INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES (ICT)

Open Accessibility Everywhere

Groundwork, Infrastructure, Standards

AEGIS

Collaborative Project

224348

Consolidated Peer Review Report of *D3.5.2a*			
Deliverable No.		D3.5.2a: Accessibility Best Practices	
Deliverable File Name:		AEGIS_D3.5.2a_v3	
SubProject No.	SP3	SubProject Title	Web Applications Accessibility
Workpackage No.	WP3.5	Workpackage Title	Accessible rich Internet applications
Activity No.	A3.5.1; A3.5.2; A3.5.3	Activity Title	Accessible rich Internet applications using browser-based UI component sets; Accessible rich Internet applications using Java-based UI component sets; Accessible rich Internet map applications using the SVG technology
Authors		Kontotasiou Dionysia (CERTH-ITI)	
Quality Manager (name, company)		Dr. Evangelos Bekiaris (CERTH/HIT)	
Report File Name:		"AEGIS-CERTH-IR-A5.1.3-v2-D3.5.2aconsolidatedpeerreviewreport_authors'response"	
Date of Deliverable review:		October 2011	
Project start date and duration		01 September 2008, 42 Months	

PROCEDURES USED FOR PEER REVIEW

The **AEGIS** Consortium uses the **Peer Review** process for its internal quality assurance for Deliverables to assure consistency and high standard for documented project results.

The Peer Review is processed individually by selected reviewers. The allocated time for the review is about two weeks. The author of the document has the final responsibility to collect the comments and suggestions from the Peer Reviewers and decide what changes to the document and actions are to be undertaken.

Reviewers:
Dr. Evangelos Bekiaris (Quality Assurance Manager)- CERTH/HIT

Mr. Cristophe Strobbe (Internal Quality expert) – KUL

Dr. Nikolaos Glezakos (external quality expert)

Overall Peer Review Result:

Deliverable is:

□ Fully accepted	■ Accepted with reservation	□Rejected unless modified as suggested	□ Fully rejected

Please five an overall rating of this deliverable in a scale from (1: very poor to 10: excellent): 9

Suggested actions:

1. **The following changes should be implemented:** Only minor changes; see below topics.
2. **Specify missing chapters / subjects:** None.
3. **Required changes on deliverable essence and contents:** None.
4. **Further relevant required improvements:** None.

CONSOLIDATED COMMENTS OF PEER REVIEWERS

Overall Consolidated Comments

General comments

- **Deliverable contents thoroughness:** Complete.
- **Innovation level:** Innovative, as it is based on experience coming from innovative development.
- **Correspondence to project and programme objectives:** Adherence to project and programme objectives as expected.

Specific comments

Topic A: Relevance

Reviewers comments

Absolutely relevant. Addressed web developers guiding them through AEGIS best practices.

Author(s) response

- ***Actions to meet the comments***
  NA
- ***Reason for non conformity (if applicable)***

Topic B: Response to user needs

Reviewers comments

Provides a full guide to web developers that wish to experiment with similar fiels as AEGIS has done and as being described in this Deliverable.

Author(s) response

- ***Actions to meet the comments***
  NA
- ***Reason for non conformity (if applicable)***

Topic C: Methodological framework soundness

Reviewers comments

Clear and thorough; however, the method/process for deriving the guidelines of Chapter 7 needs to be clearer.

Author(s) response

- ***Actions to meet the comments***

New lines were added to Chapter 7 describing that after having reviewed standards such as WCAG 1.0, WCAG2.0 and WAI-ARIA, AEGIS developers have started to use and implement several of them during SP3 development phases. In some cases, they have found some additional practical tips that they would like to share with anyone else who may benefit from them for creating their own web applications.

- ***Reason for non conformity (if applicable)***

Topic D: Quality of achievements

Reviewers comments

Sound achievements; usable by external to AEGIS parties; However, see the attached to this report reviewed document for further optimisation. Some issues to revisit:

1. It is not clear what the next release will include in addition. Please clarify in Conclusions.
   Conclusions section is updated, describing what the next release will include in table 1.

2. Section 4.3: The application is intended for blind users and uses Java, which is poorly supported by screen readers on Windows. (1) How do blind users "discover" the applet and interaction with the webpage before switching from the keyboard to the haptic device?
   Currently, a click on the applet is required. We expect in the next version (February 2012) that automatic focus will be given to the applet once blind user activates the corresponding tab including the applet. Thus, blind user will be able to discover the applet and interact with it automatically.

   (2) How does the application make sure that its own TTS output does not interfere with the screen reader's TTS output?
   While user navigates in the Haptic RIA Map's site with the three available tabs (help, about, applet), only the screen reader's TTS provides output. Haptic RIA Map's TTS is activated once user press "Get Map" or "Search" options. Then the map is loaded and user can haptically explore the map listening to audio messages deriving from the Haptic RIA Map's TTS. During this exploration, screen reader's TTS does not provide any information, thus no intervention is caused. However, in the next version (February 2012) we could automatically stop screen reader's TTS once the map is loaded and let only the Haptic RIA Map's TTS enabled.

3. Section 4.4.1, First guideline: Does "efficient" refer to what WCAG 2.0 calls "operable" (WCAG 2.0 Principle 2)?
   The first AEGIS guideline for map applications totally conforms with WCAG 2.0 Principle 2: Operable, thus it is better to use the same terminology. Efficient is replaced with operable.

4. Section 4.4.5, First guideline: This is not entirely clear. There are at least two types of information: information about the user's position (distance to a POI, crossroads, etc) and names of streets etc. Which language is used for these different types of info? E.g. the user's languages for info about his position, and the map's language for street names (e.g if a German user is accessing a French map)?
   The language that is supported from Haptic RIA Maps is English. However, for usability issues, we have provided multi-language pronunciation for POIs and street names. The application uses the keywords from search criterion in order to understand the user's country and then provides corresponding pronunciation while user is listening to audio messages. For example, a message from the application is: Crossroad with Egnatia and Agias Sofias street (Greece). For words crossroad and street, English language is used, however for street names like Egnatia and Agias Sofias, Greek pronunciation is used.

5. Section 4.4.6: Since this is an application for blind users, how do you avoid conflicts with

AT shortcuts?
We have tried to follow commonly recognized shortcut key assignments such as "+" and "-" keys for zoom in and zoom out. We haven't detected any conflicts during tests. If problems arise, they will be faced in the next version.

6. Section 5.4.2: Should keyboard shortcuts be consistent with the ones that users use for desktop applications?
We have tried to follow commonly recognized shortcut key assignments and we haven't detected any conflicts during tests. If problems arise, they will be faced in the next version.

Author(s) response

- ***Actions to meet the comments***

Please see above (per se).

- ***Reason for non conformity (if applicable)***

Topic E: Quality of presentation of achievements

Reviewers comments

- Whevener you refer to development work that has been held in the context of AEGIS, make sure you refer to the place this happened (i.e. the widgets were implemented in WP3.2, etc.).

Author(s) response

- ***Actions to meet the comments***

This was updated in the whole document.

- ***Reason for non conformity (if applicable)***

Topic F: Deliverable Layout / Spelling / Format

Reviewers comments

- Please remove the internal wiki references from your References. For AEGIS Deliverables, you need to fix the references (add authors, date, etc.).
- Make sure your document is fully accessible.
- Check minor spelling/syntax mistakes in the attached reviewed Deliverable.

Author(s) response

- ***Actions to meet the comments***

Wiki references were removed. All done.

- ***Reason for non conformity (if applicable)***