

Potential WCAG 2.2 success criteria

These are the 4 Patterns we selected at the Face to Face as being the most important candidates for inclusion in WCAG 2.2

See details on each Pattern in the Design Guide using the links

1. [Make it Easy to Find the Most Important Thing](#).
2. [Do not Rely on User Memorizing Information](#) (including short term memory)
3. [Make it easy to undo errors](#)
4. [Make it easy to find and use help](#) / [Feedback is usable by everyone](#) (we are merging them in our design guide)

Example use cases that each SC should support

1) Make it easy to find the most important thing

- Find the send button on an email. (or other critical paths for the primary functionality)
- Headings (visual matches structure)
- Anything information having to do with danger, healthy, safety such as :
 - Alerts (kindergarten ended early, do not park here you will be towed, page is no longer being updated)
- Things that are so important if you don't know about them...you may make a mistake/decision that makes you cry (with sadness)

2) Make it Easy to Undo Errors

- Unsend a email (within x seconds). "Oh no! I sent that to the wrong person!"
- Failure: You entered wrong data in a form....but you can't go back and change it without starting completely over. (If you start over you might just make different mistakes...)
- Failure:Any system that throws you off when you make errors (unless necessary for security or safety)

3) Do not rely on user memory for information

- Voice Menu Systems “press three for this thing - you need to remember the three while you process if you want “this thing”
- Conversational Interfaces that expect you to remember information as you go, give your id number, birthday height and what you last eat, before you can reach a person.
- Information required to be remembered from previous screens
- login

4) Make it easy to find and use help.

- Make it so you can find help and support on every page
- Make it easy to find a way to get a human being to help you (where there is human help available)
- Example of a Failure: When a user gets caught in a cognitive trap. Example....voice menu system where you can't get where you need to be. lether throws you off or sends you around in a circle.

The next candidate patterns are:

5) Be internally consistent (visually)

6) Avoid data loss and timeouts (upgrade from AAA to AA)

Useful terms (Thanks to Jamie)

Cognitive trap: see confusion

Confusion: see cognitive trap

Other stuff

Post from Rachael and things to consider

Process

I was not looking for which were the most important SC. Instead, I was trying to determine which SC would be easiest to successfully get through a shorter WCAG

review process. I believe the group is better able to determine which are most important.

I reviewed all the COGA SC and To Do List, and then selected SC based on a two criteria:

1. Did the working group make progress on the SC in 2.1? Several SC had been discussed in depth and simply ran out of time before being finalized. These seem to be to be better candidates than SC that got little or no discussion or SC that were discussed at length but were not close to a final wording.

2. Does the SC lend itself to the 2.1 framework? Some SC require usability-like assessment which fits better in Silver than in the current framework. I eliminated these from the list.

I also eliminated any that made it to an SC in 2.1.

Results

SC that had a lot of discussion and some solid proposals but didn't make it in:

- * Feedback: This had a proposal to split it into two SC, one on general feedback and one on auditory feedback.

- * Accessible Authentication: This had a proposal to split into two, one for authentication and one for captcha

- * Undo: This had a good bit of work done on it and ran out of time.

- * Error Prevention: This had been changed to a level A that interacted with 3.3.4. It had a lot more discussion left at TPAC but ran out of time.

- * Extra Symbols: This was a little unclear what happened but it also may have run out of time. It had good discussion and a clear proposal for a way forward.

Two SC that are not quite as proposed from COGA but may have a way forward:

- * Affordances: This isn't a term on the COGA to do list but it came up in discussion at the AG group as part of 1.4.11 Non-text Contrast. 1.4.11 requires that if affordances exist they have sufficient contrast. It does not require the affordances exist. An SC requiring consistent affordances such as input outlines could tie together concepts from Visually Clear Controls and Consistent Cues.

- * Clear Instructions and Messages: Mike Gower proposed an overarching SC around clear instructions and messages. This would then use Plain Language, Understandable Language, Chunks, and other language centered SC as techniques.

Getting across user needs and

Make short videos to get user need across