INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

One of the things we have got at the bottom of the screen is the word creating. One of the working groups are looking at it specifically. To what extent can we create media? We will be looking back at that. In May and September we had a look at what kind of media are we looking at? We have to decide on our priorities. This listed the trends in terms of global consumer spending, over the next few years. If you look at the white line on the graphic the most dramatic change over that period is the fact that by 2015 video games or electronic games will be just as important economically as newspapers. When we are talking to day it may be necessary to make some adjustments when we are talking about accessibility to the kinds of media we are talking about. This it is essentially the same graphic but I have added television. The vertical access is looking at how much are people spending globally on different kinds of media. You can see a film, and television in the same period is accounting for 3 1/2 times as much. Even in a fairly troubled economic time we are spending US$370 billion on television globally. That is one way in which we can talk about what media we are going to be working on. Another way is to look at what media people have access to. I have been using statistics published on an annual basis, most recently in November. Nearly 4/5 households have access to television. Internet is growing rapidly. Over the last seven years this has increased. On this particular motion, if we take the top 20% of those around the globe, 20% of the population have no access to electricity. This is part of a speech from the director general of the United Nations who wrote an article about it last Thursday in the International Herald Tribune. One out of five of the population cannot make use of some of these media because they have no electricity. That is why we have to add the mobile statistics. This represents an opportunity, there are no mobiles in people's pockets than most widespread kind of technology, more than 3 billion people have mobile phones. Some don't require a power socket in some parts of the world, they are using solar energy and other ways of charging the batteries. In our planning meeting yesterday we decided we would need to make some changes here. John who you will be hearing from and his group will be looking at some clarifications on what do we mean by smart phones and other handheld devices and the implications for accessibility. When we are talking about which audiovisual media we have to think about which of them do we need to prioritise in terms of how much are we spending, but which do people have access to, if they have disabilities. At our meeting in May we were trying to say which particular media should we address to begin with. We made the distinction between content and the devices on which these are displayed. It was clear television and radio were important, and films were important. What has become increasingly clear is that we may have to make some adjustments to what we are doing to look into things like social media. Look at what people are using the Internet for. A wide range of different things. Perhaps we will have to revisit the area of videogames, both in terms of their prevalence, but in terms of their economic importance. In particular for certain demographics for young people for whom games may be the source of social exclusion if they are not able to play games with their friends. We talked about the contents and we looked at the various platforms. We have already agreed to look at digital broadcast television, we have also got a group looking at delivering television using the Internet, IP TV, and a group headed by John, looking at mobile networks and wireless networks. The circle in the middle is about the platforms or networks in which we deliver content and the third area is the devices. We have agreed to look at digital television receivers, mainly because over the rest of this decade the world will go digital. This year quite a number of countries will be switching off analogue television, and in the record – the rest of the decade we will see many other parts of the world including Africa start to move in this direction. It is not just the flat panel displays for television, it is also conventional computers, laptops, telephones, and when we talk about mobile phones, smart phones. In the next four years most phones will be smart veins. And the phenomenon of tablets, computer tablets. These are selling better than laptops. They are a force to be reckoned with. We have to look about the accessibility of audiovisual media on these devices. It is not just the devices themselves, but how we interact with the content. We will be looking at peripherals, things like remote controls, keyboards, other ways of interacting with media. That is a very important area. We were talking about it yesterday afternoon. In a world where the population is getting older, we have been successful in people living for longer than 20 years ago, for the elderly democratic and I include myself in that demographic, the over 60 age group, when you get to 75 or 80, using a remote control may not be quite as natural for what we would call the digital immigrants, our children or grandchildren, born with these things. If you have a remote control for your hearing aid it may not be as easy as the engineers thought. Increasingly we have not just got to look at the primary devices, but how we make use of media on these. Things like the design of remote controls will be very important. Last, and not least, we have to think about how these media on various primary devices interact with other assistive technology. In the May meeting and the September meeting we began work to look at the challenge of communicating between a television set and a hearing aid, a mobile phone and a hearing aid. This room has an induction loop, a magnetic system, that is analogue and it is very noise prone. What the various stakeholders concerned with hearing aids are interested in is a way of doing a better job, a more consistent and reliable job, so people with hearing impairments can hear something directly in their hearing aid while watching television, or using their mobile phone, rather than having to use the built-in microphone and not get the full quality that could be there. When we are talking about audiovisual and the what we have decided is to say we will be focusing primarily on digital media. Within the next 15 years just about all media will have gone digital. It makes a lot of sense to focus on things like televisions, computers, tablets, hearing aids, all using digital technology, rather than the challenge of doing the same things on Analog devices, assuming these are on the way out. We need to focus our energies on where we can make a difference. What can we do? If we want to make things accessible there is a lot we can do this afternoon or tomorrow which would make a dramatic difference. I have listed four of the main areas. Some have got nothing to do with standards or regulation or anything else. It is all to do with how we produce the media themselves. The kinds of examples we have talked about, the World Cup, the audio for the commentary was unintelligible for the first 24 hours. When we know there are things like trumpets we can make a difference. Another challenge widely discussed is drama programmes on television. It has got a lot more natural over the last 30 years. When you move in the direction of things which represent the way we speak in the outside world, the demands we make on the intelligibility of the audio increase. The audio has to be changed. Last Thursday we saw in Sweden examples of the way in which you can retain the original audio all the way through the production and transmission chain on digital radio, so if you have a hearing impairment you can choose to hear the programme primarily with voice and regulate the voice content and reduce the music or background effects because they have got a simple way of keeping multichannel audio and delivering it through conventional channels and improving the intelligibility. Getting production teams to sit down and look at how they produce things can make a huge difference. The second thing is some of the things to do with the platform we are talking about. If we are talking about remote controls and television there is a lot we can do to make sure remote controls can be used by as many people as possible. We can make sure people can find digits on their keyboards, or mobile phones without a keyboards, the intelligence where the first place you touch on the screen becomes the five, and you keep your finger there is nowhere the five is. Simple ways of having a user profile. If you set up your television set because you have a hearing or visual impairment you can set up your television so every time you use it it will display captioning or the audio description. Rather than asking people to do this every single time, there are other ways around it. Direct connections between television and hearing aids or mobile phones and hearing aids. It is the context in which we want to enjoy media that can have an impact. The third thing we can do is provide access services. We can offer captioning, audio description, sign language. Therefore we have to look at how we can plan this, how we can produce it, we have got some interesting examples for the production of audio description, and small adjustments which make a huge difference in the production process, they have a big knock-on impact on the accessibility of the final programme and the ability to produce audio description. We have to think about producing access services to go with the content. Finally, making sure the devices are intelligent, they are truly assistive. Many devices will be able to speak to their users, or they may be voice activated. Certainly a lot of computers have been able to do something quite important such as text to speech, produce synthetic speech to read aloud things for those who are blind or with visual impairments. We have put four main areas we can use to make a difference to accessibility is. We have to understand what makes the difference to accessibility and we have to be able to put these together. I have got a simple metaphor, we know where we want to be in October, the blue men at the far top right. Right now we are the yellow people on the bottom left of the screen. We need to understand the gap between what we want to do to make media truly accessible, and what we are currently able to do. We need to establish what is the gap between what we would like the situation to be.

The building blocks require us to ask for fairly basic questions, where do we want to be? What is our vision of accessible television, what would make it truly accessible, both in general terms, in terms of producing the provision of access services in the context issues in terms of the devices themselves, where are we now, what are the key obstacles? That has been the focus for the last few months. Identifying some of the key obstacles to making media truly accessible. A number of the contributions we have to look at in this meeting have addressed, identified issues. We have a colleague from Poland who has identified some issues for the commercial broadcasters who find it difficult to see how they could fund access services provision. Some of this depends on whether they know what it costs to produce various things. Are they expensive as people think? We need to look at the various obstacles, some may be technical, legal, economic. This is of particular importance in the economic climate we find ourselves in, doing more with less. In Denmark they have discovered they can take the same provisions for producing audio description, helping people with visual impairments, and make a 40 fold increase in the proportion of programmes accessible for those with visual impairments, without making a substantial increase in operating costs. You can identify something which can have a dramatic increase on the proportion of programmes that are accessible. The decision maker who can come up with that kind of improvement will be happy. We know where we want to be, we are identifying the key obstacles, the barriers, and we want to look at what's coming do about it. What can we do to break down those obstacles? We need to look at which of these actions need to be dealt with, either here or in other forums. The International Telecommunication Union can make the difference when it comes to legislation, and one of the issues was going to be creating awareness. How'd you make sure the stakeholders understand what accessibility entails.

Geneva, Atlanta, and so on.out.in the course of the autumn, a number of things became clear, and that is why we have been discussing a major rethink in the way we are working. Can we do what we are supposed to do. By October,? probably the most important thing we have discovered… What is quite clear is that we have participants from stakeholders, from a whole range of the media field, who really know what they are talking about, so as a group of people, the focus group has the knowledge that we need to make a difference, so that is a really good starting point. The problem is, we are a self-funded body as a focus group and that means there is no money from the ITU for these activities and those who take part in meetings have to find the funds for doing so. The meetings themselves cannot incur expenses from the ITU. That is a difficulty for a number of the people who would like to take part in the process, in particular for NGOs, the organisations representing persons with disabilities. We have heard from many of them saying, this is very important to us, but we do not have a budget to travel to Geneva and Delhi and other places. There is no way we can do this kind of thing. Could you have another look at the way in which we are organising the work,?. This was a very important point made by other people. I am working two days a week on average unpaid for this. I had to attend the meeting at my own expense. Of course I can do it, but at some point I will run out of money and other people have similar challenges. Clearly, it was necessary in November to do everything. – To do a rethink. We said we need to revisit the plans for what we are doing so, we have revised the plans. We now have a clear agreement on the areas we need to analyse in more detail. We have clear agreement on the four ASIC questions we want to ask. Our vision, what are the supplements and the present time, what other problems to make this vision a reality, and what actions can we suggest. We have 11 working groups. So now the focus will be on virtual communication in working groups. That is why, in the course of October and November, we set up 11 forums using SharePoint's where those interested in setting up SharePoint can work collaboratively in answering those four questions to provide us with the necessary inputs for doing a roadmap of actions for the ITU. The second thing we want to do that came up at the meeting yesterday, when we actually do meet, whether at a full meeting or as a focus group for the various working groups, we want to look at in some cases two days sessions where a particular working group can use the web or anything else to edit and discuss and draft updates for the things. We now have clear agreement on what it is we want to analyse, what questions we want to address. What we will now make sure it is. There is the logistics and your so the 11 groups can get stuck in – infrastructure. They can do this kind of analysis. In particular, if we are trying to meet physically, it does not make sense for somebody like John Lee to my left to fly in from Canada for 24 hours and fry back home again if he has to get to get his organisation to send him, then it makes sense for them to send him for days, not just discussing at follow up, editing and drafting. That is a suggestion, we have taken on board and which we will make more active use of. The third thing is we will still have international meetings, but we want to change the focus of what we do when we are meeting in different parts of the world, so as their main work is going to be done in the working groups, the analysis, the production of documents and so on, that will be taking part. There, we want to focus when we do have the opportunity to meet with decision-makers in Las Vegas in April or at the end of May in Japan or in Canada at the end of September to change the focus on getting feedback on specific recommendations, we foresee will emerge from the roadmap. We want to make sure that there is consensus, there is high in from all of these key stakeholders, so that when we actually propose a roadmap to the ITU sometime in October, the necessary stakeholders will know what is coming and there will be the necessary commitment to be able to move forward. So, what we agreed in September was to add one working group to the 10 we had already chosen, so if we look at the working groups. We had agreed to have, we have got three working groups which we could call platform or network working groups, we have got one on digital broadcast TV, we have got one on IPTV, delivering TV services on closed Internet systems, and a working group which deals with mobile and handheld devices, tablets, other kinds of handheld devices such as smart phones, tablets and so on. We have also got groups looking specifically at how we actually deliver access services. So we have got groups looking at captioning, looking at audio and video description and spoken captions, groups looking at sign language, groups looking at emerging access services and in the room. We have a lot of expertise about some of the new options for making things more accessible. We have got something on electronic programming guide and on-air promotion. It does not matter if we make things accessible. If people cannot find them. If you don't know where to find a program with audio description and captioning, to all intents and purposes, it does not exist. We have to make sure that when we produce things, when we broadcast them, when we deliver via a mobile network,. – People know where to find things when they are accessible. What do we mean by participation? We asked our colleague from Cambridge to help coordinate that group and to help us with new eyes at things like social media, sitting back and consuming things. What are the implications of participation,? the change in the way we interact with media and whether this will actually make it necessary to change some of the work we are doing, perhaps some additions to platforms? And at the bottom, just go back one… Something to do with key performance indicators. We want to do a more systematic review on the whole way we legislate and regulate accessibility. We often assume everything requires standards, standards are, of course, important, but without some of the other things, they may not in fact make a difference. Therefore, we want to look at, for example, the difference between what the engineers call quality of service, making sure that the bits and bytes are being delivered, compared with quality of experience. How do end-users, people watching TV, actually perceive this? Are they in a position to actually enjoy media or is something getting in the way of their enjoyment? That means we need to shift our focus from being exclusively supply-side to also looking at the demand side, making sure we look at how people use and enjoy A/V media. At the last group, working group, K, this is our guilty conscience in a way, a way of formulating our guilty conscience. We are in an auditorium, which is well-prepared to make sure that we can hold a meeting which is as accessible as possible, so we can cater for a number of users with different kinds of functional impairments, but in terms of the way in which we are working, we have said that we have to be accessible. Also, in terms of our working procedures, and therefore, Mark and my, they are very much going to help us improve the way in which we are working to make sure that our procedures are accessible so that people can take part fully in this kind of work. Remember the slogan: nothing for us without us. If people have disabilities, they should be the central stakeholder, they should have the opportunity to take full part in this, and not be the unsuspecting subjects or victims of what other people dream up. They have to play a central role in what we are doing. So for each of those working groups to look at those four questions, where do we want to be? where are we now? what obstacles and gaps have we identified? what can be done about it? And what do we propose to the ITU in terms of actions? That means that the working groups will be making sure that we stick to the basic templates, but there are clearly interdependencies from one group to another, so an example that came up yesterday when we were discussing the input document from working group G, about digital TV, and we looked at the statistics, the television compared with the Internet, it was clear that we needed to have a better understanding of statistics for mobile phones and tablets, so when it comes to media on these devices, on these networks, first of all, we have the issue of size. In many cases these are small screens with unique requirements. So we have to look at where we are in a situation where the media are being delivered directly onto a smart phone or tablet? And where are we looking at two screen solutions, that is to say somebody watching a TV and using an iPad is the secondary device – as a secondary device. We need to look more carefully. Lee. This is to make sure we are not drawing incorrect inferences on the basis of the statistics. We received input about the methodological – statistics within accessibility. Hopefully we can disseminate those. We have the four basic questions, and we are shifting the emphasis to the 11 working groups, and with regular meetings for the coordinators of the various working groups to keep everything in think, – in think, what we need to make sure is that we have enough people in those working groups, a number of people have said they are interested. We have to make sure they physically sign up, that they join. First, the focus group, but then sign up for the working group. We need to get them to contributing to the answers to the four questions. Much of this can be done virtually through the Internet using SharePoint. There will be situations where we need to be able to discuss things because they were important differences of opinions, even when we had the planning meeting yesterday afternoon and at that point the whole working group, part of the working group, may need to discuss things and they can choose to do that by e-mail, or we can help to get them to a meeting using the web to be able to do things, but they need to help us and then we can set up the necessary logistics. Once they have got something to discuss. At some point we are expecting that each of the working groups will have a preliminary output document, that is to say, something they would like to get more extensive feedback from from other stakeholders, both in their own part of the world, but also globally. We are expecting that as and when working documents have some sort of reasonably finished form, we can freeze a draft and make it public, and start to discuss that frozen version with key decision makers, key stakeholders in particular fields. So, the coordinator will then provide it to the secretary. It so that it can be visible directly on the website for all and sundry. And what we will be doing for early next week is providing you with the briefing document which tells exactly what is it we are going to be doing, how we are going to be working, what are the main deadlines, and how we are going to be preceding. We have a draft on the table, which was discussed in detail yesterday and we are expecting to have a final version yesterday, both in the working groups, but also, in fact, for anybody of interest in it. We are nearly finished… Let me just go down… Let's choose the approved yet one from here. – The appropriate one. We are near the end. It is here. So, we could have done more, we haven't done enough, but we are still on track. I think that is the conclusion. We have got a clear idea of where we need to be. We have a clear idea of how we can get there and also deliver the goods. By October. From now on the coordinators from each of the working groups will be working keeping things moving in each group and across working groups, preparing things for the following international meetings and we will be talking… about that. A little later in the agenda. We all have a clear idea of how we propose to organise the work, so we do deliver a roadmap of actions to the ITU by October 2012. Are there any questions to the floor? Andrea? do we have a roving microphone? shall be switched to your machine? Okay.

Andrea, why not come up and sit beside me, so that everybody can hear you clearly? It is also for the virtual participants. If we do not do that, we are excluding people who are actually taking part and that is not fair. NEW SPEAKER: Thank you very much. I can explain the problems in being a focus group and billing a study group member and participating in ITU and why we are having some funding problems. How much time can you give me? five minutes? the focus group is a different animal in the study group. A study group. People pay to join the ITU, which inadvertently… When you come to the headquarters in Geneva, you have room to be there and meet their but a focus group is open to everyone and there are no fees involved. A focus group must support itself. We have resolutions that the Tate how we run and how we function – that the Tate. They are decided at the different meetings. The next one will be next November or October, I can't remember at the moment, and I am challenging some of these edicts on the basis of accessibility and one thing is clear, that the accessibility focus group will be able to have captioning paid by the host, which you have done here. Very brilliantly and I have learned another mode of captioning, but the problem is, the member states and the set to members have made it clear that they don't want standards work being done in a focus group and people are not officially members. The other side of the coin is that focus groups do feed and give new life to study groups and they are open to everyone, which works well for people with disabilities, but they must be self-funded, so it is a Catch-22 situation. The ITU has really developed its programme on including persons for accessibility. We are not there yet. There is loads of work to do. There are plenty of people who do not get it. There are plenty of people who do get it. The problem boils down in the ITU to money. Even though we can't fall back on this, we did create, because I helped to write the last resolution, PPE 10, 175, held in 2010 in Mexico, a resolution which allows us to have a fun as well as allows us to fund different things like captioning, but everything has to be done by the book and this takes a lot of time. There is an idea that then again, it is Catch-22. Somebody said, why don't we have a study group on accessibility? I did not like the idea because I wanted to keep the accessibility in the mainstream of study groups and also a study group would require you to become a member, which would be expensive, unless you come under special dispensation of being a non-profit organisation, which can be granted by counsel or universities, that have a reduced rate… We are on the same wavelength. We have great faculty in fact, in funding a lot of things for accessibility. It is not that the ITU is unwilling. The ITU is very willing. We have a wonderful director, Malcolm Johnson, who knocks his socks off trying to help us without breaking the rules, and I try to help him break the rules, it is great. I wanted to share those problems with you. The ITU is conscious of the problems with the funding. I do not work for them, I am independent, funded by a charitable trust. I feel like I am with the ITU, I have been doing it for 20 years, but I am an independent volunteer, like many of you here, so I hope that makes it clear as to what the problems are regarding the difference of a focus group, a study group and why there are great financial hardships on all of us should come and attend. NEW SPEAKER: Thank you, Andrea. A quick plug at the meeting we were planning yesterday. People at the meeting were representing six universities and in fact we have another nine or 10 universities and research groups. In addition to industry members, so this particular area find it easier than many to be industry based because we do have a strong RND – research and development following. Not all of them here and online, but planning to contribute in the course of the next 10 months. NEW SPEAKER: I really want to encourage universities to take the opportunity to join the ITU because you can write a contribution, then, and actually participate in the standard writing of different recommendations. In other words, you could be a part of global standards. It would make life a lot easier for people with disabilities. If universities could join. We could take over the ITU on that level! I welcome the idea being put forth to other universities who could be listening. Thank you, Peter. NEW SPEAKER: Thank you. Pilar is doing a good job of keeping the show on the road. NEW SPEAKER: I would like to tell you that universities would love to join the ITU, but unfortunately, we are broke. At least in my country, the way things are going, we are going to be more broke. If it is possible. I don't know if I am the only university that has got this problem, but unfortunately this is not going to happen if we have to pay for that, sorry. NEW SPEAKER:, Which is why we have the focus groups. We do understand that. Every once in awhile. We think it is not a bad idea in case somebody makes a donation and says we will allow you to do this. This is not a good economic time for any of us. I want to say I am very impressed with the facilities you have here. And yes, you are accessible. I will take a few of your ideas back to the ITU. Thank you very much. NEW SPEAKER: Thank you, Andrea. We will do a rapid introduction to the agenda, and perhaps we can do one of the small presentations and then we will have a break. NEW SPEAKER:, May I go back to my seat? NEW SPEAKER:, You are welcome. The draft agenda for the meeting, AVA, input, revision 1, so for those of you taking part online, we are now on point. Two, which is the approval of the draft agenda and the document allocation. You may think it is rather overwhelming and it is rather overwhelming. What we are intending to do, if I explained before we approved the draft agenda, the following: we are not going to do a detailed analysis of all of those working documents. We have over 40 documents in a plenary session. We think this is a waste of time and most people would fall asleep if we tried to do it. What we are going to be doing is preparing you to work in the working groups, and that is to say, each of the coordinators of the working groups is going to briefly say why the particular documents which you all have available is of interest to the working group, but also briefly point out why that document might be of interest to certain other groups within the focus group. Why is it of interest to make sure that you can find the appropriate documents that match your particular interest, so we are not expecting that everybody has to read all of the documents. What we are trying to do is to help you get started to find the appropriate documents that match your particular needs. Once we have approved the agenda, we will get on and just look at the report from the last meeting, but then we will review the logistics and then we will go through these various documents hearing input from the various coordinators. So that you understand why the particular documents may be of interest to you and to what extent they may match your interests and needs. So, we have got the agenda on the display, the various points. Does the draft agenda meet with your approval? Both the people in the room, but those taking part online? We have to be careful, if anybody flagging online that they have any problems with the agenda and are wanting to make changes or additions.? Nobody online wants to make any changes or additions? Anybody in the room wants to make changes or additions? If not, then I would say that we can use the input document as not just a draft agenda, but as the actual agenda for this meeting, so that is point. Two of the agenda approved. The third point is the approval of the report from the second meeting for those of you who want to check it online, it is the AVA output document. Two. This is the report of the second document meeting that was held in September. Are there any observations, factual errors, or things that were omitted from the document? Anybody in the room have any comments to that? Anybody online? So we can say that the report from the second meeting is hereby approved. If we go through this at this speed, we will be over.that is fine. Sorry? You need to come up, microphones? NEW SPEAKER: The problem with the microphone is that they don't get it. NEW SPEAKER: Come up and sit beside me. Yes. Take this one. NEW SPEAKER: Hello, I am a coordinator. On this occasion we are using the live sub titling, which has about a 10 second delay, so you have to wait about 20 seconds to get the action from the online people who are only monitoring the captioning. NEW SPEAKER: If we want to practice what we preach, given that we have delayed due to respeaking, not just respeaking, because that in fact it's quite fast, there is probably a technical delay for getting the stuff out through the Internet, we will have to make sure that we wait for around 18 or 20 seconds before moving on. And that is a very important point to have flagged. Thank you for that. Remind us if we are too impatient to count to 20 before moving on. Thank you. The fourth point is a review of progress on logistics and chaff – infrastructure. I can briefly point out what has happened. It took us longer than we had hoped. What has happened is for each of the working groups, we now have a SharePoint forum on the extranet. If you look at the focus group website, there is an explanation on how to get there. It requires that you have registered. Once you have registered. There is also a mechanism so you can sign up for a particular working group, or a number of groups and take an active part. That is up and running. If you actually register and log on, you will find that all of the basic documents for each of those 11 groups is already in their and in the case of the newest working group, the one which is coordinated by Mark and me up, you will find it is not just the original document, but some new updates have been posted. That is in place. Intel – in terms of holding web seminars for a particular workgroup, the coordinator is it expected and requested to contact the secretary at and she can help you with the tactical arrangements, so you can post information about a web seminar and remember, there will always be challenges, not just in terms of accessibility, but time zones, so when looking at who will take part,, so always keep in mind, geographical issues. So somebody from Tokyo and somebody from Europe, and somebody from Atlanta, between them, they spanned 13 different time zones, so you will have to think about when that meeting can be held so that people can physically take part. The timeframes for these meetings will depend on who needs to attend and when we have time slots which are accessible to everybody. I can remember in New Zealand, having to get up at a 2:45 in the morning to do a presentation somewhere in Europe. It can be done, but we need to keep in mind what these time zone differences are. That was the fourth point. Are there any question in connection with that? Remember, we have promised to provide a detailed briefing document by the end of next week, talking about what we are going to do, how we are going to do it and by when. That document will be edited, with the collaboration of the coordinators and posted by the end of next week. Any comments? Questions? I am counting, five, six, seven, 8.not.there are no indications from the web. We can take that agenda point as read. We can move on to the fifth point, which is overview of the inputs. We have some suggested inputs to help you in your work. Some of them are related, it. If we take the first one, input document 56. This is something Andrea has been working on on telecommunications relay services. There are areas where what we are doing can actually benefit from cross-fertilisation. The importance of that document is that it explains how you actually do the realities of helping people who are using, say, a telephone system, to make sure it is truly accessible for persons with hearing or visual impairments, or in some cases, both, in addition to mobility and dexterity impairments, so that is why briefly. It is worthwhile noting the FCC decision for those in the audio description group, the reason audio description has been reinstated in the states, it is worthwhile making a note of the working group B. Moving on to detailed suggestions to the various working groups. The report that I was asked to write or the ITU was published and released at the FCC in Washington in early December. We have tried to make it easier for you. Depending on the topics you are interested in, so the various input documents, from 59 onwards, sorry, 60, so that tells us who that might be of interest to, to which working groups. 61 talks about the different groups of persons with disabilities, the kinds of issues that may arise and what we have done to make that easier to use. When we come onto it. Later on, is a document from Louise Frayer, so we have got 13 K stories for different kinds – case stories. People with visual and cognitive impairments. This will give us a sense of who we are doing this for. There are 13.dot.it, we will come back to this later on. That will be joined in the not too distant future. I another document for people with hearing impairments from pilaf. That is something in the pipeline. Some of the questions people ask, what is currently being done in the area.? This document, input document, 62, does a very rapid review of some of the things currently being done in the television area. Input document, 63, looks at what we are doing specifically with access services. Document 68, looks at the issues facing people, organisations who have to introduce something new or scale it up, the kinds of trouble is they may have to encounter and address – and document 69, looks at the issues of incentives and sanctions, carrots and sticks. Is it enough just to have standards, what things may you be in need of? To move forward? 17, you may find this of use, it is an attempt to produce some terminology, because in different parts of the world. We use the same word with different connotations. There is a listing of terminology which you may find reviews. I think that is it, in terms of the generic documents of general interest. Yes, two minutes. Are there any questions in connection with that? Yes. NEW SPEAKER: I will just make a quick thing, I got an e-mail on the 17th, saying that on January 13, 2012, the federal commission, the Federal Communications commission released the rules on closed captioning for television over IP, and I have got all the information, and at some point I thought I would win that your attention, so we could discuss that. But this is a big step forward to making television accessible for persons with disabilities over the Internet, so the rules were released on the 13th and I was not sure if you were aware of that. NEW SPEAKER: We were and it is therefore of specific interest. The rules were closed captioning, that is captioning or subtitling, that is something we would have to refer to work group G and work group H, platform working groups, probably to John's group on mobiles, and also working group that will look at captioning to make sure they are conversant with that. NEW SPEAKER: I have the links to the rules, so perhaps we could do something during this meeting. NEW SPEAKER:, We will make sure they are made available, but the primary groups who are interested in working groups, G, H, and I, and the first working group, which has the remake to look specifically – a remit to look specifically at captioning, and also working group J, which looks at key performance indicators, the whole business of regulating, so that is what we need to do. NEW SPEAKER: One comment. It is an amazing document. I read it in an electronic version and I was surprised and impressed. It is your work, Peter. Congratulations. APPLAUSE. It is possible to translate this in Polish? Because it would be very, very interesting for stakeholders, broadcasters, operators and regulators. Is it a special copyright of something? NEW SPEAKER:, We will take it up the secretary at to see what is possible. As the author of the content, I do not have any objections myself but I am not a person who is ultimately holding the copyright. I hold the moral right for having actually written it, but I do not hold the copyright, but I will take that matter up with the IPU. I think it would be in their interest to explore that particular area. I am the person who pushed the pen, but I did not write it on my own and I try to thank many of the people who helped me to do it, so I just tried to organise the contributions I got from a lot of people. I am just the pen pusher. It is me and all the other people who helped me do that. Without all those people, including yourself, I would not have been able to do that. So thank you for helping me. NEW SPEAKER: For who can I address to have the permission? Alexandra? NEW SPEAKER: Alexandra is from the secretary of the focus group and she has made a note of your question, and will address it and get back to you formally and I will make sure that happens, as the author of that particular document. I would like to rapidly go through the presentation for the first working group before the Offaly break. – Coffee break. Input document 65 just mentioned is all of the areas where there is mention made of things to do with captioning in this particular report, just to make it easier for them to find their way around, and the same applies for input document 66 and 67, so those are the three input documents of specific interest to people working with captioning, subtitling, just to help them find their way around. It is 70 pages, which is not a huge amount, but if you need to go to the areas specifically have something to do with captioning, those are the three input documents that will help you to find your way around. The final input document we have four captioning is from a software lab. It is not, please speak to Ed G. Just to make sure that everybody in the room can actually see who he is. For those of you taking part online, we will make sure that his particulars are made available and those of his boss and his colleague, so if you want to follow up by e-mail. Some other way, we will make sure that the project's particulars will be accessible also to those taking part on the web seminar. Are there any questions to the fifth point, 5.1? If anybody online asking anything? No questions. A few more seconds, just in case. If not, we will take a break for the coffee or tea.

Welcome back to those of you in the room and following on the Internet using the webinar. This morning we reached .51, we would like to move on 2.2, a brief introduction for Working Group the, it is about audio description known as video description. We have also included spoken captions or subtitles. The focus is on persons with visual or cognitive disabilities. I would like to invite Aline Remael to take us through the documents, why they would be important to those in Working Group B. But also what implications for those with other interests. I will tell you a few things about myself. I am a prim pressure – Prof in translation studies at University College Artesis. I collaborate with the public channel in Flanders, I am their audio description expert. Pilar and I are involved in the Transmedia research group and other projects. I will maybe ask her to present herself first. I work here and am the host here today. I also work in this European research group, Transmedia, I am the head here in Barcelona. We work together on many issues related to audio description. I am a teacher here at Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona. I work at the centre for accessibility and ambient intelligence. We would like to look at three documents. 87 looks at a number of central obstacles. It is based partly on my research and partly on my collaboration with the broadcasting company in Belgium. It is a document for discussion, I would like others to contribute. And then we will look into how we can deal with this.

The first issue is legislation. In countries where there is legislation things look – move more quickly. The different countries can choose how to implement and to what extent and on what level. In theory this is very good. In practice it is problematic. All the details are in the document for you to read. As you can see, 2.2, specific issues is how much. I have explained by way of example how they are divided over different ministries in Flanders and I am sure it is the case in many countries. If they share responsibilities how do you combine implementation? It can be practically difficult. Related to that is on what level do you want legislation, and who will inform the legislators on how much they should do, what's quite as they should introduce, because they are very often ill informed – what waiters. Another issue apart from legislation is technical. At present I have found there are a number of different formats that cause problems when you want to reuse audio description. If you could use it produced for one carrier or format in other environments as well, that is proving to be difficult sometimes. Technical issues as well, related to access to the service. There may be a D on the television but how do you get to it? A lot of coordination is required. The opportunity offered by technology and its limitations. There seem to be two schools, those who expect everything from technology and those who think they cannot do much for us. It is a bit problematic. We need to determine what we can do, so they work together in harmony the ultimate aim is inclusive design. A lot can be done by approaching the director of the film before the final editing was done. The way they edited it allowed it to a greater extent. If we can work towards this very gradually, involving other people who do not know much about it, would improve the endproduct considerably. Inclusive design – design can be achieved on smaller levels. If you make people aware of the possibilities on a smaller level that works fine. Awareness is a bit of an obstacle on different levels. First of all, among users, in countries where it is only beginning. People say we don't really need this, but when they start using it they not only enjoy using it but it is more useful to us. I work with test groups and the longer they have used it the more critical they become, the more useful, R. Awareness among users and promoting these is important. Likewise is the need to provide awareness among those who produce the products, but on different levels, artistic, technical, financial, so people are aware it does not need to cost the earth. If you edit slightly differently accessibility can be achieved. Very often it is because people in film studies or television in other areas are not aware of what they can do. The same awareness is missing among legislators. They don't really know how much they should do. In research, in Flanders for instant, there is a problem getting funding. There is much less availability for projects that have social output or an accessible output that doesn't generate money immediately. Governments should be addressed on the importance of such research. Do I get questions now?

Probably best to move on. We are expecting people both here and online to register to take part in your Working Group. This is the starting point. It is not an exhaustive list of obstacles but it is a place to start. To get some people on board to help, you flagged some technical issues, we will my – we will need to get people like Nick Tanton to have a look at it. We have concrete examples and see if they can be easily resolved or if this requires changes in legislation or standards.

NEW SPEAKER: The other document I would like to comment on, descriptions of

people who use audio description. This has been provided by Goldsmiths University in London, it is a useful document in different respects and related to the issues I raised before. Government needing to introduce legislation don't need who this is for, who will be using it, people designing access need a clear picture of who the different people are using it. In this document which will be completed gradually, I am not sure if this has 12 or 13, they paint a picture of the different types of people with different abilities or people who can benefit from audio description in different ways. Knowing who uses a D, they are different ages, completely different types of people, different types of users, using audio description in different environments, different purposes, so the user group is broader than one tends to think, not only people with visual disabilities. Quite a few others can benefit. Input like this from people working on a domain is important to working towards resolving the obstacles. It can resolve many different obstacles. I would like to encourage people to contribute in this manner. Lastly I would like to invite Pilar to comment on the dead document.

– The third document.

We are not only issuing some reports, but we have decided to embark on some dynamic research.

The document is 85. This group has decided to take action on the work we do as a subgroup. We have started a new European project, it is document number 85. It is looking at drafting standardised guidelines across Europe for audio description. The interesting thing is it is user centred like all the research we do. We take into consideration the users. We are working with a Blind Association in Italy. The leaders for the project are Italy, the members of this group represents the different language situations in Europe. We have got Poland, Belgium, Italy we have got dubbing, Spain, taking Catalan as a minority language, and Portugal, subtitling. And we have also got to broadcasters from Germany and Belgium and we will draft these guidelines. We have just applied for a project called Access for Europe. It brings together two projects, and we have looked at existing technologies for broadcasting for television, and we also looked at emerging technologies for broadcasting. The other project means to the previous countries I have explained we have added Brunel University, and another broadcaster from Denmark. Peter Molsted, who is in this Working Group, will also be part of that project. We have included two members, Peter Looms, and Nick Tanton, as experts. And to companies, one from Heidelberg, which deals with speech technologies, and the company which is interested in machine translation. We will look into new technologies for media access and trying to find solutions that are interested – interesting for the market. We have also created a research centre, for audio description materials. It is also online. Can I show it?

This is a webpage which contains documents related to audio description. You can see documents you can access.

We have PowerPoint presentations like those we take into conferences.

Articles we have published.

We have guidelines

that people can download in their original languages.

These are the documents requested from people outside academia,

and I think this sort of initiative, a place to collate all these documents,

could be a good way for other groups and the project as a whole, you could request a sponsor to create this material.

NEW SPEAKER: When it comes to documents they are creating themselves we could start by using the infrastructure for your home-grown documents.

At some point it would make sense to have web access in a more general way.

Until we have resourcing to be able to do this

you have a useful example for audio description,

but we need to point out how we could do this for all the other areas.

We need to make sure people are familiar where they can find the documentation for audio description,

but at the process level

we could pass it over to Mark for making this more generally accessible.

To help people find resources of this kind.

It would make sense to find work group K to have a look at that.

NEW SPEAKER: It is important when there are open source is available as a link, it would be useful to not go through SharePoint but have them available, have the links listed somewhere, because every time you have to do a login, there is a new possible barrier. If we can find a way to have those links available easily, it is very useful.

Also for the awareness raising.

NEW SPEAKER: It is not either, or, but the working groups have do have the chance to discuss things on their own terms.

As soon as they have something in the public domain, you can make suggestions about how we best could do that. The links have to be easily available to everybody. They are not creating a new document. They should be readily available without going to the SharePoint. NEW SPEAKER: You could recommend what we could do on the focus groups for our websites. At the moment we have something on the bottom right hand side which looks at past events and forthcoming events. We may need to expand our coverage. Perhaps that would be useful for you to make some recommendations about what would be best. Any questions?

NEW SPEAKER: We would like to ask more associations, partners, to join in, and bring us all your expertise and experiences. It is an open group and we would be happy to have more people. A call for more collaboration.

NEW SPEAKER: Anything online?

We will move on to Working Group C, visual signing and sign language. Let's get a brief introduction to that work.

NEW SPEAKER: We are the only public broadcasting Corporation in Japan, just like BBC in the UK. My work is on sign language, and what I did since last September, I submitted the report last September, and what I did is collected information related to sign language and translation research. Not so many organisations are researching on sign language translation. We need to share information to encourage others to research. I attached two documents. One is on sign language technology, and the other on the project conducted in Italy.

For more detail,

we will describe this.

I also discussed with a research group in Thailand,

who are conducting research on image-based recognition

and the translation of sign language,

they have received a research fund

from the government of Thailand,

and the scope of the research is quite a big one.

They will provide some documents for this Working Group.

And they are interested to attend the next meeting in India.

I also discussed with people from the Korean broadcasting service.

Relating these activities I revised the report of working group C,

and I also revised a technology orientated part.

Page 3,

it is in the middle of page 3,

I emphasise the importance of close to signing.

It may reduce the barrier against the spread of sign language interpretation service. In the open signing deaf people sometimes complain the image is too small, and sometimes people complain the image is annoying. When you introduce closed signing you can switch on or off the image whenever you want. Maybe you can adjust the size of the sign.

We need another transmission channel

to send the video to receivers,

and a hybrid system of broadcasting channel, and broadband network, is one of the most promising technologies.

There are a lot of hybrid systems available in the market.

It is important to make clear what kind of function necessary to realise accessibility for deaf people. This might be a point of standardisation.

On page 4,

I also add some discussion. How we should combine these on a television receiver. The signed image should be large enough to show facial movements and expressions. We may need a kind of guideline, how to combine the video and sign language interpreter. This is a deaf people understand the television program better.

After I wrote this report I found that IDC published a set of guidelines on digital terrestrial television. They mentioned about the size of the image, and the qualification of signers. This guideline is welcome to be contributed to this focus group.

After this meeting I will take the following action.

Collect more cases of research in this field.

Collect guidelines from broadcasting services,

and collect information on evaluation and qualification.

I needed a lot of help from those interested in sign language service, and broadcasters,

and briefly I explained the contributed document.

Number 73.

This document describes on computer graphics, a special computer program language was developed, a television programme making language. This can generate television programmes of computer graphic animation. This document describes how we modified the system

two describe the motion of the numbers of signers, and it is a technical issue.

NEW SPEAKER: I would like to remind you about the presentations of these, but to whet your appetite, to explain why a particular document would be of interest to people in the room, or those taking part online, or those subsequently joining a particular Working Group. We are not going to be dealing with it in depth. But it is the aim to provide you with indications of where you want to go into more detail at a later point. I would like to mention some other contributions which are on their way. Portugal is probably the country that produces most sign language. It produces annually 4200 hours which is probably more than the whole of the US at the moment. The issue is that they have a good tradition but the size on the screen is relatively limited. This is one of the issues. The second point is when you are delivering not on a television screen, but on a smart phone which has got considerably smaller real estate, what other design issues when you want to do this, either with a human or either an avatar with an animation system behind it. You need to look at sign language not just on big screens, but on small screens, and to screen situations. Thirdly you raised the issue of hybrid broadcast broadband delivery as a viable solution. We know closed signing is rather expensive if it requires you to do an additional channel. We need to look at what are the options and the implications of those options. And have some cases of this. Last Thursday we were shown a commercial broadcaster which have started signing on the Internet and what the implications are, so we would like more cases we could input to Working Group C. Also, documentation which looks at the size of the sign on the screen, and we have already got some screenshots to help you. Some additional documentation on the rationale for the solutions, and finally at the presentation we did in Dubai on 22 September, it turns out there is a regional centre of excellence which has done documentation on about 170 different sign language is, and has looked at combined avatars using animations both forehand and faces, and services which run on mobile phones. We want to make sure that particular contributor at the workshop can also, if you can't take active part, can send input documents because that was very interesting. We have a number of things we would like to contribute to Working Group C to add to the range of cases you have. In the meantime I am hoping ATLAS is up and ready.

I am from the Polytechnic of two Reno. – Turin. I am just referring to some issues that the doctor mentioned. For instant, I have a short video prepared by our colleagues. Probably you cannot, there is also some voice, but there is a problem with audio, but this is the current situation in which Wright, use a human translator, and the goal for us is developing this

… We selected specific domains, and for the weather broadcasting, we are able to automatically translate, this is an example, using terrestrial TV, TV, of the avatar, the character, but his shape, his colour, his position on the screen, everything is completely controlled by a joystick, and this is extremely important, not only the position of the camera with respect to the sign, to decide the best avatar. He needs and in addition to this. It is possible to have an avatar in another media, like a mobile, so the possibility from one side. Obviously, translating, automatically translating a weather broadcast, because the problem is, translation, obviously. If you are doing a manual translation, for instance, for a website, something like that. While this is going on, let's give you an example. This is the partner of our project. The next step will be. This project. You will enter the railway station and if you connect your mobile to the local network, at any audio announcement, your mobile will vibrate and you will get on it. The translation in sign language, which is already done automatically. This is the output of the track and we think this can be a side-effect of the ATLAS Project. Also referring to another project, our colleagues have done a completed test for linking the signing, the visual carrot, to the broadcast, – the visual character. We have gained significant experience in all of these problems, and I think we should definitely be able to work on your document and to provide some additional information on this. As you can imagine, ATLAS is the scientific project, so there is a lot of scientific challenges from former Visitation of sign language, linguistic, etc, but I will skip those because it is not the right place to mention that. This is a complete overview of the project. We convert them into the form that we have defined. Then, starting from the sentences, we generate the virtual carrot, with also facial expression and everything – the virtual character. The translator will decide where the signing will be done, which proportion of space, the location and everything, is done automatically. This is just the details. Obviously, the side-effect, thereby project. It – the byproduct, we developed a dictionary for Italian sign language which advances on a different platform, and it links in such a way that you can get synonymous and all of this stuff for different platforms, Android, etc. We have an engine on both Windows etc, and everything is completely open and it is definitely more welcome in providing you with material and discussing with you all of the issues and helping you and cooperating. If you give me just a couple of minutes more. We are now also working for death-blind people. – Death. deaf. We are trying to use anthropomorphic robots, so that the speaker can recognise what the speaker is signing by detecting the movement and then we convert this into our format and we use than anthropomorphic robot to give the communication for the blind and deaf, and it is very surprising to me that the guy understood what the robot, what the humanoid man, sorry, it was going on in terms of doing research in this area, so… I stop here, I don't want you to lose your time, but I am open to any kind of questions and whatever you may have.

That was very, very interesting. No apologies. It was a very important input, so thank you. I would just like to point out the links between group, the over two the other one, because one of the issues we will have to be looking at on a context by context basis is this business of on the one hand, machine translation over to human intervention, so it is not a question of either or. But, in which context is it appropriate to use that? In which context of the quantitative and effects of a human sign language person onscreen justifiable and it is clear that in many cases there are quantitative differences, so I would very much appreciate as we move forward in the various access groups, evidence-based inputs on what we know about machine translation, the intermediaries, all the way over to human-based access services, to be able to qualify the differential – debate. This is a very emotive area. The more evidence-based input. We have, the better, to avoid highly charged discussions which are often perhaps ill informed of the context in which this is being done.

If you give me just a couple of minutes. I forgot that you mention that we also developed the complete track in terms of assisted editor, etc, to allow the human translation done by an interpreter, so we automatically translate some thing, otherwise if an interpreter translates whatever, a movie or what ever, using the editor that we developed, then we are able to deliver according to the ATLAS track, whatever, so the integration. If you want of machine translation for a small domain. That is why I mentioned your profession. For instance, some deaf people and interpreters can start translating and signing movies on CD or whatever, and we are able to deliver it to them. I am ready for any question.

Thank you very much, for that very important input and presentation. Are there any questions?

I am collecting everybody who is working on blind and deaf issues and avatars and I am finding we need to put all these people together occurs. I think we want to have interoperability on how we do these things technically as well, even if that is not totally.not.even if it is a pipedream. Aaron in New Delhi will probably be at the focus group and he is also working on the death blind. – Blind-death. I would like to connect all of you up. I think it would be important to get a correspondence group going. Sense in the UK. Duplication of work is unfortunate, sometimes. I congratulate both of you. I am coming to Rome! I am going to come and see you if I may! We will make a deal! NEW SPEAKER: No problem at all. NEW SPEAKER: Do you know somebody either name of Roberto Worth, who is deaf himself. He is in Rome. We can do it. Thank you.

NEW SPEAKER: Have we any questions from the audience, or online? At the moment, nobody is flagging online and nobody in the room. Thank you, Paolo.

We just need to switch. Before we move on.

As I say, we are now going to move on to 5.4 of the agenda.

It is 5.5 of the revised agenda, which is….After lunch. I will do working group G.

Peter got gastric influenza yesterday just before he was going to the airport, which is really horrific, so he was very sad not to be able to be here, so I will be standing in for him because I have been having discussions with him on a weekly basis since September, about the group on digital broadcast television.

The things I would like to highlight for that updated version, what I have done to make it slightly easier for those who do not have visual impairments, is that I have tried to flag the areas that are new, highlighted in yellow.

It is an attempt to look at some of the issues as we have seen them. Page 2. It looks – it talks about some of the underlying trends. We know that analogue is being switched off, digital broadcast terrestrial transmission is becoming increasingly widespread, IPTV is there. In some territories. It is now the dominant means of delivery. For example, in Hong Kong, more people watch television by IPTV then in the broadcast mode at the moment, but that is an exception. What we do need is to look at, as we are looking at something that the medium to long-term, how will television be changing in the next few years?

What we are seeing is a move to multiple platforms. This document outlines what we know at the moment about these changes in actually delivering broadcast. Also, where does the money come from? We tend to forget that in the past we have been thinking about advertising as the dominant business model and in some territories, state funded television or public service broadcasting through some kind of license, what we can see if we look at the economic aspects is that the area, which continues to grow its subscription-based television, or pay-TV, which has now become bigger than advertising and globally, public ward casted or state funded broadcasting are still very small – public broadcasting. They are not particularly growth areas. That is to set the scene. If you look at it from a user perspective, we also understand that television itself is changing in terms of user habits. 30 years ago. Television was used when it was broadcast. Television in the UK, to take one case, 10 percent of all television is now consumed at a time, other than the moment at which it is broadcast. That change has taken place in less than five years. It is an indication that broadcast television will still be around, but we have to look at multiple delivery scenarios and what the implications for accessibility is when you don't just see a program when it is broadcast. But you want to see it on catch up TV, delivered centrally, or you have recorded it on your personal video recorder. It has implications for standards, for making sure that when you have access services. These are awarded and are still available when people choose to see television when they want to do so. In the Nordic region, it is not an option, but it is a mandatory requirement for their digital television system that if an access service is available, it still has to be available on free to air television when it is accessed when people want to use it. So if you have made a recording of a television program on your PVR, that means that the audio description must still work, captioning and subsidised tools must still work – captioning and subtitles. And signing must still be available when you call it up at a time and place of your choosing. It is interesting because in some countries, this is an option. It is an optional requirement, but it is not a mandatory requirement. What we need to do in this group is to map out what particular regimes exist in different territories and also, couple that with the things we were discussing on the train, different regulatory approaches. Do you want to do this, just through legislation and regulation? To what extent do you want to ensure industry participation to actually achieve that? For example, in Japan, which is consensus-based, many of the rules for how to implement the end to end services have been agreed by the industrial stakeholders. That is to say, the broadcaster and the consumer electronics manufacturers, without any government intervention. But they have to be able to deliver, sorry, but that is one of the things we want to document properly in casework. Japan has clear targets for captioning and the other things. NHK is not just applying to NHK at commercial broadcasters and they have to finish that implementation by 2017, I think.

What we want to do is to look at the things that are specific to the platform and what we have done in the document is to highlight some of the areas for the areas we know best. That indicates that as there are five families of digital TV standard, we need to know more about Japanese-Latin American standards, the Korean standards, the emerging digital terrestrial standards for China, because after all, that accounts for more than 20 percent of the world.'s population, and therefore it makes a lot of sense to understand it. We have some information about the DVD standards, and others, and we need to make sure we have a full understanding of the rules of engagement for platforms or the other three standards. This is clearly a work in progress. We have flagged a number of the issues, some of which will need to be addressed by the ITU, and some of them are more difficult to look at. There may be something we have to revisit in the group on regulations. We have heard it from the previous groups. The balance between legislation, regulation and implementation, carrots and sticks. To what extent do you make a minimum requirement and then look at other ways of ensuring that things actually do become accessible? It is clear that legislation alone does not necessarily work, as we have seen on occasions in Spain. Spain has very tough legislation, but there is still work to be done to ensure that the compliance is appropriate.

So that was just too briefly tell you about working group G. We have the input document from Nick Tanton and Peter Maltz dead. We are hoping to get more input from Poland. We have some suggestions from places like Portugal and Taiwan [Province of China].

And some other territories where they were definitely want to contribute, and we are in the process of putting together more cases to document the kinds of obstacles and barriers. We are coming across, which have a significant impact for broadcast television. Andrea has a question, it says.

NEW SPEAKER: In all things, I test what is going on, but it popped up as a question, it didn't get a message from me, or did you? What did it say?

INAUDIBLE

Does this allow me to communicate with the secretariat? I have a question which is not on your thing. If you want to send a message to one of the people who are your recipients, can you do that as well? I think it would be helpful. After lunch, if you explained how that works, because some of us would like to use that more effectively. I am sorry to interrupt. I didn't think it would make it a question, I was communicating directly with Alexandra.

NEW SPEAKER: I would like to suggest that Maya and Mark have a look at how people can make effective use of the logistics and capabilities. As we have a whole group looking at making our processes more accessible, not to say that we won't do it, but I would like to make sure that Maya and Mark follow up on that suggestion, and look at how we make sure people do that because I would suggest it is probably better to have a demonstrator that people can explore at their leisure, before attending a meeting, physically or virtually, to understand how to get the best out of that particular system. So we have to look at demonstrators or whatever, so that people can familiarise themselves with something before they come.

NEW SPEAKER: I am pretty loud. You said before they come, I think it would useful to have a tutorial in the meeting because even though I have some technical ability to use this properly, there are other people in the room, for instant I have had to mute my sound, otherwise we are going to have feedback. Little suggestions. A little bit more information. And also for dyslexics. I can't make head or tail of that. We need to do something about that. A small tutorial author if you want to do that in the room. I am still operating in the dark.

NEW SPEAKER:, Point taken. We have, to look at the role of tutorials in conjunction with other means, to make sure that people make full use and get the full benefit of the logistics. The balance in terms of the time we have available needs to be discussed, too. Again, I think this is clearly an important task that Maya and Mark can help us with. What do you think, Maya? You are looking a bit nonplussed.

Yes. Okay. Maya says it is also the question of which tool we are talking about. Remember, we have multiple solutions here. During tutorials on all of them… The problem is we are offering multiple solutions. A number of different things are actually available to everybody. But that is very valid. We will follow up.

So I don't want to take more of your time. That is what we are trying to do in work group G. It has also already triggered some discussions with the other two platform groups, H. And I, and we had a constructive discussion yesterday with the mobile groups and John will be mentioning that later in the programme.

INAUDIBLE

You are recommended to read the document at your leisure and we would welcome more contributors to working group G. Christina is a regulator, but we have other people who we are actively campaigning to take part to the work. As I say, we have got expressions of interest from places like Taiwan [Province of China], Orchard goal, and other places – Portugal. Certainly for Australia, just to mention, Australia is currently drawing up guidelines about quality and captions.

We know from the US that quality is normally, it boils down to the extent to which it is a faithful transcription of what is being said. That is perhaps at variance with research we have on subtitles and captions being used by different groups, with, say, visual or cognitive impairments, and transcription work can be self-defeating, in that for some groups, there is too much text and there is no longer any time for the person to enjoy the programme, as they are having to spend all their time reading. So the issue of what is quality seems to be one of the things that comes up. The other question is that of synchronicity. How important is it that the subtitles appear when the people are speaking?

The Australians have asked a group, working groups, to provide us with feedback on that particular issue,

because their concern in particular about respeaking and what we call life captioning, because there is often a delay, and we have noticed in the UK is the – it is a little as five seconds. In Spain, what we did. Two weeks ago indicated that on the news programs, the delay was at least 15 seconds and the cognitive research indicates that this is a show stopper. 15 second is far too long for anybody to benefit from it.

What the Australians were asking for is a discussion about was the importance of synchronicity. What is the evidence of showing how the synchronicity of subtitles, what impact that has on the intelligible to the programme, and perhaps doing that by programme category, news, current affairs, whatever. They would like to explore in more detail what evidence there is. We already have some from products and project. About the need to look at synchronising again, that is to say, if you are doing live subtitling, whether in hybrid solutions, we can delay the audio to synchronise the captions with the subtitles and the programme, to help those for whom the service will otherwise be completely unintelligible. Remember, the research we know as indicates that in the least bad of the countries, the UK, a quarter of people with hearing impairments do not benefit of captions with a delay of more than five seconds, so we need to address that particular challenge, and come up with Related Solutions. That Is All I Have. – Platform Related Solutions.

Any questions, then I think that concludes that particular point. We are almost back on time.

We would aim to back in the room at 13:45, Central European Time, to resume our work with 5.5. It is fortunate because we know there will be an online contribution from somebody around 2 PM. That will be very good. Thank you very much you will use the lunch break to network informally. And begin to think about which Working Group or working groups you would like to contribute to in the coming weeks and months. Thank you.

We would aim to back in the room at 13:45, Central European Time

If you have the agenda, input document, 55, we are resuming, which is the report from Working Group de on emerging access services and to help us to do so, we have the man on my left, who will introduce the group and lead into some a virtual contribution from one member of this group. NEW SPEAKER: Hello, I am from Brunel University in England. I used to coordinate at the European project, specialised access service implementation and assessment. I am cochairing the Working Group. Unfortunately, my co-chair cannot attend. He was about to submit a document from Working Group D, but he has had a bereavement, so he could not submit the documentation today.

To date we have an input document. It is a liaison statement from the hearing aid manufacturers association. An external person will present on this paper.

NEW SPEAKER: We just wait while we reconnect, so you can hear Marcel taking part from somewhere further north in Europe. Do we have Marcel on the line?

As I say, we are waiting for Marcel to come online, so we can hear his report on input document, 76, AVA, technical characteristics of wireless aids for hearing impairments. As you may remember, we identified the need for a replacement of the old magnetic induction loop technology, that is prone to interference and other difficulties. We talked about this already in May and again in September, and this document represents something that has then gone on to be considered in the other groups with which we have liaison agreements. So we are still working to get Marcel online.

Input document, 76. Marcel, we still can't hear you. We are trying to fix it so we can hear you in the room here. In case Marcel can hear, we are still trying to make sure we can hear your contribution at this end in the plenary session in the auditorium in Barcelona, so if you could just bear with us while we sort out the connection. We are still working on it, so don't worry, we will find a solution. NEW SPEAKER: Can you hear me? Peter? NEW SPEAKER: Yes, Marcel. We can hear you. We would like to give you the floor to explain briefly the background and where you are going in connection with your input document, 76, of technical characteristics of wireless aids. The floor is yours! You speak okay, thank you. NEW SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I hear a very long delay to the Internet. I am representing the European Hearing Industry Manufacturers Association and we are working on the improvement and effective replacement of the service, that is used by hearing aid for the use of induction loops, to have an understanding of speech in public places, television, mobile phones, without distortion, and meaning directly from the equipment, not using a microphone, and that gives a huge improvement for understanding and is essential for people with hearing impairment. The document is a continuation on a form of presentation that we have made, – on former presentations. Firstly, it refers to a report and secondly a suggestion to make a statement. The report is issued by task group 17, ERM. This document contains information about hearing aids and wireless instruments and it is about understanding what is important for hearing aids and in relation to wireless connection, so it contains technical information, also background information like marketing information, the number of people using hearing aids and things like that, the use of existing assisted listening devices, like old transmitters, but the main purpose of this document is to identify that we are required. Ring – requiring a worldwide frequency change so that users can use such wireless connection services, all over the world, with the same equipment and the same performance.

For that study has to be done by the group of hearing aid manufacturers, and one of the things we included, it is not explicitly in the document, that existing free bands, like 2.4 gigahertz band, associated with Bluetooth, for instance, the free bands are, in effect, not very useful because they give no protection to any interference, because it means that any other service can emit radio spectrum on that, and in particular when there is high level power use, it will give large interference for hearing aid users when using such frequencies. Also, Bluetooth is having problems, they use high levels of power, which is not feasible with small compliance is. This document identifies to start with two bands which we have found to be possible candidates for worldwide frequency, it is on page 14. These are existing bands and on that, they will probably be available, but these have to be signed and add some point one of the two for use of this service, and these other documents that will identify these candidates and start the process in making the world of radio spectrum aware of this need and the bands that we think should be used for that. This is a background document. It is a continuation of documents that we have written before, and we will continue writing the kinds of papers that can be published worldwide.

This document is approved and will hopefully also be approved by ERM as a whole and will then hopefully the public document and can be used and will be accessible for everybody working on this. This is about my contribution.

NEW SPEAKER: Thank you very much. That was very concise and very precise, to. I found it very useful. Are there any questions from the floor? There is one from Andrea. We will just pass this on to her. NEW SPEAKER: Is this a double question, are you aware that the WRC is meeting in a few weeks time at the ITU headquarters?

Maybe it is not going through to him?

NEW SPEAKER: Did you ask a question? NEW SPEAKER: Yes, I did. ECHOING. Switch it off.

What shall I do? FEEDBACK. It is not working.

This is a test. This Mike may be muted.

This is Andreas Sax in case we haven't met. I am with the ITU. We have a great interest in this, and also… To have a frequency but we know we are asking the impossible assigned that would be global, so that anyway you were in the world, your hearing aid would work. I might as well ask for what we… FEEDBACK. The other aspect is emergency services because with eight PA system for instance, at an airport, and nothing a particular item of interest for hearing aid users, if you had multiple countries in that airport, using different hearing aids, that would be a very important human factor use is one example. We sent a liaison to everybody. We could, no mean that we were not on the agenda of the WRC. We realised that the work would have to be studied in Working Group 5A. I wondered if you were aware of this and that is, there was some kind of joint effort, to try to get it on the next agenda for the next WRC. My question is statement and a question at the same time. If you could eliminate any of this for me, it would be great. Thank you. NEW SPEAKER:

That is very pleasant to hear. You made reference to the FCC asking for this and we were aware of this. We asked to have ERM task group 17, of which has been originated in this document, so this public document, and also FCC activities will prepare the way for asking for preparing for the radio conference, for assigning these frequencies, one of those frequencies. This is a long way because the WRC works quite slowly. I think we have to take our preparation for that to the next meeting. I think it is in two years time. I don't know. We can make such a submission so that we can have at some point the decision, so that certain bands can be reserved for this purpose. The second point is that for public address systems, we also adhere to these points, and can also use a similar service, possibly for the same. NEW SPEAKER: Thank you, very much. So, Andrea, does that answer your question fully? INAUDIBLE. Does that work better? Test again. Yes and no, it does answer my question. You basically told me the obstacles I had been given already, but what I would like to propose is that if you could work with us, the joint coordination. It typically, I would link up.not only the FCC. It could feed into the FCC on the technical information that they have, because as you know, the frequencies are different in the US as referred to the European Union, so perhaps I can propose that we can work together on this, and you may already know some of my colleagues, but this has come up and I think we have to try and get this into the consciousness at this meeting, so they know it is coming. That is what I am trying to do. Then I can go back to Switzerland and see if I can sneak it in. I have asked the State Department to let me in, and they said I might. It means I will be networking from the floor, but two years is a long time to wait, and hearing aids will be involving so fast and changing so fast, that often we are left behind, so I am wondering if it has representation in WRC? Can you do something to make them open their mouth and say some about this, even if it is not on the agenda, because agenda is decided by counsel, which of course are the member states, so we have to find a way of invading. That is the battle plan. I am trying to get people to help me with. Do you have an idea about that? NEW SPEAKER: Yes. We have started activity and also to work together with it. See about half a year ago. We knew about the WRC, but indeed, there are two ways, steps. FCC, on the other side, to introduce our request for a common frequency. So I would very welcome the corporation, together with you, to synchronise on that, so that we can start with that. The only warning, there is a lot more than just happening at frequency. We have identified that having a common frequency is the most important thing. In two and four years, the window. We will be closed, it will be too late. On the other hand, a lot of effort has to be done to get it really operational…

NEW SPEAKER: I am just going to ask one more question then we will move on. Do you have somebody that you know is attending WRC in there that I can get to? I hang out at the ITU all the time. Are we still operating from this possible we might try and do something in a year? I have got to people in there. Although their hands are tied to be able to put it on the agenda, do you have anybody that I could link up with? You could do this off-line. We have your e-mail address. Thank you very much for the information you gave me. It is really appreciated. NEW SPEAKER: He is a consultant and chairman of task group 17, he is a regular attendant to the World Radio Conference. We would like to broaden the support. Thank you very much. NEW SPEAKER: That was very useful. Any more from your group? NEW SPEAKER: We do not have any other documents at the moment. NEW SPEAKER: Thank you very much. NEW SPEAKER: Can I interrupt? I asked for a formal liaison to task group 13.

NEW SPEAKER: We are displaying it in the conference room right now. It is proposed to establish liaison. We will draft a liaison with those interested and get it done, we will ask Andrea to come up with a suggestion and we will look at it ASAP, preferably before we leave. We will come up with a suggested text and we will send it back to you, Marcel, in a question of hours rather than days or weeks.

Any questions? I don't think we have anybody online or in the room with further questions. I suggest we move rapidly on to Working Group E. I can present the input document which isn't greatly changed from last time. It is 00 84. I don't think we need to add a whole load of details. The whole point of this is if you have an access service or programme for which an access service exists, it is also important those who need it can find it. This leads into discussions which vary from do we need a captioning button on remote controls, which is one approach which is appropriate in some territories, such as India, with 24 languages, that will not necessarily help unless it defaults to a menu where you can choose the language. Another approach is to set up your equipment, whether it is a television receiver or whatever, so that it defaults to what it is you need. To give you an example when I watched television in Denmark, and I want to watch television from Danish channels, but also Swedish channels, it knows if the program language on television for the channel concerned, if it is not Danish, it will automatically display captioning in Danish if this exists. When I watch Danish drama often it is difficult to understand what is being said. It is useful for me to be able to see captioning in Danish and that will come up automatically in my case. When I watch a channel from Sweden, next door, I don't have to do anything because Swedish public television is in some cases transmitted with captioning not just in Swedish but in Danish. They are being paid to make the captioning by a cable operating network and they deliver captioning in Danish. If I watch Swedish television what happens? I can see the program and hear the audio in Swedish but without having to do anything the captioning appears in the Danish language on top of the program. What we are looking at is the whole chain of events from the time that somebody wants to watch a particular program, to being able to discover whether there is an access service available, and to be able to watch a program with that access service to get the full benefit. If that person chooses to do so on a recording, are these access service is still available, and where do I know if it is present? It is not a very big group and an important one because it involves things like awareness. We know from studies in the UK, other countries, among persons who belong to the blind community, that levels of awareness of things like audio description are quite high. But if you cannot find the service, or it is available infrequently, it doesn't really help. It is not enough to produce the service, it has to the able to be discovered, made available so that people can find it, use it and enjoy it and that is what we are looking at. Collecting cases of problems, and looking at the possible actions. This has implications not just for standardisation but for regulation, legislation. We have begun the collection process. If this is of interest to you we welcome examples of problems. We have examples from Aline Remael in collection with – connection with audio description. Also the problems in Europe with closed captioning, if you use teletext, that is the way it is delivered, the difficulty is different countries use different three digit codes. This may not be a problem in some places, but if you live in a small country like Holland which retransmit signals from neighbouring countries, it becomes an issue if you have to use different codes depending on which channel it is on. This working group hopes to identify the kinds of obstacles, barriers, facing people who need to choose access services. What the options are and where we can do something to improve the situation through regulation, legislation and standardisation. Any questions?

Good, then I think we can move on to one of the most challenging groups. Group on participation and digital media. Before I hand the floor over I would like to remind you we still need to discuss the extent to which we cover social media, video games, electronic games, and this is an important area. One of the ways we can do so, clarify the nature of the challenge, is by looking at participation. Much of the existing legislation regulation assumes people are couch potatoes, people are sitting back and watching and consuming passively. That is clearly not the case for either computer games, electronic games, video games, social media, and that is why we ask if he can help us clarify the issues. I would like to hand over to him to explain how far he has reached and where he plans to go with this particular area. It has implications for many of the other working groups.

NEW SPEAKER: I am a researcher at the University of Cambridge. Looking at the most challenging field, participation. The primary objective is people found types of people that can enjoy the media, and during the second meeting in Geneva we found that existing problems, and the main problems are that still most of the digital media is designed by thinking about an average user, and many assist this devices, different means to help people but there is no way by which people can select what is the best solution. As we know that during the elderly population there are different types of impairments. People can be both blind and deaf, and the level of impairment progresses with H. We need some sort of solution that can be adapted, and we should think about selecting a particular solution from the user to the system so the system can understand the user. It is easier to say it difficult to implement. In this particular document what we propose that I should also mention our original idea came from Peter, also work on a European Union task force, so I combined the idea of them as well. In this particular working document, 79, we proposed a set of studies where we tried to have a broad spectrum of participation and we looked at if it is possible to classify this defined scenario in different classes. We looked at a model by Shannon, and another media model that exists, and based on the time and space of the media creation and consumption, and classify – classified different media, social communication, where you are sharing your participation based on the time and place, and if you had this in your mind you need not look at the whole spectrum, you could scale it down into two or four combinations, and that would help designers, developers, to select the appropriate solution for the audience. And then we move on to define the sort of vocabulary, a description of user and device. I hope to present output of the task force in a White Paper at the next meeting. We make a description of the user in terms of different functional variables and put a description of the device and scenario of interaction. You can pick up any participation scenario, classified according to the place and time, described the scenario of interaction, and scaled-down the whole range of participation scenarios into a finite amount of solutions and create specification or recommendations, and take the existing guidelines and map them in respect to the classification scheme we are trying to propose. We are particularly interested to know the other problematic scenarios you can face, please let us know. If you come up with any possible new solutions or new issues of participation, please let this working group know. And then we can include it into our participation scenario and see if it meets with ours.

NEW SPEAKER: This is an early release of a document which aims to produce a fairly broad taxonomy to look at participation. In the meantime while you are working on it you would invite those in the room and those taking part online too, with cases which specify, and we can look at some examples produced by ONCE, the Spanish disability organisation, we looked at the report on the accessibility of websites, and what their report on some of the major portals revealed, that all of the major portals are essentially inaccessible because with very few exceptions, when you have to log on the procedures presume that you are cited. – You are a sighted person. If you don't have a mechanism for reading these allowed, for those with visual – impairments, you have locked people out of their Facebook account, or their other accounts. It is a small but crucial first step. I would very much recommend that we are conscious of the need to look at social media, not just the web but other kinds of interactive audiovisual media. If you come across a specific case, a specific instance of a problem where people are being excluded, prevented from participating, deriving full benefits, being able to enjoy media, the working group F, they are the people to send that to. It is their job to see whether their draft taxonomy would be able to handle a particular case or whether it needs to be changed to cope with those examples. The more cases you can come up with the better. So those working on group F will have something substantial on which to base their recommendations. We discussed the issue of computer games yesterday and our suggestion is to sound out to of the major manufacturers of hardware, Microsoft connect and Nintendo, to find out who is working with what, because both have an active accessibility project and we are looking at how we can go about more formalised contact. We are at an exploratory stage. The coordinators are looking into this on behalf of the focus group. We hope that meets with your approval. Any questions from the floor or those online?

Has anybody flagged during that presentation?

I would like to thank you for being so energetic and working on what is going to be intellectually one of the most challenging working groups. Certainly an area where you have to break new interdisciplinary ground, so it is certainly not going to be easy. I hope you continue to show the same degree of energy you have done since May. I wish you well in the next month or so in the next releases of your document, and what you do when you start to receive some more input cases.

Thank you.

That was working group F.

Group G we have dealt with.

Group H, we have the original template document which is still valid. We haven't got any updated inputs. We expect to be hearing more from them. I suggest we move onto group I, mobile and handheld devices. We have the co-coordinator, John Lee. I would invite him to present the current state of play.

NEW SPEAKER: We are a little light on contributions themselves. Part of the reason for that is there are a lot of things going on within the mobile world related to media. We are waiting on a few things to be available for us to process those. Talking about mobile and handheld, the mobile space will grow and start affecting a lot of different activities. Accessibility is a major issue. When you talk about media accessibility for the mobiles, as Peter mentioned, some of the standards change, especially talking about smaller screens and capacitor limitations you may experience using a mobile. We wanted to take a two pronged approach. First we analysed existing standards in media accessibility and look at how they can transition to be specified in the mobile space. This will require us to first understand what is out there with the help of the other working groups, and compile those requirements that do affect the smaller screen, that we have, particular to your platform. And rewriting them and looking at extending them to make sure the capacitor requirements are taken into account. Part of that will be coordinating with the other working groups and exploring the existing standards out there. Secondary to that is there is a lot of work regarding media accessibility in several during session – jurisdictions. We need to take a look at the mobile chapters existing within those regulations and standards produced, to look at how they could be adapted to have a broad appeal and be included from a broader perspective. One of the great examples is it was the foundation in the US, having said that, the second approach is to investigate future capabilities of devices and networks and to make recommendations into what will be required to ensure the continuity of accessibility services, as people move towards mobile lifestyles using these devices. Part of the contributions we have currently is 88, 89, some charts submitted. They were presented previously in some of the introductory remarks Peter made. The interesting way is it relates to looking at Internet access, the progress of measuring this and it describes the transition happening from a telephony world into a mobile world, and look at the measures used to make them more effective. When we talk about media currently the idea of television and Internet is described but when you talk about mobiles, the traditional notion of broadcasting, programming is different. When you talk about data pipe, it is not typically done through a broadcast system, but through an IP network that is reliant on the cellular network. Those are some of the areas we need to address and approach to look at how specialised requirements will be coming out regarding the mobile platform. Anybody interested should contact us and as we move forward, we hope to have a lot more contributions deliverable for this particular topic.

NEW SPEAKER: We still have the same basic framework. A vision for mobile device accessibility that the current situation, state-of-the-art, and obstacles we are running into, and moving on to identify how those obstacles can be resolved, and which of these actions will be relevant in the ITU context. Some of the questions I still have to get you to look at those, encouraging people to come up with specific instances of challenges, and the one I briefly mentioned this morning, imagine somebody with an iPad, they require accessibility provisions. On a mobile phone which has got a keyboard with keys on it there is a dimple on number five. What is the accessibility of a dimple on the five on the keyboard on the phone when you don't have a keyboard, you only have a virtual one, how does the user know this? That has already been addressed. When you turn on an iPad you say the first place you put your finger will default to being the equivalent of five when you have got the keyboard activated. Examples of that kind could be useful to send in to John in that Working Group, specific instances of problems users have when they want to work with these. Then we can pass them around because they may well have a solution we can address across the working groups. That would help you analysing the existing standards, legislation. You are also at the advantage of having a recent global report looking at accessibility and mobile devices which has either been published or will soon be published. Any questions from the floor or those taking part online?

We are looking forward to hearing more from that particular group. Phones have overtaken all other devices, they are owned by more than half of the world phosphorylation. Where we may have had some excuses in the past we have the need to address these particularly. I am looking forward to an example of your table of contents, addressing where is the device, the primary delivery mechanism, and where is it a second screen for other media, and we have heard from Pilar about the use of mobile phones not just here but in five theatres, cinemas as well as theatres where they have Opera and so on. We have examples from Sweden where they have been making sure we have a full gamut of access services. There is quite a lot happening where a smart phone is being used as a second screen for other kinds of performances or media. Andrea has indicated.

NEW SPEAKER: I seem to be talking a lot, is it working? There is an area we haven't mentioned strongly. That is Africa and the developing world. You have to wait five years for a landline. They are exaggerated with mobile telephony. They are talking about you can transfer money with your mobile phone, you can decide what the bill is in your hand, whether it is a one dollar bill or a $10 bill, you can deposit checks. That is one of the biggest markets in the world. It is one of the largest population of people with disabilities. Service providers and mobile manufacturers should be conscious of the fact we have something to learn from them and how they use a mobile phone, and to make them much more accessible using some of the techniques described. I want that to go into the record or the report. Also, clean audio, Richard Nichols, I hope he will talk about that. That is important for mobile telephony and television, the fact is we don't have high definition sound, broadband sound, and that is important for mobile telephony and that has sometimes to be built into the mobile phone itself. A lot of the new generation of mobile phones have that capability that it depends on what is transmitted. I am learning. All you guys teach me all this stuff. I want those to be mentioned.

NEW SPEAKER: I would like to respond, clear or clean audio, we already have that in the group and we have in the pipeline inputs. Last Thursday we heard from Swedish public broadcasting that their solution which maintains three different audio channels for radio broadcasts and cant put it out – and can put it out through stereo or mono and break it up in its constituents in a mobile phone or other device to allow users to make their own adjustments between voice and nonvoice. We have a number of other instances of things of this kind being looked into. The outstanding work being done by Dolby, they will be welcome in Working Group D, and the other point, your first point, which was about the developing world. We have already made mention of that. So when taxonomies are worked on, if we are talking about enjoying audiovisual media, one-dimensional is can I actually pay for it? If you are talking about participation, that the participation taxonomy will have to be able to handle things of that kind. We know of examples from India where fishermen and farmers check out the latest prices for their crops. In the case of fishermen, they will land their catch in the port which will offer them the best price. In Africa, mobile banking, people have second Sim cards and go around just with a Sim card, they may not even have a mobile phone, but they can handle electronic transfers. I would expect to see examples of that popping up in Working Group I, and also in the participation group so they are clear these things that need to be addressed so we can collate the proposed actions. At that point we have been through all of the technology groups. Last, but not least, we will be hearing something quite interesting from Working Group K, because our institutionalised conscious, Mark and Maya have a lot to say about processes and we have the active participation of various people, persons with disabilities.

I think that everybody here appreciates the efforts that are put into trying to make these meetings accessible online. I think Malcolm Johnston from the ITU started the last meeting with emphasising this, it is a very positive thing, but still there are a lot of problems and obstacles. But we are trying. Also I would like to say that there is no way that this group. Cancel all the issues involved in participating in standardisation – that this group can solve all the issues. Andrea has been working with these for a long time. And some others. I think we are trying our way and trying things and we will probably learn something out of it. What Mark and I doing? We are working for NGOs and like Peter, we do not have a lot of time to put into this group, but what Mark McGuinness has done, he has done a web survey, and from the first meetings, 14 people have answered this survey, and he has done an analysis of the results. It is available on SharePoint. The whole analysis is available in SharePoint, the answers to the questions they were given. When this group was introduced, Peter made a to-do list for us so we could have done with the issues that we get from the participants. This is document number 82, is it? Yes. You could probably have a look at it. Basically, what is in this document is like functional requirements that we have discovered through this web survey. Now we are thinking, how are we going to continue in this group? First of all, we are going to continue with the to-do list and at a status column, and see what have we done and what would be the next big question to address. We are also thinking that since most of the participants have been participating online for meetings previously, it would maybe not be valid to continue the web service because they would get fed up answering the same questions, all of the time, so we would like to have people that are finding problems addressing them to me and Mark. But we have to do that when you do the whole e-mail list because there might be a lot of people that are not able to be here and give their comments. So we have to put them there. What we are also doing is we are trying to check on what other tools are available that might be easier to use, then going to the webinar. We are trying to put a list, not a total list, but some experiences on different tools. I just spoke to ONCE, what tool they are using for their online meetings in the European Union, and there they have experience from using a tool, and that would also be interesting, so we are sort of gathering this information as we go along. We are training to stick to this document and update it and maybe put some background documents on the SharePoint. SharePoint as well is not always accessible.

Another thing I have discovered, a lot of people are interested in the focus group issues, but they are not, for different reasons, participating in these meetings, like Peter has said on several occasions. We had a very good meeting in Stockholm last week and there were a lot of people, like people from the Swedish radio, that are interested and I tried to get into the Working Group, but they are still not going there. It is not for accessibility reasons. It is for other reasons, they don't have resources, time, whatever. I think it would be good to have another channel of the communication for people that are interested but not giving in to the focus group, sorry, into the Working Group. I have suggested we start a Facebook group. Not a big one. I know Andrea is shaking her head. I have experience from this in Sweden. We have Facebook groups that are addressing social media and the government. –e-Government. I am not saying this is a good way to solve the issues, not at all, but it would be a way to see if we could get quicker into typically between people who are not experts – and also tried to give links to people who are interested. I know there are accessibility issues with Facebook. I know that everybody is not online air.

But it does not take a lot of resources, it is a complimentary channel, so that is my suggestion. NEW SPEAKER: Maya, could you briefly explain the case, we saw last Thursday? How a commercial broadcaster is using Facebook as a way of continually refining their sign language service, which started just a fortnight ago? Could you explain for a couple of minutes. What they are doing and why. That approach seems to have some sort of merit? NEW SPEAKER:, It is a long story, but I will try to cut it short. Last year, an agency for television put accessibility requirements on commercial broadcasters, but they did not say how they would deliver the services, it was up to them. The Swedish disability, NGO, we have worked with accessible web casts, is commissioning web casts, and working with small enterprises that we do, so what Channel 4 in Sweden has done, they have picked up on those web cast solutions. They wanted to try those. So they started a Facebook group, saying, making a commitment with their audience: we are going to start something new. They got the audience going along that we are trying something new. That way, when they are doing these life sign language interpretation is on the web, they can get quick feedback on how it works. They sort of get the relation with their audience.doc.it is not working, we will try to fix it. A little bit like we do here. It is working very well actually.

Of course, they get the spreading of the information that there is live interpretation into sign language on their channels, and at the moment they are doing so many programs live, and they also use this remote life system that makes it quite cheap at them – live system. They have a cheap solution, and they get quick feedback from the community. It is not a solution that is the best everybody, but it is a way of getting quick unification. – Communication. When we use e-mails and these other communication tools, it is not available to everybody. It takes quite a long time. If you have questions and answers, frequently asked questions. For example, then there is somebody administrating that. It usually takes more time, but everybody is not a Facebook user, that is a fact. NEW SPEAKER: Andrea, I see you on hearing up to asking something. NEW SPEAKER: Facebook has security issues, so I personally would never use it, have never used it, and lots of people in my work cannot use it for other reasons. I would be inundated. I don't find that to be a good solution. I like the e-mail reflectors. We use them a lot at ITU and that is how most people communicate. If somebody is on Facebook, they have got to be on e-mail. That is my point. Another thing that I saw, what is the young lady's name in Venezuela that runs that wonderful group? Ginger?, She does these wonderful, real-time conference calls on Skype. They are fabulous. You can just click in the amount of people you want, and everybody texts back and forth, which is accessible to a lot of people, it including blind people. I did not realise that Mike was from Ireland. We have a wonderful chap called Jerry Ellis, who works with us. I speak to him on Skype all the time. I would not do my thinking while Skype was on my computer – banking. But I would feel so comfortable with nothing else but Skype. Facebook is invasive. I do not feel comfortable with that. A lot of people in government share my view. It is not that it is not a good idea, it is just something that somebody like me could not participate in comfortably. NEW SPEAKER: Let me be clear. It is not that the e-mail reflect the… It is not taking the e-mail away. Skype is still working as well. This is trying to address the people that are outside. Also, to promote the work that is being done. We are speaking about awareness raising. We have a problem to get people to come into the working groups, and this is just a way of trying to raise awareness through the people that are not here. Is that clear?, It might not work very well, but it is the effort that we can put into it and see if it works. During lunch, I spoke to somebody else who would be administering the group with me, and it would not interfere with the dialogue, with the focus group. NEW SPEAKER: One of the other options that is also being explored is the accessibility group in linked-in. We are speaking about different social forums and there are professional ones. This had a slightly different profile. There are a number of different options. It is realistic to look at the pros and cons of them. The example of Sweden's Channel 4 and their use of that further continually developing a new service, it makes a lot of sense if the contact is with the viewers. Not with professional users. For professional users. We have a wider range of options. There are probably others as well, and I look forward to having a more systematic review of the options and their implementations. NEW SPEAKER: I met representatives from the European Union on the European level, and they have a very active Facebook group, so I could try to get them involved as well. Maybe it will work, maybe it doesn't. It is one way to promote a group.

NEW SPEAKER: Any questions from the floor to Maya? Or online? No? That concludes our work on the 11 working groups. It is quite a daunting task. We have completed more or less on time. Shall we take a break now and just explain what it is we have to do? If you look at the screen to your left, perhaps we can make it slightly bigger. The idea is that after the break, we have the option of basically breaking into limited numbers of working groups, to see who of those he would be interested in contributing. It makes sense. Perhaps to deal with those practical issues with those meetings. First, before we break into groups. My suggestion is to take a break now. When we come back, we can review the suggestions for resources and finances, and the next meetings. Some of the crap tickle nuts and bolts – some of the practical nuts and bolts.

There is a chance for those who would like to do so. To contact the coordinator's from the various working groups. And for those who aren't, to use the secretariat and myself, to say what you would like to do from now on. If it is okay with you, the time is now 3:15 PM Central European Time. We will take a 15 minute break. We will be back at 3:30 PM Central European Time, to continue the meeting. Thank you.

Good afternoon and welcome back. This is the final part of the meeting of the focus group. I would like to express my thanks to somebody who has been behind-the-scenes and we haven't seen anything of, without him we wouldn't have been able to put all these things in place. We should also express our sympathy because he has to leave us because of the death of his father. I would hope the organisers can pass on our thanks for the incredible work he has done to put together the setting up of everything here in Barcelona. Many thanks and I am very sorry to hear about that. What I would like to do is run through rapidly points six, seven and eight so that we can use the end of the meeting to break into groups, and that is easier for our incredibly confident respeaker's who have been helping us this morning and this afternoon. That makes it easier for those taking part online because they will not have to have split personalities. It will be difficult for those to help those following online. .6, resources and finances of the focus group. The focus group doesn't really have any resources other than those that you as participants bring along. Andrea makes sure she can help us along the way. We have a lot of informal support from the ITU. For this kind of activity to succeed it depends on the goodwill of all of those who have expressed an interest. That also means we have to look at the issues like sponsorship to make sure the incidental expenses we have, for example the provision of access services, and some of the other expenses can be covered in one way or another.

If we look at the first one that has been agreed, the meeting in New Delhi, a one-day fall meeting, in connection with at least one of the working group's plans to continue working on editorial input work. Jointly who is sitting in the auditorium – John Lee. He would like to organise an activity so that on the 14th and 15th there will be additional drafting sessions for his particular group. That makes a lot of sense, their race a lot of interest in connection with mobiles in India. Subject to discussions in the virtual meetings of the coordinator there may be one or more other groups who would be interested in doing that. Just for the record, I should like to note there will be a full meeting for and we have been invited to hold tutorials, activities to discuss some of the nuts and bolts, the concrete issues of turning a vision into reality in India on the 14th and 15th of March. That means that our hosts have been gracious enough to cover the costs of three people who would be taking part in this tutorials. Meeting for, you may remember in September we were talking about a meeting in at Atlanta – meeting four. Sometime around the 19th or 20th of April. From the 14th until the 19th in Las Vegas there is probably the biggest trade show of its kind called the National Association of Broadcasters tradeshow. The original idea was to hold the meeting in Atlanta, with Turner broadcasting, and this was at the invitation of Clyde Smith. He has recently become vice president at Fox, we are discussing at least two alternative options. One would be a public activity, probably directly associated with the National Association of broadcasters,, this is being looked into by the vice-chair, and we would know by the beginning of next week if that is viable. An alternative is having a closed event for specific decisionmakers to do with the same constituents as those who will be there. We are hoping to have clarification of one or the other options in the course of the next five working days. As soon as we have more information we will post it both on the web and the reflector. At the meeting yesterday afternoon where we discussed this activity, John Lee also suggested there would probably be a need for a number of the working groups to hold a virtual drafting and editorial session in connection with their work, sometime in April. We will try to make sure they are not on the same date, but we are planning to announce virtual meetings which could then be scheduled by Alexandra with her help to make sure the infrastructure is in place, so that each of the groups interested in doing something at that time can start work on the draft of their particular document, which would become an output document. If we move on to D, the suggestion to hold a meeting five, in Tokyo, Japan, since the last meeting we have heard from NHK they were exploring the possibility of posting a meeting, and they are currently discussing with the various stakeholders in Japan the possibility of doing so, towards the end of May. It is premature to say a specific date. I think it is sooner rather than later. At – it is out in the area for discussion so I am sure he and his team will be ready to do something, the latest information is the very end of May, is that correct?

E, meeting six. We are talking about holding… Meeting seven, sorry, we are starting to discuss with John Lee meeting in Canada, and the dates currently being discussed, 25th until 27 September, the location is still subject to discussion. It is probably going to be Toronto, Niagara, although Buffalo is just on the other side of the border. For those coming to Canada and requiring the fees that make – might make life complicated having to get a US and Canadian Visa, so we will probably look at a venue in Canada on the East Coast at least, and what we have been talking about is sometime around the 25th, until 27 September. We will have a definitive draft of an output document with the various suggestions we are proposing, and if that is the case, it should not be a huge amount of work between that meeting and submitting the final roadmap to ITU in the course of October. It is showing to your left and it is essentially the one included in the draft agenda. We have just added some additional comments. I hope that is okay for you. These were the focus group meetings of the next eight months. What we plan to do, which was arranged earlier this morning, is that by the end of the next week we will circulate another document talking about working group activities, deadlines and so on, which is currently being drafted on the basis of inputs from various coordinators from the 11 working groups. As we have only agreed to do this yesterday we want to give ourselves until next week so it can be posted by the end of next week. So we all have a shared understanding of the process, things like deadlines, and so on. As I indicated in my introduction we are planning to have regular virtual meetings of the coordinators. First of all, to see how things are moving, and to deal with the interdependencies of the various groups. This emerged clearly yesterday in our planning meeting and I foresee it will occur on a regular basis. What we are trying to do is each of the coordinators of the working groups has the responsibility for flagging things that need to be discussed across the working groups of the whole of the focus group. We have got useful comments to that effect. It is a very useful point. That is number seven of the agenda, any comments from the floor? Or any online?

Andrea.

Just do all of them in one go. A, meeting for. A full meeting of the focus group that will take place in New Delhi, India, on 13 March. Following the meeting on the 14th and 15th, we have heard from Working Group I, they want to hold an online drafting group session. John will physically be in India that he wants to be able to hold an online session to do drafting with those in the room, but also those online, with those who aren't able to be in Delhi for all three dates. If there are other groups wishing to do so, they should contact the secretary to make sure we have the infrastructure in place. The tutorial, the opportunity for us as a group to help those who are interested in going into more detail, with specific issues to do with the planning and the production and delivery of access services. We have something organised and we will have a draft version for circulation with them in the next six working days. This is the tutorials...

See, - C, meeting five, this was scheduled for Atlanta. The reasons I have explained is we are exploring two options, either a public session at NAV in Las Vegas in the timeframe the 14th to 19 April to coincide with NAB, or a private session of interested stakeholders to be held in Las Vegas in the same timeframe. We plan to report back next week. April is rapidly approaching. If we are going to do it we will need something in place in the next nine days. We have been discussing this with macro Axel. - Axel Leblois. We have under point D, the suggestion to hold a meeting hosted in Tokyo, Japan, and the exact dates are thought to be around the end of May. As soon as NHK can get back to us they will make their information available to those interested.

E, the seventh focus group meeting. The plan is to hold that in Canada, the 25th to 27 September. The possible venue is still under discussion but those we have been talking about our Toronto or Niagara. We will be back with further information when our hosts are in a position to tell us more. The plan is to hold it in September, it is not quite so critical. As soon as we have the information it will be posted through the reflector and listed on the website. It should be noted by September we should have a near final version of the output document which would be our proposed roadmap of accessibility actions to do with legislation regulation and standardisation and should be ready by that time. We foresee there will not be a need for further focus group meetings between then and the final submission of the roadmap. All of these activities are the focus group and there will be a working document outlining the procedures and the deadlines and activities of the working groups available by the end of next week, for which we have an early draft and we are expecting inputs from various members and the other coordinators and this will be made public by the end of next week. Andrea?

INAUDIBLE

we will wait until we have the microphone. NEW SPEAKER: I would like to make a suggestion. The group in ITU that would extend the remit to increase the amount of time the focus group runs. The next and last meeting for this year will be in July. If you come to the point you feel you would like more time you might want to consider proposing to extend it at that time. It can be done when we don't need but it is more complicated. If you think at that time you might want it to go on longer, I just wanted to point out that timeframe.

NEW SPEAKER: We were set out by study group 16 and our primary point of reference is study group 16. NEW SPEAKER: You have corrected me. We meet at the end of May. We don't meet again until when?

Nine months later. After WTSA.

The point being if you want to extended you will have to think fairly quickly about doing so before the study group 16 meeting.

NEW SPEAKER: When there is an option of extending things you lose a sense of urgency. I would prefer to stick with that and say this is what we do. I would like to use our ongoing beatings with coordinators to take corrective action. I don't think it would be advisable for us to let it drag on. We have got a mandate which lets it go on until the end of November because it was set up in November, 2010. That was the first document. Psychologically it would be inappropriate to ask for more time. If we really get stuck, yes, but I would prefer to stick to our guns given we don't have that many resources. NEW SPEAKER: The information is for you. It is not saying you should do it. But the rest of the group should know this possibility does exist and you don't know what the rest of the group would vote you in on. I am sorry I got the wrong group. NEW SPEAKER: Most of the focus group extend their period,…

NEW SPEAKER: I will not be able to afford to work into 2013 the way things are currently going – 2013. I have a vested interest in making things go on time. A number of other people feel it is useful for you to mention it but we will do our best to deliver on time. NEW SPEAKER: The raised another thing to take into consideration. WTF say is meeting with the resolution that deals with focus group funding. I will be working on a resolution to see if we cannot get funding for accessibility on a greater scale than we have now. We do not know what that will be. I would leave your doors open, you don't know what will happen. I appreciate the fact you want to keep the pressure on, but everyone should know what the possibilities are, so there is choice if choice is needed. NEW SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Andrea, that is very good. Any other comments for agenda .7? Let's move onto liaison. We heard a good example from Mark Fleming, the kinds of implications liaison documents can have. Just to repeat, it would be great for Andrea and Mark to work bilaterally to put together a draft document. You do not need us to interfere. I am sure together you could do something great fairly rapidly that meets the requirements. Remember we heard the contribution about hearing aids and frequencies. Marcel Fleming and Andrea, together to work on that particular liaison document. That would make a lot of sense to keep the pressure on so we don't have to wait two years or four years, but hopefully less time so that we can realise that aim of global frequencies for the kinds of things we were talking about. The liaison documents just to take it from the top, we have got input documents 57, an incoming liaison document. This is one of the two parts of the ITU that got us going as a focus group. It was initiatives from study group 6C that God is moving, and we get some very constructive criticism from that end and we continue to report back to them. I am personally very grateful for the input we are getting. 71, the liaison document. That has been dealt with. In the document 78 about this business of driver distraction, a very important issue and something we talked about in the meeting yesterday. John Lee will be following up on that. We can move on to input document, that is in fact it. We have got incoming statements. 77, the special working group. If you can see if it is of relevance, please go and have a look. You have got access to all of these documents through the FTP site. Any questions? Comments? From the floor or those online. Andrea?

INAUDIBLE

The question is are we aware of the recent liaison document that was covered listed… NEW SPEAKER: We will follow up with Marcel Fleming. We will make sure he is cognisant of the fact there may be wording that will be pertinent to the kind of things he wants to bring up. If we have the transcript from respeaking that is a reminder to make sure nothing slips through the net. Before we have the informal working group meetings, any other business, and that was just to repeat under future meetings, the focus group tutorial that will take place in New Delhi back-to-back with the fourth focus group meeting, from the 14th until 15 March. The details of how to participate are available at the link shown in the agenda. That will also be available I think on our website as well. You can find it in both places. You will see it there. Any comments to do with any other business? Nobody online? Great. So, what I now suggest is before doing anything else, to express our warm thanks to the ladies at the back if you have been doing a fantastic job helping us with the respeaking for the live subtitling, and for all the other team working with Pilar who have been looking at the technology, the organisation, all the practical things that are required to hold what is after all a fairly complex meeting of this kind, even though Murphy visited briefly earlier and turned off the power in part of the building, these things happen. Everything worked without an error or a hitch yesterday, we couldn't make something 100% Murphy proof. We expect to hear from Maya and Mark who are responsible for our quality control, what has happened, how people taking part remotely have found this particular meeting. We continue to do something to make our meetings accessible. Thank you very much for your great work. I hope we see you again on other occasions and I hope it has been interesting for you professionally to hear people talking about your profession. Thank you very much.

Now what I suggest is that the coordinators stand-up and say where it is they will be between now and 5 PM so we can actually have a preliminary meeting for those interested in various things and arranger who will be doing what to get started in the working group activities. Pilaf, perhaps you can help me out – Pilar.

We have a room booked next to this room for a large group to move in there. And some of us can stay here. If you require a closed room there is one available. Alternatively people can have small clusters within the auditorium. We can take it from there. I think we will not, it is probably not necessary to reassemble. Thank you very much for coming, thank you for your rich inputs for the work, and a big thank you to Pilar to you and your team. And I am about to commit a big social gaffe by not thanking Diego. He has been holding, making sure the participants who are taking part in virtually have been able to follow and identify whether they are having problems and helping us fix these, thank you very much. And for those of you who have taken part online, I would like to thank you for doing so, and encourage you to make use of the evaluation questionnaire you will be able to fill in from Working Group K, so that we can continue to identify weaknesses in the way in which we are working, and do something about it, so for every meeting we get less bad in terms of accessibility, because it is all about making sure audiovisual media are accessible. Thank you very much.