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>> SUSANNA LAURIN: We are still trying to get the captioning ‑‑ we now have captioning. So, we are not waiting for the captioning anymore. So, hello and welcome everyone. And thank you for coming here this lovely day in Brussels where it is not raining. I'm always as happy as that. And I hope that the one of you ‑‑ ones of who can see the screen do appreciate my fantastic layout of the ‑‑ how the two log in for the Microsoft network. It says that the network name is MSFT guest. So, Microsoft guest and then there are three alternatives. Choose the second one which is the event attendee code. And then the code that you are supposed to remember, is a large M for Microsoft, S event 812GH. Yeah, that's long. MS event 812GH.   
 And I did take a photo of this to send to my designers so they can be impressed with what I am doing with material. It is very ugly. Thank you. If you would like to communicate around this workshop with anyone outside of this room, please do. We are happy to share everything that we share in this workshop. And we do have a hashtag, we4authors and also a project website which you can reach at www.funka/we4authors. I can show this again later and now I have no idea what my next slide. My next slide is the agenda. We are doing a short introduction here first so that we know who everyone is and who the many tables. And then I'm going to present to you the results of the project so far. And what the project is about and everything else like that. And then we go for lunch which is very important. And the lunch is served outside of the doors here. We have three doors where we can go in and lunch is where you got the coffee in the beginning. And then we start with the Round Table discussions. So, then we will urge you to sit down with people that you don't know from before, if possible, so this we get interesting discussions. And we have a coffee break and then we report back to the Plenary. So that all of the small groups results will be shared with each other.   
 And then we present the draft guidelines that we have started to work on and that is really the idea of this workshop is not only that we present to you what we have found in this project but even more important that you come up with ideas and things that we can implement or include in our guidelines. So that's sort of the idea. And then we have a little bit of a wrap‑up and next steps. And please interrupt me or us if something is not clear or if you have question. We do leave room for questions after each part of the agenda. And wave ‑‑ make big gestures because I don't have very good eyesight.   
 So, I wanted to start with saying thank you to Microsoft for providing this fantastic venue with all the technology and everything and a fantastic staff who have been helping us the whole morning. And we did have a little bit of a misunderstanding with the times with the captionists and we have sign language interpreters and really nice to be here. I want to introduce my team. I'm Susanna Laurin and I also have Anett Ruszanov. You met her when you registered, and she will be helping us out today and also Jos´s Usaro will be the moderation of the more interactive parts of the workshop. José is based in Madrid. I am based in Stockholm. And I wanted to say something to José. Do you have a microphone? So, because we are doing this in cooperation with European Disability Forum, yeah.

>> JOSÈ USARO: Do you hear me well now? Yes. Okay. Good. So, thank you very much Susanna. Thank you very much to Funka for the organization of this event, of this workshop. A big thanks as well to Microsoft for allowing us to use this wonderful space. And when I was thinking reflecting about this event and this workshop and what we are going to discuss today about authoring tools, I remembered that story that legend of the space race, one of them, of course. This problem that the Americans found when they realized that pen didn't work in space because of lack of gravity, and the USSR came up with the solution and used a pencil instead that could work in lack of gravity.   
 And, of course, this legend is just a legend of it is not true but anyway, I thought it was ‑‑ it reminded me of what we are going to discuss today of the importance of the authoring tools and importance of having something that is ‑‑ that fits in the context. And now we have a new context, and new context that we are pushing for from the disability movement, and organizations such as Funka. This new context is more inclusive web for all, for Persons with Disabilities. For the past years we have been advocating for the Web accessibility directive, and recently the European Accessibility Act. We do have a European standard on accessibility requirements for ICT products and services. So, we do have all these tools and this legislation, this new playing field that in which we need to come up because we have to and we must come up with accessible content. And to do so instead of investing in a complicated new pen system to write in lack of gravity in Spain, so a complicated way of using authoring tools to come up with accessible content, I hope that thanks to this project we will have better authoring tools in the future that will allow the Web editors and the organizations to produce more accessible content for Persons with Disabilities.   
 And I'm very much looking forward to these discussions and to the guidelines that we all produce together. And thank you very much all of you for coming. Thank you.

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: Thank you. I love the idea that we are creating a pencil for space. Oh, that's not a good idea.   
 So, this project is funded by the European Parliament. So, we have a member of Parliament who wanted to send us greetings. I think he is in Hungary today. He has sent a video and with any luck I can now play this video. And we will have ‑‑ yes. Sorry. Can we ‑‑ we need to ‑‑ we need a microphone for the sign language interpreter. Yeah. And the captioning doesn't work.   
 Can somebody more technical than me understand why the captioning is not showing in the video? Because it is captioned. Where are the captions? That is crazy. We embedded it in the ‑‑ in this but then the captions disappeared. Let's do this. Yeah, the subtitles.   
 We have a microphone for the ‑‑

>> Yeah.

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: Can we have the microphone on?

>> Dear participants, Funka's workshop. First, I would like to thank the organizers for the invitation based on which I am sending you this short video message.   
 Industrial production both globally and in the EU is undergoing a radical digital transformation. New advanced manufacturing techniques rely primarily on innovative digital technologies which cannot work in isolation. In this context the subject of the workshop which authoring tools to procure for more accessible digital services is topical and essential and special for people, particularly for people with disabilities.   
 The European Union is funding the Funka We4authors project on accessibility in a very hands on practical and innovative way to support the four recent e‑regulations.   
 Procurement directive of 2017, the Web accessibility directive of 2018, the audiovisual media services directive 2018, and finally the European Accessibility Act of 2019. To which I have contributed significantly and for a long time as Rapporteur and member of the EP negotiating team of the ‑‑ of the employment and social affairs Committee, the European Parliament. All of this is part of the digital agenda and connected to the sustainability goals. Accessibility is not only about the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Human Rights and democracy, it is also important for internal market for Acting against defragmentation and offering opportunities to the EU based industries to work across borders and to compete with the United States and Asia.   
 Legislation alone will never solve accessibility issues. We believe that the private Actors and public sector bodies would equally need help and support to move in the right direction and correctly implement the European directive. According to the Web accessibility directive each Member State has the responsibility to not only monitor but also support and guide and facilitate and to educate. And make sure that the public sector websites and mobile devices are also considered in this. I would like to point out that in my country, in Hungary, we implemented the service which we call contact which allows deaf and hearing impaired peoples to communicate with one another.   
 (No audio. Standing by).

>> Also in public services using an interpreter who is located somewhere else and still connected via the video camera. On the other hand, the new service called remote eye aims to provide the blind and partially sighted communities. By giving them access to high quality online aid services, across the country through accessible mobile devices. Thousands of people use the app every day and operators provide 24/7 availability. For further implementations I think there would be a need for the training that Funka provides. Particularly in regard to the implementation of the new European Accessibility Act, which will be mandatory for all service providers manufacturers and distributors from 2022.   
 I wish you a successful workshop.

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: Thank you. So, let's go on with this and now we will have no more complicated things like videos to show. So probably, hopefully the ICT will stay with us a little bit better now. But that was a very nice message I think from the member of the Parliament. So, I would like to first just talk a little bit about us. So I'm happy that I don't know everyone in this audience because sometimes when you work in accessibility it feels like a family gathering every time you do a meeting, you have seen people before and that's nice but we need new voices and faces. I will say a little bit about us. We are a small consultancy, Swedish company and we were founded by the disability organizations in Sweden in the mid '90s and we started with the IT for Persons with Disabilities and created a portal, a web portal at that time for disabled persons by disabled persons. And that project that was just a non‑profit at that time and project based and funded by the Swedish Government. And it was a big success not because it was fantastic, but it was, I think the first one at least in the northern part of Europe. So that ‑‑ the resources technical resources and human resources created in that project were then converted into a privately-owned company. So, from the year 2000 we are a privately-owned company selling consultancy around accessibility issues and usability issues. We do consulting. So, we develop websites and systems that are accessible. We also do a lot of training, of course, and we do analysis and audits and things that accessibility consultants do mostly. But we are also a little bit different from many of our colleagues in this industry that we are also doing around 20% of our turnover comes from research and innovation. We do a lot of European and national and Nordic projects of different kinds and we do brag ourselves with having a position of trust where we do a lot of policy work. We do studies and investigations for Governments in all the markets that we are active in. And we have also been very active in the subgroup of the web accessibility directive transposition period. And so on. So, I think we also ‑‑ we do nitty gritty details converting PDFs in to being accessible and so on but we try to make sure that the policy and legislation and standardization is following in the right way. So, we try to really impact accessibility work from all sides and all levels of   
 We work a lot in standardization. If you find the EN301549 standard difficult to understand you can blame me and a couple of others. I have been in that work since 2008. We believe that standardization, the real definition of the word standardizations that it a sure way to lose friends and put family to sleep. I am a very impatient person. Moving too slow for my taste but our grandchildren will thank us. But I think standardization is sort of key for making sure that we don't need to do one billion usages every time we deploy anything new. We need to have a standard as a minimum requirement. And especially now with the legislative framework.   
 We are also one of the proud founders of the International Association of Accessibility Professionals which is now is global organization where Microsoft also one of the founders and IBM and Adobe and a couple of other small Actors. And we have now members in 42 countries around the globe and we have been certifying a couple of thousand specialists in web accessibility and basic accessibility knowledge, the idea is to raise the knowledge base so that everyone that calls him or herself an accessibility specialist actually can prove that, you know, we know what we are talking about. So, we are trying to make a real profession out of be a web accessibility specialists. So that's us. And we are based in Stockholm, Sweden, Madrid Spain because of the weather and Brussels because of also the weather I guess I should say.   
 But we work all over the world. I'm going to Kenya in a couple of weeks doing also, trying to sort of sell the EN standard there. We have been working in South America and Australia and everywhere. So, we are clearly a global company. And I think we represent nine or ten nationalities and I think that staff can speak 15 languages or something like that. Very impressive. We are having this workshop three times. We are having it with you the end users and tomorrow we have the public sector bodies and then we have Thursday we have the same sort of setup with the industry. So, I do have a piece where I talk about what accessibility is. And it starts like this, 80 million reasons for diversity. I will not do this with you because you already know that people have different abilities. And UNCRPD let's skip that. You know that already. I will do that next two days but something maybe about the EU regulations that the member of Parliament talked a little bit about. I think it is important to understand so the framework of the whole regulation piece here because we are really moving from soft recommendations into legal things. And that is usually a good thing, but it is not without problems. So, it is important to remember that the web accessibility directive is what this project is sort of based on, is stipulating what to do, but not how to do it. And that has been a very important thing to remember when we worked in the subgroup and also from the client, the commission that we should not be too prescriptive of exactly how to do things because then we could sort of lower the innovation power of the industry. So, we need to make sure that things are accessible but exactly how it is becoming accessible that should be up to the market. I think really that is not only because of the commission is in the room here but I think it is the right way to do it. The market should actually be able to provide the different solutions.   
 So, the idea behind all of this is not only like Adam said, democracy and so on but to reduce fragmentation and to get equal opportunities for big businesses across borders. That's been one of the main things behind all this legislation. And really to foster innovation. I think we are in a very, very interesting time with Artificial Intelligence where we can see that some of the accessibility problems may have a better solution in couple of years. I am happy that I haven't retired yet because think many things will happen in the next couple of years, hopefully.   
 And also it is an opportunity to open new markets, new markets for European businesses in other places but also to invent new things so that you can sell new products and services attached to the whole accessibility market so to speak.   
 And, of course, the ‑‑ to support the internationalization. And so what was the problem? What kind of problem is our projects trying to solve? Why are we doing this? What is really the problem? You can look at accessibility digital accessibility in like three parts. So, the technology part, UX and design how things look to put it mildly and then the real content. So, the technological part, the technical part is really the code, things that we don't sort of see with the eye. We don't need to bother about how it really works on the sort of back side of the computer but extremely important that the technology works and especially for people who need assistive technology. Because the technical part of the accessibility is not working then the ‑‑ sometimes I present this as a picture with pyramid, with the technology in the bottom because if you don't have the technical accessibility in place, then you ‑‑ you really risk to exclude people with assistive technology. But if you just see sort of what kind of roles and what parts of accessibility affects the whole user group of Persons with Disabilities, actually all the three parts are equally important. So the UX and design part maybe some people think that design is just ‑‑ it should look nice and you have the idea that a bank should be blue or you are ‑‑ if you are selling something, it should be look sexy or whatever. But UX and design is user experience. So, both the functionality and how different objects are placed on a website and the colors and the fonts and size and things. That's extremely important from an accessibility point of view. If you have objects too close to each other it can be really hard to click the right thing or if objects are placed too far from away from each other then they get impossible to understand how they connect. If you have an enlargement, for example. So, there are many things in the design part that are extremely important for accessibility.   
 And then, of course, the content. I mean what's the use of having the possibility to get to the Internet with your assistive technology and then understand where you should go because the navigation and the UX and design is sort of helping you to understand where you are. And then when you reach the content that's absolutely incomprehensible. If we look at this ‑‑ and that's, of course, important for everyone. But it becomes even more important if you have dyslexia or cognitive disability or not used to the technology.   
 So, all these three parts are also the technology is the responsibility for the technical accessibility is usually from the developers side and also the industry, the suppliers that producers of the content management system or web authoring tools. And the UX and design are, of course, the UX designers and graphical designers, their responsibility. Sometimes the authors can also do things in the design but they should not because that's not their competence really and then the content. There are millions of people out there who are actually publish ing things. And all these people really need to understand accessibility to make the whole sort of ecosystem of accessibility work. So, this is why it becomes so complex. And if you look at the standards, and the legislation, they cover a large part of the technical part, maybe half or so a little bit more than half of the design part and almost nothing from the content part. So, we do have legislation here now. And that is good.   
 But we are not finished. The minimum requirements of the standard can never be sort of the goal: It is only the baseline that is very important to understand. And what we try to do in this project is to connect the technology with the content in a way that the idea is that the authoring tool which is sort of the tool that you need for publishing something online, should try to make default accessibility. So that it will ‑‑ first of all it doesn't ‑‑ doesn't create problems, of course. But also that is sort of raises the basic level of accessibility of the whole website without you needing to do anything so that decreases the need of competence for the person who actually is sort of developing website. But the other thing that the authoring tool can do is to support the author, the person who is actually publishing something can get help from the authoring tool. The idea is to try to fix two out of three things with sort of one goal.   
 So, a little bit, formal about we 4 authors project, it is so‑called pilot project. First time we do pilot project and I think it is kind of new also to everyone. It is European Parliament who ask the commission to do this and it is funded by the Parliament. It started in May last year. And we will be ending just after this workshop. We have ‑‑ when we have sort of summarized and made the reporting and everything. So, in November this year it will end. The total funding is 150,000 Euro and it is led by us Funka and our partner is the Spanish W3C office, CITIC, who are the research partner and we have the three partners for the workshop and outreach which is European Disability Forum and tomorrow we are doing it together with the European regions, European regions and first day we do the industry and standardization workshop together with ANEC which is the consumer voice in the standardization and I guess the French ‑‑ so it is (speaking in a non‑English language). And I can't make that into a sentence but that's at least the letters behind ANEC. So that's the sort of setup of this whole project.   
 And what we are doing, what we have been doing and what we are still doing sort of main parts of this project is that we started out with mapping the existing tools. What authoring tools are out there, not the whole market. Which tools are used by public sector bodies in Europe because that's sort of the scope of the project. And then select the ones that we thought were most interesting or relevant to work with and then try to collaborate with them which is not always super easy because they are very competitive and so on. This was built into this project from the start. What each authoring tool can do, what the state of art, what default accessibility do they provide right now and what can they do in the future and then try to ‑‑ we like to do things in reality. We are ‑‑ one of our payoffs is that we do everything that we recommend should be tested in real life. So, we really do prototypes. We don't only listen to the providers and ask you, can your tool do this and then we say yes. We build it ourselves and try it and test it. We have done a lot of testing and still doing testing. We are doing workshops with the stakeholders like this week to collect input and a reality check to make sure we cover the needs of the three stakeholder groups in the guidelines that we are going to produce. And they will be free online after the project finishes, of course. So that is sort of what we give back to society. Hopefully they will be helpful. That is what I hope.   
 And, of course, there is also part of the dissemination in the workshop. And then we do reporting back to the commission, of course. So, this is more or less what the project is about.   
 And what are we looking for when we are doing this research? What did we expect and what would we like to find? What would be the goal and objective of this? Because accessibility by default that can mean that's a bit abstract. It could mean many different things. And what we were trying to find, what we were thinking of finding or trying to look for was really that all the parts different parts of the authoring tools comply with the regulations. So, it shouldn't be any built in in accessibility because that would be crazy. But really the framework and the templates and objects and everything the different tools have different sort of technical setups and they work in a slightly different way but all the different parts they consist of should comply with the regulations. That is sort ‑‑ that should be the baseline. And then nothing that the authoring tool is creating should create any bad code because usually there is a gen‑ ‑‑ you can generate a formula, a generate a table, generate different things within the authoring tool and that is where the bad things usually start. So, when you are actually creating something that something creates also extra direct code or code that is really disturbing the accessibility.   
 So that is the other thing we were trying to check that is not happening. And then, of course, the human factor. So that the authoring tool helps the author, the person who is actually publishing things online should get support from the tool because the tool is a tool. They shouldn't be left alone. There should be no or little room for mistakes. And if for some reason need to be room for mistakes because of flexibility or the client wants to decide for themselves what to do, if you cannot sort of cut off the possibility to make mistakes then at least support and help the author to do the right thing. You can, you know, you can lead people a little bit to make sure that they ‑‑ or guide them to make sure they do the right thing. Then the third thing, is something that we provide is the possibility for the publisher to control the accessibility before it actually goes online. And we are looking in vain. We haven't found that yet.   
 So, but that is ‑‑ that is really what we were envisioning trying to make sure we can find. That is sort of the ecosystem and everything we are looking for here and Bart wants to say something. We need a microphone. Can one of the microphone runners please run? Anett has very high heels but she can't run. She is doing a very good job.

>> Bart: I didn't understand the third point that you mentioned and my ‑‑ maybe it is an answer to my question. Did you also look at accessibility of the user interface of the tools? So, like the back end for author with a disability that his interface to create is also accessible? Is that your third point or is it something else?

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: No. Yes. No. Yes ‑‑

>> Bart: I didn't get it.

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: I understand what your question is. Thank you. So, the control before publishing is really for an editor with or without a disability, before you push the send or authoring button, the authoring tool is checking the accessibility for. That's kind of a wizard or a service that is impossible to build but that's one of the things that we think is one of the clever things to help the Web author to do the right thing. Before you publish something it is checked for accessibility. So, if it is not accessible it will not be published. That is my third point. And to your other question very important question did we look for the back end, how the accessibility of the editor? Yes, that's part of the project. That's not the main research question but that's part of the project. Our problem has been we very soon discovered that that was not on the agenda for any of the biggest authoring tools. But yes, we did look at it. But unfortunately, we didn't dig a lot in to it because the answer was no, we haven't really looked into it. And the problem is the editor in most cases, a third-party product. So that is a disappointing part of the ‑‑ of this project. But hopefully it will be pushed and solved in the future. And I hope at least with an authoring tool that we have been working with at least they have got some inspiration and ideas I think for working with this in the future. But very good question. Thank you.   
 And the project results until now are really that we ‑‑ when we did the mapping, we used an automated analysis tool. And we based it on ‑‑ I mean the funny thing is with the Web accessibility directive no one, not the Member State, not the monitoring agencies and not the commission, none of them has any clue on how many websites there are that are covered by the Web accessibility directive. We have legislation and we know the scope but what we don't really know who the legal object of this is. So, the way we choose to do it was to base this analysis on the procurement directive where there is a list of public sector bodies that are sort of the same more or less or similar in all EU Member States.   
 And that is a list of everyone that is covered by the procurement directive. And it is from 2017. You can argue that it is old. It is not covering everything because it doesn't list all the local Governments and so on. But it is the most comprehensive list where we can find it is sort of fair to all the Member States because we could have taken in the countries where we work and where we understand the language, we could have made maybe better cluster sample of public sector. But in some countries, we just couldn't. We needed to rely on some kind of open source. And the way we did it we have now the same structure in all EU Member States. So, then we wouldn't be biassed on any part of Europe. We did crawl 10,817 pages which equals 1734 public sector websites. So that is the baseline of this, the basis of the analysis. And from that 1734 websites, we could identify 832 ‑‑ so. It says identified tools on the screen. That's very stupid of me. 832 of websites we could identify the tool. So, it is not 832 tools. That is a mistake. Sorry.   
 About half of websites that where we could ‑‑ that we analyzed we could detect what tool is used. And among those 832 where we could actually see what tool they were using in the code, we detected 61 different authoring tools. So, we have a list of 61 authoring tools. What we were looking for is the top 100 but we got the top 61 and that's not because everyone ‑‑ it depends on how website is coded and it is very technical but not ‑‑ it is not possible everywhere to make sure that we ‑‑ that you from the outside can crawl in to the code and see what kind of authoring tool is behind it.   
 And from this 61, we made a list of the top 30 and we validated them by interviewing public sector Government procurement specialists and monitoring specialists and other experts in public sector to make sure we sort of covered most of the biggest ones. So, we have validated this also manually to make sure that at least the top 30 were the ones that people are actually using.   
 And then we made the manual selection of ten, the top ten of these 30. And that was not based on how many, I mean the top 30 is really the number of usages that we could see. But then we wanted to have a very good blend. So, we made sure that we have a geographical difference. We you have north, south, west and east of Europe represented here. And also different technical backgrounds or environments for this. I mean they have different programming languages. They have different ways of producing the content and so on. So that we have different kinds of web authoring tools that we want to have as broad a picture as possible and then the business model level is important. And that was really decided by the commission, that we were covering both open source and licensed products. So, by these three criteria we think we made a good selection of authoring tools. And the ten authoring tools that were selected by this selection criteria were dot net nuke, web server, IBM web sphere. If you are familiar with these names you know ‑‑ you see that some of them are open source, some of them are licensed. Some are, you know, more complex than others. That's the idea that they should be a broad perspective of what is used in public sector in the EU.   
 And after choosing this we tried to contact them and persuade them to collaborate with us and we talked to the provider the, the producers and suppliers and communities. This works in different ways. If it is a business licensed product or online community, so we had to do a lot of the outreach and talk to many people. And we also wanted to make sure that the people we collaborate with are the ones that know most about accessibility. If we have a contact who says yeah, I am very interested in this, many wanted to be in this project but not right ones. We had to can picky. Because some of the suppliers wanted to be in this project because they realized that we would give them accessibility knowledge and ha would be good for their business, fine. Would we make the absolutely best accessibility out of the authoring tools or would we just get sort of amateur that wanted to do something? We needed to be very, very picky with the collaboration part to make sure we have the absolutely best supplier or producer to make sure whatever we find about the possibilities for each authoring tool is really the best thing that your authoring tool can do right now. Every question that we ask can be answered in a very competent way.   
 And then I have a small illustration about how this goes. This is first bubble is the goal. When we have provided them with framework and made friends with them and made sure that they wanted to collaborate in this project we told them what the goal was and looking for and aiming for and how this would work and so on. Then in the next sort of bubble we gave them the requirements. So, this is what we want you to do and this is what questions we want asked and really what we want to try to do with the prototype with your tool. We then develop the prototypes together with them. Sometimes in a very close relations and sometimes they did something and we sort of provided the control. And then we did the testing. So that we know that the prototypes that they were providing is actually also providing accessibility by default, what we wanted to try. So now I have here four different sorts of bullets with arrows between them. And then in reality this is how it looks like. So now I have a lot of arrows going back and forth in circle. This was an agile project and it is never straightforward when it comes to accessibility. You have one step forward and two steps back. It has been a very agile process where we learned a lot. And I am sure they have learned a lot as well and the research questions we wanted to have an answer to is really what kind of accessibility work you have already done. And under laying this question, did you ever look at accessibility of the specific editor interface. I mean is it possible to use this tool if you have a disability?   
 And what is the ‑‑ what do you work with users? Do you test things? How do you work with accessibility? And then we asked, of course, if they do have any accessibility by default features today, I mean if they did build something in and also extra add ones for accessibility. Not everything has to be by default from the first time you sort of push the button. And start building your website. You can add things on later on, like support and that kind of things. And we asked for a demo environment, because it is good for us in the research that we have some environment where we can develop and deploy things without sort of ruining everything. But it is also very interesting to understand how they work with their own development and with their accessibility testing and so on. If they don't have an environment to do demos, how could you or anyone else try the tool before you buy it. That's impossible. So, it is also an accessibility feature for outside of the project.   
 And then comes another set of very important questions and that has to do with templates. Many of the Web authoring tools have like a motor, engine which is sort of making sure everything becomes a website but then there are different templates that you can use. One template for a video and one for an Article and one for bullet points or whatever. And you can call it different things. But templates are one way of calling it. Some web authoring tools are providing ready to use templates. When you buy the authoring tool you get a set of templates. And if that is included, that is according to our research, very, very common that the client uses these templates because you get it sort of in the price and if you download it, it is for free. People use it. And if these ready to use templates are not accessible, then we have a problem.   
 Next question is if the templates are release safe and this is something that we have experienced with a lot of open source tools, especially. And that's that you choose an open source authoring tool, and then you fix the accessibility things which is fine and then you are happy. And then comes a new release from this open source tool. And because you cannot choose yourself often if you want to stay with the old version or get the new one, because after a while it will not work with your browser. So, you need to upgrade and then sometimes the new code deploys all the accessibility features. So, you need to redo this work. And that is very good for us as a supplier because that is like an eternal machine and we have to dot same work again. It is not very good for the market. So have really safe templates, there are technical ways to work around this. But that is one of the important questions.   
 Another research question was, of course, if they do quality checking of the templates. So, do they know that the templates are accessible. Does anyone check it? Do they know if they are accessible? And also if they have third party templates. Because some of the tools like Word Press has a lot of ‑‑ they ‑‑ Word Press comes with tools but also a separate market where you can buy templates and download some of them for free. But some of them you can buy. It has around authoring tool it has been created a new market that's separated from the tool itself but where people earn money and share things around templates. And that makes it further away from the creating of the tool and potentially even harder to make sure that the accessibility is controlled in these templates. The further you go from the responsibility so to speak it becomes harder to control.   
 We also asked about partner networks because it is very important for the Web author to have somebody else to ask. It is very much easier to choose your tool if you can ask not only the market but also your friends. And other public sector authors in other local Governments or whatever. And it is also a way to share knowledge and new training and so on so. It is very important. And also for the partners to share knowledge and raise the competence, of course.   
 And then the last question we asked, I mean there are many questions under each bullet point here but really the next sort of theme is if the Web authors can influence the code, because in some authoring tools you are only sort of in the editor and you cannot destroy anything or do anything bad. But sometimes you are when you are ‑‑ when you want to create a form field or a table or something like that, then you are actually in the HTML code and that means you as a web author don't have the competence or the knowledge around this, you risk of doing many bad things, but one thing, of course, making really crappy code and thereby destroying the accessibility.   
 So, kind of obvious, but accessibility is a shared responsibility. The tool producer and provider have a responsibility. The partners who provides the template has a responsibility. The supplier or the person who is ‑‑ or the company who is developing website or the template for you has a responsibility. And, of course, the person buying or procuring the tool needs to also have very good requirements so that that, you know, what you buy is accessible. So, it is a very shared responsibility and that why we try to cover so many parts of this to make sure that we understand how it works and what potentials there are. And, of course, the authors. I forgot the authors. That's probably 50% of this.   
 So, if we summarize the results and I want to make sure that you are now not disappointed, we will not point out which tool is the best one. And we will not point out which one has the biggest problems. That is not the point of this project. It is on a higher level, trying to make sure that we can push the whole industry in the right direction. And the only way we can get the suppliers and the producers to work with us is to make sure that we are not making a list of which one are the good guys or bad guys. I am not going to tell you the specific detailed results on every one of them.   
 But the summary of the results high level is that a lot has happened. I mean ‑‑ it is a first time we do this big study on web authoring tools only. But we are constantly doing audits and testing on different websites all over Europe. So, we have met or we have seen websites with all of these tools before. And, of course, we ‑‑ when we do many audits with the same tool in the background, we realize that most of the problems come from the tool. And we went back and looked at the ‑‑ all the material we have had from before. We have a very ‑‑ we have a large database since 2001 when we started doing things with the same methodology as we do now. All the tools that existed at that time have been evolving and developing much better accessibility. So very good. A lot of things have happened of that's encouraging.   
 Despite us trying to make we have a breadth and many different kinds of tools they have many similarities when it comes to the disability. We see a lot of similarities. It is hard to say ‑‑ we can say some things are better solutions than others. But they really do share many other problems.   
 Unfortunately for the project we found very little accessibility by default. So, this is not really happening yet. So, more is needed, I think. And generally, also is that they do not check their templates. They have no idea if the templates are accessible or not. This is big, big trouble for you if you want to buy a tool that the templates are not qualitatively checked. But the biggest problem we have found generally is the editor. So, the editor is really what you as a web author see, that is the little engine that, you know, you write something, and it creates the code that goes out on website.   
 And the editors that almost all of the tools that we have been looking in to use, is the same one. They use the same editor and the editor is not good at all. And it is a third-party editor. So, they say no, no we cannot do anything. It is not us. It is not us. But it is them because they use that editor. So, of course, it is their responsibility. But you need to put your efforts somewhere else. But if all of these tool providers would go to the editor vender and say hey, we want to use this product, only if it is accessible. Then I'm sure something would happen.   
 The biggest problems are in forms and tables. Not surprisingly. That is where most of the accessibility trouble arise. And where the tools could help but don't help generally. And the author is generally very much left alone. And that is very sad because we hope to find more support but really the authors are really, really left alone in many cases. Big room for mistakes which we try to make sure it is not.   
 And maybe the saddest thing, back end accessibility, the possibility for Persons with Disabilities to be actually working as authors, completely lost. It is in a fog. It is nowhere to be seen. Some of the tool providers couldn't answer the question. They didn't know what we were talking about. So very, very negative. And now everyone is taking a photo of that slide.   
 So my suggestion I have two minutes until lunch, so for you as end users probably working in end user organizations I would say as things stand now I would suggest not to focus so much on which authoring tool you use because they are more or less the same when it comes to accessibility, all the big ones. Focus on the supplier. You need a supplier that is interested in trying to make sure that the templates are accessible and do the work around as much as possible.   
 So, the supplier is your primary goal. The key to making things accessible here. Also, it is extremely important to have clear requirements. It is not enough to say follow WCAG or comply with the EN504349 because the suppliers do not know what you are talking about. Try to work with the requirements and make sure you have something that the supplier can answer yes or no and that you can control that they are doing the right thing.   
 Required to test your tool before you buy it, I think that is reasonable. And especially if you have users with disabilities, you need to be able to test it and then see if this is okay for your organization or not. And then I think also you should require training because what we can see sometimes is that the authors could do the right thing but they are not trained to do the right thing and that's when a lot of this ‑‑ many of these problems arise because they don't have the training. And it is not intuitive. So, you can do it the easy way and then it becomes inaccessible or can you be trained to do it the right way or then it becomes important. The end user organizations I know there is a budget problem. But they need to be the front runners of this.   
 Manuals, some people are not ‑‑ not everyone is publishing things on the Internet every day. So, you need to remind them on how to do it even if they have a training in September and then they do the first authoring thing in December, they might have forgotten. So have manuals on how to do this. How do we write our links? How do we produce captions? It doesn't need to be rocket science and there are many good free sources online to use. But just to have a short manual can really help. And then can be further research here. I think there is room for much more research and there a call out now for a second step of this project. So hopefully there will be much more research and we can all await better results and more sort of tangible results because this is like a step one where we do the mapping and results, research. But the next step is the call is really looking for the solutions. So hopefully we will in a couple of years' time or so have much more to say. And we still haven't got publishers. When do you decide who is going to get that? I don't know the answer to that. This month. So, in October. Yeah. So hopefully the commission hopes that the answer will come this month. So, within a couple of weeks then hopefully you will all know and we as well if somebody is going to get the opportunity to make further research. And we hope that we can be part of that. But if it is somebody else, I'm also happy as long as somebody is doing something for this problem.   
 So, any questions so far before we break for lunch? Yes, we have two questions.

>> Thank you. I actually have three questions.

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: I think that everyone knows you.

>> Alejandro from the European Disability Forum. Editors, third party editor.

>> Tiny MCA.

>> All of them they use the same editor?

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: Yes, except for one who is doing something based on that editor but sort of something they created themselves a little bit but there are alternatives but I mean yeah, ‑‑ it is a freeware thing and it has become the sort of ‑‑ what you call it? Not state of the art but that's what most of them are using, and I think ‑‑ I can't explain why but there is not a big market for free editors. So, it is a money question. And also, it is sort of working quite well but not from an accessibility point of view. And I must admit that when we at Funka research the market for we search for tiny MC.

>> When you mentioned in your previous slide that the NGOs we should focus on the requirements but maybe not so much on the technical standard set, like WCAG or EN ‑‑ so example how we can focus on requirements. Because if you imagine an NGO that doesn't know accessibility much and they want to ensure they work in other field and they want to ensure that website is accessible what they should say. I want my website to be read by blind people. If we use this kind of requirements, probably the results won't be good.

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: That's true. I did not mean that you should not focus on the technical standards. We are engaged in standards. They are written by experts for experts and that's hard to interpret what it means. If you put two accessibility E certificates in the room, they disagree on how to determine the WCAG standards. There are some problems with that. We have divided each success criteria into smaller parts so that you can actually ask one question and it is a yes or no answer because WCAG is never a yes or no answer or very rarely. We have divided them into smaller parts, and we write them in human language. We could do some kind of project to provide you and your members with that. I mean it is a commercial service we do but I would be happy to share with you the way we do it. It is about rewriting them in a way that you are sure so that both parties are sure about what we are talking about. It is not leaving the standards. It is just making them comprehensible. But let's discuss that offline.

>> Yeah. I think that's ‑‑ to make it more practical.

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: Yes.

>> You mention suppliers, that's my last question, you mention the Web authoring tools, no? What do you mean by ‑‑

>> SUSANNA LAURIN: There are ‑‑ there are companies producing authoring tools and then there are partners to these tool makers who are suppliers and they will also suppliers ‑‑ like, for example, in Word Press or Drupal they are open source. Can be a vender of ICT development. That's what I mean about suppliers. So, the supplier uses the tool to build your website for you. That's a supplier. But ‑‑ and I know there is a ‑‑ I mean provider, producer, vender, there are many, many different stakeholders on that side. It is not only the tool producer or developer. There are also many other parts of this ecosystem. Unfortunately, only ‑‑ if you have ‑‑ but you need to make sure of everyone. But what I mean is don't go to Drupal and talk to them. Talk to the local ‑‑ your local Brussels based, you know, John's website company or whatever you choose. I don't know. So that you can talk to and really describe your problem and make sure that you choose a supplier who is interested in accessibility.   
 There was another question. I think Bart again.   
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