Website Testing Results

# General

1. **Arrow** – As you’re going through the questions, sometimes when there are a small number of possible available mechanisms at the bottom of the screen it will show only 2 or 3 of them and have an arrow indicating you can click on the arrow to see the rest. Is there a way to always have as many mechanisms on the screen as the screen can show rather than having the arrow?

Discussion required - significant effort involved in changing this behaviour as it is designed to accommodate smaller (i.e. smartphone) screens.

Happy to discuss this one. We think that most people will use the online tool on a computer and our preference is to eliminate the arrow even if it makes the smartphone version a bit wonky. However, we want to hear from you about a) how bad it would look on a smartphone, and b) how much work it would take for you to change it.

1. **Transition between questions** – On all questions that don’t require you to click ‘Done’ it takes you to the next question rather quickly such that you might not notice if you accidentally clicked on the wrong answer. Would it be possible to slow down by ½ second or a full second the transition to the next question? We also had some discussion about whether there should in fact be obvious checkboxes in every question but we think this is a question for the web designers.

This is possible and simple to implement but it also raises the possibility of users thinking nothing is happening and clicking around other answers to try to trigger a response. Some sort of additional visual confirmation may be required, e.g. “Processing...”

We think a 1 second delay wouldn’t cause users to think nothing is happening and start clicking around. If your experience is that 1 second is too long, then maybe we can do ½ second.

Implemented a full 1 second delay and displaying the text 'processing...' beneath the answers area to indicate activity

1. **Reset button?** – Is it possible to have a ‘reset’ button on each screen such that you can clear all your answers and start over?

Yes, should be relatively simple, but is this actually something that users are expected to need or is it just something that would make testing easier?

We can envision various scenarios where users would want to use this so if it’s relatively simple we’d like to do it. But we decided the button should be called “Start Again” rather than “reset”.

Implemented Start Again button on each question. Resets all question answers, removes outcome availability history, resets question button colouring, resets unanswered question count, and resets % complete information.

1. **Why This Question** **part 1** – I can’t remember if we discussed this but is it possible to have “Why This Question?” be a pop-up? We just noticed that if you click on “Why This Question” and it gives you the answer, if you move on to other questions but then come back, the answer to Why This Question is still on the screen. *This isn’t a big issue for us so if it’s difficult to change then we don’t want to worry about it.*

Yes, should be relatively simple.

Implemented as requested.

1. **Why This Question** **part 2** – We’d like to give more of an explanation about what choosing “unknown” implies in certain questions. So we’d like to add the following sentence(s) to “Why This Question” for the following questions:
   1. **Question 2a** – “An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question assumes that there were not citizens of any other country who participated in the abuses. In other words, for this question an answer of ‘unknown’ will have the same result as ‘no’.”
   2. **Question 10** – “Please answer ‘unknown’ if you are not completely sure who was responsible for the abuses. An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question will not eliminate any of the justice options.”
   3. **Question 11** – “An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question assumes that none of the people responsible for the abuses are currently living in Canada. In other words, for this question an answer of ‘unknown’ will have the same result as ‘no’.”
   4. **Question 12** – “An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question assumes that none of the people responsible for the abuses ever visit Canada. In other words, for this question an answer of ‘unknown’ will have the same result as ‘no’.”
   5. **Question 13** – “An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question assumes that none of the people responsible for the abuses travel outside the country. In other words, for this question an answer of ‘unknown’ will have the same result as ‘no’.”
   6. **Question 14a** – “An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question assumes that the courts are not fair and independent. In other words, for this question an answer of ‘unknown’ will have the same result as ‘no’.”
   7. **Question 14b** – “An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question assumes that the victim or the victim's family did not try to bring a case or a complaint. In other words, for this question an answer of ‘unknown’ will have the same result as ‘no’.”beyond
   8. **Question 15** – “An answer of ‘unknown’ to this question assumes that the victim or the victim's family did not submit a complaint to any other international court or body. In other words, for this question an answer of ‘unknown’ will have the same result as ‘no’.”

OK, simple.

Implemented

1. **Mechanism Names/Logos** – We think it’s really important to be able to see the full name of each available mechanism at the bottom of the screen as you’re going through the questions (or at least a suitably descriptive name). Currently you can only see a portion of the name with a ‘…’ and the logos are really big. The logos, frankly, aren’t that important because very few people are going to know the logos and several mechanisms have the same logo so the names are more important. I think we discussed this before and I can’t remember what the conclusion was but if there’s any way to make the logos smaller and include the full names, this would be optimal. *What would you suggest? One thing we wondered about was whether the logo could be faint with the name superimposed over the top.*

Implemented

1. **Limitations period** – We want to get rid of the limitations period as a factor in eliminating mechanism through question 3. In other words, in the Excel spreadsheets for several mechanisms, the last column said “Does the complaint/claim have to be brought within a certain amount of time (2 years, "reasonable time", etc.)?” and for several of these we put in an arbitrary 10 year deadline. We now want to eliminate the 10 year deadline and instead just put a note in the description of these mechanisms on the final screen (under “available options”) just like we have already done for the European Court, Inter-American Commission, CERD, CESCR and CRC. So, this change will need to be made for the African Commission, the Committee against Torture, and Civil Lawsuit in Canada. (However, the answer to question 3 will still be relevant in terms of when a country signed on to a particular treaty or mechanism.) Theressa is writing up language that can be included in the descriptions of these mechanisms to tell the user that there may be a limitation period for these mechanisms (just like the statements we have already included for the European Court, Inter-American Commission, CERD, CESCR and CRC).

OK.

In progress, pending answer from Matt regarding ECCC.

1. **Top banner** – We want to change the wording on the banner that always runs along the top. Rather than “Assess” we’d like to go with “Assess Your Options” and instead of “Justice Options” we’d like to go with “Learn About Justice Institutions”? (Is that too wordy? If so, maybe we could do “Justice Institutions”.) We just thought the old wording was confusing. We then also need to make this change on the home page.

OK.

Implemented, opted for 'Justice Institutions' as the full text was too much for the home page's middle column.

1. **Spacing on home page** – On the home page we’d like a bit more space between the three columns (the descriptions of the three options you can choose from) and smaller gaps between the words in each column. The contact information should also be farther down on the page if possible – more of a footer.

OK.

Had to disable text justification to reduce space between words, text no longer meets square dimensions.

Footer presenting problems - revisit

# Specific pages/questions

1. **Final Page (Next Steps)** – We would like to make a number of changes to the screen that comes up after completing question 15:
   1. We should cut the "Check Your Possible Options" banner
   2. The banner about how many unanswered questions there are should go on top, and we should add the phrase “which can cause inaccurate results” (i.e. it should read “XX questions are unanswered which can cause inaccurate results”)
   3. Below that should be "← Back to the Test".
   4. Below that should be the three tabs: “Available Options”, “Unavailable Options”, “Next Steps”. These should be larger and more prominent, typographically. Currently it takes you to the “Next Steps” tab but instead it should take you to the “Available Options” tab. Under that tab it should include a phrase telling people that they can click on options to learn more. Then a new paragraph for the disclaimer information. Same language for the "Unavailable Options" tab.

Tom: Is the disclaimer provided later in this document??

* 1. We want to change most of the wording for the “Next Steps” tab. It should now read:

[Header] What To Do Next?

You can take any of the following steps or end your session.

* + 1. **Learn more about your options.** More information about your options can be found in the "Available Options" tab or the "Learn About Justice Institutions" section above. In addition to descriptions of the different tribunals and courts, these sections suggest links to find further information.
    2. **Read about what other survivors have done.** Our "Stories" section has descriptions about current and past CCIJ cases and interviews with individuals who have sought justice. This section can give you a better sense of what occurs when a person tries to take action in different international or Canadian legal processes.
    3. **Contact CCIJ to discuss your case.** Contact details are provided at the bottom of this page and at the CCIJ site.

□ If you want to send your results directly to us, please click this box and provide your email address.

□ If you want to receive regular updates from CCIJ, please click this box and provide your email address.

Could do what is requested in both of these bullets but it requires some time and adjustments, saving until later. May require PHP edits, not sure.

* 1. We also want to add a fourth tab called “Feedback” and that page should just be the same as the current box that pops up when you click on the ‘provide feedback’ logo.

OK, it would be much simpler to implement these changes if the Feedback tab raised the current feedback pop-up, instead of the same content being in a new tab. Perhaps it's best if Feedback is offered prominently (e.g. as a button) on each tab instead of having a separate tab.

We’re happy to go with whatever you think is best – a feedback button would be fine.

Partially implemented, see note on e3 for additional work.

1. **Question 2a** – An answer of “unknown” should be considered the same as an answer of “no”

It already is ?

1. **Question 2b** – If in Question 2b the nationality of other people who also committed the crimes was left as "Please select" then the International Criminal Court remained an option even when the date in question 3 was earlier than July 1, 2002 (which it should not be). However, as soon as you input any nationality in question 2b, the ICC appears to no longer be an option before July 1, 2002 (which is correct). So, having no answer for 2b somehow incorrectly trumps the date that the crimes occurred.

This is working as designed. In the scenario described the user has said 'Yes, one of the abusers was a citizen of another country' but has not yet said which country the abuser was a citizen of. As a result we do not yet know that ICC is eliminated. A date earlier than July 1, 2002 could be valid depending on which country is selected for the currently unanswered 2b. If the user selects 'No' or 'Unknown' in 2a the ICC is correctly eliminated. In my opinion this is the most sensible approach and it is aligned with the tool's philosophy that mechanisms are available until proven otherwise.

1. **Question 3** – Can the dropdown for ‘year’ in the calendar go back to 1900 rather than 1950? (By the way, if you type it in manually, it will accept years before 1950)

Changed to 1900. It's fine if the user can manually enter an earlier date - the 1950 limit was only imposed to keep the list of selectable years to a manageable size and avoid excessive scrolling.

1. **Question 3** – We had at least 3 problems with the calendar: a) Sometimes clicking on the calendar would just take you to the next step (i.e. not letting you select a date). b) Sometimes once you had inputted a date and then moved on to another question, if you wanted to go back and change the date, just clicking on the correct date in the calendar wouldn’t work – you had to manually type it in and hit enter. C) Sometimes clicking in the box to type the date manually made the box temporarily disappear.

I will need some more information on the device(s) that was used when these issues were encountered. I haven't seen any similar issues on my laptop or my Android phone.

Okay, here’s the information on what devices were used. Problem (a) was encountered both on a PC using Chrome as the browser and on a Mac using Safari (however, another person using a Mac and Safari did not encounter any problems). Problem (b) was on a PC using Mozilla Firefox. Problem (c) was, I think, on a PC with Chrome.

Tom: Will have to revisit

1. **Question 3** – Belgium recently ratified the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child so if someone puts in a date of 30 May 2014 or later, the Committee needs to remain available for Belgium.

Done

1. **Question 3** – Belgium recently ratified the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights so if someone puts in a date of 20 May 2014 or later, the Committee needs to remain available for Belgium.

Done.

1. **Question 3** – Cabo Verde recently ratified the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights so if someone puts in a date of 23 June 2014 or later, the Committee needs to remain available for Cabo Verde.

Done.

1. **Question 3** – Any date entered seems to eliminate the War Crimes Chamber at the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This needs to be fixed. The date of ratification on the spreadsheet is 3 July 2002. If question 3 is left unanswered, Bosnia court remains available.

Fixed, but does this make sense in its fixed state? Surely the crimes the court is interested in occurred before 2002/07/03 (i.e. the early 90s)???

1. **Question 5a** – “Unknown” should be deleted. We no longer want this as an option.

Done.

1. **Question 6** – Move “Select all that apply from the following options:” up to put it immediately under “Describe the abuse(s) committed against the victim” and put “all” in caps so it says “Select ALL that apply from the following options:”. What we want to do is make sure it’s prominent.

Done.

1. **Question 6** – We need to delete “Religious persecution” and “Serious mental harm to a person based on race, ethnicity, religion or nationality”. For any mechanisms that would have been kept alive by choosing either of those two acts, they will be kept alive if the person selects, “Persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds”.

Deferred - too much effort for now

1. **Question 6** – For the Inter-American Commission, we need to add these acts to the list of those that trigger the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Commission: Denial of fair trial; Enslavement; Forced abortion; Forced displacement; Kidnapping; Killing; Persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds; Poisoning of water or food supplies; Stealing children.

Done.

1. **Question 6** – For the UN Human Rights Committee, we need to add these acts to the list of those that trigger the jurisdiction of the Committee: Abuse against a child under the age of 18; Burning of houses; Denial of fair trial; Enslavement; Forced abortion; Forced displacement; Forced sterilization; Persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds; Poisoning of water or food supplies; Religious persecution; Serious mental harm to a person based on race, ethnicity, religion or nationality; Stealing children.

Tom: how does abuse under 18 integrate? Currently only relevant if something else is also selected?

1. **Question 6** – For the International Criminal Court, we need to eliminate “Denial of fair trial” as an act that gives the ICC jurisdiction (i.e. if that is the only act selected then the ICC needs to be eliminated).
2. **Question 6 –** Any acts checked for question 6 eliminate the Committee on Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). This needs to be fixed. CEDAW needs to remain alive if “abuse against a woman” is checked along with any one of the following: rape or other sexual assault, forced nudity, enslavement, kidnapping.

I don't see the issue here - this is exactly how CEDAW currently works. Checking any of the listed abuses alongside “Abuse against a woman” correctly makes CEDAW available. There could be some confusion here as the available mechanisms are re-assessed each time a checkbox is checked. As at least two checkboxes are required for CEDAW this means that on the first checkbox, regardless of which one it is, CEDAW becomes unavailable until the second checkbox is checked.

1. **Questions 7, 8, 9** – “Unknown” should be deleted. We no longer want this as an option.

Done.

1. **Question 10** – “Person in plainclothes” should be deleted. We no longer want this as an option. Instead we want to add “None of the above” and “Unknown”. “None of the above” eliminates any mechanisms requiring a government actor (if you need me to tell you which mechanisms these are, I can do that). “Unknown” should not eliminate any mechanisms (i.e. it keeps alive any mechanisms that were still alive prior to question 10)
2. **Question 10** – We want to re-order the columns. The left column should have: Soldier in government's army, Police officer, Other government official, Company or corporation. The right column should have: Soldier in rebel army, None of the above, Unknown.
3. **Questions 11 and 12** – An answer of “unknown” should be considered the same as an answer of “no” so “unknown” should eliminate all of the Canadian mechanism (criminal, civil, immigration)
4. **Question 15** – Currently, the International Criminal Court is eliminated when question 15 is answer "yes". This is incorrect. An answer of “yes” should still keep the ICC alive.
5. **Questions 2b, 5b, 14c** – Would it be possible to have their numbers remain faint gray if they don’t have to be answered? We just want some indication to the user that they were skipped over rather than just keeping those tabs white with dark lettering.

OK.

1. **Questions 6 and 9 –** After the “unknown” option is deleted from question 9, we just need to double-check that failure to click on “Persecution on political, racial, or religious grounds” in question 6 will eliminate the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD).

OK.

1. **Extraordinary Chambers of Cambodia** – On the “Justice Options” page (or what we are now calling the “Learn About Justice Institutions” page: [http://www.ccij.ca/test/index-en.php#remedies](http://www.ccij.ca/test/index-en.php" \l "remedies)) as well as the pop-up description under “available options” or “unavailable options” at the end, the description of the ECCC needs to be updated. It currently reads: "To date the ECCC has completed one criminal prosecution and is currently working on a second." It now should read "To date the ECC has completed the trial of Kaing Guek Eav (Duch) and a trial of Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan. A second trial of Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan is in progress. While there are plans for..."

OK.

1. **International Criminal Court** – On the “Justice Options” page (or what we are now calling the “Learn About Justice Institutions” page: [http://www.ccij.ca/test/index-en.php#remedies](http://www.ccij.ca/test/index-en.php" \l "remedies)) as well as the pop-up description under “available options” or “unavailable options” at the end, the description of the ICC needs to be added to. We want to add the this note: “The ICC can also receive the legal authority to investigate any situation when authorized by the UN Security Council (as happened in the cases of Sudan and Libya, which are not parties to the Rome Statute). Non-members can also request the ICC to have jurisdiction, as happened in the case of Cote d'Ivoire. (Note: Our "Assess your options" questionnaire is unable to include situations in with the UN Security Council or a non-member state decides to retroacivitely give jurisdiction to the ICC. As a result, it may in the future become possible for the ICC to prosecute crimes that happened in countries in the past, including Syria and Palestine for instance.)

OK.

1. **Additional text edits**

**Front Page:**

1) For the contact information add the word “Email:” before [meisenbrandt@ccij.ca](mailto:meisenbrandt@ccij.ca) (actually, this is on every page)

2) Under the header “Assess your Options”, add the word “members” so it reads: “committed against you or your family members”. This is consistent with the wording at the top of the page.

3) The heading “Justice Options” should be changed to “Learn about Justice Institutions”.

4) Under Assess your Options, the wording should be changed from “and suggest tribunals, international bodies or Canadian processes”, to “and suggest possible options for pursuing justice”.

**Second page (waiver):**

1) In the 3rd paragraph, add “Emailing your results to CCIJ does not mean that you have started a legal case, and CCIJ will not contact you about your results.

**Question 1:**

1) Under ‘why this question’: replace “tribunals and justice processes” with “justice institutions” for consistency with the re-wording of the heading on page 1 and the tab on the last page.

**Question 2(a):**

1) Amend the question to say “Did people who are citizens of any other country participate in committing the abuse(s)?”

2) Same as for question 1, under ‘why this question’, replace “tribunals and justice processes” with “justice institutions”.

**Question 2(b):**

1) Amend the question to say: “What other citizenship did they have?”

**Question 3:**

1) Replace the instruction regarding detention and torture to a more general instruction that says: “If the abuse lasted for more than one day, select the most recent date on which the abuse occurred”.

2) Same as above, under ‘why this question’, replace “tribunals and justice processes” with “justice institutions” for consistency (this wording appears twice in this one).

3) Change the instruction to: “select a date using the calendar below”

**Question 6:**

1) Same as above, under ‘why this question’, replace “tribunals and justice processes” with “justice institutions”.

**Questions 7, 8 and 9:**

1) Similar to above, under ‘why this question’ replace “tribunals” with “justice institutions”.

**Question 10:**

1) Same as above, under ‘why this question’ replace “tribunals and justice processes” with “justice institutions”.

**Question 13:**

1) Under why this question, change “Although analysis of this option is too complicated for this website…” to “Although analysis of this option is beyond the scope of this website…”

**Question 14(a):**

1) Same as above, under ‘why this question’ I would replace “tribunals and justice processes” with “justice institutions”.

**Question 14(b):**

1) Under why this question, change the sentence: “this might make it more likely that an international justice process might look into the case” to “this may make it more likely that an international justice institution might look into the case”. (get rid of 2 mights in the same sentence and replace ‘process’ with ‘institution’)

**Question 14(c):**

1) Again, under why this question, change the sentence: “this might make it more likely that an international justice process might look into the case” to “this may make it more likely that an international justice institution might look into the case”.

**Question 15:**

1) Under ‘why this question’, change the wording to: “Some justice institutions want to avoid duplicating the work of other institutions. As a result, many will decline to accept a case if another tribunal or international body is already reviewing the case.”

**Specific Mechanism Descriptions:**

The following additions can be made to the end of each of these mechanism descriptions regarding limitation periods:

**African Commission**

\* The African Commission has a strict limitations period. If you have tried to file a case in your country and it was unsuccessful, you have to file a case at the African Commission within a “reasonable time”, unless you can demonstrate that it had not been possible to submit the complaint within that time limit.

**UN CAT**

\* The United Nations Committee Against Torture has a strict limitations period. If you have tried to file a case in your country and it was unsuccessful, you have to file a complaint with the United Nations Committee Against Torture within a “reasonable time”, unless you can demonstrate that it had not been possible to submit the complaint within that time limit.

**Civil Lawsuit**

\* There is usually a limitations period for filing a civil lawsuit in Canada. Some cases must be filed within two years of when the abuse(s) occurred though sometimes this period is longer.