

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS OF THE
INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
8:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M., JULY 20, 2018
DXC TECHNOLOGY BOARDROOM
6TH FLOOR, 200 GRAHAM AVENUE**

Present: Lisa Snider (Chairperson), Jim Hounslow, Jeff Buhse, Doris Koop, Allen Mankewich, Tanis Woodland

Absent: Carol Bartmanovich, Tony Sailor

Paul Knapp has left DXC Technology and resigned his position on the Information and Communications Standard Development Committee. After relaying his departure to Lisa and the Secretary, it was relayed on to other members of the committee.

This is the first committee meeting since the sub-committee produced a draft standard for the committee to consider and work through. The draft standard closely follows the layout and structure of the Customer Service Standard (CSS). It was agreed that consistency with the CSS is appropriate and familiarity in look would not confuse the public.

Terminology in the standard is fluid and it was agreed that we would come back to the Definitions section at the end of the discussions. Similar to the CSS, the next section attempts to provide a meaning of accessible information and communications as it applies to the proposed standard. Again, as with definitions, the committee will review this section at the end to ensure it is consistent with the content of the proposed standard.

Part 3 Application and phase-in of obligations was discussed. It was taken directly from the CSS as well. It was noted that the sub committee had considered emergency services, as the Committee had suggested. In the end, in consultation with John, it was felt that this shouldn't be added, and the sub committee agreed that it should remain the same as the CSS for consistency. The Committee agreed about the consistency, but also discussed how if the emergency area was important, as we all agreed it was, then shouldn't it be highlighted in this section as well? The Committee will consider this again at the end of the process and make a final decision on this item. It becomes complex because there are private and public entities providing emergency services. The years for each sector were discussed. The Committee will discuss all timelines noted in the draft standard at the end of the process to ensure consistency.

Part 1 of Section 4-Overall was discussed. This section says 'must' and the Committee agreed on this being required. The Committee also agreed that we had to say that this applied to vendor or 3rd party items as well as things the organization created themselves. So this applied to Facebook content as well as documents created by the organization. It was agreed that the guide was important to note examples for the public to use to understand the scope. It was agreed that this more general language was good, because specifics would lead to more potential loopholes.

Part 2A of Section 4 was considered. This part talks about identifying barriers for current IC, that exists already when the obligation comes into effect for the particular organization. The Committee agreed that this is a **continuous process** for organizations, not a one time only thing. To make this continuous process more clear, it was agreed that we would add the word 'updating' to the phrase 'In establishing, implementing and updating its measures, policies and practices...'. .

Part 2B of Section 4 was considered. After the organization identifies barriers, in Part 2B it has to try and remove barriers from current IC. The Committee talked about the word 'seek', in 'Seek to remove existing barriers'. It was agreed that the word seek could mean many things, including just seeking and not actually doing the removal. So it was agreed that 'seek' would be replaced by 'make reasonable efforts', so it now reads ' Make reasonable efforts to remove existing barriers in current IC...'. .

The Committee agreed with the 5 year timeline for the removal of barriers. This was suggested by the sub committee, because if a timeline wasn't applied, then the removal work may never be started or completed. The Committee suggested taking out the middle column in the timeline table to make it easier to read. This timeline is a bit complex, more than the others, so simplifying the table was recommended. The Committee also talked about undue hardship and whether we say something in the standard or put it in the Guide. This issue was considered in the 2017 Committee meetings, but it will be revisited at the end of the process.

Part 2C of Section 4 was considered. This section relates to current materials, and is the 'on request' area for current materials. Organizations are supposed to identify and make reasonable efforts to remove barriers in Part 2A and 2B. The Committee agreed that it is unrealistic to think that any organization can make every single IC accessible for everyone. So Part 2C

is included so that if a person contacts an organization and says 'I can't access a certain IC', then this part relates to how the organization should work with that person. They are to make reasonable efforts to provide that person with what they need to access the IC. Part 2C relates to the individual, and isn't 'universal' like Part 2A and 2B.

The Committee talked about wording, in terms of the phrase 'persons who are disabled by a barrier'. That phrase can be problematic for many people and it was suggested that 'persons encountering a barrier' may be a more positive term to use. It was agreed that while the Committee agreed that the 'disabled by a barrier' phrase may not be the best to use, that since the AMA Act and CSS use that term that we would not use it in our standard. However, it is to be noted in the Notes that go with the standard to the Council for consideration.

The Committee discussed the concerns John raised over a possible override of Part 4 and the FAR over the CSS. John asserted that the CSS was in print and in person only, and there was no mention of digital, but that the ICS was digital only. He also asserted that the FAR should be digital only, because otherwise it would override the in print and in person CSS. As well, he raised concern that Part 4 duplicates the CSS, and to solve this it should just be digital only.

These issues were discussed in great detail, and the Committee felt that we needed to define the relationship with the two. The Committee felt the FAR was not digital only and no override would occur. The issue of communications being mentioned in the CSS was discussed in great detail. Each member of the Committee was asked about their view of the CSS and ICS.

There was full agreement by the Committee on the relationship of the ICS to the CSS. The Committee agreed that the CSS was for individual needs or accommodations, and that the ICS was more universal/global for broad based needs (systemic) and it was mainly proactive (with some individual/reactive areas for the on request sections like Part 4C) and provided the 'how' for the CSS. It was noted by a couple of members that the CSS was not clear as to what it covered, and that one can't say it is just x or y. It was noted that Ontario was similar in this relationship, from the information gained from the government and one committee member. The Committee agreed that the ICS and CSS were not hierarchical, in terms of

parent and child, but equal in terms of siblings (hand in hand, worked together, etc.). **It was agreed by the Committee that we need to make this clear in some way in the ICS that the two are different.** John noted that it was important to distinguish the relationship between the two standards and where the differences are, and that potential wording changes may be needed in Part 4 to distinguish it from the CSS Part 4. As well he again expressed concerns about the FAR governing in person and in print and that overlapped with the CSS.

There was full agreement by the Committee that both standards applied to in print, in person and digital. One thing noted by the Chair was that in our deliberations, we also have to consider the other standards, such as Transportation and Built Environment because the ICS will relate to those as well.

The Committee will consider how these two standards are different and how they work together, and how the FAR works overall. One suggestion was to change the FAR wording and possibly focus it on IC. However, this will be considered next meeting when the FAR will be more fully explored (as it wasn't fully explored in this meeting).