**Annex A**

**DCAD meeting Report 25 October 2014**

The following is a list of areas need improvement for the Internal Governance Forum 2013, Bali, Indonesia. It was established by the participants of the 6th Meeting of the Dynamic Coalition of Accessibility and Disability (DCAD) on the 25th October 2013. It was taken from the captioning notes. These comments as well as others will be added to the existing DCAD Accessibility guidelines that are currently under review. An updated guideline will be created in time to be presented in Turkey at IGF 2014 meeting. In the meantime these comments were given to the IGF secretariat to assist as part of the DCAD meeting report.

1. **Logistics/ The forum** schedule presented some difficulties as the time between meetings was inadequate. A 10 minute window for transition time is necessary. To travel the distance from one room to next was difficult even for persons without disabilities.
2. The scheduling of meetings in relation to the DCAD was not functional. The DCAD meeting could not review the DIPLO-Foundation workshop number 68” because it took place afterwards. Meeting rooms were not easily accessed as many times only one door was open, and every other door was locked. Correct emergency evacuation would have been challenging. Were local regulations being followed?
3. Not enough venue signage to indicate where facilities were located, e.g. toilet facilities - It is noted that only one accessible toilet was available and a second one was locked.
4. The programme, both printed and on the web, did not meet accessibility requirements for persons with visual impairments (including people who just wear glasses) for reading. The printed version was on glossy paper which can reflect light making text difficult to read. The font used was too small on the printed programme also for people who only wear glasses for reading. The color choices are also adding the difficulty to read on both the web version and the printed version. People who have color blindness can’t distinguish between green and red. Choice of colors to contrast background and text were also ill chosen - black text on dark purple background proved to be very difficult to read.
5. Font size has to be bigger for the badges as well. It was also a gender issue as women do not feel comfortable when men have to get too close to read their badge details. Badges should have both sides printed with the same information for this reason as well and for visual ease.
6. Registration forms should add a question on specific needs:

Do you have dietary requirements and specific needs?

Are you accompanied with an escort/assistant (people with visual impairment)?

1. There was no clear provision signage for people with food allergies, and very little choice available especially for lactose intolerant individuals. This also applied to people who were strict vegetarian. A procedure has to be created that indicates this special need and that all caterers be prepared for the eventuality of invited guests who do not register in advance.
2. **Website:**
3. Does not provide enough information on accessible hotels and transportation. Fortunately as it is a popular resort area, other websites had this material.
4. Design was not accommodating. Quite packed in some areas and blank in others like the location page. This makes it problematic as the mouse jumps to the right at certain points and produces malfunction for those using screen readers.

Index was missing. Difficult to open remote participation pages as the links were organized by date and at the very bottom of the screen. Because of this structure, you lose time and furthermore could easily make the mistake of opening link for the current day.

Braille reader users are employing different layers of technology making navigation extra tougher. This could have been avoided if they had a landing page for each meeting.

Little things like reducing the magnification allows the mouse not to get frequently stuck. Good practices for electronic documentation are those like EPUB used for e-books.

Broadband capacity was also a problem.

1. **Multilingualism:**
2. Only plenary room had interpretation. IF UN languages are not provided for, it should be clear from beginning and announced in various accessible ways so as not to waste time of attendees. It should be made clear that captioning is only in English. This should be integrated in the registration form. If UN languages are provided for and host country is not one of them, the courtesy of adding their language in the interpretation service is standard procedure as well.
3. **Remote participation :**
4. Promise of testing the remote participation system before meeting was not delivered.
5. Floor audio was bad enough to discourage not only intervention but also remote meeting attendance. Surprisingly audio between remote participants themselves was better than remote to the room and for the participants in the room
6. Interpreting services only worked for those physically present not for remote participants.
7. Captioning provided couldn’t be displayed to the advantage of everyone in the room as the 2 screens available could only show one document at a time. A screen should also be provided for speakers to view from the podium as well as screens around the room for attendees.
8. More training of chairmen, remote moderators, and AV employees well beforehand is necessary to familiarize them on how to run a meeting with/for people with disabilities, e.g. the standard procedure (not only for people with disabilities) to constantly say your name before intervention; the moderator should remind chairman of the queue of intervention requests because if the remote participant can’t read the chat, he/she has no idea of the queue in line. The queue needs to be acknowledged on a regular basis.