# Evaluation Methodology Comments

3/14/12

This document lists comments on the following draft of the Website Accessibility Conformance Evaluation Methodology 1.0:

* W3C Editors Draft: 6 March 2012
* <http://www.w3.org/WAI/ER/conformance/ED-methodology-20120306>

### 1.4 Terms and Definitions

* Need better word for “Elemental Web Pages.” – Fundamental, Foundational, or Key web pages?

### 2.1 Scope of Applicability

* Bad example for “full website without exclusions or omissions of website parts.” Difficult for someone outside the organization to determine what is a “full website.” The methodology needs to allow the evaluators to determine the scope.
  + For example, the university website and the university’s library website might be owned by different organizations. You can see that by going to a number of different university pages.
    - <http://www.berkeley.edu/>
      * <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/>
      * <http://www.cs.berkeley.edu/>
    - <http://www.ox.ac.uk/>
      * <http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/>
      * <http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/>
* Would be nice to include the definition of “complete processes” in the text of the document instead of just linking the definition, since understanding the definition is key.
* The “Exception” for “clearly separable areas” is hard to define. Would be better to have scope of applicability determined and agreed upon by the evaluator, evaluation commissioner, and website owner. (And not put any information about “guesses” of scope in the evaluation methodology document.) For example, would the Berkeley library be a “clearly separable area” from the Berkeley.edu site? If we can’t define clearly define examples of scope and exceptions, better to leave it out of the document.
* Also, how is “self-enclosed websites” defined? Since Berkeley.edu has a link pointing to the Berkeley library website, does that mean is it not self-enclosed?

## 2.2 Required Expertise

* Link for “1.3 Background Reading” is broken.

## 3. Evaluation Procedure

### Step 1: Define the Evaluation Scope

* Requirement 1.a – Wording is confusing. Need to rewrite.
* Detailed Review – Make count recommended, but not required. It is difficult to get an accurate count. For example, WebAIM’s Wave Toolbar counts the error for “Form Label Missing” as a separate issue than “Orphaned Form Label” when they both apply to the same field. Another evaluator might count that case differently as one issue with the way the field and label is coded.
* Step 1.d – Take out “minimum set of web browsers and assistive technology to evaluate for shall be defined” and take out paragraph “It is important to also define the minimum set of web browsers and assistive technology to evaluate for.” – This should be in the product documentation what browsers and AT is recommended, not in the conformance documentation. It might be good to list what was used to test as an optional step, but not required. Conformance should be agnostic to the web browser and AT used.
  + **See WCAG section on conformance claims. Need to refer back to WCAG. “A list of user agents, including assistive technologies that were used to test the content.” - is listed as optional:** http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG20/#conformance-claims
  + Browser technology changes fast. The report might list which browser it was tested on, not on “minimum set of web browsers.” For example, the product was tested using “Browser x.x.” – not “The product was tested to work on Browser x.x and above.”
  + Documenting the AT used may be recommended, but not required. Conformance should be agnostic to the assistive technology used. For example, something may not work correctly with JAWS, however, if the website was coded correctly according to standards and works with NVDA, then it is a JAWS error and not a website conformance error.

### Step 2: Explore the target website

* Requirement 2.a. – Same comment for “elemental web pages” as above – need better definition of “elemental” and “pages”
* Requirement 2.c. – Need to provide an example.
* Requirement 2.d. – As the Section 508 refresh merges with WCAG, technologies for creating software applications and other products that might be evaluated using the evaluation methodology may be proprietary and the product may need to be evaluated from what is customer-facing on the front-end. (Informing the evaluator of the technologies might help the evaluator, but it should not affect conformance evaluation.)
  + The WCAG conformance claim section does call for a list of the [**Web content technologies**](http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG20/#technologydef)[**relied upon**](http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG20/#reliedupondef). However, I don’t know how that would be resolved if WCAG is going to be used to evaluate products that are not “web-based.”
  + http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG20/#conformance-claims

### Step 3: Select a Representative Sample

* Representative sample should be separate from scope. Rewrite the representative sample section to be a sample of scope. A representative sample could be a percentage of the total scope.
  + Requirement 3.a. - Elemental web pages were already part of defining scope.
  + Requirement 3.b. - “Exemplar” instances – should be part of scope and not “representative sample”
  + Requirement 3.c. – “Include Other Relevant Pages” should be part of scope and not “representative sample.”