

# Proposed responses to issues from 2023

We need to address any feedback and open issues

Issues and feedback are from: **coga** [github issues](#) and [lists for public-coga-comments](#)

This document contains suggested responses to issues at See <https://github.com/w3c/coga/issues>

They are in a few categories

- Easy responses.
- Responses that may need discussion
- Issues that need discussions, solutions and resolutions

## Easy responses

Next step for editorial were there is no possibility of changing the meaning

Eric makes a branch for the next editors draft

Clear editorial issues such as broken links get fixed.

Eric responds with standard text 1 and closes the issue.

Editorial/ Discussion	Issue	Validation	Proposed Action	Actions from June 19,2023 Meeting
Editorial	<a href="#">329</a> : Broken links to w3c/personalization-semantics	Checked, still fails Note this is now called Adapt	Fix: Shawn provided replacement links	Adjust per Shawn to <a href="https://w3c.github.io/adapt/">https://w3c.github.io/adapt/</a> Change OK
Discussion	<a href="#">324</a> : 4.8.3.5 Example uses too many “or”s. Clarification needed	Still same text as original content in bug	Review if rewrite actually required. Assignable for quick rewrite.	<p>Proposed: Send email to the list</p> <p>Change from :</p> <p>When choosing an airline ticket, if a ticket option is to a different destination or there is another unusual action or change that could be unwanted or have risks, the user is asked to confirm the change.</p> <p>To</p> <p>When choosing an airline ticket, if a ticket option is to a different destination, such as a close city, the user is asked to specifically confirm they know about the changed destination. If there is another unusual action or change that could be unwanted or have risks, the user is specifically asked to confirm these changes.</p> <p>Change: Bullet list (and full editorial review for this kind of sentence)+1 Change (Rain): Limit each unit/sentence to one idea at a time</p>
Discussion	<a href="#">323</a> : <a href="#">4.8.3.1 User need</a> should be mapped to	Appears to be incorrectly mapped to	Recommend redirect to <a href="#">3.7.5 Task</a>	Change mapping to <a href="#">3.7.5 Task Management (User Story)</a>

	3.7.5 Task Management	<a href="#">3.7.4 Cognitive Stress</a>	<a href="#">Management</a> (likely mistake in link creation)	Also in appendix 1. Change: Adjust link to Task Management
Discussion	<a href="#">322: 4.8.2.1 User Need</a> links to Help User, should be <a href="#">3.7.2 Support User Story</a>	<a href="#">3.7.2 Support User Story</a> appears to have correct destination text to match.	Recommend changing 4.8.2.1 link ( <a href="#">3.7.1 Help</a> ) to 3.7.2 Support User Story	<b>Proposed:</b> Map to: <a href="#">3.7.2 Support (User Story)</a> Change: Make the proposed change.  User stories: “Support” and “Help” are confusing.
Discussion	<a href="#">321 4.7.4.4 More Details</a> includes undefined text “Use Tapered Prompts”	Term “Tapered Prompts” does not appear in Working Group Notes pages	Review; if source definition of Tapered Prompts exist, it should be linked to, or refresh the text if not.	Proposed: Change Use Tapered prompts  To : Use prompts that adapt with the user’s behavior (Tapered Prompts).  Look at simplifying paragraph (added to suggestions) Change:
Editorial	<a href="#">320 4.6.2.1 User Need</a> has content from <a href="#">3.2.2 Searchable (User Story)</a> but link says <a href="#">Distractions (3.5.1)</a> .	Link under 4.6.2.1 User Need has related link Distractions but should go to 3.2.2 Searchable (User Story)	Recommend changing Distractions link under 4.6.2.1 User Need to 3.2.2 Searchable (User Story)	Change in pattern and in Appendix A  Change; Needs to be researched again and validated. (like search feature - searchable) Also, could review user needs and be sure they’re in the right place..
Discussion	<a href="#">319 4.5.11.1 User Needs</a> has text from <a href="#">3.7.4 Cognitive Stress</a> but the link is to <a href="#">3.4.1 Assistance and Support</a>	Link under 4.5.11 should be 3.7.4 Cognitive Stress	Recommend changing Assistance and Support link to Cognitive Stress to match extracted text	Ask list : Where should the following user need be?  I need to know I am safe and secure when using a web site, especially if providing information or communicating with others.

				<p>Current: cognitive stress</p> <p>Is task management or other better? Then change in pattern and in appendix a</p> <p>Change: Look again at user need overall? Eric and Lisa will do a full review.</p>
Discussion	<p><a href="#">318 4.5.6.4 More Details</a> include reference to title that is not clear</p>	<p>Context of 'Title' is not clear.</p>	<p>Recommend (per comment) text be changed from "titles" to "title attributes (HTML)" - this seems to match the intended meaning.</p>	<p>Change and add reference to HTML and alternative text.</p>
Discussion	<p><a href="#">317 Section 4 Design Guide</a> Related User Story links are missing number heading (e.g. Clear Operation but should be 3.1.2 Clear Operation)</p>	<p>Links are missing number heading</p>	<p>Update Section 4. Design guide to include number headings.</p>	<p>Proposal : do not add more numbers by created user stories. It is fine without.</p> <p>Send to list in email with a bunch of things that are low level</p> <p>Draft reply to issue Some feedback has been that people find the document is too long, so we have decided against adding more numbers at this point</p> <p>Thanks for the feedback</p>
Discussion	<p><a href="#">316 4.5.1.1 User Need</a> related user story should be <a href="#">3.1.2 Clear Operation</a> rather than <a href="#">Assistance and Support</a>.</p>	<p>Link under 4.5.11 still incorrectly mapped to Assistance and Support</p>	<p>Recommend changing Assistance and Support link</p>	<p>Proposed: Assistance and Support...Is not well named; it should be under <a href="#">3.4 Objective 4: Help Users Avoid Mistakes and Know How to Correct Them</a></p>

Editorial	<a href="#">315</a> Typos in <a href="#">4.4.6.4</a>	Text of ""Avoid the use of Roman Numerals and unfamiliar symbols in text were possible. " should be "...where possible"	Text change in 4.4.6.4 ; "were" to "where"	Standard text editorial
Editorial	<a href="#">314</a> Per <a href="#">4.4.1.6 Examples</a> Acronym tag no longer used	Reference to using an acronym tag still there.	Per comment, change "an acronym tag" to "an abbr tag (element)" for HTML. (acronym tag is deprecated)	Standard text editorial
Editorial	<a href="#">308</a> Missing User Need Heading	Appears to be fixed and issue creator marks as fixed in issue <a href="#">309</a>	Close issue as restructured design guide (309) addresses issue.	Already fixed.
Discussion	<a href="#">307</a> <a href="#">Direction Patterns</a> links to wrong <a href="#">Help user story</a> (should be <a href="#">directions user story</a> )	Directions user story is not link to by any other story and would match to Help with Directions pattern	Redirection Help with Directions Pattern to Directions user story.	Proposed: Should go to <a href="#">3.7.3 Directions (User Story)</a> Which needs to be filled in as per the new issue paper!
Editorial	<a href="#">306</a> Use Github action instead of Travis CI	Should ping plehegar to see if this is implemented and/or can be closed	Shouldn't be an open issue if already done/changed.	Process issue - need to find plehegar
Discussion	<a href="#">305</a> Underserved users described as "High Potential"	Terminology "high potential" when referring to users does not appear in	Review; if source definition of "high potential" exists, it should be linked to,	Discussed a few weeks ago. <a href="#">Julieawr mentioned that High Potential might be best replaced.</a> Open discussion item as not clear if high potential infers high value to a business (e.g. CEO) or a more

		Working Group Notes pages	or either refresh to new text or consider creating a definition.	generic high potential for individuals to contribute to a business more than currently.
Discussion	<a href="#">304 5.5.7 Is there Enough Help and Support</a> ; Undefined term/example required for “A process is in place for acting on it?”	Final bullet point from issue still in place; may not be sufficiently defined or requires example	Term may not be sufficiently defined or requires examples	Proposed: “Complaints are prioritized and followed through” or “Maximum times for addressing”, etc.
Discussion	<a href="#">302</a> In <a href="#">5.4.1</a> , terminology “General Population” not clear in context of users without Cognitive and Learning Disabilities	General Population implies a group that does not include the group in context (People without Cognitive and Learning Disabilities).	Recommend leaving as-is, text context implication of two unique groups seems clear.	“Neuronormative population” or “neurotypical” maybe ‘typical user population’. From previous discussion, <a href="#">rachaelbradley</a> mentioned that it might be rephrased it terms of the considerations for user with cognitive disabilities
Editorial	<a href="#">79</a> Duplicate bullet point in <a href="#">Intro to Gap Analysis</a>	Duplicate text in Gap analysis document is still there (fix in July 2019 appear to have missed this)	Review to ensure Bullet 6 is really a duplicate and hasn’t overwritten an existing bullet 6; find source	Good catch. oops
Editorial	<a href="#">26</a> Duplicate bullet in <a href="#">Gap analysis</a>	Duplicate text in Gap analysis document is still there (fix in July 2019 appear to have missed this)	Duplicate of #79. Should close as covered by 79	Good catch. oops
Editorial	<a href="#">66</a> Reference to non-existent ARIA property ARIA-Importance	<a href="#">Section 3.1</a> Includes technique ARIA-importance which was never	Remove or update reference (if alternative exists).	It is now in the Adapt specification - need to update the link ( <a href="#">WAI-Adapt</a> ) ...Was in personalization)

		implemented		
Editorial	<a href="#">59 Broken links in techniques</a> (github review)	Unclear if linked github files are even in use.	Verify OK to close issue- referenced local files no longer referenced in page source	Fixed already in 2019 by <a href="https://github.com/w3c/coga/pull/97">https://github.com/w3c/coga/pull/97</a>
Editorial	<a href="#">1</a> Table formatting is missing	Generic reference to table improvement in document.	Verify OK to close; table formatting appears to be updated.	Seems to be handled

**Note:** [Items from the list have been added as issues to a github issue](#)

## Mid level responses

Our process is

1. Take an issue (assign it to you)
2. Make a proposal
3. Inform the list and any relevant subgroups, members etc
4. Once we have four +1 and no objections you can answer the issue if not we add it to the call agenda
5. Tag as either
  - a. closed if the issues is fully addressed or
  - b. revisit in 6 months

## Big issues and issues from W3C review (such as internationalization group)


Send to list the issue and we need to address next steps on the call

## Standard text

**Standard text 1:** Thank you for the great find. We will fix this issue before publishing the next version!

Old drafts

 Drafting responses to COGA issues - for plain language

 coga issues



