**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS OF THE
INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
8:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M., JULY 25, 2018
DXC TECHNOLOGY, 6TH FLOOR, 200 GRAHAM**

Present: Lisa Snider (Chairperson), Jim Hounslow, Jeff Buhse, Tanis Woodland, Doris Koop, Allen Mankewich, John Wyndels (DIO), Jim Baker (Chairperson / AAC)

Absent: Tony Sailor, Carol Bartmanovich

The Committee discussed an email the Secretary had forwarded expressing some of his concerns with proposed standard being developed by the committee for the Accessibility Advisory Council's review. A number of the issues have been aired in previous meetings.   The committee remains committed to the contents of the proposed standard it will forward to council.

Each Committee member was asked how he or she wanted to proceed. All members present agreed that we would go through the standard from the beginning and talk about how each section would relate or interact with the Customer Service Standard (CSS). The Committee agreed it would put each of the standard parts to the 'test' by talking about examples and focusing on the relationship with the CSS as we went through each part.

It was agreed that timelines for compliance of obligated organizations and definitions would not be discussed until the end. Section 4 of the proposed standard was the focus of the majority of the meeting. Wording in many of the provisions of the section were changed to more accurately define the intent. It was agreed that procurement should be revisited at the end to see if a section or paragraph should be added to address it directly.

The Secretary noted that the language used in section 4 is very close to what is stated in section 4 of the CSS. The Committee discussed and agreed that CSS Part 4 applies to goods and services. The Committee sees Part 4 pf the Information and Communications Standard (ICS) going beyond goods and services to a broader application of all aspects of all information and communications.

The Committee discussed that while the Functional Accessibility Requirements (FAR) are Information and Communication Technology based, they could also be applied to the physical environment.

The Committee agreed that the wording of FAR be changed, so that it indicates that it won't apply to every situation. Some individual items in the FAR were also discussed, in terms of whether they are clear and understandable. As well, the committee briefly discussed whether the FAR should be specific or general.

The Committee talked about the definition of 'information' in the Terms of Reference. It is a 'one way process' and mentions the consumer or end user. The Committee felt that the term 'end user' could mean anyone in the process, and not just the public. In addition, a consumer can mean anyone, internal or external to an organization.

Large portions of Ontario's ICS are on request. The committee feels strongly that the proposed standard be proactive and directly address the on request language used in Ontario's ICS. The committee feels that is a major loophole that doesn't recognize how current and future technologies can be easily equipped to provide information in accessible formats from the outset, rather than in a reactive manner. The committee also has concerns with the phrase 'accessible formats and communication supports. The belief being most, if not all, all formats can be made accessible, and the phrase may indicate to some people/organizations that many forms of information can't be made accessible in some way or form.

The committee has adopted a number of terms that are different than 'in a manner that takes into account the barrier' phrase used in the CSS. The three phrases were:

- By alternate means.
- in a manner that is appropriate in the circumstances and is suitable for persons who are disabled by barriers
- in consultation with the person making the request to determine the suitability of the different manner.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.