Selecting and Using Authoring Tools for Web Accessibility Update - Planning

# Purpose/Goals/Objectives

The purpose of the [Selecting and Using Authoring Tools for Web Accessibility](https://www.w3.org/WAI/impl/software) document is to provide our audience with information to consider when selecting authoring tools. It is also to provide our audience with information on how to adjust around tools' limitations.

[Maybe instead of above, how about bullets like below (which includes additional ideas):]

\* Help readers know what to look for in selecting an authoring tool

\* Education readers about ATAG

\* Help readers work around tools' limitations

\* Encourage procurers to require (or at least request) ATAG-compliant tools

\* Indirect: Encourage authoring tool vendors to make their tools more accessible and meet ATAG.

# Audience

* **Primary audience**: Web developers and designers
* **Secondary audiences**: Procurement officers, web accessibility specialists and researchers
* **Indirect audience**: Authoring tool vendors.

[SLH: I wonder if procurement should be a primary. I think should also include project managers – and whomever decides what authoring tools to purchase and use.]

# Current Documents

* <https://www.w3.org/WAI/impl/software>
* (previous work info: <https://www.w3.org/WAI/EO/Drafts/eval/selectingtools-changelog> )

# Recommended Approach

[SLH: This document is very old. No need to feel tied to current content or format. Can consider starting from a blank slate – with info from this version as advisory input. Suggest you revise below accordingly.]

* Update content with current references, standards and resources, including links.
* Simplify and tersify language.
* Reduce amount of text if possible, without changing meaning.
* Information should be accessible nearly at a glance.
* Complete rewrite of introduction to be a Summary – It should serve as TL>DR and hit main points of the page.
* Break the page into four clearly different sections:
  1. Summary
  2. ??? Introduction
  3. Tool selection
  4. Tool use
* Align section titles to page title
* Review entire section "Working around Limitations of Existing Authoring Tools" – Important information, likely needing updating. Could be reduced.
* Delete Product reviews section as entirely too far out of date.
* ***Consider***: Create an actual checklist after the information about what to consider. Or rename that section without calling it a checklist.
* ***Consider***: Seeking informal feedback from CMS/LMS/CRM developers about what they would find useful on such a page. This could take longer to get information, but would arguably lead to a resource developers find useful. [SLH: good to get input. Although CMS/LMS/CRM developers are not the primary audience of this resource.]

# Proposed New Outline

[SLH: + Summary; - Product Reviews; not sure about the rest of it…]

<h2>Introduction

<h2> Selecting Authoring Tools

<h3>Points to consider

<h4>Adjust headings according to text edits

<h3>Checklist

<h2>Limitations of Existing Authoring Tools

<h3>Examples of strategies to work around limitations of existing authoring tools

<h2>Product Reviews

# Target Delivery date (subject to change)

[SLH: We're not in a hurry for this. Let's not push ourselves and stress about it! Suggest relaxing the schedule – especially \*anything\* that needs time from Eric or Shawn :)]

* Send out email to CMS/LMS/CRM developers about what they'd find useful on this page – March 16, 2018
* Create resource on GitHub – March 17, 2018
* Prepare First Draft – March 17 to March 25, 2018
* Consult with EOWG during F2F meetings (if necessary) – March 19 to March 23, 2018
* Draft ready for Review Team – March 26 to March 30, 2018
* Review Team/Editor Iterations – April 2 to April 6, 2018
* One week review cycle and feedback – April 9 to April 13, 2018
* Final Draft ready for EOWG Thorough Review – April 16 to April 20, 2018

# Dependencies [maybe not need this section?]

* GitHub resource setup [let's just use wiki for now. Can move to GitHub when available.]
* Response from CMS/LMS/CRM developers [see above]
* Response time from review team [need to establish one – Brent & Sharron :-)]

[SLH: ATAG is no longer. afaik, no one has resources to do updated reviews. Assume just delete this section.]