MARK: Welcome everyone to the webinar of accessible procurement.

There are live captions that I said, which you can switch on using the C.C. tool within zoom.

That is for you to control at your end.

Or you can go to stream text.net player question mark equals ability net - that's where the captions are played out live on the web page.

Slides are sable at slide sir slash ability net.

You'll be able to see the notes in transcript from today at abilitynet.org.uk/accessible-

procurement-webinar we'll record, convert the questions into FAQs as notes from the session and there'll be a transcript available for anyone that wants that.

After event there's a feedback form.

We have built this webinar around questions that came in.

I am sure they'll lead to other questions.

Please use the feedback form if you can and comment on the quality and the quantity of what we delivered today.

And any ideas you had about further sessions.

It's interesting to get your input at that point to think about what other webinars we can do.

I'm hoping a lot of you know who AbilityNet are.

For those that don't we are a charity based in the U.K., going about 25 years we focus on technology.

And connection.

We have technology and individual advice for technology and disabilities, a popular fact sheet is technology and dyslexia, a lot of help for individuals looking for knowledge and advice on how technology can help at working home and education.

We have accessibility services team, and a network of consultants can do testing: we access them through training and user research.

That's how we earn our keep.

We work on workplace consultancy.

It's a customer experience.

And employee experience.

And work with HE organizations to help them look at delivering inclusive education.

What is next.

Procurement is not a sexy subject in the sexy world of accessibility.

It's not something which there has been a lot of information around.

I'm talking principally from the UK perspective.

When we went looking we found a lot of knowledge around the area which is useful.

And some that you will use today.

I think procurement is like the orphan in the Grand scheme of things, is that it feels like it's going to be complicated, and feels like it's a long-term project, trying to change things, and it's not quite clear what the rewards may be, that's where I started from a couple of years ago, for things like tech share pro.

The more I worked on it, the more I realized if you change the mechanics around the decision making, the more you would have shifted the culture, brought the right tools in to the building at the right time.

I do think this is an incredibly important topic.

And it's a bit crunchy, we are only getting into the detail, it's all detail.

But we asked 400 accessibility professionals last year about what they are doing about accessibility in the benchmark survey.

Which you can find on the website.

This is the weakest area by some way.

In terms of questions are you doing anything about it.

What do you think are the biggest challenges.

Procurement is coming back.

We published a guide, it's available now.

We interviewed a couple of people you'll meet today and others.

And disability in particular I mentioned have something called procure access, and there's a lot of work going on there in terms of adding procurement to the mix in the internal accessibility programs.

And is obvious that we needed to keep going, and we published the other documents, and the webinar keeps that going, giving you a chance to interact a little with the questions that you have with people who are directly working on this.

So I think this is interesting that we have started focussing more, and there are many dimensions to it.

In the public sector, those of you in the public sector are required under certain regulations to include procurement in response to the regulations.

It's not quite so clear in the private sector.

It adds a new dimension to the accessibility leaders do work with procurement.

That's the framework and a reason to present it as a starting point.

So without further ado, Liz from Google couldn't be here.

I have recorded an interview with her.

We are publishing a longer version of the interview as a podcast.

Please do look out for that, we'll send you the link.

Liz sets the scene for how Google impose about procurement.

And how she works in with procure.

Professionals.

It's a good place to start the conversation.

LIZ: I'm Liz Heaney, I had the core accessibility programs team.

I head that team.

They produce tools and external facing one.

My scope ensures ensuring that third party parties purchased a Google’s are vetted.

I own the third party procure.

Progress from an an accessibility standpoint.

INTERVIEWER: Tell me about procurement in Google.

Is there a way Google makes decisions in terms of software, are you following a blueprint in terms of your role.

LIZ: Mostly there's RFP, request for proposal.

We use a lot of acronyms in the US.

Stop me if you hear one you are not familiar with already with.

The request for proposal is a standard way.

There could be, like I mentioned before, maybe, leader of an organisation that has used a product, and want to buy it here, and will come through the PL.

Then, for the RFP, we work with procurement to add questions with regards to accessibility there and then so when you compare vendors, you can see 2.1A A, do they have accessibility conformance report.

ACR -- conformance report, ACR, what is the o process for addressing issues will they give us access to the systems to smoke test them.

Once we select a vendor, there's a tools governance team at Google to see if we are trying to buy something that is in existence in the echo system, so we don't have a proliferation of tools.

That's a place we have talked to that team to make sure that we look at accessibility as one of the governance items.

And then it comes to our team at the time of launch - sorry, there is a step ahead, like I mentioned.

If they do give us an ACR, which is that accessibility conformance report.

We'll smoke test the product.

To make sure that it is accessible.

Any bugs or issues then the person procuring the software will work with a vendor to try to get those solved before launch.

I think this is the best part, or the best time where you can hold the vendor accountable.

>> Testing is expensive as you might know.

We can't just test 13 products.

We want to make - you do have some answers, like I said on the RFP that will give you an indication.

If they don't know if they are WCAG 2.1 compliant.

Odds are that they are not.

Once we get to the short few, smoke testing really is just like a cursory test of the main walk-through scenario for making the main activity you want to do.

Getting that done.

We don't test the entirety of the software, that would be, like I said, expensive.

Really it's the responsibility of the vendor.

Many times, even though they have an ACR or many wall is V PAC, if they have one, the person completing it has no formation in accessibility so they go is there enough contrast.

Looks like it to me.

You know.

I feel like it's important to still test those, just to make sure that what you are getting is a good ACR.

And that people, when they get the software, we are testing in a test version, it's before you purchase, so when people get on the software they'll perform the activity.

I would say the lion's share of the work is testing internal products, and new versions that come up to make sure they are accessible.

And, yes, we get an occasional request for a third party, we try to push it to the vendor to, like, use an accessibility company to do their testing, someone that specializes in it, such as AbilityNet, it seems.

We have Level Access, and a few we know that do good testing.

Our Code of Conduct for vendors, says that they have to be WCAG 2.1AA compliant.

We have contracts that they try to rid line, and they go -- red line and they say we're not 2.1AA.

I say let's put it in the SOW, statement of work, that you have to be compliant by the time we launch, it's okay not a to have it now, but at the time you launch.

They try to red line, scratch occupant the accessibilities section, I tell them that's in our Code of Conduct.

You can't delete it from the contract and make it go away.

It becomes more of a discussion of when they can become compliant.

Getting in with your head of prow cure.

To -- procurement to me is the key point.

They are the gatekeeper of anything that comes in.

Like, whichever way it might come in, it will go through procurement.

It's one touch point that you can can have, when you are in, you are in.

They own the RFP process, all the processes.

Getting them this is critical.

Mostly the advice, party product for the areas of finance, or human resources.

All human resource operations, all the human resource ones are used by most of the companies.

You are found hit someone with disabilities, having them watch someone with a screen reader trying to do a performance review or self-assessment - I think it could be an awakening for them to see the reports.

Absolutely.

Here it is, like, if you can't get your procurement office to buy into this, I think your second-best would be your program management office, or P.M.O.

Project management office.

Product management office.

Normally when you are going to by product, while there's the build versus buy.

That's already a project.

I find that they are going to be e involved in the RF process.

F -- RFP process.

If you get them to say if they are in a decision.

I would like to make sure that we ask.

If they know that this is happening.

They can plan for it as well.

>> And the short checklist is that of the level of a smoke test.

I don't mean literally in terms of the activity, making sure they said this or this type thing.

>> Ask if W C.A.C. 2.1AA or in Europe there's a now regulation more appropriate.

See what discipline they have in testing.

Do they have an ACR, who filled it out.

Do they have a process by which someone with disabilities can escalate.

Can they give you access to test the software ahead of purchase.

Those are the questions.

Those basic questions will give you a check.

If they say they are not W C.A.C. 2.1. There's a lot of intentionality people thing I don't know, we probably are.

That's probably the opposite.

There's so much intentionality making it accessible and useable.

Going to the tab 40 sometimes is not useable.

It may be accessible, not useable.

You have to design with accessibility in mind, and it makes a big difference when you do.

MARK: Fantastic.

Thank you so much for joining us.

It's been interesting.

I think, you know, you know a bit about Google because of others that you work with.

The process that you describe $, and bringing to life the decision making are fascinating, and I am sure people listening in will learn a lot from the top tips and some of the point at which went to prod and step back.

It's really fascinating.

>> I hope so.

Sorry I'm not there, like, with you guys live.

Happy to answer any questions after the meeting if that's needed.

MARK: Great.

Liz is great to chat to, I recommend listening in to the podcast.

I managed to get about 30-35 minutes of interview with her, of which you saw some things to set up today.

There's other stuff in there.

I have Susanna and George with me.

I'll get them to introduce themselves.

Susanna, could you introduce yourself and tell us what you do.

.

SUSANNA: Thank you for having me and thank you, Mark.

I wear at least three hats, I guess.

I'm the Chief Research and Innovation Officer at Funka, a small accessibility based out of the Sweden, and I'm the I A.A.P.

representative to the EU, the member organisation for accessibility professionals everywhere, but I'm focussing on the EU part of this, and I'm the chair of the Joint Working Group working on the standard for accessibility minimum requirements in the - connected to the EU legislation.

MARK: A quick question about procurement.

Is it liking the poor relation in the accessibility Cannon.

You have been working on accessibility for some time, has it has been bubbling on underneath.

Is it coming to the surface.

People are recognizing that it's important.

>> To me, personally, it's a key issue that I have been trying to market.

Promote or talk about and we developed a series of trainings, and working with the EN standard, 149, developed for the EU.

I diplomat see how you could succeed in accessibility if procurement is not part of that puzzle.

Is it bubbling - not really.

It's like standards and procure.

Two things that are important and are super boring and people fall asleep when you talk about it.

Unfortunately know.

I'm happy to have 100 people listening.

They can be the ambassadors of the topic and hopefully it can trickle down.

I have not seen progress in the 25 years or so we worked there.

I hope you are right.

INTERVIEWER: How about you, what is your view about this, tell us what you do and where procurement fits into your priorities much.

George: I'm George roads.

The university lead at the university of the Westminster, couple of years out of the date but I used to work for the home office on accessibility and a director Of Allable a small ability consultancy company.

I agree with Susanna, I agree what is several years ago, having conversations about procurement.

We need to change things in the Crown commercial services framework, there's not enough due diligence, and five years ago I was receiving push back on those questions, and it's still a problem.

You know, we are half a decade on.

There's still a lot of challenge in getting everyone involved in a procurement process to take this one set of questions as seriously as they take the cyber security questions, or other big yes or no - that's it, we don't buy the product questions.

Yes, I agree with Susanna, I think it's still a forever problem at this rate.

MARK: I guess it's hard to relate to, from the - you know from the audience’s point of view, anyone working in accessibility.

Part of the barrier is it feels like it could be.

DEFNE: Tailed.

-- detailed.

Susanna you say boring, I guess the detail that is put into it can make it boring.

I guess one of the turnaround if you talk to procurement people, that's their job, they deal with the boring detail stuff.

You bring them something on their terms to say here is something you need to measure things against.

The other problem is you identified George whether it could be prioritising the enough.

Whether people feel compulsion to include it in the processes.

The questions we had, which are derived from the audience, half are how do I get people to take it will seriously, and I guess back to your point.

It really - the standards within the regulations are clear or become clearer, it's about identifying that they should be included in the processes, it's not bringing the detail, simply the principle.

And a final point I picked up that I like, I will mention.

Smoke and smell tests.

She's not likely to be given the budget to test every one of 17 product to test of the products for compliance but may have a chance to run the smoke test.

The smell fest is if they say it's WCAC double compliance, it smells long, the smoke test is running through with a screen reader user something that gives them a sense of how useable that site is and how much they considered accessibility.

They are two simple things.

We are trying to normalize it a bit and give people tools and ideas that they can pick up from here today.

Because the problem, I think, is getting the procurement people considering it assist something they want to do.

It looks a bit technical.

We are trying to give simple steppingstones, I think.

Question one - I'm going to ask Susanna to pick up on this first.

In your experience, what are the key stage in ensuring accessibility is embedded in the procurement process.

Bear in mind from our audience’s point of view people may or may not be clear about the procurement process.

Liz set out a few steps Google undertakes.

From your point of view are there points in the process where accessibility needs to be highlighted.

SUSANNA: If I can start somewhere else, I wanted to say I don't blame the procure.

Officers, they are specialists in the legal part of procurement and need to know billions of things of everything.

It's not their fault or that they are against this.

That is important to state.

They have done a good job, with tons of different things, we need to support them.

That's why I think the people on board are interested in accessibility, what you need to do it talk to the procure.

Officers to teach them.

It's not that they are complaining about the procurement officers.

Back to your question.

I think the short answer is every step.

Probably you won't let me get away with that.

I would say before, during and after.

Because the procurement process is it will look different depending on what regulation you are under.

If it's - if you are procuring something that is a product off the shelf.

Oven the case is that you --

often the case is that you procure something that doesn't exist.

You procure a partner, which supports you and help you design and become accessible.

And you need to have different strategies if you procure a thing or partner who is developing something that doesn't exist.

This is - it needs an hour to go through all the steps, and we don't have an hour.

What I think it important, is first of all, think before you start doing anything, to start to think how is this thing.

Often people talk about target audiences, that may or may not be relevant.

I'm interested in where is this going to be used.

Is this a ticket machine used outdoors.

Is could be sunshine, noisy, things like that.

You need to think about the target audience, and the context, the use case, the -

that - those things are important.

And then - so that and think about you start doing this.

When you have decided do we want to follow the legislation.

Or do we want to be best in the world.

Then we can start developing your requirements.

When you write the requirements you need to make sure to put in the requirements one way or the other in preparing still.

During the process, some procurement processes includes a negotiation process.

Where you talk to the supplier before you make a selection.

If that is the case, that is where you can be clever, I don't think you need to do tests if you call them smoke or smell or whatever you call them.

I don't think that is really the case.

I think you can ask some very particular questions, and from that decide if the supplier knows what they are talking about or if they are lying.

I would say do have a - 3-5 smart questions, for example, how do you Vo end users with --

involve end users with disabilities, if they can't respond to that, they don't know what they are talking about.

That is easier than trying to detect all the possible flaws in a test, if you don't have loads of money to do a real test.

When you get the delivery, you need to control what you got what you asked for.

There's no other way to know that you have something accessible.

You need to do the controlled thing.

If you right that in from the start.

We will have a third-party vendor to do the checking.

From the beginning.

Then maybe you don't have a super lot of budget to do the testing.

If you have told them that you will do testing.

They have the bad apples falling away.

Mash Mark thank you.

George is there anything you'd add in terms of process.

It's all of it.

Is there anything in particular from that Susanna said that you focus on in your work in the university that may be a starting point tore people not quite clear where to begin that relationship procurement.

George: Sure thing.

That was a comprehensive answer.

I think I approach some of those conversations with suppliers in much the same way.

Clever questions to really see whether they do know what they are talking about.

Things come to mind, but they'll come up in questions further down the line.

I'll save the answer for then.

I think go and talk to you procure.

Colleagues is the first answer, that's the first step on the thing.

We can say shift it left as much as possible.

Get in as early as you can, the first thing is go and speak to your procurement colleagues tell them you have requirements or procurements.

The request for proposals and that.

That we were hearing about.

And then as Susanna said, it goes all the way down the line through talking with the suppliers, evaluating the responses, getting the in the contracts before you get a delivery, and holding them to account once you enter into that BAU stage after the procurement is completed.

I completely agree.

MARK: Thank you.

You have stepped into the next question, which is how to connect with the procurement Department.

I don't know if you remember before you did and after.

Is there anything particular that struck you about going and talking to procure.

That you hadn't thought of before you did.

>> My response is going to be predicated on talking to different procurement Departments over my time.

Everywhere does it a little differently.

I think the biggest thing for me was almost bursting in the bull in a china shop.

Saying I'm here, I want to talk to someone about procurement.

Someone comes and helps up.

I think it's always a learning process seeing how different organizations do it.

When I was talking to the Crown commercial services a lot about their procurement frameworks, there were interesting chats about the cycle they go to to keep them updated to build in the due diligence.

It's a bit of give and take with it.

You want to go in.

Understand what those procurement colleagues are going through, this is a small part of their whole role.

They have many different specialist teams that are going to be talking with them and helping them evaluate procurement staff.

Offer as much support as you can, don't give them another thing that they now need to think about.

Give them another contact that they can call on to help them get through the exercising and try to foster that positive supporting relationship I would say.

MARK: I think that's an important point.

Make yourself helpful.

Susanna where does accessibility sit in terms of procurement colleagues, how high up the league table will it be, and what other things should we be aware of.

Security, in terms of software, cost, value - presumably accessibility is a long way down the list.

SUSANNA: Yes, it is a long way down, be nice, that's a good tip.

It can be a bit of a war between the different Department.

And that will not lead anywhere good.

Be nice is a good tip.

There's also - we see with our clients a big misunderstanding.

Because this, we have a law, a standard, and that looks technical.

This seems to be technical.

Some procure.

Officers can go about this as something that it isn't.

We see that sometimes they use the procurement template that they use for copy machines and paper.

Things that are fixed and they try to procure the website.

That is clever.

It's so far away from what they usually do, that this is very abstract.

You need to make them understand that this is about humans.

And soft things, if they only see the technical specifications they'll go wrong in their own processes, 9-10.

I would say apart from being nice, which is the most important part, I would give them tools.

The best tools I know is the F3109 MPB.

Where you see what target audience needs which requirements, and you get a list of requirements that you need.

So try to give them this free of use tool, and teach them how to use it, and they'll thank you, instead of being irritated with you.

MARK: Can you say it slowly, it's not something I use.

This is part of the challenge of jargon.

I know where it comes from.

Tell us what that is.

Say it again so people can get the numbers written down.

Tell us about why the tool exists.

That's the point you are making isn't it, that it's there to guide the decisions in a way which is operate from the process, that's the point about the existence of that document.

SUSANNA: Yes.

In the EN 301549 standard, the European norm, the harmonized European standard that is the presumed conforms, sorry for the blah, blah, of the minimum requirements of the web accessibility directive and one of the standards also acting as presumed conformance for the accessibility Act coming into force in 2025.

This was delivered as a standard for procure: in 2017 we had the procure.

Directive but lost the enforcement part of that.

This is made for procure.

And is valid, even if it's also working as the presumed conformance for web accessibility.

We have a load of an ex.

It's a super long document.

We have an annex EE where we can learn how to read the standard, I wrote that and I'm happy about it.

That is not jargon, I hope it's in human language.

If you are interested in reading the standard you can start with annex E, and you can speak about how it can be used.

There is an annex B where you have a table.

Where you can see all the user requirements or needs in horizontal line, and then on the vertical line on each requirement.

And then we have posted if it's - or marked if it's secondary or primary or secondly to user groups.

I'm going to procure a ticket machine, it has these features, for whom is it important.

Which requirements should be used for this.

Unfortunately, the automated fool that was created during the first process of this, during the first mandate that is now taken down.

There was no budget to have it updated.

You need to do this manually these days.

It is a good source of information.

When you start using this annex B as your tool or support for checking what requirements are important for you, that does really help.

We see that all over.

I have been touring the world with the annex B training, they use it in Australia, Mexico, Kenya - I mean, this is something that really does help procurers to make the right decision.

Have a look.

It's a free of charge standard.

You can download it from Etsy.

MARK: That bridges the gap between what the procure.

People are looking for, standards, sign posting what is important and the accessibility person saying I understand and recognize these bits, I can help you work out whether we can judge it.

Something that Liz said that fits into how can I connect with the procurement Department.

And you mentioned being useful to them.

Liz, I don't think she said it in the clip.

I try to be the first person to come back with an answer so they can't blame me for holding it up.

That's cool.

That's why the smoke test exists.

You are not going through a drawn-out process, but what are the 3-4 candidates, who is hitting the top of the list at the moment.

Quickly, and easily, you can say I had a look at the R.C.M.P., I looked at the documentation, this is where the smell test came in.

These are stinkers, this doesn't look right at all.

And you feed it back as quickly as possible.

The challenge that the procurement person has is taking account of all the different standards and requirements.

Is still a time-based decision for them.

They have to get the decision made as quickly as possible.

It needs to be the right decision, and all the budget and stake holders -- holders, one of the top tips be the one that is helpful to her first and be helpful.

A person on the other end that can answer questions, but don't dawdle, because you become a thorn in the side of the process.

It's a sell-fulfilling prophecy.

If you talk to the procurements teams and you think about how is crosses over there are a loft tools for you to delve into it the somewhere in the process you feed to consider these sec stores.

>> You can't avoid this.

You can do light touch.

It leads us onto the next question, how do you write accessibility requirements into the statement of works, and into contracts successfully.

How, I guess, means what sort of level, what detail do you need to go into, and the contracts -

you mentioned contracts about being clear about the penalties, I guess, as well.

That there is a reason you are asking these questions, and if a supplier doesn't match up to your requirements, there's a penalty which is at least mentioned or clearly labelled, if you don't do this, we'll do this.

How much of that do you think needs to go in that level of detail into the statement of works in the contract.

SUSANNA: It depends on if you know the supplier beforehand.

And also depend on if you buy a product or service, of course.

In general, I think you need to be rather detailed.

We see sometimes people saying follow the EN standard and that doesn't really work.

It's extremely hard for the supplier to respond yes or no to the question.

Usually we try to explain why is this important to us in the procurement.

Why are we doing this.

Maybe not just a legal requirement.

But we have a use case, and people will use the product or service, whatever the reason is, and say this is why we are asking this set of questions and asking do you know your level of accessibility.

How did you test it.

How do you work with uses with disability, a couple of questions like this, and referring to a list of technical requirements, that can be in an annex.

Procurement documents are super lengthy.

One person is filling in the sales pitch of this, and you need another person to fill in the technical specifications, and we say yes or know to each one of very much.

You need to be clear to get what you are asking for, just referring to a standard.

Unfortunately that doesn't make it.

When it comes to the contract, our recommendation is to say that if you haven't delivered accessibility if you agreed, we are not paying the last 10-20."

Do it like the person rebuilding your kitchen, you wouldn't pay them until you have signed off on this.

That means that the third-party vendor needs to sign off that this is the level of accessibility you agreed on, and you can pay the last bits and pieces.

Use the same paragraphs as with delays or copy what you have in your contracts and write accessibility into it.

So that it is treated in the same way that any early problem that you would encounter, that would make you really angry with your supplier.

Then you need to follow up.

Usually our clients are very - I don't know polite, or shy.

I don't know what it is.

They usually - they write about the requirements and accessibility, and do not write about it in the contract.

Having it in the contract one way or another that helps, to be able to get back to the supplier and say hey, you promises us to do this.

Even if you promised it wasn't perfect, you were going to do this and this.

Be brave.

Put into the contract one way or another.

MARK: George, anything to add through your experience around works and level of detail.

George: Yes, I agree with Susanna about play hard ball with them.

Once it's in the contract use the clauses that you have got.

I was just thinking about for many in the audience, we may have smaller organizations here.

Some that may be don't have the resources to fight those contracts on an ongoing basis and try and enforce some of that.

We know suppliers, once you have something signed.

Once some of the money is handed over, they tend to take a more relaxed approach following that.

I was going to highlight some stuff to front load, coming back to the questions that you are asking.

One of the things that came out from the article and the guide, was linking to questions I myself use in our procure.

Questions - that's maybe on make things accessible.com.

And you can find through the AbilityNet guide.

I agree with Susanna, I would ask about their documentation, testing process, how they work with disability users do user experience testing.

Not only for the public facing stuff, end user, stuff, the admin side of it, content upload - is it more accessible.

All of these things, and the regulation compliance as well.

Through the contracts, it's one of the only ways for public sector bodies to pass some of the risk to the suppliers.

I think you can be quite stringent with the questions.

And the top three, if we get responses in the first question they say we are 100% we are WCAG 2.1.

Second point give me a documentation.

They send a Document 2.1.1 keyboard.

There are some parts of the site that are not keyboard accessible.

That's something I hate about poorly written WCAG.

Does that mean social media is not accessible or main navigation doesn't work.

The lack of detail in some of the responses can be a nightmare and as Susanna was saying.

The lack of the details in contracts can be a problem.

As much detail as possible.

Complete clarity on what we are asking, expect, and hold them to account for so that it's clear we are not going get taken for a ride would be my advice.

MARK: There's interesting questions, if you haven't seen them have a scan.

We are picking up on a lot of issues there around the level of detail, which is that it's not prescribed.

It's not when you but this everything will be okay.

The other top of tip is it's not just compliant.

It's nowhere near enough.

It's not detailed enough to name a standard.

Somewhere in between is smart questions that flush out whether or not these people are going to work with the standards that they have, whether they under them.

If you want to draw it a little bit in the case of software.

You choose a supplier, not a solution, a finished solution.

At the minimum.

They'll configure it for you according to requirements.

Just because someone mentioned a tool is accessible doesn't mean the website they build using it will be accessibility.

What they do on the service they are providing you over and above the platform you are procuring is equally important.

And equally an investment for the organisation.

Likely that the sorts of software will be there for a few years, knowing you picked a particularity form and a supplier may not tie you to the supplier, but probably ties you to the platform, there are a few subtle things in there for the purchase decisions you make when looking at websites.

>> I'll pick another one in here, the difference between internal and external faces systems.

I wonder, I can't thing that there is particularly.

Is there anything that occurs to you that would be different about the statement of works, and the requirements and so on.

>> When it's an internal facing system compared to external.

The use cases may be different.

The price is broadly the same, you know, that you set up the requirements and you make sure you choose someone that can match them.

Any particular experience with internal systems that you have to underline that.

George: I think - I am not saying it's right.

I'm saying I think what occurs is a bit more leeway with internal facing systems.

I think we have an as much responsibility to our staff as to external users something that happens when you look at systems for 2-3 suppliers, none are perfect.

You have to make compromise; you have to see what concessions you can get for them.

It will not be perfect out of the box.

Something that comes up a lot.

And is a common conversation as additional leeway, it's not as accessible.

Often this is also lumped in with it being a smaller user audience as well.

You know, it may be it's only the 15 people in the finance team using it, rather than 10,000 external users.

And I think those need to be treated with a bit of care, yes, you have to balance certain requirements.

I don't think we should let off internal systems as it's a smaller audience, it's a higher technically skilled audience, coming across a lot.

Because you expect them to be more familiar with the platform.

There's often those decisional bits that come up when I talk about internal stuff.

>> Anything from your experience, Susanna, the internal-external facing systems.

SUSANNA: I agree, 95% of our clients don't bother about the internal systems, they look at the external ones, that's what the monitoring agency goes after.

The legislation covers some of the internal stuff.

To me personally, I think getting people with disabilities into the labour mark is an important thing that societies can do.

Whenever you make a decision that the internal S is not as important as the external facing website.

You are excluding people with disabilities to get employed in our organisation, it's an active decision to exclude people.

It makes me angry, that is still the case, I agree with George.

We shouldn't let it be that way, when people say there's not enough out there, it is true.

The public sector has enormous purchasing power, if you all post the requirements, the suppliers need to change.

If everyone - we don't find it, we don't put the requirements in there, nothing would change.

Put the requirement in there and be flexible enough to pick something if you need it.

Try to ask, keep asking them so they do change some time.

MARK: Liz's role is almost entirely within internal systems, mentioning how many systems Google purchased in the past and someone has to keep tabs on systems they have so they don't buy them against, there's a lot of organizations that have multiple systems.

They are complex and difficult to Nav Kate.

And a smell test is can you claim your own expenses, they are a simple test to say I want my colleagues to enjoy the same access to the same tools and systems, whether it's claiming expenses or doing the final system.

And those cases you mentioned about beginning to workflow o who is going to use the system.

You have more with purchasing power before you spend your money, thank you have just after.

When people are looking here.

Some of questions about where to ask and what to ask, if you have the procure.

Person on your site, and they are aware of getting the risks of getting this done.

That's precision, they want to know what do I need to know to make sure I get the most from this supplier, and the solution that they are offering.

There are questions, that's the point to inject them.

The procurement person is looking for that.

That's their responsibility to make sure they meet the legal requirements and the organisational requirements.

>> It's a good way of raising it in the first place.

>> There'll be a cost for the organisation, maybe not where the procurement was made.

There'll be a cost.

When with the ageing population or you hire someone with a disability, you need to do reasonable accommodation, this is a way to save money, not spend it.

MARK: Equally maybe the use case is different to the requirements.

You are painting a picture at what you want the system to do rather than pointing to a long document that may or may not apply to a particular system.

I'll ask a final question and see what's popped up in the questions as you are answering.

I'm going to slightly extend this.

There's questions in here about how useful a V PAC is, and in your experience, I don't know if either of you have been on the supplier side and produced a VPAT.

Or on the purchasing side.

And is that really enough to demonstrate - for you to shift through the potential suppliers, and in the VPAT which is common, what is there that you can do as a second stage.

Does it help you sift out.

And if not, what do you think of next in terms of beginning to dig a bit deeper.

Any thoughts on that.

I don't know if that's something...

.

>> The answer is no.

They can help a built.

Most are not done correctly, they are filled in by marketing research, they are not updated.

They are millions of problems.

And this time I hope you are wrong, that they are not coming to Europe, it's not how we should do it here, it's not help.

.

>> What is happening, certainly this is a conversation for a different time.

People in the US as suppliers are seeing the reg u lakes, the -- regulation, the EAA, so therefore the VPAT is the tool they are used to using, so we think it will be the same answer despite the shortcomings about VPA "T"s, George, do you have VPA "T"s or accessibility performance reports that customers send you.

Are they worth what they are written on.

V pats no, other stuff by and large, yes.

I have made a comments about my problem with the lack of information in VPA "T"s, I think they becoming more of an international document with digital suppliers based out of the US.

It's a thing you should know how to read and what looks good and what does not.

They serve a useful purpose in early questioning.

If someone sends a VPAT and they have poor responses, I can follow up.

It gives me a smell test how am I feeling about this, how is the VPAT level of detail looking.

Also, I produced VPATs, customers, but they sit, as an additional piece of documentation, I see them as a final documentation in the same way I see accessibility as a final documentation, it's a bit of a summary to share with people.

Very low detail document in general.

I put in - you know, more useful statements about what is wrong when I say that something is not keyboard accessibility.

By the by.

Normally, what I ask as a follow up question.

If someone sends a VPAT.

And it's not detailed enough, where is the more detailed testing documentation that this was created from.

This really gives me a sense of whether they know what they are talking about.

You can write a VPAT once you have done a comprehensive audit report.

Once you go through and have detail.

Here is the issue, that level of detail to know what is going on, and if you are writing VPATs without having down the process beforehand.

Something it wrong there, you shouldn't pull these out of the thin air.

MARK: Okay.

We have got - I think we have covered a lot of ground here without directly answering the questions.

I'm checking if there's anything else.

We are coming to the end of the time allowed.

I'm just going make a couple of comments.

The first is isn’t procurement interesting.

SUSANNA: Yes, it is.

MARK: Here is the key advocacy we should do Susanna, the fact is that anyone with accessibility knowledge would have followed the conversations and be clear that there's an almost endless level of detail blow the surface if we are not careful.

The starting point is na that's not going to go first.

We need it to be in the decision-making process, we need the people in the organisation to recognize where it belongs, there may be a clear legal risk that the organisation is taking by not considering this, these are top level reasons why accessibility professionals should think about how this is done in the organisation.

Beyond that is a level of detail depending on where you are working with and how they are addressing it, there may be some of the links in the guide, it may be useful to questions I can use the in the press, there are plenty of resources you can use to drop in questions to your statement of works or in to your contract.

Until you are engaging in that level.

You can't send it over in an email and Trop it into the contract.

You need to know where about what decisions they are making, and what the priorities are, that comes through loud and clear.

The relationship between the accessibility person and the procurement team has to be positive.

It's progression, you are working on it over time.

There'll be challenges around priorities, versus internal, external are the benchmark equivalence.

Do they under standards, to get their heads around it, do they have an I A.A.P. certification.

MARK: So I hope that people listening in get a sense that this is a direction of travel we are on, and the profession needs to adopt it as a significant issue to connect with other sections in posterior procurement in particular, and that there is a lot of information to draw upon when they get close to the detail number of the middle -

the smell test, the smoke test.

The light touch commonsense from an accessibility point of view not to forget that you are talking to someone in a procurement team that doesn't know the difference between a screen reader requirement or other accessibility requirement.

Being comfortable that you can tell quickly how well a supplier or particular piece of software will meet the needs.

That came through to me over the course of the guide and the other resources that come together.

As an accessibility yet professional, you can rely on your first instinct to begin w simply to say that doesn't sound right.

Beyond that lies the detail.

We are going to take any other questions in the list hear from the Q and A.

If you have further questions, or points that you'd like to make.

Please put it into the Q and A.

We'll copy it down after the close of webinar and look at anything we have not addressed as part of the transcript and provide a bit of an FAQ back where we can, including thoughts from George and Susanna to links for resources making sure they are clear to people.

That'll be part of the follow up.

Thank you to Susanna and George, and Liz.

For sharing your knowledge, and also maybe bringing it into a professional context and explaining challenges that anyone working in accessibility will have in dealing with the subject.

Of course, both of you contributed to the guide.

If people listening, this is digging a bit deeper into it.

Providing ideas about how to bring accessibility into procurement in your organisation, a couple of other things, we have training courses that we run, there's a few coming up all the time.

You can look at the AbilityNet website.

If you use AbilityNetwebinar10, you'll get a discount on the training courses, and some of the stuff we consider is around procurement and user testing.

They'll be relevant in terms of your own skills and procurement teams, things like accessibility, we run courses.

Extending your knowledge drawing people across the line.

Finally, thank you to you who joined us.

We had over 100 people on here, 300-400 sign up.

It's a growing topic much interest.

Tell us if there's more that you want to know when you do the feedback.

Tell us if there's a level of detail we could go into to provide knowledge or experience that helps you in your own working and join us for future webinars.

The next one, how to make remote and hybrid working accessible for every employee, including someone from Microsoft.

That's what we do.

Look at the website to see our upcoming webinars.

You will hear me and Liz talking on the podcast.

Which will drop into your inbox this afternoon, I think.

The longer version of a conversation with Liz, which we recorded at the time.

So, thank you, lovely to see you Susanna and George.

Thank you for everyone that joined us, and to everyone behind the scenes, hopefully you learnt something, let us know in the feedback if there's anything you want to know from us.

Thank you.