434 members. I don't think anybody can qualify for the [indiscernible] discount unless you are living and working in the U.S. federal program. The training programs, and I don't know the prices of them off the top of my head, but when we do publish the Princeton study program it will be free to members and $125 for nonmembers. One of the things that is included if you are a IAAP member is all of our webinars are preapproved for credits, so you could realistically earn everything that you need within the IAAP community. Other questions from the group about how you as a program lead or a team lead may find it would add value to your team, and if you have an opportunity to look at the content outline and the body of knowledge, it will give you a understanding of how the contents apply to what you do everyday within you work within TSA and your coordinated agencies. If there was a federal group that wanted to put together a study group I would be happy to contribute to that information or help you if you have questions. We will be posting some sample questions for CPACC and W.A.S. to prepare to get a flavor of what the questions are like. All of the answers are multiple-choice and there is more radio buttons to choose from and one is a correct answer and the others are not correct. There are scenarios on W.A.S. where you would identify, seven lines of code, and they do require some experience knowledge and it is not like I can study this and memorize it and answer the questions. Lauren, you are correct and if you do have a disability they do offer their university courses at no fee for people with disabilities. Is there any other questions? I hope it was useful and I hope it was an interesting consideration. I hope there is some useful information and even if you are not pursuing the certification program, I think the CPACC body of knowledge is a useful tool for education so people can have some shared understanding of types of disabilities and assist in strategies and under W.A.S. if you are interested in learning more a little bit more about the technical side of web assess ability, there is some great learning and study goals in the body of knowledge if you are just trying to dig in a little bit more, and the body of knowledge is free resources on line. I refer people to it frequently as a resource and if they are useful to you too, then so much the better. I hope it will be something that you might dig in and take a look at. I think we have answered all the questions that came in the chat. Is there any other questions. One of those is a question for Yvette that was related earlier. We have sessions that are about 4-6 weeks long and there is six sessions each year and they are listed on our applications and date webpage so you can plan. We suggest that people prepare to take 6-8 weeks to study and prepare for an exam unless you are heavily involved in the program and assess ability. We encourage people to make time to study a plan. Tim, I am happy for the slides to be shared. I have shared them with 11 and I am happy for them to be distributed to everyone. Said he was so good Sam, and there is no more questions for you.

We may have gone through that a bit fast, but I hope we was able to answer everyone's question. It is always a treat to participate with GSA in these programs and I was happy to anticipate in procurement programs late last year as well. Hopefully we will see you again at another event or activity for the assess ability programs and if there is questions I am happy to answer them.

Much appreciated and thank you so much. I will be contacting you anyway. Everyone, thank you, thank you for our presenters John Sullivan, and Michelle, Betsy, Robert, and then Sam Evans on the IAAP program. I'm just going to say a few words and then I'm going to turn it over to John to see if he has anything else to say. Very quickly everyone I am putting the survey link in the chat and please take a moment to take our follow-up survey. It would be greatly appreciated as it will help us as we continue to move forward in these training meetings. In addition going forward, we plan to provide certificates to those attending our training. If you do join, we need you to join the your name because we will be using the zoom report to check who attended the training. If you join with your phone number we will not be able to issue a certificate, so you have to change your phone number to your name or at least send me a message with your phone number and say when you attended and I can double check. In addition to that we look forward to us showcasing those who have attended all of our training sessions. We are going to do something special for those individuals as well. That is within a years time, all of those with us who attended all of our training sessions. We plan to showcase you in some way for your dedication to gaining more knowledge on what we do and what we are about. Right now I'm going to turn this over to John Sullivan to close us out.

Thank you Yvette and thank you Sam and I appreciate you going over these offerings. It reminds me that my certification I need to update it myself. I and most grateful and we have a comment from Darlene, well worth it, and we are happy that we are able to include people from other places, and thank you for coming in and for those on the East Coast perspective and time zone. This is a critical issue that we need to work on, and we appreciate everyone with the involvement in that, and the suggestion by Gary that we have a federal study group for some of the certifications and exams, and that is great. Good ideas keep coming into this group so keep them coming. We are kicking off the planning for this October interagency assessable forum, and it all starts this week and if you are not already engaged perhaps you will consider being part of the plan and working with us on the planning. It takes a lot of people an effort to pull that off and following the great success last year, it is virtual, and we have done some great events, and this is going to be another year to really get the attention that we deserve. Thank you all and thank you Yvette for putting this together and thank you to our interpreters, and enjoy your lunch or breakfast if you are on the West Coast. [ Event Concluded ]
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