

COGA's feedback on Collaboration Tools Accessibility User Requirements

(Note the review of the responses from RTQF is in section 2)

Current Response from COGA

Here is the latest version of comments. Please let us know if we have missed anything from **Collaboration Tools Accessibility User Requirements (CTAUR)** that you think is very very important! See <https://w3c.github.io/ctaur/> for the latest draft.

General comments

1. We need a glossary or definition of icons and symbols as they mean different things in communication. We are getting confused here!
2. *I found the sentence *"In addition, non-normative guidance of a general nature on improving accessibility for people with cognitive and learning disabilities has been published in [coga-usable]"* a bit negative about our work. Why call it *"of a general nature"* ? Why point out that it is non-normative?
Suggestion: change it to ***"improving accessibility for people with cognitive and learning disabilities is addressed in [coga-usable]."*** (reduced as requested by Janina)
3. I could not find the following items in the document. Did I miss them?
 - a. Language, icons symbols, and the interface patterns should be familiar. We also need to have short clear paths for common tasks. This was covered in our suggestions for Common pitfalls (GitHub issue #59: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/59>).

Common pitfalls

Collaborative tools often have unique interfaces and a lot of essential functions and processes. Users with learning and cognitive disabilities, including age related forgetfulness, may struggle to learn new interfaces and new proprietary design patterns. Reducing the requirement to learn new patterns, and follow complex processes will help more users be able to use your application effectively. This includes:

Coga Suggested User Need 1: As a user with a language, processing, or memory impairment, I need the interface and language used to be clear and easy for me to understand. As a user with short and medium-term memory impairment and impaired executive function <<https://www.w3.org/TR/coga-usable/#dfn-executive-function>>, I need a familiar interface so that I do not need to figure out and remember new interfaces. This may take a few weeks of

repetition and I may not manage to learn it all if I have a condition affecting learning new things, such as dementia.

Coga Suggested REQ (Requirement) 1: Help users understand what things are and how to use them. Use things that are familiar to the user so that they do not have to learn new icons, symbols, terms, or design patterns. People with cognitive and learning disabilities often need common behavior and design patterns. For example, they may know the standard convention for links (underlined and blue for unvisited; purple for visited).. This includes:

- Keep it simple. Keep process and workflow as simple as possible
- Have short critical paths with as few steps as possible, Do not require the user to open multiple tabs, windows or panels to complete a task as remembering and navigating through this content can disorientate the user.
- Use familiar terms, such as save, Help, Copy. Avoid making the user need to learn new terms such as mode or Fork.
- Do not make the user learn new terms or language for editing, such as a markdown, html or other syntax that they may not know. For example, provide an edit button and WYSIWYG (you see is what you get) HTML editor. Familiar icons, such as the help icon, with the word help.
- Use common design patterns when you can. Do not require a new way of thinking just to something simple like create/edit/make available a simply formatted text document
- When new processes are necessary, keep them as familiar to the user as possible. Always allow users to roll back to an older interface. This allows older users to continue being productive.

It was also in Coga suggestion 6 (GitHub issue #49: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/49>) :

Use plain language names for each feature or process. Example: Using words like "fork" do not describe the feature using concrete language related to the task. Use chat instead of IRC .

I could not find this in the document. Is it included?

Was Coga comment 8 (GitHub issue #52: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/52>)?

For collaboration tools that also allow document editing, editing tools/collaboration tools should be available, as well as a view, in a method that is very familiar to both document editors and collaborators.

(The above is paraphrased from the COGA doc "Issues using W3C Tool and Processes")

GitHub issue #44: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/44> and #45: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/45>

Coga Suggested REQ (Requirement 2) Help users correct mistakes. A good design makes errors less likely. When errors occur, the user should find it easy to correct them. Be forgiving. When the user makes a mistake make it easy to roll back, make changes, undo and go back.

GitHub issue #33: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/33> and #34: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/34>

Coga Suggested User Need 3: As a user who finds some web sites hard to use and struggles with finding the right control for what I need to do, I sometimes need in-page and inline support so that I can use the content. However, with an attention impairment any support required needs to be in my control to avoid distractions.

GitHub issue #42: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/42> and #43: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/43>

Coga Suggested REQ (Requirement 3) Provide help. (key details follow in the document at https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CJhBYRI-zk2rl_mohHZ63xAGZxzpDMxhHhXT66bjFBI/edit)

Note: following is about the environment providing support in for form a consistent place to fill this information

GitHub issue #35: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/35> and #36: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/36>

Coga Suggested User Need 4 :As a user with a memory impairment, attention impairment, or executive function <<https://www.w3.org/TR/coga-usable/#dfn-executive-function>> impairment or as a user with a communication disability who uses symbols, I need to know the purpose of the content so that I know if I am in the right place, and what I am doing, even if I lose attention and focus for a time.

Coga Suggested REQ (Requirement 4:Help the author make the topic and connections to other documents is clear. For example provide automated breadcrumbs showing the drive name and the document title.

***Suggestion to add: This can include ***

- Review a summary of current work history on a project
- Allow the user to determine the storage location of the collaboration space.
- Allow search through a page, whole document, a group of documents (such as a project or directory).
- Allow the user to structure the collaboration space.

- Support wayfinding/orientation space within a collaboration tool such as where within the tool they are to complete certain tasks.
 - The names and locations available within the tool used for a specific group.
Example: if there are multiple document libraries within a collaboration space, this makes finding the one related to a project difficult to find.
 - Upcoming important deadlines and tasks should also be available and easily found. This place needs to be:
 - Persistent

Note that this is about the environment providing support in for form a consistent place to fill this information

GitHub issue #33: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/33> and #34: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/34>

Coga Suggested User Need5 :As a user who finds some web sites hard to use and struggles with remembering and following instructions , I sometimes need in-page instructions so that I can do the correct task

Coga Suggested REQ (Requirement 5)Instructions from the author are easy to find. For example, an icon and link to a readme document is always available on the main toolbar.

Note that this is about the environment providing support in for form a consistent place to fill this information

GitHub issue: #37: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/37> #38: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/38> #39: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/39> #40: <https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/40>

User Need X: People with cognitive disabilities need to be able to follow comments , track what they have read and not read and track and replies with becoming overwhelmed with many levels or needing to navigate between the levels can be difficult.

REQ Xa: The structure of comments and conversations are visually Clear. For example, by using icons and different colors to emphasize the different levels of comments.

REQ Xb: There is a consistent, visually and programatically clear way to find and jump though responses that the user has not yet read

REQ Xc: Multi levels can easily be expanded or closed.

REQ Xd: The current draft of wording should be easy to see at the top of a

thread or in the text.

Old feedback summary

Over the last few months, I (David Swallow) have been communicating COGA's feedback on Collaboration Tools Accessibility User Requirements (CTAUR) to the Research Questions Task Force (RQTF) who created the document.

Although RQTF welcomed all feedback, and there has been a lot of discussion, they pushed back on quite a few issues due to them being out of scope. This is typically where:

- COGA's feedback doesn't pertain specifically to collaborative tools, but rather to software in general.
- RQTF felt a particular issue was already covered in CTAUR.
- RQTF felt a particular issue was about a very specific environment and not generalizable enough.
- An issue was explained from the perspective of a person with cognitive disabilities, but the document doesn't explain it from the perspective of any other user group, so it would seem odd to mention them specifically.

Due to the number of issues rejected, it was felt that a meeting between COGA and RQTF would be useful, as this would allow members of COGA who feel strongly about a particular issue to make their case.

Unfortunately, because of how COGA gathered feedback in a Google Doc, some of the comments have become disconnected from the person who created them. So it's difficult to know who might want to attend a meeting. We know John, Jennie, and Lisa gave some of the feedback, but there will be others.

This document attempts to summarize COGA's feedback on CTAUR to RQTF as well as RQTF's response, to allow COGA members to decide on whether they would like to join the COGA-RQTF meeting. The first few issues have 'additional response from COGA' as we managed to discuss these issues.

Please have a look through the document, particularly at the issues that RQTF have rejected, and if you see something that you feel needs further discussion, let us know.

- COGA's original feedback on CTAUR can be found here: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CJhBYRI-zk2rl_mohHZ63xAGZxzpDMxhHhXT66bjFBI/edit?usp=sharing
- The latest version of CTAUR (which may have changed slightly since COGA provided feedback) can be found here: <https://w3c.github.io/ctaur/>

Issue #59 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/59>

Proposed new section on “common pitfalls”.

Response from RQTF

Rejected by RQTF due to much of the content already included throughout the document.

Also they didn't want to replicate the content of another publication in this one.

Additional response from COGA

COGA would like to see evidence of how the proposed content (the bullet points) has already been incorporated into CTAUR. How do these common pitfalls map to the current draft.

COGA wants to stress that the proposed content does not comprise generic suggestions, but rather specific problems that members have encountered in this scope (for example, the bullet point relating to familiar terms stems from difficulties faced when using GitHub).

Issue #58 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/58>

Clarify use of “WYSIWYG”.

Response from RQTF

Rejected by RQTF due to WYSIWYG being well known among the target audience for this document. Also the acronym is explained on first use.

Additional response from COGA

COGA maintains that “WYSIWYG” is a “very old term” and a “meaningless term” that is not familiar to a modern audience.

Further, by suggesting that the term will be understood by CTAUR's target audience, it gives the impression that the target audience only includes people who have been in the industry a long time.

Issue #57 / #56 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/57>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/56>

Clarify scope.

Update the specification with new technologies.

Response from RQTF

Rejected by RQTF due to a feeling that the scope is already pretty well defined, plus a desire not to name specific products.

Additional response from COGA

COGA would like to stress that they were not suggesting that specific tools are named, but rather specific types of tools.

There was a lot of confusion when COGA were reviewing earlier drafts, e.g., is Slack included? Is IRC? What about WhatsApp (if used to collaborate on)? Some members were even unsure whether GitHub was included in the scope of CTAUR. Collaboration functionality and assisted support is really important with a helper.

COGA would like to see a clarification of CTAUR's scope that clearly states what type of tools are / are not included. Currently the only example provided upfront is "cloud-based office application suites", but these days "everything is a collaborative tool".

Issue #55 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/55>

Rephrase to use plural.

Response from RQTF

Accepted and closed.

Issue #54 - REQUIRES CLARIFICATION

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/54>

Add example to cognitive demands paragraph.

Response from RQTF

Want to accept this, but don't really understand the example.

Right-click isn't used exclusively for spelling.

Want COGA to propose a clearer example.

Issue #53 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/53>

Add recommendation to follow Making Content Usable.

Response from RQTF

Can link to Content Usable but can't include it as normative requirement.

Accepted and closed.

Issue #52 - REQUIRES CLARIFICATION

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/52>

Add sentence on document editing tools.

After the last paragraph of '1.2 Distinctive features of collaboration tools', add the sentence:

For collaboration tools that also allow document editing, editing tools/collaboration tools should be available, as well as a view, in a method that is very familiar to both document editors and collaborators.

Response from RQTF

Not understood, needs clarification. Does it relate to desktop behavior?

Want COGA to indicate what issue this is trying to avoid so they can figure out a pattern to match it.

Issue #51 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/51>

Add sentence on permissions.

In '1.2 Distinctive features of collaboration tools', add the following section after the Suggested changes section:

Permissions

Make it easy to know who has access in a collaborative space to read, edit/suggest, approve, delete, archive.

Response from RQTF

Accepted. But some want to add it as a specific requirement, with more detail, so it won't be overlooked.

Will take up an access control section and then enumerate something in this intro list.

Issue #50 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/50>

Add sentence about reviewing history.

In '1.2 Distinctive features of collaboration tools', under 'Comparing revisions', and after "... for purposes of comparison." add the following:

The ability to review history easily can be especially important for people who need to remember how something happened or changed.

Response from RQTF

Rejected as doesn't belong here.

Explanations don't belong in scoping section.

Also, there's a feeling that if you add explanations for one user group, you'd have to add them for others, which isn't the approach taken in existing specifications.

Issue #49 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/49>

Add plain language names example

This suggestion was inserted into the second paragraph of '1.2 Distinctive features of collaboration tools', after "... manifest in the user interface of the tool." and before "From this perspective ..."

Use plain language names for each feature or process. Example: Using words like "fork" do not describe the feature using concrete language related to the task. Use chat instead of IRC.

Response from RQTF

Rejected. Definitely not the right place.

Plain language for whom? Don't want to prescribe terminology when there's different audiences.

If you don't use the expected term, the meaning might be lost.

People might be expecting a particular term.

Not our role to dictate terminology.

With regard to "Use chat instead of IRC", what about when you have Zoom Chat AND IRC?
Could cause even more confusion.

Issue #48 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/48>

Add example to 'What are collaboration tools?'

Add the following bullet point under '1.1 What are collaboration tools?':

- Connections to other tools within a related set from the same company. Example: if a document collaboration tool has features that integrate with the same collaboration tool maker's email programs, project management tools, etc.

Response from RQTF

Rejected. RQTF didn't feel the need for this one.

RQTF feel it's addressed in the existing section on Notifications and Messages.

Issue #47 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/47>

Add a Glossary.

Response from RQTF

Accepted. RQTF agree and were surprised there wasn't one.

Issue #46 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/46>

Restructure the document to make it easier to follow

Coga has found this document difficult to follow. We suggest the following restructure:

*Put sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 under a new section called "User needs and requirements".
The structure would now look like:*

- 1. Introduction*
 - 1.1 What are collaboration tools?*
 - 1.2 Distinctive features of collaboration tools*
 - 1.3 Collaboration tools and accessibility*
- 2. User need definition*
- 3. User needs and requirements*
 - 3.1 User needs for Real-Time co-editing*
 - 3.2 User needs for Annotations*
 - 3.3 User needs for Version control features*
 - 3.4 User needs for Notifications and Messages*

Response from RQTF

Rejected. RQTF felt the proposed restructuring would not be consistent with other documents. They were also unsure how it would make the document more readable.

The feeling was "Why and how does that help?"

Also "easy to read" should be intended for the right audience - tool creators etc.

Issue #45 & #44 - ACCEPTED WITH CAVEATS

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/45>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/44>

The suggested location for this one was before “3. Real-Time co-editing” but it was part of the proposed section on “Common Pitfalls”, which was rejected by RQTF. So, it’s without a real home in the document structure. The suggestion is:

User Need X: *As a user who has difficulty with organization (executive function), typing, and putting letters and numbers in the right order, I want an interface that stops me from making mistakes, and helps me complete tasks successfully.*

REQ X: *Help users correct mistakes. A good design makes errors less likely. When errors occur, the user should find it easy to correct them. Be forgiving. When the user makes a mistake make it easy to roll back, make changes, undo and go back.*

Response from RQTF

Accepted with caveats.

Some concern about whether this applies specifically to collaborative tools.

Some felt that it sounds like a version control matter (which is addressed).

Others felt it's addressed in the section on standard commands.

RQTF will review an existing pull request with this User Need in mind and incorporate it that way.

Issue #43 & #42 - ACCEPTED WITH CAVEATS

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/42>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/43>

As with the previous suggestion, the suggested location for this one was part of the proposed section on “Common Pitfalls”. So it’s also without a real home in the document structure. The suggestion is:

User Need X: *As a user who finds some web sites hard to use and struggles with finding the right control for what I need to do, I sometimes need in-page and inline support so that I can use the content. However, with an attention impairment any support required needs to be in my control to avoid distractions.*

REQ X: *Provide help. This includes:*

- *All functions and tasks have good instructions in easy to understand language*
- *Instructions are complete, and do not miss out steps*
- *Images are used so I can clearly see what to do*
- *Instructions are easy to find for every step where it may be needed*
- *Provide instructions for screen reader users*
- *Enable document search, though comments, annotations, collapsed sections, etc. Document the search capabilities, features, and limits. Support conditional search such as regex and provided clear instruction on how to improve search results. Allow for searching through a drive or multiple documents. When possible, divide search with heading to make it easier to find the relevant results.*
- *Provide a glossary for new terms that is available from every step that it may be needed.*

Response from RQTF

Accepted with caveats.

Some concern about whether this applies specifically to collaborative tools.

Good points, tackled nicely in Content Usable, but don't belong in this document.

Possibly something to say about this in the Document Editing section.

Some sort of configuration option to lock a section of a document to avoid unwanted distraction.

Issue #41 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/41>

Suggestion is to add the following text to the end of the existing REQ 3, which refers to suppression of status messages.

People with cognitive disabilities and attention-related impairments can also lose their train of thought and orientation due to interruptions from messages, notifications and other similar noises and distractions.

Response from RQTF

Rejected.

RQTF feel that is already covered and don't see the need for the additional detail.

It's actually covered in the existing User Need 5.

Also there is a need to be consistent with other documents.

RQTF don't see the need to explain it in detail, pointing out this is not an accessibility foundations course.

Issue #35 & #36 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/35>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/36>

The suggested location for this one is after the existing REQ 5 at the end of "3. Real-Time co-editing".

User Need X: *As a user with a memory impairment, attention impairment, or executive function impairment or as a user with a communication disability who uses symbols, I need to know the purpose of the content so that I know if I am in the right place, and what I am doing, even if I lose attention and focus for a time.*

REQ X: *Help the author make the topic and connections to other documents is clear. For example, provide automated breadcrumbs showing the drive name and the document title.*

Response from RQTF

Rejected.

RQTF feel this is general editing advice.

It applies generically to everything, it's not specific to collaboration. That's not what we're looking for.

Issue #33 & #34 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/33>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/34>

Again, the suggested location for this one is after the existing REQ 5 at the end of “3. Real-Time co-editing”.

User Need X: *As a user who finds some web sites hard to use and struggles with remembering and following instructions, I sometimes need in-page instructions so that I can do the correct task.*

REQ X: *Instructions from the author are easy to find. For example, an icon and link to a readme document is always available on the main toolbar.*

Response from RQTF

Rejected.

Same problem as the others - it's a general software usability guidance, nothing collaborative.

RQTF felt it was a good general principle, but not particular to collaboration.

Issue #12, #13, #14, & #15 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/12>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/13>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/14>

Again, the suggested location for this one is after the existing REQ 5 at the end of “3. Real-Time co-editing”.

These issues have already been discussed by Jason and Scott on GitHub. It looks like the outcome was a mixture of needs clarification or needs to be more specific.

User Need X: *As a user with a cognitive or learning disability and who likes to browse on the Web, I need the structure to make sense to me, so that I find what I am looking for, without looking in the wrong place.*

REQ Xa: *Allow the user to determine the storage location of the collaboration space.*

REQ Xb: *Allow search through a page, whole document, a group of documents (such as a project or directory).*

REQ Xc: *Allow the user to structure the collaboration space.*

Response from RQTF

Rejected.

Same problem as the others - it's a general software usability guidance, nothing collaborative.

RQTF felt it was a good general principle, but not particular to collaboration.

Issue #37, #38, #39, #40 - REQUIRES CLARIFICATION

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/37>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/38>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/39>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/40>

The suggested location for this one is after the existing REQ 9 at the end of “4. Annotations”.

User Need X: *People with cognitive disabilities need to be able to follow comments and replies without becoming overwhelmed with many levels or needing to navigate between the levels can be difficult.*

REQ Xa: *The structure of comments and conversations are visually Clear. For example, by using icons and different colors to emphasize the different levels of comments.*

REQ Xb: *Multi levels can easily be expanded or closed.*

REQ Xc: *The current draft of wording should be easy to see at the top of a thread or in the text.*

Response from RQTF

Accepted, with some clarifications. Accepted as necessary, all good examples, but concerns about the applicability of this to all collaborative spaces.

Going to find appropriate examples for these.

Issue #16, #17 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/16>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/17>

The suggested location for this one is after the existing REQ 12 at the end of “5.2 Presenting Differences Between Revisions”.

User Need X: *As a slow reader I need short summary for long pieces of content or an option for an easy to understand language version.*

REQ X: *Provide summaries of changes. Examples: list of comments and revisions they made (for use in meetings, for example). Also, items marked resolved: these can be difficult to track, understand how/why they were resolved.*

Response from RQTF

Rejected. Considered out of scope.

This applies in a text environment (perhaps) but how would you do it for something graphical?

RQTF was not very optimistic about being able to do this automatically (e.g. with AI).

Could include a changelog/commit history requirement? (as you do in Git).

Could suggest supporting it where it makes sense.

Could suggest a mechanism (to summarize changes) but can't force people to do it.

Issue #18, #19, #20, 21 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/18>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/19>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/20>

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/21>

The suggested location for this one is after the existing REQ 14C at the end of “6. Notifications and Messages”.

User Need X: *As a user with an executive function impairment who struggles with too much content, I need support to focus on the key content.*

REQ Xa: *I need ability to mark for myself which items need you to follow up on. Notifications sometimes get marked "read" but do not have a way for you to remember to come back to them. You may need to review them multiple times to be sure you understand, and to complete the task. Further allow Users a view of just the items they need to follow up on, both from notifications, and any additional they identify.*

REQ Xb: *Provide a mode of operation for a separate viewing mechanism. Example: different window. This can better support readability, and maintain focus in the main document.*

REQ Xc: *Ensure that users can choose how the notifications are delivered, such as through personalization and extensions.*

Response from RQTF

Rejected. But open to further discussion.

RQTF was unclear what “notifications” are intended here. Comments and suggested changes in a document are not presented as notifications.

RQTF was unsure what the requirement should be. This seems to be more about issue tracking. Does it require anything beyond what issue tracking tools already tend to provide?

Regarding the User Need, some felt it was already covered for multiple users. People with executive function trouble are not the only ones that need that.

It may be useful but it's getting into software design. Again, what is the meaning of "notification"?

If we put in more explanation support for a specific disability, we'd have to put that in for all disabilities. It's consistent with other documents, don't want to do something new here.

Would like to figure out how to perhaps include the REQs, with Lisa or other members of COGA contributing.

Issue #22 - REJECTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/22>

Add section about needing a wayfinding/orientation space within a collaboration tool

This helps users:

- *Know where within the tool they are to complete certain tasks.*
- *The names and locations available within the tool used for a specific group. Example: if there are multiple document libraries within a collaboration space, this makes finding the one related to a project difficult to find.*
- *Review a summary of current work history on a project*

- *Upcoming important deadlines and tasks should also be available and easily found. This place needs to be:*
- *Persistent*
- *“One source of truth”*

This has already been discussed. Jason felt it wasn't clear how to describe the desired functionality in more concrete and specific terms. Suggested treating each of the bullet points as separate requirements/issues. Some refer to the UI, others to the content.

Response from RQTF

Rejected. General requirement, not specific to collaborative tools.

Considered more project management. A "you are here" might be a good idea. Not clear it applies to all tools... e.g. how would a Word processor do this as it doesn't have PM facilities...

Seems very general, already covered in WCAG SC, so doesn't need to be singled out here?

Out of scope, unless there's something specific we should be mentioning.

CTAUR is focusing on collaborative features, not EVERY feature. So this one is too general, out of scope.

Issue #23 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/23>

Add section about improving participation of all members. Examples include:

- *Identify when group members are not participating in conversations and decisions.*
 - *They may not be able to use one or more of the methods.*
 - *They may not know the conversations and decision making opportunities are taking place.*
 - *Silence is not necessarily an indicator of agreement.*

Response from RQTF

Partially accepted.

RQTF considered this to be social usage advice rather than software advice. So it falls out of scope.

Wonderful to have a mindful facilitator. Could say something general about "know your participants". But that's about it.

Will add a section to acknowledge this. Reminds people that having well-designed software is not enough.

Issue #24 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/24>

This is a general comment that covers various things – some of which have been covered.

I went through it... overall I'm unsure about the definition of collaboration tools frankly.

I think a call may be good.

I'd just add:

- *Microsoft Office 365,*
- *Google Workspace now to the list.*

We are really talking about the collaborative functionality of these content creation tools (For Documents, Presentations, spreadsheets, designs etc.)

However, it seems to me the definition a "collaboration tool" these days is more like Miro, Trello, Slack, Jira, Asana, Canva. ... do we want to go there?

But maybe not. ... I think the wording should be changed to collaboration functionality rather than 'collaboration tools'?

Should we also note...

something of the importance of these tools as giving access and accommodations to people with cognitive disabilities. Gives the "a seat at the table".

Real time collaboration *functionality is maybe one of the most powerful tools for cognitive accessibility. Helping someone in real-time finding their place, tracking information, giving real time understanding. Real time editing can serve functional cognitive assistance can be under the guise of 'collaboration'. Think about screen*

sharing with a family member to help them complete a process? Or enabling someone in vocational capacity that needs assistance for access.

Response from RQTF

Accepted.

All good advice and will be considered in the revision of CTAUR's scope.

Feeling that a lot of this has either been discussed or is already in the document.

Not sure about changing the title to "collaboration functionality", but better definitions make sense. Will stay with tools but acknowledge the functionality. Acknowledge social aspects but note that they can't be fully subsumed by tooling.

It is valuable to emphasize the positive potential to enable people with various accessibility requirements to contribute collaboratively.

Issue #25 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/25>

I'm curious how screen reader users feel about having to use a new tool instead of the screen readers they are used to using? Instead of using their normal action keys, they have to use different ones when using a specific collaborative tool?

I'd like to see something in that document that talks about allowing users to use the options/tools/functions they are used to and not have to relearn something new. It's talked about a bit in there but I feel it's missing something.

If I want to read / comprehend a Google Docs, I have to download it to a Word document, which Google allows you to do, then open it up in Word to read with my tool. Which breaks the collaboration part because I can no longer follow what people are adding in real time.

Although what Jennie and I found out when working on the sub group, was that we could put a Word doc on Google Drive and open it in the browser or in Word directly if you have Google Drive synced on your operating system. You still lose some of the collaboration options but still better than download and upload versions like we did in the 2000s.

Something I'd like to see in the future is interoperability between editing tools. Content is content and the tool is just the user interface. I can see this maybe happening with markdown, but I think we are far from that.

Response from RQTF

Accepted.

RQTF consider this to be already addressed in the document, but are willing to expand upon it.

Issue #26 - ACCEPTED

<https://github.com/w3c/ctaur/issues/26>

We had great difficulty following threads in comments and mentally following were these multiple discussions ended and what the conclusion was, as well as the overall status of the document.

This could lead to a requirement of allowing wrap features on any text and expanding any section of the screen so that full text is visible.

Response from RQTF

Accepted.

RQTF feel that they've already said something on this, but maybe not enough?

Will review and make fine tuning.

Some overlap with work going on in ADAPT was noted.