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>> Richard:

Hello everyone. And a very warm welcome to today’s webinar, “Telling the Story: Better Accessibility Statements with ASPIRE”. My name is Richard Orme from the DAISY Consortium, and I am your host today.

And so let’s get this webinar started. I’m delighted to hand over to our panelists who will introduce themselves and tell us how to aspire to better accessibility statements.

>> Huw Alexander: Hello, all. Thank you Richard for the introduction there. I'm joined by Alistair McNaught. We will be talking about ASPIRE and helping you create better accessibility statements so you can tell your story about your content and platform and the inclusive publishing work you are doing within your companies.

We have an overview of the items we are going to be touching on through the hour or just under. Accessibility statements and the law. Alistair will talk about the changes in UK and laws in recent times. I will talk about the evolution of ASPIRE from the original project through to the service that it now is. Then we will talk through the process of ASPIRE review and then look at what makes a good statement or a gold statement as we call it in terms of what are the brilliant statements out there and what can you learn from them. Finally, we will wrap up with the benefits of writing accessibility statements and why companies should provide them as a standard whether because of the legal requirements or just because it's great practice to do so and it really does tell your story.

So I will hand over to Alistair who will now talk us through accessibility statements and the law.

>> Alistair McNaught: So in the next slide in the UK context in particular but it's equally true in the U.S., legal legislation has been really important at driving accessibility. In the UK context and in the European context, critical to this is that the public safety websites and mobile application regulations specify that failure to meet the accessibility requirements is a deemed to be a failure to a reasonable adjustment. That has never been so well framed before. Secondly, there's a requirement to make accessibility statements for all your digital estates.

We have grayed out the areas that have gone past already. The bits coming up. September 23rd, 2020 all websites and internets and digital estates should meet accessibility requirements and there should be something explaining what it succeeds in and failed on. By the 22 of June that applies to mobile apps as well. E books count as a website or part of your digital estate. So let's look at the implications of that for libraries.

The library obligations are very clear. We have spoken specifically to government digital services in the UK and if you pay for or subscribe to digital content you are responsible for it and are responsible for providing an accessibility statement. So for your e book and journal platforms it's the customer that bears the legal responsibility. So that creates dilemmas. The librarians dilemma is to be or not to be.

Are they going to simply accept poor quality accessibility information from their suppliers and be an unpaid researcher of product accessibility or are they going to be the author of products already paid for? Are they going to be an unpaid administrative assistant? Or are they not going to be not any of those things and say no accessibility statement or a poor accessibility statement, forget it. I will go for a rival product.

So the next slide shows how a good accessibility statement actually interleaves with the fundamental requirements of UK law and the UK law is based on an EUY directive. So if you get it right for the UK, you get it right for most of Europe. So section 8 gives us 4 parts that defines what the minimum accessibility statement should look like. It should include an explanation of those parts of the content that are not accessible and the reasons why. A good accessibility statement with a good score on ASPIRE would do that because that was exactly what ASPIRE was built around. It should also where appropriate have a description of any accessible alternatives. How you might tweak a different version, how you might download an EPUB and why that might benefit you. All of that is in a good ASPIRE accessibility statement then you are covering 2 of the 4 fundamental parts of accessibility requirements.

You get a bonus in it, something that scores well on ASPIRE also tells you not just what doesn't work but positively and productively tells you what does work and what the students can benefit from.

If we look at the next slide I said there was four minimum requirements. High scoring ASPIRE accessibility statement will cover two of those. There are a couple of things it can't cover nor should it. On this slide for example, you can see that the other elements that a good accessibility statement from a university or college has to cover are the content from who do you contact if you have a problem? You are probably as a student user if you are having a problem, you are not going to go directly in contact with the supplier. You are going to contact somebody internally. Your learning platform will have an accessibility statement which says who you contact internally. Your website will have an accessibility statement that will talk about the appropriate people to contact for accessibility issues. So that's an internal bit of information that already exists. It probably exists in a boilerplate format that you can have a link to it. Then the other part on this slide is the internal enforcement procedures. So for any of your internal accessibility statements in a university or college, you already have that information. It will say this is the enforcement procedure. It's a legal requirement to put that in. It's boiler plate. If there are exemptions that may or may not come into this bit that's what it means by section C2, but generally speaking that won't be within your per lieu because you are not going to be in a position where you change the workflows and so on of your suppliers. So that bit you will probably ignore.

So the next slide shows you how these daunting prospects of creating an accessibility statement for each of your maybe 50 60 platforms actually becomes straight forward because it's essentially 3 sentences. Find out about the accessibility platforms benefits and barriers and if they got a good score you can guarantee they will cover that bit. How to contact us about accessibility difficulties that's an internal thing. That's fine. You have your boiler plate text. If you need to complain, that's internal. So you have done it. If we look at the next slide, the key elements of ASPIRE I'm going to give over to Huw.

>> Huw Alexander: So I can give you a background and run through of how ASPIRE developed and the evolution of ASPIRE from project to now a serve.

Essentially as Alistair was walking you through, the legislation came in the end of 200018. We set up ASPIRE as a project in the summer of 2018 as a health check of the industry as it stood at that point and the standard of accessibility statements and the availability of accessibility statements at that time.

There's a crowdsource project. It had a remarkable range of stakeholders from librarians to publishers to e book vendors all across to what actually critical to them from an accessibility standpoint. We ended up with the actual scoring being done by disability offices across the UK from 49 different institutions. So it was a real group effort and a [inaudible] effort as well. People wanted to see the benefits from the publisher side, the EPUB side and the vendor and user side. So it was an incredible effort to get the ASPIRE project off the ground.

The process was 243 audits and 54 different platforms, and 342 audits conducted on 87 publishers. We were testing publishers in the UK, Europe, Australia, Canada and America. It's a huge range. A very good turnout of audits and a number of audits per publisher.

So what does ASPIRE measure? We have broken it down to simplify accessibility statements as much as possible as Alistair was mentioning there. There's only a few certain elements you need to concentrate on. ASPIRE tests across a range of criteria. Broadly they related to communication, content information, and interaction. So for instance, do you provide contact details for your users to get in touch with you? What types of formats do you provide? Do you provide content through institution's or organizations like in bookshare or access text? What is your approach to DRM settings? Do you provide DRM descriptions? What would be relevant and useful to the users and details that are actionable.

The key findings for us for the initial ASPIRE project were there were a number of untold stories. If I show you the average scores across publishers and platforms, you will see the publisher average was 13% and the platform average was 22% which isn't that fantastic really. The story here though is the missing information. This is what we really got the kind of data we got back from these initial tests was the fact that 87% missing score for publishers and 78% for platforms.

Really relates to the fact that the publishers and e book platforms are not telling their story and not engaging with their audience. ASPIRE is a fair reflection of the information available but we think it's not a reflection of the work being done. Publishers and e book platforms are investing money resources and time to make accessibility a focus on their platforms. The problem is they are not telling that story. They are not telling their users. When we did the project initially in 2018 that was really the key finding. We have seen that improve in time, but it really is a case of getting out there and telling that story of what you have been doing. It's remarkable how few publishers and e book vendors were doing that.

The next steps I will hand back to Alistair and he can walk us through.

>> Alistair McNaught: Walk us through indeed. So the success of the ASPIRE project was that it sat in this unique position between universities because some of the key stakeholders were library and disability support teams, but it also had buy in from platform providers and also buy in from publishers. The three were related because the end user experience of the students wasn't necessarily the platform. It might have been the publisher had fantastic content but by the time it went through a third-party platform lots of the accessibility was stripped out.

So ASPIRE endeavored to sit between these three and create a language through which they could talk to one another.

So, the problem we had though was that doing that work 500 audits on platforms and similar numbers on publishers et cetera that was a lot of hard work by volunteers. It was not sustainable. So the requirement was how can we make this last? We have got something that is recognizable, and the scoring was put together by librarians and disability support people alongside publishers and vendors telling us what was and was not realistic to put in and include in terms of what they could give you information about.

So it was recognizable but not scalable and sustainable.

So we needed to move from crowd sourcing efforts to something that was more long term where people could know if they were being audited, they were being audited by people who knew what they were doing.

The next slide shows where we moved to. Huw Alexander offered to host it long term. We recognized that would mean move from volunteer crowd source model to a commercial model. We felt it would be worth it because it would give them a sense of something to trust long term. Not only on the quality of the accessibility of the supplier, but on the quality of transparent of that accessibility. So we don't go around testing the suppliers accessibility. We test the information, the quality of the information on their accessibility statement because if you have good quality information, people can find out whether it will work for their students or not.

I have supported Huw in that process.

So if we look over what we aim to make ASPIRE and we show as a service there's three things: Formful and helpful. It's not a question of hey you didn't do good on this so here's a bad mark. We talk beforehand. We talk people through the process. What we are trying to achieve is a transparent process that's trusted by the people taking part in it and the people using the end content. It needs to be cost effective because there are 3,000 or so publishers that feed into the academic market.

So, we need something that can have that long tail of publishers to say yes we could do this, we could get a score that is a verified score and we are cleared on all the key things that librarians and disability support people need.

Next we have the overview of what it involves. It's a 5 day turn around. If publishers want us to score their accessibility statements as soon as we get the go ahead it's 5 day turn around. It's a detailed review. Then it results in an ASPIRE score and also a verified badge. So if you are gold or silver or bronze and you can put that badge on your website if you wish to. It puts you on the list of ASPIRE so you can see your ranking. And then librarians can look at where you are on the list. The final thing it gives you is recommendations on how to improve. You just don't want to be told what you have done well and not well. In some cases Huw and I have written suggested recommendations that have been longer than the accessibility statement that we received.

So it's a very detailed effort to work with you in getting you as transparent and helpful to your customers as you can do.

In the next slide we have got the key bits of matter to publishers. This might matter to librarians too because we are not asking publishers for gigantic amounts of money. We are asking for something short. The cost is 200 pounds to the publisher. That's as much as some organizations would spend on a lunch with a director for the day. So these are modest sums and retest within 12 months if you take away all of the suggestions for improvements and make the improvements and retest that's our price.

So the next slide shows what the ASPIRE list if you haven't seen ASPIRE before on the ASPIRE website there's a list for platforms and publishers. You can see where people are in their ranking and you can click if I click on Cambridge or EBSCO it goes to their ASPIRE page with the breakdown of their score, what they got for each element. You as a librarian may say I need text to speech. Have they got a good score on text to speech? Great. So you will have what they tell you about their text to speech. You have the knowledge and think about how you advise students on how to use that particular supplier.

So that's the list and platform. The stories is an important one we feel for the sector. It's good for advertising and for each of the suppliers to say this is our story and what we did and what we found out. Some of the stories have been interesting. One of the stories talked about how we had all of this information, but we didn't realize how it was in [inaudible]. So those are helpful for other suppliers to look at. That might be true of us is what they might say. Stories from the libraries and stories about how they use ASPIRE information. So next slide.

The impact of ASPIRE. Now, before we did the sustainable version of ASPIRE, when we did the first iteration of ASPIRE, the crowdsourcing one, our scores were all in that lower bracket apart from one or two creeping up to the 60s, 70s, 80s. What we have now we have big organizations come take the information they got from their initial ASPIRE review and come and ask us for support. We are now getting lots of scores. There's a huge break point of high scores coming in. That means good information and intelligence so customers can make their purchasing decisions.

So the next slide shows some of the gold standard platforms that are there.

We have EBSCO, BibliU, Cambridge, science direct, VitalSource, ProQuest and Kortext. You will see some of their accessibility statements later.

Great work being done by some of these suppliers. We have KoganPage which is one gold standard publisher. That doesn't mean others are not doing great stuff. It means they are not telling their story as well as KoganPage. They went from a score in the 20s to 98%.

The final point I want to make before handing back to Huw, the beauty about ASPIRE is that suddenly there's a chain of responsibility and interoperability and a chain of transparent because for example if you get a KoganPage publisher high level of native accessibility with a VitalSource supplier with high level of interface accessibility and pass through of accessibility content, you know you are going to get a really good experience.

So over to Huw.

>> Huw Alexander: Thank you, Alistair. So this graph is an indication of where we stand overall on average scores across the different criteria for ASPIRE. I think the main thing to take away is none of the scores are above 50% on average across all the different criteria. The highest is 51% on discoverability. The lowest is about 16% for response time. So if we add in more information and taking out the gold standard ASPIRE verified publishers and platforms you see a massive difference. The red line towards the bottom is all other platforms, nongold standard. So they dropped down as soon as you take up the gold standard ones. You are seeing 100% scores with the gold standard publishers and that's a remarkable difference. There's a massive gap between the gold standard and others, especially for things like response times and 95% average response time within 5 working days from gold standard publishers and platforms whereas response times for others are very low down at 5%.

So this makes for an incredibly frustrating customer experience. If you are users are going on to your accessibility statement and not being able to find your accessibility statement or any really relevant information on that statement then it's going to have an impact on how they perceive your content, and it's going to result in making purchasing decisions from your competitors.

So let's go down to the anatomy statement. Alistair has written guidelines for ASPIRE. Alistair was involved at the legislation update for the UK and writing these templates for the government website as well. So he see experienced in providing detail and layman point of view of how to create an effective and efficient accessibility statement.

Being discoverable. Accessibility statements may seem scary but when you break it down, they are fairly straight forward. Being discoverable means can people find your accessibility statement on your website? Is there a link? Can they discover that link easily? Can they find you through a Google search? Things that you know don't work on your website or with your content or do or don't work. Tell the story for the things you have done. These are the things we know don't work at the moment or things that make your life easier. Make sure you have content. You would be surprised how many don't provide an e mail or telephone number for someone to contact if they have an accessibility issue they need to resolve. And finally how do we know what works and doesn't work? A lot a section on how did you test the accessibility statement. Which audits did you use, and which browsers and screen readers did you use? And a section on what are we doing next? So that is for pipeline. These are the things we are going to be doing. We know this relates to the area that things don't work. We know this doesn't work but we are going to fix it in the next 6 months, so customers are aware of the issues. Alistair has written guidelines for creating an accessibility statement. We are interested in helping publishers and e book vendors to make a great statement. We are not keeping these secret sauce hidden. All the guidelines are there on exactly what you need to do. So we are trying to be as transparent as possible so we can help you be as transparent as possible with your statement.

So what makes a gold statement? 5 things that we have discovered. Basic things: Being detailed focused, making sure to include all information relevant, making sure it's jargon free. We will touch on this later but making sure it's simple language that can be some of the information can be technical. Explain it in a way that is the maximum audience. Having a practical layout so people can jump through if using a screen reader and that's attractive so they can find the information quickly and easily.

Transparent information. Be honest about what you are doing. ASPIRE rewards being transparent. If you haven't done something and you say you recognize that fact and say you are going to be doing it in the future, you get points for that. We promote transparency. And then the last is being human. Making sure you reach your audience and remember what level they are at and how you are going to be reaching a range of people. So make sure the language and simple and detailed but relevant.

This is an example from EBSCO. They recorded a 100% score about a month ago on ASPIRE. This is a fantastic example of layout, logical layout providing details for navigating e books for screen readers. It's easy to find the information you need. It's very clear and detailed. They tested across a wide arrange of screen readers and browsers. It's a great user experience. You go on to the website and you know exactly what you are looking for and find it easily.

Similarly with ScienceDirect. Fantastic job with accessibility and usability features. Again, as I mentioned earlier and Alistair mentioned, all the links are provided as part of the ASPIRE website. So you can go and visit all the different URLs that we are posting here. It's a real inspiration to go through and see what other publishers and e book vendors are doing. Science direct created a lovely table that breaks down the accessibility statement so you can find the information as quickly as possible. We have an example of contact details. BibliU and Cambridge and VitalSource are up front on providing a dedicated e mail address and telephone number and endeavoring to respond quickly. In the case of BibliU and VitalSource they are providing 24 hours response. Not hiding away. We have seen in statements they hide the contact details. It's fantastic to have this information at the top so if people have an issue they can get in touch with you as soon as possible.

A great example from KoganPage. The simplicity of the page. Logical reading order, changing the font, enable text to speech functionality, simple sentences but containing useful information. So if you think about the logical reading order at the bottom they said alternative text for all of their images. The thing that a lot of vendors have fallen back on in the U.S. market is a VPAT. A VPAT is incredibly useful. It is very technical and long winded. I have seen VPATs go up to 30 40 pages. That's a lot of information to wade through. If you think back to the KoganPage example of logical reading order and simplicity. This is a little bit more technical. Not everyone in your audience can read a VPAT and know that's got all the information I need. An accessibility statement along a VPAT do provide VPATs but accessibility statement along provides a bit more accessibility to your content.

So it's a bit more simple and easy to understand.

Alistair is going to talk about stating benefits.

>> Alistair McNaught: To summarize what the benefits are of having a good accessibility statement. If we look at the first slide it is going to be supporting customers in terms of their legal requirement to provide an accessibility statement for content that they are presenting to students. It helps protect your sales, your adoptions because if you imagine somebody looking at one of those EBSCO or KoganPage accessibility statements and comparing with one that says we endeavor to be compliant to accessibility standards you can imagine which one is the most attractive one for a librarian when they know they have to create an accessibility statement. So it reduces legal risk, not so much for you but for your customers.

The next part it gives you an opportunity to tell your story. So on this next slide it's about you telling about we have done this, we have tested that, we have spent this resource. It is clear when I look at the EBSCO it is clear how much time they have spent. If helps tell the story of what you have done. Obviously if you haven't done much it doesn't tell a good story, but it is still telling you know this is important to YOIR users. It tells you what you have done or haven't done and what you might yet do. That transparency is important.

Then we have the sense of opportunity to talk about engagements. So scoring points available for the extent in the UK for example people engage with bookshare or in the U.S. they engage with access text because it tells the user our interface or our content may not be the best content in the world yet but we are as a result of recognizing that we are working with other sources to ensure that students can get it as soon as they need in a DRM free format to adapt to their Assistive Technology. So these are important opportunities for you to talk about those commitments. The decision making helps with university procurements. If I have a good publisher and I'm having a poor experience with that content, that causes me to question the vendor through which I'm purchasing, and I might change vendors. That could be good for vendors that have invested in accessibility.

So the final part here is the user experience. Because in the last of the core slides before Huw looks at the final section the user experience if they are empowered they know whether to download the EPUB 3 or the HTML or download the chapter or the whole book. They know which of those options is best for them because you have told them. In this kind of context, text to speech works best with this or whatever it is. If you don't tell them, they won't know. If you do tell them, you improve learning outcomes because people find that they can achieve in ways they didn't think possible. So over to Huw for the final parts.

>> Huw Alexander: Thank you. The slides will be shared. There are two links here. W3C has a lot of information about planning your accessibility statement and we have guidelines on the ASPIRE website. We have a page of resources, articles about the importance of accessibility statements and these are from a whole range of back grounds international aspects as well. Not just written by us. They are links we found useful that we gathered together as a resource page for the industry.

>> Richard: Can you read those web links out?

>> Huw Alexander: It's... [Reading].

A reminder of the date that we should be thinking about in the UK is the 23rd of September 2020. That's when all accessibility statements are required for public sector bodies. If you are wanting to tell content into the UK market as of then, you will need to have an accessibility statement because librarians will want to have that. Otherwise they will write it themselves and they don't want to do that for 40 50 platforms.

The aim of ASPIRE is to create a hub. To help create accessibility statements. We want you to get 100%. We want to help you do that. Working together we can really succeed and achieve something very special. A completely type of publishing. Everyone wants to get there. We know it's difficult. So we have the resources and guidelines on our website, and we are willing to have a conversation with you. We are happy to help you achieve the goals that you are setting. So I'm listing the contacts here. Contacts for the ASPIRE website is... [Reading].

That is it from us. We are happy to take questions.

>> Richard: Thank you. We have a lot of questions lined up. You said at the beginning that legislation is a driver here. One question is could you talk about the UK law being based on the EU directive. Do you know to which extent that directive has led in other countries?

>> Alistair McNaught: Good question. The core of the legislation is going to be very similar. I think where the main differences I'm not a lawyer. I'm telling you on the impressions I have from speaking to lawyers. Where I think the main difference is going to be is almost the way it becomes incorporated into law will influence some of the guidance on how an ideal accessibility statement might look or the guidance on whether or not the law is implemented in one go or as it was in the UK it was implemented across 3 dates in 2018, 2019 and 2020 and 2021 perhaps.

The details will differ. The fundamental requirements of being aligned with the web content accessibility guidelines 2.1 will be similar I think. The other thing different I suspect is how technical or otherwise the required accessibility statement looks. So in the UK experience when we first started I was part of a group working with government digital services, when we first started looking at the model accessibility template, it was drawn almost directly from the EU directive and it was very negative. It was a deficit model. These are our compliance failures. That wasn't helpful at all in my view. It's not that you shouldn't have that but the biggest problem is people have no idea how to benefit from it which is why in the UK context the model template the government provides starts off saying these are the things you ought to be able to do on our website. So it's more positively from the beginning. I think that's important to take across to publishers. It's good to know that your reflow doesn't work or your reading order is funny. It's good to know so we can communicate support needs but fundamentally do tell us what works and how we can benefit. I have seen nothing apart from one recent ASPIRE client that we served, nobody else has actually said why an EPUB 3 might be really useful format for me to use as a student. RIVEN.

>> Richard: Thinking about different legislation how relevant are the process of ASPIRE to the U.S., Canada and other countries?

>> Alistair McNaught: I don't know because I'm not familiar with their legislation. I think what would be interesting if we knew what that legislation was, we would be happy to have conversations there. One of the things we have already done as Huw mentioned in the ASPIRE project, we have taken the legislation and shown how ASPIRE would be able to slot into these different elements that bit of information tells you what it does and doesn't do. So I suspect on a macrolevel that will be dependent.

>> Huw Alexander: I think ALS also there's a question of separating out law and Section 508 in the U.S. doesn't deal with accessibility statements in the same way the UK or EU legislation does have that within the clauses. I think publishers have to look at themselves and think why would you not want an accessibility statement? It's kind of like trying to think I'm going to publish this book but not put a cover or description on the back in terms of like a blurb. The publisher would never do that. It's the same as you give someone all the ingredients but not the recipe. It ties things together. It's looking beyond the legal pressures which I agree are important but the accessibility statement and the way we design the testing and criteria for ASPIRE is a general approach that crosses international boundaries. So as you got a statement in Australia or U.S. or Canada, these things are all relevant to making a better statement and they need to tell that story.

Thinking about an accessibility statement is another tool in your mark team area or armor. It's a great way to tell a good news story and say that you are listening to your customers and engaging with them.

>> Richard: That leads into the next question. We are short on time. You talked about how ASPIRE was initially a crowd sourced initiative with lots of universities and publishers involved. How can others build on the ASPIRE model in their own markets?

>> Alistair McNaught: That's a nice approach. We did have colleagues in Australia doing some work with Australian publishers on the bases of the ASPIRE model. Initially the original process is still on the original ASPIRE website. It doesn't look as nice as Huw's website. The data and process is there. I will find the URL in a second and pop it in here. It was very much an open access creative commons piece of work. We would be delighted if people want to replicate the crowd source version in their own jurisdiction. One thing I say is doing it is a lot of hard work and you need good networks to carry you through.

>> Richard: Thank you. I had a question from one of our attendees around the way that information was presented on the site comparing different accessibility features using a table. Do you consider the kind of accessibility of the accessibility statement itself and ease of use as part of the process?

>> Alistair McNaught: I popped an answer into the answer pane for that. To be honest we focus primarily obviously if there's something clearly odd about the accessibility statement in terms of its accessibility per se that's something we would point out. We have to be very careful of mission drift here. What we are not doing is we are not doing an accessibility audit of the publishers e book or the platform providers interface. We are auditing the information they give, and we are not primarily doing an accessibility audit of their webpage. Although we sometimes pick things out in the feedback we give them that's not what we are scoring for. We are scoring have they told the typical user with a disability how they can maximize the benefits and minimize the barriers and be warned of difficulties.

>> Huw Alexander: I'm thinking of the science direct example. That was specifically designed the table was designed with the accessibility in mind. As Alistair says we are testing the information. The tables that have been shown the EBSCO one as well were designed for accessibility.

>> Richard: Thank you for that clarification. I need a short answer on this one. How does this ASPIRE process relate to the third-party certification of EPUB workflows like benetech, global certified accessible?

>> Huw Alexander: It's not a scoring criteria. If you are benetech scored or global certified accessible it's not a scoring criteria at the moment for ASPIRE. It does bake into what format you have accessible and that's something we love to see on the accessibility statement. You are not penalized if you don't have it but it's a good thing to have. It's not a direct influence on your score at the time.

>> Richard: So it's two complementary approaches.

>> Alistair McNaught: The other thing I will add is that people may not yet be in a position where they could work at that level in terms of their overall work flows but they could give us really good user focus information that would help users make best use of what they currently produce whatever its level is.

>> Richard: Thank you.

OK, we’re coming to the end of this session. Thank you to everyone who joined us for today’s webinar. Alistair and Huw, thank you for sharing your wonderful information and expertise.

Coming up in the next few weeks we have the following webinar topics:

May 6: Publishing, accessibility, W3C standards where are we and how did we get here?

May 13: Easy access to books and articles through a smart speaker

May 20: Leveraging InDesign for Accessible EPUB Creation.

Make sure you are signed up to the webinar announcement mailing list to learn about new topics as we add them. If you would like to suggest a subject, or if you are considering presenting a webinar, then please email us at webinars@daisy.org

I hope you will join us again next week. In the meantime, thank you for your time and have a wonderful rest of your day. Goodbye.