

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS OF THE  
INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS  
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
8:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M., AUGUST 22, 2018  
DXC TECHNOLOGY, 6<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, 200 GRAHAM**

**Present:** Lisa Snider (Chairperson), Tanis Woodland, Jeff Buhse, Tony Sailor, Allen Mankewich, Doris Koop, Jim Hounslow, John Wyndels (DIO), Yutta Fricke (DIO)

**Regrets:** Carol Bartmanovich

The Chairperson emailed members of the committee and the Secretary to discuss the timeline of our work, and it was confirmed that the Chairperson was asked to complete the development of the proposed standard for review by the Accessibility Advisory Council (council) for the beginning of September. A report was not sent from the Standard Development Committees to council in the other two standards. The information and communications (IC) Committee will be the first one to complete a report and present it with a proposed standard.

The Chairperson noted the Secretary has outstanding issues with the proposed standard. The report and the proposed standard will be those of the committee and will not speak directly to the concerns raised by the Secretary. Council will hear those directly from the Secretary. The Chairperson said that Council may request the presence of the Chair and/or committee members to answer any questions or clarifications they may require.

In the Policy section of the proposed standard, the committee members confirmed the differences between “new” and “current” and the compliance timelines of the various organizations will have to meet the proposed standard’s requirements. There was agreement on the suggested changes of language to make clearer and more easily understood. It was agreed by members that the developed guide to assist organizations understand their responsibilities will provide examples of how to carry out provisions with the standard.

There are still limitations of procuring accessible technology when vendors are not fully knowledgeable of accessibility requirements. The individual with an organization responsible for procuring technologies may need to negotiate within these limitations. The hope is that the Federal Government will offer leadership as part of the proposed accessibility legislation. A definition of procurement in the context of its use in the proposed standard will be required.

A number of terms used in the proposed standard that will require definitions. They include legacy, unused and/or archived. The subcommittee suggested that there are instances when it is unlikely that old documents would be upgraded. There remains an unresolved question about whether obligated sectors must document the changes. This

interaction requires two-way consultation. “are only to be made accessible when persons who are disabled by a barrier request ...”

The main goal is of the feedback section to introduce a process, formal or informal, to provide feedback. This does not override CSS. The documentation of resulting action is limited to organizations of 20 or more employees.

The functional Accessibility Requirements (FAR) are written in an action-oriented way. Some concerns were raised about how to interpret this section and how easily it will be understood by those organizations that have responsibilities under the standard. It needs to be written in plain language for starters. Many people won't understand words like 'tactile', so plain language is crucial. Offer an introduction to FAR in definitions. Offer general overriding statement about applying elements of FAR that will be relevant to information and communications. Have it understood that not every FAR element applies to every situation.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.