Eval TF

Changes made after remarks by WCAG group, Shadi and from the Telco and some from the list (still adding)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Comments, actions, status** | **Status** |
| **Jon Gunderson** | How will the evaluation or reporting methodology handle web resources where the state and content of the web page change based on user interaction with the page? The same URI could be accessible in some states and not be accessible in other states based on the user or external events.  Action: Added this remark into the editor note to the introduction of section 7. The Taskforce will discuss this when looking into this section.  Future status: Pending | Done |
| **Frederick Boland** |  | n/a |
| **Adam Solomon** |  | n/a |
| **Michael Cooper** | The document is Note-track yet includes normative references. The "normative" should be struck.  Action: Delete “normative” | Done |
|  | Also very confusing to encounter references towards the beginning of the document, it should be at the end in the usual place. If the goal is to introduce those documents, then there should be an actual introduction of their content, rather than just a definition list, and the section retitled, such as "important background reading" or something  ]. Note there is an (almost empty) references section at the end, all the more there shouldn't be a section with the same name towards the beginning.  Action: Change the title as indicated and make changes and addition to the text as indicated. Move other references to the end of the document | Done |
|  | Similarly, there is a (empty) "Glossary" at the end, yet there is a "Definitions and terminology" section towards the beginning. Suggest keeping the latter, and in its current position, and striking the glossary.  Action: Delete “glossary” until needed | Done |
|  | The Acknowledgements, References, Annex 1, and Annex 2, should all be under an "Appendices" section, and all the appendices numbered accordingly.  Action: Move indicated sections to Appendices section and number accordingly | Done |
|  | In general the document needs to be checked against the W3C Manual of Style http://www.w3.org/2001/06/manual/  Action: Check against style. Watch out for Web and w in website. Also W in Website start of sentence and Web site separate words in sentence.  Future status: Ongoing | Done |
|  | The header "Procedure to express the Scope of the evaluation (based on:)" seems incomplete, with nothing to complete the colon.  Action: delete “(based on)” | Done |
|  | I suggest sections 2, 3, and 5 be sub-sections of section 1, the introduction.  Action: Apply | Done |
|  | Although First Public Working Drafts of course aren't expected to be complete, the point of them is to get initial public review. I question if there is enough content there. In particular, I feel the need for more introductory content to explain the organization of the document and the intent of each of the sections. I think it dives too fast into nuts and bolts without giving that orientation, and after a couple sections of nuts-and-bolts moves to a bunch of sections of empty headers. That doesn't give me enough of a handle to review the content, and I don't think public reviewers would have one either. I feel that either the document needs to be fleshed out more (with good introductory paragraphs at least for each section), or that it needs a good introduction explaining the goals, structure, and anticipated content for each of the now-empty sections. The latter is more realistic for short turnaround, of course, but even so isn't something that can be done in less than a couple weeks. I'm hesitant to say "don't publish until this is done" but also question the utility of publishing without doing this, so I strongly suggest delaying a couple weeks to address this point. The other points I raised are mechanical and more easily addressed of course.  Action: Add a bit more info to the now empty section with only short explanation of what will be in there. Filling those sections will be more time. Will try to add more flesh to the editorial notes.. | Busy |
| **Loretta Guarino Reid** | I don't understand what you are trying to do in 7.1, "A webpage is part of the scope of an evaluation if one or more of the following apply:". It feels more proscriptive than appropriate. Do you want to prohibit using this evaluation methodology on subsections of a web site?  Action: There is indeed more discussion needed here. Input from the public would be welcome. | Open |
|  | Re 7.2: WCAG doesn't limit a conformance claim to web pages under the same base URI, nor does it require that everything under the base URI be included. If this is meant to be a general methodology for WCAG evaluation, it shouldn't apply just to a subset of appropriate content.  Action: Good input. This is indeed important to make clear. But this is also an important discussion. I am afraid that this discussion can take more than a few weeks to finish. | Open |
|  | 7.6: authorization issues can certainly be a problem for evaluation, but doesn't remove the requirement that the pages behind the authorization need to conform, right?  Action: That depends.. What if it is the entrance to the intranet or extranet of an organization? | Open |
|  | 8.1 should take dynamic pages into account, that is, sampling may need to sample different states of a dynamic page like a web application.  Action: Add to the editor note  Future Status: Ongoing, we will work this into the text of the section | Done |
|  | 10.1 seems incomplete.  Action: add more explanation | Busy |
|  | 10.2 probably also needs to describe the set of AT and User Agents available to the users.  Action: add as action point | Done |
| **David MacDonald** |  | n/a |
| **Bruce Bailey** |  | n/a |
| **Kerstin Probiesch** |  | n/a |
| **Call EvalTF** | Evaluation not just automated, but should include manual checking. It is now in section 9. We should not replicate but maybe add.  Action: Add into text more clearly | Done |
| **Call EvalTF** | The sections in 6 could be clearer. Could be like 6.1 approach, 6.2 collaborative, 6.3 individual. Now it looks like teams are necessary.  Action: Add into text more clearly | Done |
| **Call EvalTF** | Add to section 10 about conformance: we will not be redefining the WCAG clauses on conformance. But will add. Find wording that says that we will refer to WCAG2.0  Action: Add text | Done |
| **Shadi** | Editorial changes proposed  Action: make changes | Done |
| **Shadi/Eric** | Be more verbose in the editor notes. We will open here soon.. what will come here.  Action: work in progress | Busy |
|  | Section 4: Editor note: An evaluator can manually evaluate all pages, but on website with millions of webpages that is a lot of work. How to select a representative sample of a website is described in this clause. How many pages and how do you choose them? 🡪> this section will propose … Try to avoid new questions like “ how many pages..” We could add some bullets like “key questions”  Action: | Busy |
|  | Editor note = section description  Action: when relevant this could be changed | Done |
|  | 4.1 is a good description. Maybe add complete processes  Action: Add to 4.1 | Done |
|  | Add in status of document: We are looking not for details on how to do this but if we missed any consideration in the process of evaluation that are necessary.  Action: Add this to status of the document | Done |
|  | Add to abstract that we mean website including web application, mobile etc, dynamic…  Action: Add to abstract | Done |
|  |  |  |