Content Creation Process for Migrating WCAG 2.1 Success Criteria (SC)

File Naming Conventions

Instructions for File Naming

Goal for Content Creation Process

For writers and contributors to migrate WCAG 2.1 content to Silver structure, by:

- Making the process as easy, accessible and scalable as possible;
- Ensuring user-centered focus;
- Writing in plain language or clear language (where applicable);
- Defining guidance and methods which are clear and efficient to implement;
- Completing the process so that Silver reviewers can determine if it is ready to include.

Part 1 - **Define User Need**

Instructions for Define User Needs

1. List disabilities and the barriers they encounter

From “**Intent”** in Understanding WCAG 2.1
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/non-text-content#intent

- **a person who cannot see a picture** can have the text alternative read aloud using synthesized speech.
- **A person who cannot hear an audio file** can have the text alternative displayed so that he or she can read it.
- In the future, text alternatives will also allow information to be more easily translated into sign language or into a simpler form of the same language.

From ”**Benefits**" in Understanding WCAG 2.1
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/non-text-content#benefits

- This Success Criterion helps **people who have difficulty perceiving visual content**. Assistive technology can read text aloud, present it visually, or convert it to braille.
- Text alternatives may help **some people who have difficulty understanding the meaning of photographs, drawings, and other images (e.g., line drawings, graphic designs, paintings, three-dimensional representations), graphs, charts, animations, etc.**

- **People who are deaf, are hard of hearing, or who are having trouble understanding audio information for any reason** can read the text presentation. Research is ongoing regarding automatic translation of text into sign language.
- **People who are deaf-blind** can read the text in braille.
- Additionally, text alternatives support the ability to search for non-text content and to repurpose content in a variety of ways.

From "**Why is this important?**" in "Images Concepts" of "WAI Tutorials"

https://www.w3.org/WAI/tutorials/images/#why-is-this-important

- **People using screen readers:** The text alternative can be read aloud or rendered as Braille
- **People using speech input software:** Users can put the focus onto a button or linked image with a single voice command
- **People browsing speech-enabled websites:** The text alternative can be read aloud

The followings are not about users with disabilities:

- **Mobile web users:** Images can be turned off, especially for data-roaming
- **Search engine optimization:** Images become indexable by search engines

2. Common and unique needs between groups

Common Needs

From "**SC 1.1.1**" in WCAG 2.1
https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/#non-text-content

- They need **a text alternative that serves the equivalent purpose**.
  From "**GL 1.1**" in WCAG 2.1
  https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/#text-alternatives
  - it can be changed into **other forms people need, such as large print, braille, speech, symbols or simpler language**.

Unique Needs

- **People who are blind** use screen readers and/or braille displays
- **People who have low-vision** and **People who have cognitive disabilities** might use screen readers at the same time while they see non-text (visual) content
  - Also they can browse speech-enabled websites without screen readers
- **People who are deaf or are hard of hearing (People who cannot hear an audio file)** can have the text alternative displayed so that he or she can read it
- **People who can't use or have difficulty using a mouse (pointing device), keyboard and touch screen** use speech input software

3. Known Solutions

From "**SC 1.1.1**" in WCAG 2.1
https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/#non-text-content

- All non-text content that is presented to the user has a text alternative that serves the equivalent purpose

From "**Intent**" in "Understanding WCAG 2.1"
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/non-text-content.html#intent

- make information conveyed by non-text content accessible through **the use of a text alternative**.
- **Text alternatives are a primary way for making information accessible** because they can be rendered through any sensory modality (for example, visual, auditory or tactile) to match the needs of the user.
- **Providing text alternatives** allows the information to be rendered in a variety of ways by a variety of user agents.
    - a person who cannot see a picture can have the **text alternative read aloud using synthesized speech**.
    - A person who cannot hear an audio file can have the **text alternative displayed** so that he or she can read it.
    - In the future, text alternatives will also **allow information to be more easily translated into sign language or into a simpler form of the same language**.

From "**Note on CAPTCHA**" in "Understanding WCAG 2.1"
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/non-text-content.html#intent

- **Requiring two different forms of CAPTCHA on a given site** ensures that most people with disabilities will find a form they can use.

From "**Additional information**" in "Understanding WCAG 2.1"
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/non-text-content.html#intent

- text alternatives can **make the same information available in a form that can be rendered through any modality** (for example, visual, auditory or tactile)

4. Exceptions

From "**SC 1.1.1**" in WCAG 2.1

- **Controls, Input** If non-text content is a control or accepts user input, then it has a name that describes its purpose. (Refer to Success Criterion 4.1.2 for additional requirements for controls and content that accepts user input.)
- **Time-Based Media** If non-text content is time-based media, then text alternatives at least provide descriptive identification of the non-text content. (Refer to Guideline 1.2 for additional requirements for media.)
- **Test** If non-text content is a test or exercise that would be invalid if presented in text, then text alternatives at least provide descriptive identification of the non-text content.

- **Sensory** If non-text content is primarily intended to create a specific sensory experience, then text alternatives at least provide descriptive identification of the non-text content.
- **CAPTCHA** If the purpose of non-text content is to confirm that content is being accessed by a person rather than a computer, then text alternatives that identify and describe the purpose of the non-text content are provided, and alternative forms of CAPTCHA using output modes for different types of sensory perception are provided to accommodate different disabilities.
- **Decoration, Formatting, Invisible** If non-text content is pure decoration, is used only for visual formatting, or is not presented to users, then it is implemented in a way that it can be ignored by assistive technology.

5. Tags for Information Architecture

WCAG SC number (if applicable)	1.1.1
WCAG Principle	Perceivable
Disability groups served	Blind, low vision, deaf, hard of hearing, cognitive disabilities
Functional user needs from Mandate376	4.2.1 WV Usage without vision 4.2.2 LV Usage with limited vision 4.2.4 WH Usage without hearing 4.2.5 LH Usage with limited hearing 4.2.10 LC Usage with limited cognition
Meta-organization (if applicable)	
Technology or component where commonly used (e.g. video, navigation menu)	Image, video, audio
Other?	

Part 2 - **Develop Tests:**

Instructions for Develop Tests

Goals:

- *To write tests.*
- *To confirm that the solutions are addressing the user needs.*
- *To ensure that the solutions we recommend can be tested.*
- *To identify considerations identified by testing that must be considered when writing guidance.*
- *To identify user needs that are not met by current tests or current solutions.*

Resources: *WCAG Techniques/Expected Results, criteria in How to Meet WCAG, Web Accessibility Tutorials, Easy Checks, ACT tests*

For: *The Tests go in the Method file (Part 3)*

Do not reinvent the wheel. Look at the WCAG Techniques tests. Most of them are very simple. Tests are about evaluating the organization's content for the condition we would want in order to meet the user need. If the WCAG Technique test meets the user need, then simply link to it and move on.

Tips for writing tests:

- *The more granular the test, the easier it is to write. If you having trouble writing test conditions then break the test down more.*
- *Tests will generally be technology-specific.*
- *Keep it simple. We will get help from ACT task force in improving the tests.*

1. *List the known solutions to the user needs identified in Part 1 and how they are tested. Solutions are a bullet list of short, high level descriptions of what the author needs to do to meet the user need of people with disabilities.*
2. *List a common example, preferably a technology neutral example of the problem and simple solution.*
3. *Identify known exceptions. Exceptions will generally be listed in the WCAG success criteria, although they will occasionally be found in the other documents. .*
4. *List any user needs identified in Part 1 that do not have a solution or exception. If there is a solution that could be addressed by a new test proposal, list it, and plan to write it. If there are user needs that do not have solutions or cannot be tested in current technology, enter that user need to document that the gap exists and should be addressed in future SIIver work.*

5. *Current Tests: Copy existing WCAG Techniques that apply to the Silver guideline. You can get a list of the applicable WCAG Techniques from How to Meet WCAG. If there are a large number of Techniques, just make a note.*
    a. *Review the WCAG Understanding & Techniques links from the applicable success criteria in How to Meet WCAG.*
    b. *Review the applicable Web Accessibility Tutorials.*
    c. *Review the Easy Checks to see if the tests are there.*
    d. *Check the ACT tests for additional tests.*
    e. *Some accessibility tools test for conditions that are not part of WCAG. You can link to or reference these tests by tool if they apply.*
    f. *Existing tests or techniques can simply be linked to. Don't copy all the text into this document.*
6. *Write new tests: Are there potential solutions that could be tested if a more flexible test than true/false were used? Demonstrate the capabilities of the new Silver structure. What new tests should be considered for this? These tests are:*
    a. *True/false - the condition exists or not. These are the common WCAG tests.*
    b. *Scale - the condition exists in some kind of scale condition such as 1-5 or percentage. The conditions can be briefly described and commonly agreed on.*
    c. *Rubric - variation of a scale test where the conditions can be subjective. The rubric test defines the subjective conditions so they can be placed on a scale. There are different types of rubrics, so you do not have to feel constrained by a specific format. The alternative text example below is an example of a simple scale rubric. Example of a paragraph writing rubric used in teaching English is a holistic rubric that is scoring multiple factors in one table with subjective descriptions for each. .*
    d. *Distance from mean - Test defines the average (mean) condition and scores the test by the difference between the mean condition and what the tester observes.*
    e. *Task completion - This complex test evaluates how a user with a disability or a tester simulating disabilities is able to demonstrate that the content is accessible. Silver needs some detailed guidelines of how to set up valid task completion tests that can be verified by outside users across a range of disabilities. Once that is done, than individual tests can reference those broader instructions.*
    f. *Usability (aka user research) - Like Task Completion, we need a meta set of instructions for user research testing that individual guidelines can reference.*
    g. *Other appropriate test. Existing academic research into the needs of specialized disability groups may identify other possible tests. We should take advantage of those.*

***Example**: In the User Needs for Alternative Text, it was noted that blind users need alternative text that "serves the equivalent purpose" (quoted from WCAG 1.1.1). Users with a cognitive accessibility (including those who are also blind) need text that communicates in plain language.*

1. *The current WCAG tests test for the presence of alternative text in different technologies*
2. *The user need solutions test for the presence of alternative text*

3. *The user need of "serves the equivalent purpose" isn't tested. (G.94 covers it in a very generic fashion, but we want to improve that.) Plain language isn't tested.*
4. *Since "serves the equivalent purpose" isn't conducive to a true-false test, a rubric that defines subjective conditions would work for this purpose. As you work on the conditions, you realize that different kinds of alternative text have different conditions, such as informative images need to describe the image while functional images (icons or buttons) need to describe the purpose the user wants to perform, such as Print (not printer). Break the test down into multiple tests (not necessarily multiple rubrics) that can be applied to different conditions.*

An example of a rubric for evaluating alternative text for informative images could look like this:

1. *Remove, hide, or mask the non-text content*
2. *Replace it with the text alternative*
3. *Does the text alternative serve an equivalent purpose? Use the rubric below to score the image. If the image scores a 0 or 1, it does not pass.*

Text describes the purpose of the image within the context of the surrounding material. It is succinct and is written using plain language techniques. See Clear Words guideline for specifics on plain language.	*4*
Text describes the purpose of the image within the context of the surrounding material, but it is not succinct or it is not written in plain language	*3*
Text describes the purpose of the image, but it is not in the context of the page. (For example, a painting of a famous person has a different description whether it is in a history context or an art appreciation context.)	*2*
Text does not describe the purpose of the image, but it does describe what the image is.	*1*
Text does not describe the image	*0*

***IMPORTANT**: List the user needs (with any explanatory notes) that are not addressed by the tests, so we have documentation of the gap.*

***Completion**: You are complete when you have a list of existing tests, a clear description of any new tests (optional), and a list of user needs that cannot be satisfied by the tests. Email the chairs to be on the agenda for the next meeting to show your work and get feedback.*

Current Tests from WCAG and other sources

See "**Sufficient Techniques**" in "Understanding WCAG 2.1"
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/non-text-content.html#techniques

- Situation A: If a short description can serve the same purpose and present the same information as the non-text content
- Situation B: If a short description can not serve the same purpose and present the same information as the non-text content (e.g., a chart or diagram)
    - Short text alternative techniques for Situation B
    - Long text alternative techniques for Situation B
- Situation C: If non-text content is a control or accepts user input
    - Text alternative techniques for controls and input for Situation C
- Situation D: If non-text content is time-based media (including live video-only and live audio-only); a test or exercise that would be invalid if presented in text; or primarily intended to create a specific sensory experience
    - Short text alternative techniques for Situation D
- Situation E: If non-text content is a CAPTCHA
- Situation F: If the non-text content should be ignored by assistive technology
    - Techniques to indicate that text alternatives are not required for Situation F

See also "**Failures**" in "Understanding WCAG 2.1"
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Understanding/non-text-content.html#techniques

New tests for Silver

1. Name of new test

2. Name of new test

Part 3 - **Write Methods**

Goal: To provide methods that meet user needs.
From: Current methods: WCAG Techniques [Todd] and UAAG [Jenn] /ATAG [Jenn].
For: A Method File. The list of "Methods" would be included in the Guideline Explainer tabs (Design and Develop tabs are technology neutral, Methods will be technology-specific.)

WCAG Techniques [Todd]

https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Techniques/

The current methods for this are:

ARIA10: Using aria-labelledby to provide a text alternative for non-text content

C9: Using CSS to include decorative images

G73: Providing a long description in another location with a link to it that is immediately adjacent to the non-text content

G74: Providing a long description in text near the non-text content, with a reference to the location of the long description in the short description

G82: Providing a text alternative that identifies the purpose of the non-text content

G92: Providing long description for non-text content that serves the same purpose and presents the same information

G94: Providing short text alternative for non-text content that serves the same purpose and presents the same information as the non-text content

G196: Using a text alternative on one item within a group of images that describes all items in the group

H2: Combining adjacent image and text links for the same resource

H24: Providing text alternatives for the area elements of image maps

H30: Providing link text that describes the purpose of a link for anchor elements

H35: Providing text alternatives on applet elements
H36: Using alt attributes on images used as submit buttons

H37: Using alt attributes on img elements

H45: Using longdesc

H67: Using null alt text and no title attribute on img elements for images that AT should ignore

PDF1: Applying text alternatives to images with the Alt entry in PDF documents

Demonstrate the capabilities of the new Silver structure:

What new methods should be considered for this:
The component parts of a new Method are:

1. Identify what platform, language and technology you are writing this for. [Look at the existing technique, its application, expectation, description and examples]
2. What the Method does technically [look at the code or instructions listed in the technique]
3. How the Method solves the problem or user need [review Part 1 and the Scope Exploration document or Gaps Analysis]
4. Code Samples or Design Patterns
5. Test(s) from #2 - Tests [choose a test type]
6. Points (TBD)
7. Tags for filtering [what kind of tags would be appropriate]
8. Resources [Which existing WCAG resource might be helpful here?]
9. Is there a way to customize this method or add a new Method for user agent, authoring tool, or assistive technology?

User Agent Accessibility Guidelines (UAAG) [Jenn]

https://www.w3.org/TR/UAAG20/

The current methods for this are:

See **“Guideline 1.1: Provide access to alternative content [Reference for 1.1.1]”**
https://www.w3.org/TR/UAAG20/#gl-access-alternative-content

PRINCIPLE 1 - Ensure that the user interface and rendered content are perceivable

Guideline 1.1 - Provide access to alternative content [Reference for 1.1]

***Summary**: The user can choose to render any type of alternative content available (1.1.1) with an indicator that the alternative content is present (1.1.2) or a placeholder replacing the non-text content (1.1.3) . It's recommended that users can also choose at least one alternative, such as alt text, to be displayed by default (1.1.5). It's recommended that caption text or sign language alternative cannot obscure the video or the controls (1.1.4) and that the user can configure the text (1.1.6), size and position of media alternatives (1.1.7).*

***1.1.1 Render Alternative Content:** The user can choose to render any type of recognized alternative content that is present for a content element. (Level A)*

Note: It is recommended that the user agent allow the user to choose whether the alternative content replaces or supplements the original content element.

Reference for 1.1.1

***1.1.2 Indicate Unrendered Alternative Content:** The user can specify that indicators be displayed along with rendered content when recognized unrendered alternative content is present. (Level A)*

Reference for 1.1.2

***1.1.3 Replace Non-Text Content:** The user can request a placeholder that incorporates recognized text alternative content instead of recognized non-text content, until explicit user request to render the non-text content. (Level A)*

Reference for 1.1.3

***1.1.4 Facilitate Clear Display of Alternative Content for Time-based Media:** For recognized on-screen alternative content for time-based media (e.g. captions, sign language video), the following are all true: (Level A)*

- ***Don't obscure controls:** Displaying time-based media alternatives doesn't obscure recognized controls for the primary time-based media.*
- ***Don't obscure primary media:** The user can specify that displaying time-based media alternatives doesn't obscure the primary time-based media.*
  Note: Depending on the screen area available, the display of the primary time-based media can need to be reduced in size to meet this requirement.

Reference for 1.1.4

***1.1.5 Provide Configurable Alternative Content Defaults:** The user can specify which type(s) of alternative content to render by default for each type of non-text content, including time based media. (Level AA)*

Reference for 1.1.5

***1.1.6 Use Configurable Text for Time-based Media Captions:** For recognized on-screen alternative content for time-based media (e.g. captions, sign language video), the user can configure recognized text within time-based media alternatives (e.g. captions) in conformance with 1.4.1. (Level AA)*

Reference for 1.1.6

1.1.7 Allow Resize and Reposition of Time-based Media Alternatives: *The user can configure recognized alternative content for time-based media (e.g. captions, sign language video) as follows: (Level AAA)*

- ***Resize:*** *The user can resize alternative content for time-based media to at least 50% of the size of the top-level viewports.*
- ***Reposition:*** *The user can reposition alternative content for time-based media to two or more of the following: above, below, to the right, to the left, and overlapping the primary time-based media.*
  Note 1: Depending on the screen area available, the display of the primary time-based media can need to be reduced in size or hidden to meet this requirement.
  Note 2: Implementation can involve displaying alternative content for time-based media in a separate viewport, but this is not required.

Reference for 1.1.7

See **"References for Guideline 1.1 - Provide Access to Alternative Content"**
https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#gl-access-alternative-content

Reference for Guideline 1.1 - Provide access to alternative content [Guideline 1.1]

Summary*: The user can choose to render any type of alternative content available (1.1.1) with an indicator that the alternative content is present (1.1.2) or a placeholder replacing the non-text content (1.1.3) . It's recommended that users can also choose at least one alternative, such as alt text, to be displayed by default (1.1.5). It's recommended that caption text or sign language alternative cannot obscure the video or the controls (1.1.4) and that the user can configure the text (1.1.6), size and position of media alternatives (1.1.7).*

1.1.1 Render Alternative Content:

The user can choose to render any type of recognized alternative content that is present for a content element. (Level A)

Note: It is recommended that the user agent allow the user to choose whether the alternative content replaces or supplements the original content element.

Return to 1.1.1 in Guidelines

Applies to:

Content user interface, Configuration settings (optional)

Typically Implemented in:

browser, media player, plugin, add-on (e.g. to render longdesc)

Intent of Success Criterion 1.1.1:

Users with some disabilities can find a specific content element causes them physical pain (e.g. an image with high contrast) or distress (e.g. an image that triggers post traumatic stress disorder), or that the element's size can make the page difficult to use (because of difficulty scrolling, or shifting gaze, or moving the pointer more than a certain distance). In these cases the user needs to be able to hide that element or replace it with alternative content or a placeholder. Other users can find specific elements are simply unusable (e.g. an image that is too low contrast for the user's vision). In these cases the user needs to be able to access author-provided alternative content (e.g. alt text or longdesc) or the very minimum a placeholder (e.g. filename).

Some users with disabilities need alternate languages or audio tracks (e.g. descriptive video). Users need the ability to choose tracks that best meet their accessibility needs (e.g. the caption track in their own language) when authors have provided many alternatives.

Note: If the user cannot directly select or choose the element in order to perform commands upon it (e.g. if the browser does not support clicking on HTML background images or moving focus to them with the keyboard), the user agent must provide an alternative user interface for this feature.

See "Examples for Success Criterion 1.1.1" and "Related Resources for Success Criterion 1.1.1":

https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#sc_111

1.1.2 Indicate Unrendered Alternative Content:

The user can specify that indicators be displayed along with rendered content when recognized unrendered alternative content is present. (Level A)

Return to 1.1.2 in Guidelines

Applies to:

Content user interface, Configuration settings

Typically Implemented in:

browser, media player, plugin, add-on

Intent of Success Criterion 1.1.2:

Users need to be able to easily discover when authors have provided alternative web content that may be of interest so they can decide whether to have it rendered (see Success Criterion 1.1.1). While the type of indicator is not prescribed, the success criterion requires that the indicator be placed along with the rendered content that has the alternative. This rules out indicators such as in the status bar, that don't clearly identify which content within a document has the alternative. Suitable indicators include outlines, adjacent icons, and adjacent links. As

with any other feature of the user agent, the indicator itself must be accessible (e.g. keyboard accessible, alternative text, zoomable).

See "Examples for Success Criterion 1.1.2" and "Related Resources for Success Criterion 1.1.2":

https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#sc_112

1.1.3 Replace Non-Text Content:

The user can request a placeholder that incorporates recognized text alternative content instead of recognized non-text content, until explicit user request to render the non-text content. (Level A)

Return to 1.1.3 in Guidelines

Applies to:

Content user interface, Configuration settings

Typically Implemented in:

browser, media player

Intent of Success Criterion 1.1.3:

Users may wish to hide images for a number of different reasons. Some users with cognitive disabilities may wish to hide images in order to avoid those that would be severely distracting. Some users with visual disabilities may wish to hide images in order to avoid those that are painful (such as those with high contrast). Other users may wish to replace images with alternative content because they are unlikely to be able to visually discern, understand, or otherwise benefit from the images. Some users with impaired motion or dexterity may wish to replace images with smaller alternative content to reduce the amount of scrolling they have to do, while some users with attention deficit disorder may wish to do the same thing in order to keep as much information visible on the screen as possible.

See "Examples for Success Criterion 1.1.3" and "Related Resources for Success Criterion 1.1.3":

https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#sc_113

1.1.4 Facilitate Clear Display of Alternative Content for Time-based Media:

For recognized on-screen alternative content for time-based media (e.g. captions, sign language video), the following are all true: (Level A)

- ***Don't obscure controls:*** *Displaying time-based media alternatives doesn't obscure recognized controls for the primary time-based media.*
- ***Don't obscure primary media:*** *The user can specify that displaying time-based media alternatives doesn't obscure the primary time-based media.*
  Note: Depending on the screen area available, the display of the primary time-based media can need to be reduced in size to meet this requirement.

Return to 1.1.4 in Guidelines

Applies to:

Content user interface, Configuration settings

Typically Implemented in:

media player, web-based media players

Intent of Success Criterion 1.1.4:

Users who require or can benefit from alternative media tracks in video or audio may not find that the default or authored position and size of those tracks is usable. Enabling the user to move and scale any displayed alternate media tracks (e.g. captions) allows displayed content to be positioned and sized to meet the needs of the user.

See "Examples for Success Criterion 1.1.4" and "Related Resources for Success Criterion 1.1.4":

https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#sc_114

1.1.5 Provide Configurable Alternative Content Defaults:

The user can specify which type(s) of alternative content to render by default for each type of non-text content, including time based media. (Level AA)

Return to 1.1.5 in Guidelines

Applies to:

Content user interface, Configuration settings

Typically Implemented in:

browser, media player, plugin, add-on

Intent of Success Criterion 1.1.5:

Alternative content is wasted if the user agent doesn't render it for users who need it. Default alternative content is a global setting because it is an unreasonable burden for users to change the rendering options every time they visit a new page.

See "Examples for Success Criterion 1.1.5" and "Related Resources for Success Criterion 1.1.5":

https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#sc_115

1.1.6 Use Configurable Text for Time-based Media Captions:

For recognized on-screen alternative content for time-based media (e.g. captions, sign language video), the user can configure recognized text within time-based media alternatives (e.g. captions) in conformance with 1.4.1. (Level AA)

Return to 1.1.6 in Guidelines

Applies to:

Content user interface, Configuration settings

Typically Implemented in:

media player, web-based media players

Intent of Success Criterion 1.1.6:

Users who require or can benefit from alternative media tracks in video or audio might find that recognized text displayed within alternate media tracks is unusable due to its configuration. Enabling the user to configure alternate media tracks (e.g. changing caption font and color) allows content to be displayed in a way that meets the needs of the user.

See "Examples for Success Criterion 1.1.6" and "Related Resources for Success Criterion 1.1.6":

https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#sc_116

1.1.7 Allow Resize and Reposition of Time-based Media Alternatives:

The user can configure recognized alternative content for time-based media (e.g. captions, sign language video) as follows: (Level AAA)

- ***Resize:** The user can resize alternative content for time-based media to at least 50% of the size of the top-level viewports.*
- ***Reposition:** The user can reposition alternative content for time-based media to two or more of the following: above, below, to the right, to the left, and overlapping the primary time-based media.*
  Note 1: Depending on the screen area available, the display of the primary time-based media can need to be reduced in size or hidden to meet this requirement.
  Note 2: Implementation can involve displaying alternative content for time-based media in a separate viewport, but this is not required.

Return to 1.1.7 in Guidelines

Applies to:

Content user interface, Configuration settings

Typically Implemented in:

media player, web-based media players

Intent of Success Criterion 1.1.7:

Users can want to reposition the alternative in close proximity to the most important portion of the main media to reduce the visual scanning distance between them. For example, if the video frequently includes on-screen text near the top of the video then the captions will be easier to read if they are located above the video.

See "Examples for Success Criterion 1.1.7" and "Related Resources for Success Criterion 1.1.7":

https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-UAAG20-Reference-20151215/#sc_117

Demonstrate the capabilities of the new Silver structure:

What new methods should be considered for this:

The component parts of a new Method are:

10. Identify what platform, language and technology you are writing this for.
11. What the Method does technically
12. How the Method solves the problem or user need
13. Code Samples or Design Patterns
14. Test(s) from #2 - Tests
15. Points (TBD)
16. Tags for filtering
17. Resources
18. Is there a way to customize this method or add a new Method for user agent, authoring tool, or assistive technology?

Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines (ATAG) [Jenn]

https://www.w3.org/TR/ATAG20/

The current methods for this are:
Copy/paste link to technique (s) -- technical solution (s).

See **"Guideline A.2.1: (For the authoring tool user interface) Make alternative content available to authors"** under ATAG
https://www.w3.org/TR/ATAG20/#gl_a12

Principle A.2: Editing-views are perceivable

Guideline A.2.1: (For the authoring tool user interface) Make alternative content available to authors. [Implementing A.2.1]

Rationale: Some authors require access to alternative content in order to interact with the web content that they are editing.

A.2.1.1 Text Alternatives for Rendered Non-Text Content: If an editing-view renders non-text content, then any programmatically associated text alternatives for the non-text content can be programmatically determined. (**Level A**)

Implementing A.2.1.1

See **"Implementing A.2.1"** from the document "Implementing ATAG 2.0" https://www.w3.org/TR/2015/NOTE-IMPLEMENTING-ATAG20-20150924/#gl_a21

Implementing Guideline A.2.1: (For the authoring tool user interface) Make alternative content available to authors. [Return to Guideline]

Rationale: Some authors require access to alternative content in order to interact with the web content that they are editing.

Implementing Success Criterion A.2.1.1 Text Alternatives for Rendered Non-Text Content:

If an editing-view renders non-text content, then any programmatically associated text alternatives for the non-text content can be programmatically determined. (**Level A**)

Return to A.2.1.1 in Guidelines

Intent of Success Criterion A.2.1.1:

The intent of this success criterion is to ensure that authors with disabilities have access to text alternatives for non-text content within the web content that they are editing, because this information can help authors orient and navigate as they edit.

The term "programmatically associated" is used to take into account that text alternatives may sometimes appear within web content in ways that authoring tools are not able to detect (e.g. when the information conveyed by an image is described in an adjacent paragraph without the relationship appearing in the markup).

Examples of Success Criterion A.2.1.1:

- **Non-web-based editor:** If an image in the content being edited includes alternative text, this is exposed to assistive technologies via the platform accessibility service.

- **Web-based editor:** If an image in the content being edited includes alternative text, this is included in the markup of the editing-view, so that the alternative text will be made available to the user agent.

Related Resources for Success Criterion A.2.1.1:

- User Agent Accessibility Guidelines (UAAG) 1.0.
- WCAG 2.0 (including Understanding WCAG 2.0 and How to Meet WCAG 2.0), especially WCAG 2.0 Guideline 1.1 and the section Understanding "Text Alternatives".

Demonstrate the capabilities of the new Silver structure:

What new methods should be considered for this:

The component parts of a new Method are:

Demonstrate the capabilities of the new Silver structure:
What new methods should be considered for this: [Todd's Techniques work]
The component parts of a new Method are:

19. Identify what platform, language and technology you are writing this for.
20. What the Method does technically
21. How the Method solves the problem or user need
22. Code Samples or Design Patterns
23. Test(s) from #2 - Tests
24. Points (TBD)
25. Tags for filtering
26. Resources
27. Is there a way to customize this method or add a new Method for user agent, authoring tool, or assistive technology?

Part 4 - **Write the Guideline Explainer**

- How: the crux of the solution

- Why in "Get Started" — plain language version of step 1

- Who — plain language version of groups

- Summary of the user need (in 1-2 sentences)

- Exceptions

Goal: To explain guidelines and activities in a technology-neutral manner, using plain and clear language. This is a rough equivalent to the Understanding document.
From: Step 1 - Define User Need (for “Get Started”), and from subject matter experts in each activity. It will also link to methods and tests (Steps 2 and 3).
For: Guideline Explainer (formerly the plain language prototype)
Confirm content for Get Started Page (based on #1)
Write Plan tab

- How can this be included early on in the process of the project, and how can you make up for it when it was not designed into the project (e.g. legacy)?
- What skills does your team need to do this?
- How can all members of a team best cooperate to help users accomplish this task?

Write Design tab
Simplify methods for designers without accessibility expertise
Write a technology neutral summary.
Write Develop tab
Simplify methods for developers without accessibility expertise
Write a technology neutral summary.
Write Test and Audit tab
Write the tags

Part 5 - **Write the Guideline**

Goal: To write a clear summary
From: The total experience
For: The universe of the people who will use only the list of guidelines.

A simple summary in imperative case, that is, “Do this” (informed by #1 to 4)
Tags for filtering the Guidelines

Part 6 - **Where the migration proposal is incomplete**

Goal: To identify the known problems with this individual proposal (including issues with the SC).
From: Team writing proposal
For: Silver review team

- Which item is incomplete?
- What are the barriers?
- what kind of expertise do you need?
- Do you have questions for the group?
- Etc.

Part 7 - **Evaluate**

Goal: To ensure the guideline and methods meet user needs.
From: evaluation by Silver reviewers (emails, Github, minutes, etc.)
For: Documentation page which will enable FAQ for that content
Documentation -- with consistent titles, headings and structure -- should address:

1. Key issues of concern emerging from discussion
2. What types of disabilities/needs are sufficiently addressed in this SC? Which ones are not?
3. Should this guidance or method be combined with another guidance or method?
4. Should it be split into two?
5. Are there ways this guidance or method will change, given emerging technology?
6. What gaps, conflicts and side-effects/negative impacts exist in this current guidance, method and test that must be addressed in creating new content? (see flags raised in Shawn's calls on migrating content)
7. What are two examples where this is implemented in the real world?
8. Is there research or other references to support this guideline, method, test, or user need?
9. Other notes for future guidance and methods

Experience:

Goal: To capture best practices in scaffolding content creation for Silver migration, to make the experience accessible, efficient, and effective.
From: Those who are testing the process by migrating success criteria.
For: Silver review team and contributors, to improve the support around the process.

- Work in small groups, where possible.
- Identify subject matter expertise of team members, looking for a diversity of skills (plain language, technical or user-centric concept, process expertise)
- Identify person with the idea. And person who is passionate enough to get it done.
- Consult examples of previously completed work.

- Coaches should be available for consultation, when teams get stuck.
- Iterating content creation process improves capacity to scale and consistency (within migrated content and between migrated and new content to be developed in the future).
- Reminder: consider accessibility improvements throughout the “supply chain”: product user, content contributor, implementing team, Silver content review team.

Lessons Learned for Testing this Process:

Goal: To capture the experience of completing this document, in order to iterate the process.
From: Interviews of content contributors who have used this process to migrate SC.
For: Silver reviewers, to streamline and improve the content writing process.

1 - Where did you get stuck? (list item #s)
2 - Which parts were slow and why?
3 - Which parts went really quickly/well?
4 - What caused speed bumps?
5 - Were there times when taking more time was helpful in improving quality?
6 - Add other questions as they come up.