

AGWG Retro — Sept 2024

Positive — What were our positives?

- Since stopping focus on WCAG 2.x, the pace has improved.
- Attitude has been more welcoming recently, across a diversity of abilities.
- Plain language - essential for WCAG 3 to be easily understandable, and easily translated.
- Task forces - we've addressed 154 issues (in WCAG 2.x TF), glad we have this task-force, really enjoy working on that.
 - +1, when doing current work, all around WCAG 2, appreciate the TF on Fridays working through the issues.
- Heard more voices that we haven't traditionally heard.
- Hear comments about speed/pace, but I don't think they are participating. I think feedback has been sought, and I do see progress now, where I didn't to start with.
- Migration to google docs has helped to speed up the work, more collaborative.
- Thank you to those creating summaries to the group, when those are available.
- Hybrid joining options are really appreciated.
- Async participation, especially in sub-groups has been useful.
- Appreciate efforts to t-up discussions in github.
- Like the github summaries, and willingness to meet with individuals, and lack of scrolling when sharing.
- The working sessions have been really fun, and good work & progress. Think we're approaching a break-through. As hard as it is to wait, don't think we can focus back on 2.x.
- Love having the discussions in github, much easier to find that the survey approach.

Poor — What went poorly?

- Unsure about the direction and the timeframe (see also the minutes with [part 1](#) and [part 2](#) of the comments.)
 - Don't think re-write is a net positive.
 - Predict increased pressure from legislators that means deadlines will be reduced and quality goes down.
- Lack of new guidance before the publication of WCAG 3.
- Need to think about people struggling with the sub-group method, e.g. with cognitive + hearing disabilities (they have both)
- Difficult to follow screen-share, vocals, zoom chat etc.
- Do like the sub-group work, but difficult to commit for 8 weeks, would like to drop in/out based on availability.

- Working meetings and subgroup work in particular are not designed to support people who cannot hear or have challenges following multiple information sources at the same time.
- During subgroups, trying to watch a chat, zoom, IRC and documents at the same time. When contribution is difficult,
- When we bring a topic to the group, there hasn't been as much discussion as we thought there should be. People are happy to +1, but concerned we aren't getting the necessary scrutiny from members.
 - Seems to have dropped off in the last 6 months.
- Times when it's difficult to speak up due to the tone, doesn't feel safe to speak up. Hasn't been handled well by previous leadership. Wish there was a way to empathise with how difficult it can be to bring up. Could there be some training? Perhaps Wendy's? Some people don't know about disabilities that aren't the usual mobility/sight/etc.
- Github threads still feel like there's a lot to wrap your head around. Then people join in, and it's a massive quantity of information, complicity, jargon. Part of it might be people trying to process the information.
- Sometimes the amount of emails etc is overwhelming, appreciate the summaries.
- I was bullied in Github by a few members and therefore have refrained from participating.
- Time zones have been difficult on the west coast. Perhaps a better rotation of meeting times?
- Github, blessing and curse. Much easier than going through the emails. But some people can't navigate it and stop participating. Particularly for people less technically oriented. Lose track of current status, e.g. the current proposed text, or the 3 options people are talking about. Long discussions make that impossible.
- Github for issues, is not being able to sort by name, a-z. Can only sort by recency.
- We've made quite a few issues with github. In COGA we provide support, e.g. with direct links to a comment, or a summary. Need alternative ways.
- Can find it hard to follow some lengthy github threads. People need to know when to open new issues rather than tangent a thread.
- Parsing names in IRC can be tough.
- Difficult to address comments that come in last-minute.
- With a year's experience, others have years of experience, I don't have context others do.
- Reviewing the same topics is useful for new people, but difficult for people who have already been over them umpteen times. Need a place to store topics & arguments somewhere.
- Last minute comments: Some can have anxiety about deadlines, and leave them at the last minute. Has prevented contribution.
- Working at banks or other institutions, sometimes get blocked from github.

Potential — Where do we have potential to improve?

Should we release a 2.3 because it will take so long to come out with the new standards?
Maybe it can be a hybrid approach – so not backwards compatible, but that incorporates some of the new research and maybe some of the format of 3.0.

Could we create a page where all the issues are listed in a nice fashion, or a link to where you'd find that page to list priority things?

Town hall meetings that you don't have to have to read things in github?

Use AI more, e.g. summarisation of meetings, note taking.
Summaries of threads. Someone (i.e. chair) would have to review and check, they sometimes say exactly the opposite of what was actually said.

If people talk about a topic that's been thrashed out years ago, give context.

Sub-group on tooling, and how we interact as a group. Could we set it up to be exposed in different ways, in interfaces people are comfortable with.

Need a place to store topics & arguments somewhere, so new people can be referred to that.

Put in range of time that provides time to process it, so people can't leave "last minute" comments.

Fragmentation of information in different wikis and other places.

Key points

Onboarding (sub-groups)

- Buddy program
- Sub-group to explore
- Onboarding Chunks

Feedback timeline

Sub groups

- Better support?
- Smaller chunks of work
- Different languages
- Scale up leadership
- Kick off meetings in AGWG

Tooling (github)

Tooling (ai)

Delivery vs overwhelm (velocity)
Testing implementation
“Last Draft”

WCAG 2.3 / interim version?

Progress — How do we make further progress?

Onboarding

Add tags when posting information, so people looking for a certain topic can review previous discussions. Could also tag decisions for each topic, so we work from there.

Video for github / IRC / documents. Just the basics.

Onboarding meetings for more process / working mode discussions.

Buddy process / mentoring programme.

W3C staff (Tamsin) is looking at the onboarding info. That should cover the basics on how to get going.

Ask people to cite previous decisions if they are relying on it for their point.

Chunk onboarding emails / documentation over a few weeks, e.g. an email a week.

As part of onboarding, explain how people can contribute. E.g. if you know a lot about this topic and can contribute, here is how.

Sub-group for onboarding sessions.

Sub-group onboarding: have meeting summaries for each week.
(Tzviya / Janina may have a magic solution?)

Email sig which has links to instructions for the basics?

Note that AI summaries may be harder for people with cognitive issues, and needs reviewing.

Helpful when chairs step back and explain the big picture.

Potential Actions:

Now

- Create a sub-group for finding the onboarding info, and creating a buddy programme.
- Investigate sub-groups that are in different languages.
- Run sub-groups in the main meeting, split the meeting into decisions / discussions and then sub-groups.
- Break up the onboarding emails into 3-4 weekly emails.
- Setup sub-group for onboarding, that gathers together the materials and makes them findable (possibly update them), and then starts a buddy system for new members.
- Keep doing the introduction 1st week, discussion 2nd week approach. Ask if people need a bigger picture explanation.

Later

- When we have enough guidelines for gathering testing experience, setup post (draft) publication webinars that take people through the latest draft for the purpose of getting real-world feedback.
- Pre-CR, create a “final draft” version to get feedback before we go into the W3C publication process.

Parking lot

WCAG 2.3

Github tooling

AI tooling.