About Web Accessibility

- Access to Web content and services regardless of ability or disability, or assistive devices used
- Sensory: Vision, Hearing
- Motor: Use only keyboard; only mouse; touch screen
- Cognitive
- Ageing-related (in ageing population but also children)
- Technological: old computer, slow connection, mobile device

Other considerations

- Assistive technology
- Services and applications
- Mobile-enabled accessibility services
- Mobile Text

Mobile Web Users with Disabilities

- Blind or low vision: Screen reader (eg, Talks, http://www.nuance.com/talks/); screen magnifier (eg, Code Factory Mobile Magnifier)
- Motor disability: Large keyboard (antiquated second-hand phones; DDC?)
- Hearing: Captions, visual cues for events
- Cognitive: more time (turn off auto refresh); text easier to understand annotated with images (adaptation);

Parallels

- Disabled users have involuntary disability
- All mobile users have voluntary “disability” due to mobile context that parallels innate disability
- No mouse (motor disability)
- No colour on monochrome display (colourblind)
- Small view area (restricted vision and screen magnifier)
- No sound, in public place (deafness)

Regulatory context

- Law, eg. Disability Discrimination Act in UK
- Required for mobile content, too
- European objectives, Lisbon agenda; Information Society for all. EC Mandate M.376 (public procurement requirements; will be developed by ETSI and CEN/CENELEC) and others under drafting
- MobileOk not yet (but look at regulation of TV for mobile devices)

Stakeholders

- General Mobile Web user
- User with disability
- Content provider
- Device vendor
- Policy maker, regulator
- Evauation tool vendor
- Authoring tool vendor
- Consumer advocate

What Do Stakeholders Need?

- Users: Non-discrimination (mobile and disabled users share common cause)
- Content providers, tool vendors: Advice on how to leverage investment (synergies):
  - MobileOk compliance to be accessible
  - Accessibility to improve mobile OK-ness
- Policy makers, advocates: Understanding of effort required for compliance

Gaps and Problems

- Developers may see WCAG and mobileOK as separate and disjoint, missing the synergy and the overlap between them
- Many similar content development and evaluation processes in both; leads to duplication of effort

What Can MWI (and WAI) Do?

- Describe relationship, overlaps and differences (mapping) between MWBPs and Web Content Accessibility Guidelines.
- Explain synergies in implementing WCAG and mobileOK together
- Help understanding of parallels in user experience

Benefits for All

- Save cost, effort
- Integrated strategy
- If you understand one set (Bps or guidelines) it's easier to learn the other
- Organization aiming to create accessible Web site may also go for mOK
- Partial compliance with “other” set: "While you're at it and designing mobileOK site, you could also consider some additional provisions and be WCAG compliant too..."

Document Contents

- Compare user experience (user ability v. device and environment)
- Compare WCAG to MWBP
- Compare MWBP to WCAG
- Implementation strategies

Why not just map one the other?

- Should be easy to map mobileOK provisions to which WCAG and vice versa.
- Not in practice, except in very few cases.
- MWBP based on limitations of devices; WCAG of users.
- MWBP already includes unhelpful “Related to” references; indicates confusion among editors
- Will cause confusion among users.

Mapping Document

- **Mapping**: **annotated** mapping between MWBP and WCAG
- **Gap analysis**: in the wider and more modern perspective? May be part of the first deliverable? Including Mobile Web/Internet enabled accessibility applications?

Doing Both

- How to implement mobileOK provisions in a way that also complies with WCAG provisions at the same time?
- How to implement WCAG provisions in a way that also addresses the mobile Web context at the same time?

Out of scope

- Making Web content accessible on mobile devices
- Accessibility (WCAG) techniques for mobile Web

Concepts

- How does BP help users with disabilities?
- Does BP give me WCAG compliance (no; not quite; “yes but you must....”)
- How does WCAG checkpoint improve experience for all users (with or without disability) in mobile context
- Does guideline or checkoint give me MWBP compliance.

Quick Summary

- Lists of checkpoints and BPs that:
  - Give comppliance with other provision with no extra work (eg, alternative text for images)
  - Require some extra work
  - Require consideration of wider range of user or device capabilities (eg, color blindness for contrast).
  - Mean that checkpoint or BP doesn't apply (eg frames, tables in WCAG)

Task Force History, Progress

- Approved and started summer face to face July 2007
- Several present agreed to take part
- Alan started writing it, little feedback or participation from others
- September, more input from few members (especially Charles, David Torres)

Wish-list (1 of 2)

- Once two primary documents are more stable
- Business case (not just for accessibility)
- Education & outreach resources (not just for accessibility)
- Explanation of how each Mobile Web Best Practice affects disabled users
- Investigate accessibility of Web content on mobile devices
- Investigate special needs of mobile users with disabilities

Wish-list (2 of 2)

- Describe assistive technology used by disabled users with mobile devices (for example screen readers and screen magnifiers).
- Customised content adaptation for user accessibility preferences.
- Describe special use cases relevant to disabled users (how disabled users get special benefit from mobile devices).
- Business benefits of accessibility in mobile context

Participation

- Mobile Web BP WG members
- WCAG WG members
- Disabled users, groups
- Government
- WCAG WG
- Not a priority for vendors (not necessarily true!)

Problems

- WCAG WG tied up with GLs work
- WCAG 1.0 out of date, 2.0 not stable
- People too busy with other things
- Perceived as unimportant
- Already done elsewhere (not really)