

W3C MobileOK Basic Tests 1.0
(“Last Call” draft version of 30 January 2007)
ANEC comments

page 1 of 4

Title **Comments on “W3C mobileOK Basic Tests 1.0,
W3C “Last Call Working Draft 30 January 2007” version**
(available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/mobileOK-basic10-tests/>)

Source **ANEC**

Contact Bruno von Niman, ANEC W3C Representative
ANEC_W3CRep_Bruno@vonniman.com

To W3C Mobile Web Best Practices Working Group

Document for:

Decision	x
Discussion	x
Information	

1. Introduction and scope

As a general standpoint, ANEC considers Web accessibility and usability of very high importance to consumers. Given the increasing number of consumers accessing the Web through a mobile device, we appreciate W3C’s efforts trying to improve the experience of the mobile Web into a better consumer experience.

Our comments on this test specification draft document are provided below, with good intentions and in a positive spirit and should be considered as our contribution to improve the current Last Call draft.

The comments are intended to provide consumer-centric input and guidance on how to further improve and extend the coverage and usefulness of the present draft and/or future Recommendations within this area.

The comments reflect issues relevant to consumers, discussed and agreed in the ANEC ICT Working Group.

W3C MobileOK Basic Tests 1.0

(“Last Call” draft version of 30 January 2007)

ANEC comments

page 2 of 4

2. Comments

Section “Abstract”

It is understood that “this document defines the tests that provide the basis for making a claim of W3C® mobileOK Basic™ conformance, based on W3C Mobile Web Best Practices (<http://www.w3.org/TR/mobileOK-basic10-tests/#BestPractices#BestPractices>)”.

Furthermore, it is understood that “content passing these tests has taken some steps to provide a functional user experience for users of *basic* mobile devices whose capabilities at least match those of the Default Delivery Context (DDC).

The concepts introduced, mobileOK Basic (the lesser of two levels of claim; the greater level being mobileOK) and mobileOK do not assess interoperability, usability, accessibility, nor the accessed content”.

Comment #1: In the perspective of the above, we believe that this may be understood as (strongly) misleading consumers, who will have other, natural assumptions about the meaning of the trust mark. Assumably, if a mobile Web site is declared to be “mobileOK”, consumers will assume the trust mark to be some kind of guarantee for aspects that will mean OK to them. In other words, it may well be assumed as a guarantee for reliable content, safe access, and trustable connections with a fair usability and some minimum levels of accessibility. Furthermore, depending on the consumer’s age, assumptions may even be made about the some kind of appropriateness of the content, when accessed by young children.

An analogy to the above is TV sets marketed as “HD ready”. Even if this is only a declaration of one of the TV set’s capabilities, consumers (typically uninterested in details of this and other technologies) will naturally assume this to be a declaration of compatibility and capabilities for receiving and displaying high definition TV broadcasts without further needs to buy additional products (such as a set-top box) and most probably, subscriptions (that will also imply a considerable monthly fee). Consumers are often not aware that HD displays will only display an HD picture when connected to an HD receiver (set-top box).

This will lead to consumer disappointment and the product may even be handed back. To continue with the analogy, “Real HD ready” TV sets are now marketed and the situation is becoming very confusing...what was “HD ready”? And what may be next? False marketing does not aid the successful uptake of new consumer technologies.

Therefore, we suggest the re-branding of the mobileOK™ and mobileOK Basic™ trust marks in some way that reflects their true and proper meanings. Due to the complexity of the required branding, this may be a challenging task but worth the effort. It is not our task, nor competence area to propose alternative names that would work properly on a global market but wording that consumers would understand may include:

- Ready for mobile use;

W3C MobileOK Basic Tests 1.0
(“Last Call” draft version of 30 January 2007)
ANEC comments

page 3 of 4

- Mobile device adapted site;
- This content displays OK on mobile devices.

We believe that third party provisioning (or certification) is the only way to provide a reliable trust mark information to consumers as often, products do not match qualities declared by manufacturers, entailing a loss of consumer confidence. ANEC therefore encourages third-party certification.

Section 1.1.4

“The best practices, and hence the tests, are not promoted as guidance for achieving the optimal user experience...It will often be possible, and generally desirable, to provide an experience designed to take advantage of the extra capabilities.

Content providers should provide an experience that is mobileOK conformant to ensure a basic level of interoperability.”

Comment #2: The above is a valuable statement to developers but, again, misleading to consumers, who should understand the trust mark in the right way.

Section 2.3

“Creators of implementations of the tests described in this document are encouraged to provide as much information as possible to users of their implementations. Where possible they should not stop on **FAIL** and specifically they **should**:

- Provide information about the cause of failure
- Continue individual tests as far as is possible
- Carry out as many tests as is reasonable”

Comment #3: In addition to the above information recommended for provision, the consumer should be informed about the reason of failure in an understandable way. Additional information relating to other functionalities should also be provided. Furthermore and in addition, a technical reason or code may be provided to help the operator or creator of the implementation to identify the source of the error.

Last but not least, consumers should be able to contact customer services through a single point of access per modality (e.g. by calling the “usual” number for all issues).

Section 2.3.4

Some tests refer to “CSS Style” information.

W3C MobileOK Basic Tests 1.0
("Last Call" draft version of 30 January 2007)
ANEC comments

page 4 of 4

Comment #4: We would like the WG to confirm if the consequences of applying and using CSS have been examined with regard to mobile Web accessibility (possibly in collaboration with the WAI/WCAG Activity)?

Section 3.3

The current requirements are to support only UTF-8 encoding.

Comment #5: We believe that the UTF-8 coding support should be studied in more detail, as it may have implications on the displayable text and the data transmission.