

Please put your comments and / or vote Under the URL
(please add your name)

Comments must be dated!!!

1 .Safety **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/safety.html>

Submitted draft

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (maryjo was after consensus of 24th of Oct but will try and address were we can) *****Mary Jo*** I had logged my comments on this SC on 24 Oct by 5:00 PM CDT, so I don't know how you reached "consensus" prior to the end date for the review. Lisa: OK, I had looked at a previous version and did not see them , but anyway i addressed them.**

Lisa: +1 (will add definition of harm)

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-10-23.)

Thaddeus +1

Mike:+1

Lisa: let us add some examples and add the word "non typical" and define non - typical. And resend to the list, with 48 hour for approval

Mary Jo: I have the following comments:

- I find this SC a bit difficult, especially when the term "harm" is used - as I don't know what "harm" we are trying to avoid - physical harm, emotional harm, financial harm, etc. I think it has more to do with the web content not doing something without getting user consent (or a user action) than actual safety. I imagine that someone who really intends to cheat or physically harm a user won't be following guidelines or standards in the first place, so I'd like to carve out where well-intentioned content can still cause users with cognitive disabilities difficulty - maybe without realizing it...and define that in this SC.

Some examples for techniques:

- Not automatically selecting quantities more than one without a user action to do so
- Do not share personal information without user consent
- Don't show products of other brands unless asked for
- Setting up bill payments that are easy to understand (like set up recurring payments vs. one-time payments - don't hide the options and don't reset the options if you get an additional account - show similar payment options to what they have on other accounts and ask the user if that's OK).

- Make it as easy to unsubscribe for something as it was to subscribe. I've seen many subscriptions that are very difficult to stop - they require a telephone call, contact information is well hidden, etc.
- I have the following comments on the testability section:
 - The types of "harm" are not well defined as to what you are testing for and how you know you meet this requirement. Lisa: harm has been defined now
 - I'm assuming that since you say "sufficient techniques are used to protect users" you mean the techniques listed in the sufficient techniques section. If so, I think it needs to be clearly stated as such.
 - Procedure step # 3: I think when you are testing for conformance, you are testing and claiming per web page and not a web site (per WCAG conformance claim definition).
- Technique titles should be stated in a similar way to other WCAG techniques. I have some proposed restatements of the techniques and failures listed below:
 - Avoiding automatic changes or selections that can result in unwanted financial charges or subscriptions.
 - Marking advertisements and paid articles to indicate it is third-party content not generated by the web site
 - Notifying the user before leaving the site or task where it may cause unwanted consequences. Note, an example for a health care site, when looking for one drug, and an advertisement takes the user to a different drug.
 - Indicating when a site contains or offers sexual content, or is intended for chats of a sexual nature
 - Failure of Success Criterion 2.3.x (@@ change 'x' to the SC number once known) for adding automatically-incrementing numbers of selected items without warning
 - Failure of Success Criterion 2.3.x (@@ change 'x' to the SC number once known) for not clearly identifying sexually explicit content on a web site
 - Failure of Success Criterion 2.3.x (@@ change 'x' to the SC number once known) for not explaining potential scams that could be accessed using third party content appearing on the web site

Lisa: check the merge from the last version and then send to john

E.A. really liked Mary Jo's comments about explaining harm + 1 ('Another example may be:
I am presuming another example is in the update - I could not think of one at the time)

Lisa: changes are in from 15/11

2. Direct feedback **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/rapid-and-direct-feedback.html>

Lisa: +1

Kurt: +1

Thaddeus +1

Mike: +1

John R.: + 1 conditional upon copyediting and addressing Mary Jo's comments (note comments were after the consensus period)

E.A.+1 agree with John and also check this statement and possibly change

John R.: I copyedited this on 2016-11-14.

“ understand that their action occurred (e.g. the click did something),” possibly should be “E.A. understand that their action **occurred** (e.g. the **selection** did something),

Mary Jo: I have the following comments:

- Short name has ‘and direct’ but nowhere else in the SC is this used, so I’m not sure what that means. Suggest that is removed. Lisa: agreed
- In the SC description, ‘primary modalities of the content’ needs to be linked to the definition. Lisa: agreed
- In the SC description, ‘Audio feedback should be a user selectable option.’ should not be in the requirement part, but in a suggested advisory technique. The reason being is the use of “should” makes it not a requirement and the SC needs to be limited to the requirement alone. To my knowledge none of the other SC has a “should” statement in the requirement. Lisa: must, not should. But add that it is supported by semantics via the testability. If not supported that part sc can be removed at cr
- The links for the definitions are going to the Cognitive and Learning Disabilities and WCAG document - not to the definitions in this SC which have different verbiage. Lisa: will remove the link
- “Primary modalities of the content” needs to link to the definition on this page.
- The glossary definition of ‘clearly indicated success or failure’ is not the term as it is stated in the SC verbiage, as ‘clearly indicated’ is separate from ‘success or failure’. Also, what is meant by using ‘Post’ as in ‘post user action’? Does it mean ‘after’ the user action, or ‘provide a message or other indication’?
- **Rapid feedback definition says ‘The next activity or event affecting the application’ but that isn’t clear to me. Does this mean the next visual change made in the application, which is done in response to a user action? Feedback could be something as simple as an animation showing a button was pushed or a checkbox is checked/unchecked, or as overt as a message of success or failure due to a**

form submission that the user would have to dismiss before doing something else. Perhaps some examples would be helpful. - not fully addressed

- Audio feedback definition: Typo - first sentence 'then' should be 'than'. In addition, does the alternate modality have to be audio? It could be haptic along with the visual or some combination with user-settable preferences. Lisa: see small change is SC text
- Definition of primary modalities of the content: I don't think the term "modalities" is obvious and the definition contains that term instead of an explanation. In addition, defining it as modalities of design and test phases doesn't make sense to me. I would think it is the design alone that defines what modalities to use for feedback. It would then be carried out in development and then tested to ensure it works - but testing in a modality? **Change made**
- Description - Do you really mean 'continuously' or really mean 'consistently'. The second bullet of the examples, the state being programmatically determinable is already part of the WCAG requirements - See Role, State, Value. So I don't think we should include that in this as well - keep the criteria distinct from each other. However, is there some need to talk about causing an event to occur (e.g. using aria-live)? Lisa will remove that word
- Benefits: I have some small edits that I can send in a Word document, if that's helpful - too hard to put those things in here. There's a couple of misspellings - 'occurred' in the first bullet and the following paragraph, 'inadvertently' in the paragraph after the bullets.
- Testability procedure and techniques - I have some suggested edits here too that are easier to show in a Word document with change markings turned on.
- Techniques - There are lots of states that could be coded up in ARIA. Aria-selected, aria-checked, aria-posinset, aria-valuenow, aria-expanded, etc. So maybe a more generic technique is best: Setting WAI-ARIA states to indicate the effect of a user action.

Lisa: comments addressed were I knew what to do 15/11

3. Authentication **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/accessible-authentication.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (maryjo was after consensus of 24th of Oct but will try and address were we can)

Lisa: +1

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-10-16.)

Thaddeus +1

Mike: +1

Kurt: +1

E.A. I have read it and all of Mary Jo's comments and also agree with some of the concerns such as benefit re: doc appt. - more likely to leave the page and fail to use the service.

Mary Jo: I have the following comments:

- Delete duplicate text 'User Authentication Methods' after the heading. **Lisa**-this is how SC's are written
- In reading the requirement it seems that the 'simple page' might be an exception to this SC. Is it? :**Lisa**- I do not understand this comment
- The requirement, as stated seems to repeat itself a bit in the information given for the primary authentication method and the alternative needed. The only differences is that the alternative is more descriptive in what cannot be done. This confuses me, as the primary and alternative user authentication seem to both require the same non-use of those things. I am also unsure of when the exception can come into play. Can it be considered essential if security is extremely important to prevent fraud or unwanted access to financial or private information? **Lisa** - this was discussed for weeks on the call, please review minutes
- At what point is something considered "memorized" Is it considered to be using memory if an authentication code is given to the user and the user has to type it in correctly to authenticate? It just seems there are so many things you can't do that it is difficult to understand what you CAN do.. **Lisa** - typing it correctly is something that many people can not do. See the success techniques for ideas on what you can do
- 2nd bullet: I have some suggested edits, but not sure if it changes the meaning of your intent: "perform calculations, such as correctly identifying and entering **only** numbers **or** letters from a **mixed** character string" **lisa**- it changes it
- Definitions: "Simple web page" - the term isn't named here first, then the definition provided. Also, this definition of a simple web page seems to fit the description of a login screen where it is only a message with a couple of simple inputs and a submit button. But that is what we are trying to cover here - authentication. - **lisa**- the idea is to describe what skills can be expected
- It's debatable as to whether this SC belongs in "Operable" or in "Understandable", as this requires both things and seems to be more aligned with Understandable's principle 3.3 Help users avoid and correct mistakes. You're helping them to avoid authentication errors. If it remains in "Operable" then what Guideline would it fall under, as it seems it doesn't belong in any of the existing ones. **Lisa**- WCAG chairs have said that is OK **Mary Jo: So which of Operable's guidelines will it fall under? That isn't stated in this SC; or will there be a new guideline added for it? Lisa : We can give both suggestions. The whole stucture might be redone so we can let wcag deside this type of thing**
- Should there be a definition of 'user authentication method'? **Lisa** - we only need definitions if things are unclear.
- I have some edits to the Description that are better communicated through markup in a Word document. In addition, the last paragraph is confusing to me. It mentions an alternative SC, but I think it really is talking about the alternative user authentication method. In any case, that paragraph isn't clear to me.
- Prefer that 'SC' is spelled out as 'success criterion'. **Lisa**- ok, but note this was on the WCAG template

- Benefits: I think it's a stretch to claim the inability to make doctors' appointments is partly responsible for lower life expectancy in people with cognitive disabilities. We should only say that if studies have shown this to be true. **Lisa-** We have them. There were mncap studies that implied this
- The issue paper actually is clearer in its identification of authentication methods that would be helpful instead of focusing on what can't be done. This is the difficulty I am having with understanding this SC and what a web designer of user authentication would understand they need to do to meet this requirement. **Lisa-** they can look at the techniques
- I find the testability difficult to understand as well, as it requires knowledge of all of the development techniques (which WCAG always has the disclaimer "Note: Other techniques may also be sufficient if they meet the success criterion.") So how do you really know you've avoided the pitfalls and successfully pass the SC since this is purely judgement as to how much cognitive capability it takes to authenticate?
- Techniques. There should be a link to the web authentications specification in here. I don't quite understand the last part of the last item "the total number of a current account balance". I think people that are knowledgeable in security would cringe at the thought of a link in an email allowing someone to gain full access to an account. If your email account got hacked, someone could have full access to that account linked from your email. Same with texts. My Mac has a iMessage app that gets my phone texts, so linking from there could be accessed by malware. **-lisa** - that would be for simple not very secure things, such as allowing you to comment on a blog, but is easy to implement. Also note we just need to provide titles for techniques. Clarified this in the SC

4. Chunks **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coqa/master/extension/chunks.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (maryjo was after consensus of 24th of Oct but will try and address were we can)

Lisa: +1

Thaddeus +1

Mike: +1

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-14.)

Note this has been updated
from today's call
(also in wg notes section)

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (maryjo was after consensus of 24th of Oct but will try and address were we can)

Kurt: +1 (with editorial change) The 2 sentences preceding the last sentence in the Testability > For audio or visual media section appear to need punctuation/format and wording changes.

Current: This is testable by timing/identifying the gap between programmatically determinable and logical; and navigation to chunks that have unique descriptive labels. If a gap is over 6 minutes, it does not conform.

Suggested: This is testable by:

- Timing each segment
- Identifying programmatically determinable gaps
- Identifying logical order gaps
- Navigation to segments
- Confirming segments have unique descriptive labels

If a media segment is over 6 minutes, it does not conform

Lisa: done with small changes.

E.A. having been involved with this SC and knowing I was concerned about it all, I am wondering if this should be withdrawn until it is checked again. I will quite understand if this is the case. **Lisa: Is this the white space issue? If so it is resolved**

EA 23/11/2016 - Thank you. +1

Mary Jo: (review in progress)

- Where does the recommendation of one conjunction and two commas originate from? I can think of plenty of simple sentences that involve more than two commas, and/or more than one conjunction. For example, many of the WCAG 2.0 success criteria wouldn't pass this requirement, and this particular SC draft would also fail this requirement. **LISA:** because wcag have insisted that we do not use bullets
- Media requirements all say "should" which means this is a recommendation, not a requirements. Is that intentional? **Lisa:** change made
- I'm not a media expert, but how would one provide programmatically determinable order in media, and what would be considered a "logical" order for media?
- It appears the Exceptions only apply to text, not media which brings to mind a question: Would it be better if this SC was split into two - one for audio or visual media, one for text content? Then each SC could be written more in the style of current WCAG criteria. **:Lisa** I made the exceptions more general . wcag can split it into two if they want - not an issue we need to resolve.
- Glossary term should be "manageable blocks", as that is how it is used in the SC text above, with the definition describing what that means: small sections or pieces of informational content. **Lisa:** disagree, it is about chunking. Will add this as an example however.
- Glossary term 'important information' is already used in WCAG without a definition, and if we provide this definition it doesn't seem to fit the other use in WCAG. In addition, it seems that #1 part of this definition is a description of instructions, as that would be the

only thing that might contain a lot of text information a user might need to complete an action or task. Labels on a form wouldn't fit this description, for example. #2 part of the definition, what kinds of "opportunities" are we talking about? I think that needs some elaboration.

- The first bullet under "Splitting information into manageable blocks assists:" has a second sentence that is incomplete (a fragment) that I don't quite know what to suggest to fix. Is it trying to say that over half of people over 60 have a mild cognitive impairment? **Lisa**; yes. clarified
- I'm not sure how these research-based facts relate to the listed points being made under "Splitting information into manageable blocks assists:" For example, has research shown that working memory and retention of content is increased, but the research information given is on how long people spend looking at web pages which doesn't seem to prove this benefit bullet point. Same with the attention span research - does it show that chunking information increases that average attention span?
- Testability:
 - The tests will need to have a procedure and pass/fail criteria outlined. See the techniques in WCAG for examples. **Lisa**: no - it is just to give an idea to the group that it is potentially testable. This is not how it goes into the WD **Mary Jo**: **Other criteria have procedures and pass/fail criteria described in their proposal but this SC doesn't.**
 - It is difficult to test the single point per paragraph and single ideas in a sentence without manual analysis of the content, which is very time consuming on large websites. **Lisa**: OK, hopefully tools will automate this. If not it will be time consuming.

Mike [21st November]: In re-reviewing comments **and how they were handled** I noticed two things:

- In previous drafting of the wording a main bullet was called "a single **point** per paragraph" but, in the call where we dealt with this I proposed the word "**topic**" instead of "point" and, as recorded in the 13th October minutes someone on the call found the concept of a "topic sentence" to reinforce the link with the use of "topic". We incorporated the concept of "topic sentence" in the tests. I'd be happier with "**a single topic per paragraph**" but if the consensus is that point is best I do not worry too much.
- I agree with Mary Jo's concern about "one conjunction and two commas" - and no changes were made to address this concern. I think that this condition was added to allow some numerical testing, but I've never heard of such a rule before and I really think that we should remove it - leaving that part of the requirement as:
 - "sentences only contain one idea.. Exception: Where *usability testing* has found a longer sentence to be clearer or easier to understand." - I've re-written the first part to remove the "must"
 - The only thing that can be tested is whether there is more than one idea in each sentence. This should be relatively easy to test and will avoid the possibility that those testing may have insufficient understanding of grammar to identify a conjunction.

- Lisa: automatic parsing of sentences becomes completely ambiguous after this point . hence simplification etc will not work as well. Assum if it can not be parsed by matchien humens will confiuce it.
- Lisa: also it is mesurable

5. Task-completion **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/task-completion.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (maryjo was after consensus of 24th of Oct but will try and address were we can)

Lisa: +1

Mike: +1

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-14.)

Thaddeus +1 for content. Grammar below:

- Second paragraph “**relationships for the the a clear**” - typo
- Benefits first paragraph - “services that (are)often critical” - add “are”
- get there water - “their”
- Second paragraph ends with ellipsis “access to a doctor,”

(lisa: thanks will add)

E.A. +1 with changes mentioned by others... This one also has the “*This may be partly responsible for the reduced life expectancy of people with learning and cognitive disabilities.*” I have to agree with Mary Jo that although this really could be true, I am not sure where I could find the research to back the statement. **Lisa:** mencap , will add sources

E.A. 23/11/2016 health services failing for those with learning disabilities - Mencap

<https://www.mencap.org.uk/sites/default/files/2016-08/2016.126%20Health%20vision%20vision%20statement.pdf>

Kurt: +1 (with editorial changes) SC Text section, sentence following **Task completion:** I believe is missing the meaning changing word “not”. **Lisa:** Done

“Successfully completing tasks does (not) rely on users memorizing information presented in the current, or previous, user-interaction dialog steps.”

Testability section, sentence following **Test option 1:** I believe is a copy/paste error as it speaks to user authentication methods, a topic/task not mentioned anywhere else in this SC. Lisa: done

“Check if one of the user authentication methods offered conforms to the sufficient techniques”

Perhaps the words “user authentication” should be replaced with “task completion”.

Techniques section, Method 1 bullet, sub-bullet number 2

Current: the option and described before a number is associated with it and

Suggested: each option is described before a number is associated with it and

Techniques section, Method 3 bullet, second sub-bullet should have the first instance of “to” deleted

Techniques section, Advisory technique bullet should have the second instance of “something” deleted **Lisa:** done

6. User-information **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/user-information.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (maryjo was after consensus of 24th of Oct but will try and address were we can)

Lisa: +1

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-14.)

Thaddeus: +1 for general content - Do you think it would be beneficial to add links to secure coding standards and testing from OSWAP that reference client-side vulnerabilities? A few examples are below:

https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Client_Side_Testing

[https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Cross-site_Scripting_\(XSS\)](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Cross-site_Scripting_(XSS))

https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Transport_Layer_Protection_Cheat_Sheet#Rule_-_Keep_Sensitive_Data_Out_of_the_URL

(lisa: will review and probably add them)

Mike: +1 Comment: “I’m bothered by the statement “Don’t store user personal information that could be used to harm a user.” Whereas some personal information may not be directly harmful in isolation, most personal information can contribute to user harm if someone aggregates different information gathered from multiple sites.

Lisa: will add Don’t store user personal information that could be used to harm a user, without being very careful to minimise any risk to the user.” now addressed.

E.A. +1 I am also struggling with the way we are using the word ‘harm’ across several SCs and how we define it in these different situations so that a developer understands its meaning and how the harm can be tested? Lisa: Added definition from safety sc

Kurt: Object Comments: The SC text language is ambiguous and unnecessarily broad. The phrase “keep the user information safe” may mean ‘don’t lose it’ or it may mean ‘protect it from unintended sharing’ or it may mean ‘protect it from unknowingly being changed or altered’. Perhaps “safe” needs to be defined. Additionally, requiring users to be warned about “any known risk” with respect to their information is perhaps asking too much. There are many types of risk. The disclosure would need to include language covering

any which are known to be possible such as unauthorized alteration, loss or theft of information. The only word defining “information” in this SC text is “user” which means any information submitted by a user would be subjected to the warning requirement. I propose replacing the existing SC text with

Use known techniques to keep personally identifiable user information protected from unauthorized access and warn the user about any known atypical risks associated with providing this type of information.

Suggested definitions for “personally identifiable user information” and “atypical risks”:

Atypical risks are risks outside of those commonly known to exist.

Personally identifiable user information is information that may by itself or in conjunction with other information be used to discover the identity of, locate, or contact a specific person.

The first sentence under Description and Benefits is “Don’t store user personal information that could be used to harm a user.”

This would cause the demise of a considerable amount of online functionality enjoyed by millions worldwide. Data like a home or work address, phone number, age, race, sex, sexual orientation, health care appointments and information, credit card information, income, taxes, political affiliation, identification numbers (driver’s license, social security number in the US, government issued ID), etc. must be stored to provide online access to goods and services. An address or phone number alone can be used for nefarious purposes as recently demonstrated when a woman spoke up about being sexually assaulted by a political candidate in the US. I propose removing this sentence.

Lisa: change to sensitive user information that can be used to identify the user or identify that user may have a disability.

7. Clear-structure-and-relationships **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/clear-structure-and-relationships.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed

Lisa: +1

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-14.)

Thaddeus +1 for content - Question - I see a change in the template format. Description and Benefits are in one heading and there is a “Who it Helps Section” should be follow this format or the older or does it not matter. Lisa : I think that is Ok

Kurt: +1 (with editorial changes) Testability section, Part 2, bullet 2

Current: Are they separated using a know technique OR are unambiguous via user testing in user testing of at least 5 users (in the primary modality of the content) ?

Suggested: Are they separated using a known technique OR are unambiguous via user testing (user testing of at least 5 users in the primary modality of the content)?**Lisa:** changed

8. Clear text **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/clear-text-and-voice.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period will be addressed

Lisa: +1

Kurt: +1 (with editorial changes) SC Text

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-19.)

Current: Provide clear typography (text), punctuation (text and numbers) and voice (speech) for readability and comprehension.

Suggested: Provide clear typography (text and numbers), punctuation, and voice (speech) for readability and comprehension. **Lisa:** done

Also in the SC Text section, consider adding “or content” to the end of the exception (example, citing a portion of a law or regulation which contains lower case roman numerals). An exception for logos should also be considered. **Lisa:** CHanged to just essential which should include logos

Related Glossary additions or changes section - remove period at end of third bullet and add “ or,” lisa: done

Description and Benefits section - second sentence, add a comma after “discriminate”; third sentence, capitalize first word - ls: done

Layout for Numbers section - second sentence is missing something, perhaps it needs “people with cognitive disabilities” added after “confuse”. Ls: sentced changed

Testability section, bullet #1

Current: Are fonts (text), punctuation (text and numbers) and voice (speech) used known to be clear from the WCAG techniques

Suggested: Are fonts (text and numbers), punctuation, and voice (speech) used known to be clear from the WCAG techniques? Ls: done

Techniques section - remove bullet with no text; improve readability of fourth and fifth bullets -done

Current 4th bullet: se left justification with ragged right edge. (localization: for left to right languages only)

Suggested 4th bullet: For left to right languages, use left justification with ragged right edge.

Current 5th bullet: Right justification with ragged left edge. (localization: for right to left languages only)

Suggested 5th bullet: For right to left languages, use right justification with ragged left edge.

Failures section, first bullet - consider listing types of font changes in a region that would qualify as a failure. For example, as written making the font bold for key items (listed as a technique) would also be a failure. Ls: done

Failures section, second bullet - consider defining what “Using all capital letters” applies to.

For example, would WCAG or COGA be a failure? Ls: changed

Thaddeus +1 - With some level of the suggestions from Kurt implemented above

9. 3.2.4 Consistent Identification: (change) **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/consistent-identification-and-styles.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period will be addressed

Lisa: +1

Thaddeus +1

Kurt: +1 (with editorial changes) Benefits section, fourth sentence

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-19.)

Current: If identical functions are in a differently on different Web pages, the site will be considerably more difficult to use.

Suggested: If identical functions are presented differently on different Web pages, the site will be considerably more difficult to use.

LS: done

10. 3.2.3 Consistent Navigation **CLOSED do not edit**

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-21.)

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/consistent-navigation.html>

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed

Lisa: +1

Thaddeus - Should it be called out that conformance is required even if a change is initiated by the user - as a reference to the original SC? “unless a change is initiated by the user.” is being omitted from the original SC so we may want to speak to that in some way? (Lisa: Agreed will add and make grammar change) done

Batch 2 (due the 6th Nov)

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (but will try and address new comments were we can)

11. Understandable language **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/plain-language-a.html>

(due the 6th Nov)Note all comments in the consensus period will be addressed

Lisa:+1 may need copyediting

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-21.)

Thaddeus: +1

Clear and simple language

Mike: +1 with possible mods/additions as below.

Throughout the text we use “Metaphors and non-literal text”, but “metaphors” are just **one type** of non-literal text. In the ETSI work I did some research and found that the term “figurative language” seems to be a term used by experts in the area.

We ended up with a guideline to not use “**figurative language**” and added this note:

“Figurative language is language that uses words or expressions with a meaning that is different from the literal interpretation. Figurative language includes, but is not limited to, metaphor, sarcasm, simile, personification, hyperbole, symbolism, idioms, and cliché.”

Explicitly listing several forms of non-literal language is better than **just** singling out metaphor. There is no doubt that many ASD people have troubles recognising sarcasm. If we don’t like “figurative language” we could still use “non-literal language/text” but not have the incorrect “and metaphor”, but explain that metaphor is just one type of non-literal language.

We also included an example:

"I've told you a million times to clean your room!", "The sun is like a yellow ball of fire in the sky", "You are what you eat", "busy as a bee" are a few of the many examples of figurative language in common usage.

And another note that might provide some words to help in our “Description” and/or “Benefits” section:

“Some users, particularly those on the autism spectrum, will have difficulty with figurative language as they will try to interpret it literally. This will frequently lead to the user failing to comprehend the intended meaning and may instead act as a source of stress and confusion.”

Here are 5 additional references directly linked to figurative/non-literal language and autism (one exclusively refers to idiom and another to metaphor):

[i.49] Vogindroukas, I. & Zikopoulou, O. (2011). Idiom understanding in people with Asperger syndrome/high functioning autism. *Rev. soc. bras. fonoaudiol.* Vol.16, n.4, pp.390-395.

NOTE: Available at

http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1516-80342011000400005&lng=en&nrm=iso .

[i.50] Oi, M., Tanaka, S. & Ohoka, H. (2013). The Relationship between Comprehension of Figurative Language by Japanese Children with High Functioning Autism Spectrum Disorders and College Freshmen's Assessment of Its Conventionality of Usage, *Autism Research and Treatment*, vol. 2013, Article ID 480635, 7 pages, 2013. doi:10.1155/2013/480635.

NOTE: Available at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/aurt/2013/480635/> .

[i.51] de Villiers, P. A. et al. (2011). Non-Literal Language and Theory of Mind in Autism Spectrum Disorders. Poster presented at the ASHA Convention, San Diego.

NOTE: Available at

<http://www.asha.org/Events/convention/handouts/2011/de-Villiers-de-Villiers-Diaz-Cheung-Alig-Raditz-Paul/> .

[i.52] Norbury, C. F. (2005). The relationship between theory of mind and metaphor: Evidence from children with language impairment and autistic spectrum disorder.; *Oxford Study of Children's Communication Impairments*, University of Oxford, UK; *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 23, 383-39.

NOTE: Available at

http://www.pc.rhul.ac.uk/sites/lilac/new_site/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/metaphor.pdf.

[i.53] Language and Understanding Minds: Connections in Autism; Helen Tager-Flusberg, Ph.D; Chapter for: S. Baron-Cohen, H. Tager-Flusberg, & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Understanding other minds: Perspectives from autism and developmental cognitive neuroscience*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

NOTE: Available at <http://www.ucd.ie/artspgs/langimp/TAG2.pdf>.

Lisa - All changes are in!

12. Timed events **CLOSED do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/timed-events.html>

(due the 6th Nov)

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-27.)

Lisa:+1

Mike:+1

Thaddeus +1 - One grammar/spelling comment - 4th sentence of Description section.

Change “persons cognitive skills may temporarily decrees as they get tiered” to

“person’s cognitive skills may temporarily decrease as they get tired”: lisa done

5th paragraph - “Web site” = website Lisa: DOne

13. Minimize-errors **CLOSED- do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/minimize-errors.html>

(due the 6th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Thaddeus +1

Mike: +1 **[After consensus]** (I don’t think we need to define “common input errors” as the term is not longer used. Lisa: might as well keep it in incase of rewording

Batch 3

Note all comments in the consensus period were addressed (but we will try and address were we can)

14 Cues **CLOSED- do not edit**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/consistent-cues.html>

(due the 7th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Thaddeus +1

Mike: +1

John R: +1 (I copyedited this on 2016-11-27.)

15, Labels **CLOSED- other than copyedits** Thaddeus Copyedits complete

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/labels-instructions.html>

(due the 7th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Thaddeus +1

Mike: +1 **[After consensus]** (I think that the “This includes the user’s name, phone number, address, date of birth and other information where user testing has shown that the information is known by the intended audience” should be rephrased as a note to avoid making the “known by the intended audience” point being too long and being a point that can be misinterpreted”. Lisa: done

16, Help **CLOSED- other than copyedits** Thaddeus Copyedits complete

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/help.html>

(due the 7th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Thaddeus: +1

Mike: +1

17, Error Prevention - Legal **CLOSED- other than copyedits** Thaddeus Copyedits complete

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/error-prevention-legal.html>

(due the 7th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Thaddeus +1

Mike: +1

18, Reminders **CLOSED**- Thaddeus Copyedits complete

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/reminders.html>

(due the 7th Nov)

Lisa:+1

John R.'s comments:(inside cfc!!)

- “Should” has to be replaced with “must” because we are creating requirements. Lisa: done
- The following, which I don’t understand at all, should be rewritten, “If a user with cognitive accessibility needs skills decreases to an extent ...” Even if “deceases” is supposed to be “decreases”, does it refer to “needs” or “skills”? And either way, what does that mean? Lisa: redrafted
- This doc needs significant copyediting. I am too distracted and confused by the errors to be able to comment on it further. Lisa: Reread and changed some of it

Mike: Generally +1. **[After consensus]** Suggest change “Enable the user to” to “The user is able to”. lisa:done

19 Familiar design - (AA) **CLOSED**- Copyedits complete

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/familiar-design-aa.html>

(due the 8th Nov)

Lisa:+1

John R.'s comments:

- The description includes the following sentence. “If abstract designs are used, alternatives should be provided that are understandable to all users.” I think the reference “understandable to all users” is an impossible requirement. How can an alternative be understandable, to all users, across cultures and languages?Lisa:done
- Why aren't we referring, at least as an example, to the symbols and JSON work we did?Lisa:done
- This doc needs copyediting. Lisa:agree!!

Thaddeus +1: with any copyediting mentioned above

Mike: +1

20 Clear controls **CLOSED**- Thaddeus - Copyedits complete

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/visually-clear-controls.html>

(due the 8th Nov)

Lisa:+1

John R.'s comments:

- We of the the COGA TF may want to consider and refer to a SC we of the Low Vision Task Force are creating. Currently, it is called “[Metadata On Hover](#)” and is “Content that appears on hover should not obscure the triggering element or other content.” lisa: they will probably be merged, the disision with the chairs is we each pout in out “use case” and then wcag will merger them if needed. However I will add this as a note
- This doc needs copyediting.

Mike: **[After consensus]** Strongly agree with John R. I have seen a huge amount of well discussed debate on this topic on the Low Vision and Mobile TFs. We really must have one SC here - so I think that the COGA TF role, with our fewer contributors, would be to see if the LV/Mobile proposed version is lacking something important for COGA - and propose that this lack is addressed. Lisa: see coment above

21 Identify charges **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/identify-charges.html>

(due the 8th Nov)

Lisa:+1

John R.’s comments:

- Shouldn’t the Techniques section include a statement similar to “charges must be made clear at the start of the transaction task”? Lisa: done
- This doc needs copyediting.

Thaddeus +1: with any copyediting mentioned above

Mike: **[After consensus]**: Although I understand the motivation, I’m not sure if identifying “All types of charges and conditions” at the start of a transaction could create more of a barrier than the task of dealing with them during, or at the end of the transaction”. This barrier could deter usage of a potentially valuable service. Lisa: added note and sent to list

Jim S.**[After consensus]**

22 Undo **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/undo.html>

(due the 12th Nov)

Lisa:+1

John R.’s comments: (inside cfc)

- It seems to me that, based upon our implications that people with cognitive disabilities need extended time to complete a transaction, that we should recommend that web server timeouts be extended for transactions. Lisa: this is addressed in the time out SC
- There is commentary in the Techniques section that refers to unfinished work.: This has been discussed with the wcag chairs,mwe can give techneque titles that are under

development, it shows that implementation will get easier by the time this becomes a standard

- This doc needs copyediting.

Thaddeus +1: with any copyediting mentioned above

Mike: **[After consensus]**: Replace “Provide users the ability to undo ..” with “Users are provided with the ability to undo ...”

23 Critical features **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/critical-features.html>

(due the 12th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Thaddeus: Should the definition of Critical Feature be “features that are required to complete the main role or tasks of the **user interface**” vs “content” lisa: done

I have seen definitions of above the fold that may use simple language for instance - positioned in the upper half of a web page and so visible without scrolling down the page. lisa: changed but added the main modality bit

Mike **[After consensus]**: Re: Thaddeus’ comment: I think that “content” should include the “user interface”. lisa: done

“Above the fold” is surely very dependent on the user agent. This is not my expertise, but I’m not sure whether it will be possible to test in any general way whether this success criterion will be met (necessary for A or AA). :lisa: added note we may need to define semantics in the header, accessibility conformance statement or other mechanism for declaring the main modality. That should help

24 Section Headings **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/section-headings.html>

(due the 18th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mary Jo: Comments posted 16 Nov. Lisa: well done!!!!

- Description section: I would think that we would take the content that exists in the current WCAG 2.0 SC and show the necessary modifications to it. In addition, the justification for making it Level AA instead of AAA should be in the section suggesting the priority level. **Lisa:** we are doing this exactly how wcag asked us to following their template.
- The current WCAG 2.0 version of the criteria has examples used in the justification for Level AAA could be added as exceptions to the SC, if the group thinks that they are allowable exceptions. **Lisa: group might not have time to discuss it, but i dont think it is needed because of the wording change discussed in the sc**
- Benefits section: Simple edit of the last sentence before the bulleted lists: Suggest it reads, “It supports users who need a structure that is easy **to follow by** providing signposts **for** users **to** find the information they need. lisa: done

- Benefits section references: The background research document link needs to cite the section where this requirement came from which looks like there are two: [3.1.9 Extent To Which Current Needs Are Met](#) and [3.7.6.4 Focus and Structure](#). Also, while

Lisa: that does not always work, and wcag did not say we needed to

- Benefits section example issue papers: The personalization and preferences issue paper doesn't talk about personalization of headings in the content. Lisa: the whole point of the change is to add personalisation and therefore the topic and how it works is extremely important
- Related resources: For the background research document link, should the specific section be named? Actually, it seems odd that the background research document is listed in the benefits section above as well as the related resources list. **Lisa:** it is better but we don't need to
- Testability: Procedure step 1 - should say "Determine the sections of a page" rather than "Define sections of a page" as this is testing, not development of the page. Lisa: done
- Techniques: Editorial - Techniques should be provided in an unordered list.
- Techniques: [G141: Organizing a page using headings](#) should be included in the list, as it is currently listed for SC 2.4.10. Lisa: added
- Techniques: The 2.4.6 Headings and Labels SC should not be listed as a technique for this checkpoint. We need to keep them distinct. This SC would require having headings, the other SC is to ensure they are meaningful. Lisa: ok
- Techniques - editorial: 3rd bullet should say 'headings' not 'headers' which are used on tables. Lisa: done
- Techniques: Last technique should be reworded in WCAG style, plus I edited to be more succinct: Providing headings that can be made visible or hidden by the user through personalization Lisa: done
- Working group notes - Is this a note for our task force members to answer, or for the WCAG working group? I think that we should be talking about sections within writing and those original WCAG SC notes should be included in this SC. Lisa: done

Thaddeus: [Nov 20] +1 with comments above

25 Understandable language (AA) - Copyedits Complete (Jan)

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/plain-language-aa.html>

(due the 18th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mary Jo: Comments posted 16 Nov. Lisa: I asked everyone to check over and comment on the first version (A) before I duplicated it !!!!!

- The short name in the HTML file is "Plain language", is that incorrect or is the HTML file name incorrect? Lisa: the name was changed after the last set of comment. Changed the file name
- Glossary: two editorial items
 - "List of word frequencies" can be deleted, as this term isn't used anywhere in the SC: Lisa: done

- Definition of “word frequencies” last sentence: Capitalize “Word” at the beginning of the sentence.: Done
- Description section: First paragraph describes the scope of this SC differently than the SC requirement itself. SC says to use clear language in headings, error messages, and important information (information the user may need to complete any action or task including an offline task as well as information the user may need to know related to safety, risks, privacy, health or opportunities). Not sure what “opportunities” used in the definition of important information means either (financial, purchasing, educational, job). To me the two different descriptions aren’t equivalent. Lisa: done
- Description section, last sentence, editorial change: ‘the exception ensures’ should be ‘the exceptions ensure’. lisa:done
- Benefits - editorial: I don’t think receptive aphasia or dementia need to be capitalized.
- Related resources: It seems that the http addresses should be part of a link with the title of the article/item used as the link text, to abide by WCAG requirements for meaningful link text. E.g. [Stroke Association Accessible Information Guidelines](#) lisa: we were told not to worry about formatting
- Related resources: Semantics for adaptive interfaces and COGA Techniques links don’t work.;lisa: fixed
- Testability - editorial:
 - The paragraph descriptions under each of the bullet points should be indented to the level of the bullet point (don’t use after each bullet point. Instead, have only one after all of the descriptions of the bullet points is included. Lisa: We have been told not to worry about format yet
 - Description of simple and clear words: ‘languages’ should be ‘language’.lisa:done
- Techniques - editorial: Easier to read the techniques if they are in an unordered list. Some are not worded in the WCAG manner which is to use a verb first. Some suggested changed bullets are as follows:
 - Using a default term as the text on a function on an operating system platform (**Mary Jo added note:** I also changed verbiage from “user platform” to “operating system platform”, as I don’t know what a user platform is - it isn’t a defined term anywhere.)
 - Using the link destination as the text on a link (such as “home” or “contact us”)
 - Failure of SC 3.1.x due to failing to replace words with pronouns, which decreases clarity
 - Failure of SC 3.1.x due to requiring users to learn new terms or new meanings for terms or symbols
 - Failure of SC 3.1.x due to showing words that are common, but not in the correct context or with an unclear meaning
 - Failure of SC 3.1.x due to using non-literal text without an easy to use literal text replacement
 - Lisa: done

- The scope of this SC should be made clear so as not to confuse it with SC 26 below.

Should the scope also mention controls? Lisa: that is the one above - (single a)

Thaddeus: November 20. Should there be an exception for use of proprietary words or should the SC should state that if a proprietary word is used an associated common word or clear definition should be provided. I am thinking of the Github example for instance. - i will add it as a technique under “provide”

[Comment After Consensus - Jan] Since I am not a linguistics expert, I had to look up the definition of “text corpus.” I am new to this group and this may have been discussed in great detail, but since this is about using plain language, would it be possible to replace that term with “large and structured set of texts” or provide the definition in the glossary?

26 Understandable language (AAA) **CLOSED- Copyedits** **Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coqa/master/extension/plain-language-aaa.html>

(due the 18th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mary Jo: (18 Nov.) LISA: see comment above

- The short name in the HTML file is “Plain language”, is that incorrect or is the HTML file name incorrect?
- Suggested priority level: Priority level for this one is AAA not AA
- Glossary: two editorial items
 - “List of word frequencies” can be deleted, as this term isn’t used anywhere in the SC
 - Definition of “word frequencies” last sentence: Capitalize “Word” at the beginning of the sentence.
- Description section: This whole section needs to be modified to indicate the Level AAA SC covers all content, and should provide examples of other content not covered by the Level A proposed SC. Right now it is a carbon copy of the Level AA criteria description.
- Benefits - editorial: I don’t think receptive aphasia or dementia need to be capitalized.
- Related resources section: Same comments on the Related resources and broken links as in the Level AA criteria above.
- Testability section: Same comments as the Level AA criteria above.
- Testability section: Should make it clear the distinction from the level AA SC - in that you are testing all content. - lisa: added word all
- Techniques section:
 - There should be at least one additional technique that covers content that isn’t covered already by the Level AA criterion. Lisa:done - but not sure why? Note we only need to provide one technique heading at this point. I think we more then covered that
 - Remove the ‘;or’ on each of these, as that is not consistent with WCAG criteria.

- Same comment as the Level AA SC - use suggestions in rewording the techniques in WCAG technique writing style that I have for the Level AA SC above. -done

Jim S. / Neil M. (18th Nov)

- Exceptions. Should we consider the intended audience of a page? For example, if the intended audience is a scientific or legal community a certain style will be expected. This may be covered in the first exception under “more appropriate” but how do you test for what are, essentially, conventions? Addressed via word frequency lists for intended audience
- Testability. “Tense and voice are facts, and hence are verifiable.” should be changed to “The tense and voice used are objective and hence verifiable.” lisa:done
- An example of each of the proposed failures may be useful. Lisa: yes but not needed at this point
- Given that this SC covers all content, having replacing words with pronouns as a failure seems somewhat restrictive (especially if the suggested as it may not always decrease clarity to use pronouns. Removing the pronouns from a block of text could, in fact, make it harder to read as the text will quickly become turgid and repetitive. Do we need to expand on the impact on clarity that using pronouns causes?lisa: agreed
- Can we provide an example of an easy to use literal text replacement technique? Lisa: we can but we do not need to at this point

Thaddeus Nov 20 - There is a more clear definition of nonliteral language that may be a good opening sentence for the definition - **Nonliteral language** is language that goes beyond the dictionary meaning of the word or phrase. Lisa: added

27 Finding help **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/finding-help.html>

(due the 18th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mary Jo: (Comments posted 18 Nov.)

- Principle and guideline: Could potentially be under Principle 2 Operable, Guideline 2.4 [Provide ways to help users navigate, find content, and determine where they are.](#) I say this because this is about being able to access/enact the help functionality and get contact information within 1 or 2 user actions. I don't think it belongs under Principle 3 Guideline 3.1 'Readable', as this doesn't seem to be about the content being readable. If a new 'Help' guideline is added, that would be the best fit. Lisa: added as option
- Description - editorial:
 - ‘The existence of **the** help content, support page **or** support function...’ makes that sentence clearer. Use ‘or’ as that is the word used elsewhere in this SC when providing this list.
 - ‘Interoperable’ is misspelled as ‘interoprable’.

- Benefits - editorial: Simplify first bullet to read: ‘access quick answers to questions’ as the word ‘user’ is in the introductory text to the list. Lisa: done
- Related resources: [Semantics for adaptive interfaces](#) and [COGA Techniques](#) links don’t work. Lisa: done
- Techniques - editorial:
 - Suggest this be made an unordered list, as the order of these techniques isn’t important. lisa: done
 - Technique 2 - ‘interaction’ should be plural ‘interactions’. lisa:done
 - Technique 4 - Suggest changing ‘Making link...’ to ‘Providing a link...’ lisa:done
 - Technique 5 - ‘Standard’ not ‘standards’ lisa:done
 - Technique 7 - ‘available’ not ‘available’ lisa:done
- Techniques:
 - Technique 3 - Nowhere in this SC previously was there mention of the requirement for the content of the help itself to be understandable, so not sure why this technique belongs in here. Seems this would belong in an “understandable help” SC, or this SC text include ‘understandable’ and the description and benefits sections have text that support that part of the requirement. lisa:ok
 - Technique 6 - I’m not sure I understand what is meant by ‘enabling symbols’ in the context of providing help. Do you mean that ‘enabling symbols’ would include some verbiage in it for enabling standard help symbols such as a ‘?’ or ‘i’ icon? I think that could be made clearer in this technique suggestion. Lisa: we just need to supply headings

Jim S. / Neil M. (18th Nov)

- Can this be combined with SC 29? lisa: they are different conformance levels, wcag will be moving things and combining as they see fit
- Benefits - should we use “easily get human or beginner’s help when available” to be consistent with SC 29? Ls: i am not sure, will add these comments to the notes for wcag

28 Search **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/search.html>

(due the 18th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mary Jo: (18 Nov.)

- Short name for this SC: In this comment document and in the HTML file name, the shortname is ‘search’ yet in the SC it says ‘Provide a search capability’. I think the shorter ‘Search’ is a sufficient short name. Lisa: done

- Editorial suggestions for SC text, but I don't think it changes the meaning at all. An exception is provided for *small organizations* and for small websites that include simple links to each page from the home page. (Changed phrase 'for organizations with small websites...' to 'for small websites...', and also changed 'includes' to 'include'.)
- Definition: Not sure where this definition came from, but the 'balance sheet total of less than 3.26 million' is problematic as we don't know what currency that is stated in. Pesos would be a lot less money value than euros, for example. In addition, in WCAG 2.0, the definitions are normative and it is a bit difficult to accept having a value that could rise or fall with inflation and the value of the currency at the time, and not have specific values defined for each country's currency. It works when there's policy in a country or somewhere there is one common currency whose value does not rapidly change, but not when you're doing on the fly conversions to other currencies. lisa: agreed - will remove the amount
- Definition - editorial: Both the small organization and small website definitions should be stated using the format used in the WCAG 2.0 glossary. E.g. *small organization* an organization with 50 or fewer employees....: lisa: we dont have to do format (I am going to stop comenting that)
- Definition of small website - Did the 15 page number come from an accepted definition or standard or is this an arbitrary number that seems small enough. Just curious how well vetted the number is. Lisa: came from the amount of links on a page that typically is conisidered ok
- Principle and Guideline - It seems that this SC fits better under Guideline 3.2 [Make Web pages appear and operate in predictable ways](#) than under 3.3 [Help users avoid and correct mistakes](#).
- Description - editorial: 'help' rather than 'enables'. If you keep the word enable, make it singular. lisa: could not find this
- Description section: I realize that this isn't stated in the requirement for search, but some usability notes might be helpful here (or a modification to the requirement) as I don't see another SC covering usability of search, that search is most useful when it allows for common misspellings, yet still finds the appropriate content or provides suggested auto-corrected versions of the search terms that the user can choose from. Lisa: added, let wcag see what they do with that
- Description & Benefits sections: Something I just noticed is that in WCAG 2.0 the benefits typically is an unordered list of benefits for specific disability groups, or stated as applicable to all users with disabilities where the description contains the long prose description. Not sure if it matters at this point. lisa: not yet
- Benefits section - editorial:
 - 'Can not' should be 'cannot'
 - 3rd paragraph, last sentence is missing a period punctuation at the end 'categories.'
 - 4th paragraph, two sentences need a comma: 'In some cases,' and 'For example,'
 - 'then logic' should be '**than** logic'.

- Last paragraph: ‘with an impaired short memory’ should be ‘with impaired **short-term** memory’
- Last paragraph: ‘...why they are looking...’ should be ‘...**what** they are looking...’
- Lisa: done
- Related resources: COGA Techniques link doesn’t work.
- See also is missing a link to the Nielson aging user study. Not sure which link is for the right article, as Neilsen (see this has corrected spelling of the name) has a few different\ aging user articles, so not sure if this is the one that was meant here, as there’s another from 2008 listed:
 - [Seniors as Web Users](#), Jakob Nielsen, May 2013
 - [Middle-Aged Users' Declining Web Performance](#), Jakob Nielsen, March 2008
 - lisa:Thanks!
- Testability - editorial:
 - Procedure #1: ‘exist’ should be ‘exists’
 - Procedure #2 : I don’t think ‘interpolatable’ is the right word here, perhaps instead of ‘interpolatable user settings’ say ‘personalization settings’. Lisa: Changed the word
 - Procedure #3:
 - Wouldn’t you check for the exception first before checking you provided search capability?
 - Add a comma after ‘fail’ in the first phrase.
 - If previous simplification to the SC is accepted, also modify #3 2nd sentence to read ‘An exception is provided for small organizations and small websites...’ lisa: done
 - Remove extra space in sentence: ‘page.’ instead of ‘page .’ lisa: done
 - I think you can remove the Note: if you simply provide a link to the definition of ‘small organization’ - that way you don’t need to repeat the definition. Lisa: editing in note pad. I do not ahve time to add links that are not stictly needed...

Thaddeus Nov. 20 - I can see why a website with a limited number of pages would be an exception but not why a small organization would necessarily be an exception. Lisa: cost

29 Extra help **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete - (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/extra-help.html>

(due the 18th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mary Jo: (comments filed Nov. 18)

- There are 3 different short names used between this comments document and the proposed SC: ‘Help’, ‘Extra help’, and ‘Human help’.

- Italicized verbiage for a defined term in the SC doesn't match the term defined in the glossary: 'easily available beginner's help' vs. 'beginner's help'. So what is 'easily available'? I think that the 'easily available' part was required in the Finding Help SC proposal above (# 27) which says how many user actions are needed to obtain help, so is it needed in this SC at all? Lisa: we are not sure what sc will get though. So cleaning up all redundancy is risky ADDED THE EXTRA DEFINITION
- SC text - editorial: The term 'critical services' should be italicized since it is a glossary term.DONE
- Glossary definition of 'beginners' help'
 - bullet 2: Suggest saying 'social media' instead of specifically naming 'Facebook'.
 - bullet 4 editorial: More understandable if stated as 'HTML controls **such as** underlined links,...' instead of 'HTML controls **of** underlined links,...' lisa: chages meening
 - bullet 5: What kinds of symbols would be required at the beginning of most paragraphs and headings? I've never seen any of those requirements stated or given as examples anywhere. Lisa: see new sc...will add resources with examples
 - bullet 6: Missing a word so should read as, 'gives detailed instructions on how to **perform or complete** critical tasks'. You could use one or both of those words and it's understandable.
- Glossary definition of 'critical help'
 - Editorial: Since 'services' is plural, the definition should read 'services that **are** needed...' (remove 'is one' as well) ls: done
 - Editorial: Since we have an SC that warns against using really complex sentences with lots of commas it might be better to list the examples of harm, risk, and loss as bullet points. LS: wcag has asked ius not to. They can rewrite!!!
- Glossary definition of 'easily available'
 - Editorial: 'follwing' should be 'following'
 - Editorial: add punctuation 'following is true:'
 - Since the sentence leading up to the bullets says 'one or more of the following', remove the ';and' on the first two bullet points or the definition conflicts with itself.
 - Editorial: 2nd bullet: 'were available' should be '**where** available'
 - I'm not sure what 'where available **interoperably**' means - 'interoperably' with what? Do you mean to have this setting to be applicable to a whole website, or could it be to a subset of the website? Not sure how the scope is applied.
 - Last bullet says 'the path and the control conforms to all of this document' and I'm not sure how that works here when it is carved into a single SC. Suggest removing ', and the path and control conforms to all of this document' part of the bullet.LS: copied the def from last time...
- Principle & Guideline: Need to point out the original text of Guideline 3.3 along with the proposed text. In WCAG 2.0 it is [Help users avoid and correct mistakes. lisa:done](#)
- Description:
 - Editorial: 'A human help...' should be 'Human help...'

- Editorial: 'interface design' should be 'user interface design' in the places it is used.
- Editorial: 'interoperable' should be interoperable'
- Benefits - Editorial: **users** should be **users'** with the apostrophe lisa:are u sure?
- References - broken links: [Semantics for adaptive interfaces](#) and [COGA Techniques](#)
- Test procedure - editorial:
 - Use an ordered list for the main 2 bullets
 - 2nd bullet: 'conform' should be 'confirm' and 'there is a one' should be 'there is one' :done
- Test procedure - missing "Expected Results" section saying 'Passes checks 1 and 2.'LS :done
- Techniques:
 - 2nd bullet editorial: 'interoperable' should be 'interoperable' ls:done
 - Last 2 bullets editorial: 'non critical' should be 'non-critical' ls:done
 - Editorial: Techniques should be written in the WCAG 2.0 style:
 - Providing a live help option. Note: It must be easy and clear to close the window.
 - Providing a phone number to automatically call via VoIP (What makes VoIP 'interoperable'?)
 - Providing a simple contact us form
 - Using available standards to get human help such as using the 0 digit on voice menu systems
 - Ls: Done

Jim S. / Neil M. (18th Nov)

- In Techniques
 - "Live help option. Note: it must be easy and clear to close the window." Should read "...Note: it must be easy and clear to close the live help session." ls:done
 - "A phone number that will automatically call via an interoperable Voice over IP specification." This is not clear - is the page calling the user or the user calling a number via the page? The assumption is that this should be a toll-free but this should be made clear. Also, if the action is that the call is made to the user then any requirements on the behalf of the user should be made clear as well as any privacy issues if they are not using a headset. There is some potential to violate other SC around changes in context if this is not implemented carefully. Ls: it is just a title, the idea is to interfrate with the user voice over ip

Thaddeus Nov 20 - +1

30 Support API's **CLOSED - Copyedits Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/standardized-apis.html>

(due the 19th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mary Jo (comments logged 19 Nov.)

- Short name 'Support methods for comprehension and interaction' is pretty long. Suggest 'Standardized APIs' perhaps, as the short name doesn't have to convey the whole meaning of the SC. Is: done
- Exceptions - editorial: 'brakes' should be 'breaks'. Ls: done
- Benefits, next to last paragraph - editorial: Add comma after 'especially those with cognitive disabilities,' Is:done
- The Internet of Things section - editorial:
 - first paragraph: "This can creates" should be 'This can **create**' singular.
 - first paragraph: "may causes" should be 'may **cause**'.
 - 2nd paragraph: Last sentence needs punctuation, a period at the end.
 - 'interfaces may aims' should be 'interfaces may aim'
 - '**in order** that users can focus their **attentions**' should be '**so** that users can focus their **attention**'
 - LS: done
- Internet of Things section - I it is difficult to understand the phrase, '(essential for completing interaction with wifi for remote monitoring successfully, for instance)'. Are you talking about setting up the wifi linkage to a device like a smartphone, or something else?: Is: not sure, taken from Janina's work. However it ois only a discriptioun for the WG not everyone
- IoT section: There is a statement, "The following solutions support general usability of the IoT for everyone, in addition to assisting those with cognitive disabilities." that isn't followed by any solutions but some notes about solutions that seem to belong in the Working Group Notes section. IS: no need to correct this, it does no harm
- IoT section, bullet #4 - IndieUI is no longer a separate specification, but will be included in WAI-ARIA itself.
- References - editorial:
 - [Semantics for adaptive interfaces](#) and [COGA Techniques](#) links don't work - Error 404 received: Is:done
 - Background research document link has generic parenthetic '(cite section)' but doesn't say what section(s) to reference
 - Use meaningful link text and create a link for the Web of Things issue paper
 - See also links need to have meaningful link text.
 - Testability - editorial
 - Make steps an ordered list
 - Second statement: 'confirms' should be 'conforms'
 - Most of the SC's testability sections have subsections called 'Test procedure' and 'Expected results' which were in the WCAG SC template

but missing in this SC proposal. : We are not doing the wcag right up. Just showing that it could be testable. ls: It was not the wcag template but my tempalte as best practice

- Techniques - editorial: The HTML and IoT techniques have working group notations for work that needs to be done which should be called out using @@ or instead notated in the working group notes section at the bottom.:ls: no we just need to provide headings
- Techniques
 - “Using WAI-ARIA roles appropriately” should be a technique (as stated in the note on the proposed HTML technique.
 - Failure technique 1: It says’ right click menu-bar’. Do you mean the context menu that is used on UI elements? If so, use the terminology ‘context menu’.ls: no not what i meant
 - Failure technique 2: There should be an exception for turning off spell check only if it is used for testing spelling skills (essential to the function of the web content).ls: yup, but not needed now as it is just headings

Jim S. +1

Neil M. +1

Thaddeus Nov 20 - +1 I believe the short name is misplaced ls: done

31. 2.2.4 Interruptions (change) **CLOSED - Copyedits** **Complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coqa/master/extension/interruptions.html>

(due the 19th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Mike: “From Etsi” should be “From ISO 9241-112” LS: done

Jim S. +1

Neil M. +1

Mary Jo: (Comments posted Nov. 18)

- SC proposed text - editorial:
 - Missing short name heading ‘SC Shortname: Interruptions’ ls:done
 - ‘availible’ should be ‘available’ ls:done
 - Italicize ‘easily available’ since it is a glossary item.
 - The exception is listed twice, suggest removing the 2nd restatement of the exception. LS:done
 - Remove ‘(Level @@A@@)’ from the SC text part, as the suggested change in level is stated in the next section. LS: not nessisary and adds clarity
- Definition of ‘easily available’ - editorial: 2nd bullet ‘**were** available’ should be ‘**where** available’ ls: dpone

- Definition of 'easily available' Is: switched to the other SC one to make consistent
 - It seems to me that this term was defined in other SC with a slightly different definition (though my memory may not serve me right on that one). Will need a single commonly accepted definition at some point.
 - 2nd bullet: I'm not sure what 'where available interoperably' really means in the 2nd bullet.
 - 3rd bullet: It says, "the control conforms to all of this document" but this isn't a document but a single success criteria, so what is meant by that? All of the SC in WCAG? All of the requirements in this SC?
- Description - editorial:
 - Add comma after 'For example'
 - 'Doctors' should be "doctor's"
 - 'Interruptions course' should be 'interruptions cause'
 - Bullet point #7: 'a standard techniques for the above' should be 'standard techniques for the above,'
 - 'taskforce' should be 'task force'
 - 'IE' should be 'i.e.' or 'For example,'
 - LS:done
- Description:
 - bullet point #8: This sentence isn't clear due to "must be always consistently easy to close and avoid so...." It seems to contradict itself, as are you supposed to avoid use of further pop-ups or make further pop-ups easy to close? Ls: changes
 - Paragraph about the task force semantics proposal - should that go into the Working group notes section at the bottom? LS: that is just for us
- Benefits - editorial:
 - 'disabilities. Including: dementia ADHA' should be 'disabilities including dementia, ADHD'
 - Gap analysis link names 'section x' instead of naming the section where this is discussed.
 - Broken links on [Semantics for adaptive interfaces](#) and [COGA Techniques](#)
- Testability - editorial:
 - Add subsections 'Test Procedure' and make 'Results' a subsection 'Expected results'
 - Make an ordered list and then you don't have to have 'Step 1' and 'Step 2'
 - Step 1: remove the 'e' after the phrase 'is there content'
 - Step 1: 'replace' should be 'replacing'
 - Step 2: 'postponed or suppressed' should be 'postpone or suppress'
- Testability: Step 1: should say that you're looking for added or replaced content that 'was not' initiated by the user. Currently it says that is initiated by the user initiated, which already complies with the SC as it is written.
- Techniques - editorial: Write techniques in the WCAG 2.0 style.
 - Use an unordered list.
 - 2nd bullet: Providing methods to control and turn off interruptions

- 3rd bullet: Providing methods to control and turn off media events
- Rewrite failures in WCAG style, such as: Failure of success criteria 2.2.4 due to secondary content (such as special offers or complementary material) that cannot be easily identified, controlled, and turned off.
- LS:done

Thaddeus +1

32. 3.2.5 Change on Request (change) **CLOSED- - copyedits complete**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/change-on-request.html>

(due the 19th Nov) -

Lisa:+1

Jim S. / Neil M. (18th Nov)

- Add to Techniques that a warning should precede any of the changes in scope for this SC to make the user aware of the impending change and allow the user to prevent the change if required. The warning must allow sufficient time for the user to process the warning and react. Lisa: done

Mary Jo Mueller (posted comments 18 Nov.)

- SC Text: The exception in the proposed update to the SC should be written in the WCAG style and verbiage. Suggest: Exception: The changes are part of an activity where it is essential (e.g. a game). ls:done
- SC text - editorial: Italicize the glossary items 'route', 'orientation', and 'easily available' in the SC text. Ls: done
- Glossary - same comments as before on the 'easily available' term. (See previous checkpoint 31 above.)LS: done
- Description:
 - The 2nd bullet doesn't seem to belong in this SC which is about not having unexpected changes of context, and being able to easily navigate back to the previous context. LS: it is a form submission, which is a hue change in context but the user ddid not see it coming!
 - The 4th bullet about disabling pinch/zoom is not a "Change content only on request" kind of item. In addition, it will already get covered under low vision SC proposals so I suggest this bullet is removed. LS: done
 - The 5th bullet and 6th bullets are already covered under SC 2.2.2 Pause, Stop, Hide (Level A) SC unless this proposed Level AAA only allows the pause option.
- Benefits:
 - "(cite section)" should be the section name that covers this SC.
 - The following link is broken: [Semantics for adaptive interfaces](#)
 - The following link is going to the wrong location: [User Research - 3.7.6.6 Orientation and Error Prevention/Recovery](#)
 - Lseeman: done

- Testability - editorial:
 - Section is missing the sub-headings 'Test procedure' and 'Expected Results' that were in the template. LS: Not in our template! You are right this would be good but we do not have time now.
 - Should simply use an ordered list, like WCAG does for the test procedure steps.: LS we were instructed just to show potential testability
 - Step 2: 'conform' should be 'confirm' and 'to suppress and changes' doesn't make sense in the sentence. Did you mean 'to suppress **any** changes'?
 - Step 3: 'conform' should be 'confirm', and add 'the' to 'go to **the** previous context'
 - Slide shows and intermittent content updates, add the word 'confirm:' to the end of the text before the bullets.
 - 2nd bullet of Intermittent content updates: 'role' should be 'roll'
 - LS: done
- Techniques - editorial: Some need to be written in the WCAG technique style:
 - Should state that the suggested techniques below would be new for the SC.
 - **Providing a** "pause" button for slideshows, video and audio
 - **Providing a** "request update" and "pause update" button for news feeds or embedded social media updates
 - **Using** semantics and personalization to control changes
 - 3rd bullet contains 'Yoytube' which is 'YouTube', but why call out that particular implementation of video specifically? Shouldn't that apply to any video or multimedia content?
 - LS: done
- Techniques: Other existing WCAG techniques could also apply, such as:
 - G4: Allowing the content to be paused and restarted from where it was paused
- Techniques: I'm not sure the video autoplay techniques really belong here, as this is a AAA requirement and they are already covered in the Level A requirement 2.2.2 Pause, Stop, Hide. However, if the video techniques remain, there could be an HTML5 technique called 'HTML5: Avoiding use of the autoplay attribute for video' which is missing from 2.2.2 Pause, Stop, Hide.
- LS: we can leave it in, and let WCAG discuss it

Thaddeus +1

33. Familiar Design (A) **CLOSED- Thaddeus - copyedits complete**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/familiar-design-a.html>

(due the 19th Nov)

Mary Jo Mueller (posted on 18 Nov.)

- SC Text: While I understand the 'Familiar' design thought captured in the short name, the SC Text verbiage doesn't address what should be familiar in the design of the help, navigation to help, and search forms. I would have a hard time understanding how to

implement this one. I think the thing that really needs to be captured here is that when you're creating a platform-specific UI, then the look and feel of these features should appear and operate in a manner consistent with the platform or be capable of being personalized to meet that requirement. The only exception would be a design that has been proven through user testing to be intuitive and easy to use even though it departs from that of the platform. LS: changed , please recheck

-
- SC Text: Write the exception in the WCAG format - 'Exception: An....'
- The glossary term 'common icons' has no definition
- Description and Benefits section - editorial:
 - 2nd paragraph is an incomplete thought, "However, at a minimum level as many users should be able to reach help and a search mechanism" :LS
 - 3rd paragraph, last sentence: Add comma after "Therefore" and "for" in the phrase "user need **for** things..."
 - Why is "Personalization" bolded? Was that supposed to be a defined term? If so, it should be italicized, not bolded and a definition added to the glossary.
 - Missing comma and 'they' in the sentence, "If the user is learning impaired or has an impaired memory, **they**..."
 - Common icons sentence should say: 'in the expected position helps' rather than 'in the expect position help'
 - First bullet under "easy personalization with:" should read, "Easy to tailor symbols **and** a user interface **based on (MJM: or use 'customized using')** user profiles".
 - The link <https://w3c.github.io/wcag/coga/user-research.html> should have meaningful link text.
 - Broken resource link: [Semantics for adaptive interfaces](#)
- Testability - editorial:
 - Missing the subheadings 'Test procedure' and 'Expected results' from the template. (not nessisary)
 - Step 3: 'role' should be 'roll' - in 2 instances of the word.
 -
- Techniques:
 - The first technique's verbiage needs editing to be understandable. It's the 'programmatically determinable enables' part that seems to be misstated. Maybe you meant 'programmatically markup enables'?
- Techniques - editorial:
 - 2nd bullet should be written in WCAG writing style for techniques 'Using standard web...'
 - 1st sub-bullet under 2nd bullet: Shouldn't it be '**top** right hand corner' as opposed to bottom or middle which would not be in the 2015 style.
 - 2nd bullet of 2nd bullet: missing punctuation, should read 'a question mark for **help, etc.**'
 - Last item in Techniques should be an unordered list item and worded in the WCAG writing style "**Following** the standard user interface guidelines for a specific platform."

- LS: done

Thaddeus +1

34. Extra Symbols **CLOSED - Copyedits complete (Jan)**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/extra-symbols.html>

(due the 25th Nov)

Note , we know this is a long shot

Lisa +1

E.A. (23/11/2016) +1 It might be too cluttered if it is every sentence but extremely helpful when linked to menus and headings for topics using short sentences

e.g.<http://www.easy-read-online.co.uk/> . Lisa added clarification via personalization

Thaddeus: Is there a condition for which this would apply that we can add to make this more feasible to WCAG. LS: I added this question to the conformance . Actua;ly thought some more and made a change.....

E.A. (23/11/2016) Aphasia where the person has the intellectual ability to understand concepts, but cannot express them, read text or write the word needed in a search so is dependent on browsing pages for information. Lisa :”added

Mary Jo: (posted 23 Nov.)

- Since this is being suggested to be a SC under “Input Assistance” (Guideline 3.3), are these symbols limited to sentences and phrases where user input or user interaction is required, or for all web content? The scope should be stated in the SC text. lisa:Will change the sc.
- Techniques: ‘interoprable’ should be ‘interoperable’, and the ‘types of functions’ bullet item has an extra character or symbol embedded in it that needs to be removed.lisa: done
- Testability - Should have “Test procedure” and “expected results” spelled out as part of the test information. Lisa: we were told this is not nessisary

35. Visual Presentation (AA or AAA) **CLOSED- incuding copyedits**

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/visual-presentation.html>

(due the 25th Nov)

Note , we know this is a long shot

John R.: I copyedited this on 2016-12-01.

Lisa +1

E.A. (23/11/2016) +1 Thank you Lisa for all the help on this one. Lisa :)

Mary Jo: (posted 23 November)

- Proposed SC Text:

- There is the text 'for Latin based languages' in the first part of the SC text, but then there's requirements listed in the 2nd bullet for non-Latin based languages so it seems to contradict. Suggest removing this phrase from the first part of the SC. Lisa: done
- 6th bullet: 'boarder' should be 'border'.
- 6th bullet: Instead of 'adjusted 200%' should be 'increased up to 200%' to better match language used in bullet 5.
- 6th bullet: I'm not sure what 'within the framework of a page' means. Is it the same as 'on a full-screen window' as used in bullet 5?
- 6th bullet: 'without loss of content or readability' - the loss of readability will be difficult to test, as I suspect that for some, increasing line spacing, space around blocks of information would make the content harder to read for some users and easier for others. So do you really mean "readability" or mean instead "functionality" similar to WCAG 2.0 SC 1.4.4 Resize Text? I'm not sure how you can test 'readability' easily, as what is readable to some, may not be so for others.
- I'm thinking the bullet might read something like this to be more consistent with both bullet 5 and SC 1.4.4 Resize Text: 'Line and border spacing can be increased up to 200% around blocks of text and objects without loss of content or functionality.' But maybe this is changing it from your original meaning. Lisa: done
- Testability: Doesn't have any test procedures or expected results listed. Lisa: we were told we do not need them at this point
- Techniques: The two new techniques use 'clear and easy to read' which isn't very specific. Lisa: we only need one specific technique - it is just a place holder for now

LS: done

36 Extra help - AAA **CLOSED**- Thaddeus - Copyedits complete

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/extra-help-aaa.html>

(due the 25th Nov)

Lisa:+1

Jim S (21/11/2017:

- Under Techniques can we clarify “Providing a phone number that will automatically call via an interoperable Voice over IP specification.” I’m assuming that this will be initiated by the user via a link similar to an embedded Skype number so that the user is in effect calling the support rather than a link that will result in the support calling the user. LS: done LS: done

E.A. +1 with some comments (22/11/2016) Under easily available

“can be set one time with as a wide a scope as possible” - does this mean to be set once? (sorry British English query as one time could mean there may be another time?)

have an impaired memory and therefor do not remember terms and design.

Possibly

have impaired short term memory and therefore do not remember terms and design.

- Live help option. Note: It must be easy and clear to close the window.

Possibly

- Live help option. Note: It must be easy and clear to close the message window. (live help session is used later in the document)

Under Benefits

- access quick answers to users questions

Possibly

- access quick answers to users’ questions
- Lisa: done

Chaohai +1(25/11/2016)

37 Return CLOSED- Thaddeus - Copy edits complete. Pull request approved on Nov 28

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/return.html>

Due: 26th Nov

Lisa +1

E.A. (23/11/2016) +1

Chaohai (25/11/2016) +1

Approved before this googledocs

The following SC were approved on the list and call before we started this document

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/clear-purpose.html>

<https://rawgit.com/w3c/coga/master/extension/support-personalization.html>