City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Patel, S. (2007). An insight into the evolution of mutual understanding in teamwork - Volume 2. (Unpublished Doctoral thesis, City, University of London)

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/30742/

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to City Research Online policy.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@citystgeorges.ac.uk

An insight into the evolution of mutual understanding in teamwork

Sajal Patel

Submitted for Examination of Doctor of Philosophy

Centre for Human-Computer Interaction Design
City University
London
United Kingdom

July 2007

Table of contents volume 2

K: 6/6/02 face-to-face meeting transcript 3

7/6/02 face-to-face meeting transcript 38

L: E-mail messages sent to the team after the 3rd face-to-face meeting 62

M: 12/9/02 face-to-face meeting transcripts 82

13/9/02 face-to-face meeting transcript 111

N: E-mail message sent to the team after the 4th face-to-face meeting 120

O: Linking proposed guidelines to empirical data from the case study 206

P: Informed consent form for validation exercise 207

Q: Log sheet for recording face-to-face interactions 208

R: Final questionnaire for 1st validation meeting 209

S: Pilot questionnaire for 1st validation meeting 210

T: Log sheet for recording e-mail interactions 211

U: Final questionnaire for 2nd validation meeting 212

V: Pilot questionnaire for 2nd validation meeting 213

W: Monitoring mutual understanding in the case study 279

X: Transitions

Work package 1 279

Work package 2 286

Work package 3 293

Work package 4 303

Work package 5 312

Work package 6 315

Work package 7 322

Other 331

Y: Group development phases in the case study 332

Attendees: Adam, Thomas, Morris, Ronnie, Lucy, Annie, Conwayne, Christopher, Geoff, James, Fabian, Charles, Mary, Erin, Kenneth, Michael, Translator for Michael, Mavis, Kevin, Paul and Desmond
Absent: Hazel and Elsie

Review of agenda for the day's meeting

Jack: I remember one of the conclusions of the meeting for Paris
[Can hear Lucy whispering to Ronnie]
Jack: was that we said that the next three months are, [pause], are very important for the project. At that moment we did not even know that the first month was [pause] was finally the [pause] really really important month. The European Commission changed our plans and so we have, we have to do these efforts
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: to pass the evaluation, so, but [pause] we are here, and we are all happy that we are here with our report from the
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: from the experts, uh [pause] recommending the continuation of the project, and that is a very important step. So I guess things are different [pause] in our minds, so I think, I think we can have a different um, [pause] meeting, and what one from the one we were expecting. The agenda was 9.30 10.15, have me [pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: have me explaining the administrative issues
[Can hear whispering in the background – Ronnie and Lucy]
Jack: related to workpackage 7, and then workpackage 6 and then the coffee break, since it is 10 and then coffee. And then from 10.30-11.30, I think we can change, I think I can just talk about the workpackage seven or [Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: administrative issues and then have a coffee break, and start up after that with workpackage 6. [Pause] I do not think it is a problem as we have enough time, and after that we will, we will work this,
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: Ok, so I will remind you that today, is mainly dedicated to the [pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: to the administrative part, and more technical part of the project. We will have [pause] before lunch
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: a presentation of our new prototype or demo of the technical work that has been done. And after lunch, again we will have a demo, but this time you will be able to play with that demo to [pause] to feel how it works. And then after, after the afternoon coffee break we will have an hour and a half just to talk about what we have [pause] seen in the morning, [pause] or the demo or any problems
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: you will find or somebody
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and Kenneth wants to talk about the Annex, the annex that has to be sent, and I think it is a very good issue to talk about what changes the commission or the expert have asked. [Pause] Or anything, anything we can
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and tomorrow is mainly, mainly dedicated to the users
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: workpackage, review of workpackage one. I remind you that workpackage one end [pause] um in September and the start of workpackage five
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and that starts this month in June
[Pause]

Administrative issues

Jack: I will start the meeting with the administrative issues. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background. People seem to be having their own discussions as nothing is being said]
Jack: Ok, I have [pause], I have given a copy of the first amendment of the project that was signed by all of the partners. And finally sent by the European Commission, so what we have there is a copy of the amendment with all of the signatures. Remember that you sent [pause] two copies of just your signatures
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: to us, and this is a compilation of all the signatures
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: And this amendment says that this University of H is [pause] not longer in this project, and that partner 8 is participating in this project and this is a change from [pause] Hazel and her team from H to London. And also the change in the commencement of the project, in the contract, said that the first of September, the amendment says that the first of October was the start date.
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: And also it says that one article of the contract that just said, that partners 1 and 2 presented, partners 1, 2 and 4 for signature is no longer there, the representation stopped with this amendment. So, for further amendments or signatures, we [pause] if you want further representations, to send your representations to us. The old representation are no [longer pause]
Jack: And things that happened after the amendment was that there was a [pause] we could pay partner 8. And this transfer was done immediately after
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: the signature by the commission. So we have for your file copies of this signature. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: The second quarterly report was sent to the European Commission, [pauses] May 10th
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: we used the second quarterly report as a base for the [pause] for the annual review, the special annual review. [Pause] and one important thing is that, [pause] Fabian sent I think last week, a new version of this second quarterly report, because [pause] the experts have asked that the table at the very end of the report was not filled in, so please check the values, that were included in this table. This is important
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and we can collate this. It is debated this values that you are the partners, the partners know what was the effort. The table is cumulative effort to date person hours. So it is a place where you say [pause] I have used two person months, and how many hours, and this will be used in the end for, for [pause] cost report
[Can hear Ronnie whispering in the background]
Jack: I gave you with the amendment copies of this presentation.
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: There are many things to do, so maybe you can check in the presentation, um [pause] this kinds of things. So, [pause] do this, remember to do this. So, ok
Morris: IS there a deadline for this?
Jack: Um, [pause] next week
[Can hear whispering in the background – someone laughs]
Desmond: Yesterday
[Morris laughs]
[Some others laugh as well]
[Can hear whispering in the background]

Jack: Now, so
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: as you remember we all thought that the [pause] that the annual review for the project was going to be at the end of July, but, but [pause] we thought and that the commission thought [pause], but suddenly at the very end, at the very end of April we received an e-mail from the project officer saying that [pause] due to the bureaucratic effort that the European Commission has to do in order to have prolongation of the contract All these evaluations [pause] had to be brought forward to [pause] mid may. We were able to [pause] to have this date, May 13th as the [pause] deadline, because they were asking us for a week before that, but it was impossible. So, finally, the Friday after, before this deadline we sent all these documentation's – the annual review record is the special report that they will require for us, saying that we, what was the, the [pause] um, the [pause] state of the project at that moment, explaining problems, changes, and what we were expecting [pause] They also asked for a new annex 1, the annex 1 is the technical annex
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and we are now in the version, we were in the version 14, and this is the one that was sent
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: The draft of the evaluation on current e-learning applications
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: they asked for also, some drafts, and we have sent this
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: documentation, and the accessibility of the web authoring tool, and the evaluations. So, [pause] in fact if you read the evaluation report, they were very happy with these drafts, and they said that they were very good.
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: so at the end, I think it
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: it was like a week later, two weeks later, we have possible evaluation report from the external experts. These are the names of the experts, and maybe you know some of them.
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: GF,
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Paul: He is a well-known person
Jack: GF, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Yes, he has been in the field for, I do not know x number of years ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: EA from Finland and NS [pause]. So you will have the
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: the evaluation report,
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and I think it is very interesting, about what they say
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and we must have this report in order to do the new annex 1 the commission has asked us to do from us
Jack: Ok, so these evaluation reports say that they recommend to continue the project from the remaining 15 months of the project
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: It is important to say that, [pause] that this is just a recommendation from the experts
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: As always the European Commission is always saying that
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: that you still do not have this propagation This is just one of the information
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: that we will use
[Laughter from Fabian]
Jack: In order to decide if we finally have or not this propagation. [Pause] They are always putting this pressure on us [pause]. Something can happen from here, that stops the [pause] propagation
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: And so, [pause] I am saying this because now we will [pause] because now I think we have this 15 months and we are relaxed
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and but no, please
[Some laughter]
Jack: but please be aware that this is just the beginning of a new administrative phase, [pause] in order to get this propagation. This is again just administrative information, mainly administrative, and [pause] I have already requested from you an updated annex 2, this is the financial information
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: an updated CPF and now we are on version 31
[Laughter from Fabian and Charles]
Jack: and the CPF is where you say, le, legal information of your organisation and your budget
[James puts up his hand to ask a question, he waits for an acknowledgement from Jack before speaking]
Jack: of all the cost, as it is written here. And also they ask from us an updated annex 1. Now we are in version 15th, the one that the one was sent to you. [Pause] We tried as a draft version, we tried to do the recommendations of the experts
James: Jack, excuse me, regarding the previous slides, uh [pause] the recommendations of the group of experts. Must be considered like one of the opinions that the commission is going to consider of the main opinion that the commission is going to consider, in order to, in order to communicate this, this if we have got the continuation of the project or not.
Jack: ma
James: it is one of the opinion
Jack: my guess is the, my guess is the main opinion, the most important opinion
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: But, now what they have is the opinion of the
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: of the financial people also, and also the project officer and the, his team. So, it is not only the experts
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: I guess that it is the main. At least we started there [Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: We are now in the same phase, the negotiation phase. We had last July or August.
Kenneth: There is probably one other major consideration in this, and that is we are right at the end of the fifth framework. They have a certain amount of money that we have got to use
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: that we have to use and that and in the end we have got various projects still in negotiation from the eight call, um, and you have got these projects which are are being looked at for continuation, and they will in the end have to put all of the various budgets together, and see whether it makes all that up, at the right amount
Jack: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: And if it doesn't, [pause] some of the projects, which have got to the negotiation stage, at this stage will be dropped
Jack: through
Kenneth: because they simply cannot afford them, and that is one of the realities out of this process, that at the moment, um, we are involved in two

negotiations, which they have now delayed
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Kenneth: and while they actually do these final sums, and that pot of money, a finite pot of money
[Conwayne whispering to Geoff]
Kenneth: and in the end, that is going to be the decision that they make, and what they are going to do is to see if it all adds up.
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background – James and Fabian]
Jack: Ok, so all this [pause] administrative information, annex two, CPF annex and annex one was sent [pause] last Friday [pause]
[Can hear paper shuffling in the background]
Jack: and what we ex, expect from here is [pause] that we will produce one or what they say now is, is two amendments
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: amendments, it looks like they need mainly an intermediate uh [pause] an intermediate uh [pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: an amendment, just legal, FJ said this
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: Ok, and so at the end, this um-good news, this could mean a complimentary advance payment, um, it could be set
Someone: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: [pause] If this information is properly, if this information is good and also the information is sent on time, it is very important [pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: We are also, I, I, I would also like to remind you that
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: that at the same time we are doing this amendment, and that is the propagation of this project. We agreed in Paris to include some changes, some other changes, um [pause] due to this evaluation [pause] um, process we had in May, in view of this somethings stopped and there are things to do, so
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: so the answers were, they have delayed so,
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: so that, I have got these answers yesterday, about some of the requests [pause] um, I remind you that one of the requests was to inform the project officer that
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: the effort of partner 7 in workpackage four, has been, has been brought forward, that was just inform them, it was not a change in the money, if you remember
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: Also, there was a change in the budget changing the costs from travel to consumables
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: that was for partners 6, 5 and 7, and also there was a change of budget from partner 8
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: And also at the same time with this new information we have also communicated
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: to the commission a change in name, a legal address for partner 3, but you already did that in general to the European Commission, and partners 1 and 2, and I remind you that partners 1 and 2
[Can hear whispering in the background – can hear James and Fabian]
Jack: and this part is still there, and now it is part of a new organization
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: a new broader, wider organisation called xxx [pause]. Ok, so we have at the same time many things in the same book
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and yesterday FJ looked like he a lot of time, and I received like six, seven emails from him
[Someone gives a small laugh]
Jack: answering many things. [Pause] and um [pause] ok, important things for this, for all this, it is very important [pause]. About the new annex one, he needs answers, his wordings so, he needs answers from the consortium as a whole about [pause] a report on the price [pause] for the experts in the review report, and communicate these answers to the consortium were in the answers. So, please it is very important these experts, the ex, the expert mind. I have been checking this several times
i
Jack: the report and most of the comments are
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: to the workplan [pause] regarding the workplan. They have other comments about dissemination
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and use plan, and exploitation plan, but what they say is that it has been
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: it must be improved during the project and
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and other comments about the drafts sent, that the main things we have to do to check the workplan and how the information from one workpackage goes to another and all the stages in the time of the workpackages [pause] so, we can talk about this
[Can hear someone typing some information into their Braille device]
Jack: at the end of the day.
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: Also, important the German association is very new that arrived yesterday, and they need this updated information, of the financial information
Desmond: mhhh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So this information for 2001
Desmond: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: because they say that [pause] that you only have the data for [pause] 2000, and with that information you [pause] there will be no advanced payment at or unless you provide them a bank guarantee, so, they need this new information
[Can hear whispering in the background – Morris is whispering to Ronnie]
Jack: to check with the financial people
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: so this is great news, it is also new for this change of
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: name and address of partner 2 [pause] they need official documentation of that change, and I already talk with someone, and it looks like
[Can hear whispering in the background – Morris is whispering to Thomas]
Jack: [pause] The very, very official documentation will be here in September, but we will already have some official information and it can be sent
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
Jack: for the requests, he says it is ok
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and the request for the change for budget for partner 8 but they need a circula and a workplan for that person, and I already sent this to Hazel yesterday
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
Mary: thank you
Jack: The changes in budget from travel to consumables is ok, but he [pause] writes these two questions that now you have less budget in travel just to explain him, in it is enough for you this money that our we have less money, and how are you going to manage with this less money
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: This, since this consumable
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: He wants um, um a description of
Ronnie: ok, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Where do you want to spend this, this money for consumables [pause] and what was said last week
[Can hear whispering in the background]
what is the name of this price
[Can hear someone typing into the Braille machine]
Jack: just to draft the, the background for this
[Can hear whispering in the background]
[Can hear someone typing into the Braille machine]
Jack: to the changes, in the start of the work on, on
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: workpackage two, um four, for partner 7 [Can hear someone typing into their Braille machine]
Jack: he says that is this ok
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille machine]
Jack: um, [pause] what he said, is that there was not [pause] an effort in the CPF [pause], there was not a change in the [pause] but it was a breakdown of years 1, 2 and 3. [Pause] Since this, this arrived, very late yesterday, I think that what was said, is that [pause] that you if you want to use people from year two [pause] now in year one we have to put this in the CPF, and you have to, this would have to be a change, a change in the budget for the one in the breakdown between the different years, and so we have to think about this And he say that this
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille machine]
Jack: was ok because the total amount of the money is not touched, but
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and so we have to approve this in order to, to give an explanation
Ronnie: To explain this better
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
Jack: It is always, asking for the signed CPF pages. I say here some of them are already sent, I think it is most of the, I think it is almost all of them, have been sent, and [pause] um
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: So, please next Monday, I think partner 3 and partners 1 and 2, it has been this
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and I will ask for this officially signed for you as some of you
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: as some of you already sent that, so I think I have
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: from the Italians, for sure, I have this, signed
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: this is the page, I think it was annex seven or something, and uh
Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and that extra page
Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and so, I am sure the Italians (partner 4) and partner 8 and I think partners 9, 5 and 7, I already have this signature, and the Germans (partner 6) I do not know, I do not remember.
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: But I will try and ask you for this signature
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Ok, since we are heading to a new
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: amendment, what [pause] FJ asked from me, is please check that
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille machine]
Jack: that if the same person that signed the last amendment is still the same person that will be [pause] signing this next amendment. Is there any change?
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: is the same people the same person?
Ronnie: Not for us. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: um
Ronnie: not for us
Jack: ok, so then ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: I have a question
Jack: yep***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: Until now there were two persons, who for partner 6 signed our
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: contract information, and um, we would like to make only one of them
Jack: only one of them ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: Mr E or Mr A to sign
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and could we change this?
Jack: yes, yes, that is done in the CPF, this marked when you say [pause] the two persons must sign or just of these, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: ok, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: you can change the names, you can change the order
Desmond: and this is in the CPF
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: In fact, um [pause] um, partner 9
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and they changed their signatures
[Can hear Ronnie whispering in the background]
[Pause]
Desmond: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: The signatures must as I already said the, all mandates are no longer active, so

[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: so, right now we are no signature mandates
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: This is just the possibility, we have the things to do, and um [pause] remember that we are version one, maybe two amendments, [pause], that is something you, you can
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: you have to decide. The signature mandate is just, you send me a um [pause] letter, and I can send you the template for that letter, saying that it is ok for your organization that partners 1 and 2 sign there
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
Jack: their amendments for you, so
[Can still hear someone typing in their Braille machine]
Jack: so this is up to you, to do this
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: or not, and [pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: it also depends on how your organization is, it works, there are organizations that never do that, and some organizations who do sometimes, it is
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: easier, it is much easier for the process. Remember that the contract
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and the amendments were delayed by this [pause] by this process
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: If I will ask you, if you have, if you do not have signature mandates
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: [pause] it is ok, but please. Um, please, we will need to hurry up
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: the process, the signature process, [pause] in future, so please when we ask for signatures, send it as soon as possible please
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Kenneth: In that you, there are designated people to sign this thing
Jack: Sorry
Kenneth: in there, there are designated people to sign these things, we have a problem, because if these contract amendments come out in July and august
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: then it is very likely that the signatories are going to be on holiday or are not available
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: to us and it is no good if the commission suddenly says, we need the signatures within a week when we have, um [pause] my director is on holiday for like three weeks
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: there is not a possibility of getting this signature necessarily especially around the July, august time. I do think the commission needs to let us know ahead of time when these signatures will be required
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Ok, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: yes, otherwise there are going to be difficulties ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, yes I remember that, last year we had the same difficulties in august ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: um
Paul: that is on everyone's part that needs to be clarified
Jack: Ok, so I will ask, if you send a signature mandate ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: partners 1 and 2 will for sure, will be signing in July, august, and will be no problem, um [pause], at [Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: Of course I will ask FJ, when it is, when does he
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: expect to have the signature
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and ask him maybe [pause] what to ask the commission to change things, at least to know that
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and also, they are asking as the first time, the bank guarantee for partners 1 and 2, this is almost done
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
[Pause]
Jack: This is just reminding the deliverables already sent, some, some of them are not official deliverables, but are official documentation's that have been sent. So, just to remind you we have to send
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: the project presentation, this was the first deliverable, the first quarterly report, at the end of February, the dissemination and use plan, this was also official deliverable, it was sent at the end of April, remember, remember this was one of the main points in Paris
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and this are the documents sent for the special review, the annual review, the annual review, the three graphs
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and the second quarterly report so this all were all sent May, mid May and at the end. The quarterly report two was also sent Mid May, [pause] oh no, this is the expected date, we sent it almost a week before the date. [Pause] and for the near future, just to remind you, what are the deliverables, the commission will expect from us
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: I should say that we must send [emphasis placed on the word must]
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
Jack: Ok, so the first one at the end of June, at the end of month nine is, plug in compatibility, this is workpacakage two
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
Jack: Here is the responsible, here I put in the [pause] the leader of the workpackage, here it is, partner 2, and then a preliminary version of the manual for accessible design, this is workpackage one
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille device]
Jack: a preliminary version of the specification dossier
[Can hear someone typing into their braille device]
Jack: this is the end of
Fabian: This is July, not June
Jack: It is July***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: good
Jack: They always have a problem with dates
[Some laughter from team members]
Jack: Because they have, in the first version of the agenda they have May
[Can hear whispering in the background]
[Can hear some laughter again]

Jack: So, [pause] this preliminary manual for
[Can hear some whispering in the background]
Jack: this is for the end of July, July correct this
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: The preliminary version of the specification dossier, at the end of July. The preliminary version of the prototype and the integration of the plug in tool, this is workpackage three, end of July, preliminary version of the project manual, end of July, workpackage four
[Can hear some whispering in the background]
Jack: and a preliminary version of the new portal, end of July, also workpacakge four. [Pause] And a preliminary version of the final presentation dossier. This is workpackage five, [pause], and this is another of this strange, I would say preliminary versions that we had to send for that evaluation, because we are now starting workpackage five
[Mary is whispering something to Erin]
Jack: in two months we should send a preliminary version of this, [pause] um, um documentation. We, we talk with
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: with FJ, we
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille machine]
Jack: We, ask him, ok, ok all these preliminary versions were meant for the evaluation, the evaluation has now already [pause] gone and we still have to send this preliminary versions and he said yes, because they are in the contract. So, we are in a strange situation, that were meant because they said, they told us that the evaluation was in July, and they change now, and we already have this, stuff that is not well fitted in the, in the workplan, it is strange We will do our best, [pause] and of course we must send this. [Emphasis is placed on the word MUST]
[Can hear Mary whispering, she said at the end of September]
Jack: and after that [pause] we have
[Can hear Mary whispering to Erin]
Jack: another four deliverables, yes
Mary: can I just ask about the dates for the delivery of the, of the previous slide of the document
Jack: yes, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: all of this?
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, July, July
Mary: is July the dates for for the preliminary versions?
Jack: the preliminary versions ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: how, so do they need to be submitted to the commission or do we need to submit
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: need to submit the full versions at the end of September, to the commission?
Jack: no, he said that we still have to send this preliminary ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: preliminary version
Jack: preliminary version, to the commission
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, the preliminary version to the commission, so the submission should be made to the commission, of all the documents ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: at the end of July, ok
Jack: and then the final version of the manual for accessible design will be two months later
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and the final version of the specification dossier, also three months later and our first year report, for workpackage seven as well at the end of September. And also we have the quarterly report number three, this is April, May and June, the report on this three months
[Can hear someone typing into their Braille machine]
Jack: the deadline is the end of august, but of course we can send it before. The [pause] work for this
[Can hear whispering in the background
Jack: All [pause] as you see there are lots of things to do, and alot of things are moving now, so the deliverables, ammedments, changes in the project, and the new annex and the [pause] so, a lot of things moving and [pause] as I say in the beginning we still do not have the signature for the propagation of the project, so please be aware that all of this work has to be done, has to be done properly
[Adam whispers something to Morris]
Jack: in time, and so we need to work hard together. So, questions, comments, suggestions
Kenneth: It is probably worth taking the points that even if the commission is not going to prolong the contract, most of what you have talked about now has to be done in order to actually get the final payment ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: for the next 12 months anyhow
Jack: sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: regardless of whether this work is going to continue or not
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: this is for the payments for the first 12 months
Jack: yes, yes that was one question we, we, we [pause] asked FJ when we [pause] when the evaluation was starting, we say what happens if the expert says no, this is not worth it, this should be stopped and we say we do not know, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kenneth laughs and so do some others]
Jack: and we say [pause] this
[James whispers something to Fabian]
Jack: and he said no because he does not know, this thing of the payment for one year, and then a propagation is very new, and it is the first time it has been done. So, what he says is of course there are two possibilities. One, was to stop immediately the project and to say stop it in may, and not even till the end of the first year, and the other was just at the end of the year, and of course all the deliverables must be sent if we want to, if we want the full payment. And may I remind you that in your bank, banks you only have an advance payment of the whole amount at the end of September they will evaluate this and say ok, you have done your work
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and what you have spent what you said and you have developed your plan. [Pause]. So, I think we can stop here and have a coffee, and then we can come back to workpackage six, two, three and four. Um, wait
[Some laughter]

Identifying how many people who requires lunch on day 2

Jack: Um, tomorrow as you will see in your agenda we have an hour, and lunch and coffee, and lunch here, I remind you I will give you a ticket for the, for the lunch here, and then tomorrow also we have lunch, but I do not know, how many people are staying for the lunch
[Can hear Mary whispering]
Jack: lunch, because we always have the problem with planes going back, and I will go now while you are having the coffee and give a list. So, please tell me, today we must know today, how many people is going to have
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: who is going to have lunch tomorrow
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Jack: and of course tomorrow we can, you can ask me for taxis and whatever
[Can hear whispering in the background]

Jack: Ok that is all.
[Own discussions]

Work package 6 Dissemination, Standardization and Exploitation

Fabian: and that is what they said, and we will start with reviewing the objectives which is the creation of the critical mass of interest for the deployment in the technical scale of the project, ok, this is very important and in order to obtain a, um [pause] the economic results, the economic viability of the project, so we have to make important the dissemination
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: in order to inform all of the sectors involved in the [pause] in this project
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: about the project, and the results. Ok, this is a review of the tasks, included in this workpacakage, number one is the standardization
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: and second is the exploitation plan, and the third one is clustering
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: and the forth is the dissemination of the project tool and certificate, and the last one is the creation of the voice webpage. Ok,
Paul: what was that? sorry
Fabian: regarding, excuse me
Paul: say it again
Fabian: It is a review of our task, the task of this workpackage, it I standardization, the second is the exploitation plan, and the third one is clustering, the forth is the dissemination of the project tool and the certificate, and the fifth, the last is the creation of voice web pages ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: oh, ok, thanks ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: Ok, regarding the standardization we, in the dissemination use plan decided to focus our activities in this task, in this groups which are in this slide, which are the web accessibility initiative within the W3c, the world wideweb consortium. I think partner 3 is a member of WAI, and I am not sure if partner 8 is a member too
[Mary nods her head] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Fabian: because I checked the website and I could not find it, I do not know if any department
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: of partner 8 is a member of WAI or not? No,
Mary: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: because I [pause] I thought that you was a member, but it was a mistake. So there was a meeting in Los Angeles in March 23rd and 24th, I think one member of partner 8
[Mobile went off]
Fabian: and I think they were assisting with this meeting
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: and it was [pause] a planned presentation about project, and I think it could not finally be done
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: and um [pause] there was just an assistant and there was some comments in the [pause] because the official presentation was not made
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: because I do not know if any advance has been made in this work, in the WAI, both from partner 3 or partner 8, or if you have any planned activities to contact officially these groups, and this work to inform them about project, and the work that we are making [pause]
Kenneth: With regards to the web accessibility initiative, [pause] it is difficult to exactly contact them, we are part of
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: of the ongoing work in that area, um, [pause] and yes we, certainly the project is mentioned within that, that sort of work, but it is not a body that you can actually contact in that way
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: yes, so it is part of that work we are doing [pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: so, other groups, or organizations of standardization, there is ETSI, European union of Standard Institute, which has several tax courses, which are working on accessibility and universal design, I think we have a person here who knows very well this institution, and I do not know if it is the same question with partner 3, if any events have been made or it is planned in order to involve them officially, but the project, Ronnie
Ronnie: I think the, I think the best way to inform the different standardization bodies is to be for [pause] for us to organize a presentation in the workshop which is the SEN ISSS [pause] WSDFA, which means SEN is the European Standardization institute committee, ISSS is information to society standard systems and the workshop DFA is the workshop for design for all. So, this is a special temporary working group which is called a workshop and it deals with standardization in the field of [pause] Assistive technologies and design for all, and I will make sure that you receive an invitation for, for our meeting, which will take place on July, 16 in Paris, so you will be, you will have, you will have the possibility to make a presentation regarding the project during this session. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: ah don't worry [laughs] ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Others laugh as well]
Ronnie: I was supposed to be on holiday as well
Fabian: ya [laughs] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and I will be there in anycase.
Fabian: ok and other groups are SEN, DAPSCG, which is design for all Assistive technologies standardixation organization group, I think we have a member of that in partner 9, which is Jason, which is a member of our organization for SENILEC. Is that right?
Charles: I do not know, exactly ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Fabian: Maybe we will contact with them directly, and find out, because there is a possibility that are people with work officials
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: in organizations, so
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: Actually Jason is a member of the association of the advancement of Assistive technology in Europe to become the representative of this group, and I think this is a good opportunity for our
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Ronnie: I am also a member of this group
Fabian: ok [pause] Do you think there will be any possibility to make something similar with this groups? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: this workshop
Ronnie: yes, I think there would be a next meeting, there should be a next meeting, the next meeting should be, if I am not wrong to be October ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: not earlier than that, but I think that it would be possible
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: The meeting will most probably be in France as well
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: Alright, well then there is partner 9 which is interested more in learning, [pause] and the IMS consortium, and [pause] e, e-accessibility in nEurope, we will try to find out more from these organizations ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I am a member of this group as well

Fabian: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Fabian laughs and so do some of the others]
Fabian: that is great
Ronnie: we could,
[Can hear Mary whispering]
Ronnie: the accessibility group, is an emanation of the European Commission as you know, it is not a standardization body, it is something different, and it has, and it is a technical advisory committee to one of those bodies which are called a high level groups, representatives of different members dealing specifically with specific issues. The issue of within this
[Can hear Mary whispering]
Ronnie: E-Europe 2002 action plan
Paul: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: is um, um, under the responsibility of such a high level group which is the [pause] employment and social dimension in the information society, of the high level group, as the commission is very complicated names, and the E-accessibility committee is a technical advisory committee to this, so it is not a standardization body
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: ok. Is it possible to have some information from you or about this group? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: well I think it is all
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Ronnie: I think what I have said is will be enough, because they, you want ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Ronnie: because you want me to, to write down something, something for you?
Fabian: yes, [pause] do you have any directions in which we can, um, I mean an Internet direction, where can find out more ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I, I, will let you know ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: ok, thank you. Alright, so we will go to the next slide which is the exploitation plan, and in the review we received from the commission, they said that the exploitation plan must be in, improved, during the development of the project. And we planned some problems to find statistics [pause] about the number of signs and schools in Europe We contacted Eurostat, a statistical organization and they do not have any information about, and I think they are trying to get some, and some, so we could not ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Fabian: make any dissemination
Ronnie: Can I interrupt you?
Fabian: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: you could perhaps look at the Internet, the website of for the institute of design and the disability
Fabian: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: which is organization, which could provide you with similar information
Fabian: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: EIDD – European Institute of Design and Disability
Fabian: ok. Well the standardization plan will be creating, will be created by the partners who will initialize this, and as the slides says this was made with the dissemination plan, and it seems like it was not perfect for the commission, but this does not, so we will be improving this document in the future. Ok, clustering, which means that the contact with the project, related to the projects with the one we are working, we found out that we are including the Assistive technology and systems cluster, and we are currently identifying the projects which are in this line, in order to help us find out [pause] more detailed information about their work, and to find out if we can take advance of their results they are getting in the developments of their projectors. I have tried to visit official websites of these projects and some of them are not very available, and I have contacted one of them which is involved in the dissemination of the WAI activities, and I am just expecting back some [pause] some e-mail back on that, in order to receive some information on that, and what they are doing, and the documents they are using. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Did you mention some of the projects in that cluster?
Fabian: well I, actually about the visually impaired people, I think there are [pause] I think there were only a couple of them, I think. Um, I [pause] but one of them was especially of interest for us, I do not remember the name, but I will send you an e-mail with this on it if you want
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: [pause] Ok, so that was with dissemination. There was also, we have also been very focussed on, in this stage of the project with dissemination task. Um, we have [pause] with this slide you can see here a photo with the Spanish director of science and technology. We [pause] we had a stand in an exhibition and, well it was a conference and an exhibition. It was called The Open Market European Conference of New technology and apparatus It was organized by the Spanish Presidency of the European commission and they took place in Madrid and it was the 6th and 7th of February of this year, 2002,
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: and well in the photo you can see us [laughs] and you can see the Spanish ministers of technology, closer is our CU and the president of Ofcol. This is us, everyone knows it is the Spanish organization of the blind
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: and other activities we have been making is, we participated with a conference in ASPI which is the direction
Paul: Can we just come back to the February conference
Fabian: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: in Madrid, you said that the Onser president was the president there,
Fabian: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: did you um [pause] try to establish any contacts with them regarding the project?
Fabian: We have tried to establish some contact with the conference through other [pause] through other ways, through other efforts. We have been, I think partners 1 and 2 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: had a meeting with the
James: Yes we have been trying to contact with Ompeere for a long time ago, and just from the beginning of the project, and as you know unfortunately we have not received any positive answer from them on time. Fortunately there is the ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: There is the
James: From that time, we have been in contact with some technical groups who works for, from Omsere, but other really, we have not [pause] um [pause] a common point in which we can develop a joint activities with them. [Pause] in any case we are, we follow in this contact in order to reach a common point for us, but up to now we have not been able to obtain any positive answers from them in order to start any work together. [Pause] yep
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: Ok, as I was saying, um we participated with a conference in
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: the 7th ASPI accessibility in
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: people with disabilities,
[Fabian looks at Annie and Christopher]
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: and um, the conference was in, was about people with disabilities and the need to communicate with information and science technologies. It took place last year, October, towards the end of last year. [Pause] We are, we participated, partners 1 and 2 in the second bit of congress according to dissemination without barriers in the [pause] 21st century and in the UNICORM conference, and other activities have been participation in new technologies in the social
Kenneth: sorry, when you say you, sorry, when you say that these have been participated
Fabian: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Kenneth: in what way?
Fabian: well, [pause] with um, with um in these two activities, the first one with the conference where people have with the one with the conference where people were talking about what the program was about.
Kenneth: Have they, has anything been delivered to these conferences?
Fabian: Papers have been delivered, I do not know about that, I do not think so ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Fabian: yes, just the conference, it is an exhibition
Kenneth: well it would be useful for the consortium to know what is being said at these various places
[Some people say ah in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: oh we can, we can
Kenneth: it should be very, um you know, so we understand what is the participation
Ronnie: that would be very good ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: that is also something we were going to talk, talk about later, to inform all of the consortium about the
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: about the dissemination activities, we are making, because I think that is very important.
Paul: We already talked about that in Paris
(Sub-state 5.1)
Fabian: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: Ok, so, for the future we have the [pause] one conference to give us the chance at IBC 2002. It is International Broadcast Convention. It will take place in Amsterdam in September 13th till the 17th. This is the world's Premiere broadcast technology event, and it covers all the key areas of the media business, like audio cable, radio satellite
[Morris whispers something to Ronnie]
Fabian: and Internet, it will be included in the Internet of this event
Kenneth: Sorry, when you say,
Fabian: ah
Kenneth: um, sorry I was going to say
Fabian: ok, yep
Paul: Were you aware of the conference in Austria, the ICC's call
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: International Conference on
Fabian: Yes, I think it is in the dissemination use plan ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Can hear some whispering]
Paul: Was the project going to be represented there? Are you going to present a paper?
Fabian: We are not submitting their directly, we do not know if any of the partners were, we are thinking about we are studying about participation in the REKIA, I think that is the name ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: in the position and they have a centre for information about these exhibition, we are now starting the
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: course and we have to think about this.
[Charles whispers something to James]
Fabian: well it is not in the presentation, but I was going to mention it later about, if the German partners were going to participate in this
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: exhibition, we, were going to participate in this event, is partner 6 going to there, or are you thinking about that or
Paul: partner 6 are certainly going to be there ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: there is going to [pause] a number of organisations sharing
Fabian: uh-huh
Paul: an exhibition area,
Fabian: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and my view would also be to have a presentation on the project, at least as far as say to, to put out
[Someone says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: as far as a project description, and there might not be time, [pause] or there might not be the possibility to actually have [pause] a paper presented to the convention which is also the [pause] in conjunction with the exhibition
Fabian: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: but we, we have to, to look at that, and the German partners, I am sure have some information about the project
Fabian: ok, so, maybe we can speak directly between us, to get this participation and if you need any help, or maybe some of other partners are interested in having a stand their or some presence ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I am sorry, excuse me, to do with the dissemination plan for the IST conference in Copenhagen in September
Fabian: yes, I, I think so
Ronnie: um
Fabian: because right now we have studied more in detail, and it is more detailed the participation
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: and we are more focussed on IBC and are studying REIKA, and we are studying out participation, but we will be checking out other possibilities
Morris: Jack,
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: The European Blind union is holding its 7th conference in 2003, and I think it would be an idea for us. I think the end result for the project would be at the end of our project, it would be just before December.
[Someone says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: but I think the general [pause] assembly, which is the national organization of the blind, I said, would be an ideal opportunity to show the project, um to the end user
[Someone says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and to have, what would you call it to have a what's the word
Paul: yeah hands on
Morris: yeah hands on at the stand. I think more information on the technology policies regarding this, [pause] in 2003, and I think it would be a good thing to ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and something else
[Pause]
Jack: Excuse me, when is this in Athens
Morris: From 25th to 30th
Ronnie: November
Paul: November ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: sorry [pause] about the, the conference in Austria, I think Adam or Thomas [pause] you were preparing something?
Thomas: no, because there was not enough elements to write the paper. What was there was the creation [pause] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]

Fabian: Ok, so [pause] as you know I have said that we have participated through events and have had made papers, and we can always help you with this activity, if you are interested ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: Anyway, in Austria on the 18th, there will be a market session, regarding disability issues, and I will have to make a presentation there for [pause] for standard accessibility form, and if you want me to distribute some information material
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: that would be my pleasure.
Fabian: So, what I think, [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: you know, partners is to improve the dissemination activities, you can contact me [pause] and send me all the information and the help you need, and we will try to provide you with.
[Some people say yeah in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: So, ok [pause], we will go back to the IBC for more information about it, and this event consists in a conference, and several conferences, and it has 4000 square meters of space, and it is a huge exhibition. It is one of the most important exhibitions about broadcast technologies and reports, and over 1000 companies are exhibited here, it has around 4000 visitors from over 100 countries, and [pause] as I said before, it will be held in September
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: in Amsterdam. Maybe as it is close to [pause] partner 9
[Someone laughs]
Fabian: maybe you would like to have your presence there [pause] maybe we can speak directly about that
Charles: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: it would be
Paul: Are you talking about the Broadcasting conference?
Fabian: yeah, yes, I am talking about the broadcasting conference, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: why, there isn't really the [pause] it is not really the project's area of interest, why [pause] do you think of participating there?
Fabian: because it has the [pause] we are participating in the new technology compass which involves several [pause] new technologies about [pause] media, and content distribution and the new ways of disseminating information. And I think we would be [pause] would be very [pause] what is the word, it would be very [pause] suitable for us to be there
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: and I [pause] and we sent a paper to the conference we are going to, going to go there, and by now, partners 1 and 2
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: and partners 1 and 2 and the thing by now it might be open to other participants
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Yes, there are session, about Internet ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: social applications
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I think that is where the project is
James: Yes, I think this would be there ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Have you distributed that abstract?
Jack: What>?
Kenneth: Have you distributed the abstract?
Jack: No, ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: Because it would really, the consortium should see the abstract before they are sent, [pause]
Fabian: but they asked us this, this project to the very very end, and you know it was very late
Paul: But still, I mean you are doing this in the name of the consortium, so, it is just no way that you could just do something without letting us know, you have to have at least, you have to have, if I understand the procedures correctly, you also have to have the consent, and consensus, so if a partner or one of the partners or partner organisations say it is not agreed, so I do really think that you are compelled to let us know, or to send information to us before hand. So, I ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: Ok, ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: so I really urge you to do this next time as this is not the first time, it is not the first time we have said this, and I think it has been talked about and mentioned in Paris, and it is coming up now, but this is not the first time, and it is coming up over and over again. So, please be sure to inform us of whatever you are sending out, especially to official organisations and to official conferences, this is really necessary. [Pause]
(Sub-state 5.1)
James: Ok, we are going to try, try and communicate in all new events which our partner, which every partner is going to participate
Paul: but try and do this beforehand, not after it is done
James: yeah, yeah, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yeah, yeah we will be happy to receive any comments ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in any way
Fabian: I think in this case, the problem was the time, because we had a very very short time to answer [pause] because they offered us a free stand as the project is a [pause] involved in a social activity, and they offered us a discount, so it was a matter of time, that was the problem. [Pause] Ok, and this is the last point, which is the creation of voice web pages. The first step is to have some pages of the partner 7's portal using voice, which will show how it can improve the interactivity of the user, of the people who are accessing the website
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: and the [pause] also the, also several e-learning examples will be included in this website. [End of tape 1]
Tape 2
Fabian: and to decide if it is the project [pause], and um we can study the um, [pause] some other blind national organisations, the interesting things that they do, wesbites and with the project.
Morris: I have a question
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: the intention was to have a pilot
Fabian: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and to see, the, the portal, we
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: have in our web sites
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and is viable, and it works, and it allows access
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: to e-learning websites. So, we first have to validate these findings and then
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: to cross validate these findings with other pages
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: I think we are going to have to write examples
Morris: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: for the use of voice in,
[Kenneth is whispering to Erin]

Fabian: and one way to do it, is to have the portal designed in voice, with voice xml, and but not public sites. And, after the evaluation you can.
Jack: I think, um [pause] we can, we can, [pause] after lunch do the demo from partner 7, we can do that after lunch, all the demo's will be done.
[Annie nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: right, that's all

Review of work by work package 2/3/4

[Individual discussions taking place, until Annie was ready to deliver her presentation]
[The laptop was used to present the slides of the presentation]
Annie: We are now going to continue with the rest of the presentations. For those of you who do not know me, my name is Annie, and I work for partner 2. [Pause] What I will introduce now is a brief review of the work, which has been done in work package 2. [Pause] which is mainly devoted to the voice plug in. In work package 3, which is the development of the tool, web authoring tool
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and work package 4, [pause] which is the, [pause] as you know we have been working in work package three and four, [pause] at the same time. As we understand that they both, [pause] fit each other, since the e-learning portal must be developed [pause] using the web authoring tool. The partners are collaborating with us in the packages [pause] in work package 2, we have partners 1 and 2 and in work package 3, we have partners 1 and 2, also. It is the [pause] Italians (partner 4) and [pause] with the [pause] partner 9. And in work package 4, we are also collaborating with partner 7.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: In work 2, it has three main objectives. This is to study the compalbras functionality, that is the
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: [pause] the API, that is the browser interface, and the interaction of compalabras, which is using
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: scripts and on web pages, and the compatibility of the compalbras plug in, and the screenreaders, which should be working at the same time
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: [pause] and um, [pause] we should disable the screenreaders and all the issues. [Pause] And, the compalabras functionality, basically enables you to, [pause] perform speech synthesis, selecting the features we want in your voice. That is the, [pause] the gender of the speaker, the age, the speed of the voice, and the rate. It also enables speech recognition, [pause] once you have defined a certain grammar that is the voice that you are going to say, and the voice that you are going to be realised. Also, it can be multiple language. Right now, it is working with Spanish and English, but we plan to have all the communities
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and the languages, which are involved in this project
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: [pause] Second, browser interaction, this is using Hava scripts, [pause] um, um
Paul: using what?
Annie: Hava scripts
Paul:
Annie: Java, I am sorry. [Pause] and that way you can access the content that is on the page, mainly the plain text which is written there, and you can also test data that is stored, the text that is stored on remote servers, for a database, and you can also have e-learning assistance, in terms of [pause] it is not static, it does not always read the same text that is on the page, because, it reacts to the behaviour of the user. But, it is, for instance, if you have a text field, and you have to enter that,
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: a number, and you enter a letter, it can tell you, that you have, introduced a wrong character, and that you must introduce a number. And, it can also validate the data, that you are introducing, so for example if the same text field, if you have to introduce a zip code, with 5 digits and you only enter 4, it can tell you that you must introduce 5 digits. [Pause] So, I think, we think that is very useful in the e-learning work. [Pause] In the screenreader compatibility, since
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you cannot have both of them speaking, well, you can have them speaking at the same time, but [pause] that would not be very efficient
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: We studied the possibility of saving the screenreader, but we found out that some of the accessibility guidelines, warned that you should not do that, because it does not make sense to disable something that gives you accessibility, for it to, let another accessibility to work, [pause] so that you must have both. That way, we thought, that a solution, that a potential solution could be for compalabras plug in to wait until the screenreader stops speaking, and then
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: set, save the message. But, we must get feedback from the users, to see what other solutions, we could find out
[Erin nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone in the background says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[People having their own discussions]
Annie: And moving onto work package 3, which is the tool, we have [pause] made an architecture design
[People having own discussions]
Annie: and well, you have all the technical descriptions available on the project web page, and also on the compalabras web page in case you are interested. But, we intend to make it as I said multiple language
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and very, [pause] and to have a high level of customization
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: that is, [pause] everything in terms of the type of the letter, the types of the application, and could be selected by the user, so if you are not totally impaired
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you can change the font and the colours to feel more comfortable with the application. And, also in terms of the
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: how would I say, [pause], how experienced the user is with the web authoring tool, you will get more help or less. So if you are very [pause] you have used the tool for many times, you can, you can use short cuts, and [pause] um also you can use commands that [pause] with your voice, rather than hear the whole explanations.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: UM [pause] we also made an analysis of
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: how we could integrate the synthesis and the recognition, and in applications in order to help the user. Um p[pause], also in web pages.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: um [pause]
[People having their own discussions]
Annie: You will see later on, the prototypes that we [pause] have been designing, which has little experiments in order to see what things we made with the authoring tool. [Pause] I, you will not see the samples working, like I said they are little experiments, but I will explain them. For instance, we have created a window that pops us, and lets you select the [pause], it enables you to create the [pause] a simple html webpage, that displays the message when it loads. So, in order to do so, you have a window, and
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and in this window you can move using the tab key, and using your voice.
[Can hear whispering, it is Geoff and Conwayne]
Annie: and you can select the gender, and the speed and the frequency of the voice, which is going to come, out when the page loads. You also input the

message that it is going to reproduce, and to enter the name of the file, where you want your html file to be saved. So, when you say, ok, or you move onto the ok button, it moves onto that page
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: That will be a simple sample. Some other things, we have a voice xml file that has
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: also the tabs that describe the characteristics of the voice, which is going to be the text
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: that is within the text. You can also select the gender, the age, etc, and you write the message, which is going to be [pause] put in the voice xml task. You, enter the name of the voice xml file that you are going to store that information, and you save it. That way you can access that remotely from your web page.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: And we did another sample to enter the user, to create his common grammar file.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: Again, you have a pop up window, where you have entered the token of the grammar, that is the works that the grammar is going to be able to recognise.
[Can hear whispering]
[Mary whispers to Charles and asks if he was involved in creating this, he says no]
Annie: You have to link the task in order to, in order to make more efficient, the way that you [pause] compare the token that has been introduced, [pause] with the tab, and you enter the name of the grammar, and the file where you want the grammar to be saved. That way, once you have created this, [pause] saving the grammar, [pause] you can a url, for instance, if you want to create a navigation sample, and you say, project, it opens yours www.project.org, or whatever. It can be easy that way that is for ways to create the web-authoring tool [Pause]
Annie: Moving onto work package 4, the e-learning portal, we are working on how we could design this portal
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: although the contents of the portal has to be provided by partner 7, [pause]. We have decided that the test methodology of work has been, it had many problems, finding out, how quick, [pause] how the speech synthesis and recognition help e-learning. We had many problems, so we thought that the best way of working is to face real life problems, which have been provided by Mary, and provide solutions to them [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and our solutions should be tested by, [pause], by all the members of the group
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: to see whether they work or not
[Can hear whispering, Paul is talking]
Annie: [pause] we are also analysing the design of the e-learning platform, and how are we going to make the contents accessible using voice. [Pause] And that is work package 3 and 4 together, since the pages we have in the e-learning portal will be made in the tool. [Pause] And we have made some prototypes, to see, for instance, problems that, for instance, learners, have [pause] that visually impaired learners have, to see how voice synthesis, can help [pause] them, in their e-learning. [Pause]
[Conwayne says something to Annie]
[People having their own discussions]
[Jack puts his hand up]
Annie: and one more thing, in work package 4, we are working together in the same office with
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: IPT, partners 1 and 2. And, in the examples that you are going to see now, we tried to make them accessible, but the interface is going to be made by partners 4 and [pause] 9, so, we did not, take so much attention to take.
Jack: Annie, Mary, do you have a question
Mary, yes, I have two questions. One, my first question is about work package three, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Louder please, we cannot hear
Mary: sorry,
Lucy: Louder
Mary: I will speak louder, thanks. MY first question is that when you developed the prototype, that you are going to show us, did you consider the requirements which came from Charles, and that are included in the report that came from partner 3. Did you consider the requirements for the authoring tools? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Conwayne says something to Annie in Spanish]
Annie: yes, we did consider those things, but they are prototypes of how you integrate voice ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: in an application, so they do not intend to solve the problems
Mary: sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: just to, yes, so they might not meet all the requirement
Mary: yep, but as long as you considered them that is good. [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and in terms of the commission, that is what we have to do, study the integration of voice in a web [pause] in a web environment
Mary: ok, ok, and my other question is about work package 4. You mentioned that the portal pages will be developed using the authoring tool ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: which is being developed, when do you plan to have [pause] more or less working prototype of the authoring tool, you will be able to do that?
Annie: It should be, it should be right now. But to be honest the pages we are showing are not going to be the final ones
Mary: I know ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because that would be impossible, but we are going to try and do, is make sure that the needs of the portal are going to be fulfilled by the [pause] by the web authoring tool, but it is a lot more complicated
[Mary nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: how you want to move on with the work in the portal
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kenneth puts his hand up]
[Erin put her hand up]
[Morris puts his hand up]
Jack: yes Kenneth, Annie ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: um, yes, you have shown work package 3, some of the elements of what you will create particular elements in voice xml and html. [Pause] When will you have designed the overall architecture of the [pause] we know from a lot of work, that the creation of things is the easiest of tasks, it is far more difficult to edit, to go back and edit, therefore you have to go and search in the whole application, so we can get a better feel for how these elements can be built, into practical webpages. Because, again, yes you can create a particular message, but how will that message, be built into the wider application. At what point will we see that architecture? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: we are going to show it now.
Kenneth: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: at least I hope it, if it is not what you expect
Kenneth: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Erin, Mary and Morris put their hands up]
Morris: I have a question on work package 4, you said that you have been working on the architecture of the portal. You have developed your own architecture or have you based your work on partner 7's.

[Christopher says something to Annie in Spanish]
Annie: Can you repeat that
Morris: yes, yes. You said that you were working on the development of the portal. Are you developing your own architecture? I am not talking about the content, just the architecture, or are you basing yourself on the work done by partner 7 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: yes, what I intended to say, I am not sure if, what I mean, what is your question [looks directly at Morris when she is talking to him] ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Annie: but, I intended to say that
Morris: uh-huh
Annie: that we are studying the architecture of the e-learning portal, in terms of how you can integrate voice on it.
Morris: I see your point ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: How voice can be useful
Morris: ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Correct me if I am wrong, but here, we have [pause] three different portals or web pages, and [pause] sometimes we are confused about this. One web page for the project, this is the project. Org. Now it is very simple, and we are working on it, to have better things. And then there is the partner 7 portal
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and at the end, we will have also an e-learning portal, which will be a different portal, that partner 7's, I think it is the picture
[Morris tries to speak]
Jack: and also any other portal with voice or pages, partner 8, or other organizations
[Morris tries to speak again]
Jack: partner 7 is the example, which we work to have [pause] an example to show the integration of voice, and of the e-learning portal, and with the e-learning portal as a link
[Morris clicks his fingers]
Jack: to the partner 7
Someone: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: This is a different construct, part of the project.
Morris: Are you saying that the e-learning portal, part 3 will be the end result
Jack: one of the end results, yeah. One of them ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Mary puts her hand up]
Ronnie: can I say something? [Ronnie raises his hand as well]
Ronnie: This is a bit confusing. You have said it, that it could create some confusion, and it does.
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: indeed, because, wouldn't it be wiser to try and [pause] let's say [pause] include, incorporate the research which has been done, and [pause] money has been expended on. My, my question is, couldn't we try and avoid parallel developments, parallel developments, towards a common, towards a common goal, a common scope, and a final goal. I, I , think you should be analysing in a little bit more detail,
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: in order to see, if we really need to, to do this kind of parallel development, which could be at the end affecting the quality of our project, possibly in front of the final evaluations, of the project itself. So, I think this should be made an object of some consideration and reflections, because [pause] I think, it could be useful to see if we could, if we really need to go parallel ways towards the same goals.
[Morris says something to Thomas]
Annie: Excuse me, what do you mean by parallel ways?
Ronnie: well, Annie, what has been said, [laughs] a few minutes ago
[Annie looks at Christopher confused]
Ronnie: it is a goal. It is in the sense that we have a web page and that is clear
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: and you explain your web page and that is ok. We are working on a [pause] um, we are working on a [pause] a portal in partner 7
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and we have developed some results, really and acquired some. And now, you say maybe that it would be useful to develop the e-learning portal, as a [pause] specific portal, as a specific tool.
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: My question is, would it not be wise to avoid to develop a new portal,
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: a new portal, and to work on the basis on the work which has already been done
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: and which we intend to, and which we have clearly giving you our availability to put our work, at your disposal in the project, for you to benefit from it
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: So, I think, so, I think you should reflect on it.
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: why use time and effort, if part of the work has already been done. You can benefit from this work if you want.
Annie: Yes, I think that there is a misunderstanding. We are not developing our e-learning portal by itself, we are developing [pause] a small solution that are going to be used for the e-learning portal. There is only one e-learning portal, and we are going to be building up small solutions that are going to be implemented on that portal. But, we are not making our portal ***(Sub-states 1.1 and 1.2)***
Ronnie: So, you are talking about, now [pause] about research work
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: That you are doing on the basis of the project, and the problems
Annie: that's it, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: which has been [pause] put forward, especially by partner 8 and others. With e-learning difficulties
Annie: exactly ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and this research should then be [pause] should be the solutions, regarding this research should then be used with existing work
Annie: exactly ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: thank you. This has now clarified it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: There will be two different things to the web page. The presentation page, and the portal being developed by partner 7
Jack: sorry?
Morris: There will be only be two elements that are not free
Annie: yes, yes, 2 elements ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Um, it was more objective, the elements can be one, can be different
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and of course [pause] the project.org can be linked to one of them, so
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, any [pause] solution, pointing to one portal. We, as Annie have said it is e-learning right now and the solutions.
[People having their own discussions]
Jack: More in the administrative

[Mobile phone goes off]
Jack: work package
[Mobile phone still going off]
Jack: it is mine?
[Someone laughs]
Jack: chhoop. [Mobile phone stops] Work package 2 is ending
[Mobile phone starts ringing again]
Jack: Work package 2, the deliverable for work package 2 is only three weeks from now. So, how is the progress of this work package?
Annie: It is almost finished. It is only the conclusions, which are missing
Jack: There are some [pause] some comments from the experts in the reports, about all the drafts, which were sent, and I assume was taken into account or will be So, we can can expect to have a deliverable at the end of august.
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone clicks their fingers]
Annie: Right, now I will show you three samples. The first one, I will explain it before you hear it. It is [pause] it is the initial page of partner 7 and once you have downloaded the plug in, you will hear how the plug in reads the text which is written on the page.
[People having their own discussions]
[Can hear the web page. People stop discussions]
Voice output: Welcome to the partner 7,
Annie: and when I press the tab bar
Voice output: the voice of partially sighted people in Europe
Annie: I can move in front of the text fields, no, um the plain text.
Voice output: Welcome to the partner 7. Description of the logo, we are clicking on a text version of the web site. Links on accessibility, please enter central office calling, 75, 000 square meters,
Desmond: um, I have one question.
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: Have you made a program to say that there is a link
Annie: yes, well not now. You have to display ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Some people start laughing, including Ronnie]
Annie: No, if you do not have to hide behind something, that tells the plug in, through the voice xml
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: can you elaborate on the difference
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: what?
Paul: what we have been hearing right now, [laughs] is exactly the same, with a few limitations of what a screenreader can do. So, I, I do not get, it, it is less than what we have already.
Annie: Yes it is not supposed to be something which substitutes your screenreader. It is just a sample of how the [pause] plug –in provides speech synthesis to the page Just now, ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: why? ***(Sub-state 5.1)***
Annie: Um [pause] Now, um [pause] now we are going to see that, maybe if you didn't, I don't know if you have already experimented with the plug in, but just to show it works. Now you will see a sample, which you can, which you might appreciate, how the plug in can be [pause] can give an advantage to the screenreader.
Paul: yes, well let's see it***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: [laughs], thank you
Voice output: [could not be heard clearly to transcribe what was said]
Annie: And these examples show an e-learning problem, that some users have when given a question, when they have to choose an answer
[Can hear whispering]
[Mary raises her hand]
Annie: and they have problems with that, because it would not know, which answer it had selected, or maybe if they had selected the right answer or the wrong one, they did not get no feedback.
Voice output: Welcome to the partner 7 website. We will read the question. Move the answers with the up and down cursors and push ok for the button HTML to create a dotable line.
Annie: As you hear the [pause] it first gives you the instruction to [pause] answer the question and how you have to move in between the elements. So, if I had to [pause] press the, wrong keyboard
[Someone gives a small laugh]
Voice output: radio element has been selected
Annie: If I say tab, it tells me I have selected the first value, and I can move it
Voice output: radio button, PH has been selected, radio button, HR has been selected. [Male voice]
Annie: and then when I
Voice output: ....or you can ask to go back to the answer [female voice...all of what was said was not transcribed]
Voice output: you have gone for job [male voice]
Annie: and I enter. If I choose a different value
Voice output: Radio button, PH has been selected
Annie: and if I write test whether it is ok or not
Voice output. element [female voice]
Voice output: this answer is incorrect [male voice]. If you would like to retry, hit the retry button. If you would like to get the correct answer, push the answer button.
Annie: So in that way the user
[Paul is clicking his fingers]
Annie: knows where he has chosen the value, and whether it is valid or not. I don't know do you want to make any comments. Yes, many [laughs]
Paul: So, these instructions have been implemented using voice xml,
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and the plug in?
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: And now what happens, um [pause] is that the web site, or part of it, available someplace, so that it can be tried with just a screenreader, because I would really like to know, what one of our screenreaders would do in that situation
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: because I just suspect
Annie: yes, sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Erin whispers to Mary]
Annie: yes, that is what we are explaining for you to do
[Erin raises her hand]
Annie: You give us the problems, and you can test the solutions with your screenreader
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: to see if it prevented or not
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: That is what we intend to say, when we say that we wanted feedback from the users

[Can hear whispering]
Erin: We have actually tested it with two screenreaders
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: we tested it with screenreader Jaws. My colleague Ned who is completed blind, tested both examples, examples 1 and 2. It was not quite as advanced as what it is today, as it was a few weeks ago, and I can since see that you have made some changes. Initially I think that example 2 worked slightly better than example 1, because it informed the user a lot more
[Mary whispers something]
Erin: but we tested with the plug in.
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: I think with one of the attempts we tried, we managed to get the plug in and the screenreader to read at the same time. That was when we did not turn the screenreader off.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: so in general, I think the radio buttons solved the problems of the problems we had in Jaws that when you navigate backwards
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: it does not tell you what radio buttons had been selected, but this time it did. So, that is something, which had improved over the screenreader. And um [pause] there are other areas that need further improvements with the refound
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and I think the other thing, is that it needs to be tested with magnification
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: so, we tend to find things that have been centralized, and magnification makes it harder to find
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: So, if it is left centralized, it will be much easier for them to find it in there I think the hardest thing is to turn of the screenreader, and to put it to sleep in the background
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and to inform how the screenreader can be put back on, because not all users know how to turn the screenreader on and off.
Annie: yes. That is why we said that they must be working together ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: so, you do turn the screenreader off, but we still [pause] do not find out, how it can
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: be more comfortable for the user. How they are both working at the same time, and not being confused
[Mary puts her hand up]
Mary: Can I ask two questions.
Voice output: Welcome to the partner 7's page
Jack: Annie
Mary: Annie
Voice output: push tab to enter,
Annie: I will show you
Jack: [speaks louder this time] Annie
[Mary tries to speak]
Voice output: and then press the ok button. Which HTML is used to create?
[Jack gets up an tells Annie]
Annie: sorry
Mary: Before we go to this example 3, I think I mentioned in my e-mail, in response to example 2, that I find it very slight difference in the way, that you navigate using the plug-in, with the way that people usually navigate using a screenreader. Because the navigation through the four options is through the up and down arrows
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: I think she has updated that
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Can you use that the tab to move between the two?,
Someone: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: because I think that is the standard at the moment
Erin: I think, I think you have just updated that
Lucy: please louder
Annie. yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and the tabs as well.
Ronnie: we are that far away, we cannot hear you at all
Lucy: we cannot hear you ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: sorry. We have provided some feedback for the navigation
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and we were saying that normally, that the screenreader would normally navigate the
Annie: yes
Erin: page using the cursor keys
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: as well as the tab keys, and if you use a tab key it would not tab through everything on the webpage. It would say for example, only tab through links. It would not tab through paragraph text, and we were saying that screenreaders are used to doing that, and it is important for the plug in to have similar method of navigation
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes you are right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: you have made a few changes already since then
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: which is good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Private conversation: Mary: but I do not think that they have included the tab, yes And Erin: and I think it is still with the up and down arrow, but that is still confusing, so I think that they can drop that]
Geoff: The thing is that, we are not using image that way, we are using image provided by html elements
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone clicking their fingers…think it was Paul, heard a sigh as well]
Geoff: So, the navigation with this common elements, are this one, not
Mary: any
Geoff: if you are using image, you use tab
Mary: it can be changed? Ok, it can be changed the way to navigate
Geoff: it can if you put image, but for this example
Mary: image
Geoff: we used this, as it is more natural

Mary: oh ok, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: There is another um [pause] issue around this, which I think we really do need to be somewhat careful about. What we [pause] if we are going to look at a voice based e-learning portal, most important thing is around the learning experience.
[Lucy and Conwayne nod] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences from 2 people)***
Kenneth: In other words is this a suitable way of someone to learn. If you were going to actually have a [pause] a teacher sitting in front of a student, asking exactly the same question, what they would actually do, on that way, is ok, what is the element you used to create a horizontal line? Is it TI, HI, BR, so you actually get all those, and the person would respond. One way you could do that in an audio term, is to say press 1 for TI, 2 for HR, etc, so you have everything presented to you. The way we do it on a web page, is to present everything visually, so that everyone can see things visually.
Mary: mhhhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but if you have got a tab through that or have to use your cursor keys to go through each answer, that is not a natural audio way of accessing it. Um, and therefore, one of the important things that we need to be looking at, is coming up with the agenda, very much in Europe, and it was a very much central part of the CSUN conference earlier this year, is to look at usability, rather than accessibility. Um and in this case if we are talking about learning, just simply making a web page accessible, does not make a learning page usable.
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: And that is very important. We are talking about a voice in, voice out type of web page, and we are talking about not just looking at accessibility of what is on the screen. We are looking at how do you design this, so it is good interaction between the system and the student.
Someone: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: And that would be one of my criticisms, of what we see at the moment, as we are looking at accessibility of screen presentation. And, we do need to look at in the audio world, at the presentation of quality audio
[Annie goes up to Christopher to say something to him]
Kenneth: and how you make that, and how you code that into the system, in this type of project.
[Own discussions taking place]
[Mary puts her hand up]
Mary: Can I just add something to what Kenneth said.
[Jack bangs on the table and says shhhh]
Mary: when building e-learning, particularly e-learning web sites and materials, it is also important to not look at the accessibility and usability, but also the learnability, and the materials as well. It is learning from an e-learning or from a pedagogic point of view, and does it help students learn, rather than just navigate and browse through pages of material. So, this is also important to consider, when developing these solutions.
Annie: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Can you say that again?
Mary: to evaluate. It is important, I said that when looking at developing e-learning portals and materials ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: the accessibility, and the usability are very important, but we also need to consider, how effective, the design is from a learning or pedagogic perspective, and whether it helps students to learn the material. And, not only is it easy to navigate in and to access the material and information, and whether it teaches them new knowledge and skills.
Annie: That is why, we had by publishing these examples and having you test them with the students, you can
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you give us a better understanding of what is more usable
Mary: mhhmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: If there are no more examples, I will move onto example number 3
Voice output: welcome to the partner 7's website. Please mention the input type. How old are you? Please type a maximum of three characters.
Annie: So,
[Laughter from team members]
Voice output: you must produce a number
Annie: it validates the character that I already introduced
[Can hear whispering]
Voice output: 5, 7
Annie: and if I press tab
Voice output: you have said that you are 57 years old [female voice]
Voice input: enter your name, no commas, maximum length 20 characters
Voice output: D,A,R,O,S
Voice output: you have introduced commas in my name
Annie: and now if I click press enter
Voice output: you are 57 years old, and your name is Daros
Annie: gives me feedback on what is already introduced. So, it might be helpful when you fill in forms, what you introduce, and when you introduce it, to make a summary of all the data that you have introduced.
[Own discussions taking place]
Adam: The things that you are showing
Annie: Can you speak louder
Adam: What you are showing to us, is it the logo? Is it the way that websites
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: yes
Adam: instead of the voice capability, which is also the way that e-learning web sites should be
Annie: no, we are, what we intend to do, is that the users all have to decide together, which way should the website be evaluated in the e-learning environment.
Adam: Um, what I mean is that is this, if you want to have such wizards, you have to ask web designers, web masters [pause] not to provide the structure
Annie: structure of the feedback, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Adam: and web master should include in the development [pause] the, [pause] features, which say that you have the wrong answers
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Adam: you have the right answers
Adam: yes, using the web authoring tool, they want to make better web pages more accessible, and if they want to continue developing pages in the same way, they will have problems.
[Mary puts her hand up]
Geoff: but the web authoring tool, will be designed [pause] so if you say this is an input, would you like it to be only four numbers, when you take a course, it will create an automatic Hava script
[Conwayne nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Can I just add a couple of things, sorry Paul
Paul: go ahead ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: From a usability perspective, I think it would be better to keep the two pages which are presented consistently, so I noticed on this page, the button is labelled accept, and on the previous page, it was ok
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: So, it will be better to keep just one
Annie: no, yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: to keep them consistent.
Annie: yes, we just, as I said, we did not pay to much attention to that, consistency ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: that s ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: as you said, I need to shift that, and enable the user to change how he uses his screenreader

Mary: absolutely, it would be confusing to the user as well ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: My other question is, as we are developing an e-learning portal, and these two pages are part of that, is that correct?
Annie: um [pause] no, [this is said hesitantly] this is just something to show what we could do ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: that they are available
Mary: well, ok. My suggestion is that it might be useful for the presentation to the commission to include in the e-learning portal examples that are connected to e-learning ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Erin nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and I know that this is not
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: a more general assumption
Annie: no, no, it must be something much more elaborated. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: I mean if we are
[Paul is clicking his fingers]
Mary: spending effort on developing those examples, maybe we should, maybe it would be better to tie them
Annie: I know ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: to tie them up to the main idea, of the project
Annie: No, but it is not that there is a need to do this ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: at this time
Mary: ok, sure ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: just to make it
Mary: And one more other thing, in your presentation, before the, before the demonstrations, you mentioned that the plug in also provides a voice recognition.
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Are you planning to develop examples that incorporate that feature?
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes, because I did not show those that we made for the web authoring tool ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhm-hmh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and it will recognise the voice, but they are not very well done at the moment, so that is why we did not decide to show them. But, I did say that you enter the text, and select the name of the file
Mary: mhhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and if you say ok, it, it does the same action, as you would press the ok button
Mary: oh ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes Paul
Paul: The example here, for example shows, or asks for numbers, and for example if you hear the age, where you enter the age of the person
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and you enter the [pause] characters instead of digits, you would probably get a response telling you that you are doing the wrong thing. Now, does the authoring tool [pause] ideally prompt you for that type of action? So, does the authoring tool, when you are actually creating that situation, does the authoring tool, does it ask you that in this instance, in this place, do you want to
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: have numbers only
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: or do you want to have characters
Annie: yes, to make a validation, so you want to have [pause] a letter validation and into the message that you are going to prompt the user. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Morris puts his hand up]
Morris: Can I come back on two things.
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: First of all, sorry, first of all, I did seem to have problems what the [pause] what the plug in can do, that a traditional reader, screen reader, cannot.
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Mary and Erin nod] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences, from 2 people)***
Morris: and also, I very much agree on what Kenneth said about usability, and I would like to elaborate, we all know, and this has been said here repeatedly, is that one of the major problems we have with accessing and using the web, is the fact that we have process the information line by line, and this time consuming, etc. And, I would have expected that with the plug in, we would have had, the following kinds of information. If you have three possible answers [pause] then the page should be designed in such a way that you will the choice in between three ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: 3 questions, right, this gives you, this gives a partial solution to the fact that we have to proceed line by line. At least you know where you are and you prepare psychologically yourself that you have three choices
Annie: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: is this possible to do with the plug in?
Annie: The thing is that you have to design the page, [pause], so in our sample we did not do that, but we could have done that, it would have been very easy, as we did not want to change the original design, so much. It can have that possibility, that when he enters that question, the questions plug in and voice xml file gives the user the output saying how many answers, and how many choices can be in and to choose and things like that.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: That is not so much how you designed the page. And the plug in enables you to read that input that you have already designed from the users.
Kenneth: I think this is a real major issue here, because we are talking about two things at the same time. Although you are presenting this as the plug-in, in reality, the plug in will do what it is presented with. As with many other voice tools. If you present something to a voice tool, it will tell you what it said. Then we have got the design of an e-learning application, as Mary has been talking about has to produce a learning environment, an environment in which someone can gain some knowledge in some way.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: The design of that will not be inherently helped by any voice tool. It just happens that if we design the application correctly, the voice tool will speak those things and give you that information. But, effectively, the voice tool, in and out is the interface. It is at the interface point, it is the information behind that, which in part is going to be [pause] needs to have people who understand and have expertise in the way in which audio is well designed and works for people. The very particular, saying people here and not visually impaired people here, and all of us, can work in an audio environment. And, yes, [pause] some visually impaired people are more used to working in that environment, but we can all work in that environment. We need to understand therefore how as humans we work with audio, and behind that, how do we, how does a learning environment actually work. And there are all very specialist areas to work on. I think there is a danger here, that when we try and work on and compare a screenreader to a plug in, if a screenreader is actually presented with information in the right way, it will do all sorts of things. But, it is just as though you had your, it speaks out your answer, you are 57 years old, and your name is Daros, but you also happen to add to the screen at the same time. So, that a screenreader would have reacted by reading that out.
[Annie whispers to Conwayne]
Kenneth: it is not the plug in which has achieved that, it is that we have presented new information, which has achieved that. We must not get ourselves, mixed up

Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: between what the plug in is doing, and what the design of the [pause] information is doing
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: And within, [pause] we do have a danger that because we are looking at this in a web environment and forgetting that an audio environment is not traditionally a web environment. And if you are looking for instance, a lot of this work has been done in access others and natural language areas
Mary: hmmm hmm***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: they are moving very strongly away from interpreting, what would traditionally be on a web page. So, um a lot of what we are doing, and we have two project on natural language processing on the go, at the moment, other than this, and the work we are doing their, is that yes, it happens to the web, and the internet is being a transport mechanism, but really html, and that the web in this term, is not being, is not influencing that design. At the moment, we have got this tension, and some of these areas, that what shall we call the buttons, well, actually are buttons really relevant in a purely audio environment. If this is an audio based portal, is this whole thing, or concept with things such as buttons, which is a visual based metaphor, does that make sense. And, that is the question that we still need to address
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and it goes to the heart of what this project is about.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: but, if we are designing a true voice based input, output portal, then quite honest are most of the visual elements particularly irrelevant and therefore is this translation from a web to audio, a particularly relevant thing to be doing. Now, it is a huge question, but we do need to address it if we are going to look at usability and learnability aspect of an e-learning, voice based, e-learning portal.
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: I think that um, if I understand correctly, what you are saying that if we are going to the voice [pause] solution. Some element, some visual elements does not make sense. But, the, what are also addressing is that we want the same page, for, for both solutions So, maybe we will have at the end, to, is maybe at the beginning to have the buttons for the visual navigation, but at the same time, the voice is telling you in a different way.
Mary: mhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone is clicking]
Jack: so maybe that is the way
Kenneth: but you have not because ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Lucy raises her hand]
Jack: if not we can from here
Kenneth: where it says how old are you here, if I enter a letter, it, um nothing appears on the screen to tell me that I have done something wrong. So, if I was deaf, that would not help me, and the voice that is telling me that, would not, [pause] and what you are doing is that you are producing extra information in the voice which is not on screen so would not work.
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: would not be produced in the same way.
Jack: of course you need to have in both solutions, more information, and may be presented in a different way.
[Could hear voice output whilst Jack was speaking]
Kenneth: There is a very big question about whether you can actually produce the same thing, effectively produce the same thing, in an audio only environment, and in a visual only environment. This is the assumption that a lot of people are making, and there is more and more evidence that this assumption is not valid. That, you, what you present in audio, a very good example was presented earlier, that if you have got a number of options to choose from, that in audio that they all need to be presented. And to have to go down and to tab between each one is a very slow process, and you do not know where the end of the list comes.
[Lucy raises her hand]
Kenneth: and it is not an effective process. So, [pause] there are many, there is a lot of other evidence, that to present something that can be voice only, thing solution, will look very different from a visual solution or s screenread solution.
[Someone is clicking their fingers]
Kenneth: They are not the same thing, and we need to be careful, because for the validation if we go down this route, and we start asking about learnability, for someone who is dependent on voice, that is one of the things we already know from where, from some of the work we have looked at on e-learning courses, which have been made accessible, turn out to be [pause] not learnable
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: They are not effective in their learning capability, because, because if you actually ask someone, for instance someone like [pause] linguaphone, how do you actually do, an audio learning environment. They will come up and tell you something completely different, from someone you ask, how do you do a web based learning environment.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth. and that is vitally important, and it does not matter how much we want to produce something which does both, if [pause] as humans it is not effective for us, that is the most important thing, we have to make something which is effective, not something which meets our desires as developers, to achieve a solution.
Lucy: Yes, I understand very well, what you are saying, and I do agree with you totally, but this is a question. Is it part of our project, do we have the necessary resources to transform totally in fact an e-learning site. Do you think that part of our job, or shall we limit our project, with translating with the right tools, [pause] the technical tools from the [pause] web site, which is just written, to an audio one. I understand the question, but it is a very important one, it is a very deep one, as you have to transform the e-learning system totally. So, Jack what is your answer? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charles laughs]
Jack: Because what I have been saying is that, [pause] that you are heading to totally different solutions, so audio solution is a totally different one
[Can hear whispering]
Jack. from a visual, not the right word
Kenneth: what I am suggesting is that, when we come to [pause] ask users themselves, is this effective, then [pause] what I am saying at the moment, and what I am hearing from my colleagues is that they are saying, no this is not effective, and they are quite likely to say, that no as a learning environment, um, using Jaws or a screenreader to work with a standard online learning, [pause] um presentation, is not an effective way of learning. E-learning courses, are not working well with visually impaired people, and if we have a project, which is aiming to produce a voice based learning portal or system creation and we do not have addressed some of those issues, we are failing, and we are not going to make that advance over and above of what a screenreader would do, and it is a question that we keep coming back to and you demonstrate something, and someone comes back as says, that is what a screenreader can do. Present it with the right information, yes, you may make minor changes, but basically we are not moving forward, we are not moving beyond what screenreader technology will do, or what screenreader technology will be doing in the very near future.
(Sub-state 5.1)
Paul: exactly ***(Sub-state 1.1)***.
Kenneth: We want to train, we are trying to say, within a European context, we are trying to say to the web accessibility initiative people, and the other big standardization bodies that we have talked about, here is the standards, you should be looking at to design audio materials. And yet, we are saying we do not have the resource to work out for ourselves how this should be done, and I am sorry, I do find it very difficult to go to WAI, or someone like that, say we are the experts in this, but we do not know how to do it [Paul laughs]
Kenneth: which is more or less what we are saying. We do know some of the issues, we do know that the ideal, that the ideal learning environment for most people is the pupil teacher relationship And, that, much of that is conducted in an audio fashion. And, especially for blind people, we need to look at that and need to understand what that relation is and what that interaction is. Because, that is what, that is what a good learning environment is.
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Kenneth: and [pause] to simply translate from a web environment, into a voice, voice [pause] type of environment is not creating the standards that Europe should be following
[Morris says something to Thomas]
Kenneth: it is going to do work, quality work, in e-learning. Um, it is something I said, right from the beginning on why I was concerned right from the beginning talking about e-learning, because it is a very specialist area. And we know that it is a very specialist area. And, we have got to be extremely careful, because otherwise if we talk to people like IMS who are doing huge amounts of work in this area, they are not going to be very amused with

what we come up with. Um, we could do ourselves a great deal of damage, we do need to understand ourselves, what that learning environment means.
Jack: Paul ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Paul ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: For me, it all boils down to the question, do we or can we create a totally screenreader independent, voice xml or whatever environment, e-learning environment, or do we simply want to have a voice xml screenreader based learning environment. Because, that is the way that I understand it. We have to try and figure that out, because do we want to try and use, our screenreader technology with just a traditional voice xml assistance, or do we want to switch of the screenreader completely and have a totally screenreader independent audio environment.
[Own discussions taking place]
Morris: well it is a difficult question [laughs]
[Some others laugh as well]
Paul: it sounds like it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kevin: Paul will translate it
[Kevin speaks in German and Paul translates]
Paul: In everyday work, screenreaders and screenreader technology, are [pause] are seen to be the predominant means to visually impaired people to work, and we have also seen that in everyday work, it takes a lot of training effort to give visually impaired people, the opportunity to, to make effective use of the technology that they already have.
[Kevin speaks in German and Paul translates]
Paul: Special web tools such as the IBM homepage reader, and others have made it, have not just made it possible, but relatively. Easy for visually impaired people to use the web effectively. There are still a number of limitations.
[End of tape 2]
[Tape 3]
Paul: and difficulties and Mary pointed out where some difficulties are, and those difficulties, might just be the result from not sticking closely to WAI guidelines.
[Kevin speaks in German and Paul translates]
Paul: in my opinion, what I think we should have, is something to complement, the tools and the access means we already have, and not creating something completely new. And not just voice based or audio based.
Ronnie: Can I? I am a little bit confused again, but maybe because, I am not extremely expert in the area, and maybe it may be why some of the passages are not clear. But, what I have heard now, confuses me, because I was expecting something different. I was expecting a new solution, which incorporates existing tools, [pause] upgrading them, to an easier level of use, and a better level of use. So, I not expecting of course, the new system to be competing with screenreaders at their level. What I am expecting from the solution is
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Canwayne whispers to Annie]
Ronnie: that the new project tool, does something, which takes away from me, which I am not a specialist, takes away from me, the need to do certain activities, specific activities, Assistive technology activities, in order to access information. Because if this is not offered [pause] the new solution is completing and gives me no [pause] easier use, which was my understanding was, the first [pause] the first goal of this project. That this project should create, an instrument which in a certain sense puts automatically into action, screenreaders or whatever they want to use, and my question before, I did not pause it, because I wanted to wait for the right moment to do so. But, when you will [pause] you will use the speech implementation, and when you will talk to your computer, [pause] are you developing a new system, or are you implementing an existing system like Dragon or ViaVoice, and including it in a more complex and higher level, tool for accessibility, because this is the problem for me. You will understand, you will understand my confusion, when Desmond has said what he has said, because this is not what I, was expecting from the project. I was expecting an upgrade, and not [pause] not a wider scope, I was expecting an upgrade. And, all the existing material should be instrumental to this new solution. Sorry, if I am a little bit [pause] I would like to have an explanation on this please.
Adam: I think that there is two things on what the project should work. You should create, develop and improve the accessibility, in terms of clients, and in terms of browsers, and on the second work, you should have done is to consult the web master to develop the web site in terms of accessibility. And if there is not these two things, I think only the plug in [pause] new tools is not necessary.
[James says something to Fabian
Paul: From the standpoint of the user it would be important to have something that is helpful. We know that to a certain extent that e-learning applications are navigable, but what we want to make them more efficient, because as Karsten pointed out, it is already a problem, to really train people, it really takes a lot of time and effort, to train existing technology to visually impaired people that is, but we do not want anything to add some more learning, and just learning to use the application, we do not want that. And, we need the actual applications to be [pause]
Desmond: easier
Paul: easier to use, that we do not have the same sorts of problems. We would like to have, ii have understood what Catani just said, he wants to [pause] that is not as difficult to handle, which will give us extra feedback, that will make it easier for us to [pause] to use and to learn, using an e-learning application. [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Adam says something to Thomas]
Desmond: It is a question, do we have to develop a technical tool, that we want to keep in mind, the graphical user interface has the information, and to make it in an analogue way to an audio environment. Do, we have to do something technical, or do we have to develop something [pause] as an e-learning portal in a more social way.
Adam: We need to work on that [says more but cannot be heard]
Morris: The question is, to what extent will we be able to combine the graphical and the audio dimensions?
[Annie says something to Conwayne in Spanish]
[Adam says something to Thomas and Morris]
James: Excuse me, I, I, remind that our last meeting in Paris
[Can hear whispering]
James: that our colleague Hazel, who is unfortunately here, says more or less, these things are going to find a suitable solution for our terms, to fix, for the objective of the project, [um, um [pause] to develop a tool designed especially for, for the creation of e-learning portal, and considering, the point of view of each of the users. Um [pause] maybe these proliferation's made by Hazel in Paris, can be in this point, applied again, to provide some light to that point. So, I do not know if you agree that this must be the, must be the general objective of the project, to create, a [pause] a voice tool, in order to facilitate the access of the internet to the user, especially for the e-learning portal
Paul: exactly ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: exactly, it is exactly what I wanted to say. Because, if we do not create something new, we have already screenreaders, which have been developed in a way that accessibility, is offered ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[James says something to Geoff]
Ronnie: in a high percentage, and something new must give us the possibility, using in my opinion, and maybe not, using or not, existing technical solutions to upgrade the accessibility and the usability of e-learning materials. Because, if we, if we create a portal, and we create an e-learning portal as an example, I will never forget, this is a research project, and that we are working in the area of research. Creating a portal, and showing how the solution of accessibility and usability of e-learning portal should be, means that those e-learning portal that are responding, that are on the same level, should be accessible with the tool, which are introduced. So, I think that it is exactly, how, how [pause] you, exactly what you said. There must be [pause] a demonstration, research number one, a demonstration, led the tool of an accessible and usable e-learning portal. But, if we do not create a new tool, and this is the object, the aim of our project, and if we do not create a tool, which is upgraded, in relation to the existing ones, which means screenreaders. It will be difficult, for us to reach the goal of our project. In this sense, the tool must offer more than things are offered by the existing technical and software solutions. I do not know if my stand point is clear.
Mary: mhhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Morris says something to Adam]
[Annie says something to Christopher, and then Jack gets up to speak to them both]
James: Ok, we agree with the point of view of Ronnie ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering – some own discussions still taking place]

James: and one of the objectives of the project is the demonstration
[Can hear whispering – some own discussions still taking place]
James: of the voice capability for disabled people, to have access to the e-learning portal. And the second, and another objective of the project is the creation of the tool
[Can hear whispering still]
James: using voice capacity, that must be compatible with ones already used such as screenreaders, and
[Can hear whispering still]
James: and these must be the two principles by which, the two main objectives of the project. Is everyone agree. Kenneth?
Kenneth: Not a 100% certain. Um [pause] can you repeat what you ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
James: One of the objectives of the project, is, as was agreed some time ago, is the creation of an accessible portal, showing the capabilities of the voice, especially for e-learning functionalties.
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: This is one of the main objectives of the project. Another one, as already agreed at the beginning of the project, is the creation of
[Can hear whispering still]
James: [pause] of a tool, a web authoring tool, compatible with the technical solution already existing like screenreaders, for the creation of web pages. Alright?
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: especially for e-learning capacities.
Geoff: These tool, is not only a ViaVoice, with a little more extra functionality, it is a tool, which used for a screenreader or compalabras, to produce, [pause] new pages. So, this tool on itself is to be functionality, which we can secure, and this tool, we have to develop
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: in 15 months, we can show, we can show us, what it is going to look, because it is not developed
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Yes, it is in the scheduled plan for the overall project. Not only for the last 15 months, 20 months, we have to the end of 2003. And this is more or less, or the same as what was agreed on in Paris. Ok? Ok, so perhaps if there is no additional questions we can go to lunch, in any case, if it is necessary to start after lunch some questions or some new points regarding this point, we can start with just this point. Ok? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I think that is important. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Preparation for lunch

Jack: I am going to check if lunch is ready.
James: so, thank you very much everybody.
[Own discussions taking place]
[Break for lunch]

Informing of changes to the afternoon session

Jack: We have made a change in the afternoon session We will start with the demo, a demo by the partner 5 on the portal.
Lucy: partner 7 name said***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Morris: partner 7 name said ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: ok [gives a small laugh] sorry, [gives a small laugh again]. And then instead of doing what was prepared before, the demo of this morning, is start, I think we should talk and discuss about what was started this morning, and what was the objectives, the, the [pause] the objectives of the future, and what are the things we should do. It is important that we all agree today, on this point, so we all know exactly where we are going. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: Jack. Jack
Ronnie: Just to clarify please
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: we had during the morning, the change, of [pause] of views, but I would like to make it clear that our point does not substantially differ from yours
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: there is no conflict there
Jack: hmmm, no, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: no just making clear. I do not think that we need to start again the long discussion of the, [pause] what are our goals, aims, etc, we need to discuss some of the details
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I would like to acknowledge some of the good work we have done, and just to clarify, that there is no critical position, ok, clear?
Jack: hmmm, yeah, but ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Adam and Morris are talking]

Demonstration of the partner 7 portal

[Laptop was use to present the slides during the presentation]

Adam: We are going to show the web portal
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: You must produce your voice, please Thomas: So, we are going to present you the portal. Concerning the contents, we evaluated 75 sites. We used [pause] the checkpoints from WAI. And we used the [pause] the Cynthia browser. So, [pause],
Paul: Can you explain why you used Cynthia? What were the reasons?
Thomas: Um,
Paul: It is not a well-known application
Thomas: in order to develop functionality, to try, to think of functionality. And we thought that it was a good browser, to see what we could do with it
[Paul raised his hand]
Paul: may I add to this, that information was provided by members of the consortium. It was our friends, from partner 9
Someone: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and what prompted our team to have a look at Cynthia, and they found it interesting to try it, and you will see here the results for it.
Thomas: You will find a solution for the application for designing websites and for navigating what is the evaluation for the plan, what is the evaluation for non sighted, and what is the evaluation for sighted people. There are several disabilities. And you can ask the web browser, so we used Cynthia for that reason. And also what functionality develop, and what for the portal.
[Can hear whispering – some own discussions taking place]
Morris: I am going to translate you, the presentation by Adam, if you do not mind. Alright, so our work was based on two major aspects We wanted to have it portable and as accessible, as Jaws, which is, is a charity responsible for those to receive, and not just those that are visually impaired. So, we also had those considerations in mind.
[Adam speaks in French and Morris translates]
Morris: we have also taken on board, the needs of the partially sighted people, whose needs are very often pulled out.
[Can hear whispering – own discussions taking place]

Morris: So, I am going to cover this afternoon, all the main, all the major functions really. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Mary whispers to Kenneth]
Morris: So, first, the user, [pause] must register, with the, needs to have full access
[Mary continue whispering]
Morris: and then he can what is the word [pause] customize, customize a working environment.
[Mary continues whispering]
Morris: and for those of you who cannot see, Thomas is doing this, manipulation. So, he is typing in his password. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: The first thing that he arrives at, it cascading stylesheets,
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: Now of course, the first, set of style sheets is provided by default, is that the right word?
Kenneth: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Other team members say yep as well, including Mary] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2)***
Morris: and he had a choice of what colour or style sheets. And he has the possibility, of using the stylesheet before making a final decision. And with you of course, with a variety of stylesheets, he just chooses what he wants, and has a possibility to try and see.
[Adam speaks in French to Morris]
[Own discussions taking place]
Morris: so, for example, Thomas is selecting style sheets, and he is choosing white and black background.
[Can hear Mary whispering in the background]
Morris: and if the selected style sheet is ok, he just saves it. And, when connecting, the next time he connects himself to the portal, he gets himself, immediately, the style sheet, which he had already selected. I hope that you have understood, the style sheet, allows you to work in the right environment, colours, and for watching the contrast and things like that. [Pause] There is even the possibility at a late stage, to [pause] to, to make your own stylesheet.
[Adam speaks in French to Morris]
[Erin and Mary are whispering]
Morris: And right, what we realised was that very often when surfing on the web, that when they have moved to the 20th page or whatever, they have to go back to the initial page, with the initial values and that this is not always easy, so, we have an function, which allows you to go back to the original heading
[Can hear whispering – own discussions taking place]
Morris: Now there is another function, which aims at customizing the service, if you want to work with, on a very specific issue, there is a functionality that allows you to describe it, and if you want to work on it. I
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: it goes beyond what a [pause] search engine can do for you. As it targets more precisely and the feel of the search. And here again, you can use your own items to meet your own needs. So, we are going to show you the search engine now.
Thomas: we looked at 75 sites, and I would like to add the 16 were inaccessible.
[Can hear whispering – people engaged in own conversations]
Morris: Ok, so, for example if we take the –learning search engine. In which you have several topics and themes, like manuals, schools and encyclopaedia
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: So, for example we are going to click on virtual libraries, and [pause] and you have installed the selected libraries, the virtual libraries which have been tested, and which are accessible with the entire test. The data presented are presented in the form of a table in fact. We have tested it in terms of accessibility.
Thomas: And there was a link on the web site, with a description of the web site, and notes of accessibility.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: So, for example you come across, a [pause] a library, which is of interest to any site, you can, you can save the page you are interested in, in your customised, environment, and which will of course make it easier for you to, to, [pause] carry out your research work.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: can I ask a question
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: about the accessibility ratings
Morris: sorry
Mary: How did you assign the accessibility ratings, which are presented against each website.
Morris: In fact, as you know
Mary: mhm hmm
Morris: we have WAI guidelines,
Mary: mhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and WAI guidelines, are [pause] generally believed to be a bit complicated, and more user friendly guidelines have been developed in a number of countries.
Mary: mhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and in France, we have a set of guidelines that are developed by Braillenet. And, we based our work, our rating system on the Braille net guidelines
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: This is basically how we developed it
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: it is developed in French, and the French guidelines look at space of WAI guidelines.
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Can I just ask, you have set your [pause] cascading style sheets, at the [pause] at the black and white [pause], but you have left the, [pause] towards the top part where it says the project name you have some token inaccessible text, in terms of its title on dark grey
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: or blue on dark grey, and when you float your mouse
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: buttons to the side, you end up with a [pause] very dark grey over
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: a lighter dark grey, um, [pause] which introduced the accessibility question
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: considerably.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: You told me about [pause]
[Own individual discussions taking place]
Morris: grey on what?
Kenneth: Well, where you have got, where you have got the mouse hovering over the buttons you have got
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: black, possibly black on grey
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: which is very, [pause] which is a poor contrast, but not as bad as a contrast between
[Can hear whispering]

Kenneth. two links
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: and it is at the top of the page, just below where it says the project.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: underneath
Morris: Ok, well the problem, it is just a particle problem ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: We decided first to have it working like this, because then it would really be in the heart of the problem, and it turns out that this combination of colours, is well, well the one that suited better. [Pause] Adam's needs. But of course, this can be [pause] can be reduced.
Kenneth: I, I find it very difficult to believe that ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: the two links towards the top of the page are
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: suitable for anyone's needs, certainly for [pause] dark grey
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Morris: what he says is that once again, [pause] I mean this can be our other change by
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: our customizing your stylesheet. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Desmond gets up]
[Own discussions taking place]
Morris: Kenneth is that clear then?
Kenneth: pardon?
Morris: Is that clear?
Kenneth: Well, yes, I think, it helps to demonstrate things, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: we do need to make sure, that [pause] that those sorts of things
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: are dealt with
Morris: uh-huh, absolutely ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: because at the moment,
Morris: yes we agree with that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: part of the screen is definitely unreadable
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: I have another question
Morris: just to finish with this
Desmond: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: the answer is that
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: of course, there is [pause] the possibility to work
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: and capture your own style sheet, and to choose the colours that
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: suit bests your needs
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: and that is particularly important for partially sighted people Now of course, I agree that the two links may not
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: be the best of colours, and there is always scope for improvements.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: But, but, yes, I mean I agree, but you, [pause] have suggested, I do not know, as I have not seen, what the style sheet is set up to be ***(Sub-states 1.1 and 3.1)***
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Kenneth: but, it suggested that this stylesheet, it was going to be black text on white background, and a fair amount of that background is not white, which therefore for someone, who is sighted, that is what they want.
Morris: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and I do not know how, because, because I do not know what you set up, I do not know how widely ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: that style sheet is actually able to effect the page. Is it, is it quite possible, to set up, pages where, where the style sheet only affects part of the page.
Morris: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that is what concerns me
Morris: yes, yes, I see your point ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: So, that is something that we are working on, and that is something, which will be improved as well. But, I mean, they have taken note of your remarks. [Pause] and there is a question by our German friends.
Desmond: Can you show us how to navigate, because most of the visually impaired navigate, and it is impossible, and to highlight the functioning.
Thomas: I think this is going to be difficult for me, as it is a Spanish keyboard ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Desmond: ahhh ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Someone laughs in the background, and then a few people laugh in the background]
Mary: inaccessible
[Own discussions taking place]
Morris: they will do it, they will do it, but that is something, which has been taken into account as well. And it would be possible for a blind user to navigate with the keyboard, with the keyboard, yes
[Can hear whispering]
[Kenneth and Erin are having a discussion]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Morris: So, we are trying to, we are going to, [pause] in the next few months, develop new functions, and now it says for like for example the exchange of files, and of course we are open to any suggestions. We would like to remind you
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: this is something, this is something
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: we are doing on behalf of the consortium, and that the portal is available for your comments online. So, it is important that we also hear from you. If you have good suggestions
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: new functions
[Can hear whispering – own discussions taking place]

Morris: So, we are going to use Cynthia, lets hope that it will work
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place, Kenneth, Erin, Mary]
[Voice output can be heard for a short time]
Morris: Sorry, we have a technical problem here. [Pause] apparently our friends here have a technical problem. I do not know if it would be possible, to show this to you, at a later stage, may be tomorrow morning, to try and fix, to try and fix it
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: will there be time to do that tomorrow?
Jack: Tomorrow?
Morris: yes, because there is a problem with Cynthia. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: There is work package one, how long, would it be? 20 mins, I am asking Mary
Mary: maybe the second slot, that is discussion of work package 1, which is between 11 30 and 12.30
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: mhm hmm, after the coffee break ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: So, if you have any other questions, or any other points
Erin: Can I just check with you, if say, I did not want to use a stylesheet, and I wanted to use my own browser settings, is that possible. Say, for example, if I wanted, I don't know, bright pink background with purple text. Could, I do that using by browser settings?
[Pause]
Morris: yes. The answer is yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: And that will override all the other settings
Morris: sorry
Erinn: and that will override all of the other settings, including the menu settings
Morris: [pause and then speaks to someone else] yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: can you demonstrate it
[Can hear whispering]
[Can hear voice output for a few seconds]
[Own discussions taking place]
Charles: It is a Spanish computer
Erin: in England it is tools and options
Fabian: it is in Spanish of course [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Own discussions taking place]
Erin: if you go to the other option for colours, and then you can change the link colours, it is the colours box, and then [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: Ok, so always have the possibility to not use, the [pause] style sheets. The style sheets are available,
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: but you will not have to use it necessarily
Mary: mhhm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and just by [pause] canceling the option in the stylesheet, changes the link colours. Does this make sense?
Kenneth: yes, but you are, but still what you have done there, you have some text just below where it says home page and site map ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and there is a bit of text, which is unreadable, because it is very dark
Mary: underneath that
Kenneth: just underneath that
[Erin says something as well]
Kenneth: just below that
Mary: the black, the one in black
Mary: yeah
Kenneth: there, ahh [sounds surprised] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Mary gives a small laugh]
Desmond: yes that is not accessible. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Morris: the text and the links can always be changed, using the stylesheets
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: and the problems that we certainly have here is that, using this equipment, [pause], Adam does not understand why it is presenting it in those colours. And that it simply has to be changed.
Kenneth: That, it seems that area of background, whatever you do, does not seem to change
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: which suggests that in [pause] that colour is a hard colour there
[Can hear whispering]
Adam: not at all ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: if you have dark text you will always have that problem.
Morris: yes, I understand that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions are taking place]
[Can hear Adam say in the background ahhhh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: You can easily change the colours
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: you must use your own parameters for that, but it can be changed
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: so for example, so for example
Morris: if you are on this page,
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: and the colour does not suit you, you have the possibility, of changing it
Kenneth: But, that is what we have asked you to do, to set it up, such, as it is suggestible
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions are taking place]
[Conwayne says something to Annie and Jack]
Morris: we are not in a position to do this here ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: why
Morris: you can change the palette
Lucy: why?
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: because these have been included in the design. I told you this early on. What we had in mind, was to have of course to combine accessibility,

and attractiveness for sighted people. And, so, it has been included in the design of the page
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: it has got,
Kenneth: but that means that the page is inherently inaccessible and if someone wishes to have dark text
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: I take your point, yes, that this should be changed ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charles raises his hand]
Charles: um
Lucy: Charles has a question
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: Um, I do not really see why this colour should be in the design of the site, to make it attractive to sighted people. Because, I um [pause] because if you are free to change the style [pause] I mean, [pause] if you think it is fine, [pause], you just leave it, [pause], [gives a small laugh] and I do not know why it should be in the design of the site
[Erin looks at Charles and says it does not need to be fixed does it. The navy it should be unfixed. Charles: huh? Erin: the background colour should not be fixed. Charles: mhhm hmmm]
[Pause]
Kenneth: yes, but that still does not answer the question, is if prefer to have dark text on a light background, because if you fix part of the background as dark, you cannot do it. [Pause] and that is the accessibility issue, which is at a number 1 level of accessibility issue ***(Sub-states 1.1 and 2.1)***
[Someone laughs]
Kenneth: you must, [pause] fix, part of the background
[Can hear whispering]
Adam: We are, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Adam: on a stylesheet we use background to match, and we do not choose the background page, and the other, [pause] and the background page we put in the site
[Can hear whispering]
Adam: it is now [pause] it is part of
Morris: temporary, yes
Adam: and we plan to make other background image, we plan to also, [pause] to create stylesheets, without [pause] background page. So, if you do not have background image, like the stylesheet you showed before,
[Can hear whispering]
Adam: you only have text, white, and white text, and black background
[Can hear whispering]
Adam: which you can, [pause]
Morris: you can use you own parameters
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: customize
Morris: customerize ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: I would like to say that, [pause], now I understand more, [pause] comments, seeing what you have done of the work you have done. I thought after Paris what [pause] that what was decided was that the technical partners would be integrating voice as an example
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in the partner 7 page
Someone: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jaoquin: but now, what you have developed, is kind of a project portal, and [pause] so, my position is that this is very good job, and now what we should do is to work with this portal that you have developed.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and to summarize all of the things I said this morning. That the e-learning portal, for the project, and the partner 7 portal in this
Lucy: structure
Jack: now, seeing what we have done correctly. So, I would say that [pause] we can take this as a starting point, all these [pause] comments that have been done about style sheets and colours should be sent to [pause] to the, [pause] to Adam, and we will also send our comments, on how to improve this, and how to start working. So, we can [pause] make this pictures as the project portal.
Mary: Can I ask a question, in relation to what you just said. Will, these be implemented using the plug in?
Jack: no, no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: it is totally, independent
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: so, the idea was that, we will be implementing [pause] the plug in over an existing page, which is the partner 7 page
Mary: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and now, we will work on this page. Try to put [pause] implement voice here
Morris: on this page here?
Jack: yeah, [pause], I understand that this was your [pause] intention ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, everything is now, and also now, the project. Org, maybe it is not a different page
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: we were developing this other page, so what we will do, is send all recommendations to you, and to put here, the information of the project, also the ftp access
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and with the [pause] the others of the project. Org. I think we can go in this direction.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Others agree as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Tape 4
Jack: Please, I think that everyone should send comments on this, this page, so we can start to improve this site.
Mary: So, we need to register first
Lucy: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: yes, you register ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter from Kevin]
Jack: So, thank you very much to PARTNER 7, and now I think we can
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: to go back to the discussion of this morning. And, we can talk more about the project itself, the tool.

Discussion of the tool

Jack: Just as a start point of the discussion, I, I would remind you, of what is in the contract, that the commission has. So, um [pause] what they have are the, [pause] that the objectives are to develop authoring tool, using voice, in order to improve accessibility, to web pages. So, [pause] and as a demo of the authoring tool, and an e-learning portal, with again, as a demo again, one course which will be the project tool itself, how to use the project tool itself. That is more or less summarizing what is in the [pause] in the contract. Um, in Paris [pause], um, after several comments, it looked like we decided that one of the strongest points was that, of the authoring tool was e-learning. So, [pause] we decided to focus the authoring tool, in some functionalities, that will solve some problems detected by the users in the e-learning courses. So, [pause] is everyone, everyone agrees with this picture? Yes, please, this is the moment, [pause] to say no, [gives a small laugh] that this is not what you [pause] or to [pause] it is ok?
[Team members say yes in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, that is [pause] so everyone has here the objectives. So, now maybe, this morning, Kenneth has, maybe that was a new [pause] a new comment on the project that I would say. That is, if we working in e-learning we should not just have accessibility into account, but learnability, and pedagogical [pause] aspects into account. So, how can we fit this, [pause] this problem into the project?
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: Maybe, I would suggest to do a totally different voice [pause] solution that is for e-learning. It is not exactly part of the project
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: but is it, possible to, that both solutions can be together? To design solution and a more [pause] a more voice solution.
[Lucy raises her hand]
Kenneth: part of the question is that if you had [pause] the plug in to have a look at what we see here.
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: what is that going to add
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: over and above what a screenreader already does, because, that page as it already stands, [pause] and correct me if I am wrong, it is potentially accessible by a screenreader like yours. So, this project has to do something new, something different. It has got to handle other material, and it has to handle it better. So, the reality is yes, we can certainly put, we can voicify, [pause] for a better word, this material. But, in the end we need to have something else, which in this moment, a screenreader is not going to handle well. And the question is what is that going to be. It has been suggested thoughout this, and it is not, entirely clear, because we get messed around a bit, with what we mean by an e-learning portal, because a portal would not normally contain any [pause] an e-learning portal would not normally contain courses itself, it would be a link to courses. But, if we say that we are going to have [pause] e-learning content on that, we actually have to decide, what is it, about that content, which is going to be [pause] which we are going to present in a way, which is going to be a significant improvement on what a screenreader would already do for us. That is the question. Now, if you are going to simply voicify a page, [pause] an e-learning page, you are still doing what a screenreader does. Now, if you are not going to do that, you are going to add content, you are going to make something different out of it, therefore you are building a different page, and we need to do that in the best way possible. So, the question, whatever way you look at this question, if it is going to simply be that we are going to voicify what we see on screen, then you are doing what a screenreader already does. And, there is nothing more than that, and we will have to re-design. [Pause]
Jack: yes, yes, this is the same, [pause] I remember, that we were discussing in Paris, I think it was Ronnie, where is the innovation here. And, at the end the answer was, that the innovation is the –learning ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: absolutely, therefore it has got to be innovative. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Lucy raises her hand]
Lucy: Jack, I have a question. I do agree that to be innovative, we do have to be [pause] to have a link with the e-learning, which should be vocal, I guess so, audio, which will be on the web site with the visual audio system. But, we have to buy an e-learning, have the copyright, and ask the owners of the e-learning to accept, we will transform the course, because as we saw this morning, if we have a list of answers, a list of possible answers, we need to introduce a sentence, saying for instance, that you have 5 possibilities, you have to choose between them, and press the buttons by numbers. So, this must be done with the copyright, it is a right, which we have to buy the right for, isn't it? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charles raises his hand]
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: but, the subject, the subject of the e-learning portal, the portal has suggested that, [pause] that the technical annex is some kind of introduction to the [pause] to the project authoring tool. So, then we do not have copyright issues, I think. ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Kenneth: but then we have to write a whole e-learning course
Mary: mhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: around that, and that is a [pause] and do we have someone who is able, and capable and has the expertise, to write a quality e-learning course
[Lucy negatively nods her head from left to right and right to left] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: around the tool. I do not know, I know of some people who have that expertise, but it is certainly not [pause] part of this consortium at the moment. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: if we want to create some accessibility in e-learning for everyone [pause] we have to [pause] to develop something, according to the research, [pause] for example Mary, which she already did. For example, existing screenreaders have to be [pause] have to have added scripts or something like that. [Pause] which confirm with the requirements that we already found out
[Christopher says something to Geoff]
Desmond: and if you only create one web page, [pause] which confirm to the requirements, we are, [pause] we are building an island. [Pause] and we want to gain, and we want to make the developers of the screenreaders, on how these things work, and sensible for these problems, for blind and visually impaired people. And, [pause] and we have to show them I think, what the real requirements are, and we have to develop something, which confirms with this requirements
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and this is first, to find out, what are the requirements and then maybe build it into an existing screenreader, and then an e-learning portal as a demo.
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and that will fit exactly the same [pause] objectives as we were told before.
Jack: but, now we are, working in that direction. That users from work package 1, is doing all this user requirements
Mary: mhhm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and even ahh [pause], the deliverable,
[Can hear voice output]
[Can hear voice output]
Ronnie: shhhh
[Everyone laughs]
[Can hear voice output again]
Jack: So, there is even a deliverable called the specification dossier, [pause] that is where [pause] the specifications and the manual for accessible design
[Can hear voice output again]
Jack: should have all the requirements, which should have to be
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, I think that point should be covered.
Desmond: yes, um ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and, um e-learning portal as a demo, which is of course an objective. What is in the middle?
Desmond: I think you are, as I saw in the demo, with Compalabras this morning, and I thought you are inventing the wheel for the second time.
Kenneth: uh-huh [Kenneth nods his head as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
[Annie looks at Jack]
Desmond: and still, and we could [pause] and you do not have to make so much work, as this moment. There are exiting things
[Can hear whispering]

Desmond: and you could add some scripts or something like this, and to get the same objective. You do not have to invent something new, for this scope.
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: it would be very much easier
Annie: what do you mean that we are inventing something new, can you please explain.
Desmond: As, um, the speech output, and [pause] and, and, I saw you wanted to add with the source code, the age, [pause] and the requirements for e-learning. The user was told that I have 4 questions, but was not told
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: of the page
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and it should be, [pause] of a tool, and the tool should see how many questions that there are, and not the webpage
Annie: but we do, the plug -in ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: tells you that there are 4 questions
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: and the first is the age
Desmond: for example, the IBM homepage reader, the homepage reader
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: tells you how many columns and rows that you have. And if, [pause] this plug in comes to form a new element, why should this plug in not tell you how many formula elements there are there?
Annie: yes, I understand. ***(Sub-state 1.1)*** [Annie speaks to Christopher and Geoff]
[Individual discussions taking place]
Annie: Desmond
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: we have been talking. We think that there are three things. We have the plug in,
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: which I said this morning, only recognizes and synthesizes speech.
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and we have a web authoring tool, and what you are bringing up now, is that it might be better to have something [pause] some software that maybe could be built, from your screenreader, or to collaborate with, your screenreader
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: so, that it would, [pause] mix it, [pause] makes it better [pause] helps you read better the web pages, better, that is without having to re-design the whole page. That is what you are saying
Desmond: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: so, maybe, [pause] the API of the screenreader, and then try to build something, functionality, over the screenreader functions
Desmond: for just voice xml?
Annie: to make better, something like that
Desmond: yes, yes, that is what I meant ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: Karsten, just said something very nice. Voice xml, has to start at the point where a screenreaders are too passive,
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and to see the interaction
Annie: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: between people and the screenreader. It is [pause] some cases, very passive
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and the direction could matter
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: voice xml, should stand exactly at this point. That would be a real advantage
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kevin speaks in German
[Can hear whispering]
[Paul translates]
Paul: visually impaired users only [pause] only have access to a small, a very small portion of the contents, and in order to make life easier, the interaction, that the voice xml tools, give us, they should make life easier, and give extra information at a point, where a screenreader is just too passive
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: so, [pause] in a situation where we get very limited information from the screenreader, the [pause] the whatever, [pause] the voice xml assistance should
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: yes, yes, we think that is a very good idea, and it is a different [pause] line of work, and what we were thinking, is that it appears ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and it would be more useful. But, also we will have to find out, how to interact with the screenreader
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and I do not know, right now [gives a small laugh]
Desmond: I could give you a small example,
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: maybe not a very good example, but in Germany there is a project, with a group of blinds,
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and they want to make an adaptation of Jaws,
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: to create, [pause] PowerPoint presentations
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and they work together with Freedom Scientific to get a sourcecode
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and they add a script to Jaws
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and Freedom Scientific is working with them, in this case
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and you could work together with Freedom Scientific, to [pause] to work on our objectives
[Someone in the background no, no, no] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: um
Paul: Um, I do not think this is the right approach ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: I do not think that you can simply go, and work together with one screen reader manufacturer, that is not the way ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Mary: mhhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: ok [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 1.2)***

[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: I just said that as an example, you should not
[Annie tries to speak]
Desmond: you should not work together with a group of one manufacturers
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: I agree with Paul ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I know, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: but it was just an example
Annie: we must, [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Charles raises his hand]
Jack: Charles
Charles: I was wondering if it would be possible, to [pause] to develop the kind of software, that [pause] would work for more than one screenreader. Because, [pause] not sure if there is actually a common interface should apply, which should develop something for one or two screenreaders, that works with the other ones.
[Christopher speaks to Jack]
Desmond: but would it allow out the project tool, which is also just one tool
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: but, but this tool, reduces web pages, and voice xml pages, it does not [pause] and the idea is to use, the accessibility feature of Java, which are not geared towards, certain categories of screenreaders, they are more general.
[Pause]
[Own discussions taking place]
[Kevin speaks and Paul translates]
Paul: an example taken from another area, is that screenreaders, for example, cannot interpret Jaws
[Can hear whispering]
[Kevin speaks, Paul translates]
Paul: Pie charts, and other such diagrams which can be produced using excel, are for example available, in different places, for example the internet
[Can hear whispering]
[Kevin speaks, Paul translates]
Paul: There is a project, which is being prepared by a team at the University of Berlin
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: and they are trying to do image recognition
[Kevin speaks, Paul translates]
Paul: They developed a plug in which tries to analyse and recognize graphical elements, and in additional with a screenreader, it kicks in at the moment, [pause] when a diagram like that is encountered, and it tries to recognize what type of diagram it is
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: and to tell the visually impaired user, this is for example a pie chart, and it has [pause] it demonstrates the percentages, the different percentages.
[Kevin speaks, Paul translates]
Paul: There is also an additional piece of software system, which would help [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: dealing with special situations easier, and works out, and moving away from a graphic situation in an e-learning, situation, where you have different presentations, and here you could use, what we are planning to do, in the voice xml presentation, to give you, the user, additional information, which is just more, than the screenreader traditionally renders.
[Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place – Geoff says something to Conwayne, Annie, Jack and Fabian]
Jack: Desmond, so the comments here, is that your idea is a good idea, and a good approach, but now, this is really a, a totally different project. [Pause] we have oriented the project to the web authoring tool, to the compatibility of the plug in, and so, this, we do not know the technical approach for this project
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: we do not work on it
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and it is not an authoring tool, and it is not anything, here in [pause] in the contract, so
Annie: what we intend to say, we can analyse the [pause] technical mobility of building a plug in that does that with a screen reader, but we cannot say if are going to succeed
Desmond: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because we do not know, what kind of problem we are facing now
Desmond: hmmm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because we do not have technical knowledge on screenreaders
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and how to interact with them. We can study that, but we are not sure,
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: if we are going to be able to implement a [pause] solution
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: to that problem
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: I am just afraid that
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: that all the features of the screenreaders have, must be implemented in our authoring tool
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and the development of the modern screenreader
Annie: yes I know ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: in the last 10 years and how can we manage this, in this short period of time.
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: that was the reason for my idea
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone clicking their fingers]
Desmond: just to make it a little bit easier.
[Can hear whispering]
[Clicking fingers again]
Desmond: and to have a look at our main objectives.
Annie: yes, but ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and to do something new.
Annie: yes, we are aware of that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: we are aware of that, most of the authoring tools have been developed for 10 years
[Clicking fingers heard]

Annie: and they are not going to, [pause] make something in 10 month, that has all the functionality of the existing tools, that have been in the market for many years
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: but, what we intend to do, is a web authoring tool that [pause] makes easier to [pause] for our web developer
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: to create a page that is accessible
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and enables voice input interaction, but it might be a small tool. Of course we do not intend to do a tool that does
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: what is in the market, Dreamweaver
Desmond: mhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: screenreader
[Ronnie raises his hand]
Ronnie: I have a question both to Annie and to Desmond. Since this is a research project, and we cannot be too [pause] use all existing, [pause] screenreaders for all existing tools.
[Can hear whispering]
[Fingers clicked in the background]
Ronnie: So I think, would it not be a good idea, to show one, possibility in our evaluation one of the best
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: and try to use this in order to build up [pause] what we would like to have. So, I do not think we can make an analysis of all existing screenreaders, and include all the features
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: of existing screenreaders. I think, a practical solution is to take one, but maybe this is a proposal of an incompetent person who does not know how difficult it is to do these things. But, I put it on the table to see if it is an idea of not.
Annie: we share your view Ronnie, we think it would be much easier if we choose a screenreader, where we can focus our studies, functionality and how you can interact with it, and that is why we use the user's help to choose that screenreader, that we can focus on. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: I would take a different approach. If you look at accessible web authoring tools, such as say, Hot Metal Pro, or Version 4 of Acracnophebia, and these are no matter, what screenreader, you are using, these are accessible screenreader tools. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and you try and study one of those, and the way that they are working screenreader mdependent
[Annie and Conwayne are whispering]
Paul: and then if you add some extra functionality, for example, some functions that would prompt the developer of an e-learning course, not necessarily, an e-learning course, but any old website
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: if the author would be prompted in certain situations, that some additional, voice [pause] outputs, or voice xml might be, [pause] might give us some additional information. Just, as [pause] some people have said a couple of times today, that what we really want is something which goes beyond a screenreader. So, if we [pause] if the project web authoring tool, would do that, and tell the [pause] the author of a web page, in this situation, some extra voice xml output, might be very helpful
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: with [pause] would that not be a way? Would that not be an approach?
[Own discussions taking place]
Annie: I agree with you, I do not think that goes against what Ronnie just said ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: No ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie. another point of view ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: they are both lines of work [laugh]. The way that you introduced yourself, I thought, you were, you thought
Jack: Kenneth
Kenneth: can I just go back to something else, from a slightly different way of viewing this conversation. As, the project reviews report, where our reviewers have carefully set out for us, the three main work areas for this project.
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: The first is on speech based interaction, based on voice xml
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that is part of this study, part of this area of speech recognition, which is so, [pause] is such a complex area. There are also looking, asking us to look at tools for producing web pages, including voice xml, html and xml
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and it is that integration of three standards, that I think it is off, huge importance here, it is not just a matter of can we produce some voice xml, and dump it somewhere. It is about how to integrate these. And, e-learning through interactive web pages, so they are bringing out this learning capability, through web pages, and later on they pick up that in terms of, [pause] to take further by looking at the standard for e-learning document mark up. And that is, a huge area, which were [pause] which we are not really touching on yet. Um [pause] and looking at existing authoring tools of voice xml. And this needs to be reviewed. We really do have to, [pause] absolutely take note of all these reviewers comments, and also have to answer those in re-write of annex one, in how we are going to take account of these. Um [pause] much of what we have discussed has not been addressing these areas, which the reviewers see as highly important. And, this is going to be an important test for us, especially if we are going to get an Annex 1, acceptable to the commission, for the new part of the contract. [Pause] So, we do need to address, annex 1 against these reviewers' comments and we need to do it urgently. And it builds on the conversation that we have been having up until now but it is not re-focussed around what the reviewers are saying.
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: So, the annex 1, version 15, was sent to you a week ago,
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or something like that and the version over the start [pause] the version for this
Kenneth: would you be very kind, and I have got version 15, but I have not got the earlier version, can you be very kind and tell us where changes have been made
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: so that we can actually see how they so far, to reflect what the reviewers comments are.
Jack: They were mainly in the work plan part
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: Well, basically, changes are very short, it says that the authoring tool will be focussed on e-learning content, and that was not said before. And, um [pause] it says here that work package 3 and 4, we are changing their start date, to have a preliminary versions of the tool and the portal to be evaluated by users.
Desmond: which page is this?
Fabian: Um, page 23
Lucy: 23 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: what section is that under?
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: I think we will have some tasks in work package 3 and 4, like [pause] task 3.3, which is the creation of the prototype of the tool.
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: and in work package 4, it is task 4.1, which is the integration of voice in e-learning projects. That's it. I mean, there are very few changes taken

into account, for the recommendations of the work plan. We will be working on improving, and increasing the changes in this document. And we are aware of course, of all changes, contributions and comments. You can see,
Jack: You already sent some comments,
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Maybe you can summarise the content or explain
Kenneth: The, the particular comments that I made, were to introduce to task 3.3 and 4.1, both state, that they will show to the user group, various things, but they do not seem to, there is no time scale given for that. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and, there does not seem any option for the user group to convey, no they do not show that. It suggests that, the creation of the prototype of the tool will show to users, how the use of voice can improve the interaction with voice on a web-authoring tool. My, my suggestion is that, it should be saying, it will demonstrate that, and we need an additional statement along the line of, it will be the user groups to evaluate that or something. Because, the technical partners can demonstrate something, but we need to have the option as user groups of agreeing, that is what it does
Fabian: of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: That was our idea, maybe it was not written.
Fabian: of course, that was the idea
Kenneth: it is a bold statement, which is going to happen, but may not happen
Jack: In fact, the whole
Fabian: we are not going to teach you [laughs] of course
Kenneth: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in fact the whole of work package 5, is evaluation and this is evaluation of all these parts. And as you said,
Kenneth: but there is no link from those particular tasks
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: they need to have something to suggest that if this does not work out in that way, there is an alteration which will take account of that
Fabian: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and will continue that process
Fabian: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: It, it is a minor point. My more, major point is that the changes made to date, whereas they picked on two of the points, particularly section 4 which is the particular section where they summarise, they are not picking up these [pause] these bills of these three major work areas. And, that is important, because a lot of the discussions that we have had is actually, around those three. In other words, is [pause] work package 2 going to pick up this whole question of speech based interaction, on voice xml. Is it actually going to address interaction, voice interaction as a [pause], so not just a technical, so at the moment, work package 2, looking at [pause] the various areas around the [pause] speech plug in, and [pause] looking at compatibility. What they seem to be asking us to do, um [pause] is to widen that look, and to look at actually, speech-based interaction. Now, that is incredibly important in terms of [pause] of talking about voice recognition, voice in, voice out, system, and somewhere we have to address what are the interactions that occur and how do we define those interactions. Now, [pause] we've sort of, [pause] someone has said that we need to gather [pause] words, [pause] um, we need to gather a corpus of utterances somewhere along the line. What is it, how are we going to train the voice recognition system? How are we going to [pause] how is this voice input going to work overall? That is a very complex area. We know it is a complex area. And, um, at the moment we are not addressing it, and at the moment, and what the reviewers have picked up is not being addressed, and therefore they are asking us to specifically address it. Tools, the second one, the tools to create web pages, including xml, voice xml and html, and that is, my belief is, reading between what they are saying is, how are we going to look at the interactions of this, there are already tools out there, that do html, that do html, tools that do voice xml. What we are saying, is that we are trying to look at building a tool, which has integration of these technologies. And it is part of a question I was asking this morning, [pause] when we saw elements being produced, and it is not the elements, and it those things are relatively straight forward, [pause] there are some technical difficulties. There is integration of those elements. How do you build those elements into something that is actually usable and useful? That is a very much more difficult task. It is the whole issue around, why are tools, which are being approved to section 5.8 not proving to being usable, and that is because they may be accessible, but the integration has not worked, the integration to make some thing useful has not worked. And what we are talking about here is a usability question, how are we going to look at in work package 3, that integration question. So, it is far more, than just the elements, it is actually, therefore what I am looking for, and I was trying to ask this morning, what is the vision for this tool in terms of, what is its scope, what is it trying to achieve
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: Um, and we have already heard, Annie has quite rightly said, that we are not going to redesign a web authoring tool, after they have taken years to build. [Pause]. So, what are we going to do about trying to produce, what is this thing going to do? It is going to have to integrate something in order to author web pages. After all that is what we have said that we are going to do. [Pause] How are we going to write that into work package 3, that is, what they are asking for? In work package 1.4, they are saying e-learning through interactive web pages. How are we going to build e-learning? What is the interaction around e-learning, we have to build in? We started looking at this in work package 1, and this has been acknowledged what they are building on. They are also building on the fact that we are looking on IMS, and they have said that, you are obviously looking at standardization, and in the e-learning industry. Um, [pause] it is a very tall order, but that is an important statement. In creating industry standard, the e-learning document mark up [pause] I would suggest that is a huge subject. I know, we have got to address that comment, and address it in terms of annex 1. That is what we have been asked to do. And how are we going to do it? That is some of, where we should really starting to concentrate. This annex 1, I am assuming has to actually be delivered to the commission, very soon, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in a form that they are going to improve. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: hmmm –hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and we have got to demonstrate
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: as you said this morning, um [pause] one of the things that we have been asked to do, um [pause] and whether it is in that, or whether it is a narrative, running alongside, annex 1, how have we altered annex 1 to address the question, the points raised by the reviewers. So, we have got to through this, and take this point, and we have addressed this by, [pause] or what in certain cases we may just have to say, look we understand the point that you are making, but it really is outside, the context of this project
Jack: hmmm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: to actually say, [pause] we are taking the industry stand for the e-learning document mark up, sorry it is not within the scale of this project. We do not have the expertise, within this consortium to do that task. But, we do need to address it, coz that is what the reviewers have said. If you don't address it, be sure, the next review they will [knocks on the table] where is it? [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]

Discussion of review questions from review report

Jack: I would suggest that, maybe we can try to prepare, [pause] an answer, a document answering these questions, and try to put these comments into the annex 1, for [pause] next Tuesday.
[Annie positively nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: To circulate this, and of course everyone is thinking about this, at the same time, and circulate the version, and the comments, and the corrections in a couple of days, lets say Thursday, in order to send to Friday, the final version, the next version.
Kenneth: is there any reason, why we cannot use the rest of our time today, to address these questions?
Jack: yes, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: then come to a consortium agreement,
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Kenneth: which will be much quicker doing it around the table
[Partners including Annie and Desmond say yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 from 2 people)***
Jack: yes that is great. We have a coffee break, and then we can do it shorter, but, yes, can [pause] do you have actually the review here? Everyone has it? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I do not have it ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: can you bring it?
Jack: we can try to make some copies. This one is full of comments, so I will produce 2,3,4 copies
Charles: I only have an electronic version
Lucy: perhaps one more ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: 6 ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: 6 ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: so coffee should be waiting for us.
Desmond: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Break for coffee]
Jack: We should start with
[Can hear whispering]
[People engaged in own conversations]
Jack: point number 4, from the project review report. The work done and work plan, I think it is [pause] it is the first point where [pause] the one you were referring to.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, the consortium has identified a new preliminary version, etc, and the starting dates for work package was brought forward. Think this has already been changed in the new annex 1. I think the dates are wrong, they begun in March instead of December
Mary: they are the other way round ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: it is the other way ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Mary: mhhhm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: an in December 2001, rather than March 2002. So, I think the consortium should prepare a more up to date work plan, including the inputs of three major work periods.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: The first one, speech-based interaction on voice xml, work package 2. [Pause]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: So, this should be a new task, in [pause] in work package 2. [Pause] 2.4
Kenneth: can you not simply do it as an extension for task 2.2?
Jack: 2.2?
Kenneth: upgrading
Jack: speech synthesis and recognition capabilities so include here in the definition of task 2.2 paragraph for the plug in voice synthesis?
[Can hear whispering – own discussions taking place]
Annie: may be we think that it might be more suitable, to have a new task, as we will study the integration of voice xml, not only with the plug in, but may also with screenreaders, so it will be by itself, a new task.
Kenneth: Yes, maybe we need to [pause] we all have a common understanding of what is being asked of here, because you used the word integration here, where, this is talking about ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: interaction
Kenneth: interaction, and as I can see, it is to do with [pause] understanding how, yes, a voice recognition system has to recognise a voice, and interpret the words. But, what happens especially in terms of this project that we are looking at any semantic or recognition as well. So, [pause] are we verging on the edges of natural language processing, [pause] we need to at least address that even if we are doing that or not. [Pause] um, and how does that, it is part of what we were talking about earlier on [pause] in terms of recognition, that some of this will [pause] the way that a speech interaction will work, will be different from a screen interaction. So, as we talked about this morning, with the radio buttons, there is some content alteration, which will be required. So, that is my translation of this, that it is some of the interaction, with voice in and voice out, and how the tool, how the plug in is going to help us with that interaction. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: but using voice xml?
Kenneth: based on voice xml, certainly, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: how does voice xml work with all this as well, but this is in part, because at the moment, we although, voice recognition is mentioned several times
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: there is no [pause] real suggestion here of, how, what we mean by voice recognition and the level of recognition
Annie: yes, I know what you, yes, describe the user grammar system ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: yes, you have to find it out
Kenneth: yes. So, we need, so I think we need to talk about here, in that deliverable in work package 2, what level of interaction are we looking for in this type of project ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: because that will help us to define
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: what comes later
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: Now, so, one question comes to me is, we are changing
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: work package 2, and including a new task, and we are [pause] only three weeks from the end of this work package. This can be addressed,
Annie: yes, absolutely, because, although it might not be included, we have all of the stuff ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: there is no reason why, we cannot, why the change at this point, actually deliver the deliverable, more or less as it is now, and say, [pause] and promise an amendment to the commission, a month later, if that was [pause] helpful, in order to cover this task adequately. Because at the end of the day, again, [pause] we should be giving the consortium time to review, [pause] these deliverables, and at the moment, if we have a deliverable which is due out at the end of this month, which [pause] unless I have missed it we have not yet seen ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Kenneth: and we still have a major new task to be added in, is going to be very difficult to give us the opportunity to comment on that before it is delivered. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: In fact Mr J when we asked about this, [pause] changing the evaluation dates, and how shall we still send all the deliverables at the end of July, [pause] his first answers was there is no one here in the summer [small laugh] so, [pause] it is not a big problem if you shift a bit
Kenneth: mhhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: the delivery
Kenneth: But, we have delivered things,
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: with a promise to the commission, that a month or two later, there will be an amendment

Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: for particular reasons, so we do not delay
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: the initial delivery
Jack: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and the rest of the information does go in this case, because it is a fairly big additional task.
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions talking place]
Jack: Ok, so, the next work area, we mention is tools, creating web pages, html, xml and voice xml, work package 3. [Pause] So, what are they [pause]?
[Annie whispers to Conwayne]
Jack: My guess is that they want us to [pause] to study other tools that create web pages for these three different types of languages. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Kenneth: I, again, my reading in part is to [pause] now we have moved on in this project, and they are assuming that we have a better idea of what this tool is going to do, what it is going to look like, and to some extent how it is going to work. And they are asking for especially, as we do not have to deliver a specification of the functional analysis and technical development till month 18. I think, in part what they are asking for, is an interim statement here, about what this tool looks like. They are asking for an update, to the work plan
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: what is, what is this design task actually going to do, because at the moment, it is a task outline in fairly general nature, and in part, I think some of the questions around the table have been, ok, what does this tool look like? What does it do? And I think we need, both from the consortium's point of view, but also what they are asking for is, let us have some update on that. How is it [pause] are we talking about [pause] an integrated tool that is going to work in html, xml, voice xml. How does that then relate to, we are not going to re-design um, a web-authoring tool, from scratch? Where does it all relate? What is, what is the work that is going to be encompassed in this? [Pause]
[Own discussions taking place]
Paul: Kenneth,
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: to clarify what you just said, are you, you were just talking about the web authoring tool, and any ordinary production of web pages, and not just e-learning applications.
Kenneth: I, I am simply talking about, where we talked about work package 3, tool developments
Paul: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: what, at this stage, this far into the project, this work package is meant to start in month 3, and there has been 6 months worth of work in this work package, and [pause] we should be in a state now, where we should be more clear, and the generalised description for work package 3 at the moment, as to what this tool is going to be doing. [Pause] and that I believe, is what they are probably asking for, because at the moment, there is a huge generalized statement, and task 3.4, talked about extraction of the plug in functionality, which are to integrated in the
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: design tool, and a list of 6 things, including a grammar editor What do we mean by a grammar editor?
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: We should, my feeling is this, at this stage we should be having an initial stab at effectively doing 3.1
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: the functional and technical analysis of this tool
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: we are due to be delivering the prototype fairly soon. Um [pause] we should be able to, that is what seems to be missing here, that definition. And that seems, and when they said a more up to date work plan, that is the layer
Paul: But does that not mean we have to try and identify and classify a certain number of
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: events, and how the tool can react to those?
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: That seems to be a preliminary version of deliverable 3.1. Functional analysis and technical design of the tool
Kenneth: yes. But surely after this point
Annie: yes
Kenneth: we ought to be in a stage where we can talk about that. My feeling is that at least that addresses the point that they are making. And the point that they are making is quite wide. But, if we are going to talk about an up to date workplan, surely it is that information, that we have now developed, over the last 6/9 months, we should now be able to fill out that, as a more clear work plan. And I think, as you say, it will not only help the [pause] the commission, it will also help the consortium, for us all to understand. And some of the discussion that we have had today would be addressed by that. And, I would be very interested to hear your plans at the moment to what that looks like. Which is what I had hoped to hear this morning when you were introducing work package 3.
[Geoff, Annie, Conwayne and Jack have a brief discussion]
[Other individual discussions taking place as well]
Annie: Kenneth, just looking at your issue, um [pause] what we intend to do, is to still analyse the functionality of the tool, and right now, not to [pause] say here, right now, what that functionality is going to have, because that is going to be developed in the next months, to fulfil the requirements.
[Can hear whispering, big Christopher and Jack]
Annie: But, what we can do is to try and circulate a document, that has a list of functionality, that we have thought about up to this moment.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: that will be fine, and to have all the comments of the users
Someone: mhhm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: You are going to have to address, somewhere along the line, of what [pause] a, linked with work package 2, how are we going to deal with
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: the input as well, and I think that is another important question here, input and output. Um, plus also, is that integration? And, we know from other projects that the integration in voice element, in what is otherwise a spatially arranged screen page, is quite a difficult concept in some ways. How do we do that? How do we build those web pages and how are we going to address that in this whole thing? It is not just the elements, which I think is
Annie: Is that how you are going to design the page?
Kenneth: But how is the tool going to help us design the whole page?
Annie: the web authoring tool?
Kenneth: and thereby integrate voice xml, into a html type of page.
Annie: mhhm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: and um, voice xml was originally designed as a language, which sat on its own
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: we are actually suggesting to turn it into an integrated language, and html or xml page
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: how are we going to do that? What is the process by which we are going to do that? What are the tasks? So, what I am saying in part, is that the tasks which are listed, don't

[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: recognise, some of the questions around voice recognition and the grammar building after that. They do not recognise necccesariliy, the integration of voice xml into a non xml page.
Tape 5
Kenneth: and in work package 3, there is a clearer plan, backed up with a Gantt chart, which will give us the timescale for the various elements, in order so we can see that progress and how it is going to go. At the moment, my belief is that is what they are asking for, and that is updating the work plan in work package 3. We need, I accept what you are saying, we are not ready there. But, what they are saying in part, is that you have put a lot of effort in, and you should be able reflect in part of that in building this [pause] part of the work plan
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: And certainly from the rest of our point of view, we need, we need to understand that, and potentially we can help you, the more we can [pause] see, the more we can help to move that forwards.
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: So, you are not guessing now, and know exactly what elements were
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: detailed functions we will have and more general view of what general functions
Kenneth: yeah, we have said around this table, that we will not be re-developing a web-authoring tool from scratch
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: so, what are we doing? Because if you look at what is promised in work package 3, and the first 5 objectives, they are huge.
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: we have to address those. At the moment, there is no plan behind it to really say I am going to address them. So, there is an enormous amount of functionality, which we have already promised. [Pause] and I am not sure how we are going to address that, and how are, if we are not going to design a web authoring tool from scratch what are we going to do?
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: in order to achieve those objectives. And, I think we need to be spelling this out a bit more clearly
Jack:uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: because this is not, it is not clear to be how it is, and my feeling is that it is partly what they are saying. That, there is a huge promise in here, but how are we going to meet it.
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: but was that not the objective from the outset that we were going to create a web-authoring tool from scratch. Because, I mean we do not have the copyright, the source code to any of the web authoring tools that we could simply build on. So, from what I understand, there is actually a necessity, to build a web-authoring tool from scratch. Or am I wrong?
[Own discussions are taking place]
Annie: Well, we definitely said that we are going to do a web-authoring tool. But it is not going to be a web-authoring tool, [pause] that will be able to do as many things that dream weaver can. It is going to be a web-authoring tool that will enable the developer to make the web page with accessibility features, using voice. But it is not going to have as much functionality as a [pause] a web-authoring tool that is already in the market. At least what we understand. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Well, we need to begin to define, what it is what we are going to do, and what we are not going to do, because at the moment, if you produce say a cut down authoring tool, that does not do, everything that dreamweaver does, is there a market for it? Is it of any interest to someone if it does not do everything? Um, again, it is not a question, I am not trying to create problems, but it is the reality, of the thing, that we are suggesting, that we are producing a web authoring tool, which is going to be interesting and usable in the market place. Um, and yet, at the same time, it is not going to do, so what is it going to do, that the market is not already demanding?
[Annie, Conwayne and Jack have their own discussion]
[Others having their own discussions as well]
Annie: Kenneth, so, we promised the commission, a web authoring tool, do you suggest we change the
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: that we change our goal
Kenneth: I am not saying that we change our goal. We need to define what we mean by a web-authoring tool. We have also promised that the tool is going to be a marketable proposition, and that it will meet, not only meet, but create a new level of standard, it is going to be able to look at accessibility in a very side sense. It is going to do all sorts of things, we need to be clear of what we mean by that. At this stage, if we cannot be clear on that, I do not think, this project is in bit of a problem, because we are a third of the way through the project, and we need to define that scope and what it is that it can and cannot do. Um, [pause], I am just trying to reflect, all the things that we have promised, and some of the things ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: we promised in the business plan, seems to be widening the scope of this.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: and the reviewers have picked up on the e-business applications, so that is another huge area, that reviewers think are there. What are we going to do, and what are we not? The difficulty, we have got, is if you look at all the promises in the work plan, and ones which reviewers have picked up, I would suggest that [pause] that we have got a, a demand on us that we cannot possibly meet.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: now we need to define what part of that demand, are we going to meet
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and check with the commission, are going to accept that are a reasonable response to this project, because that in the end, why I am stressing this here, is that the new annex for this contract is what we will be judged against for this project at the end of the project, and we will not have another chance to alter the annex. So, we need to at this stage, agree with the commission that this is what we are going to deliver
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: um, [pause] at the moment our promises and capabilities, seem to be [pause]] quite a long way apart
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and I would like to see, the discussion that has gone around the table today, suggests to me, that there are [pause] very significant differences between what people around this table believe that this project is going to deliver. All I am asking for, this is a really good opportunity for us, once and for all, to say in work package 3, what does this tool look like, and really at this stage in the project we should be able to say that. Not down to the detail of D3.1, but at least an outline detail, for us all, to feel confident that we have a project which is the deliverable.
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: Can I, just one point. I would like to, recall and go back, and think the way out, in opinion, is that we were very near to a practical proposal. A practical proposal, in my opinion, seems to be, the possible way out, has been offered by Paul, by Paul, one hour, more or less ago.
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: to skip all those problems of screenreaders, and to go directly on existing authoring tools, and to put the [pause] project tool amongst one of those. Is that correct Paul?
Paul: That is the reason, I tried to give, to make it screenreader independent, yes. But, if that is possible. But that should mean, that we need to know more about what you, about the people, that those in work package 3, that we know what you have in mind. Um [pause] with the authoring tool, and what you want. Because, at least, I, this morning did not get a very concrete idea of what you were on about. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: that is my question, because I expect something, when you say the authoring tool does not have the functionality
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: of a screenreader, I expect an authoring tool, more doing content and the means to create text, headers, format text, and bold, but that's all
Someone: mhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I could suggest two examples to integrate the authoring tool into content management systems.
Morris: what?
Desmond: A content management system. That means a way out if given for, and the content can be edited by different users in a network. It is not our

thing to give rights to users, but, if we just care for content, [pause] of our web pages, I think we could manage this thing. [Pause] And some content management systems, for example Redoor, can output already the default voice xml pages. Just a practical suggestion. [Pause]
Charles: just one quick remark, I am going to suggest, that we should not work screenreader independent by making something do, an existing authoring tool, but why would a new authoring tool not be screenreader independent.Paul: I did not say that ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Charles: ah ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: A new authoring tool, definitely should be screenreader independent. [Pause] but as I was saying before, we would need to know in more detail, what is the scope of this authoring tool. What do the developers of this authoring tool, actually have in mind. What do they want? What do they want to produce? [Pause]
[Own discussions taking place]
Charles: we distributed a requirement document to clarify part of that. Um [pause] and received input from partner 3 [pause]
[Own discussions taking place]
Annie: what I would like to say is that in general the developer
Someone: shh
Annie: the [pause] for the web authoring tool, is to make a web authoring tool, that allows the developer of web pages, to follow, and to help him build pages, that help him to follow the pages, and the WAI and also that also integrates voice on your pages. That is what we have in mind at least, but if you have something different, that you have in mind, so can say it now.
[Own discussions taking place]
Annie: That, I cannot tell you now, I can tell you a document with all the functionality, if you want that we tend to implement to do that. And we would, yes, we would welcome the comments from all of the partners on that document. And we will circulate that document.
Kenneth: I think that would be a very helpful way forward ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: also, you need to somehow summarize that into the workplan
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: for work package 3
Annie: yes, we will do that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: right. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Fabian nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that back in that a timescale for that development
Annie: yes, yes, we already have a workplan, and we can give that as well. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: at the moment, when can we have that?
Annie: the work plan?
Kenneth: well
Annie: you can have the workplan, we already have the work plan, you can have this tomorrow. But, the other document, maybe next week, by the end of next week
Kenneth: so, you have a sample, a replacement for work package 3 already produced?
Annie: sorry?
Kenneth: you have got the text, some new text for work package 3, produced?
Annie: no we are going to produce it ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: it is a Gantt diagram
Annie: ahh
Mary: it is a planification of all the tasks that we have to do in order to
Kenneth: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: integrated functionalities
Jack: yep***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: that will be in a different document, yes.
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: So, the third issue, the third work area, is e-learning through interactive web pages, work package 1.
[Fabian and Conwayne are still talking]
Jack: and work package 4. So, this is, I think this is, I think is linked to the comments by Kenneth, how interaction will help in e-learning and how we can address this
Mary: mhhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: our solution
Mary: yeah. [Pause]. Can I say something in relation to this point? I think this is quite different to what has originally been specified for work package 4. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Mary can you speak up a little?
Mary: Yeah, sure. I just started by saying that what the commission has picked out from our report, is quite different to what we originally proposed to do in work package 4, which is the e-learning portal. Because we did not really talk about, interactivity ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: in the original objective, so, probably, we need to justify why we made the change, because that is clear, we decided to introduce that change based on the problems that came during the evaluations of the existing e-learning courses. And now, I think we have to decide how we are going to implement this change. And probably, the tasks which have been specified in work package 4, need to be clarified at this stage.
Jack: uh-huh. Yes, because in the very beginning, work package 4, was spent just as a demo***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: instead of a actual [pause] part of the
Mary: yeah
Jack: investigation
Mary: yeah, exactly. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and the research
Mary: and the other thing that came in, [pause] came up, up in the discussions that we have had today, is that perhaps different partners have different understanding of what an e-learning portal is, and what the project e-learning portal should be. For example, what was demonstrated by Adam and our French partners is exactly what an e-learning portal is. It basically gives a gateway, gate or gateway to existing um
Jack: of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: existing e-learning tools, and information that they are
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and it is similar to the original objectives
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and now, the commission has picked up the change, that we would now like to make um, um [pause] to demonstrate how voice input and voice output can solve the problems with interactivity in e-learning. So, we need to decide, as to, how we are going to implement that, and what we started doing already are the examples, of the solutions. But, I feel that, we need a bit more systematic way of addressing that. And I think Geoff, mentioned something in one of his emails, about writing scenario's of interactivity or something like this, and this is one way of doing this in a little bit more systematic way. Because, what worries me, is at the end of next month, we have to have a specification of the project portal as part of task 1.2 and we really need to define the scope of the portal. And, the functionality, and the specifications, and the objectives, that it is going to address. And, we need to have this in a month and a half time. [Pause]
Jack: and what do you have in mind [pause] about an e-learning portal?
Mary: um, well [pause] we have to really consider how much time and resources we have. And, I think
Kenneth, discussed that, we do not really have that much expertise to develop a complete training course at the beginning, from the beginning. And the

other suggestion was to modify, as [pause] as our partners from Italy suggested, to pick an existing course, and to re-design some of it, in order to, [pause] resolve or introduce, or resolve some of the problems which are being encountered, in terms of interactivity
[Jack tries to speak]
Mary: But, again, it needs to be done in a more systematic way, rather than just random pages here and there.
Jack: So, actually, the portal is still, the portal is a gateway of courses, but instead of normal courses, to develop one example or two courses
[Mary tries to speak]
Jack: specially develop, with voice in a voice interaction, interactivity [pause] stressing the interactivity, [pause] more or less the feature, still to have e-learning portal, that is the gateway, and to have a course of different courses.
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and one or two, and these courses are specially developed with voice
Mary: well, [pause] they are quite different things. The e-learning portal and the interactive e-learning material. [Pause] so I am not sure if it is feasible to target both.
Kenneth, well, [pause], I think we have got, we have got a problem, in terms of the reviewer's comments. Whereas, [pause] we had mentioned almost in passing, about some e-learning content, and we have offered the project manual training material What they, what the reviewers picked up in three places, is what, the bit we have looked at, e-learning through interactive web pages, in section 6 talking about an industry standard for e-learning document mark up. [Pause] An in section 7, talking about specifications with voice assistive accessible e-learning authoring tools. Now, [pause] what they are, what they are pushing us towards, is actually [pause] is having a very much more focussed act of learning
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: rather than a portal to learning materials. Well, that, well [pause] again, we need to address this. Are we prepared to accept that change of focus that the commission, are trying to force down, and from which they picked up pointers from some of which we have delivered. Or, [pause] or, if we are going to accept that as a change focus and how we are going to deal with it?
[Fabian, Mary, and Erin nod] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 people provides the evidences)***
Kenneth: because it does, [pause] to talk about specifications and voice accessible e-learning, is not going to be simply doing one training manual. We are going to have to do quite a lot of work in that area, to understand what makes good learning, and how how do you actually mark that up. It is not a trivial task. So, we need to address it. Is it, [pause] is it e-learning through interactive web pages. Is it actually something, we are going to pick up on. We picked up in part, on work package 1, are we really going to pick up in work package 4, and really do something about it. Or, are we going to have to go back to the commission, and say you are shifting this project, and um [pause] you are shifting it way beyond the resources of the project that we have actually got. Now [pause] I just hope the decision of the consortium is which is it that we are going to take
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: because, [pause] some I would be somewhat concerned, to go up the route, of taking on [pause] e-learning and specifications of
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: um [pause] voice assisted e-learning, in terms of
[Can hear clicking in the background]
Kenneth: task to do, because I do not think that we have got the resources to do it. But, [pause] that is a discussion that we need to have with the project officer, at some point. There is some [pause] there is a bit of a problem here, so far as possibly, the reviewers have not picked up, from the original annex, because it is not there. But. They have picked it up from somewhere, and that means we need to go back to some our our documents that we have delivered to them, and what is it that they were reviewing that mentioned IMS, and what did we actually say. Because if we have gone [pause], having looked at the documents I have with me, I cannot find any mention of IMS at all. [Pause] it must be somewhere because the reviewers have picked it up. What we say, [pause] and have we actually promised something, that we are now actually going to regret.
[can hear whispering]
[own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: I remember this was one of my concerns after having read, the first version, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but, but the reviewers have said, the project hints at the IMS activities, and that this needs to be taken further. Now the reviewers comment is that this work needs to be taken. Now are the commission going to accept that at face value and say, [pause] therefore that is what you are going to have to do, if you want the rest of this contract. Or, can we successfully say that this is really outside the scope of this contract as it stood. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: It is written somewhere, that contents should be provided, I remember it, very, very clearly
Paul: but, [pause] I do not think the comments, at any point, produce an e-learning mark-up ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: uh-huh***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: because that would mean, creating a whole set of specifications
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: similar to [pause] I do not know, [pause] many other standards, like
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: like what the WAI people did, with their web accessibility guidelines. And that is way over our head, and that would be a mammoth task, we cannot do it. I think that,
Ronnie: I agree ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: I do not get, [pause] I do not find, [pause] the point in looking through our documentation, and briefly where we promised that. So, I do not really know. I fully agree with you Kenneth, I do not know where the reviewers got that from. ***(Sub-states 2-1 and 1.1)***
Kenneth: all I am saying, at this point, it is where we have to address the comments
Paul: yeah, right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: otherwise, we get, if we do not address them, they will think we are accepting them
Paul: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yeah, but, it looks like ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: So, it looks like we have to say yes, or no, one answers,
Kenneth: we have to go back
Fabian: of course, of course
Kenneth: to the project officer
Fabian: of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and say that this is beyond the scope.
[Christopher, Fabian and Conwayne nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 people)***
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: yeah that's it ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: He may turn around and say, [pause] if you think it is something, which is beyond scope, we are not going to award you the rest of the contract. But, [pause] but we have to be clear, on the basis of which were are going forward to this new part of the contract
Fabian: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and it was not, it was a debate we were denied at the original negotiation, because they said that they were going to fast track the negotiation
[Paul, Fabian and Desmond nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 people)***
Kenneth: and accept the technical annex more or less as it stood. They still argued, about it, but they did not make as many changes to that, as we would have expected, them to, as the negotiation. And part of that outcome, is that is, that negotiation is happening now, and this is a statement from the commission, as to what they expect. We have a right to go back, and say, that is not we expect to give you
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: um [pause] and negotiate, but we must negotiate, we cannot ignore
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some others say yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but, this is clear that, that all the partners agree that, we cannot take this point and go ahead
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: with creating an industry standard for e-learning?

Kenneth: but, what is it we are going to do, in terms of that original request in terms of section 4
Jack: oh ok
Kenneth: e-learning through interactive web pages
Jack: ah
Kenneth: what is it, we are going to do, in work package 4, with respect to that. And we cannot say no to it all, so we have to respond to some of it possibly
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Mary puts her hand up]
Mary: can I mention something, probably in response to what Kenneth just said. What, I am planning to do tomorrow, I did some research on the pedagogic value of interactivity, including interactivity in online learning, and e-learning materials, and I am going to present some of the results tomorrow, if the consortium thinks that would be of interest to everyone that is here at the moment, But, basically there are different types of interactivity, and if we are going to address this third point in section 4, what we will need to create is perhaps examples of how different types, and levels of interactivity can be addressed, using voice technology, and voice xml. And, as Paul just mentioned that will include, involve creating scenarios, e-learning scenario's, or implementing existing ones
Jack: mhhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, and now we have to decide, whether we have the resources and whether that is feasible to do.
[Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: In fact, what I think we can assume, we can do with e-learning is, more or less identify problems of users, in e-learning context, that is what you are doing
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and to offer solutions to that problems
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and beyond that, [pause] I do not think we can, we can offer that to them, we are identifying things
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: we are, working on our solutions and this are our solutions
Mary: mhhm hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but these are not [pause] creating a whole theory about
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: e-learning
Mary: yeah, or standard. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, we can do this ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: well concept demonstration, which is demonstrating the [pause] capabilities of voice to introduce, this interaction, yeah, okay. But if we are going to take this through, I think we need to be very clear, as to, how the portal, [pause] stands above, what screenreaders can do at the moment.
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: we need to be very clear, with the advantages of using the [pause] the plug in, and we need to, we need to specify that quite soon. Yeah, and one of the things that can potentially provide a huge benefit, of using the [pause] plug-in over the screenreader, or most of the screenreader, is the voice input
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: So, I do not know if you can produce any demo's of that? That would be clearly something a screenreader, as far as I am aware, a screenreaders do not provide at the moment.
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]

Closing for day one of the meeting

Jack: Ok, I think we can stop here, for today. I would like to remind you, that tomorrow we have the Cynthia's explanation, demo, after coffee break in the morning, Mary, will talk about work package 1, and [pause] including [pause] presentation by Charles, [pause] about this work
Mary: and Erin as well
Jack: and Erin
Mary: and Erin
Jack: ah Erin ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: she is also presenting the report,
Jack: great. Um, [pause] before lunch, we will have the start of work package 5,
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: after lunch
Jack: On Tuesday, [pause] Hazel, was it Tuesday
Mary: mhhm –hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or Wednesday, she sent [pause] she sent an [pause] a preliminary work plan for that work package. I do not know if you
Lucy: it did not have the attached document ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: No, because, [pause] we can produce it ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: we could rename it
Jack: yes, it was a doc or RTF, but [pause] I can, I can gives copies
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I do not know 5-6 copies,
Ronnie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: because we will, I am sure we will work on that document.
[Mary puts her hand up]
Jack: Mary ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: can I just ask, our German partners, whether it is possible, because we will be reviewing, [pause] the work which has been done in work package 1, and I am aware that you have done a considerable amount of review of [pause] of the voice protocols, and screenreaders as well, is that correct?
Paul: say it again.
Mary: um [pause] in what Hazel, has given to me, it is clear that you have done a review of existing screenreading technologies.
Paul: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: would it be possible for you to briefly present the main outcomes of the {pause] the review, your research so far?
Paul: but Desmond did that already in London ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Desmond: I did that already in London ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Mary: oh ok, alright, you have not produced an extension of that since the ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: No, because, that pretty much summarizes what the findings are to date. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: right, ok, ok, that is ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: if you need some further clarification, we can certainly try and you know [pause] get together along those lines
Mary: no, because, I saw in the quarterly report that the review has been extended to look at other technologies, yep, we can talk about this at the end, it

is ok. ***(Sub-states 2.1 and 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: thank you
Lucy: thank you Jack.
[Meeting closed at 6.56 PM, and partners started getting ready to leave the meeting]

Atendees: Adam, Thomas, Morris, Ronnie, Lucy, Annie, Conwayne, Christopher, Geoff, James, Jack, Fabian, Charles, Mary, Erin, Kenneth, Morris, Translator for Michael, Mavis, Kevin, Paul and Desmond
Absent: Hazel and Elsie

Presentation on work package 1

[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Today we are going to produce a presentation on work package 1, and because Hazel could not here today, so, [pause] I will try to take her place in a way, and chair the two sessions. What, [pause] we have three speakers who will present some of the work which has been done since the Paris meeting, on work package 1. Um [pause] Erin, from the partner 3, will start, followed by presenting the work and evaluating existing web authoring tools. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Evaluation was done on the accessibility of the tools and accessibility of the mark up for the tools. Charles, will be presenting the requirements for
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: designing our web authoring tools, which is being distributed a month ago
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and then I will be [pause] the final research, the results from the evaluation
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: that we conducted from the current e-learning tools. And after that I would like to spend the most of this morning's session, discussing the two deliverables that we need to produce. [Pause] as part of work package 1. I am not sure if you received e-mail from Hazel; um [pause] sent a couple of days ago. I contained two documents. One was an outline of the main deliverable we need to produce. And, I would like to spend some time discussing that, this morning. And, now I will hand over to Erin.
Erin: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Erin does not use any slides for the presentation]
Erin: Hi, I have carrying out some research, looking at both the accessibility and usability, of a selected number of web authoring tools, [pause] and um, the initial draft, we tired not to include the names of the tools, as we were going to draft, wherever possible. The initial draft mainly focussed on both the accessibility of the mark up [pause] produced by the tools and the accessibility of the tools themselves. [Pause] Since the draft has been circulated, we have had feedback and recommendations from other colleagues, and as a result of the feedback, we have had suggestions, that the report should be broken down further. That we should have one report, which is specifically focussing on the accessibility of the web authoring tools, and for example, looking at how the tools can be accessed by using the magnification of screenreader users. And, now the main purpose of this investigation was to identify the common usability, accessibility problems produced by these tools. This is so these problems can be addressed and solutions implemented to prevent these from happening for new authoring tools for project. [Pause] Um
Ronnie: I am sorry, can I [pause] ask you, please, since English, is not our, our [pause] mother tongue, we have problems with understanding and translation. And, I would like to ask, you to please, to speak as clearly as possible, um [pause] to, to help us, a little bit
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: otherwise we loose, a bit of what you said.
Erin: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: slow it down a little.
Erin: um, so, from, so since, I have circulated the report, [pause] from the last few weeks, we have had feedback from the commission, and have been working on the report, looking at the accessibility of the mark-up produced by various, web authoring tools. And, we have looked at seven tools in total, and this includes, web authoring tools, such as Dreamweaver, HotMetal Pro, FrontPage, Aracnophilia, [pause] and also looked at the W3C tool, and Mary [pause]. From the findings so far, [pause] we were quite surprised that the tools which we had initially expected to be very accessible, to adapt, to be least possible
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: to blind and visually impaired people. And, that was partly because, different tools being developed, they [pause] have not followed the guidelines
[Ronnie whispers something to Lucy]
Erin: for the authoring tools by W3C.
[Pause]
Erin: so, for, for example, when we looked at, when Mary, looked at, [pause] as this tool was developed by the W3C, we automatically assumed that it would be fairly accessible
[Can hear whispering]
Someone: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and when we looked into it, with Screenreaders and Jaws, we found that we could not even do the most simplest of functions, and use the short cut keys such as alt and F to open up the files
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and again, this was the same for the very latest version of Aracnophillia,
Paul: that is interesting
Erin: And, in version 5, [pause] we looked at other tools, such as Dreamweaver, and Hotmetal Pro
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and we found that we could access, various file menus from the screenreaders.
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: But we found that we were limited with what we could do with a screenreader. So, for example we could access most of the basic functions, and the source code. But, when the changes to [pause] changed to a different view, for example, the What you see is what you get view, we found that the screenreaders, with Jaws it was not possible to use the right mouse
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and you could not click, to access the pop up menus and carry out certain functions. So, again [pause] with the project it would be very useful if the guidelines of what view the user was in, for example the source code, or what you see is what you get view
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: it would be really, ideally, it would be nice, if the screenreader could access everything
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and pop up windows, [pause]. And we also found that Jaws went about creating tasks, so for example we found [pause] the tool Arachnophilia encouraged users to use wizards, and which were fairly accessible to the screenreader Jaws. {Pause] Um, so for example if you wanted to create a table
Paul: in version 5 as well?
Erin: version 5, not, just version 4
[Some people in the background say yeah] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: version 5 is completely inaccessible
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Erin: part of the reason why version 5 is inaccessible, is that it was developed in [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: Java and the developers have not followed the conventions for accessibility, when implementing Java. [Pause] And we have to download the

run time environment for Java, to get the tool to work. But, but, we have found in general, that the features were quite useful, and the wizards, prompted the user, to maybe set the table as a percentage, which can be quite helpful at times. As, this is, at times can be quite useful to take the table as a percent, rather than fixed, and then different users will have a different sized screen, and screen to fit different resolutions. WE also found one tool, Hotmetal pro, [pause] if you, if you look at the features from the dialogue box, [pause] it was by far the best we had seen so far
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: because you had the header search element, and to access various features which can improve the accessibility of the web page, which is produced. [Can hear whispering]
Erin: and I think this is the only tool, which went into quite a lot of detail, to help the user, for an accessible web page. For example if you were looking at help, you could select the help, and explain to you, why the Alt Tab and image, by long description is needed
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: A lot, of the other tools fail with the help facility, [pause] as help does not contain enough information on how to create accessible web pages.
[Fabian and James are whispering to each other]
Erin: so, for example
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: [pause] they had some help but it was very basic, for creating accessible web pages. There is a lot more which could be done to help the user We also found quite a lot of tools, [pause] had plug ins, to help the user create fairly accessible web pages, but they, [pause] the plug ins, were not part of the natural integration of the tool. Therefore, you had to be aware that you had to download the tools to check the plug in, to check the basic level of both accessibility, and [pause] usability. And
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: again, again, the user had choices, there were so many different plug ins with the tools
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: So, for example with Dreamweaver, [pause] we found that 13 different plug ins to help check web pages for example, as a possibility alone
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and the list has shown it to be quite useful to encourage the user and to explain the user how to check the mark up and the errors, for them to be updated
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: But we found in general, that it is better, [pause] for the check to be built in as part of the tool. We also found, that Hotmetal pro, had its own built in accessibility checker, and again, it was to increase performance levels, and not priority 1, priority 3
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: [pause] and again it would be very useful, for the new tool, for project, to include built in checkers, as well as built in syntax checkers, as we found that [pause] the syntax can also affect the accessibility of the web page. So, say for example that you have got web pages written up where you do not have the body tags in the right places, and the form tags in the right places Um, this will affect the screenreader, [pause] so, it is important to check through the mark up
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: to make sure that the mark up is in the correct place.
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: And again, that is how web pages are displayed. And we found that
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: most tools already have a syntax checker built in. We found that in general, with all these things, built into the tool, that Jaws, did not go far enough for accessibility, and usability, [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: for the integration of web pages. [Pause] and um, as part of the report, we have given suggestions of how to, [pause] of things that we should think about, for the new tool, for the project
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: we have gone into quite a lot of detail, with help system to include, for both accessible and usable web pages.
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: um [pause] also, [pause] also the help system can explain to the user the web portal tool. And again, some tools
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: it was very easy to customise the tools, but in others it was difficult to find how to customise
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and quite often, when you went to customise the tool, you could only, maybe change the colour of the text, but not the size of the text. [Pause] Because, if you change the size too large, [pause] it would through out, and of the project web screen, which made it fairly inaccessible.
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: So, again
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: with the project [pause] we can test various [pause] colours and text sizes to make sure that they can fit on the screen. [Pause] Are there any questions at all? For any of the research we have been looking at?
Morris: It is very clear. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place whilst Charles prepares for his presentation. He uses slides during his presentation]
Charles: I am going to briefly present the requirements for the authoring tool.
Desmond: Charles, sorry, can you please enlarge the font
Charles: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charles changes the size of the font on his computer]
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: thanks a lot
Charles: Is that enough, or
Desmond: No, its ok, its ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: For the project authoring tool, it should be designed with accessibility in mind, from the very beginning, which is the thing that is distinguishable from existing web authoring tools. [Pause] with accessibility of the tool itself, in terms of the way of content accessibility guidelines, and also accessibility of the pages that it produces. [Pause] So, the functionality related to the accessibility, [pause] should be naturally integrated into the look and feel [pause] and it should encourage the use of accessibility features, instead of making the
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: pages on its own. [Pause] I also thought that we should emphasise [pause] so things like that can be found in FrontPage for instance, maybe missing from project in the first version.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: you have to bear in mind that dreamweaver and other such tools [pause] that have 3,4,5 versions before what they are now. [Pause] And the requirements in several categories, functional requirements, usability requirements like performance requirements, [pause] and not all of these are equally relevant, and [pause] an um,
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: I have also tried to prioritise this list [pause] and um [pause] the priorities I used were used by the web accessibility initiative [pause] and priority 1 means that the checkpoint or requirement is essential to meeting the goal. Priority 2 is that it is important to meeting the goals. Priority 3 is

that the checkpoint is beneficial to the goals. [Pause] um, the project is developing accessible web pages, and um, the mechanism should be proven and easy to drive
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: um [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: it should also integrate voice web pages, and [pause] and to cross evaluate the accessibility of existing web pages, um [pause] and should adapt existing voice pages, to um, web accessibility guidelines. [Pause] and to help authors create and edit voice grammars for voice recognition. [Pause] um, to help authors to create and edit voice xml files. [Pause] help authors to create and edit cascading stylesheets. Also, to validate voice xml, and although we should realise that, the kind of voice xml that we need that [pause] to work with Compalabras, is only a subset of all voice xml specifications.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: It should also validate, html 3.2 and html 4.2.1
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and also some versions of h-html, and [pause] to provide authors the choice of colour palettes, to make it easier [pause] to select the web site colour or browser setting colour. [Pause] and um, also allow authors to check images, and colour blindness [pause], which means how the image would look like to a colour blind person
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and there is also a requirement, to [pause] to check the volume buttons. I am not sure, [pause] if we will be able to realize this.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and also to provide templates for different types of web pages. [Pause] Such types could be html pages, pages to forms, pages with voice, and also to be used with e-learning applications.
[Pause]
Charles: It can also be useful, to enable the tool to let the user, have presentation markers, and this can be to stylesheets [pause]
[Paul laughs]
Charles: um, [pause] it was also a requirement to provide a web certificate for pages, and for design with the project. [Pause] This will need to be designed to see how it conforms to projects needs. [Pause] um, it should also offer different views, high priority, source view, high priority, and tags own view.
[Christopher whispers something to Annie]
Charles: and the others view it structured view, which is similar to Mary's
[Can hear whispering]
[Christopher and Fabian whispering]
Charles: and after the functional requirements, you have the usability requirements. Um, a simple tool to review the accessibility guidelines, [pause] and um [pause] and database elements should be easy to understand
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and help should be complete
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and the accessibility support should be well documented, to help [pause. And the help system should be available in several different European languages, [pause] and um [pause] error messages should explain how to recover from the error
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and to provide a link. And it should be available for multiple platforms. You should also ask for confirmations.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: The tool should also be customizable to speech, for user needs, suggests the language of the users, and disabilities of the user. It should also be suitable for
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: experienced and inexperienced developers. [Pause] um, all functions of the tool, should be accessible with the keyboard
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and it should also be accessible using voice
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and also short cuts, it must agree with common short cuts used by software such as Screenreaders. Um [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: I do not think we have a list of common short cuts that would be interested
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: part of the requirements, the usability requirements will help the system. The help system should have an extended base to help users, through the help, and to allow users to search through the contents of the help. And also to be very interesting to see if the help is context sensitive, and to explain how to achieve common tasks. [Pause] And of course, to include all features that
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: promote reflection of accessible contents. [Pause]
Desmond: I have a comment,
Charles: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I just missed [pause] the keywords, when I use a help system and I am searching
Charles: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: for something, and very often, missing the right keywords
[James whispers something to Fabian]
Desmond: I am trying in the right keyword, and nothing is happening, there is no help function for the keyword, which is written already in the program
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and [pause] I think this should be an item in the help function, to provide keywords, for search functions
Charles: you mentioned that the user should be able to search, is that what you mean?
Desmond: like a search
Charles: when I say search
Desmond: like there is a catalogue, an index
Paul: keywords
Charles: ah, you mean an index?
Desmond: an index of keywords, yes, this should be very well done, because, very often, important keywords are missing from the help functions. I think it should be a feature ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: uh-huh. [Pause] another part of the tool would be a tutorial, this tutorial would be an example of how to create accessible web pages. [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and also link it to other tutorials in the web. [Pause]
Paul: In what form do you expect this tutorial to be presented? [Pause] as a help system or additional audio file, or taped tutorial or what?
Charles: um [pause] well, at this moment
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: I know at this moment, it is just a requirement, but what sort of
[Can hear whispering]

Paul: tutorial do you visit? [Pause]
Charles: At this moment, I only had
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: [pause] as you can access by file, help menu
Someone: ahh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: also prompt users to allow users to mark up, and [pause].
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: the tool also does not comply to relevant specifications, unless you are working in a html document. That is certain elements of text
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: The browser can also prompt the author to, [pause] for [pause] for using [pause] for not compatible web browsers.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: another interesting feature is checking links. Um [pause]
Paul: what do you mean by that?
Charles: um, I [pause] I have not really [gives a small laugh] [pause] provided, [pause] it could mean two things. Checking links, the document in site, that you are opening, local links
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: On the other hand, it could mean checking links to external sites. [Pause]
[Kenneth whispers something to Erin]
Charles: Software systems also have to have liability requirements. This is relevant to this context, um [pause] performance requirements [pause] are relevant, that tools should start up quickly enough. [Pause] Supportability requirements are about maintainability, configurability, and to allow the user to plug in the syntactic and accessibility of web pages. [Pause] um, the help system should be available in several different languages, and [um] [pause] the rest are [pause] the rest is [pause] and there is also an implementation requirement
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: for the developers to worry about
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and the interface requirement is something that I added recently. [Pause] The tool should be able to use the keyboard, mouse, sound card, etc
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: if the tool is voice in and voice out, sound cards should be used. [Pause] As far as software, some users might find it interesting to be able to preview a web page in their standard browser, for instance Netscape.
[Geoff, Jack and James talk]
Charles: also packaging requirements, mean that the software will be distributed on CD-ROM
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and the written manual, [pause] and one column by [pause] partner 3 was that it should, what other software is necessary to work with the tool
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: Java run time environments, and the Java access bridge
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: as far as I know, can be distributed with the tool. [Pause] and um, I think this is [pause] I think this is the end of my presentation.
[Paul clicks his fingers]
James: Charles you have one question
Charles: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: I have two questions and a comment. First of all, you said packaging, that the tool should be accompanied by a written manual. I think you should add that a text-based manual should be presented on the CD-ROM
Charles: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and not just written manual. [Pause] and preferably a Braille or taped manual as well
Charles: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and second, question, the voice xml which s being produced by the tool, by the voice output, can you see this being handed over to the same speech API, which is [pause [for example screenreader would be using?
Charles: um [pause] speech output as far as I know know would be done by
[Christopher and Annie whisper to each other]
Charles: Compalabras. So, [pause] at this moment we would not use the speech synthesis on the screenreader.
Paul: and the comment,
[Geoff and Jack whisper]
Paul: I think you have laid down a nice array of requirements, but I was wondering if the developers can see themselves develop these, and it sounds to be, all of this is definitely important, and would be a really nice set of features in the tool. But, it also sounds like a lot of work
[Uh-huh said by several people in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: I would like [pause] thank you, your effort, Charles, and [pause] I believe that this document can be considered, a bit like a preliminary version of the requirements, which could be distributed or delivered to [pause] to the work package 3, the authoring tool, to analyse the technical, technically possibly to make [pause] to get the plan first. So, if all the user group is more or less agreed in this document, this document, this document, can be delivered to the technical group. I assume that [pause] all opinion of the national user organizations is reflected in this document.
[Erin raised her hand]
Erin: there is further research going on, as we have been doing more research since that document was produced. And [pause] so their will be a second version of that report when writing the web authoring tools report has been completed and finalised
James: yah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and maybe it is something to begin with
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and then to incorporate all the other features.
Someone: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: in case anyone needs to identify
[Can hear whispering]
[Kenneth raises his hand]
Kenneth: I think there is a need to identify an issue here, and I think, the [pause] that requirements document is very interesting, and it was interesting to see that [pause] a lot of the project specific components especially around voice, are listed as priority 2. Yet, in this project, since that is the prime objective of the project, it is, difficult to see how they can be priority 2 within the project. How can voice xml be an absolute essential, if we are going to deliver against the project objectives. Now, going back to our discussions of yesterday, and what we are going to say to the commission, with regards to work package 3, we need to have a very rapid response, at least the outline of that [pause] of those requirements
[Christopher and Annie whisper]
Kenneth: because that is going to set the plan for work package 3. Yesterday, our developers indicated, they had a Gantt chart for that development.

Um, I am still confused, that since, you are saying that we need to respond to this document, I am not sure how you can have a plan for development, on the basis of a Gantt chart. I feel that there is confusion here still, which we need to sort out as quickly as possible. Whereas, I agree it is now the right time for this document to be considered by the developers, this must happen in a very short timescale, because that is really setting up, the heart of this project, for much rest of the project. The development of this tool [pause] I look at that list, and I think, 10 years work, we have 18 months
Erin: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that [pause] the difference is so enormous, yes, as users that is what we require, but as this project is not going to deliver that lot, we need to be realistic somewhere along the lines, we have to come up with that realistic view, because that is what we are going to say to the commission that we are going to deliver, by the end of this project. And somewhere along this line, we are going to have to define that, quite clearly, if we are not going to be held random at the end of this project, um by the commission, saying um, these are all the user requirements, and you are not delivering against them.
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: So, we do, have to be very careful. I am stressing this point, because it is going to be the function of the new contract, [pause], which is going to have to be dealt with, in a very short time scale.
Annie: um, Kenneth, one point, um [pause] we had already considered Charles's document, as there has been some communication
Kenneth: hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: between Charles and us, so we made our Gantt diagram according to the previous version of this document.
Kenneth: can you not therefore, give us an earlier, some type of response to this document today, to tell us, what it is that you can deliver against this. If you have got as far as a Gantt chart, surely, you can tell us more than what you have told us so far, what are the plans for the development of this tool.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: Because. I am sorry, but what we heard yesterday, was so sketchy, we, I do think we need to know.
[Geoff tries to say something to Annie and Christopher]
[Own conversations taking place]
Paul: can I just
Kenneth: sorry
[Own discussions still continue]
Mary: Paul, did you want to make a comment?
[Own discussions still continue]
Paul: Jack
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Can I make a general comment?
Jack: yes, please ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: I [pause] I am sorry, but I get the feeling, from what is happening right now, and similar situations that happened yesterday, that even though the developers of the web authoring tool, for example have previously considered the list that you have come here, very much without a concept. I do not understand, what is happening. Why you are not reacting?
[Annie whispers something to her neighbour]
Paul: and I feel that wen authoring tools, are a very important part of the project, and can almost be called the heart of the project, and that you really should put more effort in trying to answer, what you are being asked. I really, I really do not understand this.
Charles: I do not understand, why no one responded to my first request for comments, on the requirements, because when I sent it out a month ago, it was already the second time. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: well the requirements are quite alright, they are substantial and [pause]
Charles: yes, but they also needed to be prioritized, so partner 3 prioritised this, but [pause] partner 3 were the only ones who responded to this.
[Own discussions taking place]

Getting ready for the coffee break

James: To Paul and the rest of the partners, I would to propose that we maintain this moment, [pause] the coffee break. More or less on time, five minutes before
[Can hear whispering]
James: and after that we can follow up, the discussion in the same point. Is that alright Paul?
Paul: if you say so ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
James: ok. Thank you ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
[People getting ready for the coffee break]

Discussion of issues emerging from presentation in work package 1

James: OK, we are going to follow up the meeting [pause] before, the presentation of Mary, regarding the evaluation of e-learning courses [pause] um, we are going to answer more or less, the issues discussed, before the coffee break. [Pause] I think it is important that we [pause] to be aware of what situation we are in at the moment, regarding the project project, and we have obtained the recommendation of the experts, to go to the follow up of our tasks. Also, we have to consider the initial scheduled plan [pause] and also we have to consider, [pause] the modified scheduled plans that we have to do, following the recommendation of the project officer for [pause] four or five months.
[Can hear whispering]
James: So, we have to consider of these aspects, [pause] when we offered communication to the [pause] to the commission. [Pause] let me review the most important issues originally work package 1, user requirements was expected to finish in September, and it was 12 months after its beginning. The document of Charles must be considered, as a very good approach, an initial approach to the user needs
[Can hear whispering]
James: following, the suggestion of Kenneth, it is necessary to analyse from the technical point of view these, can be developed or not. Also, it is important, the point of view of Paul, in which he showed that [pause] at the beginning these user requirements are good for, for the users. And [pause] the remaining point is if from the technical point of view if it is suitable, affordable or not. In that sense [pause] we believe that it is of course, to make a deeper analysis of this document, [pause] we have time for this, but in principle it is more or less in line with the initial expectations that we have for that. In this case, we believe that the technical and non technical work, carry out
[Can hear whispering]
James: for this initial month of the project, has been very successful. And, we have to take in mind, that if we take the green light from the commission, we will have time, up to the end of 2003. Much more time, we had up until now? Yeah? So, [pause] summarising, document for work package 1, good, very good. We have to analyse for the technical partners, in principle, if we detect that there is some requirements, which must be delayed or supressed according to the point of view of the user, we could make a proposal. I would like to think this this is the general answer of today from the consortium, I do not know if there are any additional questions or if it would be [pause] the time to follow up, with the presentation of Mary.
Kenneth: so
Paul: can you give us an idea of the timeframe?
James: shout
Paul: can you give us an idea of the timeframe? Of when to expect this proposal?
James: Regarding the initial, scheduled plan sent in April 2001
[Can hear whispering]

James: and modified in July, [pause] the task 3.1, the functional analysis and technical design of the tool
[Can hear whispering]
James: and this task must be finished for the 18month, April 2003. Of course, [pause] is, we, we are aware that this is a critical point at the moment, and we are going to offer a clear, [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
James: answer to the commission, following the suggestion of Kenneth. But at least, we have to analyse the document of Charles
[Can hear whispering]
James: and I do not know what time frame we need to analyse it, the document of Charles
Annie: a month at least.
James: sorry
Annie: a month
James: a month. In that situation, I would like to hear the point of view of the rest of the partners. Perhaps the best option would be to send to the commission, a user requirements document, indicating the global point at which the tool [pause] has to be focussed, without explaining [pause] up to what point the tool will be developed. I do not know if this can be suitable for the project? Kenneth what is your point of view? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: um, I find it complete unacceptable, so far as, to [pause] set up the new contract for 15 months work, without being able to say in some detail, what the tool will actually do, ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: and that is effectively what you are saying. And it seems to me, to be a completed open ended statement, and we will come back to that at our next meeting, and
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: have exactly the same set of discussions again. We are in a position, where we have done 9 months work and still we are not getting anything beyond a very generalised statement that we can do
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: most of what the users require
James: ok, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: why can't you be more specific? You seem to be specific enough to say and form a Gantt chart. Why, if you can do that, can you not be more specific, about what, [pause] about what the development will include?
James: ok [pause] when we designed the project, the global project, some time ago, in April 2001, [pause] all the experience as you know, is coming from the technical point of view. [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: but we consider that initial point is not enough, to make worthy, research and development project. In that sense, we [pause] we request the participation of the user, and we [pause] we got a success and we got the participation of different national organizations. And, we thought, and I still think, that the point of the view of the user is crucial. And in that sense, we developed, we designed a project with one year, for the user requirements activity. After, that we thought, if necessary to analyse these requirements, and from this, we could finish of the activity, the functional analysis and technical design of the tool, [pause] 18 months after the start of the project. [Pause] I still think that this was a properly way to design, so of course, an answer to the commission and to the rest of the partners, [pause] um, what we are going to do, is
[Can hear whispering]
James: at this moment, is the document of the user requirements has been circulated, and in principle we believe, that we are able to make and I think, [pause] this is more or less, [pause] what we can do in this moment. And of course, it could be possible for us to make a proposal of a tool, for the blind people without any real knowledge of their needs, but [pause] we thought that [pause] that was not the objective. So, at this point, the user requirement is available, we need to analyse, and to consider the majority of the points in this document, [pause] can be reached, and this is, this is clear as well, from a technical point of view.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: So, what your saying is, you need 18 months, to get to the point, to produce a functional analysis and technical design, and 6 months, to actually do the development? That, seems to be
James: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: that seems to be completely unacceptable [Gives a small laugh]
James: no, no, no, no, not at all. I hope, I am sure that you know, as every partner, the initial scheduled plan, and the tool development is start in November 2001 ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: So, there is almost a techno, in which related activities are making on the same time. Like the work package requirements are starting in 2001, and finish in 2002. We started some time ago to start the tool development, [pause] before the finish of the user organization activity, considering that he preliminary research would be available, as, as [pause] as has been [pause] been the final result. SO, what we propose is that the final document [pause] of one activity, regarding the tool developing of the activity for the 18th month, means that the development of the tool, is not going to start, up to, 19th month. The tool development has started already, but not with the same intensity we are going to make, at the final part of the project.
Kenneth: but the essential of the web-authoring tool is well known. The web-authoring tool must actually be able to author things for the web. That analysis does not depend on the user requirements. The basic requirements of the web authoring tool are the same [pause] world author, we have to author web material, We [pause] what the user requirements document that you have seen today, is doing, is adding some of the extra requirements around accessibility, and the basic design, and the heart of the high level design, has to already be there, it is not something that you have to wait for.
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: So, what, [pause] why, you are saying that you are moving ahead with the design of the tool, we do enough technical development work within partner 3, to know that you start of with defining the high level objectives and what the high level scope of the project is. What, is [pause] what is the high level scope of this tool? Over, the last two days, we have had a complete range of opinions, of what this looks like.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: I want to hear a statement, about what the tool will do, to [pause] in technical terms of how is it going to handle voice xml. To what extent is it going to do these things? These will not find in the user requirements document
James: ok, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: You may get a response from the users, when you put your proposals forward, ok
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: ok, yes, we understand technically what you are trying to propose, but [pause] there are some accessibility issues. But if you, [pause] will not give us the information, about those designs and proposals, then we cannot respond.
James: ok, ok. Um [pause] in the comment, Kenneth, this is one more example of why our very important face-to-face meetings, because, [pause] because there is a better way to resolve some misunderstanding, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Christopher, Conwayne and Annie nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 people)***
James: but perhaps, [pause] the high quantities of the activities we have, we have not resolved them before. [Pause] regarding the technical work, which has been done, up to now, we can [pause] we can [pause] show exactly what had been the more important events that we have reached
[Can hear whispering]
James: if, [pause] if we have not made before, has been because [pause] these were not party of any deliverables. If you want, [pause] to, to obtain a clear idea of what, have been all the main events in the technical part, we can show. And, if you want to make right now, so [pause] if this is the, if this is the needs of the rest of the partners, we can show
Kenneth: Great, why did you do not do this yesterday, when in the agenda you had review of work package 2, and 3, and 4. Why did you not use that time yesterday to tell us exactly what you have offered to tell us? Why has it had to take to this point? This is what I do not understand, [pause] we are, this is clearly, what these consortium meetings are about and to understand, the work that people are doing ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes, well, yesterday, we showed what we had been doing in work package 3, which is the [pause] as you could see, how you could integrate voice, and how tab could help the user to interact with the web authoring tool that we are going to make. But, we only have three months work on work package 4.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and plus we have [pause] a goal for commission, which is a deliverable, the integration of voice and a plug in and that is what we are focussing on. Because that is what we have to show, to the commission.
Kenneth: You have had 6 months work on work package 3
Annie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: and you
Annie: 3
Kenneth: started on month 3
[Annie looks at Christopher]
Annie: in March
James: Work package 3 started in 15th November, or December? Sorry, 1st December. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: Ok, so [pause]
[James says something to Jack, Geoff, Annie and Christopher]
James: Ok,
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: I wanted to say something, you were saying about 18 months for the functional analysis and technical design of the tool
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: but the prototype, of the integration tool, should be finished after 10 months, because this is the end of July
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and for this to be delivered at the end of July
James: of course, at the same way, that all of the deliverables, [pause] not coming only from parttner 2 but all deliverables coming from all partners in the project project, has been delivered on time, of course, of course.
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: But if that is the case, if that is the case, you should be able to give us at least some outlines, of what that deliverable will be like. [Pause] that is the only thing that we are asking for.

Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view

James: ok. Ok, we are going to make [pause] a general presentation, we have not prepared any specific documentation for this presentation, but Geoff is going to speak, regarding a document, that has been circulated in partner 2, and [pause] and about what requirements from the technical point of view of the author, has to be included, in a, in a tool for the design of the blind people. It is from a technical perspective.
[Paul tries to speak]
Paul: just one second?
Annie: On the presentation yesterday, the screenshots I talked about, those samples are what we were thinking about, when we are going to present the prototype, of the integration of the tool, and voice xml, and the plug in.
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: May I answer for Paul?
Annie: sure***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: one very, small point, but what you showed were some windows, you could input some things
Annie: no, no, not the ones that had sound, they were static screenshots ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: how did you expect me to answer that [gives a small laugh]
[Some others laugh as well]
Annie: I explained it [looks fed up at this point]. I think I explained it, and nobody, had questions, so I thought, you understood what I said.
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: The main thing for me was that [pause] was the information required had to be in the source code of the web page.
Annie: I do not understand what you mean Desmond. The information required? ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Desmond: the required information which was given to the user, so for example, of an e-learning portal, was in your presentation shown was the code of the web page.
Annie: no, no before ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Charles tried to speak as well]
Desmond: before, ahh, my mistake ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: yes, it is not the same thing. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: I still do not get it ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Annie gives a small laugh]
Annie: I can explain it, later on again, we will have time, of course.
Geoff: Ok, we have working an internal planification that [pause] as we did not know we were going to present, we have not made it public, it is not the definitive planification. [Pause] we used the analysis it is is not the final [gives a small laugh]
Geoff: in this planificiation we have only ideas. Ideas that we are working in [pause] and we are trying to see if they are possible to research
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: [pause] and useful for users and it should be, and it is with web accessibility, and [pause] accessibility tools, such as screenreaders.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: This area, we have [pause] been designing [pause] some times we have to take it out and sometimes we think that they are good ideas. [Pause] in the planificaiton we have done, it is not the definitive planification, it is the general planficiation. We have [paused] the methodology of the work that we have chosen is, what is general [pause] requirements we have to make, which takes time to do it. With this, we see the lines and see [pause] in general [pause] if they are possible.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: Ok, the first thing, which is probably the most important is the author of the authoring tool
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: this authoring tool must have [pause] manages different documents. The documents with voice authoring tools are to create new [pause] and open documents, close documents, rename documents, send documents, from the list. The kind of documents, which could be opened, could be xml [pause] voice xml documents, grammar files, [pause] and voice xml documents. On the other documents, the user names the [pause] cutting, pasting, redo, find, replace and go to, this is not definitive. It would say that [pause] re-do is not useful or we do not have time to do re-do, and probably will be left out. [Pause] We managed to use different views.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: one for editing and one for browsing. [Pause] the browsing view is [pause] is not possible to [pause] apply into our application. We just open Internet Explorer or Netscape Explorer and the user say how the document will be seeing by [pause] by these navigators
[Can hear whispering]

[Erin puts up her hand]
Fabian: Erin? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: I will wait, I will wait
Geoff: We created a document especially, the html document, the user will need to select from the list the following elements. Frame, tables, image, audio content, list, paragraph, maps [pause] and other things we think would be useful for e-learning like questions, input types with alpha numeric, such as you see in the e-learning, in the work package yesterday maybe. [Pause] You would use, you would put an input box and the tool would automatically put a Hava script code to do that. [Pause] Um, the user could customise features such as a stylesheet in another part of the tool, and the configuration and the [pause] and the internationalisation features in an easy way. The user would use a synthesiser analyser tool to validate the [pause] documents, and to validate the synthesis analyse tool, another accessibility of the document
Paul: what?
Lucy: Accessibility
Geoff: Accessibility to review the documents. UM [pause] what we also have in mind, is that the user can manage different videos, within different documents. But, we think that this document is not useful and is better, if [pause] if we several times, the tool manages just one document at a time
(Sub-state 1.1)
[Someone outside of the team came into the room]
Geoff: at least we will have studied that. Help is very important, and it is not only [pause] will include an accessible [pause] will include a point of focus on the accessibility problems to help the user to attack accessibility in general. For [pause], making, to make [pause] to make this functionality, Charles has [tape finished]
[Tape 2]
Geoff: So, when you choose an element, [pause] you will see the element in another view. We do not know how, because the interface is not, is not designed. And, [pause] and with the element, with the rest of the element
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: the user will introduce, a type of [pause] data. For example [pause] you choose an input box
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: so the input box, will be added to the trigger, and in the other side, in the other view, the tool will ask the user [pause]. What kind of [pause], what test you will like to include with this, with this input text. Will this accept only alphanumeric characters? Will [pause] accept numeric characters, and the user checks the check mark and if it is true, [pause] what will be the maximum length of the input text? And the user, introduced 5
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: which kind, [pause] um, accessibility description you want to introduce to work with Hava accessibility, to the screenreaders, will manage this element, and this work. And this is the general philosophy, [pause] the [pause] so, um [pause] the first is to make accessible the web page, and this is [pause] is, um [pause] we have [pause] almost 5 months to work with it. And it will have [pause] a [pause] a bigger task with sub elements, in this stream. [Pause] and another task is to interact with the elements. And another is the representation of these elements in the web page [Pause] and another to edit external elements.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: in another task, like the parsing elements, like [pause] like another [pause] with another page that is not created with project, will need a parser, to get that element. [Pause] um, um, [pause] this is a bit of what we have in mind, and [pause] this is the first, the second is to integrate the voice in the application and in the web page
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: This will have [pause] working [pause] with it [pause] will be problematic, so we have calculated that we will want [pause] working for it [pause] for a very few days. Another difficulty that we have to manage is the accessibility evaluation. The accessibility evaluation will be worked for approximately 2 months. The general work will consist of validating pages, and [pause] and accessibility systems. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: for validating pages
[Mary raises her hand]
Mary: Can I just mention here about the evaluation of the accessibility of the tool. Is that what you are talking about?
Geoff: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Um, it is basically covered by work package 5 isn't it?
Geoff: excuse me?
[Can hear whispering]
[Fabian speaks in Spanish to Geoff]
Geoff: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: separate
Geoff: it is validating web pages
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: It is not evaluation of the pages, it is the evaluation of the tool itself
Geoff: imagine
Jack: with the tool
Geoff: pages
Mary: what we are planning to do, is to propose in work package 5, to do both of the evaluations, the tool and the prototype
[Erin tries to speak. She says it is slightly different]
Kenneth: The tool has to be able to validate other web pages
Mary: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and not just report on accessibility, of the web pages
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: it is one of the areas of the original statement.
Geoff: to validate the web pages, we have to [pause] parse the elements of the page, which are open
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: this work, we think, we think, it is done in the first difficulty, and we have to modify code, but this algorithm will be similar, and we can reduce work. [Pause] The philosophy of the application is object oriented
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: and we would like either, in the first five months, to settle an architecture or [pause] a method to reduce code, in most of the cases, to [pause] to, [pause] to don't do the same work twice.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: after that accessibility evaluation, we have [pause] cascading stylesheets style. We have to create a style and apply the style
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: we, we think [pause] we should work in this, in approximately [pause] another month. But, this is [pause] it is, [pause] it is 1 month.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: after we have to [pause] um [pause] to make customisation, [pause] customisation functions. First thing is customisation short cut design to make it compatible with the screenreaders. [Pause] to implement this customisation, and after that we have to do tool configuration, and the aspect is [pause] is the functionality. You have to customise the functionality, for example
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: if you wanted the tool, [[pause] to have to insert, or not to insert
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and they ask the general, the overall look and feel of the tool must be configurable by the user

[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: After that [pause] we will attack inter-internal-ization aspects. [Pause] we the inter-nat-io-iza, [gives a small laugh] sorry, I cannot say it
[Some others laugh we as well]]
Geoff: that word. That internalization aspect has been taken into consideration into the first difficulty, and [pause] in this part, we will introduce in the tool, so see that it is possible, and work well in the different languages. [Pause] and that has been done. After that, we will work with synthesis validation, of what the user [pause] are [pause] putting in the web page. It has logic, but it is [pause] it is [principle, and it is to accomplish, the [pause] um, everything, um, [pause] WAI 3 consortium standards. To do this [pause] we will pass the documents, and validate the documents with the standards, and we will have syntax assistance with [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: to show the user the standards, to accomplish. For example, in this, [pause] if a user was to put a table, it would ask for, the summary, [pause] summary elements, to help the [pause] to help to be read for a screenreader [pause] in case [pause] in case [pause] in case the user does not choose compalabras functionality, to
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: to work with the page. And after that, the synthesis validation will for 2 months, 40 days, and [pause] contextual help. Contextual help [pause] is that the user [pause] wants to [pause] wants to do some function. It will appear in the function, and it helps to do things [pause]. And after that we will attack the accessibility, [pause] in the test format. That will be easily accessed by the user. [Pause] This is, this is, in general, our first sight idea, or planification of the tool. This planification will change, this planification will adapt to [pause], users and users requirements. For example, this doesn't work well, and we can change it, how [pause] how it will be solve in another way. But this thing, it is not definitive, and we think goals of the tool development, quite good, but, but [pause], because of
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: because of tool development, it is open to new ideas, and requirements. That is in general what we have in mind. [Pause]
Desmond: I have 1, 1 or 2 questions. These, points you told us, you just told us, as I understood you only told us about html
[Erin nods and says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Desmond: and, um, before you set up your points, did you analyse and read
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: already existing
[Pause]
Geoff: um, um
James: You mean to consider their format?
Desmond: I did not understand you ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
James: to understand the, you are proposing as an initial to consider the different formats and [pause] and explained by Geoff
[Geoff tries to speak]
James: Html, it is correct, or you say it would be better to use
Desmond: What we tried to do, to develop a V, a voice xml tool
[Kenneth nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[James tries to speak]
Desmond: But you were talking about, html. How they are ported from html into voice xml? How do you plan?
Geoff: when you say to a document, it does not, [pause] it is not an external document, it does not need grammar to open it
Desmond: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: I do not think, [pause] we think, um you try to open all kinds of voice xml documents, it will too general. UM, [pause] we could do that, but we do not know if the time will allow this [Pause] But, we will open voice xml documents
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: the document, which will be used for the compalabras plug in.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: I think, I think, first of all, we need to say thank you. That, is exactly the information we have been asking for, and it is extremely helpful, because it would have actually changed the discussion yesterday, if we had heard that yesterday morning.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: because that gives us now [pause] the scope of what you are thinking about. However, I also [pause] I feel that it is concentrated, very much on html, and that does concern me, especially with regards, to how you intend to handle voice in and voice out, and voice interaction. Because, that seems to be a very complex area, and you simply say, you will handle grammar files, and grammar files are complex files in there own right.
Geoff: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: and I am not hearing a lot of, [pause] particularly, how you will handle [pause] that, which is, after all, where this project is making the advance. Much of what you have said here is already in [pause] in standard tools. What this project is about is moving beyond that [pause] into the voice field, and the integration of voice,
[Geoff tries to speak]
Kenneth: into html
Geoff: what we are trying to do, is that when you insert the [pause] a new element, it will help you [pause] validate things, such as [pause], Like, um [pause] when the user element, for example question. It told you question is composed by a level [pause] and number of inputs to choose.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and it will generate the code. The tool will automatically generate the code. It will automatically, [pause] for not only working alone, but [pause] it will be synthesised, by the [pause] compalabras plug in [pause] or the screenreader, if the user wants to. For the evaluate, [pause] will be focussed in learning in this way, will be functions
Kenneth: voice output is fairly easy. What about voice input? Grammar files and voice input, how are you going to build
[Geoff tries to say something]
Kenneth: how are you going to build the voice recognition?
[Geoff tries to speak again]
Kenneth: and the e-learning course requires from you, the word structures, etc, where is the editing coming from that?
[Annie signals to Geoff that she will talk]
Annie: in order to do so, the samples we have been developing were a number of screenshots, where the user enters with voice the commands, [pause] the age, and things like that. That is what we are experimenting on. We must get some feedback, as we do not know, [pause] what will be useful for the user. To reduce the commands or not? Or to have both
[Can hear whispering – Lucy says something to Ronnie]
Kenneth: But one of the elements of the overall design must include the ability, to modify the voice recognition system, to take into account o new vocabularies and new grammars
Annie: you will, you can create your own grammars ***(sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you as your own designer, I mean, [pause] the designer of the web page
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: can create his own grammar
Paul: specification of
Annie: of the web-authoring tool, he can define grammar, and [pause] and he can also use voice with the tool, to define that grammar. So, he must input type that way, and the token, which is the voice, which is going to be recognised, and the end user says it, and he can define the grammar, and the amount of words which are going to be recognised, and will be stored in the style,

[Can hear whispering – the German partners are having their own conversation]
Annie: so you can use them further on, in your design, but that way, instead of the user clicking on a button to say ok [pause] you do the same actions. Is that, is that, what you [pause]
Kenneth: it is in part what I mean, but [pause] it is from the work we are doing in other projects, that is very complex area. It is a specialism in its own right
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: it is just, it was not included in the list of things [pause] and what would be very useful now, is to have that, written up, in that form
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in a document
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: we have to think [pause] these are just ideas
Kenneth: fine ***(Sub-state 1.1***
Geoff: we will have to put in, and this takes time
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, but for the annex one, that is what we said yesterday, Thursday or
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: a summarised this
Annie: yes, and Kenneth, one thing more, we, we developed the prototypes because we thought it would give a better idea, than if we write our documents. Because in Paris, we got the feeling that, we did not get the idea, of how we could integrate voice input and output applications.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: so that is why we focussed on the prototypes, instead of writing the documents, but I, I, I will urge all the partners for the next meeting, since we have made the mistake in this one, that you, that you would rather have that kind of input from us
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you tell us, before hand, so that we can prepare something and show it
[Can hear whispering]]
[Paul sounds fed up, huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: We want to understand the scope of what you are doing
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and you need to understand the scope of what we are doing. And that is in part, what you have been doing
Annie: yes
Kenneth: because all we asked for [pause]
Annie: yes, yes
Kenneth: we are not asking you to do anything extra.
Annie: no, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: it is just
Annie: no, no, it is just the
Kenneth: the way you think
Annie: the way that you display it
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you better have a judgement, because, since we are developers, we feel that things are more likely to be understand a prototype, instead of writing something for people to read
Kenneth: yes, but [pause] most of the people here from the user groups ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes, I know ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: are from development organisations as well. We do understand the technical side.
Annie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: not in the detail that you do, but,
Annie: no, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in some detail.
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: so, we are going to circulate a document, which has been explained by Geoff.
[Can hear whispering]
James: this, [pause] will be done next week. And something
[Can hear whispering]
James: considering that we have to develop the new technical annex, for the Vision, we are going to
[Can hear whispering]
James: include a summary of these documents in the technical annex. Of course,
[Can hear whispering]
James: all types of comments not just from the technical partners, but [pause] also from the rest of the partners
[Can hear whispering]
James: will be welcome. Ok, [pause] I believe shortly the presentation [pause] for a bit late, but it would be better to show before, but it is important in this moment, that the situation has been more clarified for the partners. Perhaps, if there is no additional questions, you can follow up with Mary presentation. Ok, Mary, thank you.

Presentation on WP1- Results for evaluation study.

Mary: I understand that we have changed the schedule from this morning, and we only have one hour before lunch, and we do have quite a lot of work to do on work package 1. You are most probably aware that [pause] this deliverable finished in month 12. So, first of all we will not have enough time to go through everything that was originally planned.
[Conwayne says something to Annie and Christopher]
Mary: I will cut very short my first presentation, which was supposed to provide a summary of the final results for the [pause] existing e-learning courses.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: We presented most of our results in the meeting in Paris, so I am not going to repeat any of this. The report was submitted to the commission, and it is also available on the server. And if you would like any more detail, perhaps, we will look at that.
[Jack says something to James and Geoff]
Mary: So, we basically did evaluations with 5 visually impaired users, 4 were blind, and 1 was partially sighted. We evaluated, 3 courses, which were produced by Mindleaders. 1 course was related to project management.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: I will not have time to review that. So, I would like to emphasise here actually, what were the main problems we found during these evaluations.
[Can hear whisperin]
Mary: um [pause] we basically found, that the screenreaders which were used, which were mainly Jaws and SuperNova, they were quite good at

reading the textual explanations for the learning materials, and were provided in the courses. However, the main problems, were the [pause] were found by the users, when they had to interact more actively with the course, in terms of inputting information, and providing answers to their self assessment questions or to [pause] um [pause] to perform other activities which were included in the courses.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: So, this is where the main problems were found. And this is what was emphasised in the report, also why the commission picked up, and put in a recommendation, their will be more collaboration on this emphasis, and [pause] providing better support to visually impaired people, in the [pause] in their interaction, and more active interaction with the e-learning courses. And, um [pause] the problems were [pause] were of different nature. They were either due to limitations of the screenreaders and especially the input modalities for the screen stroke commands, and the cursor keys that are provided by Jaws and the other screenreaders. And, [pause] the other problems were to do with the design of the mark up,
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: which sometimes was not very accessible. Or to do with the design of the actual course or learning content, which was sometimes not very clear. Other problems were to do, [pause] with the integration and operability between the mark and [pause] and the screenreader. And also their were problems [pause] with the interoperability, with the [pause] browser and the screenreader as well. Um [pause] the main, I will not go through any of the problems, because they were [pause] that are in the report, that we sent that. I will show that yesterday the screenreader and how it can overcome some of the problems and solutions to be extended
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: the main outcomes from the study, was actually a set of user requirements, for designing e-learning applications.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: I do not know if any of you, have had the chance to look at the report, but the user requirements, are included at the end of the report.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: At the moment, the requirements were extracted from the problems that were encountered, that were encountered by the users, [pause] and also more general design recommendations
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: which were provided to us from partner 3. At the moment we have
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: 50 user requirements for e-learning applications.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and they are divided into 9 categories. The categories were user interaction, navigation, learning support, course content, user engagement, information presentation, user progress, application, learning ability and system adaptability, mobility. Maybe if you did not have the chance to look at the requirements, I can read out a few requirements.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: For example, user interaction category is specifying some requirements, to be able to easily understand what is required. And to be able to easily recover from wrong actions, and to provide consistent ways of inputting the information. As part of the navigation, category, we have specified the need to navigate back to the previous page, and forward, and the next page, which are more general, web interaction
Someone: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and as part of the learning support category, we had, to quickly find the answer, or to feedback the answer
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and providing high quality answers, which are easy to understand.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and so on. Here, I would like to emphasise, as you can see the requirements are bit more at a general level, and if you are to be used for [pause] as user requirements for the project portal, of course, they need to [pause] perhaps prioritise them, because as I said, there are 50 at the moment. The same as the requirements for the web authoring tools, because it will not be possible to implement all of them. Therefore, there is a need to prioritise them, which ones are critical to implement and to demonstrate. And, also, if [pause] if everyone can have a look at the requirements, and to add to them. Because, although there are 50 at the moment, we have not really included many user requirements, and the user [pause] who use screen magnification technology, because, we, we were unable to run the courses with the screen magnifier. So, perhaps, we need to add a user requirement,
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: regarding some support, for this kind of users. So, any input will be useful on that.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: So, I'll end my presentation
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Are their any questions on that?
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]

Presentation on work package 1, Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1

Mary: What I would like us to do now, is to go through, the plan for the deliverables, the two deliverables, which Hazel distributed a couple of days ago. Did everyone get Hazel's email?
[Yes said in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I have got it here
[Yes said again] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I have copies here
Mary: oh ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so I can distribute some, I have 10 copies so, do you have copies?
[Gets up and gives copies to some team members]
[Own discussions taking place]
Mary: As Jack mentioned yesterday, the preliminary versions of the two main deliverables for work package 5
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: are due at the end of July
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: the final versions are due at the end of September, so I will like to discuss what both of the deliverables should contain today.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Deliverable 1.1, is the manual for accessible design, and D1.2 is the specification dossier. The plan, [pause] which Hazel has produced, actually covers both of them today, in one document. But as she mentioned in her email, this is just an internal working document. At the end we will have two documents, which is going to contain the contents that we are going to discuss now. What Hazel proposed is to include10 chapters, that will cover all the work which has been done in work package 1. And, um to present all the results which came from all of the 9 tasks.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and for including this in D1.1. Hazel has specified, that for each chapter, Hazel, has specified [pause] the heading of the chapter and the partner who is responsible for writing it
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: each chapter, and the partners who need to contribute material for writing up each chapter. So, ok, I will go through chapter one by one, and I would like this to be a discussion, as you may have missed out something which has been done, and maybe you do not agree on the distribution of the partners who are responsible, for contributions, and any feedback would be very useful.

[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Ok, chapter 1, is titled cognitive and pedagogic framework for e-learning with voice
[Can hear whispering]
[Someone clicks their fingers]
Mary: and the responsible partners, partner 8, and, contributing partners
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: K K, from [pause]. And this chapter may relate to task 1.6, although I will come to discuss 1.6 in a minute. This is a more theoretical chapter, providing a framework of how people in general, and how visually impaired people, in particular, in learning from voice
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and audio material.
[Can hear clicking]
Mary: Kenneth, emphasised that we need to understand this yesterday, so this will provide a more theoretical framework.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: it is also more emphasised yesterday, that when we interact and learn other tasks with audio presentation, we actually, [pause] perform the task in a more linear fashion.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Ok, when we interact with material visually, we may process information
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: in parallel,
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: this is a very important distinction in the design, and when e-learning material in order to be deflective. So, this is what this chapter, will provide.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: are there any comments on this?
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Mary: Chapter 2, is entitled, the state of the art of screen-reading technology. It covers the work done in task 1.3. Responsible partners, the German partners, and partner 6. Contributing partners, partner 3, partner 7 and partner 5. Um [pause] I believe that the work was going to be during the initial three months
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I [pause] I delivered one document, for the, for the [pause] the requirements on screen reading technologies at the end of November.
[Can hear clicking fingers]
Desmond: and I made a presentation for this, in [pause] in London. And, I think, [pause] and some of the document is still missing
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: you asked for some of this yesterday and um [pause] it is our thing to do this
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and you are happy to contribute to that
Desmond: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: any other comments?
[Own discussions taking place]
Desmond: that is all
[Own discussions taking place]
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Do you expect more?
Mary: on chapter 2? It is to the German partners. There was a question from Morris
Desmond: excuse me
Mary: about chapter 2
Desmond: chapter 2. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Do you expect anything more from users
Desmond: we already had very much from partner 3
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: and I do not really know what you gave me last year, when I [pause] when I gave my survey.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: the thing is that we provided you with the result
[Annie gets up to talk to Fabian. She takes to him a print out; this may have been the e-mail, which was sent from Hazel, a few days before.]
Morris: but we had something of the existing screenreaders
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and because I have asked,
[Annie gets up to talk to Fabian. She takes to him a print out, this may have been the e-mail which was sent from Hazel, a few days before.]
Morris: Adam he is doing it spontaneously, he is sending messages,
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: that would be interesting, existing screenreaders beyond the general use of things, like Jaws and WindowI, that would be very interesting. That would be good, thank you.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Chapter 3, which is titled, state of the art and e-learning materials and accessibility
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: it will cover the work done in task 1.2. Responsible partners, partner 8, contributing partners, are all user group partners, including partner 6, partner 3, partner 7, partner 5 and [pause] and partner 4.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: This chapter, as I said, was meant to convert, although at the moment
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: it is presented as a more general overview, and the current state of e-learning materials and their accessibility
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and it is supposed to cover the work in task 1.2, and task 1.2, is the specification of the project, of the portal, for using voice xml, e-learning portal. And e had a discussion yesterday, about that, and [pause] perhaps this is a good opportunity, to [pause] to make the decision on that, if we are required, to provide an overall specification of voice, and what the portal should be doing. So, I do not know if we will do it, all the partners.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: because as Hazel specified, this is a more general overview, of learning materials and their accessibility. And, we have task 1.2, which I supposed to provide a definition of the characteristics, which gives our e-learning portal, is going to have. And we have promised the definition.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and yesterday, we had a discussion, as to [pause] as to scoping, or re-defining the scope of the –e-leaning portal. [Pause]

Kenneth: Mary
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: that specification really should be more part of D1.2.
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: actually it is the specification part, and you would leave what Hazel has written their
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: ok
Kenneth: for the design
Mary: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: otherwise, it will not fit very neatly into the manual
Mary: definitely ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: as such
Mary: ok that's alright. So, are all user group partners ok with providing inputs? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Erin and Lucy nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 from 2 people)***
Desmond: not yet ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Mary: not yet, ok ***(Sub-state 1.2***
Desmond: I will try
Mary: you will try, ok. [Pause] will you be able to provide some material? [Looking at the French partners] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Thomas nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: in this very respect we have a problem
Mary: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: the problem is we do not, we do not have the evaluation criteria
[Christopher and Annie are whispering]
Ronnie: and we used the evaluation criteria, which has been developed by French companies.
[Christopher and Annie still talking]
Ronnie: the problem is, if you [pause] if you expect us to [pause] to transfer the criteria, and to [pause] to say what criteria have been used
[Annie and Christopher still talking]
Ronnie: or if the end result is not enough. In that case, we have to try and obtain the criteria, which are
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: up to now, not available. We know them, but we were asked not to focus]
Mary: oh ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I do not know how we should proceed? Maybe you can give us some advice to this
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: in the work plan are the most important
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: so, that will be at the moments
Ronnie: thank you.
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Mary: Moving to chapter 4, it is titled, state of the art for web and e-learning materials, and e-learning accessibility
[Erin nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: it will cover all the work, which has been done in task 1.8. Responsible partners, [pause] partner 8, and contributing partner 3. Um [pause] this will basically present the work which Erin presented this morning, on the evaluation which has been done on the existing web authoring tools, and the views which are presented in the previous meeting. The features of existing e-learning authoring tools as well.
[Erin uh-huh. Erin and Kenneth also nod] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3, from 3 people, verbal and non -verbal evidences)***
[Own discussions taking place
Mary: chapter 5, is state of the art, for voice protocols, and voice editing tools, covering work on task 3.4 and 1.5, and 1.7.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Responsible partners 2, with contributing partners partner 9
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: did [pause] is there something you would like to add to the contributing partners?
James: Is this correct? Would anyone like to add?
Annie: That was the presentation that Charles made in London
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: it only covered half of that [gives a small laugh]
Mary: ok, hmmm. [Pause] I would like to make a query with task 1.5, which was specifying the accessibility guidelines for the voice solution. Identification of the ways to use voice for the navigation system and ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and has this been done and documented?
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: ci
Annie: no, ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: we do not have
Mary: what are we going to present to the commission? The reason I ask, why I want to emphasise 1.5 is that part of the discussion we had yesterday, was again on what is the innovation
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and [pause] what the Compalabras plug in will bring to both the authoring tool, and the e-learning
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and perhaps to specify
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: in a clear way
Annie: yes, yes [nods head as well]. We have to take the source of the information and compose ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Mary: ok. That would be very useful. And you will be able to do that? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok that is great
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Anything else, anyone would like to add to chapter 5? No, ok
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Chapter 6, survey of unmet learning needs, visually impaired people have been the task of 1.1. Responsible partners partner 8, and contributing partners again, all user group partners.

[Can hear whispering]
Mary: This study was started a few months ago
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and Hazel mentioned in her e-mail that the original plan is to have each user group partners to produce 15 questionnaires
[Fabian says something to Jack]
Mary: on that, so, here I would like to emphasize, that if you still need to do that, this is an important part of specifying what the needs are for visually impaired people. Um [pause] for e-learning, so, we will be able to produce some more questionnaires
[Annie talks to Christopher and Conwayne]
Mary: and it takes 1 month. Maybe to start with 1 month.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Thomas did you have 7?
[Thomas nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: 7 and they say that they will be able to produce more, yeah ok. We will be able to produce 15 as well, at partner 8. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: um, we will be able to produce a few as well
Mary: a few, ok. This will have to be done in the next month, yeah? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: is that 2 months?
Mary: 2 months? Well, [pause]
Desmond: what did you just say, because I did not hear
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: any number will be good
Desmond: we have 12
Mary: so we can analyse the results and put them in the preliminary version of the [pause] document. That is great. If you cannot 15 users, do not worry, any number is ok
[Paul laughs]
Mary: ok
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: will you be able to do some?
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: that is great.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and moving onto chapter 7 now. Titled observations of current e-learning applications. I presented some of the results, we [pause] we were able to collect them from our users. The responsible partners, are us, partner 8, and contributing partners, again, all user group partners. [Pause] we discussed in Paris, for the other group partners for their observations, so this is ok. I am aware that partner 3 are planning to do a couple of the evaluations.
Erin: yeah, we have got 3 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yeah, and partner 5, you have done quite a few, using a different protocol. The different methodology, so you will be able to give us some of your results? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Thomas looks confused when Mary says protocol, appeared to understand what was said when the term methodology was used]
Mary: has anything similar been done in Germany?
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: in that case, I will suggest, if you can just review the user requirements which we pulled out from the results of this study, and to may be add comments on them, that will be very useful
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: This is, can I ask you something please?
Mary: yes***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: This is something, I, I, thought [pause] was our task as well. We do not clearly remember,
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: so, I think We should be involved, not in the compiling of the questionnaires
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: but the evaluations of them
Mary: mhhm –hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: so, [pause] we also participated in the preparation of the questionnaires
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and we sent in many proposals
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: on how to structure this,
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: So, I would offer us to participate, more in the evaluations phase, than in the [pause] in the collection of answers. Because we have [pause] that is not a problem, we should invade countries
[Someone gives a small laugh when Ronnie says invade]
Ronnie: and member organisations to do this for us, ok, so we are ready As soon as the evaluation
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: process starts, please inform us, and we will
Mary: Um, we actually started a few months ago,
Ronnie: the evaluation phase?
Mary: oh sorry, the evaluation of the existing courses, we started a few months ago, yep.
Ronnie: no, I mean the evaluation of the final result
Mary: the final result, ok, we will talk about this
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: as [pause] as part of work package 5
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Hopefully we will have time
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Moving onto question 8, Flowchart for information for the construction in the web designing process, discovering working task 1.6. The responsible partners partner 2, and [pause] contributing partners
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: partner 9, partner 3, partner 8, partner 7, partner 5, partner 6 and [pause] partner 4
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: In this chapter, may I ask for a little clarification for task 1.6, because, we were not sure if it was part of the theoretical framework for navigation, or whether it is
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: detailed part of D1.1.

[Can hear whispering]
Annie: Mary, I think there is a mistake, partner 2is not responsible for this chapter
Mary: ok, we were not sure, whether your technical ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: or whether it is more user side, so we were not sure, so that is why we put that as part of chapter 1. So, [pause]
James: Sorry, um, [pause] could it be possible to have [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
James: More discussion on the activity that is required for chapter 8?
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: chapter summary? I believe it is a technical work, but [pause] do you know what is expected from the technical partners?
Mary: well, um, [pause] we were wondering with Hazel the same, because we need to cover the work done in chapter 1.6, which is flow chart and information extraction, and extraction in the web design process. Also, the construction of a logical model for the assistive navigation for a visually impaired person. So, we can [pause], so that is where we were not clear on that
James: that is exactly what we have been reading.
[Can hear whispering]
James: What is exactly expected from the technical partners?
Mary: it is
James: yes
James: besides that
Mary: ok
James: Because after reading the definition of the [pause] of chapter section 1.6, we do not know exactly what is expected
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: so we do not know exactly what is necessary to do in this task 1.6
Mary: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: any suggestions?
[Conwayne says something to Christopher and Annie]
[Other own discussions taking place]
James: Excuse me, the definition of the task
[Can hear whispering]
James: this is, [pause], this is the division of task made by Hazel?
Mary: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: This is the original?
Mary: I do no think so. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: ok, so we have to
[Can hear whispering]
James: ok, any of the partners involved?
[Erin nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: any ideas of the contributing partners?
[Can hear whispering]
James: Ok, so, we make a proposal of [pause] in order to cover the activity of task 1.6
[Can hear whispering]
James: which must be included in the deliverable as chapter 8. And after that we will be waiting for some comments from the contributing partners. Is that right?
Mary: [pause] yep, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: but, [pause] are partner 2 willing to be responsible for writing and putting it together
James: No, um, ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: the other
James: partner 1 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: oh, ok. So, we should change that? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: to S
[Can hear whispering]
James: T
James: T
Mary: ah
[Someone gives a small laugh]
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Mary: ok, I will change it
James: do not worry
Mary: I will change it
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Let's move to chapter 9.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Chapter's 9 and 10,
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Chapter's 9 and 10 are very important, because they [pause] will present the consortium with the requirements for the e-learning application and secondly for accessible web authoring tools. Both chapters include future work to the project.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: chapter 9, will cover the requirements for an accessible e-learning application, and web portal incorporating voice xml. These requirements were briefly mentioned this morning, but were also included in the report
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: which we will be submitting to the commission.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: The responsible partners are us, partner 8, and contributing partners, all.
Desmond: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so, um [pause] we will be very grateful for any comments and additions, to the requirements that we have produced.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and chapter 10, similarly, will outline the requirements for accessible e-learning authoring tools, covering the work in task 1.9. Charles, from partner 9 presented the [pause] latest version of that document. Here, Hazel has outlined that the responsible partners are partner 3
[Erin nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Mary: is that ok?
Erin: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and contributing partners again, all, everyone. So, if you would like to [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: I will put the current version of the requirements on the mailing list, um Monday.
Mary: ok. Right, that is the end of the plan, which Hazel has outlined. And, [pause] have we missed out anything, which has been done so far? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Nope. Any other comments?
Ronnie: I would like to remind about the fact that we had work on portals
Mary: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: this is something I think, I consider to be important, because the support we have given, we now have to see how it is used.
Mary: [pause] um, will that be part of [pause] work package 1 or [pause]
Ronnie: it is a bit difficult to
Mary: or work package 4? The work done in the portal
Jack: the?
Lucy: The work of the portal that partner 7 did. Mary is asking WP1 or WP4
Someone: WP4
Ronnie: it must be WP4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: WP4, yeah. What you presented yesterday? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Someone: Work package 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: It is 4. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: could the portal by Adam show the basics?
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: in terms of checking or evaluating the accessibility requirements?
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: because I mean, as we said, work has been done on this
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: and it would be good, if it can use the work done in WP4
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: perhaps you can do something about it, in chapter 9? Because in chapter 9 we are talking about the input
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yep, ok, so you can provide some material on that, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: Maybe what was, was the design of the portal, [pause] is more work package 4
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but, what was done by Thomas, the analysis of accessibility, that is more, I would say, is more work package 1 work. [Pause] because it was analysis from the users requirements
Lucy: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: But it is in chapter 7.
Jack: ah, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: So, it will be included.
[Annie raises her hand]
Annie: Mary
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: in chapter 10, is it requirements for the e-learning authoring tool?
Erin: I was going to
Annie: web-authoring tool?
Mary: it is the same thing.
Annie: you mean the same thing?
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: is the time frame realistic? Coz of the summer vacations
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: because, it is possible to move it up one month?
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: that is what I am going to discuss now
[Can hear whispering]
[Paul laughs]
Mary: It was a good introduction to that
[Paul laughs again]
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Um, Jack, yesterday emphasised that we need to produce the preliminary report
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: version of D1 and D1.1
Ronnie: shhhhh
Mary: and D1.2 by 31st July, which is the end of next month ok. Ok, in order for us to be able to put everything together, I suggest if we can have all of the information, from all of the partners by Friday the 19th of July. So, how realistic do you think that is?
Mary: not very realistic.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: Well, from my understanding, we cannot really change the [pause] deliverable, the delivery date to the commission. So, we need to [pause] to re-scope that. Is that correct?
Jack: sorry, sorry
Mary: We are unable to change the submission date to the commission. We have to submit both deliverables
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: by the end of July.
James: yes, we agree, that we have not to much, to make a contribution to the partner 8, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: We know ourselves, that the interaction of the work is not possible to use much more than what has evolved.
Mary: um
James: So, [pause] I think all partner, we have to take effort, considering this is a preliminary deliverable
Mary: yes, I was just going to ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and not the final
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Mary: yes, because the final version of both documents, the final versions of both of the documents, are due to the commission, on the, at the end of September, ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: So, I propose, is this deliverable, will not defer much from the initial version to the final version
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and the two versions will be very similar. So, I think, I think this is what has been agreed with the technician and now have to [pause] and we have to try
Mary: we have to try and stick to that, definitely.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: ok
[Can hear whispering]

Presentation of work package 5

James: Ok, so perhaps, we can, [pause] move to the work package 5
Mary: yes, if there are no more comments.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: The other documents which Hazel distributed in the same e-mail was
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: the initial plan. It was the initial plan for work package 5, which is the evaluation of both the project e-learning portal and [pause] um the project web-authoring tool. Um, so she has specified how the evaluation could proceed on both types.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Here I need to emphasize that we need to have [pause] um, deliverables in order to evaluate
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: and the, the two very important documents, which we will need, in order to start, planning the evaluation, are the specifications of both [pause] the authoring tool and the project portal. [Pause] ok, yes, Hazel has provided, to evaluate 4 versions of the project portal, and 3 versions of the authoring tool. Ok, so, it will be an iterative process, and we will evaluate for its specifications, and the initial prototypes which have been studied, and work which has been started already, and we will aim to improve both the authoring tool, and the portal, based on the results of the evaluation, ok. So, first of all
Ronnie: sorry Mary
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: We, we [pause] the prototype of the portal is there, but, but [pause] to come back to the problem of the authoring tool
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: no evaluation [pause]
Mary: we did see some screen shots produced yesterday
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: but
Mary: ok, ok
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: let me just go through the [pause] to the timescale, which Hazel has proposed
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: I will start in that case on the evaluation of the [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: of the e-learning authoring tool. The project authoring tool
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: including the limited functionality should be available for testing, at the end of September. Is that feasible?
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: And the responsible partners are, ah, [pause] partner 2, and partner 9. [Pause]
[Annie tries to speak]
Ronnie: I, I, was I not correct in thinking that it has to be ready by [pause] by July, or not? Could you clarify this for me, because [pause] one hour it came up that it should be ready by July, and now you say it is September? It is better of course, September. But is it July or September?
Mary: yes Paul,
James: Sorry, Mary
[Charles tries to speak]
James: I lost the post here, [pause] regarding the um [[pause], project , um [pause] activity evaluation. The two deliverables are expected for month 10 and 12?
Mary: for which package?
James: evaluation
Mary: Evaluation [pause]
James: when is the expected deliverable? When is the final and the preliminary
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: [ties to speak – can hear whispering in the background]
Desmond: the prototype
Morris: by the end of July
Mary: the end of July ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: the prototype o
Desmond: 3.2
Mary: the authoring tool. Ok. We will change that.
James: [pause] I believe that [pause] this work package, evaluation must do [pause] provide a document indicating what kind of measurement
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: is going to be [pause] is going to be done, when [pause] when the portal and the tool is going to be available.
Mary: the first cut, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and when is it going to be available?
Mary: I am coming onto that. Ok
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: for 10 months [pause] just the prototype of the integration.
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yes, yes, but this is [pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: does this include partial or impartial functionality?
James: regarding the evaluation, the work which has to be done
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: is a document indicating
Mary: yes
James: what kind of

Mary: yes
Annie: with one of the partners
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: So, [pause] perhaps we need to [pause] to change some of the deadlines. I want to [pause] emphasize that Hazel has produced the plan, so that I can [pause] cannot answer why September, rather than the end of July. So, the plan is to have an initial plan for the
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: for the authoring tool, [pause] in its initial version, version 1. [Pause] by the end of September. Is it that the prototype will be available by the end of next month?
James: yes, I believe that we are focussing in other ways ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: [pause] um, what is expected, please correct me if I [pause] if am wrong
Mary: uh-uh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: each organization has to make a document, [pause] indicating what kids of
[Can hear whispering]
James: evaluations or measurement [pause] will be done, to the prototype. Sorry, to the tool, which is the portal indefinitely, when it is going to be ready the portal? And the tools? So, this deliverable has to be [pausing] the measurement that is going to be done not the rest of the evaluation of the tool.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: but the, [pause] what has to be presented is the initial, mum [pause] part of the evaluation dossier.
James: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: which is actually, it has got to be [pause] two things.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: Basically it has got to be the validation plan
James: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: is what you are seeing here
James: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: and it will also [pause] be [um] an outline of the [pause] of um, what the final validation will look like.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that will be [pause] a chapter type of plan, as you saw for work package 1. We could [pause] cannot provide, um [pause] a definition of what will , and how [pause] the validation will be done, ahead of the time, before we have got the specification of what there is to validate.
[Pause]
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and the commission [pause] do not expect that
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and cannot expect that
James: yup ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: so, [pause] what we will provide, what Hazel will provide, [pause] is exactly this type of information. In order words, here is a plan of how the validation [pause] will be done. If, [pause] if we have got more information, if [pause] I mid July, we are able to provide us with a better of idea of what is in the prototype, [pause] of what is propose din the final tool
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Kenneth: and then their will be a reaction within this document, as to how, more of the validation will be done. [Pause] you cannot, you cannot possibly say how the validation will be done, ahead of the time, and you have the specificaiton of what has to be validated. It cannot be done, and the commission does not expect that.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: and many times, and Hazel is very experienced, [pause] in what has to be delivered to the commission in the early stages, in other words the validation plan, and [pause] and that is what the commission always wanted at this early stage. And that is what Hazel is able to deliver
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: But, I really [pause] do trust Hazel on this, she has done it [pause] dozens of time on various projects, and she does know what the commission wants. And, we really ought to leave Hazel to take that responsibility
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: that responsibility, without being to concern about it. She will deliver what the commission wants and more than what the commission wants. She knows the commission extremely well in this area. [Pause]
Mary: Can I just summarize what is in the document, which Hazel has produced. Basically she has
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: [pause] she is aiming for us to produce a plan for the evaluation of the authoring tool, which is what has to be presented by the end of September, and maybe we need to move that, in view of what was just said.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: And she is planning to have [pause] a plan of the evaluation of the project portal, which is [pause] there is information, and which will basically contain how to conduct user based and expert evaluations, and how they will be made. And evaluations which will need to cover both the accessibility and the material of the learning outcome. This will be applied [pause], which we will aim to evaluate by the end of October. Is that too late? To have a plan?
Kenneth: have you got an earlier one, the evaluation of the portal one, which is the end of July?
[New tape]
Mary: and we need to find a specification for the [pause] will we be able to specify that? How the evaluations will take place and the timescale which are [pause] when the evaluations will take place.
Annie: Mary,
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: Can you clarify the role of the partner 2, because we are at present
Mary: ok, [pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Maybe I think what Hazel is trying to say here, [pause] is to go up to the
Mary: Basically there are three different
Jack: yes, the project portal can show the [pause] this is not part of work package 5
Mary: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: it is input
Mary: the portal will be valuated #
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and this is an input from the [pause] work package 4
Jack: work package 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and what you mean by responsible partners, it is by work package 4?
Mary: this is [pause] this basically says that the partner 2 is responsible for, [pause] responsible to develop the [pause] the prototype we will evaluate in work package 4.
[Clicking fingers]
Mary: ok, so basically this document which Hazel has

[Fabian, James and Jack having their own conversation]
Mary: specified is the [pause] what we will evaluate, which will be the input from work package 3 and
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and work package 4
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and who will evaluate it
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and when basically, when basically we will evaluate it.
Kenneth: Should that not be partner 1?
Mary: huh?
Kenneth: Should that be partner 1?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and the contributing partners are [long pause]
Mary: right
Jack: is partner 9, partner 2 and partner 7. [Pause]
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so that is the same for the
Kenneth: uh-huh
Mary: uh-huh
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: ok
[Can still hear whispering]
Ronnie: this is, what number is this? I am lost a little bit.
Mary: what number?
Ronnie: what we were discussing
Mary: that was [pause] the initial prototype of project 1.0, for the project portal version 1.0
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: it is number 1. It is the one for the evaluation
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: it is at the very beginning of the document.
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Morris: we have been jumping around
Mary: we have been jumping around, sorry. So, let me just summarize ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: again, about how the evaluation for the project e-learning portal has been planned to take place.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: First of all, as we said, by the end of July, we need to have the first version
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and we will need to evaluate.
Ronnie: end of July?
Mary: yes, by the end of July, we will have a detailed plan, as to how, to conduct the user based and expert based evaluations. And we will [pause] need contributions from the user group partners. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: the first item was what?
Mary: the first item was [pause] was the first version of the portal that we need to evaluate.
Morris: yes, by when?
Ronnie: by the end of July
Mary: by the end of July, yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Ronnie: and what about the authoring tool?
Mary: let us go through the evaluation of the portal first
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and then we will go through the evaluation
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and the plan for further work and for the evaluation of the authoring tool
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: The actual evaluation, after the planning of the initial prototype, it is [pause] it is planned to be commenced in mid august [pause] it is planned to be [pause] by the end of mid September
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: so the evaluation will take place with users, at least 5 users, in each country need to participate, and
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and this is by the end of September. And, by the end of July, the evaluations will need to take place.
Someone: shhh, shhh, shhh
Mary: and the specifications will be provided to the technical partners, and they are available from each user group, yes.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so this is version
Ronnie: Regarding, so, are we supposed to
[Can still hear whispering]
Ronnie: This is in the hand of partner 1, this is [pause] they are responsible for this?
Mary: they are responsible for this ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: partner 1
Mary: yes, and they are also responsible for planning the evaluations for, putting the users ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and providing technical feedbacks on the prototype
Ronnie: so, what will happen [pause] how will they use, [pause] the preliminary work that they have done? This is a problem, I [pause] between us?
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: thank you, very clear.
Mary: yep, ok. The second version of the project portal should be [[pause] should convey more extensive functionality, and the results of the evaluation from version 1 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and ongoing work by the technical partners to use voice xml problems for visually impaired learners. It should be available by the end [pause] by the end of October. I will change the name of that from partner 2 to partner 1. Is that feasible?

[Can still hear whispering]
[people say yes in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so, it will be a month and a half [pause] to improve the first version of the portal, and the evaluation of those. Ok
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: to plan the evaluations, ok
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: So, there will be a similar plan, for the evaluation for the third version, which we will need to produce
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and the other evaluation [pause] of the project portal version 2, will take place in between [pause] October and
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: by the end of December this year, we need to have the results of the evaluation, with at least 10 users in each country.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: Does this sound feasible?
[Can still hear whispering]
Paul: how many participants?
Mary: 10 users, in each country
[Can still hear whispering]
James: excuse me Mary, this thing that you are indicating in your document, is coming from [pause] uh the portal
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: are they are being [pause] with the scheduled plan that we have for work package 4 or 3? That you are suggesting?
Mary: they should go together
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: with the schedule
James: yes, but the [pause] we, [pause] the, the preliminary version of the portal ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: is agreed? We already had planned [pause] for our own activity, right?
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: we have to analyse [pause] the date that you are suggesting
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: we have to analyse
Mary: mhhhm hmmm
James: so, after that we analyse the date, that you are proposing for the second date of the portal.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-sate 1.1)***
James: the tool that you are making, ok, for that day if we will be available or not.
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: right?
Mary: ok, what we will need to decide is that
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: probably fairly soon, because we will need to start evaluating this task, and we need to let all the user group partners know when they will need to be required, and when they will need to do the evaluations, and the schedule, to work from
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and if you can give this feedback fairly soon
James: ok, of course, we will, provide the preliminary version as soon as possible ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and the final portal, or the final tool, is not available after [pause] after august 2003.
[Can still hear whispering]
James: So, the final version will be difficult
Mary: yeah, but we do not require the final version to start evaluating
James: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: But we, the final version of that time
Mary: yes
Kenneth: but the
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Kenneth: but there has to be an established plan
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: because there is not [pause] we have had too many projects where [pause] um, we have set out a plan like this, for evaluation [pause] and the interim versions of the development, have not been available on time, and in the end, all that is happening, in the project, which is the end of December 2003, we have to [pause] we cannot accept that the final, version of the tool, can be later, than [pause] set out in the work plan
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: otherwise, there is not to time to carry out the evaluation. The evaluation takes a certain amount of time. So, [pause] this is why we need to make sure, in the [pause] in the new version of the technical annex, there are plans for work packages 2 and 3 and 4 and at the same level, which is happening for work package 5. In other words, these are all interlocked plans which must interlock and must work and must be stuck to, otherwise, we cannot [pause] carry out the evaluations as required, in this contract/
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: so, it is absolutely, [pause] imperative, that we now, [pause] look at this, this is the first bit of planning [pause] which is planning the first bit of the project. [Pause] we need to get the rest of the plans in. But remember, if you are going to say, that some of these dates are too early, Then [pause [all you are doing is shortening the later stages. Because the final date exists at the end of December 2003. [Pause] so we do need to understand these interim dates, and are very very important.
[Can still hear whispering]
Kenneth: and therefore the plans for work packages 3 and 4, [pause] must be established to work with [pause] to work in the same way.
[Can still hear whispering]
James: Ok, ok, we have the other, [pause] calendar regarding the work activities in [pause] work packages 3 and 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
James: We are going to shortly distributor, and we are going to identify [pause] any
[Can still hear whispering]
James: problematic point, yeah?
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: who is going to provide the evaluation documents?
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: it will most probably be by questionnaire.
Paul: by questionnaire
Mary: ok, as Hazel is put, partner 8
[Can still hear whispering]

Mary: is responsible for making the plans, [pause] all user group partners
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: will be contributing to that. So, [pause] if you have any done similar work, or if you have any comments,
Paul: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Hazel and myself will be producing the initial task
Paul: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and then will be asking all the user partners to contribute with suggestions
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and that ok?
Ronnie: looks very good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Mary: we plan to have the final versions [pause] of the portal, available
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: by September 2003, and then will be evaluated between September, and December 2003
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and again, Hazel has suggested that the evaluations will take place, [pause]
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: with users, again with 10 users in each user group country, or each in each country. Ok? Now to provide a summary about the evaluation of the web authoring tool will take place.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: So, we will move the um [pause] from the initial version, to be at the end of July, is that correct, or will that be too soon? Or will you provide us with more details in the next couple of days?
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: Ok, so we are waiting on the input of that. Ok? We will change the responsible partners
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: ok, the plan for the evaluation of the
Jack: here
Mary: yes
Jack: Here, the tool is [pause]
[Can still hear whispering]
Jack: the responsible partner is partner 2, and the contributing partner is [pause] partner 9, partner 1, and 4
Mary: and?
Jack: says partner 4 name - not the full name
[Can still hear whispering]
Lucy: partner 4 [gives correct name of the partner] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: partner 4 ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Ronnie: partner 4 ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Mary: right. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and the initial prototype should be, [pause] should contain limited functionality.
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: The plan for the initial version of the project authoring tool
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: will be available by the end of December
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and the responsible partners are partner 8. Contributing partners are all the user group partners. [Pause]
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: The plan will contain the procedures to conduct user based evaluations
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: This evaluation will cover both the accessibility of the project authoring tool
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: to visually impaired authors, and the accessibility of the mark up languages and e-learning materials.
[Can still hear whispering]
Ronnie: And Mary, do you agree on our perspectives
[Can still hear whispering]
Ronnie: that partner 7 will, will not work on their [pause] but will work on the methodology
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
[Lucy nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: is this ok?
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Ronnie: alright ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Because partner 5 will be able to [pause] and participate
[Can still hear whispering]
Ronnie: the recruitment will be done by the national [pause] organizations
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and we shall [pause] we shall contribute to the methodology
Mary: thank you, [pause] that is great.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: so, perhaps, we need to
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: change the date of the first evaluation for this plan to be done between September and December this year. The evaluation of the first prototype of the authoring tool. Ok, but in lines of what partners 1 and 2 will provide, and may or may not change. The aim is to evaluate at least 10 users from each country. [Pause] However to point out [pause] the user partners will be [pause] because the potential students or users interested in e-learning will be [pause] will be web developers, or people who are interested in developing and editing
Ronnie: a stupid question
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: Does they have to be blind or partially sighted?
Mary: definitely ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: sorry [pause]
[Can still hear whispering]

Mary: the aim to have the 2nd version of the authoring tool [pause] which will include more extensive and realistic functionality, and will be based on the results from the first evaluation, and tools by both visually impaired authors. The aim is to have the second version available by the end of March 2003. Ok, you will consider whether that is feasible.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: Evaluations of the second version will again take place with the [pause] with the users, at least with 5 users in each country, between March 2003. And the tool should be available till the end of 2003.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: And the aim is to have the third version of the authoring tool by September 2003.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: which will improve the second version of the [pause] evaluation
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: which I believe is the last version, yep.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: and the final version of the tool, and [pause] the evaluations will again take place
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: with at least 5 users in each country, and the results should be
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: available at the end of the project, by December.
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: So, that is the plan for work package 5
[Can still hear whispering]
James: Thank you very much [pause], and this is the planification
[Can still hear whispering]
James: So, um [pause] any questions regarding work package 5, or we go to the [pause] the last point of the meeting.
[Can still hear whispering]
James: ok, so [pause] next week we have to provide the information to the commission, [pause] and some time we have to provide some deliverables.

Summary of documents to be sent

James: We can make a summary of the deliverables we have to [pause] as to send in June, July and September.
[Can still hear whispering]
James: This was already presented by Jack. [Pause] and in any case [pause] and these deliverables cannot [pause] can ask to fix the, the date of the [pause] the date of the next plenary meeting, so [pause] the first deliverable expected is the plug in compatibility for [pause] for the end of this month. [Pause] The [pause] the draft version, a version has to be circulated by all of the partners. [Pause]
[Can still hear whispering]
James: in order to receive the comments [pause] perhaps we can fix a [pause] a 10 days before?
[Can still hear whispering]
James: we can circulate
Jack: A first version of
[Clicking fingers]
Jack: of
James: the plug in compatibility for 20, for the 20th of June, and after that we receive, [pause] we will send to the commission, ok. The rest, of the following deliverables, are expected for the end of July. They are [pause] they are [um] they have to be leaded by partner 8, . I believe, correct me please Mary, I believe 2 of them are coming from work package 1
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: manual for the design, and the other is the specification dossier
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: at the same way please circulate your proposal, or document [pause] around 10 days before
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: we are going to put [pause] we are going to send an email in order to [pause] to remember, remind all dates.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-states 1.1)***
James: all other [pause] this is regarding work package 1. Regarding work package [pause], regarding work package 3, prototype of the integration [pause] plug in of the tool, also has to be delivered in July.
[Can still hear whispering]
James: and the [pause] and the version has to be circulated by the software factory, by the 20th of July. The following deliverable is coming from
[Can still hear whispering]
James: work package 4, portal, the deliverable is called, web version of the project manual, and also coming from work package, portal is the preliminary, version of the learning portal, and this also has to be done by the 20th of July. And finally, [pause] regarding the evaluation, which has been explained, by now, by Mary, the deliverables
[Can still hear whispering]
James: the final version of the deliverables
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: which is the [pause], which is the standard name, [pause] of the dossier
[Can still hear whispering]
Mary: preliminary version [gives a small laugh]
James: ok, [pause] so the following deliverables are [pause] in august, the quarterly report, which has to be made by partner 1, and this has to be made, circulated around the 20th of August. I do not know if this will be fine, to many [pause] that date? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: 15th of august, nobody
Ronnie: not possible. [Gives a small laugh] problem ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: it will be a small problem.
James: and the rest are at the end of September. Two for partner 8, manual for accessible design and dossier
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and other important deliverables are the quarterly report, and [pause] and perhaps we can link this point of the deliverable with, [pause] with the date of the next plenary meeting in [pause] in my personal point of view, the deliverable, for September, are important, and to maintain that the next plenary meeting, in September.
[Can still hear whispering]
James: and we have enough time, at the beginning of September, [pause] to modify, if needed some of these deliverables, that way perhaps we will, we can [pause] maintain the 7th of June. Sorry, of September
Lucy: sorry, did you say the 1st of September? I did not hear you
James: um, [pause] first week of September is probably a bit risky, taking into account [pause] that one week before is august, and many of [pause] much people is on holidays perhaps. The week starting the 9th or the 16th?
[Can still hear whispering]

Date of next meeting

James: in that way also, software partner 2[pause] would like to make a proposal for the consortium., in the following sense. [Pause] as you know [pause] and it was explained yesterday, we are going to [pause] to make a [pause] make a speech in IBC, in Amsterdam. And, also we are going to have [pause] a stand, and um [pause] so, we have to move, some, some persons to Holland, between Friday 13 and Saturday, 17th. Yeah? So, in order to reduce [pause] costs of travelling [pause] especially for both partners 1 and 2, that we have to be [pause] in Amsterdam. We propose, after consulting with partner 9, we propose to the consortium, that to celebrate the next meeting in September, [pause] in Luevena
Mary: Lueven ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: in Belgium
Annie: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Desmond: yes, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Um, and [pause] and we also [pause] propose this meeting
[Can still hear whispering]
James: all [pause] or perhaps the 11th and 12, or the 18th and 19th, as we have to move several persons to Holland, from Holland to Belgium is not an additional cost for us.
Lucy: the 11th and the 12th, is a Wednesday and Thursday
James: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: so we will have very expensive tickets. Is it not possible to put it on the weekend?
James: the meeting?
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: Beginning on Thursday, and finishing on Friday
Someone: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: because to have an appex ticket,
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: you have to stay one night, from Saturday to Sunday
Mary: yes Saturday ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: to reduce [pause] the costs of the partners [pause] ok, 12th and 13th? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: ok 12th and 13th? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
James: or perhaps 19th and 20th, and perhaps this is to late
[Can still hear whispering]
James: if we have to modify several things
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: for the deliverables
Kenneth: I am at a conference, in Budapest on the 19th and 20th ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: 19th and 20th?
Some people say: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: 12th and 13th is available for everyone?
[Can hear whispering]
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Paul: Did we not just talk about um, [pause] having a Saturday night meeting?
(Sub-state 5.1)
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: so, I do not get it? You are now talking about a Thursday and Friday again, but in order to reduce travel costs, Lucy just pointed
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: that it would be good to have [pause] to have a weekend date. So what about Friday and Saturday?
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: we will
James: This is in the same line, with the proposal with partner 5,
[Can hear whispering]
James: in order to put the meetings, in [pause] Thursday and Friday, and [pause] um [pause] Saturday and Sunday?
[Can hear clicking]
James: is not available for the private companies, because [pause] we are not, it it, is not possible for the private companies, so, [pause]
Lucy: but we have a date on it
James: and what about Thursday and Friday?
Lucy: what about have the date on a Saturday? If we work the whole Friday, and like today, we have half a day on Saturday. Is this not possible?
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Can hear whispering]
James. sorry ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
Lucy: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James. I believe it is not ok for everyone, for [pause] for several partners
Paul: it is possible
James: Thursday and Friday?
[Can hear whispering]
James. Thursday and Friday, in the same way that we have [pause] that we have made today, for example?
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: but why not? I do not understand, why is it not possible to have Friday, and half of the Saturday, I do not get it
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Kenneth tries to speak]
James: because, because
Kenneth: because we do not agree on meetings at the weekends. I am sorry we are working long enough hours, without meeting ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: at the meetings as well. And there is absolutely no need to do so, [pause] and [pause] we should be able to hold these meetings during the week
[Can hear whispering]
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
James: ok, so [pause] trying to use Thursday and Friday?
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some others say yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

James: we will try to make it on Thursday
[Can hear whispering]
James: and try, to [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
James: What about the 12th and 13th of September
[Can hear whispering]
[Mary and Erin are whispering]
Lucy: Can you say it again?
James: 12 and 13th? [Says it slowly]
Lucy: good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: 12th and the 13th, yep, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Kenneth: I cannot be sure ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
James: ok, ok, so, [pause] thank you ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
(Sub-state 4.1)
[Can hear whispering]

Review report

Kenneth: um, just
James: Yes, just one
Kenneth: just going back to the review report
[Fabian nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yup ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: one of the things that they pick up is, is the exploitation plan should be developed the risk assessment, should be carried out, and the business plan needs to be developed.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: When are we going to.[pause] when are they going to be done, because they would be expected to certainly be [pause] be part of the annual report.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: the exploitation, [pause] the development on the exploitation plan, risk assessment of the project, and [pause] um the business plan, should be developed [pause] should be developed.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: And by including them in this review, the commission, is going to actually expect a response to those
James: One second.
Jack: My, my understanding is this [pause] is that um [pause] as, in the executive summary that they say the same thing, but [pause] they explain the exploitation plan is very general, and should be developed throughout the course of the project. I do not expect that right now [pause]
Kenneth: but, I think you need to check with the commission, but I [pause] from other projects, I would expect that they would want an updated version [pause] as part of the annual report
Jack: ah, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but the annual report
Jack: ah, you mean the annual review, at the end of the
Kenneth: at the end of the first year
Jack: ah, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in other words, when we do the [pause]
Jack: I thought you meant now
Kenneth: no, [pause] by the end of September ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Kenneth: we need to be looking at [pause] at addressing those points
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: So, that is another part of the deliverable which were not included as part of your earlier list.
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: Ok, so now we [pause] we will update the exploitation plan, as part of the deliverable for
[Can hear whispering]
James: um
Kenneth: and again it will need to be noted in the technical annex, because, again, in order to address the review comments
Jack: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: we need to say [pause] what are we going to do about it
James: ok, thank you, very much for these useful comments. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Closing the Madrid meeting

James: So, thank you very much for your presence here in Madrid, [pause] and as expected we have lunch, if anyone of you [pause] has to leave for the airport or to other place, and need a taxi, please tell us. Thank you.
[Meeting was closed at 2.09]

MESSAGE 1

From: Charles
To: Project team
Subject: PROJECT: Requirements for authoring tool
Date: Monday, June 10, 2002 5:16 PM

Dear partners,

Please find attached the current version of the requirements for the authoring tool. This document is almost identical to the version I used for my presentation in Madrid; some details have been added in response to comments by Paul.
The document should be considered as a 'request for comments', both by the user group partners and the technical partners. At this moment, around 33 requirements have 'priority 1', 19 have 'priority 2' and only 4 have 'priority 3'; the high number of 'priority 1' requirements is rather high and may not be realistic. We hope your comments will enable us to strike a
better balance.

Regards,
Charles

MESSAGE 2
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Documents after the meeting
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 11:16 AM

Dear Colleagues,

first of all, thank you for your presence in Madrid After our interesting meeting I would like to inform and remind you several administrative issues we must do urgently:

(I have already sent some personal emails requesting documents to some partners)
1.- The FTP site now includes the presentations made in Madrid (WP1 (Mary, Erin and Charles), WP2-3-4 (Annie), WP6 (Fabian) and WP7 (Jack) and also the documents sent by Hazel just before the meeting. Check the list of documents included in the root directory of the ftp site.

2.- We are working on a new Annex 1 for the Commission, trying to include the suggestions made in Madrid and the questions from the experts. You will receive the draft this afternoon or tomorrow morning. Please, at this moment we will need feedback from the partners. Remember, this will be part of the new contract, till the end of the project.

3.- The minutes from the meeting will be sent at the end of this week, including the actions decided in Madrid.

4.- Please, confirm me if the person that will sign the amendments is the same as in the first one.

5.- In case you decide to go for a mandate to Partner 1 to sign the amendments for you, please send me an email and I will send you the template for this mandate. Remember that this is not mandatory. However, it will make the process easier.

6.- Check the values in table "Cumulative effort to-date (person hours)" included in the last version of the second quarterly report. This is urgent and we will send the new version next monday with your corrections.

7.- Don't forget the request I have already made to some partners. They
are very urgent!
Best regards,

Jack

MESSAGE 3
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: New version of PROJECT Annex 1
Date: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:00 AM

Dear Colleagues,

you can find attached to this email the new version (v. 16) of the Annex 1.

Please, send your contributions and comments before Monday afternoon, in order to send it to the Project Officer as soon as possible.

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: 118. Annex1 Description of work-V16.zip)

MESSAGE 4
From: Mary
To: Project team
Subject: PROJECT: Amendments for WP1 and WP5
Date: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:46 AM
Dear All,

Partner 8 would like to propose the attached amendments for the revised Work Plan for WP1 and WP5.
Hazel is out of the office today, but will check her email tonight for any comments from partners on these amendments.

Thanks.
Mary and Hazel

MESSAGE 5
From: Charles
To: Project team
Subject: Web site usability resources
Date: Thursday, June 13, 2002 11:16 AM

Dear partners,

I found the following article in the Free Pint Newsletter.

<http://www.freepint.com/issues/130602.htm#tips>
"Web Site Usability Resources"
By Tim Houghton
Introduction

"To be usable, an interface must let the people who use the product, working in their own physical, social, and cultural environments, accomplish their goals and tasks effectively and efficiently" – Tom Farrell.
Web site usability is the practice of creating web sites that are easy to use Often also termed user-centric design. It sounds obvious but in fact it has taken 'usability' several years to climb steadily but inexorably up the agendas of those who commission, design and maintain web sites
This article does not attempt to offer usability tips, or advise on how to run usability tests; instead it provides links to information for those interested in this topic whether they are researchers, designers or web site owners. It is pitched at an elementary level and so will probably be most useful to those who are new to the subject.

Where to Start?

OK, so where to start? Well ironically, switching off your screen and curling up with a good book may be the best way forward. Whilst the web is a wonderful resource for digging up information and linking disparate sources, it is often not the best medium for the development of a linear argument and the understanding of basic principles.
My suggestions for introductory texts are:
Jakob Nielsen - 'Designing Web Usability: The Practice of Simplicity'. This book came out in 2000 and in total has now sold over 250,000 copies. Jakob is probably the best known usability guru and whilst there may be parts of his advice with which you may strongly disagree (are splash screens really always bad?) the book is an excellent introduction that has stood the test of time. For a useful precis of the book's main points see this Web Reference article which came out in 2000 <http://www.webreference.com/new/nielsen.html>. In a slightly lighter vain, 'Don't Make Me Think!' by Steve Krug is a
useful book that entertains whilst it informs. Again it sets out principles for usability rather than going too deeply into the How
To's of HTML coding
'The Art and Science of Web Design' by Jeffrey Veen adopts a more creative/design driven approach to the issue of usability (he used to run HotWired.com) providing a counterpoint to the more engineering/science driven approach adopted by Jakob. The tension between art and science, or form and function is one that runs through much of the usability debate.

Usability News

Having understood the fundamentals of building user-centric web sites you can then keep up with the latest issues via some or all of the following:
Usability News <http://www.usabilitynews.com> Does what the URL says! Well written articles plus events and jobs from a UK based team There is an e-mail newsletter also.
Useit.com <http://useit.com> Jakob Nielsen's personal site which contains links to other articles he has written plus his bi-weekly
'Alertbox' column. You'll notice several other sites in this article are in a very similar style to this one as this is effectively his
'template'. FrontEnd Infocentre <http://infocentre.frontend.com/servlet/Infocentre> A good selection of articles maintained by the interface design specialists FrontEnd. Tomalak's Realm <http://www.tomalak.org/> Looks very like Useit.com.
It contains summaries and links to articles concerning strategic web design issues, many of which address site usability.
Bohmann Usability <http://www.bohmann.dk> Collection of articles (mostly) about usability from Kristoffer Bohmann, a Danish consultant. Some are rather short but he's not a fence sitter so they can be stimulating. UsableWeb <http://usableweb.com> A usability portal rather than a news site. It hasn't been updated much in 2002 but there are still an awful
lot of good links on here. It covers 'information architecture' also, a close relation (some would say a sub-set) of usability.

DIY Usability and HTML Standards

Having cracked the jargon and got up to speed on what's happening in the industry you may feel its time to start improving your own site. The best way to do so is to use actual usability testing. In other words observe users interacting with your site and then incorporate their feedback into your design. However, this can be expensive and difficult for the inexperienced. A cheaper way is to evaluate the site yourself against a set of principles (culled from the sources above) and to test the HTML code against recognised standards. HTML standards are an important branch of usability as they try to ensure consistency across the web. Just think of trying to drive a car
with the accelerator and the brake transposed. The most important standards are probably those developed by the WorldWideWeb Consortium <http://www.w3.org> (founded by Tim Berners-Lee in 1994). You may also see references to Section 508 standards This is a US law that requires all United States Federal Agencies with websites to make them accessible to individuals with disabilities. Many US corporations have also applied them to at least part of their sites. There is also
a strong ethical argument for not closing off sites to those with disabilities.
Tools to test HTML code are widely available on the web, they include: W3Schools <http://www.w3schools.com/site/site_validate.asp> A free HTML validator, it checks compliance with W3C standards. Web Tools <http://zing.ncsl.nist.gov/WebTools/index.html> These tools have been around for a while but there are a series of useful
downloadable applications. Usablenet <http://www.usablenet.com> Submit a URL and test up to 5 pages of your site free. The software automates some of the more technical aspects of usability, for example checking HTML code complies with W3C standards. Bobby <http://www.cast.org/bobby> Another page checking utility. Net Raker <http://www.netraker.com> Slightly different from the above in that the site provides online tools to support human usability testing, for example facilitating user feedback, (a sort of virtual usability lab).
Yale Web Style Guide http://www.med.yale.edu/caim/manual/index.html A site from Yale University that offers detailed 'How To' guides to implementing easy to use web sites.

Get External Help

For those with larger sites and greater resources it may be worth bringing in an external professional Two big names in this niche are: Nielsen Norman Group <http://www.nngroup.com> Its three principles Bruce Tognazzini, Don Norman and Jakob Nielsen are all noted speakers in the field. Adaptive Path <http://www adaptivepath.com> Jeffrey Veen's consulting arm.
For those looking for less well known firms or individuals the following professional bodies may also be useful. Usability Professionals Association <http://www.upassoc.org>, the US/ global site for the association. It includes a consultant directory. UPA UK <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/research/husat/ukupa/index.html>, its UK arm.

Events & Education

To deepen your understanding of the subject there are a growing number of conferences and seminars and it is achieving greater prominence within web design courses. Links to event listings include: malak's Realm <http://www.tomalak.org/conference.html> US plus a few international events here. usability News <http://www.usabilitynews.com/default.asp?c=3> UK, US
and European events. British Human Computer Interaction (HCI) Group<http://www.bcs-hci.org.uk> UK events are listed on the right of the home page. Usability Professionals' Association http://www.lboro.ac.uk/research/husat/ukupa/diary.htm>
Diary of events for the UK chapter of the UPA.

Anti-Usability

There is a section of the web design community that hates usability rofessionals. They feel that they prescribe too many rules leading to all and uncreative sites (we're back to form versus function again). Here are three links that put the other side of the case in polemical fashion.
<http://www.youzit.com>
<http://www.alistapart.com/stories/bluegreen/bluegreen_1.html>
<http://www.alistapart.com/stories/sympathy/index.html>
Finally, maybe the easiest way to learn how to create highly usable web sites is to look at ones that aren't! Web Pages That Suck <http://www.webpagesthatsuck.com/home.html> Just hope your own site never makes it into the hall of fame.
I hope the above links make for stimulating clicking and a lively follow-up in the Free Pint Bar.
>----------
Tim Houghton is a director of Parallel54; a research firm that specialises in monitoring web site content and enhancing web site
usability. He has been an avid, though sometimes frustrated web user since 1995. Tim is also currently developing educational material for a taught module on web usability.
>----------
Related Free Pint links:
* "Internet Webmaster" articles and resources in the Free Pint Portal
<http://www.freepint.com/go/p183>
* Post a message to the author, Tim Houghton, or suggest further resources, at the Bar <http://www.freepint.com/bar>
* Read this article online, with activated hyperlinks
<http://www.freepint.com/issues/130602.htm#tips>
* Access the entire archive of Free Pint articles and issues
<http://www.freepint.com/portal/content/>

Charles – Project

MESSAGE 6
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Re: New version of PROJECT Annex 1
Date: Monday, June 17, 2002 12:17 PM

Dear Colleagues,

I forward you an email from Charles, since there was some problems in sending it.

Best regards,
JJack

----- Remitido por Jack con fecha 17/06/02 10:22

Charles — Para: Jack
project team — cc:
14/06/02 19:08 — Asunto: Re: New version of project Annex 1

Dear Jack,

My comments are in the ZIP-file attached to this mail. There is also a document with comments on the Review Report, because one issue was not discussed in Madrid: the reviewers expected that we also reviewed VoiceXML tools (their functionality? their accessibility?).

Regards,
Charles

MESSAGE 7
From: Adam
To: Project Team
Subject: Re:Project: Requirements for authoring tool
Date: Monday, June 17, 2002 1:21 PM

Dear Charles,

I have read your document concerning Authoring tools requirements with interest. Please find below my comments.

1."check the spelling of documents (spell checker invoked by author) [Priority 1];dictionary [Priority 2] ". Could you please precise this point ?
If I have understood this point, here is the questions which come to me : a) Should the authoring tool spell and verify while entering text on keyboard ?
b) Should the authoring tool verify the content of the document during the validation ? In fact, it is probable that it is possible to choose between these two options.
2. Authoring tools can be used in different ways :
- You can exclusively use them to completely design your web pages
- You may need to modify HTML code manually to meet the results you expect. or because you may ignore one of the functionalities of the authoring tool, or because of the limits of the authoring tool. In this case, what kind of help should the authoring tool provide ? For instance, many authoring tools provide a list of HTML tags or scripting language commands while editing a web page. What kind of help could we provide in this case ? –e.g.
- Displaying a list of tags or commands easily readable, attaching voice to this list which could read the currently selected tag or command....

3."enable the user to transform presentation mark-up that is misused to convey structure into structural mark-up, and to transform presentation mark-up used for style into style sheets [Priority 1];
" What does it mean exactly ?
Authoring tools provide the possibility to choose between inserting style directly in the HTML code or creating stylesheets contained into external files.

4.Tutorial "The tutorial would need to include built-in examples of how to create accessible web pages using the tool [Priority 1]".
The help and tutorial interfaces should also allow to include the possibility to exploit ready-to-use examples. This could be done with the copy/paste technology. This could be helped by voice input.

Best Regards.
Adam.

MESSAGE 8
From: Fabian
To: Project Team
Cc: Project Team; James
Subject: Answers to the reviewers' comments
Date: Monday, June 17, 2002 7:26 PM

Dear partners.

Here you can find attached the draft version of the document containing the answers to the reviewers' technical comments included in the Project Review Report.

This document must be sent to the Commission as soon as possible. Please, send your comments and contributions before the end of tomorrow day.

You will also find the latest version of the draft technical annex that will be sent to the Commission. Please, send your comments and contributions about this document as soon as possible.

(See attached file: Annex1_answers.ZIP)
Best regards,
Fabian

MESSAGE 9
From: Hazel
To: Fabian; Project Team
Cc: Jack; James
Subject: Re. Answers to the reviewers' comments
Date: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 12:45 PM

Dear Partners,

(1) I was very disappointed to receive another revision of the
Technical Annex yesterday without the incorporation of my proposed changes to WP5 and no comments from the managing partners as to why my changes are not acceptable. Given that they are based on the plan = which was discussed in Madrid and Mary tells me was not highly problematic, what is the problem. I find the current set of tasks on WP5 very difficult to understand and the deliverables do not reflect the reporting we will need to undertake. Could I please have an explanation as soon as possible. I am not at all happy with the TA being resubmitted with WP5 unchanged.

(2) I have a proposal to improve the objectives as stated at the beginning of the TA. The English needs quite a lot of work, and it seemed to me that the first objective is too general and would be better combined with current object ive 3. The bit in current objective 3 about "light text documents" has nothing to do with an objective and I do not understand why it is mentioned. I would propose the following for a more coherent set:

Objectives:

1. To increase the accessibility and usability of Web pages, and in particular, e-learning materials on the World Wide Web, for visually impaired users by the use of voice interaction.

2. To develop an accessible Web authoring tool - a tool which will both be accessible to visually impaired Web developers and produce Web pages which are fully accessible. This will also be achieved by the use of voice interaction.

3. To demonstrate the utility and usability of voice interaction by developing an e-learning web portal for visually impaired students which uses voice interaction.

(3) In your reply to 9.2 on IMS, I think we can provide a much better answer than what you have at the moment. The reviewers are not asking the oproject to develop an industry standard, and it is silly to say that, as one project should not develop a standard by itself. They are suggesting that we get involved with the standard developing work of IMS. On Thursday I am meeting with Martyn Cooper from the Open University in the UK, who is very involved with IMS work and I will discuss with him how we can be more involved For the moment I think our reply should be.

"The Project will become actively involved with the IMS standards developing work. We will seek to test emerging IMS standards with the material developed and evaluated within the projectL, and we will also feed information into the standards work from the results of the Project".

Best regards,
Hazel

MESSAGE 10
From: Adam
To: Project team
Subject: Re:Project: Requirements for authoring tool
Date: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 5:02 PM

Dear Charles,

>Do you think that providing templates is not sufficient? Do you think we should provide wizards?

1. In my opinion, providing wizard is a good idea. But this wizard must allow web authors to get pages which are very close to their needs (what they really want to do) in order to add a value to the authoring tool. This implies that the wizard has to be precise and ask a lot of questions...

2. Concerning the tutorial, providing examples that you can copy and paste in your own code is very useful. Authors may often have to search for informations in help and tutorials while they are creating their pages.
Providing ready-to-use pieces of HTML code avoid to rewrite and make syntax errors (i e saving of time). A lot of tools already propose this feature.

Best regards.
Adam

> Dear Adam,
>
> Thank you for your feedback. I'll try to answer some of your questions below.
>
> At 14:20 17/06/02, you wrote:
> (...)
> >1."check the spelling of documents (spell checker invoked by author)
> >[Priority 1];

> >dictionary [Priority 2] ". Could you please precise this point ?
> >If I have understood this point, here is the questions which come to me :
> >a) Should the authoring tool spell and verify while entering text on keyboard ?
> >b) Should the authoring tool verify the content of the document during the
> >validation ?
> >In fact, it is probable that it is possible to choose between these two
> >options.
>
> "spell checker invoked by author" means that the spell checker checks the
> whole document when the author starts that function, i.e. there is no
> "check spelling while editing" (which is an option in Word). Until now, I
> have considered spell check and validation as two separate functions; the
> validation function does not invoke the spelling checker.
> Partner 3 assigned this priority 1, but is not certain that this function will
> be included in the tool (unless we use a commercially available spelling
> checker for Java).
>
> >2. Authoring tools can be used in different ways :
> >- You can exclusively use them to completely design your web pages
> >- You may need to modify HTML code manually to meet the results you
> >expect. or because you may ignore one of the functionalities of the
> >authoring tool, or because of the limits of the authoring tool. In this
> >case, what kind of help should the authoring tool provide ? For instance,
> >many authoring tools provide a list of HTML tags or scripting language
> >commands while editing a web page. What kind of help could we provide in
> >this case ? e.g.
> >- Displaying a list of tags or commands easily readable, attaching voice
> >to this list which could read the currently selected tag or command....
>
> Lists of HTML elements, CSS properties, VoiceXML, etc. would be useful.
> Thanks for suggesting this feature.
>
> >3."enable the user to transform presentation mark-up that is misused to
> >convey structure into structural mark-up, and to transform presentation
> >mark-up used for style into style sheets [Priority 1];
> >" What does it mean exactly ?
> >Authoring tools provide the possibility to choose between inserting style
> >directly in the HTML code or creating stylesheets contained into external
> >files.
>
> This requirement was suggested by partner 3 (in their draft report on authoring
> tools) but it comes from the WAI Authoring Tools Accessibility Guidelines
> (checkpoint 4.5). An example of presentation mark-up that is misused to
> convey structure would be <font size="..." color="..."> instead of <h1>,
> <h2>, ... Some people also use <blockquote> instead of CSS to create a
> paragraph with a margin, or <address> to create a paragraph in italics.
> (This is actually misuse of structural markup to create visual effects.)
>
> >4.Tutorial "The tutorial would need to include built-in examples of how to
> >create accessible web pages using the tool [Priority 1]".
> > The help and tutorial interfaces should also allow to include the
> > possibility to exploit ready-to-use examples. This could be done with the
> > copy/paste technology. This could be helped by voice input.
>
> Do you think that providing templates is not sufficient? Do you think we
> should provide wizards?
>
> Thanks again.
> Best regards,
➢ Charles

MESSAGE 11
From: Annie
To: Project Team
Subject: WP3-Web Authoring Tool Requirements
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2002 10:02 AM

Dear partners,

as we agreed on our last meeting in Madrid we attach a document with the requirements of the project Authoring Tool that partner 2 has in mind. These requirements base mainly on the work produced by partner 9 on Accessibility and Web Authoring Tools Requirements. We have been studying these requirements since the first version of the document was released, considering whether they would add some value to the visual solution and also if they were affordable, considering the time schedule provided for the tool development. Therefore, from a realistic point of view, we understand that these will be the set of requirements that the Tool would achieve. If no partner disagrees this list of requirements will be the basis of our work on the next 15 months.

As well, our work has been focused on the integration of voice in the Tool and the Architecture Design of the Tool.

The integration of voice in the Tool has been our main goal since it is our first milestone towards the commission. Some technical aspects (Web integration, Java integration, the use of grammar files) had to be resolved. In order to do so we have created some proofs of concept. Some related to the use of voice synthesis and recognition on a navigation system, others to
test the added value that the project solution could give in scenarios such as a forms, multiple choice questions, submissions, data validation features...Some of these proofs were shown at the Madrid meeting, others are
still in deployment process.

The objective of these proofs of concepts is that the user group gets a feeling of what the project Tool is about, and contribute with their suggestions to decide the better way to make an accessible tool and an e-learning portal that is both usable and accessible.

Best regards to everyone, please submit your comments

Annie

MESSAGE 12
From: Kenneth
To: Annie; Project Team
Subject: RE: WP3-Web Authoring Tool Requirements
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2002 4:20 PM

Hi Annie,
Thank you for sending out that document. However, it does not seem to cover the same level of detail as was presented at the Madrid meeting. At this stage it would be useful to integrate all of the design specifications that you are proposing so that we get a better idea of what the tool will be capable.

You mention in your email proofs of concept. Please can you be more specific and again present to the rest of us the material on which you have been working. Any information on the use of voice for aiding navigation is of particular interest.

Many thanks
Kenneth

MESSAGE 13
From: Charles
To: Kenneth; Annie; Project Team
Subject: RE: WP3-Web Authoring Tool Requirements
Date: Wednesday, June 19, 2002 5:21 PM

Dear Kenneth,

Annie's document was sent out before I had received and integrated the comments on the document I presented in Madrid (I mailed this document on 10 June). I will send out a new version tomorrow morning; this version will contain all the requirements that have been identified until now, but with a new priority label: the requirements mentioned in Annie's document will be assigned a "Core Priority", the others keep their original priority levels. This way we will have one document instead of two, without losing track of the requirements that partner 2 has in mind.

Regards,
Charles

MESSAGE 14
From: Annie
To: Project Team
Subject: WP3-Web Authoring Tool Requirements
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2002 11:32 AM

Dear Kenneth,

the list of requirements we have sent is, as Charles called it, the "core" of the tool in terms of special accessibility features that none other tool has

These accessibility features are the add-value of the project tool, therefore we need the agreement of all the partners to continue working on these basis. We are aware that to achieve these requirements we will have to invest a lot of effort and that is why we are asking for the agreement of all the partners with this "core functionality" proposal.

On the other hand, the list of requirements showed in Madrid was a detailed set of functions that any web authoring tool should have.

The project tool will also be a general purpose web authoring tool, so it should cover a set of general functions such as html page edition, insert elements, open an existing page, modify the attributes of an element and so on. As well our project tool will enable a developer to introduce accessibility features and voice integration on pages, and that would be our added value.
The document introduced in Madrid listed those general functions any web authoring tool performs and so will our project tool. If you are interested on this detailed list of functions we can produce a document and send it to you.

To sum up the project Tool will have:

a set of functions focused on accessibility (the set of requirements we ent on our previous e-mail, "the Core Priority")

a set of general functions that any web authoring tool should have (the document presented in Madrid) both the accessibility functions and the general purpose functions will be integrated together. So to say, the general purpose functions will be developed in such a way as to be accessible and to assist the web developer to create accessible web pages with little extra effort.

If you want us to give a more technical explanation on how we plan to solve any of those accessibility functions we can produce a document as well. We have the technical knowledge but we need the user inputs to decide how we ould apply the technology available to create an accessible web authoring tool or help the tools that are already in the market. The functionality of e Tool is a result of WP1 the users requirements, and that the technical partners will give technical solutions to problems detected by the users.

You mention navigation with voice integrated and the users must be the ones who determine how they would like it to be, or else, the problems they find using a screen-reader on a web environment so that we can think of alternative ways to solve those problems either with voice integration or something else.

The proofs of concept I mentioned are a result of an effort that the technical partners made to give alternative solutions to problems visually impaired people have that Mary gave us As we agreed on our Paris meeting we would produce some solutions to the problems detected by Mary. Those samples had been tested by Mary and the rest of the technical partners before they were made available to the rest of the users at http://www.conpalabras.com/visualproject. In this web page , you must
install the CONPALABRAS plugin and then go to the examples link. If you have any problem please contact us.
More proofs have been produced but we don't want to make them available until we can ensure that anyone can download them and play with them without problems, these samples were shown at the Madrid meeting. The complexity of the project is a concern to everyone and for the technical partners is even harder since we have no expertise working on accessible environments and the help of the users group is extremely important.

Best regards,
Annie

MESSAGE 15
From: Erin
To: Project team
Cc: Kenneth; Partner 3
Subject: Project Speech Recognition
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2002 11:32 AM

Dear partners,

For further information on speech recognition and the ETSI standard please go to http://portal.etsi.org/HF/STFs/STF182.asp

On this site you should find a draft paper on the ETSI standard, some of the voice requirements in this paper may be of particular interest for the project

Telecommunication, merging with information processing, intersecting with mobility and internet technology, is leading to the development of new interactive applications and services, offering global access. The enabler technology for voice user interfaces, the most natural user interaction with these often complex systems and services, is speech recognition.

In order to enable the reuse of the user's knowledge between different applications and devices, the most common spoken command vocabulary for ICT products and services for major European languages is being standardized. Voice enabling communication devices and services, on the term of the end user, is fully in line with the ambitions of the eEurope initiative and well aligned with Design for All principles.
**********snip here**********
Kind regards,
Erin

MESSAGE 16
From: Charles
To: Project team
Subject: Project WP3 Requirements
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:08 PM

Dear partners,

Please find attached the fourth version of the requirements for the authoring tool. This version incorporates the comments the feedback given on the previous version (10 June) and the "core requirements" identified in the document that Annie sent out yesterday. I also use the opportunity to send you the current version of the glossary.

Regards,
Charles

MESSAGE 17
From: Fabian
To: Project team
Subject: FTP Server update
Date: Friday, June 21, 2002 12:13 PM

Dear partners

We have updated the FTP server with some new documents:
- The last versions of the Annex1
- Several documents about the tool requirements / functionality
- Project Glossary

As usual, you will find the List of Documents in the root directory of the FTP.

Best regards,
Fabian

MESSAGE 18
From: Fabian
To: Project team
Subject: New documents in the FTP
Date: Friday, June 21, 2002 12:20 PM

Dear partners

Other three documents have been uploaded the to FTP server:
- Work Plan for WP4 (E-learning portal)
- Minutes of the Madrid Plennary Meeting (June 2002)
- List of actions of the Madrid Plennary Meeting (June 2002)

Best regards,
Fabian

MESSAGE 19
From: Jack
Date: 21 June 2002 14:20
To: Project team
Subject: Annex 1 sent

Dear Colleagues,

we have sent to the Commission the last version of Annex 1 and the docu= ment answering the reviewer's comments.

Thank you for your contributions.
Best regards,
Jack

P.S. I will be out of my office for some days. Please, send any mail yo=u would like to send me with copy to Fabian (gives his e-mail address and James (gives his e-mail address)
=

MESSAGE 20
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Annual Review of the project

Date: Friday, June 21, 2002 2:28 PM

Dear Colleagues,

please find enclosed for your information a message from the European Commission regarding the dates for the annual review of the project in Brussels.

Best regards,
Jacj

Dear Project Co-ordinator,

Your annual review will take place in Brussels during the days between September 30th and October 4th, 2002.

Details will be sent to you officially with the exact time and place as soon as the detailed planning is finished. If you have some strong reserves for some particular days during that week, please let us know immediately as it might still be possible to accommodate them. We currently intend to concentrate the review sessions at the beginning of that week.

Details of the exact review procedure will also been sent to you with exact date and time. For your preliminary information, you will be asked to provide copies of the latest version of the following documents for the reviewers before the review:
- technical annex
- all official deliverables expected by the time of the review
- periodic report / quarterly management reports
Would you please note that the information for the reviewers must arrive here in Brussels at the latest three weeks before the start of the review session, that is by the 6th of September.

The format of the actual review will be a presentation / demonstration by the project, followed by a question and answer session. The whole review process would not last more than half a day per project. The participation of your project in project clusters, as advocated by the Commission, will also be discussed during the review.

Best Regards
NAtional Expert

MESSAGE 21
From: Jack
Date: 21 June 2002 14:33
To: Project Team
Subject: Letter for prolongation of contract

Dear Colleagues,

the Commission is asking for a letter of each partner stating that they agree in asking for the contract to be extended to cover the full project.

For the moment, an email with this document will be enough. Please, send it as soon as possible.

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 22
From: Mary
To: Project team
Cc: Sajal
Subject: Project: e-learning requirements
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 10:58 AM

Dear All,

Please find enclosed an updated version of the user requirements for e-learning applications. It has been extended to include more specific requirements for the project e-learning portal and requirements for interaction using voice. Please can you all have a look at this document and provide your comments and suggestions.

Best regards.
Mary

MESSAGE 23
From: Fabian
To: Project Tea,
Subject: new version of project official web site
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2002 10:50 AM

Dear partners.

A new version of the official web site of the project (www.project.org) is Available.

There is a new Consortium Area. To access to that section, you will need a login and a password.

Those are:
- login: project
- password: xxxxxxxx

This zone is currently under development and is not yet opperative.

Best regards.

MESSAGE 24
From: Charles
To: Erin
Cc: Project team; Kenneth
Subject: RE: Requirements WP1/WP3: request for comments
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2002 11:07 AM

Dear Erin,

Here are some answers to your questions.

At 15:35 20/05/02, Erin wrote:
>(...)
>I have some questions with regards to the use of Java. Do you know if it
>would be possible for a screen reader such as JAWS to access the new
>authoring tool for the project if it is developed in Java (with voice), without

I understand that JAWS is a frequently used screen reader, but did you test Java applications with other screen readers?
Do you know if there are problems with screen magnifiers?

>having to install the Java access bridge or utilities in order to access
>the
>tool? We have had problems accessing Java based tools. For example, if you
>look at the free web authoring tool Arachnophilia version 5 which can be
>found at: http://www.arachnoid.com/arachnophilia/index.html this tool has
>been designed using Java and is totally inaccessible to a screen reader.
>After the installation of this tool, the user has to install the JRE in
>order to access the tool. I asked the W3C list what to do next in order to
>try to get the tool to work with a screen reader, a W3C member suggested
>downloading the Java access bridge and Java access utilities in order to
>use
>the tool with a screen reader. After downloading these additional tools I
>found that the web authoring tool still did not work, it was later
>confirmed
>that this tool had not been designed with accessibility in mind. However,
>it
>appears that these downloads are likely to be needed even with an
>accessible
>Java application, this is a concern for the project.

Java applications have to be developed with accessiblity in mind. The Java Access Bridge needs to be installed AND the screen reader must correctly implement the Java Access Bridge. For JAWS, this seems not always to be the case.

(...)
>If the additional downloads are needed, it would be necessary to have all
>these additional Java tools installed/partially installed on the CD that is
>distributed with the software so that the user can independently install
>these, quickly and easily. For example the CD during installation could
>link
>to the sun web site so that it automatically searches for the latest
>software to be downloaded. I think that all sighted people would possibly
>need to install the JRE, whilst screen readers users would need the JRE,
>access bridge and Java utilities. During the installation process the tool
>would need to ask the user for their confirmation and explain why they are
>needed.

I think it is possible to put all the necessary downloads on the CD used for the distribution of the tool, even if there are several versions of the access bridge and the Java accessibility utilities. I have also seen Java applications that come with an installer that detects what JRE versions are installed on the user's PC and that prompts the user to choose which JRE should be used for the application. Another solution might be to compile to an executable file (which does not need a JRE) instead of to Java bytecode, but we don't know what this process does to the accessibility of Java applications.

>We have asked people if they know of any accessible Java applications, but
>have not been able to find any. Do you have any details of any Java
>software
>that we can look at that demonstrates accessibility? It would be useful to
>see how they work with a screen reader, have you tried this yourselves?

There are some (old) "Java Application Accessibility Examples" on http://trace.wisc.edu/world/java/java.htm, but I needed to change the code on a few places to make them work in recent Java versions. I have compiled them and put the into JAR files, which you can simply doubleclick (in Windows) to start them (if you have Java installed). But these are very small examples without any real functionality. (See attachments: Test.jar, SimpleExample.jar, SimpleExample2.jar, SimpleExample3.jar, Dial.jar.) I have also created a small Java GUI with just a menu bar that show the most important menus for the project authoring tool. (See attachment project_20020627.jar; the source code is in the ZIP-file). The code is 'internationalized': the application looks at your 'Regional Settings' (in Windows) to choose the language of the interface; at this moment the available languages are English, German (partially) and Dutch.

However, the accessibility of Java may become irrelevant, because the technical partners have discussed another solution for the user interface: we have decided to use Visual Basic for the interface. We are investigating the accessibility of Visual Basic, but we think accessibility is easier with this programming language.

>(...)
>Regards
>
>Erin

Charles

MESSAGE 25
From: Fabian
To: Project
Subject: URGENT!!
Date: Thursday, June 27, 2002 5:11 PM

Dear partners.

As mentioned in the last plenary meeting that took place in Madrid, partner 2 is now a part of a bigger company called [the new name]

This merge was made last February. The Commission is asking for a message from every partner accepting that the role of partner 2 has been carried out by the new company since then and this company will be undertaking the work of partner 2 for the rest of the project.

Please, send your messages of acceptance as soon as possible. We need them as a first step for the preparation of an Amendment showing the change.

Best regards,
Fabian

MESSAGE 26
From: Charles
To: Project Team
Subject: Project WP1/WP3 - review of VoiceXML tools
Date: Friday, June 28, 2002 4:12 PM

Dear partners,

In their report, the reviewers of our project suggested that we should review existing authoring tools for VoiceXML. They did not clearly say whether we should study the accessibility or the fuctionality of these tools. Also, there seems to be no plan for these reviews (even though our answer to the reviewers said that we were going to do this). I have created a short document (see the attached ZIP file) that gives you An idea of what some of these tools are like. Some of these tools are standalone desktop tools, others are web-based development environments None of those I have seen seems to have been developed with acessibility in mind (standalone Java applications, web applications with many frames, ...). I hope this information will give you an idea of what to do next for this task.

Regards,
Charles

MESSAGE 27
From: James
To: Project Tea,
Subject: Acceptance of new partner
Date: Monday, July 01, 2002 9.34 AM

Hello,
In attachment you will find a letter with partner 9's acceptance of the partner change in the project.

Sincerely,
James

MESSAGE 28
From: Annie
To: 'Project team
Subject: WP2 Plugin dossier (first version)-Comment request
Date: Tuesday, July 02, 2002 8:19 AM

Dear partners,
Please find attached the first version of the Plug-in dossier. Comments are welcome.

Regards,
Annie

MESSAGE 29
From: Fabian
To: Project Team
Subject: FTP: New documents - Change of partner 2's name
Date: Friday, July 05, 2002 10:46 AM

Dear partners.

We have updated the FTP server. You can find the following new documents:
- Draft version of the plug-in dossier
- Study of VoiceXML editing tools
- Requirements for Accessible e-learning Applications and Web Portals using Voice Technology
- Web Authoring Tool Requirements

The Commission is asking for the letters of acceptance of the new company replacing partner 2 (I requested them in a previous mail).

Please, send them (or at least an e-mail saying you accept the change).

Best regards.
Fabian

MESSAGE 30
From: Morris
To: Project team
Subject: The project portal
Date: Friday, July 19, 2002 8:08 PM

Hello Jack
Do you have an idea of when Con Palabras will be installed on the project portal being developed by Adam ? Evaluation of the Portal is well underway at least with French users (we of course still need feedback from other user partners), and we have reached the stage where it would be interesting to see how Con Palabras performs on it.

Kind regards, Morris
PS : I am away from office from 22 July to 19 August

MESSAGE 31
From: Mary
To: Project team
Subject: Project team: Deliverable 1.1, Chapter 3

Date: Monday, July 22, 2002 6:01 PM

Dear Partners,

Thanks to everyone who has sent me their documents to be included in D1.1 Manual for Accessible Design!

This email in intended mainly to the User partners. If, however, any of the Technical partners wish to contribute to Chapter 3 of the deliverable that will also be great.

Please find attached a draft copy of Chapter 3 on state of the art ofe-learning applications and their accessibility. I would be grateful if the User partners from all countries contribute a brief description of the e-learning applications that are developed and used in their countries for online training and education and also some information on their accessibility if you have such information. You can also look at the chapter to find out the kind of e-learning applications that are reviewed.

As the deadline for the preliminary version is next week, if it is possible for you to write a paragraph or two by the end of this week, I would be most grateful. Though I understand that the deadline is very short. Otherwise, your contributions will be included in the final deliverable.

Many thanks.
Kind regards to all.
Mary

MESSAGE 32
From: Conwayne
To: The project
Subject: WP2 Plugin dossier (second version)
Date: Friday, July 26, 2002 7:50 AM

Dear partners,
Please find attached the second version of the Plug-in dossier. Comments have been included.

Regards,
Conwayne

MESSAGE 33
From: Adam
To: Project Team
Cc: Lucy
Subject: Your document about Conpalabras plugin
Date: Tuesday, July 30, 2002 10:05 AM

Dear Charles,

I have read your mail and the document attached that you sent on july 26th.

H have two questions about it :

1 - I have tested it on our project portal (I have just followed the example given in your document). It works, but is there another way to use it. Doing as mentioned, implies that you have to write twice the text of the web page. For example :

Hello world
 in order to make the text spoken by the plugin and to display it on the web page.

It is not a real problem for short texts, but how to do with long texts ?

2 - I have also noted in the document that for the voice recognition to work, it is necessary to install ViaVoice software.
("For recognition to work, the customer must have a version of ViaVoice installed in the corresponding language.").

Could you give me more information about this ?

Thanks in advance
Best regards.
Adam

MESSAGE 34
From: Annie
To: 'Adam; Project Tean
Cc: 'Lucy
Subject: RE: Your document about Conpalabras plugin
Date: Tuesday, July 30, 2002 2:00 PM

Dear Adam,
in answer to your questions about the Conpalabras plugin

1 - As you know, the purpose of the plug is to complement the screen reader by giving more information to the user. There is no use in making spoken all the text that is written on the page, since this text will be red by the screen reader anyway. That is why in most cases you won't be writing the same text twice. The screen reader will read the text written on the page
and the pug-in will wait for the screen reader to finish and then it will give additional information to the user.

2 - Use of Via-voice software:
To perform the synthesis, the Conpalabras plugin uses some ViaVoice libraries that are installed with the plugin itself.
To perform the recognition, the Conpalabras plug in uses some other libraries from ViaVoice. This libraries do not come with the plugin itself because they are rather heavy (for instance the library that holds the dictionary takes 80 Megas). That is why the user needs the ViaVoice for the plugin to perform the speech recognition.

If you have any other questions please forward them to us.
Regards,
Annie

MESSAGE 35
From: Mary

To: PRoject team
Subject: Project: D1.1 Manual for Accessible Design
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2002 4:45 PM

Dear Partners,

You can find a draft of the preliminary version of the Manual for Accessible Design on the ftp server. It is in WP1 directory under the name of projectD1.1. It is a working version as we are still working on some of the chapters. We plan to submit the preliminary version of the document to the Commission early next week.

Therefore, I urge you to try and have a look at it and provide us with your comments either by the end of this week or during August. Please note that the document is quite big and long, currently 150 pages and the file is 2.5 megabytes compressed and about 3.5 megabytes uncompressed. I apologise if some parts of the document are currently hard to access with a screen
reader. I'll improve its accessibility for the next version. Any comments on this are also welcome.

May I also remind the user group partners that their contribution to two areas will be quite valuable. Firstly, we need more questionnaires of unmet learning needs (to be included in Chapter 7). We haven't received any since our last meeting in Madrid, and the information which we currently have is quite insufficient. Secondly, please try to find any country-specific information regarding the type of e-learning materials currently used in your country and the level of their accessibility. This information will complement what has already been written in Chapter 3.

Many thanks.

Best regards to all.
Mary

MESSAGE 36
From: <Partner 7
To: Project Team
Subject: Office closure
Date: Monday, August 05, 2002 12:57 PM

Comeu1446

Dear All,

The Rome Office of the partner 7 for Liaising with the EU will close from 8 to 23 August.

Best regards,
Ronnie

MESSAGE 37
From: Charles
To: Annie
Cc: Project team
Subject: Re: Meeting information
Date: Monday, August 05, 2002 2:11 PM

Hi Annie,

I'm forwarding this information to the rest of the Consortium, because it is also useful for the other partners.

At 10:44 5/08/2002, you wrote:
>(...) By the way, we are going to book our flight tickets to Brussels and
>we have
>some concerns. How far is Leuven from Brussels? Can we spend the night in
>Brussels and then travel to Leuven for the meeting? I know that you have
>been to Amsterdam recently, how can we go from Brussels to Amsterdam?

The distance from Brussels to Leuven is approximately 25 kilometers. You can get there by train: go to the train station of the airport and take the train to Brussel-Noord/Bruxelles-Nord (the first name is in Dutch, the second in French; Belgium can be confusing for foreigners); if you should miss Brussel-Noord you can also get off in Brussel-Centraal/Bruxelles-Central or Brussel-Zuid/Bruxelles-Midi; then you take a train to Leuven/Louvain. Leuven is the first stop for the trains going to Keulen/Cologne (Germany), to Eupen or to Tongeren/Tongres. Make sure you're not on a train to Louvain-la-Neuve, which some people confuse with Leuven.
When you arrive in Leuven you either take a taxi to Heverlee or take bus 2 (direction Campus, not Boskant) and get off at the 14th stop (a 20 minute ride).
It is possible to stay in a hotel in Brussels and travel to Heverlee, but it takes 50-60 minutes if you travel by public transport.
You can also find a route description on http://www.esat.kuleuven.ac.be/info/route.en.shtml.

Here is the hotel information I sent to Fabian. The second hotel is just a 3 minutes walk from the building where we will meet.
Another good hotel - but more expensive - is Begijnhof Congreshotel. You can find more information (and other addresses) on: http://www.leuven.be/servlet/genweb.servlet.ViewBoxServlet?toDo=expand&id=2079. (I'm not sure all the information is available in English, so if you should need translations, just let me know.)

- Hotel New Damshire
Damiaanplein
Schapenstraat 1
3000 Leuven
tel: +32 16 23 21 15
fax: + 32 16 23 32 08
email: reservations@newdamshire.com

- Boardhouse n.v.
J. Vandenbemptlaan 6
3001 Heverlee
tel.: + 32 16 31 44 44
fax. : + 32 16 31 44 54
email: info@boardhouse.be

I've never been to Amsterdam, but the timetables for the trains from Brussels to the Netherlands are on
http://www.b-rail.be/internat/E/destination/holland/summer_day_timetablesout.html.

>Thank you in advance. Kind regards,
>
>Annie

Charles

MESSAGE 38
From: Jack
To: Project Team
Subject: Third Quarterly Report
Date: Tuesday, August 06, 2002 11:58 AM

Dear Colleagues,

please find enclosed the first version of the third Quarterly Report. This report covers the developments from April to June.

Please, send your comments/contributions to the report as soon as possible. We would like to send it at the end of this week.
I will specially appreciate contributions from the workpackage leaders.

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: Third Quarterly Report v1.1.doc)

MESSAGE 39
From: Jack
To: <Project team>
Subject: Project Info for IBC Event
Date: Wednesday, August 07, 2002 12:27 PM

Dear Colleagues,

as part of the participation at the IBC Event in September, we are planning to distribute information about the project.

We would appreciate if you take a look to the attached file and send your corrections and comments (text, logos...)

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: Diptico project.pdf)

MESSAGE 40
From: Hazel
To: Project
Subject: Reminder: Survey on unmet learning needs of visually impaired people
Date: Monday, August 12, 2002 8:01 PM

Dear user partners,

Please remember that you all made a commitment to have 15 questionnaires completed on the unmet learning needs of visually impaired people, which will give us a sample size of approximately 75 participants. This is a useful part of the user requirements for deciding what type of content to include in the project elearning portal.

At the moment I only have about 25 questionnaires, which is a very poor sample across 5 different EU states. I will be writing the chapter on this survey in the first week of September, so please send me some more data by then!

Cheers,
Hazel

MESSAGE 41
From: Hazel
To: Project team
Subject: Deliverables 1.1 and 1.2
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2002 11:38 AM

Dear All,

You may be interested to know that KC has read through the whole of Deliverables 1.1 and 1.2 and has the following comments:

"I met Hazel to discuss Deliverable 1.1 last night among other things and I told her that I was so impressed with the work that it forms a core for a very impressive book. I can't think of any serious omissions in what I have read and even somebody as expert as I am learned quite a few new facts and picked up some good ideas.

I note that you [meaning Mary] have done some pulling together of the last chapters but I think we need to look at making ourselves a whole list of lists so that they can stand almost independent of the body of the text. We also need a glossary all in one place and some of the sections need some history and background to explain how we have got where we are."

I hope our reviewers will be as impressed as KC is! I'd like to discuss the book idea when we meet in Leuven in September.

Best regards to all,
Hazel

MESSAGE 42
From: Mary
To: Project Team
Subject: Project: WP5 Evaluation Plan
Date: Tuesday, August 13, 2002 2:28 PM

Dear All,

An up-to-date version of the evaluation plan for the project Portal and Authoring Tool is now available on the server in WP5 directory, which is also attached to this email. Our French partners have already started evaluating the first version of the web portal as Morris mentioned in one of his emails. As he suggested we need more feedback from all other partners. May I ask all user group partners if you can have a look at the portal using different types of assistive technologies and web browsers. If
you can provide your comments by the end of this month to Adam and Morris, Hazel and myself that would be very useful. If you have already provided your feedback to Adam and Morris please ignore the above request.

The evaluation plan is only a second draft. If you have any comments on it please let me know.

Best regards.
Mary

MESSAGE 43
From: Erin
To: project team
Cc: partner 3
Subject: Project - VOICE XML Studio
Date: Monday, August 19, 2002 11:42 AM

Dear all,

The following is for reference, some of you may already be aware of this new tool.
http://www.voicewebsolutions.net/products/studio/index.htm

VoiceXML Studio is a rapid application development (RAD) tool for VoiceXML developers to quickly build robust voice applications for the voice ecognition and text-to-speech market. Voice Web Solutions' customers can use VoiceXML Studio to build voice services around the VANGUARD technology for in-house development of voice applications.

Kind regards,
Erin,

MESSAGE 44
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Amendments
Date: Friday, August 23, 2002 11:42 AM

Dear Colleagues,

I would like to give you an update on the amendments.

We are in a very tight schedule so I will ask you to be very fast in sending the documentation that I will need from you in the following weeks It is very important for the extension of the contract to finnish this process on time.

- Second amendment (change of partner 2 to their new company name): the process has finnished and we are expecting to receive the amendment to be signed next week. The Commission will need to received the signed drafts before September 4th. As soon as I get the drafts I will send the urgently to you, and I will need from you to sign them and send it back VERY URGENTLY. Please, check that the person who will sign the amendment will be available.

- Third amendment (extension of the contract): the Commission needs some more information and papers from several partners. In following messages I will ask for this documentation partner by partner (if you receive nothing it means that everything is OK with you). The Commission expects to receive the signed drafts for September 23rd.

I will send you a draft of the agenda for our meeting in Leuven (12th and 13rd September) next week.

Best regards,
jack

MESSAGE 45
From: Jack
To: Project Team
Subject: Amendment Number 2 (very Urgent)
Date: Wednesday, August 28, 2002 11:09 AM

Dear Colleagues,

We have received the draft amendment number 2 (mainly change of names). We have sent it urgently to you by courier. You should receive it tomorrow morning.

As I already told you, it is very important to be fast in this process.

Please, SIGN AND STAMP both copies and send it back to me immediately (has to be here by 2nd September)

Don't forget to:
1. SIGN the two copies ONLY in the page reserved for your organization.
2. Include STAMP of your organization in the same page.
3. In case the person who sign is not the person mentioned, "the participant should include in its cover letter the name and function of the signatory and confirm that he/she is empowered to sign for the participant."
4. Include in the cover letter the FOLLOWING STATEMENT: "We certify that we have not made any changes or alterations to the contract nor to its annexes; not have we qualified our signature in any way"

Thank you.
Best regards,
JAck

MESSAGE 46
From: JAck
To: Project team
Subject: Project: Draft Agenda for Leuven

Date: Thursday, August 29, 2002 10:23 AM

Dear colleagues,

please find attached the draft of the Agenda for the meeting in Leuven. Send your comments, suggestions, corrections....

Any proposal to participate in the meeting with presentations is welcome.

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: Agenda Leuven 2002.doc)

MESSAGE 47
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Re: Amendment Number 2 (very Urgent)
Date: Thursday, August 29, 2002 10:26 AM

Dear Colleagues,
I hope you are receiving this morning the copy of the amendment.
Please, send back TWO signed copies urgently (and don't forget the cover letter with the statement).

I would appreciate if you send me an email as soon as you send the signed copies back to me by courier.

Just remind you my address:
Jack
[gives his company address]

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 48
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Re: Amendment Number 2 (very Urgent)
Date: Thursday, August 29, 2002 11:23 AM

Dear Colleagues,

our partners in 3 have noticed a typing error in the statement that must be included in your cover letter.
The sentence should be:
"We certify that we have not made any changes or alterations to the contract nor to its annexes; nor have we qualified our signature in any way"

notice that the new last sentence starts with NOR instead of NOT

Also, this time the Commission has sent only one copy. You should photocopy your page and send me back TWO original signed copies. It is enough if you just send me the signed pages (not the whole draft amendment).

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 49
From: Morris
To: Project Team
Subject: Erin
Date: Monday, September 02, 2002 10:51 AM

Dear Erin,

Thanks for your mail where you mentionned the bug you have detected. As you know, I am developing the project web portal on-line, and you may sometimes test it while I am working on it. That is the reason why you encontered this error message.

To solve this problem, I will now work on a copy of the portal and then regurlarly update the "test version". This version will
now display the date of the last update at the top of its homepage.

Anyway, your mail helped me to find another bug that I have fixed (displaying buttons by default).

Please do not hesitate to visit it as often as you can and send me your remarks and suggestions.

Best regards
Adam

MESSAGE 50
From: Morris
To: Project team
Subject: Confusion
Date: Monday, September 02, 2002 10:51 AM

Dear Mary, Dear all,

I noticed a confusion about the evaluation of our portal due to our last mail. When Morris spoke of evaluation, he meant tests.
As the web portal is currently being developped, I only make rapid tests on the new functionalities. To do that, I ask a textual browser user and a jaws user to tell me if they can access them.

According to me, an evaluation of our web portal using the agreed methodology can be done when it is finalised. Then, the evaluation can bring feedback to optimize the portal.

Best regards.
Adam

MESSAGE 51
From: Mary
To: Morris; project team
Subject: Re: project Portal Evaluation
Date: Monday, September 02, 2002 2:04 PM

Dear Adam,

The tests which you have been performing on the portal are good and necessary, however we need to evaluate it with more users of different abilities using a bigger variety of assistive technology (not only Jaws) and different browsers in order to identify any accessibility and usability problems and any omissions in its functionality. It is not advisable to leave such evaluations till when the portal is more or less complete, as there may not be enough time to make all changes which are necessary to resolve any problems users may find. That is why we proposed to start with an initial very basic evaluation of the portal now (please see my email from August 13th) and perform two more evaluations while you are still developing the portal to check whether the problems which are identified have been resolved and to ensure that all functions have been implemented. We would like all user group partners to participate in these evaluations as it is important to involve as wide range of users as possible, and the more users try the prototypes the better for the final quality of the portal.

Please let me know if you still have any comments or objections to the evaluation plan. I would be happy to hear the opinion of other user group partners about progress on the current portal evaluations and the feasibility of performing all evaluations as specified in the evaluation plan which I'm attaching.

Best regards.
Mary

Message 52
From: Morris
To: the project
Subject: LearnTec 2003
Date: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 4:22 PM

Dear Jack,

I thought you might like to learn about LearnTec 2003 (see announcement below). A big chunk of the programme will be devoted to e-learning in urope. Although this is a mainstream event, it may be worth trying to flag up accessibility issues there.

Regards, Morris

Learntec 2003
11th European conference and specialist trade fair for educational and information technology
4-7 February 2003, Karlsruhe Exhibition Centre (Germany)
The programme features 26 lecture sessions, as well as workshops and panel sessions. 300 international exhibitors are expected for the trade fair. More information from Jochen Georg, Project manager, at :
Tel : +49 721 3720 2137
Email : georg@learntec.de
Website : www.learntec.de

Message 53
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Annual Review of the project
Date: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 9:07 AM

Dear Colleagues,

as we already mentioned in a previous message, we will have the Annual project Review in october (see massage below with all the info regarding the review)

The final date for the project is October the 3rd.

As it is stated in the documentation, "Each Consortium will be represented by its Project Co-ordinator and Technical Co-ordinator (if distinct) and possible additional contributors from the partners, if possible without exceeding a total number of 5 people. "

Our proposal for the review of the project is to attend the following contributors from the Consortium:

Hazel, partner 8 (Leader of WP1 and WP5)
Annie, partner 2 (Leader of WP2 and WP3)
Ronnie, partner 7 (Representing the users)
Fabian, partner 1 (Technical Coordinator, leader of WP4 and WP6)
Jack, Partner 1 (Project Co-ordinator)

This issue and in general the Annual Review will be discussed in more detail in Leuven.

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 54
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Agenda for Leuven
Date: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 11:47 AM

Dear Colleagues,

Hazel has told me that she wont be able to attend the meeting on friday. I propose the following agenda in order to change Workpackages 1 and 5 to thursday, so Helen can attend.

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file. Agenda Leuven 2002 v2.doc)=

MESSAGE 55
From: Jack
To: Project Team
Subject: Leuven Meeting (from partner 6)
Date: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 5:21 PM

Paul Brass has asked me to send you this message:

Dear colleagues,

due to financial constraints, the german delegation will not be able to attend the above meeting. We tried hard to make things work, but unfortunately didn't succeed. We are very sorry not to be present at this important stage of the project.

Looking forward to seeing you next time, whereever it may be.

Desmond, Kevin and Paul

Textual chunk, Thanks
Jack sent message *2* on 12/6/02, thanking those that attended the Madrid meeting for their attendance. Kenneth sent message *12* on 19/6/02, thanking Annie for the work document on work package 3 – authoring tool requirements. Although this message was addressed to Annie it was sent to the mailing list. Jack sent message *19* on 21/6/02, thanking everyone for their contributions to annex 1 and for answering the reviewers comments. Mary sent message *31* on 22/6/02 thanking partners who sent her their documents to be included in D1.1, the manual for accessible design. Four messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Annex 1 sent and reviewers comments
Jack sent message *19* on 21/6/02 to inform the team the two documents, annex 1 and the reviewers comments were sent to the project officer.

Textual chunk, Unable to send and receive e-mails due to power cut
Partner 4 sent message *56* on 17/6/02 to inform the team that they would not send and receive.

Textual chunk, Out of the office
Jack sent message *19* on 21/6/02 to inform the days that he was going to out of the office. In this message he requested e-mails to be cc'd to Fabian and Jonathan. Morris sent message *30* on 19/7/02, informing the team that he would he out of the office from 22nd July to 19th August. Ronnie sent message *36* on 5/8/02 to inform the team that partner 7's office was closed from 8th August to 23rd August. Three messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Answers to the reviewers comments
Fabian sent message *8* on 17/6/02 attaching to the message a draft version of the document with answers to comments in the project review report. In this message he informed the team that the review report must be sent to the commission as soon as possible. Comments and contributions were requested by the end of the next day. One message was sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Acceptance of new name
Fabian sent message *25* on 27/6/02, informing the team that as mentioned in Madrid during the 3rd face-to-face meeting partner 2 are now part of a bigger company and have changed their name. In this message he also informed the team that the Commission is asking for a message from every partner accepting that the new company has carried out the role of partner 2. Messages of acceptance were requested as soon as possible. This was required as a first step for the preparation of an Amendment showing the change. Jason sent message *27* on 1/7/02, attaching partner 9's acceptance to the new name. Fabian sent message *29* on 5/7/02, reminding the team that the commission is requesting the acceptance of the new name. In this message he mentioned that it could be sent by e-mail. Jack sent message *44* on 23/8/02 informing the team that he is expecting the amendment to be signed next week as the process has now finished. Jack also mentioned the deadline for sending this information to the commission. Jack also proposed to send drafts to the team members, and requested for them to be returned back urgently. Lastly in this message Jack also said to check that the person who will sign the amendment would be available. Jack also sent message *45* on 28/8/02, informing the team that he has received the draft amendment and it has been sent to partners by courier. The team was reminded of the importance of this document and the instructions to complete it. Jack sent message *47* on 29/8/02, saying that he hopes team members receive their copies this morning. A reminder of what should be included was mentioned in the message as well, alongside with the address that it should be returned to. Team members were also asked to send him an e-mail when they send it back to him. Jack sent message *48* on 29/8/02 informing the team that partner 3 noticed a typing error. The correct version was included in the main body of the message. In addition brief instructions on what should be followed was also included in the message. Seven messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Unmet learning needs questionnaire
Mary sent message *35* on 31/7/02 informing the team that she still requires more questionnaires. In this message she also mentioned that she had not received any questionnaires since the Madrid meeting. Hazel sent message *40* on 12/8/02, reminding team members of their commitment to return 15 questionnaires. Hazel mentioned the importance of the questionnaires in deciding on contents for the e-learning portal. A request to receive the questionnaires by the first week of September was made. Currently they only have 25 questionnaires. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Third quarterly report
Jack sent message 38 on 6/8/02 attaching the first version for developments from April to June. In this message he mentioned that he is seeking comments and contributions as soon as possible as he would like to send this report by the end of the week. One message was sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Intention for dissemination
Jack sent message *39* on 7/6/02 informing the team that they would like to distribute information on the project at the IBC event in September. In this message everyone was requested to look at the attached file and to send comments and corrections. One message was sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, D1.1 Manual for accessible design
Mary sent message *35* on 21/7/02 to inform the team that the draft for this document had been placed onto the FTP server. Instructions on where it was placed were also provided. In this message Mary also informed of her intentions to submit this preliminary document to the commission next week. Comments were requested from team members within a set deadline. D1.1 was a large document and Mary said that she would improve the access of this document for those using screenreaders. Hazel sent message *41* on 13/8/02 informing the team that the research fellow working at her partner organization had read this deliverable and gave comments on it, which were summarized in the main body of the message which was sent. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Leuven meeting
Jack sent message *35* on 10/9/02 to the team, which was a message originally sent by Desmond, Keith, and Paul explaining the reasons why they would not be able to attend this face-to-face meeting in Leuven. In this message they said that they would see everyone next time. One message was sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Meeting information
Charles sent message *37* on 5/8/02 addressed to Annie but sent to the whole mailing list, answering Annie's questions on 5/8/02 to the rest of the team members. In the message their was information on travel, hotels, and train time tables for journeys between Brussels and Amsterdam. One message was sent associated to this sub-goal.

Textual chunk, Draft agenda for the meeting
Jack sent message *44* on 23/8/02, informing the team that he will send a draft agenda for the meeting in Leuven for the 12th and 13th September. Jack sent message *46* on 29/8/02 with an attached draft agenda for the meeting. In this message he requested comments, suggestions, corrections and participation from team members. Jack sent message *54* on 10/9/02, informing the team that their was a change in the agenda as Hazel would not be there on Friday. A new version of the agenda was also attached to this message. Three messages were sent that was associated with this goal

Textual chunk, FTP site
Jack sent message *2* on 12/6/02, where he informed the team of what presentations were included in the site. The site also includes the documents sent by Hazel. In this message everyone was asked to check the documents. Fabian sent message *17* on 21/6/02 to announce that the FTP server had been updated. This message also informed team members of what new documents had been added, and where they could be found. Fabian sent message *18* on 21/6/02 to mention other additional documents that had been added to the list. Fabian sent message *29* on 5/7/02 to inform the team that the server had been updated again. The new documents which were added had also been listed. Mary sent message *35* on 31/7/02 where she informed the team

that D1.1, the manual for accessible design was placed onto the site. Lastly, Mary sent message *42* on 13/8/02 to inform the team that the evaluation plan was placed on the server. Six messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Annex 1 updated
Jack sent message *2* on 12/6/02 to let the team know that he will receive an updated draft today or the next day and would seek feedback from partners. Jack sent message *3* on 13/6/02 informing the team that version 16 was attached to this message. Comments and contributions were requested by a set deadline. Jack sent message *6* on 17/6/02, which was a forwarded message from Charles that he had sent to Jack on the same day. Jack was forwarding this message as their were some problems sending it. This message was sent to Jack but CC'd to the project team. Fabian sent message *8* on 17/6/02, attaching the latest version of the annex. Comments and contributions were requested for this work as soon as possible. Hazel sent message *9* on 18/6/02 informing the team that she was disappointed to receive an updated version of the annex with no changes that had been proposed or an explanation why not. In this message Hazel requested an explanation as soon as possible. A proposal to improve the objectives was also made, and the team was informed of Hazel's meeting with someone out side of the project to discuss their involvement. Five messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Revised work plan for work packages 1 and 5
Mary sent message *4* on 13/6/02 where she informed the team that Hazel would check her mail that evening to see if there were any comments or ammedments on the proposed plan. Mary sent message *42* on 13/8/02 to inform the team that an updated evaluation plan for the portal and tool was available on the FTP site. Instructions on where this document could be found were also listed. Comments were requested as this was a second draft which had been released to partners to read and comment. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Interesting information to share
Charles sent message *5* on 13/6/02, which was an article on web site usability resources. Morris sent message *52* on 4/9/02 to share with the team the LearnTech2003 announcement, as he believed that it would be useful to the team to have this information. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Project speech recognition
Erin sent message *15* on 20/6/02 containing a URL for speech recognition and standards. In this message it summarized what kind of information may be found in this site. Erin sent message *58* on 20/6/02 which had the same contents as message as 15, but their was a time difference of 1 hour between the two messages. Two messages were sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Glossary
Charles sent message *16* on 20/6/02 which included the current version of the glossary.

Textual chunk, Annual review in Brussels
Jack sent message *20* on 21/6/02, which was a message that he had received from the commission regarding the date for the annual review. In this message it mentioned that the exact time was still to be confirmed. The deadline by which the documents must be received and the format of the review was also outlined in this message. Jack sent also message *53* on 10/9/02 to inform the team that the date had been set to 3rd October. A proposal of who should attend was mentioned in the list which would be discussed further at the face-to-face meeting in Leueven. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Letter for prolongation of contract
Jack sent message *21* on 21/6/02 to inform the team that he required as soon as possible an e-mail notifying him that their partner organization agrees for the contract to be extended to cover the full project. Jack sent message *44* on 23/8/02 informing the team that the commission requires additional information from the partners and the deadline by which they should receive it. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Project website
Fabian sent message *23* on 27/6/02 to inform the team that the new version of the official site was now available. In this message the URL and log in information, including the login name and password was included. This site was site under development. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Review of voice xml tools
Charles sent message *26* on 28/6/02 addressing an issue which had been suggested by the reviewers. Attached to this message was a short document giving an overview of ideas of some tools which have been developed with accessibility in mind. In this message Charles said he hoped that this information in the attachment gave team members an idea of what had to be done for their task. Erin sent message *43* on 19/8/02, which was a URL for reference on voice xml studio's. This message also included a brief outline of what voice xml studio's do. Two messages were sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Work package 2 – Plug in dossier
Annie sent message *28* on 2/7/02 which included the first version of the plug-in dossier. In this message comments were welcomed. Conwayne sent message *32* on 26/7/02 which included the second version of the plug-in dossier. In this message comments were welcomed. Adam sent message *33* on 30/7/02 containing two questions regarding message *32* sent by Conwayne. Annie sent message *34* on 30/7/02 answering the questions on the compalabras plug-in. In this message Annie asked team members to raise any other questions that they may have. Four messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Project portal
Morris sent message *30* on 19/7/02 with the question concerning if he knew when compalabras would be installed on the project portal addressed to Jack and sent to the mailing list. In this message he also mentioned that evaluations with French users are underway, and now requires feedback from other user group partners. In this message he also mentioned that he feels that they are at a stage now where it would be interesting to look at the performance of Compalabras. Mary sent message *42* on 13/8/02 informing the team that the French partners were evaluating the first version of the portal as Morris had informed her. In this message Mary also mentioned that more feedback was required and a deadline was set for this. Adam sent message *49* on 2/9/02 which was addressed to Erin, but sent to the mailing list, explaining to her why she had received an error message. Comments were requested in this message. Adam sent message *50* on 2/9/02 informing Mary and the rest of the team that he had noticed a confusion regarding the evaluation of the portal. In this message Adam was referring to tests. Mary sent message *51* on 2/9/02, addressed to Adam, but sent to him and to the team, saying that the tests he proposed were good. In this message Mary also mentioned some other information regarding the evaluations. For example different ability users, users of different assistive technologies, and not leaving the evaluations until the end (proposing a date as well). Mary also mentioned that she would like all user groups to participate in this task and to send comments on the plan. Five messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Chapter 3
Mary sent message *31* on 22/7/02 which was mainly intended for the user partners, but the technical partners could also make contributions. A draft copy of this chapter was attached to the message – State of the art of e-learning applications and their accessibility. Mary mentioned that she was grateful for the user partners which provided information to her on their own country. The deadline for the request of information was included in the message, with Mary informing the team that if contributions were not received by that time, they would be included for the final version of the report and not the draft. Mary sent message *35* on 31/7/02 requesting partners to find their country specific information and to send it to her for including in chapter 3. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Authoring tools
Charles sent message *1* on 10/6/02 attaching the current version of the requirements for the authoring tool. Comments were requested from the user and technical partners and a summary of the list of priorities was included in this message. Adam sent message *7* on 17/6/02 giving his comments and assignment of priority levels. Adam sent message *10* on 18/6/02 answering the questions raised by Charles. Messages *7* and *10* were addressed to

Charles in the main body of the message but sent via the project mailing list. Annie sent message *11* on 19/6/02 informing the team that as agreed during the 3rd face-to-face meeting in Madrid, partner 2 were sending their tool requirements to the team. This message included a summary of what was the focus for the web authoring tool. Those requirements were mainly based on the work of partner 9. In this message Annie mentioned that if no partners disagreed with what was included in it, this would form the base of their work for the next 15 months. Kenneth sent message *12* on 19/6/02, addressing his message to Annie and the team, thanking Annie for the document, but mentioning that it was not at the same level that was presented at the face-to-face meeting. Some suggestions were proposed in this message. Kenneth also mentioned that he would like to see the rest of the material that they have been working on. Charles sent message *13* on 19/6/02, addressing the main body of the message to Kenneth, but sent to the mailing list, referencing the document Annie had sent, mentioning that this was sent before he had integrated it with his document. A new version of his document would be sent the next day. In this message Charles also said that he would use Annie's document and use just one document instead of two. Annie sent message *14* on 20/6/02, addressing it to Keith but sent to the mailing list explaining how their list of requirements for the tool evolved. Annie said that they required agreement from all partners for them to work on what they had proposed. If required she could produce another document. Annie also mentioned that they were the technicians and required user group input. The team were requested to contact her if their were any problems. Charles sent message *16* on 20/6/02 attaching the fourth version of the requirements. A summary of what this version incorporated was also included in the main body of the message. Mary sent message *22* on 26/6/02 attaching an updated version of user requirements for e-learning applications. They were extended to include specific requirements for the project e-learning portal. Everyone was requested to look at this document and to provide comments on it. Lastly, Charles sent message *24* on 27/6/02 answering questions on work packages 1 and 3 which were raised by Erin. This message was sent to Erin but CC'd to the team. 10 messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Atendees: Adam, Morris, Ronnie, Lucy, Elsie, Translator for Michael, Michael, Geoff, Jack, Annie, Conwayne, Mary, Hazel, James, Kenneth, Charles

Welcome

Jack: As I think you read yesterday, our German partners, did not make it to come here,
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so sadly we have no representation of the Germans [pause] and um, so, I hope you all, receive the new agenda. We have changed things in order to have Hazel to explain [pause] work package one and five
Hazel: both of us ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: and so, we will start right away with work package 1,

Administrative issues - amendments

Jack: I will only, I only want to say that the administrative issues are tomorrow, [pause] but I have one important [pause] amendment number two, the one that was already signed, just arrived as I was walking out of the door.
[Hazel laughs]
Jack: So, I have it here, and I hope we can do copies [pause] for the partners here. And amendment three is on its way, and we are preparing amendment number 3. There are some issues, about financial [pause] problems [pause] well yes problems [gives a small laugh] that are finishing today, or this week. So I hope that [pause] next week, or the beginning of the following week you will have the draft amendment, and we will start the same process. I will send it to you urgently [pause] because as you see, they give us two days or three days
Hazel: yes [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and finally we made it with number 2 and now we have number 3.
Morris: and number 3 is just today?
Jack: yes, number 2, was the change of names and [pause] some change in the costs. You remember that PARTNER 3 and PARTNER 7 asked for a change in the ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Lucy tries to say something]
Jack: and in the next amendment, it will be the prolongation of the contract, and also [pause] also some things related to the prolongation. That is the bank guarantees, [pause] it has to be included in the change, the cost for Partner 8, and K K
Hazel: oh, right, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: it was not included in number 2
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: it has to be included in number 3. Ok, so [pause] and this afternoon we will talk about the annual review. This is an important thing, but we will have time this afternoon. So, Hazel
Hazel: yes, can we
[Hazel and Mary prepare to give their presentation]
Hazel: Jack, just while
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: while Mary is setting up, one of the things that I am concerned about is [pause] the deliverables are due on the 30th of September
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and [pause] um, the review is on the 3rd of October, will that give the reviewers time to
Jack: no, no, no [pause] the review will be for the work done until July ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: July
Jack: July 31st
Hazel: ok, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and we already sent [pause]
Hazel: the preliminary
Jack: the preliminary versions, [pause] um, was last week ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: right, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: we must [pause] we must send everything to the reviewers with three, well with 1 month
Hazel: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: of time. So, [pause]
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, what was delivered was things done until the end of July.
Hazel: right, ok that is good, because I was worried about that. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Review of work package 1

[Used a laptop to deliver this presentation]
Hazel: right, ok, so, [pause] I think we only need to do a quick review of work package 1, because [pause] a lot of work has been done, but there are still several things that are outstanding, and need to be finished off. As you know we have been working on deliverables 1.1. And 1.2, and I hope you have all seen the preliminary versions which have been distributed for those deliverables, and we need to produce final versions of both of those deliverables by [pause] by the end of September. And one of the things [pause] I was very conscious of [pause] is to make sure, that in the two deliverables, we can account on, [pause] or report on work which is done in all 9 tasks of work package 1, so if someone, a reviewer says, where have you reported on the [pause] what happened in task 1.6, we can say that yes, that was reported in chapter such as such.
[Can hear whispering – translator for Michael]
Hazel: and so, in the technical annex [pause] we will make sure, a possibly, a many to many mapping between chapters and tasks, but there is a mapping where every task is included. So, we will just have an overview of D1.1 and 1.2, and then look at the different chapters in each of the deliverables. [Pause] so, D1.1 now contains 10 chapters and provides a detailed description of the work, that both the empirical and theoretical [pause] work that has been done in the first year of the project, in work package 1. And that covers those particular tasks, I will not read them out, but this presentation is the basis of a presentation, that I can give in Brussels in the review. So, I wanted to have all the tasks mapped out there. You may know [pause] because I sent out an e-mail, that one of the pieces of work that K K, is undertaking is to review the whole deliverable, all of the deliverables produced in work package 1. He has also written some of the contributions, but [pause] he was extremely impressed with these deliverables, particularly with deliverable 1.1, because that is the more [pause] um, um, textual deliverable that he would appreciate. And he feels that [pause] that we should consider turning that into a book, because there is such a lot of useful information. Now we do not necessarily [pause] have to put everything into the book, because there is information about the technical developments that we are going to make in the project that is internal to the the project project, and obviously we do not want to make that public at the moment. But, the general material, he thinks would be very useful for people working in the area of accessibility and e-learning, accessibility to the web, so on and so forth. So, perhaps that is a topic we should discuss a bit later on in the meeting. And D1. [Pause] 2 covers 4 chapters, and this is the more specific the project material, because we have the user requirements for the [pause] for the authoring tool, and the e-learning portal, and the specification for the authoring tool, and the e-learning portal. Ok [pause] so, I would like to know whether we really, want in this meeting, to go through each chapter which is being finished, as people would have had this deliverable, but I will quickly mention at least, the name of each chapter. So, the first chapter was on the different types of frameworks, which might be useful for looking at how the visually impaired learners undertake work, and so cognitive, pedagogic and technological frameworks. And Mary has done some excellent work on that, and also KC contributed some work. If you have any questions at any point, please ask me at any point, any question that you may have. Chapter 2, is the state of the art on screenreading technologies and that was contributed by the German partners, and looks at the different kinds of screen reading technologies, that the visually impaired learners use, and the state of art there. [Pause] so, we are happy with that. Chapter 3, is state of the art, specifically on e-learning applications and their accessibility and we have had contributions from PARTNER 3 on that, and Mary has dome some work. We are hoping to have contributions from the German partners, and also from Italy, so we can have a more rounded European view on that, if possible. So, at the moment, we have got things on English language [pause] and French applications, which is excellent, but if we could have something on German and Italian, that would be excellent as well, so that is a small outstanding issue. [Pause] and

then we have a chapter on the state of the art, on web authoring tools and accessibility to the visually impaired authors, [pause] and that was contributed by PARTNER 3, and that is a very good chapter, that is complete. Chapter 5 is on the accessibility of [pause] of the material which is produced by existing web authoring tools, and again that was produced by PARTNER 3, and looks at 7 different web authoring tools Chapter 6 is on state of the art on voice xml editing tools and that is being contributed by Charles. [Pause] we thought that Charles would want to make a presentation, but apparently he is not quite ready to make a presentation. But, if you have any questions, please ask Charles about this, so that was good. Chapter 7 was on the unmet learning needs of the visually impaired people, and the very first survey we started. We have got contributions from everyone, and I have to say, that as one of the editors of the overall deliverable, I am one of the last to produce my output [gives a small laugh]. In spite of my, [pause] in spite of the fact that I have been harassing everybody, I am still writing up this chapter, but it should be ready by next Wednesday, and I will distribute it, and I will distribute it on next Wednesday, I hope. Chapter 8 is on the observational study on the accessibility of the e-learning, current e-learning applications. That is where we were actually looking at people, using screnreading technology to see what they could actually do, and we have had contributions from partner 8, PARTNER 3, from PARTNER 3 and from Verona
[Can hear whispering – Christopher whispers something]
Hazel: and we are very pleased with that work. And in fact, Mary and myself have written a general paper about this, which is going to presented at the European conference on E-learning, in London in November. And, we will be bringing to the attention of the e-learning community, the needs of the visually impaired students. UM, and then chapter 9 is the e-learning development process, and [pause] this was to cover the work in task 1 6, and [pause] this was one of the tasks, we had some difficulty, in what needed to be presented, but I think in terms of presenting this to the commission at the review, this will certainly be [pause] will certainly cover the ground there, because [pause] Mary attempted to develop, and had contributions from Thomas in Paris and KK a flow chart of the e-learning development process, and the issues you might need to take into consideration, when producing accessible materials. And, chapter 10, um [pause] is again, a more background chapter on, [pause] navigating in information space for the visually impaired people, and how do the visually impaired students and web users navigate around on the web, and what is the relationship of that to real navigation. Right so that is chapter that is [pause] that is deliverable 1.1. So, the two things which are outstanding are for me to [pause] to finish the chapter on survey, and if we could have any contributions, I guess, we will have to e-mail our German partners
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: and if the Italian partners could produce anything on e-learning applications in Italian, and [pause] whether they are accessible to the visually impaired people, but I think we already have an excellent deliverable 1.1. And absolutely mount of paper, if you have tried to print it out.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: How many pages is it?
Mary: 150 without the appendices
Hazel: sorry
Mary: 150
Hazel: right, ok, so I think that there is a tremendous amount of work, and interesting material there ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: and of course, for the [pause] for the the project project, that needs to be distilled down in a way [pause] the work, or [pause] the requirements on one hand for the e-learning portal, and on the other hand the [pause] the authoring tool, the the project authoring tool. So, in chapter 1, of deliverable 1.2, we look at the user requirements for accessing e-learning applications, particularly using voice technology, and that is being done by Mary and PARTNER 3. And then in chapter 2, we have produced a, we have started to produce a specification for the the project e-learning portal, [pause] and we have had work from PARTNER 3 on that, but we feel that, that chapter needs some more work, doing to make it more detailed and more specific
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: then on [pause] on chapter 3, we are doing the same set of work, but for developing authoring tool, the voice authoring tool. And this presents the requirements for producing an accessible and usable web-authoring tool, particularly for developing e-learning applications. And, again, chapter 4 presents, an initial draft specification for, [pause] web authoring tool, and again we feel that more detailed, more complete specification needs to be produced. So, we have actually done an enormous amount of work in work package 1, in the last year. So, I would like to thank everyone for their contributions. I would also particularly, like to thank Mary, for her hard work, and I am very sad that Mary is leaving the the project project at the end of the first year, so thank you very much Mary for your efforts.
Jack thank you
Hazel: so, questions, comments?
[Can hear whispering]
[Morris raises his hand]
Hazel. Morris? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: chapter 1
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: when you asked us to incorporate the requirements, you should have seen e-mail earlier on this week, we were not clear, on what to expect from us, what we did. I am speaking on Adam's behalf for language purposes
Mary: hmmm, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: he listed, he reviewed all the requirements and
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: um [pause] he rated, not rated, he made comments on the feasibility. Is that what you needed.
Mary: yes [this was said hesitantly] what we really, what you did, a couple of months ago, or what Adam did, was definitely on the right track, but we need that document extended, with more of the requirements, which [pause] you will be able to implement in the portal So, that is exactly, what is required, what you just said, yeah, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: so, I will ask Adam.
Mary: that would be great, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Ronnie says something to Morris and Adam joins in]
Hazel: and what is the situation on the specification for the authoring tool
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: because we really [pause] we do not have enough information yet on
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: [pause] what this authoring tool is going to be like, and how to write the [pause] the technical specification. So, we have set out some of the user requirements
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but, I think we need a clearer vision of [pause] what the tool is going to be like.
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: Perhaps this is something that we can come back to later on in the day, when we have gone through other parts of the project, than on [pause] opening that discussion, but before I go tonight, I think we need to have a plan, [pause] on how to finish chapter 4, of deliverable 1. 2
[Can hear whispering – Annie and Conwayne]
Hazel: ok, if there are no more questions [pause]
Jack: I just want to congratulate [pause] Hazel and [pause] and everyone, because this is the work package with more contributions
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: with more people [pause] and um, as the start of the project, it is not just the start of the project, but the basis of the project. Everything from now must follow and must be based on what is here, and now talking about [pause] from the technical partner's side, it has been very useful. Not only useful, but to learn so many interesting things that [pause] that we now have to implement in the tool,
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I hope, and I am sure [gives a small laugh] that [pause] the consortium will success in doing this part.
Hazel: well thank you everyone.
Jack: and I am sorry also that Mary
Mary: it's ok
Jack: leaving us, because she has contributed a great job. [Pause] are you going to be around?
[Hazel laughs]

Mary: till the end of this month, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and then you are leaving partner 8 as well?
Mary: yes, I am leaving Partner 8 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, it is not only the project?
Mary: Hazel will give you the name of the new contact [pause]
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ok, so one question from what you have to [pause] said, the deliverable is going to be finished on time ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: by the end of the month
Jack: well, because you read it [pause] it looks like it is almost finished
Mary: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, I think that the version that the expert has [pause] is a preliminary
Hazel: yes, I think it, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhmm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but complete
Hazel: but one thing we might do, is if I finish the survey chapter next week, and I feel there is something interesting their, we can send that separately to the commission
Jack: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: to the reviewers, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and yep of course, in the [pause] in the defense of the ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes, I will mention it, I will mention it ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: we can [pause]
Hazel: yes
Jack: they have this, but we can talk about
Hazel: yes, yes, obviously ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: more things
Hazel: if we do a presentation on this at the review, I can use these overheads, but each overhead will say a little bit about what is the content of each chapter
Mary: mhhm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: because I did not do that here
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Change of names in the project

Jack: Just to remind you now that we do not have SSF as the name of the partners.
Mary: yes, sorry [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: no longer software partner 2
[Some laughter]
Jack: now it is new name
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: I will change that right now
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: as usual the change of name has been hard to explain to the commission
[Hazel laughs]
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: for example, PARTNER 3, they have changed their name and Partner 8, is now partner 8, London.
Hazel: I do not know why [gives a small laugh]
Jack: but it looks like there are easier things to explain, because, the change of partner 2 to new name, is not only a change of name as I have explained to you, it is a merge of companies. So, they have now asked us for the financial situation [pause] partner 8, it is impossible to explain and it did not exist last year, and so [pause] it has been hard to send [gives a small laugh]. But partner 2 old name as a department, still exists
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: they have a special name
Someone: a practical
Jack: a practical [pause] more or less a department [pause] or an area of the company, and the people working are the same, so nothing has changed on that sense.
[Can hear whispering]

Work package 3 – development of the tool. Review of work done since the last meeting

Jack: now we are going to talk about work package 3, which the development of the tool. [Pause] I do not know if you remember Conwayne from Madrid,
Annie: yes I forgot. Christopher was unable to come, as he was on his wedding
Jack: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ow
Annie: yes, he just got married last week.
[Can hear whispering – Geoff says something to Jack in Spanish]
[Elsie says something to Michael]
[Hazel and Mary whispering to each other]
[The team is waiting for the presentation to be started]
[Annie uses her laptop to deliver her presentation]
Annie: it looks like we can start now, um [pause] I will review the work which has been done in work package 3, um since last meeting. We have been focussing on the deliverable 3.2, which is the [pause] integration of the plug in and the tool. And what we tried to do, was to define a the project architectural design to use it as a prototype. Um, [pause] to solve some technical problems we had trying to integrate [pause] plug in, in the tool, because the plug in did not work with web pages, than applications, and um also we have to integrate the plug in with the screenreader, so [pause] with any technology that the user [pause] will be using such as speech enabled applications, so that they will be able to work together, and will not get mixed up. [Pause] and then, um we just write, some [pause] some considerations, that we thought might [pause] might have been taken in mind, to create speech enabled applications, and when synthesis and recognition. Um, [pause] the the project architecture has changed a little, because at first thought we might create the the project interface, with Java, but then we changed to the project basic, and this was a decision [pause] which was agreed amongst all the technical partners, because [pause] one of the development speed and [pause] and on disadvantage is that we loose platform independence, but anyway, we were not platform independent. Because in order to [pause] to gain an access to the sound card, we [pause] we need to integrate with the screenreader, we have to write some [pause] some C++, so um [pause] we were not platform independent, anyway. [Pause] um, the core functions we developed in Java anyway, so that in future if we want to create a new version of the tool with a Java interface [pause] or some functionality, will still be developed in Java. Such as the html, [pause] for the validation which is being developed by the Italian partners, and they might show us this evening. And the html parser which has been developed by Charles, which we saw, [pause] and some other function we have been developing in Java as well are [pause] are the stylesheet validation, and the accessibility checks, which might be performed in order to see if the web

pages are accessible or not. Also, the compalabras plug in is developed in Java, [pause] and um [pause] by partner 2, [pause]. In order to communicate our The project Basic user interface [pause] with the Java functions, we will use C++ libraries, and which have no business build in, they just publish some methods to do, to be able to gain access over the Java functions which are implemented in Java. Also, C++, as I have said is used to communicate with the sound card, to be [pause] able to make compalabras, compatible with the screenreaders or magnifiers. Um [pause] as I said we have changed the plug –in, [pause] to make it from [pause] to integrate it within an application, so [pause] compalabras which was an applet, is not an applet anymore, it is a Java class. And, um [pause] to integrate Compalabras, we have built some more classes, that communicate with the soundcard to see if the sound card is busy or not. To see if the screenreader or the magnifier is speaking or not.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: this would be the char class of the [pause] the char class, and that will build the base [pause] of the the project application. We have the the project application that calls a DLL, it will have a DLL, and communicates with compalabras, and before it starts synthesizing a message, compalabras will communicate with the sound card, through a DLL to find out if the sound card is busy or not. If the sound card is busy, some other software is synthesizing out message, so compalabras will wait for the sound card to be free, to see this message. You will see this [pause] in the prototype this evening, and you will hear how it works. This is the char class of the changes in compalabras. And, well [pause] um for the deliverable 3.2, it covers some functionalities which either integration of the speech synthesis and recognition of the engines, the synthesis of voice messages of voice xml files, with [pause] with the properties that the user can change, the voice properties. And, [pause] it also, enables the user to [pause] create grammar files to [pause] perform voice recognition. It can also travel the token, which has been recognized, to find out which document uses it and to react [pause] according to that token. The architecture design for the plug in as I said is the project basic [pause] and the client side; C++ communicates with the Java functionality. This is a sample of the prototype that we have as screenshots, and a sample of the prototype we have sent to the [pause] to the commission, which shows how the plug in interacts with the screenreader and how [pause] and how the plug in waits for the screenreader to synthesize a new message and [pause] it tells it own message to the user. Um, [pause] we have also produced some general recommendations [pause] on speech integration, which are written in the deliverable 3.2. [Pause] in the design process [pause] when you want to integrate speech you have to decide the contents of the spoken message, and [pause] not to avoid redundancy. So, if you have a screenreader working with your application [pause] the plug in should not say the same message. Um [pause] if you are not going to have a screenreader, the plug in should provide, [pause] the same amount of information, that a screenreader would do. You have to decide the purpose of the token message, are they going to be additional help? Error checking? Or um [pause] general advice, you have to find a target audience, and the type of language you will use [pause] um, the environment conditions, if the application will be working with a screenreader or magnifier or not, and will it be speech enabled by itself, and [pause] you must follow up consistent audio behavior, for instance if [pause] if every button has, [pause] recognizes the caption of the button, on click, element, you should stick with that behavior. Um [pause] you have to make a list of all the available commands for the user, just as [pause] and to ensure that those parts of the application are available to the user at any time, so that he knows what kind of [pause] tokens will be recognized by the applications. In the speech synthesis u [pause] if you are using compalbras, you should use it to synthesize long pieces of text, because a screenreader will do that, you will have to [pause] use it to give it an added value to your application. [Pause] you must keep sentences short and simple, otherwise the user will get bored listening to long speech, and use natural language. Use the active voice; because it sounds more [pause] more mandatory than the passive voice. And you can also, as the screenreader does, use different types of voices to convey information, for instance [pause] always use the same type of voice, when you are [pause] providing help messages. And a different kind when you are [pause] giving warning messages. [Pause] and you have to be careful with voice speed, because the user might [pause] if the user is not, does not have English as the first language, might not [pause] understand what the application is saying. I did not put it up here, but when you use compalabras, you must [pause] you must ensure that the user can hear again the message that has just been synthesized. Um [pause] you have to be careful when using synthesized messages with question marks and quotation marks, because [pause] because you have to check that the message has the right information. Um, [pause] and all the information, which is not written on the page, written on the page, so that [pause] all the Internet users, can read what the others can hear. And with speech recognition, [pause] with compalabras, you are not using speech for this purpose, because there are a few tokens which are defined on your grammar, on your voice grammar, which we recognize. Um [pause] you should also keep them consistent, short, [pause] more than 2 words or 1 [pause] I think they should be kept to 1 word to to ensure that the token is recognized at the first time. And they should also be made available to the user, so that he knows what kind of input is expected by the application or the web page. And, [pause] um, you must ensure that the user [pause] knows when the token has been recognized. For instance, [pause] it is opening a new window, you should [pause] inform the user that the action has been successful. [Pause] um, these general recommendations can apply to the [pause] to the tool, um [pause] and in the tool you must be able to provide profiles, and [pause] the level of help will be different depending on the level of the profile of the user, [pause] so that the message that will be synthesized will be different, and also depending on the [pause] the, the tool, the tool is being accessed with the screenreader or not. [Pause] The same as I said before, and also each window will be very useful to provide information on the windows content and windows layout, the components, and the functionality of the window and the contents, that the user will expect, in the window. And this information does not need to be written on the window so that the designers do not like to have overcrowded windows and to have so much information on the window, because this information will be stored somewhere else, on a voice xml file, for the compalanras to try and synthesize. [pause] in web pages um [pause] we think that [pause] um, amongst the most commonly used voice based commands would be the navigation, the browser functions. Um [pause] also compalabras can give brief information on the web page layout again, and how to [pause] navigate through the page. Um [pause] hearing drums should be given to regular activities, for example when you try to open a new window and [pause] um [pause] it ums [pause] it loads finally. And in form filling, voice interaction can be a great help, because it can [pause] provide online checking for errors, so that the user does not have to go to a different window to find a list of errors that has occurred, and he will find it out immediately. Um [pause] and that's it. You will see this evening [pause] we have recorded some screen dumps of this prototype and you will see them this evening. Any questions?
[Mary raised her hand
Mary: Can I ask a question? Will we be able to access the prototype at any point? Will you be distributing it to?
Annie: yes, [pause] by, I think by the end of this month ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, excellent ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because it was in your planificaiton, yes
Mary: hmmm, you will be able to do that? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because right now, since you have to have so many things installed in your computer, it is quite
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: difficult to build
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: auto executable tables
Mary: ok, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and we are building it now and will distribute it.
Mary: ok, great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: by the end of the month
Mary: excellent. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Adam: I am not sure that I understood, but you said that with Compalabras [pause] you can type in short sentences
Annie: it is not only that you can type in [pause] do it, [pause] but it is not
Adam: I have quickly read your document, plug in dossier, and I have seen that there is functions like
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I think it is recognition that is
Annie: no, its not just the recognition which needs to be pure voice, but also for synthesis it is not just compalabras that can do it, it is the recognition, that [pause] that if you create, if you create a web page and you want compabaras to read the contents, you can do that, your screenreader can do that. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Adam: but if the project impaired people have not used that
Annie: then you can use compalabras as well. It was just a recommendation, that compalabras can give you a different add value, it is not [pause] it is not to substitute your screenreader, but you could use it to substitute your screenreader if you want to.
Adam: only using it?
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Adam: or the other function?
[Annie and Conwayne have a conversation in Spanish]

Annie: you can use the method, but you will have to write a paragraph for each method. And the voice xml document can have the same text, the same content as your web page
Adam: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: on the voice recognition you said, that [pause] how many commands do you envisage and what size vocabulary?
Annie: how many [pause] you mean for the application?
Kenneth: for the application [pause] yes, I am just trying to get a feel for the size ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I think you can have as many as you want, because it will be defined on a voice grammar. But I think it is [pause] it is short cuts, you cannot expect the user to memorize all the commands, so I
Kenneth: but, most voice recognition for more complex operations is now beginning to move from natural language, because that means the user does not have to remember that many things
Annie: I see ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: as the system is more [pauses] is able to interpret. So, I am trying to work out, for what is potentially a complex application, how many commands are you envisioning to be used, in this type of simple voice recognition? Because this is [pause] because it is the cognitive load, and how much you are expecting the users to memorize.
Annie: not many. Would say [pause] for instance in the prototype you will see this evening, that each button, ok button, cancel button, [pause] when the button is voice enabled and when the user says the caption of the button [pause] then the action will be performed. Compalabras will tell the user just after the plug in, that, that button is voice enabled, so he knows that the ok button is enabled. So, he knows that if he says ok, the complete event will be done. So, I can say that, I cannot give you a number though [gives a small laugh]
Kenneth: I guess part of what I am asking is, [pause] is still asking the same question that I was asking before, what is the tool going to do? Because that will give us an idea of what the command structure is [pause] and how big
Annie: this evening, [pause] I have prepared a presentation, a list of the basic functions that [pauses] the basic functionality of the tool, and I think that [pause] that will cover that.
Kenneth: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I can show you now, but I think it is better that I show you this evening.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and we can look at work package 4,
[Conwayne says something to Annie in Spanish]
Adam: um, in the plug in dossier, I have also read that the user needs to add a function
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Adam: that means that they have to buy it? [Pause] you can [pause] download
Annie: we are, [pause] we have our [pause] we are working with IBM. The thing is that you have to download viavoice, because part of viavoice is so big ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Adam: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: so in order that [pause] to [pause] it will make the plug in very heavy and that would not be good, for the user to download with voice recognition, because it would take too much time. It is 80MB, that is the size of the [pause] so the recognition is so, it is part of via voice. But we are working o our [pause] but we have a contract with IBM, so that if you use compabaras, [pause]
Adam: so, we have to [pause] buy via voice?
Annie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Adam: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: no, you have to [pause] as end user you have to buy it, but [pause] if you want to create your pages with say compalabras, you will have to buy it, to make a contract with us to be able to use compalabras, and that you will [pause] perform the recognition and the synthesis, and the IBM libraries that you are using
Adam: and the user will have to pay for it?
Annie: no, you will have to pay for compalabras, but not for via voice ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: the end user would not have to [pause]
Adam: and he
Annie: he will only have to download the [pause] the software, he will not have to pay for it.
Adam: and you will have to teach via voice?
Annie: yes, you have to train the recognition, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because otherwise it would not recognize your voice
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you only have to do it once [pause] and then
Adam: but it takes time?
Annie: ½ an hour, I have done it in ½ an hour.
Jack: and so related with the work package 3, this afternoon, we will have a [pause] a demonstration of the prototype configuration
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and after that some demos, screen cams of the different functionalities
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: of the [pause] stylesheets
Annie: yes, stylesheets ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and the integration of voice
Annie: yes, yes, do we need to see that in the prototype? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in the prototype, yes, and [pause] and you are going to [pause] some demo of ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: a very brief demo
Annie: and I think [pause] when you are going to show the work on the html validation
Translator: and I have spoken to Michael and he said he will show you some work this afternoon as well.
Jack: ok, ok so, this will be included, this afternoon to include this. [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: you said that
Ronnie: louder
Translator: you said that we will be able to download from the website
Annie: not via voice, but [pause] what performs the recognition
Translator: and what [pause]
Annie: and for the end user, [pause] it just means that you are using, what someone has built this compabras and that you may have to pay for it
Jack: so there is a developer?
Annie: yes, there is a developer and a distributor***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and as you say, it is only a part of via voice?
Annie: yes, but it is the biggest part of via voice ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but, someone that already has via voice has to do something, and
Annie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: it works
Annie: need to download compalabras
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: while Geoff is preparing, I forgot to [pause] in work package 1, Hazel mentioned a paper in London
Hazel: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Mary sent that paper yesterday I think

Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, now I think it is on the ftp [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]

E-learning portal

Geoff: Now we are going to talk about the work package 4,
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: which is the e-learning portal, and in the last meeting, in Madrid, it was said that the learning portal would be considered as a gateway to learning courses. [Pause] we will have to develop the the project manual [pause] and the problem is that we have not developed the project, so we cannot do a manual [pause] of what is not developed.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and we do have an idea of what will be the the project manual course, and I will show you here. Um [pause] um [pause] we also must need more e-learning specifications portal from the work package 1, but [pause] but, we are going, we are developing and thinking [pause] what will be the structure and if it will be possible. And by the moment, we have a structure, which is very similar to the paper that I will give you. [Pause] that is a comment where will, where we will have to make a log in [pause] and this is the [pause] off side navigation, so we will have the controls we will have in the online navigation [pause] and here we must have login. But in the web site of the the project project, you must include; you must introduce the log in
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and the site will have some examples and some links [pause] to courses, accessibility and e learning, we would like that [pause]
[Adam and Morris whispering]
Geoff: and in the, [pause] in the error page, will have as you know evaluation of e-learning sites and accessibility. Um [pause] we will have a [pause] volume that [pause] at the moment
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: at the moment is not developed yet, but [pause] the forum will bas-I-cal-ly [pause] contain accessibility and [pause] one forum about the project, one about accessibility, and one about e-learning problems maybe. And [pause] we have will will have tests that
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: and will have tests, which will ask about the evaluation of the people that are using the project. And, um [pause] and see if they are [pause] if they are [pause] learning other [pause]
[Can hear voice output again]
Geoff: and in the courses, we will have the the project manual
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: where our efforts will be [pause] we will [pause] by the moment, the the project manual um [pause] will have several modules, that are divided into an overview
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: that describes briefly the the project tool, and [pause] customization, especially [pause] the fonts, colours and [pause] and alt keys, alt keys, and [pause] we will show you how to change the language.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and we have an example of voice integration, and we have a taste of where the user can [pause] make a stylesheet. Um [pause] this is what we have for the moment. And we would like to know if you [pause] think that [pause] um, that the idea of what we, the way that we are taking s good for [pause] for the commission, or we think, or you think, we must move on to another point, and just later, on which way you must think we should take. At the moment, that is all.
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: I would like to ask you [pause] if you think this is the [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: this is the good way, or we must [pause] must change this
Hazel: Can you put back the last slide on what will be in the the project manual?
Geoff: the last one?
Hazel: this one ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: I would like to remind you that [pause] that this work package number 4, was a, was for this first year, was a special [pause] work package, because at the beginning, the start month was October, but the commission asked us for some deliverables before it started. So, you remember that we started to work on some of the deliverables before. So, at the end of [pause] at the end of July, we had to send some deliverables, for a work package, that was almost started, and also related to work package 3, which is also starting the tool. So, finally we agreed that [pause] um, um, [pause] the deliverable 4.3, the learning portal was going to show the the project project. Org, with a link to the examples of how to solve some [pause] so some examples
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and this is [pause]
[Can hear voice output]
Jack: this is
[Can hear voice output – welcome to the partner 7 website…]
Geoff: this is what we have now [pause] and you can see
Jack: yes, so the e-learning part is these examples, and also the PARTNER 7, [pause] um page, um [pause] site, which has links to e-learning issues, and as Geoff said. And also, the other deliverable was the web version of the the project manual, [pause] so, so that was also a very preliminary thing to do, because [pause] the project is still developing, and so what we included finally was the, was as an example, a tutorial, [pause] a manual of some of the facilities, functionalities, that this afternoon you will see. So, in July, we were at that point, and we are going to explain how to use those functionalities [Pause]
[Geoff tries to speak]
Jack: right now, it is a very [pause] I would say, this is not an e-learning course, it is just a manual
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: you do not have to [pause] you do not have interactivity, with the course, with the manual
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and right now, I would say that this is 0.1 version of the manual
Mary: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but at least, it gives an idea to the commission that also
[Hazel and Mary are whispering]
Jack: that there are lots of facilities, which have been developed.
[Conwayne whispers to Annie]
Geoff: this manual [pause] will explain what we will see this afternoon, when we [pause] when we show the specifications. Now he manual [pause] I know it is quite difficult.
Jack: and so, the other thing is that in this work package, the other deliverable is the portal design, and this is due [pause] in month 18. So, this is end of February, I think, I think so. So, what Geoff shows you a draft, possible structure of the [pause] of the e-learning site that is what has to be designed, decided. How this e-learning portal will be. So, we will be developing that part in the next month, and we will ask you of course, PARTNER 7 is contributing to this part, actively.
[Can hear whispering]
[Mary raises her hand]
Mary: Can I ask a question? Um, what are, because I see some overlapping information that is included in this portal
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and the one that Adam developed. Are they going to exist in two different servers>?
Jack: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***

Mary: together?
Jack: in the design of one ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Demonstration of the prototype

[New tape]
Annie: we have some executions that use the microphone, and the recognition engine does not work, because there is no microphone, so we cannot show you, we can show you [pause] how it recognized the tokens. We can show you just the synthesis. First, I will just explain a little bit. Um, we developed this prototype and html pages and task synthesizes a messages that the user enters, with specific voice parameters. When the user is using the tab key for the different options, but sometimes you will also be able to hear the plug in, and we use a different voice for the plug in so you can realize when the plug in is speaking. When it is for the screenreader, and it gives a message for the [pause] for the text boxes, it tells you the maximum length for the text. [Pause] do you have speakers?
[Can hear whispering]
Annie. I am afraid that you cannot hear it without speakers.
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place until speakers are interested]
[Can hear speech output…
Text message load, page will display the text message after the dialogue, it will introduce the voice properties. Tab introduces the message. Tab, type the text. [Male voice] Maximum length 20 characters [female voice] w-e-l-c-o-n-e space, p-ro-j-e-c-t space e-b- space d-e- tab. Select voice properties, add gender combo box, to change the selection use the arrow keys. Male, female, tabs each combo box. Change the selection use the arrow keys. Child, adult, elder, adult, tab speed combo box, for page selection, use the arrow key. Tab, to change the selection, use the combo key, high, medium, tag, ok button. Press the space bar. Ok label [female voice] space dialogue, a web page has been successfully created. Accept the button. Actively press the space bar. [Pause] Space, to navigate use tab]
Annie: and the page that we created would look like this [pause]
[Can hear speech output…
Welcome to the the project web page]
Annie: that is what the the project web page would say, and here is what the code would look like.
[Can hear voice output – female voice]
Welcome to the the project web page.
Annie: and you can press the tabs here for the voice to be synthesized. I will show you another sample, on how to create the grammar file, and to define the tokens that the user will use.
[Can hear voice output.
To navigate use tab. User dialogue, are used to rotate, tab, tokens, tab, click next to continue, to activate press space bar…. Introduce 20 characters s-e-o-r-d tab, to activate press space bar…maximum length 15 characters t-e-s-t-I-n-g tag, type of text…introduce text, maximum length 15 characters….]
Annie: and the project will create the grammar with the tokens, and it is a rule we use, that all the tokens, and to store them in our grammar files. We do have more examples [gives a small laugh] but we do not want to monopolize the evening. Do you have any questions or [pause]
Ronnie: what speech synthesis are you using?
Annie: I am sorry
Ronnie: what is the speech synthesis that you are using?
Annie: the messages with the child voice that you could hear, with the maximum length of the characters, that were expected from the user were [pause] and um, also when a button is speech enabled, and the user can say aloud the name of the button, a caption of the button, and the action is performed, the tool says ok and it enabled, which means that if the users says ok, that event will be that.
Ronnie: yes, yes, but what is the speech synthesis that you are using? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: what
Someone: what speech synthesizer
Annie: I do not
Ronnie: speech synthesizer
Annie: compalabras, the plug in, it is not a plug in anymore
Kenneth: that is
Annie: that is his question?
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: well the compalabras engine
Ronnie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: synthesis, as I explained this morning
Ronnie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: compalabras was a plug in, we changed it a little bit [pause] so you will be able to access compalabras functions, from a the project
Ronnie: why didn't you select a nice [pause] a nice British accent, instead of this bloody American one
[Laughter]
Jack: but you were also hearing the screenreader
Mary: Jaws
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: they were both
[Annie tries to speak]
Jack: most was the screenreader
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but some was the Jaws
Annie: jaws, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: ah jaws
Annie: which version?
Mary: 4
Annie: Jaws, yeah, 4, that is the one that we have. We did not buy it, so that is the one that we have, [gives a small laugh]
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I would like to know from the users [gives a small laugh] how it looks, how it sounds, or if it is an improvement of the [pause] to previous versions. Now we have compatibility with screenreaders.
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I do not know what you think
Kenneth: I think it is very difficult to have [pause] a much of an opinion on two very short, [pause] demonstrations like that ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Kenneth: it would have been very nice to have seen a demo, a live demo, in other words [pause] actually doing something
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that is what I think, [pause] that was interesting, but it is very difficult to make much comment, on that basis. First hearing it like that seems like their was a lot of repetition, and at times, [pause] it kept on saying tag
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and then especially, when you got to tag, tag, tag, it [pause] I think if I had not been able to see what was on the screen, I think I would have been completely and utterly confused, by that point. [Pause] I t
Jack: I think that is
[Annie tries to speak to as well]
Annie: that is the screenreader
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Annie: the one that says tab, tab
Kenneth: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: the plug in and if we had produced a version [pause] you would not have had that much repetition.
Kenneth: sorry, [pause] that is certainly, that is certainly the screenreader which is speaking it, and the arrangement of the page has actually caused it to say say
Annie: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: to have, to repeat [pause] tag 4 times. Um [pause] it is not, [pause] we know that is what a screenreader would do, so we need to make sure that the content does not force that to happen
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but, the [pause] but the really, the one thing from having seen that short demonstration [pause] is that it would be very interesting to see how someone who is not looking at the screen, or has turned the screen off, and can you actually follow what is happening? And I [pause] and I was just thinking as I was hearing it [pause] I do not think that I would have been able to have followed, if I had not been able to see it I would be very interested to hear from those who could not see, and to see if they could understand what was going on.
Morris: very difficult for me to say, because I am not eligible ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: what struck me at one point was [pause] was the selection of the key [pause] I mean how can you select, if you cannot see? How can you select a key that includes colour?
Jack: no, arrow ***(Sub- state 2.1)***
Annie: arrow ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Morris: oh arrow key ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: arrow ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: sorry.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you use the arrow key ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Ronnie says arrow in an American accent and Annie gives a short laugh]
[Others laugh as well]
Translator: Michael was saying [pause] it is interesting to be clear, of what is this, the method for the blind
Annie: can you speak a little bit louder?
Translator: what he is not clear, is that before [pause] when you studied the method, the blinds are able to use this method? [Pause] can they use that in the portal? The method of work? And in which way can the blind use this program? And the method [pause]
Annie: I still do not understand [gives a small laugh] How the user uses the application?
Translator: before to, to
Annie: can you speak a little bit louder please?
Translator: before you, decide to understand the method for the user to understand the program
Annie: do you mean the manual?
Translator: not the manual, the method. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: I think the question, I will try and translate the question, I think I understand what you are asking [pause] and it is one of the questions I had. How much of the [pause] control of the [pause] of the application will be through voice, and how much will be through other methods? So, what is the method of actually interacting?
[Morris and the translator nod their heads. Translator says perfect as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 evidences from 3 persons, 2 non verbal, 1 verbal)***
Annie: ah
Kenneth: because, my [pause] I was not sure to what extent, voice input is going to be the primary way of controlling everything and what [pause] to what extent do we need to use the keyboard. Is that the [pause]
Annie: no, voice input is going to be the primary way of interacting with the application, because you will [pause] find out a reduced set of tokens, which we will use, and recognize by the application, and mostly, um [pause] different feedback comes from the user. We cannot say here [pause] but in the prototype [pause] every button has a token, so when the user says the caption of the button, the action that the button performs is [pause] takes place, so, help is available, also, so, when the user says help, the help window opens. [Pause] the interaction does not rely on voice.
Hazel: but why, why not? I thought that was part of what we were doing. I cannot, I just sit their and say [pause] table, and then it brings up the table ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: yes it will, but again [pause] also because you will have buttons [pause] and well ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but, but
Annie: the trigger action
Hazel: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: it will be the trigger actions will be triggered by the buttons that is what I mean.
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and not just ok, or [pause] you say web page
Hazel: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and the web page will open and things like that
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and actions that will be triggered with [pause] with common keys or button, and trigger actions
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but are the [pause] are they the only voice actions, those [pause] on the active page
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: so in Hazel's example
Hazel: ah
Kenneth: you could not say table, if that was not one of the active buttons on the page.
Annie: no, no, no you have to give, [pause] imagine you are checking the accessibility of your page in the table, just as short keys are attached to a certain window, [pause] these are attached to certain frameworks ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: yeah, so I cannot say [pause] at some point, insert table, which is [pause] what I naturally wanted to say. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: it depends, it depends if at that point you want to insert a table. For instance, if you were consulting the manual and you said insert table [pause] then it does not make sense
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: in that button.
Kenneth: but how does the user know [pause] what is possible?
Annie: because the voice commands will be available for the user, to make a prompt anytime. [Pause] they may say anything, voice commands, and the list of comments, will be described and will do it
Kenneth: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: we want to make it simple, we do not want to rely on the users memory to rely on the commands
Hazel: so, at a certain point you could be [pause] I do not want to use buttons, because if are not using a mouse
Annie: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but, but, lets say at a certain point I am in a menu, where I have all the wizards
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and then I can say insert table or form or whatever, and then I proceed into the dialogue box
Annie: that's it ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: like that, and then [pause] and then I have available the commands.
Annie: that's it, but imagine you are over in the ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Hazel: yes
Annie: and the wizard and you say insert this
Hazel: yes ***(sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: it does not make sense
Hazel: yes no, no, that is ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: that is ok, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Mary raises her hand]
Mary: Can I make a point as well? When you were demonstrating the end result of the [pause] of developing html code, or the grammar, you had to go and open another window to go and check that
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: will that, how will that be implemented?
Annie: no, no, that will be built in ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: yes, we do not have the parser
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: we do not have the parser ready, but it will be
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: in the application, their will be an open dialogue box, and it will open the grammar file
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: maybe in the same way [pause] how the blind people could do [pause] navigate
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or interact so, [pause] wizards will be open since [pause] you will say, table, the wizard, to an table, so maybe [pause] maybe something in the sense the Kenneth says. [Pause] maybe the user [pause] they have, to, have in mind what wizards he has opened, or where he is
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: something like a map
Annie: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: you are here in order to
Mary: uh-uh
Annie: yes
Jack: to go
Kenneth: uh-huh
Jack: I do not know how, but something to remind
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I have seen that in the name of the window it says
Annie: y yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: more or less like a directory
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: because maybe he can be lost
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: because I do not remember where I am.
Annie: it could be fixed
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because otherwise their will be many things
Hazel: that's
Annie: otherwise it will be confused
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: something to
Annie: we would like to use Wizards
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and things like that
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and when it finishes it closes, you are again in the
Annie: yes, if you want to do something else, the application will remind you that something is open
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and to save it
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: that's ok, until you have embedded areas, and that is when you may potentially want to embed elements in another, and you want to within an open wizard, to be able to open another ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: insert another embedded object
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: the other [pause] it would be quite interesting in another area, which is [pause] um concerns me is [pause] it is fairly easy to see how one creates, um an element in this way, for a wizard. It is less easy to see how one modifies an element, in order words, to identify what the whole of an element actually is, and if [pause] if in part of a table, we have to identify the whole table in order to be able to modify it.
Annie: I like to [pause] we are thinking that one of the [pause] in the the project we have the web page, and we were thinking in what way we could show them the page
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: in a separate element, and that the user can access each of the elements separately
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and we are still figuring out how to do so
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: but that is difficult ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: it is extremely difficult
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and I do not know how to do it.
Hazel: but, but can they say, if I am thinking about that, if you are thinking in the right direction
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I do not know ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Annie: we know it needs to be accessible

Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: but, what [pause] screenreader usually have is a command, [pause] and with which you can bring all the hyperlinks, in one list, and you can probably have a similar function of the main elements
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: or similar elements
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: within that
Annie: yes, but
Mary: and higher level
Annie: but something which worries me is how the user, [pause] will have the list of elements, and do not know how they are arranged
Mary: oh ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: on the page
Kenneth: huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: how can you [pause] how can we tell the user no
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: do you have any idea?
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: Geoff do you [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Hazel and Kenneth whispering]
[Others having their own discussions

Creating a link for stylesheets

Geoff: now partner 2 will show a [pause] a part that they are developing currently, more or less they have closed
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: partner 2 is developing [pause] an editor that creates style sheets The best way to see what it is doing [pause] is to see the effect [pause] of the blank [pause] blank html page, that passes the code. As it, [pause] this page, use a [pause] use the the project point page, and see how it, when we [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: we create this, and [pause] to a html page. Um [pause] in this prototype we will see [pause] through the periods, we will show you, what we are using now in prototype [pause] and the [pause] the tool will [pause] will use. Such as [pause] the configuration, the colour configuration, [pause] and the multilanguage, palette, configuration
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and we will see that [pause] this will be [pause] it is is fully [pause] fully Jaws compatible.
[Pause]
Geoff: now lets see the video. This is page, the web page
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: and now we will call the prototype
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: as this is very long [pause], as this is very long [pause] the prototype of the video is going, both [pause] quickly through the things, but the code using more cases, the cas e[pause] and trying to simulate the most possible [pause] the important solution.
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: now we can see that we have the
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: the language in Spanish, and now we change the language to English
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: and now the application [pause] and now the application will be in English.
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: and now we are going to [pause] calling that [pause]
[Can hear voice output, tab, tab, tab, tab]
Mary: can you put the volume up?
Hazel: can it go any louder?
Geoff: the the project setting will create this
[Can hear whispering]
Conwayne: Geoff
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and that sample will create a script, [pause] and
[Can hear whispering]
[Can hear voice output]
[Geoff distributes the code on paper]
[Own discussions taking place]
[Annie gives instructions on how to make it louder]
Geoff: this particular screen, [pause] as Annie says, is um [pause] is um common dialogue, in this case, the open dialogue, we [pause] we developed, to be compatible with screenreaders. Because the common [pause] use almost all application have several programmes, we have not used [pause] because you can change the font, the colours and such things.
[Can hear voice output – in English]
Geoff: as you can see we are using short cuts as much as possible. Other navigation is the portal link, and used short cuts with all that is possible.
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: this is the colour of the form. One thing we [pause] it is [pause] it is decided to say in every movement, that you decide to change the colour, the colour value. So [pause] we can use arrows to move the colour and say the [pause] say the amount of this colour, and the colour-blind people will know which will be the colour. Um [pause] not all the web site palettes have a name
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Geoff: so, colours that have the code name, will appear [pause] will appear in part of a screen, where you can ask me, what to
[can hear voice output, number 00000, html value…]
[Morris says something to Adam]
Geoff: now we can can see the stylesheet according to the html page
[Mary and Hazel are whispering]
Geoff: and other step, that partner 2 has made is [pause] is to parse the the project page, in order to change in any configuration that we have made. That is the [pause] what we are going to see, [pause] we are going to make little changes [pause] that the the project understand, created page, and how it affects the html page.
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: [starts speaking in Spanish]
Jack: English, English
[Can hear voice output]
[Geoff continues speaking in Spanish again]
Jack: English, English
[Laughter]
Jack: Geoff in English please

Annie: in English please. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter from team members] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Geoff: the final tool is the [pause] is the html page we have start, which will give us [pause] the CSS that we have created and modified
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: the other factor that the application has, is the configuration [pause] to [pause]
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: it would be very helpful for lower vision persons
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: and
[Can hear voice output]
[Jack, Conwayne and Annie are whispering to each other]
Geoff: as you can see the application has been configured, [pause] and the colours have been coded [pause] and so will be accessible for people who has this problem [pause]. And what we are working now this week, is the integration of the template, special designing for people who have [pause] using this template, they will change the colour, and they will see the application in the better way.
[Can hear whispering]
[Can hear voice output]
Geoff: I have another video which shows the palette, because we have added the browser palette, the colour palette, and that you choose the [pause] the [pause] the colours by it [pause] not only by its full website, but also by the full colour, and it is very easy to put. I do not want to monolopolise the time.
Lucy: thank you [she smiles at Geoff as well]
Geoff: any questions?
[Own discussions taking place]

Mid morning coffee break

Jack: maybe we can have the break [pause], coffee break is at 4, we can have that, then Charles, and then we can talk about the annual review after the break.
[Own discussions taking place]

Presentation of partner 4 by Michael's translator.

Translator: I am here for [pause] Michael, and I am not personally involved in the the project project. [Pause] then I do not know the story, of the the project portal, but I will try to present the work of the Italian in Verona. [Pause] in particular, Michael asked last week to organize the meeting to [pause] some [pause] some blind people, some expert [pause] for the Italy union of the blind, and we started to discuss [pause] the the project problem, and to present the document about the the project project, and the objectives [pause of the project, and the the project authoring tool, and so on. Then Michael [pause] had a meeting in Verona, in particular we tried to address the question from the [pause] from the users, from some of the users. I was present, as I was going to be here, and I got to hear some of the views of the users, and then [pause] what the users think about [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: about the web authoring tool, and probably something we brought here, and some information we did not have before and we see it now. And [pause] and the user gives some suggestions [pause] but maybe this suggestion is now [pause] is now
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and the second part we tried gathering, [pause] to find, to find one solution to realize this web-authoring tool. And, what kind of the blind the blind like to use the web authoring tools to creates the web pages. They, they, give some suggestions and we reported those suggestion. I like an instrument [pause] program that work in this way, [pause] to have a web page to [pause] these functions and we write all this information.
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: in the second part we present a little bit [pause] of um [pause] an experiment, for try to, give information, concrete information for what the blind wanted to have for this [pause] and for the program. And another fact, we started, the Italian blind, started to work for the validator. What this means is that the validator, [pause] very confusing for us, because first we have to realize the parser
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and to create the validator, first it is necessary to have a parser, and then we can go to validator, the file.
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: what kind of validation and for whom, is an [pause] is addressed in this validator. It is only the activity for [pause] to realize that the web authoring tool is for the final users, to necessarily have all of the information, and we copy the program, and at the end, using Java, we give [pause] the parser is a class of Java. And using Java we create [pause] a validator, but Java unfortunately does not use the form, [pause] and then we present what we have done with Java, and then what is necessary to do [pause] in a validator for the form. I asked for Emmanuel
Elsie: Elsie ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Translator: Elsie, to help me because my English is not so bad, is not so well, [pause] and she is very nice to read the report ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Elsie nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and then Elsie till read it for you the report, and sometime
Elsie: it is easier for me to come there?
Translator: it is better ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Elsie moves]
Elsie: ok, so we have carried out a meeting and have invited the technicians
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and we invited the technicians for partner 4 in Verona
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: to hold presentations, as well as the readings for
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: documents of the the project, and gather general impressions and opinions. And the report forms. Firstly we have taken the activities carried out, the web site and the e-learning programs analysis, and the activities questionnaire, the documents created on access. However, the general interest was oriented towards the the project web program, authoring tool, and these documents were more detailed. This program [pause] which is the core of the the project project, arose in a vivid discussion, in which it was highlighted how impossible it is for the users to talk about something, without testing it into practice, and therefore if its objectives will be achieved or not. On this point, everyone agreed that it is not possible to talk [pause] either about interfaces or web program authoring tools, designed without knowing, very fine, which solutions have been adopted to create, the page, in a practical and appropriate manner. An indication given by the WP3, responsible refers to the possibility to consider the existing commercial progress as a comparing item. This solution has been ruled out and critised because that to the visually impaired people, it needs to be equipped with modalities, and right solutions for commercial products are certainly not that.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: first it has been required to create this individual project, [pause] and the preprototype of the program dealing with
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: with reading web pages as a study device and assessment of user strategies. What is [[pause] is required is a first prototype, which is offers the users likely first guidelines, which the users can convey their personal impressions and opinions. [Pause] then through the users criticisms and comments, it will be possible to create a second version
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and hence to improve the prototype itself. Even this prototype will be basic and elementary, that will include the new elements and items which should be tracked by the users. As far as the topic of accessible interfaces is concerned [pause] we have invited document and probably to W3C and the commission on accessibility and author of several text within this field. Also, design has shown us the reading of the W3C document, and is significant to the the project project and [pause] and has created in this field. We will show this task by highlighting that nowadays it is useless to

think of studying and creating an accessible interface of [pause] the project web authoring tool, resulted in the task and the program, working methodology, and the users interaction to it.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and the accessible interface offers clear dialogue windows, logic and understanding opportunities to select options. This will be nothing about working, and method, [pause] method-ol-ol-ig-cal problems concerning the creation of a web page.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: therefore lets come to the document presented by Michael Fredisine. In sight of W3C this document, concerns the authoring area, and not the complementary area
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: which are significant. It is an ideal picture if we want to gather a group interview.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: authoring tool accessibility guideline
Translator: of course this document, we already know, and we already know, and we presented to the users, a very short, [pause] a very short of what the document means.
Elsie: So, this document belongs to the guidelines we adapted, for the project and motor impairments. It is the first version, and we will certainly not find a final solution, functionality, which something might be implemented. In other words, for those of you [pause] like the project, if you want to create a new product, you must first work out a new way to approach the problem, as it has never been created. Particularly, to test it, the prototype, and then appears the
Translator: web site
Elsie: websites ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: web site, yeah [pause] web site, yeah, and it is able to [pause] check the checkpoint for authoring tool accessibility guidelines, 1.0.
[Can hear whispering -Annie]
Elsie: as well as this further documents that we have had, the one referring to techniques and the other referring to checkpoints
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: in order to recognize and make sense, these are the techniques
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: yeah and the checkpoints. Protocols and formats, this section wants to teach technologies the protocols and looking at achieving an art state with accessibility, it is a significant area.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: evaluation repair tools, grouping further and interesting device and progress, and assessment of recovery device of web sites, to achieve an accessible and stable version.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: it is a document, which gets continuously discussed. [Pause] Web content accessibility guidelines 1.0
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: is [pause]
Translator: mobile accessibility, it is for web site and document realized for analysis
Elsie: analysis of commercial webs. At this point the discussion has arisen, when we need to make a report on the various, web editors existing on the trade, by comparing, considering the specific ones for the creation of web pages, and those for the web pages, which have not been created for this purpose. Final suggestion, we are waiting and hoping for a pre-prototype to be created and made offer analysis, we have tried to work out how a web authoring tool, may be used by [pause] the visually impaired users. For these reasons, we have to define which pre-requisites exist, in order to define the the user interface, one in which the the project web authoring tool, by taking foreign parts into account
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: one, what is a web page normally made by? Two, methods used by commercial programs for normal sighted people, to create a web page
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: Three, problems the blind person the blind person is concerned with. Four, the solutions
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: five, a working [pause].
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: so one, what is normally a web page made up?
[Lucy has her eyes closed]
Elsie: the items, which make up a web page, are
[Conwayne and Annie whispering]
Elsie: text, images, simple animations and film, tags, tables, links and tabs, sounds, links on image, advanced objects, and many use frames etc. The listed elements in order to create a web page need a pattern and a composition, and in this you can look at the positioning and dimensioning of various objects. The success of windows and web programs are in [pause] is really offering the project image solutions for the traffic and textual construction, not to code a numeric value.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: html is a language presenting the exact, in an exact and coded way the page layout. It is code, that in a moderate fashion has been used by expert programmers, so is less practical for the complex
[Conwayne and Annie are whispering]
Elsie: two, the method of the creation of the web page consists of
[Annie and Conwayne are still whispering]
Elsie: the topics handled, and the integration of target users and necessary strategies of the site. The definition of the site pattern, the number of pages, and number of lengths, and the use of animation or not, images, accessibility, etc
[Conwayne and Annie whispering again
Elsie: construction of the main blocks and form filling with image and text.
[Conwayne and Annie whisper]
Elsie: a successful site needs channel order, clear message presentation, wish content, audio and linear path, comprehension of the position within the site, where the user is etc. All these features are gathered by positioning and evaluating the various elements, in a page, in a correct and adequate way. Supporting this, [pause] it is easy to notice how most people working with the web authoring are [pause] proficient, take by topic the main things of the web authoring [pause] focus. Obviously, the working devices, which need to be used, are [pause] programs requiring the use of mouse, and the operation and transformation of graphic images.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: Problems for the blind. What about [pause] the greatest difficulty that blind people have
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and need consist of managing and necessary features to make it attractive and interesting, and easy to access.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: therefore the greatest difficulties are related to the presentation of the page
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and the practical construction of the various elements, and positioning of the page, and suitably sized.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: it practically turns, that various web authoring programs, must make use of the mouse, and graphics in general
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: which are not accessible by the blind Let us, think of resizing objects through handles
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: even though there is an opportunity to make use of the windows,
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and insert this, the project checks still remains the most suitable approach.
[Can hear whispering]

Elsie: the usage of the Html code requires that the blind [pause] yet the blind has no way to check the graphical and the asethical of what he has created.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: it has also been pointed out that blind people, need to run web pages more than once to get them clearly, and they are still approximately represented.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: therefore, it has also been pointed out
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: that the instruction of a web page, will result in much as, if not more
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: still, let us only think of context
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: by which to attract attention, when placed on background on similar colours. Yellow, tags on white pages for example
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: the solution for the blind to create only text web pages
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: wants to risk making the pages aesthetically present, as a result of character size.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: which solutions? Some solution are possible with various levels, level, of items considered.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: by working in teams, blind experts in html programming, could offer solutions on databases and SP pages, for instance
[Annie whispering]
Elsie: and specially to sighted graphical designers
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: in this case only tools which are accessible through screenreaders are needed.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: construction through accessible preventaitonal programs, for text pages, which are turned into html ones [pause] for instance, MS words, which is well known for its accessibility, can turn, text documents, into html format, even when they contain images and links to other pages. This solution is possible even though it offers modest results from aesthetical viewpoint. Difficulties increase as the blind approach the creation of pages, and are remarkably complex from the graphical viewpoint. In this case, creating such tools from the [pause] pages and others becomes really difficult. Lets only think of the presence of text and images, and those points, where images are to be placed above, or below the text. Or in case of overlapping images, planning frames can be [pause] are understanding difficulties, which are sometimes impossible to solve. That is the reason why [pause] some solution, some solutions aim to create a pre-prototype, have been proposed. This will make a suitable evaluation, and will result in new ideas and possible solutions. The first solutions consist of defining a Meta, a Meta language which can produce html code. It is therefore needed that suitable words and sentences is the object, which make up the web page.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: the advantages of Meta can be the following. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: a meta code enables users to read, to re-read and keep in mind what has been creating, which obviously appears on the screen. If the user was to rely only on [pause] the user might not remember, what has been created, and find it difficult, to fully understand the work done. In this case, both the Meta form and the language would offer the opportunity of re-reading pages. In addition the Meta language will present you with both subjects and image size in terms of [pause] instead of numbers
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: so blind users will have to write for instance enter image, open left corner,
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: in imprecise positions the program will return the extract precision in terms of lines and columns.
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Elsie: and whether the tag has been positioned
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: so frame size, or columns, red, yellow, red. This construction in reality, in the criteria and working methods of web design to program the opportunity, and to avoid the coming of mistakes, such as checking up on readability, and background colour contrast, and text, ratio, and the ratio between text and image, and above and below positioning and things like that etc.
[New tape]
Elsie: the welcome box
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: it will keep on repeating the word welcome, and reads the text margins and the voice will inform the users that they are positioned within the working frames.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: navigating pages will be made available [pause] prolixity levels of complexity. Therefore at the first level [pause] will only deliver general information chart, whereas other details will be written at high levels such as the colour number, colours, features and of chart edges.
Translator: we have got to try and [pause] and um [pause] show you an example
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Elsie: Ok so introduction to the theory, the visually impaired people, might, thanks to FrontPage, create their own page, by only using the keyword. What he cannot do is to assess that his work has been carried out according to his intentions, in theory this control will be done through html reading and attracting the html code as syntax to be interpreted by devices and not human beings. Therefore, it would be have the code at disposal, that it is easily interpretable to the human being. To a blind user it is necessary to create two devices, which may help him with his work.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: one, an easily readable and understandable meta code, which through a converter gets translated into html and vice versa.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: Two, the screen touch, to assess the work carried out. Let's make a practical example to better understand the meaning. First of all, you use the insert guidelines and to decide the number of columns and rows.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: [pause]
Translator: to present the speaker, the Meta code, and talk about the Meta code. And the program recognizes this kind of image.
Elsie: you can decide to divide the first column into three further columns
Translator: and by voice, you can divide the first column into two or three columns.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and you can divide into rows
Translator: and you can divide into three rows.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: now if you decide to insert text, from column 1, row 2,
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: now it can start to insert an image
[Annie is whispering]
Elsie: and insert image, which you can see. Now it can insert text
Translator: insert text, from column 4 and 5
Elsie: so, at the end, we have the possibility to outline this work by reading the Meta code.
Translator: this is an example, column by column
[Can hear whispering]

Elsie: obviously this is a very small example of metacode, it must be extremely clear and easy to learn.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: in our example, text has been inserted into the window, and has been reported down in the meta hole, and it is not been forbidden that it may also be in an external file, and recalled back through the meta code.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: it is important to create a controller, and can have an aesthetic intelligence, which colours, must have certain contrast and objects must not overlap
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: words must have certain dimensions, etc. Images must be distanced, [pause] among one another
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Elsie: the creation of controller such as the one we have referred to, is the hardest work to be developed.
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: this is an example of screentouch, and to check the page, and [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: now I go to [pause] to talk about the report we see, we [pause] which Annie has asked about the validator, and we start to realize the validator, and these are the results of our work.
Elsie: so, html validator, we have created the parser, the html, and it makes uses of internal dtd's, the Java machine
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: the dtd is a document for the views of the html, for [pause] it is a manual, but all the rules about the [pause] about the html
Elsie: The rules used by the valiator are produced by the one Java virtual machine, and in case the Java virtual machine gets up to date, it is automatic revision of the html validator. The dtd's in the Java virtual machine refer to pre-existing versions of the html. The parser takes out the html tags if it does not recognize them, and from an analysis it has not been recognized, and in which position it is.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: we are working so that the rules yielded by the W3C, in the dtd's are contemplated, [pause] contemplated [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: In the hypotheses that is it not something, it is not possible to find, already existing classes, that validate the html
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: at the moment, no solution has been found that has created, and is disposed, by using external dtd's.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: it is compulsory, to build up all the necessary components, the necessary components, both the validator, this means to analyse the whole dtd document
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and build for every single element, and to check all the files and the imported files, the error
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: the work to create this validator is in these terms to quantity, 8 mid months.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: at the moment to create the validation program [pause] we have had to create a parser, to create a different, parser means to start from the very beginning the work carried out
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: and to the end of carrying on in a correct manner, the programmers have made some questions.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: what does the validator serve to? That is a test [pause] or is it part of the the project web authoring tool final program? Was it useful to? Is it for the internal use, for the development use, by the programmers, or must it be used by the users? If programmers need it, what kind of errors gets packed.
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: if users need it, how do the error messages get presented? If users need a validator, what must it check? [Pause] for instance, it must check that the html syntax is correct, however the outcomes, maybe not be readable in practice
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: if for example user, a yellow mark on a white background, the validator does not find any errors. And the page cannot be read anyway. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: In this case, it should be fair [pause] or discuss the functions. If the user writes some syntax and images, the validator must not find any errors, so the tags are not controlled. If the user writes a word, which is not in the script, the validator does not find any errors, but it is not
[Can hear whispering]
Elsie: readable at all.
Translator: this is some questions from the programmers
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and to realize that the validator is using a Java class
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: we have some web page as an example.
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: for example this kind of web page, and we go to run the validator program, and the validator program gives us some error, in this example there is some error about the picture. Another example is that the picture is not available, but there is some error with the feature, and we go to the robot. In this case they only found one error with the picture. There are several examples, this is another web page, where there are some edit box, and we go and check, there are some other mistake errors as well. The types of error [pause] is enough for the the project web authoring tool, and we need to ask the programmers. So, thank you very much. [Pause] thank you Elsie
[Elsie laughs]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: I have one question the first part of the [pause]
Translator: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I do not know, maybe it is not a question for you, it is more work package 1
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and I do not even know if [pause] if it can be used for task 1.6? The flow chart [pause] of information extraction
Hazel: but we have already presented most of this information in D1.1.
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: so
Mary: uh-huh
Hazel: which was circulated some weeks ago, but would have been good if [pause] if they could have used that in the presentation
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but it does not sound like that they did
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: so, what is the way [pause] maybe from Annie, we talk about [pause] about the web editor, so, what we see from Annie, for example, the letter that I read, she asked could you create for us, an interface for the web authoring tool. And, Michael, with a programmer, tried to found the [pause] what is, is this request. And to realize the interface, knowing without the project do is not easy. It is impossible, an interface, to do without knowing what the program is [pause]
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: before, before to realize the interface, it is important to study the method of creating web pages, and the interaction of the user to the program, and in what way the blind like to create the web page. And what are the problems for the blind to create the web pages. After it is clear, the modality for the work, with this program. And, the interface is very easy, because, if [pause] you use a standard object you do not have a problem with the object or the screenreader. The problem with the interface for the, the [pause] for the program, for the users is secondary, but before it is necessary

to know that the method of work, the work of the program and in what order the user starts to create the web page. In what Michael [pause] he would like to do with this document, is that the blind [pause] and say if you would like to create the web page
[Mary and Hazel whisper]
Translator: it is not very good, and well, and to create a web page I have to be very clear [pause] in my mind, what the [pause] the layout of this web page. First of all I have to create the layout of the web page, after that, I have to know the layout, and I have to go to the layout and change something, and the first thing, in fact, in the example, they say that I, I [pause] I know the page, and I want to go to some part, and then [pause] I am clear, that the page, after in this page, I can put in some other things. Of course the graphical solution is the best, but it is not acceptable, because it is not necessary to work on the corner of the left. And another thing that they do not like is to talk to me about [pause] for example the major sites, 90% or 70%, move the maze up 100 pixel or [pause] fot or 100 thing, but they like to do it.30 % of the box, I created. They like to talk in % of another thing it is clear that the page is like that, I like imagine, um [pause] it is a quarter of my screen, or method, I have, very, very [pause] useful, very clear method. When you read what I have created, I like [pause] the program, and I like the information, and I do not like the code, um [pause] edit box, check box, radio button, oh, radio button, I do not like that, it is impossible to use that button. They prefer to use other things, like [pause] Meta code. This is code, and after this code, there are low-level codes,
Hazel: can I ask, are these [pause] are these coders? Because our experience in Britain is completely the opposite, that blind people want to learn html.
Translator: learn html, but that is programming, not the users
Kenneth: the users ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Translator: blind people want to learn html?
Hazel: absolutely ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: the vast majority of web pages are now a days, are created by individuals. That is the whole beauty of [pause] of web that has allowed vast numbers of people to publish their web pages, in a very open fashion. They are not programmers, they can learn, and have learnt, and the tools help them to learn.
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: maybe they work with some other people?
Hazel: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: I've taught courses to blind people, all kinds of blind people, and the oldest was 1 65 year old lady, who wanted to create her own page.
[Translator speaks in Italian to Michael]
[Own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: I would not like to go into this argument
[Hazel gives a short laugh]
[Some others laugh as well]
Translator: sorry, the content type is not necessary to be a programmer?
Hazel: no, I mean, that is a stylesheet anyway ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Translator: then you do not need another program with the editor?
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but learning basic html is not difficult
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Translator: are they expert?
Hazel: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Translator: maybe there is another way, probably
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Kenneth: all our secretaries at PARTNER 3, create html pages. It is a standard thing to be using, yes in fact using some meta codes, as Annie described earlier on, yes with the wizards was a meta code
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: that is the whole point. No you do not want people to be writing this sort of text, they use tools, which create that, but they do want to learn the right words. If you [pause] do not describe something as a radio button, you have a great problem talking about it to someone else.
[Some people in the background say yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: because it is, it is a very specialist concept, but it is also a very simple one to learn, and people still learn in.
Hazel: Html is a meta code already, what [pause] when I create a meta code on top of another meta code, which no one else is going to know. I think this is interesting, because my question to Annie when you were giving your presentation, was the wizards are good, and it is a good way to go, but what if someone wants to add a paragraph, just raw, and does not want to go to the wizard, and they just want to say open bracket p
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and put it in
Annie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and I thought let's do it with the wizard first and then see how it goes
Annie: no, but they could do it as well ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: as well
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: raw as well
Annie: because it will have access,
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and if they want to create a table without a wizard, they could do it
Hazel: they could do that?
Annie: yes, that they could do that. I find it harder ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes, I, I ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: [gives a small laugh]
Hazel: I agree, I agree. Because it seems to me like the wizards are addressing this problem, that if you do not want to use the html code, you do it with the wizard ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and [pause] the wizard just asks you for the pieces of information
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: So, you are putting g a huge memory load on the blind people that they have to learn
[Annie gives a small laugh]
Hazel: a new code [pause] to translate into html and the wizard is already asking them that
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: the first one is a human, the second one is a technical, this is the difference, so
Hazel: the wizard is like a [pause] is like a human
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Translator laughs]
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: in Verona that is not so, in England, probably the blind are more expert
[Annie gives a small laugh]
Translator: have more memory, but in Verona they do not like that. Then after [pause] you do not have the exact version of the portal, and the mental extraction is very difficult.
Hazel: yes, I agree with that, but we have discussed that a number of times during the meetings ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Hazel: and the consensus was that is something, which was beyond the capability of the the project project

[Can hear Annie whispering]
Hazel: and that was not foreseen. And just make an accessible tool, that will allow people to do some coding [pause] would be received well, with the users. I agree there is still a problem of what exactly is the layout [pause] looks like
Translator: yes, because if the tool is a product for the market, we have to think a lot of people will buy, and not only those specicialised in, and not those ho would like to learn html. It is for a general market, not professional and so on. If it will be a commercial product, if it will only be a prototype, we can use html, but what for? For a commercial product it is important to consider the profession of the blind, the expert, the non-expert and [pause] and so on. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: it depends on what market you are aiming for
Annie: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: I also think you need to be somewhat careful about this graphical layout, because [pause] it is those pages on the web which have a strong graphical layout, which causes most problems when people decide that they need to change the size of the fonts, or change other things in the [pause] in the browser
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: because that layout then does not [pause] you get things like, text which disappears at the bottom of the box [pause] as you had in one of your images. That is a real problem, and in fact html, especially in the early stages [pause] where you could not do so much graphical layout and layout was very much controlled, by how the browser worked, and font sizes, and the fonts you selected. And it was [pause] the publisher could not control it to that degree. But that actually is far more accessible, when you are [pause] looking at it from a text point of view. I do think [pause] we need to be somewhat careful when talking to people, who do not see the the project outcome of html browser, to understand what is happening, and that you are not [pause] pre-setting the graphical layout in that way. But it is I think it is an easy misunderstanding if you have never seen a browser. [Pause] it is, it is not fixed.
Translator: that is the point of view of the blind in Verona, it is the same. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: I have one more, the document that [pause] Elsie has read, which work package does it address?
Translator. the document what?
Annie: the document that Elsie read to us
Translator. no, it is a report which Michael done [pause] last week for this meeting ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: for what work package?
Annie: but, to what
Translator: it is not
Annie: ah, it is not work
Translator: it is talking about work package 3, for example, web authoring [pause] tool for example.
Annie: you mean the user requirements?
Translator: what do you mean by user requirements?
Annie: so it would be work package one, I believe?
Translator: a lot of people say, that if we try to use some prototype we can try and [pause] we can get an idea, and get some other solutions, but we need to try something. After that I can say, that worked well
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: I can make a lot of critics [pause]
Hazel: and that is what was are doing, yeah, the iterative developments
Annie: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: the evaluation
Hazel: yes the evaluation for the blind ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie. yes the evaluation plan, ok that would be [pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: because for example MS word
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Translator: MS word is an outline editor, but if I wanted to create a web page editor in Ms word, I could create my web site, I would create it with MS word and it would be easy, and then why create it in another program, and I can do this navigating
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and it is enough to create the web page by Microsoft word. So, I would like to [pause] another kind of web page, and another kind of web page, results in some problems from MS word. So if you give me some solution, a different solution, I can check the solution, not a general solution, so if you give me a solution [pause] I try, and I can give you some [pause] my, my opinion, because I know to create a web page you can use MS Word [pause] if your solution is better, I can use your own, but [pause] if it is not better, I would prefer to use MS Word. This is the possibility, MS word is easy to use for the blind, and other tools is not exempt
Charles: I find it strange that [pause] web page started with the layout, before you have actually defined your content. How can you define what layout your content will fit, if your content is not ready yet?
[Can hear Mary whispering]
Charles: most web design groups say that you should start with contents and then layout. And the point of html and GSS is to separate [pause] the content from the layout, so that you can [pause] easily change the layout and
Translator: yes if you do well before, we talked about content, and the layout, they make the difference. They talk about the content first and then the layout ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Own discussions taking place]
Lucy: external or internal?
Jack: just, just one thing about the interface [pause] um [pause] I agree that you cannot do an interface of a tool that does not exist, but my understanding, maybe I am wrong, but that, is that [pause] at this point, what work package 3 needs for the interface is the [pause] is just the guidelines or the user requirements [pause] the thing, the kind of things that you have been explaining. That the users don't like to have [pause] things that way, prefer things that way, so
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: document
Annie: yes that is the kind of feedback that we were expecting from you. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: we need the information, what is the input, what you need for each function, is it possible to create a group [pause] of similar aggregate. In the interface if you use a standard object
Annie: the thing is you would have to develop the philosophy that you would like to use
Translator: it is not, it is not the method of work, [pause] what mode are you able to create the web page? When are the blind [pause] we use word
[Can hear Mary whispering]
Annie: for the method, you need to decide what the the visually impaired users would like to have [pause] don't like to have, and that is what we were asking you to tell us, from your experiences
Translator: yes, we already said a lot of things ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: in your document
Translator: and you can use some other thing, Ms word.
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: they need a digital solution, and [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: when they can use MS word why change to another
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Can hear Hazel whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]

Afternoon coffee break

Jack: we can do the coffee break and the [pause] Charles will show us his work,
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and then we can talk about the annual review
[Own discussions taking place]

Demonstration on parser

[Shown on the whitescreen]
Charles: I am briefly going to show you the parser we were asked to create. [Pause] we created also a graphical user interface and you can see the output.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: It is an interface in Java, and it can be [pause] localized if you change the regional options from English [pause] to Dutch or German, they are the two other languages.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: you will see the menu lights in the German language. And the logo, it is a document, which contains the italic mark up, and can see the report that it is generated by the parser. While we are looking at a html parser, and actually trying to find in Java [pause] it says that the parser will be provided by JDK, Java development kit, [pause] and it is not up to date. This is the output it creates [pause] and there are some mistakes. It mentions, the line and the position of the link, we have bad bad mark up.
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: in this case [pause]
[Can hear Annie whispering]
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: so, the parser says length 40, and for paragraph elements, and we look at that line, there is no start tech elements
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and J-tidy, also suggests some corrections, and to replace the tag with line break elements
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and all solutions should be to insert the style tech
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: just to show you the [pause] the localization of this screen, switch to German, start the vocabulary again
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: and now it is German menus
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Charles: and that is basically it for the parser
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: there is one another thing, a little thing, during the break, um [pause] a few people were outside were discussing the possibility of a preview [pause] and we have an editor, and a preview seems like it will be interesting for the blind user, or the visually impaired users to navigate through the documents.
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Charles: the preview with this editor expects correct html,
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: another thing that may be interesting is um [pause] this program is from the manager, and is first used, when I first related it to the appropriate files which contains the names of the menus, um [pause] it was when, when we asked some of the partners to provide translators for these menus and lines of codes. Because this tool makes it easier to navigate through the icons. It also shows which items have been selected. That's it. Are their any questions?
[Can hear Annie whispering]
[Annie raises her hand]
Annie: Charles one question, the software that you used J-tidy, is it free for development or can we distribute it? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: sorry?
Annie: the classes, the Java classes that you used
Charles: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: j-tidy is it free for development
Charles: j-tidy is an open source project
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and it can be distributed for free?
Charles: you can download it yourself
[Can hear whispering]
Charles: j-tidy is a Java version of tidy, which came from w3C
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, if I understand from the tree that you have shown that
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: can be used, not only for the parser, but also for extracting the structure and
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: making easier navigation
[Conwayne and Annie nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 people provide evidences)***
Kenneth: potentially ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: potentially, yep [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Kenneth: it is an approach that is the important thing that it is an approach
Jack: yeah, of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: so, thank you.
Charles: it has nothing to do with j-tidy
Jack: sorry?
Charles: it has nothing to do with J-tidy
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ah
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]

Annual review

Jack: ok, so I know that Hazel has to
Hazel: I should go about 6 o'clock I think
Jack: ah 6. The next point was, maybe [pause] I can talk some thing about the annual review. I do not know if a small presentation [pause] I can do it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: As I said, before I was talking with Mr. J
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and [pause] we have been talking about the annual review

[Conwayne and Annie are whispering to Geoff]
Jack: something, I will explain you
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and the other thing is ammenment number 3, and as I told you this morning
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: our financial situation, the commission for the prolongation of the project, has started a financial stamp of our companies, the organizations and [pause] with the results, the financial results of last year
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and they [pause] they came with [pause] not worries, but sometimes, the financial department says, ok we have to have the advance payment, we need a bank guarantee. Last year that happened with both partners 1 and 2 and more organizations and partners. And [pause] um fortunately, two of the partners that have this
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: the bank guarantees managed to convince the commission [pause] and um hopefully the matter is closed for them.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: for one of the organizations [gives a small laugh] they [pause] it is the Germans, they have still
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: we are still trying to sort their situation, if not [pause] it is not to advance the payments to the organizations, that means a problems, that they
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Jack: that they must work without previous money and [pause] we are trying to solve that, and hope that it works.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: the other problem is, well it is not a problem, but with us pause] asked that our financial situation is better this year, so they offered us a different solution, rather than the bank guarantee. [Pause] and we are happy just [pause] so Mr. J said that he hopes that [pause] that mid of next week they will send [pause] the amendment, the third amendment, so [pause] the process will start at the end if they send me [pause] Wednesday, I will send it Thursday or Friday, and I will try and send it immediately to you.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, the annual review, the first thing we explain you is that the [pause] different thing from the [pause] from the [pause] from the annual review, we already had in may, this year [pause] they gave us only [pause] only one year contract, first year contract. So, that we had in May [pause] was another opinion of the experts and then the decision of the commission if the project is worth it to continue, and now what we have is the normal, crucial annual review.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: we will have, previous of that, the rest of the contracts, and they will [pause] exam again our work, and say if we are in the right way or not
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Jack: so, is to go, to a single process, but with different, [pause]
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Jack: but now we have the 27-month, we have the contract for that
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: next week we will have it
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, it will be [pause] in October the 3rd in Brussels, and they asked us to send 5 copies of all of these documentation's
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: that is just [pause] they want a technical annex, which is the last agreed technical annex. It is not the original one, it is [pause] it is the last one which was agreed for amendment number 3. The last quarterly report, I
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I also sent the special report that was [pause] sent for the review in May and all the deliverables which we have [pause] produced. I remind you as I said this morning that we are going to be examined only for the work until the end of the deadline of July, and that is for most of these deliverables.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, this was [pause] this was the big box of documents
[Team members laugh]
Jack: you should see deliverable 1.1.5 times
[Team members laugh again]
Jack: so, one first thing, is what they called [pause] annual project and cluster review [pause] this is not the project, but it will examine, what the project said, and clustering, a point we will go later on.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, how it works, from our side [pause] as I said in an e-mail, we said that their was a maximum of 5 persons, this coordinator must be there, and 3 more people can be there. This is the proposal I sent, [pause] it is Hazel, as leader of work package 1 and 5, Annie, leader of work package 2 and 3. Work package 4 and 6 is also partners 1 and 2 , and work package 7 is coordination. And so, the
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and so, then the [pause] the one place is left and I propose Ronnie as a representation of the users. [Pause] from the other side, [pause] of the commission, our project officer is Mr. J, the head of cluster, and I am not sure, but I [pause] from what I remember, it was also Mr. J who was the head of cluster, so someone else will come. I do not know VR
Lucy: V R
Jack: [pause] I will try and remember. 3 experts and mainly observers. The commission [pause] can allocate that That is what it said in the papers that the commission sent me
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: right now, I just asked Mr. J about these 3 experts and if we already know their names, and he said no, and they are still [pause] trying to [pause] trying to get their names. What we have is a list, [pause] a list of 12 people, that are the list of experts for the annual review, and he said that, these 3 experts will analyse this box of the recommendations, well one of the copies [gives a small laugh] in detail. So, during the review they will be the ones who have analyzed all the recommendation. And in the review, their will also be one more reviewer their [Pause] um, in principal more oriented to the cluster activities. So, the [reads out the names of the 12 people and their country]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: in case you know someone of these people, and you do not like
[Laughter from team members Annie and Hazel]
Jack: when I was asking Mr. J about the list, he was like, why are you asking me? [Gives a small laugh] you have any problems [this was said in a jockey voice] and I said, no, no, no
[Hazel gives a small laugh]
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: I know some of them
[Lucy nods too] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: you know some of them. I remember that in May, GW was one of them, I do not know about EA
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I do not think so ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: no [sounds surprised], I thought it was ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: he said that the experts are ones usually oriented towards the [pause] social
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Jack: outcomes of the project and user side, evaluation, and one will be about [pause] technical expert, and the third, maybe the exploitation expert
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, um the project review, we have a maximum of 25 minutes presentation, and the commission will then tell us for maximum of 45 minutes
[Can hear Conwayne whispering to Annie]
Jack: and then they stop, they talk together, and they can come again with more questions

[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and after that we will talk and prepare our first result of the review.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: that is according to the documentation, it is not always done. And sometimes, you go home [pause] and they send the results.
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Jack: the review is in the afternoon [pause] at 2pm, I do not know if it is good or bad
[Hazel gives a small laugh]
Jack: but we want to go home
[Mary gives a small laugh]
Jack: and after that the possible result of the review is that [pause] successful competition is not our case, because that is that at the end of the project. Maybe we will be surprised [gives a small laugh]
[Others laugh as well, including Hazel and Mary]
Hazel: do not do anymore [said in a laugh voice]
Jack: that is fine. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: continue, remember our result of the review in May
[Hazel gives a small laugh]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: significant modifications required
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Jack: here they can come, not only with please explain better this part, you have to do this, you can normally go back to the deliverables and say this deliverable is not well finished, please do it better, and then we will have one month, [pause] to do this remedial action. Or maybe the remedial action is to change people from one work package to another or some other
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: termination of the participation of one or several [pause] and termination of the project.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: we have two options
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, [pause] we have three weeks from now, from today, till this review, and so every, everyone [pause] that is participating in the review or not, please participate in the preparation of the [pause] of the defense. We will try to send you [pause] presentations and how we can [pause] and when I say we, it is whole project, how we are thinking of defending and [pause] with any suggestions you will have. Oh, I think it is going to have one of these demos of today, or please do better one of these things [pause]. My J or example has asked if we are going to have one demo, and I said yes, [pause] and he was very happy and impressed. Oh, you have already got things to show, please do that, and do you need some special [pause] things for the demo [pause] I said no
Annie: speaker
Hazel: speakers yes [laughs] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: what?
Annie: speakers
Jack: ah, yes, I said that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter from some team members]
Jack: I don't know, maybe people who have gone through this process [pause] can explain us, [pause] what is, what was their experience, some recommendations.
[Pause]
Jack: for example Kenneth?
Kenneth: one or two things, is to be positive
Jack: to be?
Kenneth: to be positive You have talked about it as a defense; this is not a defense
Jack: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: this is more positively presented, this is good work [pause] and to [pause] and to realize that out of our list of experts, they are experts and there is no point in trying to [pause] to talk down to them, or to try and cover things up. They are experts, and know what they are talking about. Equally well, [pause] when it comes to questions, you need to answer the one that they are asking, and not the one you would like to answer,
[Hazel gives a small laugh]
[Mary gives a small laugh]
Kenneth: that can be difficult at times, especially when [pause] it is important to have relooked at the technical annex, because the review is against the technical annex, [pause] and therefore it is to understand what is said in the technical annex, and to appreciate that it might be read in a different way, from the way that we intended.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: and the only other thing that I would like to say is be very prepared for questions on exploitation
Jack: yeah***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and dissemination, this time and time again, from reviews when a vast amount of the questions are coming from [pause] will be saying things like, what is the market size, [pause] and if [pause] if you give one of these wooly figures they will be like so [pause] I know where you got that figure from but [pause] do you really consider that is the market size for this [pause]. So it is being more robust, and I think therefore that one of the people that is their to be very [pause] to be looking at the exploitation. That would be my point.
Jack: the exploitation point is Mr. J, every time we talk about the review, have I not told you that point
[Hazel laughs]
Jack: and to talk about the exploitation and that it can be tough.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: one thing has, [pause] this is Thursday, we have been [pause] to be one day before, to meet in Brussels and prepare and to talk about this, this [pause] review and the list of people who are going to be their
[Hazel whispers something to Mary]
[Own discussions taking place]
Kenneth: the only other point I would make is to [pause] is that timing is precise, and they will sit their with a watch, and if necessary, they will cut off and say sorry, you have had your time. So, when you talk about preparation, one of the things that you need to make sure is [pause] is you are giving equal weights to the parts of the presentation and it does [pause] use the time effectively that you have got
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: so it is [pause] so it is no good for an early presentation to wander of for the user needs for 60 of the minutes, and then leave the remaining 15, not that you would
[Team members laugh]
Jack: so, in the next week this will be an important point and will be
[Can hear Annie whispering]
Jack: and will be telling you any news we have and any recommendations, and again [pause] please send comments and suggestions.
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok that's it. I think we are on time.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: it was 5 minutes after
[Hazel laughs]
Jack: and Hazel you are on time.
Hazel: good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Review of agenda for tomorrow's meeting

Jack: tomorrow I said, most of the things have been talked today, I will go for administrative issues
[Can hear Ronnie whispering]
Jack: and we will [pause] have to talk about work package 6
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and then it is time for any other business
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I think we have lots of time to talk
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: that's all folks
[Laughter from team members]

Atendees: Adam, Morris, Ronnie, Lucy, Elsie, Translator for Michael, Michael, Geoff, Jack, Annie, Conwayne, Mary, James, Kenneth

Administrative issues
Jack: Ok, I am going to [pause] talk about some of the administrative issues
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: The first thing is the second amendment. As I already said yesterday
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: this amendment includes, change of [pause] partner 2 to new name
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and it is not only a change of name but [pause] change of organisation. In the [pause] we will of course [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: that you will still partner 2 and zero of the cost, and partner 1. Also, there is still a line with H University, and zero for the cost. It is not only a change of name, but also a change of the company. Then [pause] a change of the name partner 3, now, it is [pause] new name, and this is [pause] for the blind. And also a change in the [pause] in the address
Kenneth: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and Partner 8 University, is now Partner 8 University, London. Then it also includes the mandates of partners 4 and 7.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and Lucy [pause] told me that they will also, they will try and have a mandate for the next
Lucy: we
Jack: amendment, sorry
Lucy: we sent it to you
Jack: yes, but this was after this was signed ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: yes of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, I will try to do it, for next
Translator: Do you have a copy of that?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: yes we can sign that now
Jack: no, no the mandate is ok ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Translator: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: for you, [pause]. And then a change in costs
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: it was a chance in the consumables, for PARTNER 7 and PARTNER 5, we changed money in the costs from travel to consumables. It was sent to the commission on the 5, of 5th of September
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: the deadline was the 3 of September, and we were close, but it was there,
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: because now it is signed by the European commission in September
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, I have copies for your records, here, I hope that I have enough, here is
[Jack gives each partner their copy]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, next [pause] the next step is the third amendment. The main object of the third amendment is the prolongation of the contract. This is [pause] a consequence of the review that we had in May, with the experts and the commission, and they said that they were ok, to continue with the project, for the 15 months which are left. So, [pause] with this prolongation, the new contract will be until the end of [pause] um, next year. Till the end of December 2003.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: And with this, the table in the contract will change, right now, even in this amendment, in this second amendment, it only includes costs, [pause] budgeted for the first 12 months, and the new amendment will [pause] include the distribution for the whole project.
James: Excuse me Jack. So, it is not for the 15 remaining months? The budget will be their for the whole period?
Jack: I think so, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: it will, it will include everything
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: maybe it is just [pause] an annex, an annex to the new
Kenneth: if it is
Jack: sorry
Kenneth: If it is an amendment to the contract
Jack: yes, so
Kenneth: it should include the whole contract
James: otherwise it is a new contract, yes.
Jack: So, it is not a new annex, it is a change. [Pause] And also a small change to Partner 8, in [pause] a change in money for the sub- contract, for K K
James: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and [pause] we have had some problems with bank guarantees. I have already explained [pause] um, what is going on, and [pause] and in the conversation with FJ, it looks like, at least, it is now going on [pause] and we still have some decisions to make here. [Pause] but his, [pause] he is telling the commission to go on with the amendment, and it will be sent, mid, next week, and we will receive it [pause] maybe Thursday or Friday in Madrid, and [pause] sent to you, and you will receive it Friday, Monday or Tuesday. Because, last time, [pause] things were slower than expected, because some of you [pause] received the amendments, two days after I told you, that I sent it. [Pause] I will talk with the courier, because usually it is, [pause] because usually it is the next morning. Ok, so again, [pause] it is signed, and the rules will be the same, and we will have a letter again, we will have signed two copies, and [pause] and we will need also a cover letter, which will say, we have not changed the contract. [Pause] just send it back as soon as you have the signature. Of course, in case, you are agree with the contents, of the amendment.
[James gives a small laugh]
James: Sorry, which partners are going to be affected by the bank guarantee?
Jack: the bank guarantee?
James: for which partners is it relevant?
Jack: and [pause] at this moment, it is for both partners 1 and 2 and [pause] and the [pause] the German partners. But [pause] they said that they are not going to do the bank guarantee, so the decision is going to [pause] under the something which is going to happen, and the commission will not [pause] will not give the German partners the advanced, [pause] so they, now the decision is that they will have to tell the [pause] if they accept [pause] and not to receive the advance payment.
James: yup ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and not to receive the advance payment is not the [pause] is not the problem
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and not to work without the money, until the end of 2004.
Mary: oh my god.
[Can hear whispering]

James it: I think they will get money after the first cost statement, [pause]
Jack: and now, now they have the advanced payment of the first year
James: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and bank, and now, after the first cost statement, we will receive, [pause] um other 60 % of the first year.
James: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: but we will not receive the advance payment of the propagation
James: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: so, how many cost statements do you have to produce
Jack: 12
James: every 12th month, so that means now
Jack: now ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and now in 12 months and then again 3 months later again.
Jack: yep, and then maybe it will be shifted till the end if it is so close. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Who would want to do that, you would not want to do that, because the final one, will the final cost statement
Jack: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that will not be paid until the acceptance
Jack: and that is too late
Kenneth: for the annual review
James: and the final payment requires a lot more time, than the other payments
Kenneth: So, we want the cost statement at the 24th period, so that
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: so the final one only covers the three.
James: payments
Jack: Yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: I think that is the better solution
Kenneth: [gives a small laugh] otherwise it gets too costly
[James gives a small laugh]
Jack: as you remember, the commission, in the [pause] in this file, in this extra file that I sent you, which is called the CPF, and [pause] file, and you will see divided in it, your budget, in the first year, second year, and the three months separated
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, it is 12 months, 3 months
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and so, what is the promise were
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: were the position, from the German side, and from partner 1, and
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and as I already told you, we [pause] we had better numbers this year
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: And so I asked for a better solution instead, for the bank guarantee
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and they offered, a trust account [pause] and thing is that partner 1 guarantee is that the word?
[James and Mary both nod and say yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 4 evidences, verbal and non-verbal from 2 people)***
Jack: guarantee not added but [pause] the whole advanced payments for all of the partners. So, we are [pause] our bank guarantee is for 560, 000 euros, so a big guarantee, so [pause] they offer that, but [pause] in fact, we will go for the bank guarantee, this year, or we will have the financial situation for the bank guarantee. [Pause] and maybe they will prefer to do that
Ronnie: can I propose a question?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: my question is the following, since [pause] as, as we, are interested in to have the German partners with us until the end of the project, [pause] and as [pause] as your bank guarantee covers the whole of the project,
[Kenneth nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie. [pause] why do they ask the
Jack: yep
Jack: the Germans
Jack: of course tht is my question, that is how it started, the trusted account, I told the [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: F J, [pause] I do not understand we are
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: we are guaranteeing the [pause] the whole project, but they are asking the [pause] bank guarantees for another four
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: partners. And, but [pause] it looks like [pause] we are going to think, that the money comes to our bank and is then distributed by us
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: to all the partners. It is just that at that moment is that the money will be with us for one month, [pause] but sometimes it is more. Remember the problem, with the University of H.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: it was [pause] delayed the distribution
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, that is why the [pause] offer, instead of the bank guarantee.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and that was the account, that is a bank, that is owned by that bank
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: And it is them that do all the business and [pause] distribute the money. It is like a guarantee account
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, I tried to do that, [pause] and the commission said no.
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Jack: other administrative issues that have been found
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: the quarterly report after your comments was sent to the commission.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: this was included in the documentation sent to [pause] sent to the commission, for [pause] for the annual review.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and maybe it is a good moment, and again as the meeting in Madrid and Paris, please [pause] check the quarterly report we send to you. Check the table that is at the end of the quarterly report
[Can hear whispering]

Jack: where it is stated the [pause] the effort [pause] the personal effort, [pause] the personnel effort, for the [pause] for your company in that period. This is [pause] this will be used by the commission, to calculate how much [pause] you have used, all the [pause] all the cost, all the money for the personnel in the project. And also [pause] it will be used in the annual review, [pause] and see what we have used, and what was supposed [paused] according to the annex, according to the technical annex, to be used, and we say ok, you are not using all the effort that you were supposed to be using
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and what is happening
[One person laughs]
Jack: and you are using more people, explain that]
[The same person laughs again]
Jack: Also, by now, we are very close to the cost statement, and this will be used, during the money counts. Please I will suggest to do that, and in case
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: you detect that something is not ok, we will [pause] try to amend it, these things.
[Can hear whispering]
James: at the end of the annual review we will talk about that?
Jack: [pause] it is just a review, of all [pause] of important documentation.
Ronnie: when is the deadline?
Jack: sorry
Ronnie: the deadline?
Jack: for?
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: um, next week
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: As soon as possible. The sooner we have your information, the sooner we can solve that.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, from the beginning we will be delivering all the deliverables, [pause] and some of the quarterly reports, and you remember that there was an annual review, and that is old. So, this is what was sent to the commission, [pause] so, [pause] enough deliverables. This is D1.1, D1.2 was sent mid august, the beginning of September [pause] this was sent a bit late. And 1 month later than [pause] the commission was expecting it, according to [pause] the, the [pause] to the deadlines. That was the deliverable list, [pause] and we [pause] and um, also final, D5.4, the information dossier is part of the evaluation, work package. It was also sent with us. [Pause] and in near future a quarterly report was sent, [pause] and now we have 3 deliverables for the end of September. [Pause] This is the final version of deliverable 1.1, manual for accessible design, and final version of D1.2, the specification dossier. And Mary and Hazel, and Hazel and Mary did talk about these two deliverables. Some yesterday, and [pause] some actions were [pause] were [pause] were decided in order to finish these two deliverables. Please [pause] do that, and send to Hazel and Mary
Mary: huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: all the information that they need. And also we have the first year report, [pause] and that will be [pause] our review on the, a report for the review of what has been done in the first year. And we will send, [pause] we will use the special report in May, and all the new deliverables, to do one report, covering everything.
And we will send, [pause] we will use the special report in May, and all the new deliverables, to do one report, covering everything.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and after that [pause] we have this [pause] and after that
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: we have these next actions to do. The cost statement, they go with the report with month 12 [pause] that is quarterly report number 4, and [pause] at the same time the first year report, we have [pause] the cost statement. We can [pause] according to the contract, 2 months before the end of the period [pause] it is the deadline for doing that. But please start [pause] doing your calculations and filling in your tables. [Pause] and maybe you do not remember that, that was the meeting in London, or the very first meeting in Madrid.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I distributed the tables for the cost statement [pause] and in case you do not have it, you do not know where they are
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I can send it
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: the tables for each partner, and there is a table for the project coordinatior
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: add all the information
[Elsie and the translator are talking]
Jack: of course this is very important, and not [pause] and not only for the commission, but for you
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: we have to do this well
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: because your money depends on this, the cost statement
[Can hear whispering]
[Ronnie, Morris and Lucy are talking]
Jack: and also
[James raises his hand]
James: Jack
Jack: sorry
James: out of experience
[Can hear whispering]
James: and relation to the cost statements, partners should be aware that [pause] when you want to bring in travel costs, you need to absolutely need to include the dates of the travel, and [pause] and you cannot see this in the table
[Can hear whispering]
James: but it must be done
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: so, it is not just the travel to this place, but to add the dates
[Can hear whispering]
James: and to be aware that any travel outside the European Union, as it is today, has to [pause] needs preliminary permission from the commission.
[Can hear whispering]
James: which means that if you have gone to the States, and even if something has happened in Switzerland, you should have asked permission,
[Can hear whispering]
James: otherwise they will refuse paying back that cost, so, it is better to think about that now [gives a small laugh] than at the very end.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and in our project, just for two
[Can hear whispering]

Jack: both partners 1 and 2 [pause] we will have an audit. This audit can be done [pause] in the next 5 years, to any partner in the project, but that is something which can happen or not. But for [pause] this is, this was new, in the work call, and an audit must be provided
[Ronnie says something to Lucy]
Jack: by both partners 1 and 2 with an independent company, an audit company. [Pause] that will audit our numbers. Why us, is because of the cost [pause] is because our budget is more than 250,000 euros
James: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in the contract, so we have to do that.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and the commission pays some, it pays up to 4, 000 [pause] euros, for the cost of the audit, half of that, the eligible cost up to 4, 000. That was already in the list
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: sorry the next cost statement, when do we have to consider?
[Jack tries to say something]
Jack. sorry
Translator: the next statement when we have to prepare it?
Jack: it is at the end of the first year, which is September, and we have 2 months.
Translator: to present that. [Pause] and another thing. And that is till the first of October?
Jack: it is totally wrong ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: it is wrong, just because the project started in October. You have October or November ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: October or November. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: not September ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: so it is one month earlier ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: it is September ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and the new deadline is the end of November
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: starting in the first of October?
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: October to [pause]
Jack: ah, you mean [pause]
James: the next one
Jack: 12 months, it has to be delivered to the commission in that period
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and it covers
Translator: not October?
Jack: sorry?
Ronnie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Translator: September
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: from 1st October last year to 30th September
James: September ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, I think that is it, in administrative issues.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: Yep, do you have more questions? We will be happy to answer you, to help you with administrative issues that you may have.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: in the project
Jack: in the project.
[Can hear whispering]
James: Jack, is there a draft available? Of the financial tables? For the extended project?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: it is somewhere on the ftp site?
Jack: yes, in fact, you can, you sent me, [pause] you mean one
James: one table with all of the financial information for the project.
Jack: the whole project. No, no, you will not find this ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: the new Electra, I would say
Jack: yeah, yes a new Electra in fact was [pause] was created with your infor ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I asked you for [pause] and um [pause] and for the whole project, I can send you, the, whole lectra
James: yes, I think that makes sense ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: because you have only your part
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, ok, I will ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: you do not have to send it, if you put it somewhere on the ftp site, and we can download it.
[Can hear whispering]
Lucy: Jack, can I ask you a question? Did you receive the cost statement for PARTNER 5?
Jack: cost statement for PARTNER 5, what statement was that?
Lucy: did you receive the papers?
Jack: no, no, but I was not expecting to receive that till the end. Do you mean that? ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: to do that?
Jack: yes, yes, of course, [pause] but that is not the cost statement [pause] that is the CPF form ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: for the
Jack: yes, I did receive all your contributions, and that was the new [pause] new table for the whole project, and it was sent to the commission using your data. So, that is what James was explaining. IU will put onto the FTP [pause] the whole, the whole project, and [pause] it as excel form ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: it is an excel file. Because it contains lots of macros and so on
[Can hear whispering]
Jack. so, you will see the [pause] the many, many features and tools, [pause] and the very beginning AC1.2, and the project, for the first year, the second year, and then the [pause] each partners, starting on the [pause]
[Kenneth raises his hand]
Kenneth: Jack
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: since we are [pause] have had problems with amendments in the past, with other projects [pause] what would be very useful, if they could send us as early as possible, send us an electronic copy of what the amendment will look like.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: it is not something that you can sign, because that has to be the paper copy [pause], but [pause] it is very useful as at least we can check

Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: what they have done, [pause] and on another one of the projects, the amendment had the start date, effectively incorrectly placed in the contract [pause] and we, we had an argument, a discussion with the commission, from our legal experts. So, if they can let us have that as early as possible, then, that will give us an opportunity to [pause] make sure we are happy. So, when they want the signature, very quickly, we can do it
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that includes the [pause] that make sure that they have translated into the table correctly
Jack: yep, you are right. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I will ask you, [pause] as I said, you have to sign the [pause] you should sign the amendments, just in case, you agree with that is in the amendment. For this previous amendment, number 2; was [pause] is here just the change of names, and [pause] very administrative issues. Now, [pause] as Kenneth is seeing, we will have the money [pause] we will have the money with the table [pause] and we can spend, till the end of the project. So, please check the [pause [what is there is what you expected. I will check that [pause] with the Electra copy. Please if something is wrong [pause] I do not know, few things appear in the amendment. For amendment number 2, I am telling you about the change for PARTNER 3, and the change for [pause]
James laughs
Jack: you have to check that there is nothing new.
James: strange
[Can hear whispering]
[James and Kenneth say something]

Date for next meeting
Jack: one more administrative] pause] the next meeting, sorry, I forgot, I do not know if it was decided, Hazel is not here, or the Germans, but we can at least talk about it, we can talk about a draft for the next meeting. You know that we usually [pause] meet every three months or less, so that will be [pause], now it is September, so it will be [pause] will be mid or beginning December. That is our first possible date, or January, or even [pause] beginning of February. As I can see here [pause] but [pause] the next deliverables after the ones we will send to the commission, at the end of September, we have a month 18 [pause] one in [pause] one in work package 3, that is the functional analysis and technical design of the tool, and that is the end of month 18, that is the end of February.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and one for work package 4 that is the portal design [pause] also, at the end of February. Here is the old version of
Kenneth: but you have until month 16 on the evaluation
Jack: two for the evaluation, one is now for the end, [pause] is the first evaluation for the portal, and the other is the first evaluation for the tool
[Can hear clicking]
Jack: Also for the month [pause]
Kenneth: 16
Jack 18
Kenneth: 16, is the end of the year, at the [pause] at the beginning of next year. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: So
James: if you put the meeting in January, you can handle both, the deliverables from month 17 to 18
Jack: so, January, we can meet
Annie: middle January
Jack: we can meet [pause] and before the date, the place, the [pause] we have been
[Ronnie whispering]
Jack: we have been two times, twice in Madrid, [pause] and in London, and in Paris, and in Lueven. And now we have [pause] Verona, and Burn, the Germans are not here, so we do not know if it is possible. [Gives a small laugh] So, it is their problems, so I propose. I already talk to you that [pause] it is ok. What about the other partners do you agree for Verona?
Ronnie: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[James laughs]
Jack: As they say now is the best time to see Verona. [Pause]
James: and anyway it will be better than Leven in that time
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, it is better than Leuven or burn
[Some people laugh]
Jack: ok, so
James: a suggestion for the dates?
Jack: in Verona and the dates?
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: to include a Saturday night for the price of cheap tickets
Jack: yeah, that is the same, [pause] discussion we already had. We can do Thursday, Friday, and if someone wants to use the Saturday night discount then they can stay. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: to use Wednesday and Sunday, it is possible for very low prices for the tickets
James: yes, but it means that the meeting on Tuesday and Friday.
Translator: and Saturday for the low price
Jack: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: no, ***(Sub-state 1.2***
Jack: We have already had a discussion, we cannot do a weekend date, [pause] this is for the meeting, not all the partners can do it.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I think Thursday, Friday is the better choice
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: mhhmm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some others say yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, we have
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: 16th and 17th?
[Can hear whispering]
Lucy: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Thursday and Friday?
Jack: Thursday and Friday, yes, 17th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I guess we, [pause] is someone is mind, this date, 16th, 17th of January is impossible.
Ronnie: we need to check ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Ronnie: If you do not hear anything it is ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
(Sub-state 4.1)
Translator: on that day

Jack: sorry,
Translator: 17th is the Friday [pause] to fly the 17th,
Mary: it is a Thursday ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: it is a Thursday ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James: Then people should take an extra holiday
Jack: the 17th
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ah, Friday the 13th [gives a small laugh]
[Other laughs as well]
Jack: 17th on a Friday
Mary: is it unlucky?
Ronnie: it is not all
Jack. in Italy it is bad luck
Annie: ahh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in Spain it is Tuesday the 13th
Annie: Tuesday the 13th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some laughter]
James: ok, I do not think that we should pay attention ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some people laugh]
Jack: So, I think that is why our flights were so cheap
[Laughter]
Jack: this week, no one wanted to fly
Mary: to fly
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, so Morris and the translator told me Verona airport, in the partner 4
Translator: we can check for flying the best flight, we can give you the very [pause] for a direct flight to Verona, and it is cheaper flight from London to Brushia, it is only 50 minutes, and there is connection by bus, and it is very cheaper. And, with Brussels, you can use the [pause] you can use the Wygan and it is one hour 15minutes by train.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: never mention Ryan air.
Translator: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: this company, [pause] makes it very difficult, [pause] it makes you pay for a wheelchair and an assistant. So, [pause] at least do not publicise this
[Some people laugh]
Translator: I went to London with my daughter [pause] and
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and it was very very nice
Morris: she is lucky.
Translator: and there is a direct flight
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: with this, you can do some booking for the special price
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, I think administrative issues is finished
James: I have to go now.

Work package 6
Jack: so, we will go for [pause] about work package 6, dissemination issues and [pause] the first thing is the last, in the last month, in the last 3 months, have you been in any dissemination activities, [pause] when you have talked about the project.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: I do not know if it is worth mentioning that [pause] we heard about a event
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: in the south of France, and [pause] well it was in fact, the conference was about very specialised aspects of e-learning. It had nothing to do with accessibility, [pause] and disability, and we tired to flag up, the accessibility issue. It was not very well attended seminar, it was mainly students from that university. But, at least we tried to make available, and tell
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: and on the 16th of July, I gave some information on the project, on the occasion of [pause] of the [pause] for the ordinary meeting, of the [pause] um, [pause] seminar of the [pause] of the SEN ISSS sem, sorry, workshop, on design for all
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and together with some [pause] with some other information concerning the Lambda project, and [pause] and others. So, this was [pause] on the preparation [pause] probably, and over the next week, I will invite, you after the annual report has been completed, I will invite you to make a presentation to this workshop.
Jack: when, when is the workshop?
Ronnie: I do not know exactly, the date will be fixed next week, I will tell you.
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: um, so, we were going to mention that [pause] today, is starting in Amsterdam the IBC conference, [pause] international broadcasting conference, that is the biggest conference [pause] of the [pause] of broadcasting, that includes many many things. The Internet, web [pause] and digital TV, radio, multimedia and everything. And [pause] we presented a paper, that was selected as one of the six papers on [pause] which is called the new technology campus. And, so we will have a speech about this one, and they also gave us a stand for the project.
[Lucy nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and Fabian is now their opening the stand that is why he is not here. This is for 5 days.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: maybe, [pause] it is not the best conference for the dissemination of disabled technologies or [pause] or e-learning, but it is a place where to disseminate technology, and also there is [pause] Microsoft, IBM, dreamweaver and it is this
Conwayne: Macromedia
Jack: kind of people, to be in touch with their, and we will try to do more, in the exploitation plan
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and of course from the speech, what is maybe not, [pause] not devoted disabled technologies, but we will do [pause] to do that, to explain to the audience why it is important to have accessibility and usability.
Ronnie: are you going to put the document
[Jack: yes, yes, I think it is already there. As [pause] as was agreed, sorry, that the paper was already sent and approved, so what is there was approved. We are sorry [pause] we did not distribute it before sending it, for the next time, we will do it. Now [pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***]
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Morris raises his hand]
Jack: Morris ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: I sent you an e-mail last week,

Jack: yes, I have it here ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: yes, do you intend to go?
Jack: that is something [pause] we can,
Morris: I looked at the program and [pause] a sizeable part of the conference will be developed to e-learning
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and it would be a good opportunity for partners 1 and 2
Jack: yes, you remember [pause] Morris sent an e-mail, to the project.. mailing list, that learntech 2003, was the 11th European conference and educational and informational technology. It is February 2003, and in Germany, so I think, at least we should try to contact them, and to have a conference. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, [pause] if there is, [pause] if there is one partner, who is especially interested in going their, not only for being about the project, but if it interesting for them for the e-learning issues, we can go as, just as the project.., [pause]
Mary: when is the conference?
Jack: February 2003
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: maybe we can do the approach
Ronnie: maybe we can do the approach
Jack: yes
Ronnie: and then
Jack: and then we can decide if there is a success, we have [pause] because in February, I do not know if there is a chance
Mary: yes, to submit ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: in [pause] at the end of November, in Madrid, there is going to be a two days conference, in general about research and development in Spain, so [pause] companies, big companies and universities go together in a place where you can talk to each other and [pause] and projects, and running projects. So, we [pause] tend to present our project.., [pause] and Annie will do that. Is that [pause] it is local dissemination. The audience will be [pause] will be big companies, including Microsoft [pause] and IBM, and Motorola
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and [pause] and small Spanish press, it is easy to go there, and it is a good place to see these sorts of things. And we will distribute, [pause] it is a presentation, not a paper.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: it is a presentation, maybe next week as it is being prepared. Also, I think that [pause] partner 1, maybe you are going to [pause] a conference in Tenerife. Maybe you can explain [pause] what all I know is that the orgnanziation, is all the technologies for the disabled and accessibility to the net, and to see that, it is a very important [pause] institute. It is located in Valencia, and it is in Spain. And they work a lot with uMfere, and they invited [pause] usto explain the project. That will be [pause] October, I think it is the end of October
Annie: I think it is mid October ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: mid October ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: I would like to go there. And [pause] please, I will ask you about the past, and if you have plans for the near future for dissemination, [pause] and
Ronnie: we were organising a seminar for PARTNER 7 members in November
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: we are arranging e-learning, and it is a very important event, and is very much appreciated by blind people is the international computer camp. [Pause] it takes place once a year, around June or July and we are approaching the organisers to see if something can be done, but that could be very interesting.
Jack: international computer camp?
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: where is the?
Morris: we will send you an email to tell you about the exact venue
Jack: ok, ok, so that will be for mid ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: next year, yeah
Ronnie: in 6 months time
Morris: it is usually about July, June, June, July.
Jack: and I forgot you are [looks at Mary]
Mary: going to a conference, yes, an e-learning conference in November, in early November. And I actually tried to distribute the paper, and I do not know if anyone had any problems receiving it
Jack: ya, I received it [pause] um [pause] um, it was this Wednesday ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: and we put it on [pause]
Mary: great
Jack: onto the FTP
Mary: that is great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: You did not receive that e-mail?
Mary: the problem is [pause] I sent it to the entire consortium, but the paper is about 2 megabytes
Jack: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so, maybe the paper, so maybe everyone's server will not accept it. But if it is on the project server, maybe people can download it. It is zipped file and it is still 2 megabytes
Kenneth laughs]
Mary: I know. It is because it is a PDF, and it extends. Maybe I should include or send [pause] the word version, rather than the PDF. It is a word version, sorry, it is a word version
Someone: with video?
Mary: there is no video, there are some graphics though, it is a word version though, sorry ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Someone: it is this
Mary: yes, so you did receive it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: accessibility problems with e-learning
Mary: yes, [pause] it is around 15 pages ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, no, I was looking at
Mary: I do not know why
Jack: how many images
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, so
[Kenneth raises his hand]
Kenneth: An interest has been shown in the survey that we did around authoring tools, and people want to have that disseminated
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and we have some issues that we are trying to change at the moment, because, it is really useful, as it names particular authoring tools
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but there is the problem of libel. So we are having to check the legal position of that fairly carefully. [Pause] but at the same time we will be talking about that at the PARTNER 3 technshare conference in November, [pause] in Birmingham. And as an advance on that, I would suggest

that the Techshare conference in November 2003, would be a very good platform for [pause] for the latest stages of the project. [Pause] so their will be that opportunity
Kenneth: and that has a very wide audience around visually impaired people
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: with an international audience
Jack: international ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: very much so ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: but then I do not remember, but it was [pause] an, I do not remember the dates, but their was a very important conference that we had here, [pause] and it was about disabilities, and it was in Germany, and our partners were going to be there [pause] and [pause] but, I remember that they were invited to be at the conference We will try to do that, to talk about the project,
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: at least to give some information. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, I think
Mary: can I mention something?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: something else, I just remembered
Jack: sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: I um [pause] I do not know if you have all heard about the IMS accessibility guidelines for online learning, and I think that they are mentioned in our deliverable 1.1. Basically, the IMS is [pause] is a wordwide consortium and they have been developing different standards, and at the moment they are working on developing guidelines for online learning and for [pause] and for different people with [pause] for different people with special needs. And um [pause] they had an open house event, which we attended [pause] and sometime in august. And, basically what they are looking for, is for people to provide feedback to them. [Pause] So, their guidelines are similar to the WAI, although, a bit at a different level, although they are more specific for online learning. So, [pause] what was proposed, that if we [pause] if we are able to implement some of their guidelines, we can handle the project as a testbed for this guideline, and collaborate with IMS and provide [pause] feedback
Jack: I think that would be interesting ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: because they are a worldwide organization, basically, and they are working on that
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, that [pause] that gives me a chance to ask about standardisation
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or that, maybe both
Mary: I think it was mentioned in the commission's report [pause] on the first page
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: they wrote
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: IMS has
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so, we can collaborate with IMS, and the project can act as a testbed to their guidelines, and to provide feedback. [Pause]
Jack: Do, we have any news about [pause] W3C or WAI or [pause] or other organizations that you have made contacts to them
Ronnie: they were, they were [pause] present at this [pause]
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: some of them were present at this meeting on the 16th of July, and um [pause] and so information was given. We have a meeting next week again [pause] and um [pause] and I will come back to the project, about giving information on them, on the project. And those that are interested can go directly to the web site [pause] and to see what is available. [Pause]
Jack: so, that is the IMS
Ronnie: they know, sorry?
Jack: is that the ISS?
Ronnie: this is [pause] I will give you the [pause] the exact [pause] the name of the project. This is SEN and ISSS WS, this is workshop, DFA, design for all
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: So, SEN is the European standardisation body. ISSS is information society, [pause] um, systems standardisation. WS is workshop. DFA is design for all.
Jack: it is easy to remember [gives a small laugh] Ok, I think you are
Ronnie: their will also be a [pause] I do not remember exactly [pause] but their will be a meeting for [pause] of standard boards of [pause] of the organizations and standardizations organizations, and their will be most probably be given information about the project myself. Next year, in march their will be a conference on standardization, and that will be [pause] the standardization concerning the persons with disability, and then we will have the opportunity to come back [pause] back on the basis of the results, we will have to show [pause] the very careful, and um [pause] and we will talk about the project, on the occasion of results Because if we do not have anything to show, it makes no sense to go and talk about a project, which is [pause] which is starting its activity. So, we [pause] in my opinion when we go to the standardization organization [pause] we must not have [pause] we must not have just [pause] theoretical declarations, we must also have something to show. And that would be possible, as soon as [pause] as soon as the tool will be ready. With out the tool, it is difficult to make a presentation
Jack: yeah. I hope by March next year, we will have many more things ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: the second prototype
Jack: the second prototype yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I think that is all. [Pause] I will ask that if you find information [pause] please whether we can present the project, to let the consortium know If for example it is of interest to you, then you go, if you think that other partners should go, or us as coordinators should go, [pause] we will [pause] it will be best to tell us. Of course money is limited for travels and dissemination, but we are open, now, at the moment for any possibility.
[Kenneth raises his hand]
Jack: yes, Kenneth ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Can you comment on [pause] on anything going on task 6.1.2 on exploitation
Jack: exploitation, yes that is part of work package 6 [pause] but, I would say that [pause] it is just studying, I have to say that, not a lot has been done
Kenneth: I am thinking here of the annual review, because [pause]
Jack: yeah, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: looking at
Jack: now [pause] I was, we was [pause] have to take someone from our company who is a specialist in exploitation and marketing and also started for us last weeks and [pause] we will have more on that. I am aware that this is a very important issue, and I am also aware that the technical annex, that there is not much explained, and it is a very general view, broad view, and now [pause] now that the tool is more defined, now that we know better, identifying the user, so [pause] we will [pause] we will inform you of that. Of course, for the annual review that is very important. And [pause] that comes back to the agreement of the consortium agreement, and now that we have the [pause] amendment number 3, the prolongation report, it was this [pause] is this starting to work on that, and I will probably have a draft in the next few [pause] now it is an important document
Ronnie: Jack

Jack: in the project, it looks like this till the end now
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: Jack
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I think, [pause] I think we will have to take one, to take one of our meetings to [pause] to make an extended discussion about the problem of exploitation
Jack: uh-uh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: because I think this is something that we have to discuss, and to go very deep into this, this important task. Because up to now, [pause] for us, it is not very clear, how [pause] this [pause] the result of our activity will be exploitable or exploited. And um we cannot [pause] we cannot wait until the last minute to discuss the issues
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: because I, I think we have [pause] some important considerations regarding exploitation. There will be probably be a different view, among the partners, because I had already, yesterday some smell, some smelling of [pause] of different approaches. And, [pause] this will have to [pause] this will have to flow into a position of our, [pause] of our group, in order to come to an common interpretation, a common solution, because I think that will be better. But that needs clarification, discussion and maybe also [pause] um, also some programming. So, I think it would be better to put, [pause] the item of exploitation in one of our meetings.
Jack: um, I agree with you, so of course, that will be as soon as we agree that. So, in Verona [pause] will spend [pause] a whole morning or evening, [pause] so an action will be to have for them, some weeks before to have some drafts ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: about [pause] to be viviaously to the meeting. But of course, some discussions will arise in the next weeks, because the annual review [pause] we have to show some exploitation, so I will ask you, when we show you, what will [pause] what our, what is our presentation that we are going to show, and to check exploitation. And now we do not have to show them the final decision, we can show them different ideas and different approaches.
Kenneth: I, from previous experience, I would not be at all surprised if one of the outcomes of the review, is actually to produce an exploitation paper, a preliminary exploitation paper
Jack: ah ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: within a month of the review. Because this is, this has been done many times before, and as far as the commission is concerned and the reviewers are concerned, it usually is, that by this stage in the project, we should have an idea, what it is, that is in in fairly concrete terms what we are looking to exploit.
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: um, that I think, I would think, that would help us all, if we can begin draft that paper, it will help us all to understand what it is [pause] but I agree, that I think that there are different set of understandings of what the outcome of this project really is. We need to really be clear, and thereby better work towards 1A. So, I think this is a helpful process, you will find we will have to be doing something more specific as an outcome of the review. Um [pause] and then the general type of what we have done so far
Jack: uh-huh You asked us to send us the name of the deliverable, at the end of month 18, about the exploitation plan ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: to say every other, to say that is the result of the [pause] next month that is a very important issue. And as you say, [pause] start thinking about what is the [pause] in terms of the product
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: what is the better idea, of what is the end of the [pause] of course there are many results, and many deliverables in work package 1, and the project product.
Kenneth: the question we have been asked in the past is for each partner, to actually reflect on what are they going to get out of the project. In other words, [pause] although we appreciate that the industrial partners are going to be looking at a specific commercial outcome [pause] we are all putting a lot of resource into the project, and we all need to see something coming out of the project [pause] out of that, and then be able to explain something to the commission, um [pause] and that is something we have been asked to do, quite specifically, about mid term in the the project, so [pause] this is not [pause] this is not just a re-send. We should not be looking at you, as the commercial partners to be doing this
Jack: no, no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: but we have all got to contribute, even though it may not be in a commercial term, terms.
Jack: there are no more comments, we will have coffee [pause] and after the coffee, there is a discussion and conclusions, and I do not know if there are further discussions. I am going to stay here and if there is [pause] if you want to leave that is ok, and if you want to stay, we can talk till lunch. [Pause] in a more informal way.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok. In case you leave thank you very much [pause]. For some of you we will see you in Brussels
[New tape]
Jack: that is what we must do
Translator: clustering is important, can you give us some concrete examples
Jack: the cluster
Translator: it is important to hear
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: trying to discuss with some project
Jack: in fact, as Fabian told in Madrid, we tried to contact some of the projects, without any results,
Translator: and no information
Jack: and [pause] but Mr J has sent us the names of two projects that are interested.
Translator: IRIS?
Jack: sorry?
Translator: the
Jack: www aic, that is web accessibility arrears, it is on the first page
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: another technical question, why the blind use compalabras with via voice? Why do not use via voice alone? And also, according to navigation in the web page, you have to Via voice, it is possible for web advice, and possible on screen to make a macro? Why compabaras? And the other thing I found, is that Jaws and campalabras, using the voice?
Jack: compatibility was one of the main [pause]
Annie: deliverables
Jack: work package 2
Translator: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: compatibility of the plug in with the tool and the browser
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: one point of view I found [pause] don't they don't like to get permission to get this information in another softer [pause] in compalabras it is different object. [Pause] we do not want to create another software like Jaws
Jack: of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: we want to be different
Jack: It is important that they have the idea why it is novelty
Translator: why is there novelty?
Jack: not research project. Thank. Ok, we will have the coffee.
[Coffee break]

MESSAGE 1
From: Morris
To: Project team
Subject: Portal Version 0.2 / requirements
Date: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 1.58 PM

Dear Mary,

As agreed, I have incorporated all requirements including those in Deliverable 1.2 Chapter 1 and partner 3's. A first table is intended to serve as an evaluation guide for the developers of the Portal and authoring tool. Other tables show the feasibility status for each of the requirements, with comments for some of them. In my view, it is important that partners, and in particular users, determine a priority level for each of the requirements. This is important as we may not have sufficient time to implement them all.

Version 0.2 of the Portal is now ready on line and evaluations as planned during our Leuven meeting can start.

With kind regards
Adam

MESSAGE 2
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Amendment No 3 (electronic version)
Date: Tuesday, September 24, 2002 11:26 AM

Dear Colleagues,

as agreed in Leuven, we requested Mr. J an electronic version of the amendment No 3, in order to have some more time to check the amendment.

Please, find enclosed this electronic version.
THIS IS ONLY A PRELIMINARY VERSION.
In Mr. J words:
"HOWEVER THIS VERSION HAS NOT YET BEEN COMPLETELY APPROVED BY OUR OPERATIONAL SERVICE. A few changes might be made
(I hope not) before we send you the version for your signatures"

Please check the items that have changed in this amendment and the table of indicative breakdown of costs.

I expect the amendment to be received today or tomorow. As soon as we get it, I will distributed to you by courier.

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: e5_amend_P.doc)(See attached file: e5_con_brkd.doc)

MESSAGE 3
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Amendment No 3
Date: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 3:39 PM

Dear Colleagues,

We have received the draft amendment number 3 (prolongation of the project).
We have sent it urgently to you by courier. I hope you receive it tomorrow.

As I already told you, it is very important to be fast in this process.

Please, SIGN AND STAMP two copies.

According to Mr. J, in order to have the amendment signed by the Commission before the end of September, as a first step you must send a Fax with the cover letter and the signed and stamped page directly to him:
Mr. F J (Project Officer)
European Commission
Fax number: +xx xxx xxxxx

Then send the two copies back to me immediately.

Don't forget to:
1. SIGN the two copies ONLY in the page reserved for your organization.
2. Include STAMP of your organization in the same page.
3. In case the person who sign is not the person mentioned, "the participant should include in its cover letter the name and function of the signatory and confirm that he/she is empowered to sign for the participant."
4. Include in the cover letter the FOLLOWING STATEMENT: "We certify that we have not made any changes or alterations to the contract nor to it annexes; nor have we qualified our signature in any way"

Thank you.
Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 4
From: Annie
To: Project team
Subject: WP3 - Task schedule
Date: Friday, September 27, 2002 6:09 PM

Dear partners,
find attached the preliminary version of the task schedule proposed to the technical partners involved in WP3 (Partners 1,2,4 and 9). This work plan runs from October 2002 till February 03, deadline fixed for the next prototype of the Tool. I will wait for your comments during the following week and release a new version if necessary. If you agree with this overview I will produce more documentation specific for each task.

Kind regards,
Annie

MESSAGE 5
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Amendment No 3
Date: Monday, September 30, 2002 9:01 AM

Dear Colleagues,

I would appreciate if you can send me an email with the situation of the signature of the contract in your organization.
Please, remember to sign and stamp your pages and prepare the cover letter. Then SEND IT BY FAX DIRECTLY TO MR. J (see fax number below), and the original to me by courier.

So far I now that:
- Partners 7 and 5 have faxed the copies to Mr. J. Thank you.
- Partner 3: I have received the originals. I will fax it to Mr. J.
- Partner 4: you don't need to do nothing. We have your mandate and will fax it to Mr. J.
- Partner 8: I hope you have receive the mandate. Please send me an email as soon as yoou fax the signed copy.
- Partner 2: in case you already have the signature, please fax it to Mr. J.
- Partners 9 and 6: I don't have news from you ?? Please, let me know if you have the amendment and the signatures.

Jack

MESSAGE 6
From: Morris
To: Project team
Subject: project PORTAL - LAST UPDATE
Date: Monday, September 30, 2002 9:54 AM

Dear all,

I just want to inform you that the portal now meet the AAA accessibility requirements (Tested with Bobby).

You will also notice that ConPalabras has been implemented (to test) on the first set of buttons of the navigation bar.

A voice navigation has also been implemented. The results are very interesting. It works perfectly. You can try it. As I have built the linguistic dictionnary on my own, I simply hope that the voice navigation will recognize other accents but not only my poor one. Once you have downloaded the voice Navigation plugin (the portal will ask ou to do that for you), a window listing all keywords you can use with oice navigation will appear. You will also be allowed to parameter the voice input level (You will need a microphone).

NB : For the voice synthesis to work, you will first have to download and install ConPalabras.

Best regards.
Adam

MESSAGE 7
From: Mary
To: Project team
Subject: Fw: Project: Final Versions of Deliverables D1.1 and D1.2
Date: Monday, September 30, 2002 2:30 PM

Dear All,

The final versions of Deliverables D1.1 and D.1.2 are on the server in WP1 directory under the names ProjectD1.1_final.zip and ProjectD1.2_final.zip.
Although they are named as final versions, Chapter 7 in D1.1 will be added shortly by Hazel and we are still waiting for an updated version of the Project Authoring Tool Specification, which comprises Chapter 4 of D1.2.

On the server you will also be able to find the latest version of the evaluation plan in WP5 directory (file name Project_EvaluationPlan_v3.doc), and also a copy of the paper presenting the evaluation studies of existing e-learning applications, which will be presented at the European e-Learning Conference in London in November. The paper is in WP1 directory, named ELearn_Accessibility.zip.

Most of you know that today is my last day on the project. It has been a real pleasure working with All of you, and I wish you all the very best and lots of success for the future.

If you have any questions and for work related to WP1 and WP5 please contact Hazel for the time being.

Very best wishes.
Mary

MESSAGE 8
From: Annie
To: Project team
Subject: WP3 task schedule 7/10-20/10
Date: Monday, October 07, 2002 6:28 PM

Dear partners,
congratulation to every one, we have succeed with our annual review and we can continue our work with the project.

According to the Work Plan for WP3 distributed a week ago this is the work that each partner must achieve from the 7th to the 20th of October 2002.

If you have any difficulties regarding your tasks or you run out of time please contact us ASAP.

By the 20/10/2002 the work of all the partners will be submitted to partner 2 and we will integrate it in the new prototype of the Tool.

Partner 2

Task 1.5 Integration of voice input commands into Visual Basic applications. Provide a technical solution to include voice input commands into a multimedia application and check that the response time is adequate.

Task 1.6 Define audio message profiles. Create a facility that according to the profile of the user (beginner, advanced, expert) gives a different audio message selected from a range of messages.

Task 15 Review of the work performed by the partner 9 (HTML 4.0 validation and parser) and partner 1 (style sheet edition, VB help administration)

Task 11.1 Create the web page layout of the project help

Partner 1

Task 3.2 XML treatment with Visual Basic: define a API to manipulate XML files with Visual Basic and to load elements (text fields, combo boxes, tree view) with the content of an XML file. Very important: create a tree view that is load automatically with the content of an xml file, in such a way that each node is represented by a branch in the tree.

Task 11.2 Create an accessible tool to administrate the web pages that present the Help of the project tool. Actually the tool is not fully accessible to screen readers and does not have an Exit or Close button to close the window
Partner 9

Task 3.1 HTML parser to Java. Finish the parser that was introduced in Leuven
Task 5.1 HTML 4.0 validator Finish the validator that was introduced in Leuven
Task 3.4 Propose an XML document that represent the HTML page already parsed so that we can communicate Java with VB

Partner 4

Task 10.1 Create an HTML tutorial. Generate a set of HTML pages that explain what is HTML, its components and attributes. Give general guidance on creation of accessible HTML pages and provide a set of useful links. The tutorial will also provide assessment to check the user knowledge. The layout of the tutorial should be accessible. The layout of the e-learning content should be used in the future to design the e-learning templates of the project tool.

Kind regards,
Annie

MESSAGE 9
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Annual Project and Cluster Review
Date: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 3:07 PM

Dear Colleagues,

I guess that you have been waiting news from the Annual Review that took place last week in Brussels. I have been ill for a couple of days, so I was not able to inform you.

I am very pleased to tell you that the Review was successfull and we got the "CONTINUE" from the Commission.
Now I am waiting for the official documents from the Reviewers in order to
send you a copy with more details.

I would like to thank you all for the effort in this first year of the project, and specially thank and congratulate Hazel, Annie, Lucy, Ronnie and James for their great job in the review.

The review itself went quite well. We didn't receive serious objections and we even got some public congratulations.

I am also pleased to announce you that partner 6 have solved their situation

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 10
From: Annie
To: Project team
Subject: RV: WP3 Task Description
Date: Friday, October 11, 2002 10:00 AM

Dear Michael,
in case you have problems with your e-mail server I re-send you my last week's e-mail. Please answer ASAP

Regards
Annie
-----Mensaje original-----
De: Annie
Enviado el: martes, 08 de octubre de 2002 10:43
Para: 'partner 9; Eddie; Morris
Cc: 'Conwayne; Christopher; Jack
Asunto: WP3 Task Description

Dear Morris,
I have sent an e-mail to the project with the tasks that each partner involved in WP3 should achieve during the next two weeks. The overall schedule has a five month period timeframe (until February 2003) and the outcome of this period should be the prototype 2.0 of the project Tool.

In these two weeks the partner 4 must finish Task 10.1 "Create an HTML tutorial"
The tutorial must cover the following issues:
Basic HTML information

HTML introduction
HTML elements

HTML basic tags
HTML basic tags
HTML formatting
HTML entities
HTML links
HTML frames
HTML tables
HTML lists
HTML forms
HTML images
HTML background

Advanced HTML information

HTML layout
HTML fonts
HTML 4.0 why
HTML styles
HTML head
HTML meta
HTML URLs
HTML Scripts
HTML Webserver

Examples/Quiz

HTML Examples
HTML Quiz Test

References

HTML tag list
HTML attributes
HTML events
HTML ASCII
HTML entities
HTML colors
HTML colorvalues
HTML colornames
HTML HTTP

The content of the tutorial should help authors create accessible web pages

The tutorial should be a set of web pages ACCESSIBLE to screen readers, magnifiers and must accomplish the WAI WCGA accessibility guidelines Use style sheets. A navigation bar should be consistently located on the left f all the web pages of the tutorial. To the right place information or customised services ("contents"). t the top of each "contents" page two short lines of links are provided:

The first line provides two links: HTML Tutorial Home Page and Tutorial map. Then clicking on the "Homepage", the frame set is reloaded in a textual browser in order to allow blind surfers to access the navigation bar.

The second line of links tells the user where he is on the tutorial. It also allows him to review one or more pages that he has seen before.

For more information on the requirements needed to create accessible content check Deliverable 1.2

The Quiz test will asses the user. Once completed, it will give the user a eport with the number of successes and failures. According to the failures the user will be advised to revise the concerning issues.

The layout of the Quiz test should be also fully accessible to screen reader and magnifier users and will be user to collect requirements for Task 9.1 "Design of accessible e-learning templates"

If the final version of the tutorial is too large you can put it at the ftp site and we can downloaded there.

Regards,
Annie

MESSAGE 11
From: Annie
To: Project team
Subject: Guide for Software Accessibility
Date: Monday, November 11, 2002 3:14 PM

Dear partners,
find attached the guidelines for software accessibility that the technical partners will use. It is based on the IBM Software Accessibility Checklist I have removed the checkpoints that do not address to the project.

More references on software accessibility guidelines are enclosed in the document.

I hope you find this document useful. Do let me know if you have comments or additions or if you are already using a different check list.

Regards,
Annie

MESSAGE 12
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Annual Project Review of XXXXXX - October 2002
Date: Thursday, November 14, 2002 10:39 AM

Please find enclosed the official result ofthe annual project review and the reports of the experts concerning the project

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: Result Letter.doc)
(See attached file: RB+MFLCluster Review Panel Report ISIL part A public.pdf)
(See attached file: R2_project.pdf)
(See attached file: RC3_project.doc)

MESSAGE 13
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Third Amendment
Date: Wednesday, November 20, 2002 8:08 AM

Dear Colleagues,

we have finally received the AMendment number 3 (Continuation of the project) signed by the Commission. I am happy to tell you that all the problems were solved and all the partners will continue in the project.

I am sending a copy to all of you for your records.

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 14
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Cost Statements
Date: Wednesday, November 20, 2002 8:13 AM

Dear Colleagues,

this is to remind you that we need your Cost Statements as soon as possible (I have received only the cost statement from few partners).

In case you don't find the format, I am attaching it to this message. (you have to fill in only pages 1 and 3)

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: b_rtdres_e1_e3_en-v2.xls)

MESSAGE 15
From: Annie
To: Project team
Subject: Work Package 3 - Re-schedule
Date: Wednesday, November 13, 2002 2:54 PM

Dear partners,
among partners 2 and 1 we have agreed a reschedule of WP3. The news are that partner 2 will assume some of the tasks that were initially assigned to partner 1, and in return, partner 1 will become responsible of the e-Learning part of the project tool.

Partners 2 and 9 will focus on html edition whilst partners 1 and 4 will put their effort on the e-learning side of the tool.

This division of work benefits both WP3 and WP4, because the leader-partner of WP4 will also be responsible of the e-learning features included in the project Tool. The planification, analysis, design and implementation of the eLearning features will be produced by partner 1 in collaboration with partner 4.

I enclose the new version of the planification. In this version changes are highlighted.

Kind regards to all,
Annie

MESSAGE 16
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Project meeting in Verona
Date: Tuesday, December 10, 2002 12:11 PM
Dear Colleagues,

this is to remind you that the next plenary meeting of the project was agreed in Leuven to be in Verona.
The dates that were decided were 16 and 17th January 2003 (thursday and friday).

Michael will send you more information (Hotels, venue, etc) in following emails.

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 17
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Project Clustering Concertation Meeting
Date: Wednesday, December 11, 2002 4:22 PM

Dear Colleagues,

I have been invited to attend a Concertation Meeting on Projects Clustering next week in Brussels.

One of the points that will be also discussed in the meeting is the implication of the new instruments to be used in FP6, on the future constituency for the e-Inclusion topic.

I will be pleased to transmit to the Commission any ideas or message you ay have related to this topic or related to clustering.

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 18
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Meeting in Verona
Date: Monday, December 16, 2002 2:04 PM

Dear colleagues,

please find enclosed to this message a letter from Michael with relevant information regarding Hotels in Verona.

Find also enclosed a preliminary version of the Agenda for the meeting in Verona. Please, send your comments and corrections to this agenda.

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: mettinVRprenot.doc)(See attached file: Agenda Verona 2003.doc)

MESSAGE 19
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Meeting in Verona
Date: Tuesday, January 07, 2003 10:59 AM

Dear Collaegues,

first of all, let me wish you a Happy New Year!!

Attached to this message you will find a letter from Michael with more information about the meeting in Verona (Address of the Venue, Hotels, etc)

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: Information for projectmeeting in Verona.doc)

MESSAGE 20
From: Fabian
To: Project team
Subject: Project - Fourth Quarterly Report preliminary version
Date: Wednesday, January 08, 2003 11:27 AM

Dear partners,

First of all, HAPPY NEW YEAR!!

Attached in this mail you will find the preliminary version of the fourth Quarterly Report.

Please, send your comments and contributions and fill the effort tables. With your contributions, we will also create the First Year Report, that must be sent to the Commission. The preliminary version of this document will be circulated to all the partners and, of course, comments and contributions are expected.

Best regards,
Fabian
(See attached file: Fourth Quarterly Report v0.0.doc)=

MESSAGE 21
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Project. Advance Payment
Date: Friday, January 10, 2003 12:37 PM

Dear Colleagues,

we have received the advance payment form the Commission for the next 15 months.

Please, let me know if you have changed your account number from last year.

The amounts that will be paid to you according to the contract are:

partner 2: 103151 Euros
partner 3: 23447
partner 4: 61054
partner 5: 36260
partner 6: 49001
partner 8: 77432
partner 9: 67193

Best regards,
Jack

MESSAGE 22
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Project. Verona Meeting. Agenda
Date: Friday, January 10, 2003 1:05 PM

Dear Colleagues,

please find attached an improved version, including your suggestions, of the Agenda for the meeting in Verona.

Best regards,
Jack
(See attached file: Agenda Verona 2003 v2.doc)

MESSAGE 23
From: Michael
To: Project team
Subject: HTML tutoria
Date: Saturday, January 11, 2003 4:10 PM

Dear Partners

I like inform you that the first draft of the HTML tutorial is on line now in the project Portal: www.xxxxxxxxx.org/project

You can find the link of HTML Couse. I hope to receive from you suggestion and comments.

Best Regards
Michael

MESSAGE 24
From: Jack
To: Project team
Subject: Cost Statements
Date: Tuesday, December 10, 2002 12:19 PM

Dear Colleagues,

this is to remind you that we need your Cost Statements as soon as posible.

Some clarifications:

1.- This is the cost statement for the first 12 months of the project 1-Oct-2001 to 30-sept-2002
2.- You should send me two original signed copies of the cost statements
3.- In the "Durable Equipment" section, please take into account the calculation of the depretiation of the equipments.

Best regards,
Jack

Textual chunk, News
Mary sent message *7* on 30/9/02 to inform the team that today was the last day that she would be working on the project. She wished everyone good luck in this message and said to contact Hazel regarding the work for work packages 1 and 5. Jack sent message *9* on 9/1/0/2 to inform the team that partner 6 had solved their situation. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Wishes
Jack sent message *19* on 7//03 to wish the team a happy New Year. Mary sent message *20* on 8/1/03, also wishes the team a happy New Year.

Textual chunk, Amendment number 3
Jack sent message *2* on 24/9/02, informing the team that as discussed during Leuven an electronic copy has been requested. A preliminary version was attached to this message. Everyone was asked to check the information which had been changed. The team was also informed that he expects to receive the amendment today or the next day and would distribute it to team members by courier as soon as it is received. Jack sent message *3* on 25/9/02 to inform the team that the draft amendment had been received, and the courier has sent it to the partners. Instructions on how to act on it were also included in the message. Jack sent message *5* on 30/9/02 requesting team members to send him an e-mail informing him of their situation in acting on the document they received by courier. This message again contained the instructions on what needs to be actioned. A summary of what had already been actioned and what is still required was included. Jack sent message *13* on 20/11/02 informing the team that he had received the contributions from the partners and all problems have been solved. He also informed the team that all partners would continue in the project A copy of the document was also supposed to be attached for the team members own records. Four messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Invitation
Jack sent message *17* on 11/12/02 informing the team that he has been invited to attend a Concertation meeting on project clustering in Brussels the following week. In this message he mentioned that he would transmit ideas and messages on clustering. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Cost statements
Jack sent message *14* on 20/11/02 which was a reminder to the team that he needed the cost statements from partners. In this message he informed the team that he had only received this information back from only a few partners. A document with the format the information was required in was also attached in case team members could not find this information. The pages, which were required to be filled in, were also brought to attention. Jack sent message *24* on 10/1/02, another reminder for this information be sent to him. This message also included a set of instructions which should be followed. Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Fourth quarterly report
Fabian sent message *20* on 8/1/03 attaching a preliminary version of this report. In this message he requested team members for comments and contributions, by filling in the tables in the report. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, First year report
Fabian sent message 20 on 8/1/03 informing the team that he would create this report.

Textual chunk, Update on annual review
Annie sent message *8* on 7/10/02 to congratulate the team on the success for the annual review. Jack sent message *9* on 9/10/02 informing the team that he was sick so could not inform the team of the outcomes of the annual review. In this message he informed everyone that they could continue with the project, but is still waiting for official documents. There were no serious objections which were received. Everyone was thanked for their work, particularly, Hazel, Annie, Lucy, Ronnie and James. Jack sent message *12* on 14/11/02 attaching the official report from the review and the report of the experts. Three messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Next meeting
Jack sent message *16* on 10/12/02 reminding the team that the next face-to-face meeting is going to be held in Verona on the 16th and 17th January. Those dates had been agreed on during the Leuven meeting. In this message Jack informed everyone that Morris would send everyone more information regarding hotels and the venue. Jack sent message *18* on 16/12/02 which contained information sent to him by Morris on hotels. Jack sent message *19* on 7/1/03 with further information concerning the meeting venue and hotels. Three messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Agenda for the next meeting
Jack sent message *18* on 16/12/02 attaching a preliminary agenda for the meeting. In this message comments, corrections and ideas were requested. Jack sent message *22*on 10/1/03 attaching another version of the agenda based on comments that he had received Two messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, FTP update
Mary sent message 7 on 30/9/02 to inform the team that the first version of deliverables D1.1 and D1.2, the latest version of the evaluation plan and the paper that they were presenting at a conference were all included on the FTP site. Instructions on how to access the site were included and so was a summary of the changes made for the final versions of deliverables D1.1 and D1.2. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Guidelines for software accessibility
Annie sent message *11* on 11/11/02 which had attached to it guidelines that the technical partners are going to use Those guidelines are based on IBM's accessibility checklist, and ones not related to the project have been removed from the list. Annie had requested comments and additions, also to be informed if anyone else is using other checklists. She hopes that the team find this document useful. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Advance payment
Jack sent message *21* on 10/1/03 to inform the team that that advance payment for the next 15 months had been received. Team members were asked to inform him if their bank account numbers had changed since last year. The amounts which would be paid according to the contracts were summarized in this message. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Portal and requirements
Adam sent message *1* on 18/9/02, which was addressed to Mary but sent to the mailing list. The requirements were established incorporating them from D1.2 and from partner 3. The feasability of each requirement was also shown. In this message a request was made for partners, particularly the user partners to prioritise each requirement due to development constraints, not all of them will be implemented. Version 0.2 of the portal was online as well, and the evaluations which were planned during the meeting can start. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Update on the project portal
Adam sent message *6* on 30/9/02 to inform the team that the portal meets the AAA accessibility requirements, and was tested using Bobby. In this message Adam reported that their were interesting results and that team members could test it themselves. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, Work package 3 description
Annie sent message *10* on 11/11/02 which was addressed to Michael but was sent to the mailing list. In this message Annie said that she was re-sending it again in case he had problems receiving it before. One message was sent associating this goal.

Textual chunk, Work package 3 task schedule
Annie sent message *4* on 27/9/02 which had attached to it a preliminary version for the technical work of work package 3. This task lasts from Oct 02-Feb 03. Annie will wait one week for comments and another version of this document will be produced if necessary. Once there is agreement from everyone she will produce a more detailed document specific for each task. Annie sent message *8* on 7/10/02 informing the team that the plan for work package 3 must now be realized. They should be contracted if any difficulties are encountered or if they run out of time. In this message it also said that a prototype of the tool would be produced. Annie sent message *15* on 13/11/02 informing the team of the re-schedule with partners 1 and 2. The responsible partners for each task were also summarized. Three messages were sent that was associated with this goal.

Textual chunk, HTML tutorial
Michael sent message *23* on 11/1/03, informing the team that the first draft of the tutorial is online. In this message the URL was included. Morris hopes to receive suggestions and comments from partners on it. One message was sent associated with this goal.

Guidelines to promote mutual understanding before a face-to-face meeting using e-mail

Guideline number: B1

Guideline type: Circulating a draft agenda

Description:

- Before any meeting takes place, an agenda should be proposed and made available to the team.
- An agenda can help team members make preparations.
- If the team has a leader or manger, they can be responsible for this.
  If not, it can be any of the team members.
- Everyone in the team should be given an opportunity to update the proposed agenda, and comments should be sought from the team.

Rationale:

One of the main benefits of having an agenda proposed in advance is that all team members are aware of what will be discussed during the meeting. It also allows those that are making presentation to make preparations as well. An agenda also allow team members to have an expectation of what to expect during the meeting by referring to the points, which are included in the agenda.

Sources:

Source: Message *40* sent by Jack on Friday, March 01, 2002 3:29 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Meeting in Paris.*. Appendix H

Source: Message *43* sent by Jack on Thursday, March 07, 2002 7:09 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Meeting in Paris.* Appendix H

Source: Message *48* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:39 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Agenda for Meeting.* Appendix J

Source: Message *53* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, June 04, 2002 2:07 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Agenda for Meeting.* Appendix J

Source: Message *44* sent by Jack on Friday, August 23, 2002 11:42 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk Draft Agenda for the Meeting. Appendix J

Source: Message *46* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, August 29, 2002 10:23 AM. (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Draft Agenda for the Meeting.* Appendix J

Source: Message *18* sent by *Jack* on Monday, December 16, 2002 2:04 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *Agenda for the next Meeting.* Appendix N

Source: Message *22* sent by *Jack* on day, January 10, 2003 1:05 PM (After 4th meeting) From textual chunk *Agenda for the next Meeting.* Appendix N

Supporting materials:

The December meeting was the first meeting, which had been attended. Therefore, e-mail messages were only copied to me after attending this meeting. Observing the messages sent after this meeting on the proposed guideline type we could see the following:

- Draft agenda was produced for the March meeting (second consortium meeting). Jack, the project administrator circulated this draft on Friday, March 01, 2002 3:29 PM. Comments and suggestions were asked for. On Thursday, March 07, 2002 7:09 PM another agenda was sent.
- It is not known if any changes were proposed by any of the partners
- Jack also circulated a draft agenda on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:39 PM for the third consortium meeting. Again comments and suggestions were requested. On Tuesday, June 04, 2002 2:07 PM, the final agenda was sent (this is the same as that already circulated).
- Jack on Thursday, August 29, 2002 10:23 AM circulated a draft agenda for the fourth consortium meeting.
- Jack on Monday, December 16, 2002 2:04 PM, circulated a draft agenda before the fifth consortium meeting. On Friday, January 10, 2003 1:05 PM another improved agenda was circulated including comments which were received. The comments had not been highlighted, allowing team members to clearly see where the changes were being made.

There was no evidence of Cramton's indicators.

Observing what this team was currently doing derived the proposed guideline.

Guideline number: B2

Guideline type: **Back up plans for not being able to participate during the meeting**

Description:

- If you know in advance that you cannot participate during a meeting, backup plans should be made.
- For presentations you are encouraged to circulate slides, which you would have used during your presentation, so that the team can still, receive some information.
- For non-attendance at a meeting you should include what you would like discussed during the meeting in your absence.

Rationale:

There are a number of reasons why a partner may not be able to attend a meeting, for example financial, clashes with proposed dates, unexpected events. For this reason, if you know in advance that you will not be able to attend it, backup plans need to be made. Also, if there are any constraints that you know in advance which may affect your participation during the meeting, this needs to be informed before hand, in order to see if any changes can be made.

Sources:

Source: Message *44* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, May 24, 2002 7:08 PM (After 2nd meeting) Fom textual chunk *Review*. Appendix J

Source: Message *54* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, June 05, 2002 10:25 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Review*.

Source: Message *54* sent by *Jackk* on Tuesday, September 10, 2002 11:47 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Draft agenda for the Meeting*

Source: Message *55* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, September 10, 2002 5:21 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *Leuven Meeting*.

Supporting materials:

Sources from the relevant e-mail messages sent to the team show that Hazel made back up plans for her non attendance to the meeting - Message 54 sent by Hazel on Wednesday, June 05, 2002 10:25 AM (After 2nd meeting). She was lucky that another member of her partner organization was able to attend the meeting. Including what you would like discussed during your absence can be beneficial when you have someone from your organization there, and you inform them what they should be considering.

Message 54 sent by Jack on Tuesday, September 10, 2002 11:47 AM (After 3rd meeting) is an example of proposing changes, which had been informed in advance to maximize team member participation during the meeting.

Message 55 sent by Jack on Tuesday, September 10, 2002 5:21 PM (After 3rd meeting) informing the team that the German partners could not make it to the meeting, did not show any back up plans, or to highlight briefly what should be discussed during the meeting in their absence or what they could contribute to the meeting.

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: welcome (4th meeting) Appendix M

Jack: As I think you read yesterday, our German partners, did not make it to come here,
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so sadly we have no representation of the Germans [pause] and um, so, I hope you all, receive

Source: 18/12/01 transcript, Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Expected presnetation from Partner 4). 1st meeting) Appendix G

Jack: The Italian partners have already left. He said he will email his presentation about his work.

In this situation it would have been nice to receive handouts of the slides he would have used. Alternatively he could have asked to make a change to the proposed agenda.

Guideline number: B3

Guideline type: **Sending documentation(s) before a meeting, to be referred to during the meeting**

Description:

- Documentation(s), which you will refer to during the meeting, should be sent in advance.
- Team members should be given enough time to read this information before attending the meeting.
- For the meeting, you should take extra copies in case team members fail to bring their copies with them.

Rationale:

If you do not send the documentation in advance, team members may not be able to read what you are referring to. Also if you would have liked to have got some discussion etc. This would not be possible, as the documents would not have been consulted.

Sources:

Source: Message *44* sent by *Mary* on Monday, March 11, 2002 9:46 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *E-learning*. Appendix H

Source: Message *45* sent by *Mary* on Monday, March 11, 2002 9:54 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *E-learning*. Appendix H

Supporting materials:

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 2) (Second meeting) Appendix I

Charles: I will just show text jobs, which
Hazel: right, right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: they are the kind of things I had in mind. Um and would like some comment on that. I out that on the mailing list
Hazel: that's this
Charles: it's that one ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: which one was that?
Charles: its title is what voice can do for visually impaired
[Translator translating for Michael]
Paul: oh yeah, but that was only circulated yesterday or the day before ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: oh right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel laughs]
Charles: I sent a first version at the beginning of February to the technical partners, I expected comments but I did not get anything
Ronnie: to get the xml portal to [pause] I did not get the opportunity to read it because, because I was not in the office but [pause] I do not think it is possible to read it now
[Kenneth whispering]
Ronnie: Maybe you should give to all of us a time to read the written research
Mary: maybe tomorrow?
[Hazel laughs]
Charles: It will be nice to have some comments now, sometime sooner
[Hazel laughs]
Ronnie: well I mean just now, let's break now
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Individual chatter - Break for lunch. People started getting ready to leave the room]
Hazel: Charles maybe you can make a presentation this afternoon after lunch about your key proposals. I think we really need to discuss this at this meeting
Charles: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: perhaps some plans
Charles: This afternoon?
Hazel: yes, or tomorrow morning? [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report) (Second meeting) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Mary: It's ok. [Pause] Well what I am going to present now is a very basic overview of the report which was distributed at the beginning of this week, and which is basically a draft review of the existing authoring tools. I am not sure if any of you have had the time to look at it, but you should have copies of this at least [laughs]. As I mentioned in my e-mail, this is just a draft, so when you get the chance to read it and if you have any comments. In this presentation I am only going to give you the high level features of some of the web and e-learning authoring tools, and some of the main concerns with regards to their accessibility. I also included a section about how e-learning ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jack whispers something to Fabian and hands him a disk]
Mary: and also the course is being developed, and the people who were involved. Then I will [pause] go through some of the tools which are currently used for developing e-learning and then will cover some of the main features of the most widely used web and e-learning tools. I will then identify some of the accessibility issues of these authoring tools. And, at the end I will present a very high level summary of the recommendations which we can present, which can be used for developing e-learning.
[Desmond nods while Mary is reading out the structure of the presentation] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
...

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (discussion of review questions from review report) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Jack: yes that is great. We have a coffee break, and then we can do it shorter, but, yes, can [pause] do you have actually the review here? Everyone has it? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I do not have it ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: can you bring it?
Jack: we can try to make some copies. This one is full of comments, so I will produce 2,3,4 copies
Charles: I only have an electronic version
Lucy: perhaps one more ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: 6 ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: 6 ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: so coffee should be waiting for us.
Desmond: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Break for coffee]

Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk – presentation on work package 1 - results from the evaluation study. (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Mary: I do not know if any of you, have had the chance to look at the report, but the user requirements, are included at the end of the report.

Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk – Presentation on work package 1, Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1 (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Mary: What I would like us to do now, is to go through, the plan for the deliverables, the two deliverables, which Hazel distributed a couple of days ago. Did everyone get Hazel's email?
[Yes said in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I have got it here
[Yes said again] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I have copies here

Mary: oh ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so I can distribute some, I have 10 copies so, do you have copies?
[Gets up and gives copies to some team members]

Supporting materials:

A document had been circulated to the team before the meeting, but some members or the team made comments that it had only been circulated a day or two before the meeting and they had not had time to read it before attending the meeting. This shows that it is important to receive any documentation in a timely manner.

There was another example of this in the 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report). Mary mentioned the document that she was referring to, which had been sent a few days earlier by e-mail. She acknowledged that everyone may not have had the chance to have read it. The contents of that document were summarised. Again it is important to circulate important documents in a timely manner.

Another example is from 7/6/02 and the Discourse chunk – presentation on work package 1 - results from the evaluation study (3rd meeting). Mary again mentioned that she did not know if everyone had the chance to look at the document before the meeting. She was going to be referring to it during her presentation, and Jack had brought along extra copies in case anyone had forgotten their one.

Guidelines to promote mutual understanding after a face-to-face meeting using e-mail

Guideline number: A1

Guideline type:
Circulating information to the entire team

Description:

- A method for circulating information to all team members at the same time should be established.
- One possible solution is using a group mailing list.
- The list must be regularly monitored, by adding new names and deleting old ones.
- To avoid ambiguity and the possibility of receiving duplicate messages, only one mailing address should be used.

Rationale:

When working in a collocated team it may be feasible to have information stored in one place. This does not have to be in an electronic media as team members are together. However, when teams become dispersed this now becomes unfeasible. Information should be stored using an electronic media.

Sources:

Source: Message *44* sent by *Mary* on Monday, March 11, 2002 9:46 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *E-learning*. Appendix I.

Source: Message *45* sent by *Mary* on Monday, March 11, 2002 9:54 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *E-learning*. Appendix I.

Supporting materials:
Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Project mailing list address), (1st meeting) Appendix G

Desmond: Paul is not in the mailing list please include him.
Jack: Mailing list is the next point, so I will ask
Jack: Ok the mailing list. This is at present the mailing list, another web page. The address is project@xxxx.xom. Okay if you send an email to this address it will automatically be sent to this entire people. This and the next step I will show you. Please check that the names you want to be part of the project are here. Is it partner 7 or 5?
Lucy: No, no, it is ok. G is partner 5. That is why you have partner 5 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yeah. I noticed that when you sent it [laughs]. Ok, partner 3 they have set their own mailing list, so now I think it is redundant and I am sending to the mailing list and to the address. You agree I will delete this and only send to the project mailing list. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: Yes. I think that is probably the easiest as we can all access it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Otherwise you will have twice the e-mails.
Charlotte: Yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Ok Paul is not here. Do you know his email address? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: Yes. you can write it down. It is very easy. It is ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Ah, I can do it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter]
Jack: is it this one?
Ben: on the desktop at the bottom, there is the dng set-up.
Jack: This one?
Ben: Yes, ok. Press it and then yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: This is not the epp, ok this is the second page. Please make sure all the names are on there
Hazel: We need to add one person. Sajal what is your email address? ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Sajal: ax141@soi.city.ac.uk ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel repeats this address for Jack]
Desmond: Ok Paul's mail. x-x-x-x at xxxxxx.de ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Very sophisticated
Jack: okay. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter]
Jack: So everyone agrees with this mailing list. It is not a problem, you can send me I need this other people or just like it is working here anymore, please delete.

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Meeting minutes) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: Also, it would be certainly nice for the rest of the partners, to be reminded of things like that in um [pause] through minutes. Maybe, it is, for some reason, I did not receive the London, the minutes of the London meeting.
Jack: it was sent and included on the ftp site ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: was it
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: was it on the ftp server?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Ok, sorry. My fault ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel gives a small laugh]
Jack: Maybe you did not receive it, because you were not on the mailing listPaul: Maybe, I will go and check, but thank you ***(Sub-state 3.1)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (FTP site) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Jack: folder of the ftp site. So, it is the first thing you find
[Some own discussions are taking place]
Jack: I would ask you to check that these [pauses] you also have, you also have the mailing list. It is also in the root
[Hazel still whispering to Kenneth]
Jack: SO, whenever, you need the address for someone it will be there. Please check it again. This, I think is complete, what you have been sending me the names and I have three more pages
[Hazel laughs]
Hazel: its ok, its ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I have [pause] I have included here Adam, he is new from the last meeting
[Some own discussions are taking place]
Jack: partner 3 is in the mailing list,

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (E-mail address for mailing list) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Jack: so I guess to include Paul Brass
Mary: yeah. [Pause] Can I ask a question? [Mary puts up her hand] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (E-mail address for mailing list) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Mary: Um, when you sent your e-mails Jack, a couple of days ago, and last week as well, about the meeting, you did not send them to project@xxxx.com
[Own discussion between Paul, Desmond and Kevin]
Mary: you sent it to a longer e-mail address, is there a difference in the people who are included
Jack: No, no, no
[Own discussion between Paul, Desmond and Kevin – they laugh]
Jack: You just say that
Mary: the server name, yes the server name
Jack: I do not know, I saw an e-mail sent, a reply from you or somebody, no [pause] or someone who is working with you ***(Sub-state 3.1)***

Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and I noticed that. And I think the server
Hazel: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: put the different address
Mary: because
Jack: there is only one
Mary: I had a problem replying to that e-mail
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and it would not recognise the spelling of the server
Jack: and I
Mary: and I just used the old one
Jack: I
Mary: and I was interested to find out, ok, ok, ok,
[Annie and Christopher are looking at a document]
Jack: So, this is the next [pause] I included KC
Hazel: yes, good, thank you ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear some whispering]
Jack: And from partners 1 and 2, [pause] two new guys, Conwayne, who is working on the technical side and [pause] and then you have mail from Sajal
Hazel: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: on the list
Lucy: And Adam is working in partner 7 not under 5
Jack: It was [pause] included in the list, ok, I am sorry. From our side we have three new people working on it. Johnathan has left
[Someone laughs]
Jack: That is enough, it will be included for until he said until we stop sending him e-mails, so [pause] this arose yesterday, remember the
[Some own discussions taking place]

Supporting materials:

In this team, I observed that a group mailing list was used to send messages to the entire team at the same time. Informing of names to be added and deleted was only witnessed during the face-to-face meetings. No e-mail messages contained this type of information.

Also, we can see that Mary sent two messages on the same day, using two different addresses. Therefore to avoid duplicate messages being received, only one e-mail address should be used. Sending duplicate messages can be a problem when large attachments are included in the message which is being sent.

Guideline number: A2

Guideline type: **Monitoring reporting periods to the team**

Description:

- Once a regular reporting period for receiving updates has been established, to be effective it must be monitored.
- If there is no manager or leader in the team, each team member should take responsibility to speak out.
- When the team works together for more than one meeting, providing an update is important, especially when attending face-to-face meetings may be limited.

Rationale.

Reporting to the team is important and to be effective, all team members should be made aware from the start of their work together, what the expectations of the team are in terms of regular reporting. The team manager or leader must take action when team members do not provide an update by the date they were expected to contribute. A reminder may be useful

Sources:

There was no evidence of any messages being sent to the team, or by the team members to inform them that they have noticed that the regular reporting periods which were discussed during the face-to-face meetings were not being actioned. This is evidence of **State 7** (No growth in MU when actions discussed face-to-face are not followed up by e-mail. (In this state the common ground and mutual beliefs have not got larger they have stayed the same)).

Supporting materials:

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Reporting) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Jonathan: I think every 15 days everyone should provide a report of there work.
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Lucy is sitting with her hands on her mouth]
Hazel: No, not every 15 days ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Jonathan: 3 weeks maybe
Hazel: once a month ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Kenneth nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jonathan: once a month ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I agree with Jonathan, the 15 days interchange of documentation with the partners. I believe that all the packages last at least 2 or 3 months and for example our work package 2 which started 20 days ago we have a 20 day delay because we are expecting the input from the partners that people are making and we have not received anything yet. So, we are doing our best here working with one person with Jaws and the wider documentation, but we are not experts on accessibility and we need your information and documents. We do not have anything now. We do not know what people are working on, or anything. We believe that we need to put more more strength into interchanging documentation. I think that every 15 days it is better than just once a month. ***(Sub-state 2.1)*** ***(Sub-state 4.1)*** ***(Sub-state 5.1)***

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Developing a plan of future work) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Hazel: So, I will produce by the end of the week, a detailed timeline with lots of little deadlines. That is the way I would rather do it, rather than try and report every 15 days. I have a deadline every week of something happening
[Laughter – Hazel, Charlotte and Lucy]
Hazel: so, I will be saying right have you done this action comment on this, right. So it will be more driven by the little tasks rather than the period of time. So I will produce a timeline, if I do not put it on the ftp site before Christmas, I will put it on the ftp site before the New Year.
[Annie asks Jonathan something, pointing at the whiteboard Hazel was writing on]
Hazel: and I will send an e-mail saying everyone must look this, because there will be deadlines for everybody. But do you feel with those five parallel actions w are beginning to get a [pause]
Ronnie: I think it's in the right direction. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes, I also am beginning to think, although I am not the going to be very involved in this one, I will be watching it, but I think it is very important because this is where we need to develop the specific vision of what the project is going to offer to people. Well they are all very important in different ways, and if you solve of those problems that is fine, but it would give you a new set. Let's take some problems that visually impaired people are going to immediately relate too. I think the forms one is a good one, the blind people I know if I said to them, look here is a really good way that is going to make forms easier for you to use on the web, they are going to say great, yes I will have that. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Although there was no eventual agreement for what the reporting period should be, in the e-mail messages that were being sent to the team, none included any regular monitoring. This highlights that for monitoring periods to be effective, it has to be observed.

Guideline number: A3

Guideline type: **Keeping team members up to date with whom they are working with**

Description:

- When there are any changes in circumstances, the entire team should be kept informed.
- For example you are new to the team or you will be leaving the team.

Rationale:

Changes such as joining or leaving the team should be communicated to everyone. When you are new it can be useful to introduce yourself, by giving a brief summary of your background. When you inform the team that you are leaving, it would be useful to let them know whom to contact if they need any assistance, which may previously have come from you.

Sources:

Source: Message 7 sent by *Mary* on Monday, September 30, 2002 2:30 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk News. Appendix N

Supporting material:

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Review of the meeting agendal) (2nd meeting)

Jack: … And just one more thing, maybe you can see that Jonathan is missing here. He is technical co-ordinator. I would say he is I should say he was technical co-ordinator. He has left us, our company, he went to Italy, and now he is working on Telecom Italia, Lab, so in research and development. The reason is a very common one, an illness called love
[Hazel laughs]
[Others laugh as well]
[Could hear the whispering while Jack was talking]
Jack: His girlfriend is in Italy
[Elsie says something to Michael. Was to do with Jonathan not being here]
Jack: So he will still be in contact with us, and will be happy to receive any information, but he is working now since today or tomorrow for Telecom Italia. So, in the meantime, maybe from today Fabian will help us with the technical support
[Can still hear whispering while Jack is talking. Cannot hear exactly what is being said]
Jack: We will let you know any news about this.

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: review of work package 1 (4th meeting) Appendix M

Hazel: .. So, we have actually done an enormous amount of work in work package 1, in the last year. So, I would like to thank everyone for their contributions. I would also particularly, like to thank Mary, for her hard work, and I am very sad that Mary is leaving the the project project at the end of the first year, so thank you very much Mary for your efforts.
Jack thank you
…
Jack: and I am sorry also that Mary
Mary: it's ok
Jack: leaving us, because she has contributed a great job. [Pause] are you going to be around?
[Hazel laughs]
Mary: till the end of this month, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and then you are leaving partner 8 as well?
Mary: yes, I am leaving Partner 8 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, it is not only the project?
Mary: Hazel will give you the name of the new contact [pause]
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ok, so one question from what you have to [pause] said, the deliverable is going to be finished on time ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

There was no mention in any of the messages, which were received after the first meeting that Jonathan had left the project team. This information was only shared when partners were together during a face-to-face meeting However, when Mary was leaving the team, the team was informed face-to-face and by an e-mail message.

Guideline number: A4

Guideline type: Project glossary

Description:

- Maintain a project glossary to ensure that everyone has the same understanding of terms, which are important during your interactions.
- To be effective the glossary must be kept updated.

Rationale.

Different terms can have different meanings to people; therefore it is important that everyone has the same understanding of the terms which are being used. A project glossary can help to achieve this. To be effective it should be introduced at the start of the project and new terms should be added.

Sources:

Source: Message *6* sent by *Charles* on Monday, March 25, 2002 12:14 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk Project Glossary. Appendix J

Source: Message *16* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:08 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Project Glossary.* Appendix L

Supporting materials:

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Mary: the main recommendations were to have accessible templates,
[Translator for Michael asks Hazel what is a template]
Mary: but, we have to make sure that the templates are accessible, and that the developments and the templates are accessible as well. And also, to include
[Hazel explains to the translator by whispering to him, what is a template]
Mary: all the actions that are included. And in terms of the accessibility of the course component, which are produced using authoring tools. We recommend that
[Can still hear Hazel whispering to Michael's translator what a template is]
Mary: the tools, which encourage the creation of text, if we want to includes images in other media in the course, which an authoring tool can do
[Translation to Michael what a template is]
[Hazel draws a diagram to show what a template is]
Mary: Also it can incorporate course content and instructions
[Can hear other people whispering as well]
Mary: in the environment. Also, the tool can incorporate guidelines, guidance on producing effective e-learning components that are accessible to all user. And they can also enable the synchronisation of all the accessibility. And, yeah
Charles: What do you mean by the accessible templates?
Mary: Right, these are
[Can hear Hazel talking about templates in the background as well]
Mary: I do not know if it will be helpful, but I mentioned to some of the other people here, that I have a trial version of one of the e-learning [pause] authoring tools, which has got a template as well. But, basically the templates are like forms for creating the tables
[Hazel nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: which are like multichoice questions, or form filled questions, or different types of questions, and they are very much like visual, visual forms. And, you need to select the components from a combo box or different kinds of box, and as they are very much like on dragging or dropping or clicking on things with the mouse, that makes them inaccessible.
[Can hear whispering in the background]

Source: 18/12/01 transcript, (Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 2 on work package 2). (1st meeting)

Annie: but since we are going to be the one to produce that prototype and we started to work 20 days ago, maybe, what I am saying is that the 6 month period for the requirements and something's like that, maybe should be before, before the prototype is made. You know, that first maybe the project should be planned, ok first you make a prototype, then we show it to the users, we see how the user react
Jack: yes that is what we are saying. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Desmond nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes. But the project is not planned that way. Because that should start in March. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jack says uh-huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: so its you know, it is a different organization
Jack: what I
Lucy: The software to read the page of the link. We had the same problems, but we decided with two others from the university, which is working with us. They said they would give us a description of a imaginary tool. What it does and how it is. We went to the users and we asked them 'is it ok for you?' and they said no, we want it to be smaller, we want the software to work with any system with the barcodes, etc, etc. So we were able to give user requirements, which is not possible now in this project.
Lucy: So when we are talking about the prototype, it is not a real prototype that you will produce and give to the commission. It is something, which has some relationships with what we want to build up.
[Fabian, Jonathan, Annie, Kenneth nod their heads.] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 4 people provides evidences)***
[Some others in the team say yes as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but,
Annie: yes, yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but we would call that, if you just give people an imaginary description, we would call that a scenario. So, we can do it as a scenario. I actually think in the case, because this is web technology
[Annie says something to Christopher. Cannot hear what is said]
Hazel: I can imagine, mailing a prototype, a barcode reader, because this is a physical object, it is difficult to make one.
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but because this is web technology, I think we could actually go one step further
[Ronnie nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and to have something on the web, that illustrates the principles
[Charlotte nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but until we have that vision of what it is the project is offering we cannot make the scenarios or the website
[Lucy, Charlotte and Kenneth agree] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 people provides evidences)***
Lucy: A scenario plus something
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kenneth says huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but you know even if it were a scenario we could do it that way. But can this not be done in work package 2? Which has already started? Because that is where the plug in is being developed.
Ben: it is too early
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ben: you need some testing material anyway for the plug in
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]

In the observed project team, Chrarles introduced a glossary as he felt that during one of the meetings, team members had different understandings for terms, which are relevant to the project.

Although a glossary can be effective, it should be introduced at the start of the team's interactions. In this example, Charles saw the need to identify a glossary six months into the project (28/3/02). It was not clear during the meeting that team members were communicating with a different understanding for a term.

Again, in this example it was interesting to note that no one else contributed terms to this glossary, or made any reference to it during their interactions together.

Message 6 sent by Charles on Monday, March 25, 2002 12:14 PM (After 2nd meeting) according to my analysis showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"Difficulty in communicating the salience" of information"*. When Cramton was asked to validate this extract, she said that it showed evidence of "failure to communicate contextual information". There was no inter-rater reliability when looking at this particular extract.

The discourse chunk shows the use of the terms imaginary description by Annie and scenarios by Hazel. In this example Hazel informed Annie that scenarios was the 'proper' name to refer to such imaginary descriptions.

Guideline number: A5

Guideline type: Informing with your plans before starting on work/giving a summery of what has been achieved

Description:

- It is useful to inform team members of your intended plans in order to seek comments before conducting any work.
- Work should only be carried out once there is agreement from everyone.
- This ensures that no resources are wasted.
- It is also important to inform the team when plans have been actioned and any outcomes, which may be of interest.

Rationale:

Sometimes team members present their work once it has been completed, however the reactions you may receive is not what you would have expected. In order to avoid this if possible to inform team members of your plans before and to seek comments on them before carrying out any work.

Sources:

Source: Message *2* sent by *H*azel on Saturday, December 22, 2001 2:00 AM (After 1st meeting) Appendix H

Source: Message *3* sent by *Desmond* on Monday, January 07, 2002 2:03 PM (After 1st meeting) Appendix H

Two messages are from textual chunk *Detailed Workplan.*

Source: Message *7* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM (After 1st meeting) From textual chunk *Detailed Workplan.* Appendix H

Source: Message *37* sent by *Christopher* on Wednesday, February 27, 2002 6:42 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Meeting in Paris.* Appendix H

Source: Message *11* sent by *Mary* on Friday, April 05, 2002 5:03 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk E-learning problems. Appendix J

Source: Message *15* sent by *Charles* on Wednesday, April 24, 2002 9:45 AM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Authoring Tools.* Appendix J

Source: Message *38* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, May 16, 2002 2:59 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Requirements for work package 1 3.* Appendix J

Source: Message *1* sent by *Charles* on Monday, June 10, 2002 5:16 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *7* sent by *Adam* on Monday, June 17, 2002 1:21 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *10* sent by *Adam* on Tuesday, June 18, 2002 5:02 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *11* sent by *Annie* on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 10:02 AM (After 3rd meeting) Fom textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *12* sent by Kenneth on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 4:20 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *13* sent by *Charles* on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 5:21 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *57* sent by *Annie* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 10:32 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *14* sent by *Annie* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 11:32 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *16* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:08 PM (After 3rd meeting) This message is from textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *24* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, June 27, 2002 11:07 AM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message 4 sent by Annie on Friday, September 27, 2002 6:09 PM 1(After 4th meeting) From textual chunk Work package 3 task schedule. Appendix N

Source: Message *8* sent by *Annie* on Monday, October 07, 2002 6:28 PM (After 4th meeting) From textual chunk *work package 3* task schedule. Appendix N

Source: Message *10* sent by *Annie* on Friday, October 11, 2002 10:00 AM (After 4th meeting) From textual chunk *Work package 3 task description.* Appendix N

Supporting materials:

Informing partners of work, which is going to be tackled can give others the opportunity to make comments before work, is started. In this project we can see that plans were informed to the team relatively late. When referring to the transcript extracts from the face-to-face meetings, focussing in particular on the ones, which relate to work being undertaken by the technical partners, we can see that there were many negative comments received. In this situation if the team had been informed of plans before hand it may have led to development time not having been spent in the wrong direction. The transcript extracts from the face-to-face meeting show differences in understanding between two main groups, technical and user related.

Message 12 sent by Kenneth on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 4:20 PM (After 3rd meeting) I rated as showing potential evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information."* Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Message 11 sent by Annie on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 10:02 AM (After 3rd meeting) I rated as showing potential evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Message 10 sent by Annie on Friday, October 11, 2002 10:00 AM (After 4th meeting) shows action taken to avoid the problem of having *unevenly distributed information.* Cramton was not asked to validate this extract, as only a sample was given to her for validation purposes.

Guideline number: A6

Guideline type: Starting on work earlier than planned

Description:

- If time and resources permit it can be useful for you to start on some work earlier on than planned, especially if it can provide salient information to other members of the team.

Rationale:
Timeplans are good, but sometimes efforts can be expended earlier than planned due to a variety of reasons. Therefore it is in your best interest to remain flexible.

Sources:
There was evidence of team members working on tasks earlier than planned when viewing the messages, which were sent to the team. This topic was discussed during a face-to-face meeting.

Supporting material:

Sources:
Source: 18/12/01 transcript, (Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 2 on work package 2). (1st meeting) Appendix G

Annie: we were about to say that, we were supposed to start in March the prototype, but, was going to be the tool,
Jack: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: but we were discussing between us that maybe the project is not so well planned,
[Lucy agrees and uses hand gestures] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because what you need is a prototype first to show it to the people so that they
[Lucy nods her head in disagreement] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: but we are not talking about the prototype of the tool ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: no. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: but
Annie: I know, I know. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: but a
Annie: something
Jack: a prototype of something, what can be the result
Annie: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: what is the
Annie: we understand. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: but since we are going to be the one to produce that prototype and we started to work 20 days ago, maybe, what I am saying is that the 6 month period for the requirements and something's like that, maybe should be before, before the prototype is made. You know, that first maybe the project should be planned, ok first you make a prototype, then we show it to the users, we see how the user react
Jack: yes that is what we are saying. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Desmond nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes. But the project is not planned that way. Because that should start in March. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jack says uh-huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: so its you know, it is a different organization
Jack: what I
Lucy: The software to read the page of the link. We had the same problems, but we decided with two others from the university, which is working with us. They said they would give us a description of a imaginary tool. What it does and how it is. We went to the users and we asked them 'is it ok for you?' and they said no, we want it to be smaller, we want the software to work with any system with the barcodes, etc, etc. So we were able to give user requirements, which is not possible now in this project.
Lucy: So when we are talking about the prototype, it is not a real prototype that you will produce and give to the commission. It is something, which has some relationships with what we want to build up.
[Fabian, Jonathan, Annie, Kenneth nod their heads.] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 4 people provides evidneces)***
[Some others in the team say yes as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but,
Annie: yes, yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but we would call that, if you just give people an imaginary description, we would call that a scenario. So, we can do it as a scenario. I actually think in the case, because this is web technology
[Annie says something to Christopher. Cannot hear what is said]
Hazel: I can imagine, mailing a prototype, a barcode reader, because this is a physical object, it is difficult to make one.
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but because this is web technology, I think we could actually go one step further
[Ronnie nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and to have something on the web, that illustrates the principles
[Charlotte nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but until we have that vision of what it is the project is offering we cannot make the scenarios or the website
[Lucy, Charlotte and Kenneth agree] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 people provides evidences)***
Lucy: A scenario plus something
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kenneth says huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but you know even if it were a scenario we could do it that way. But can this not be done in work package 2? Which has already started? Because that is where the plug in is being developed.
Ben: it is too early
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ben: you need some testing material anyway for the plug in
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
Annie: We tried to but it's difficult because the thing is already laid out. We were saying that you would have to change the project direction in some ways in the benefit of the project I think
Hazel: but why is this
Annie: no, it's not just changing
Hazel: the project direction
Annie: but, just the arranging of the packages.
Hazel: no it is not changing the arrangements of the packages. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Kenneth says huh in agreement] ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: we are not supposed to start developing something now. That is what I am saying. We have very few people, and since we have very few people we need to train them.
[Ronnie whispers something to his neighbor]
Hazel: Can you give us the scenario then? Do not develop anything. But tell us your scenario.
Annie: yes the scenario will be easier, but since you were saying that you wanted a page, that will be harder, but the scenario will be yeah, we could start work on it right now. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: I think we are going to find this repeatedly because for example in workpackage 1, we have not specified the user requirements document for the e-learning portal. We have only specified the document for the requirements on the design. There are many aspects in the project where there is not enough detail, and we have to fill in the detail as we go along. So I think if people want the project to succeed they have to be a bit [pause] flexible about this. So I was doing work on what I could to try and understand the situation. But I feel I can't really go further on task 1.1 until I understand more about what the vision of the project is.

[Jonathan nods and says huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2, verbal and non-verbal evidences)***
[Annie nods] (Sub-state 1.1)
Lucy: I would like to add to this about e-learning. As Hazel said generally speaking blind people do not use it, they do not know about it.
[Annie nods her head and says huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2, verbal and non-verbal evidences)***
Lucy: So we should perhaps have something some sample and try to ask the blind people, how they would like to be. Because I think interactivity which is essential in our project is perhaps not the same when you have a blind and when you have a sighted people.
[Annie and Ben nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 people provides evidences)***
Lucy: and about assessment
Ronnie: absolutely. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 18/12/01 transcript (Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, from Partner 7). (1st meeting) Appendix G

Morris: Well, I have already touched upon about what I wanted to say now earlier on, when I talked about the need to strike a balance between the identifying. Let me start again, first of all I would like to say that all the workpackage we were interested in, particularly 4, which starts in months 7 or 8. Of course work needs to start much earlier and we have started work by looking at a number of websites to see what was on offer. Then came the question on the balance between, for demonstration purposes we needed to find a split between a general mainstream website with something of particular interest to blind people.
[Kenneth looks at Charlotte's paper and whispers something. Cannot hear what it was]
Morris: So, this is what we have been doing. It is more preparation work for this first stage, and again we were not really clear whether we needed wait until month 7 to use the money given to us, as the question we raised yesterday seems clear that we can start work and hire to work somebody to work more effectively on the project.
[Jonathan nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 18/12/01 transcript, pp (Developing a plan of future work). (1st meeting) Appendix G

Jonathan: Are we talking about the pre prototype
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Annie and Jonathan nod their head] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 people provides evidences)***
Jonathan: is that the portal?
Hazel: it's not even a portal, it is little bit of code, it is like what Charles showed us, but imagine that it was actually running code ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jonathan: like for example a lesson
Hazel: yes. And even it does not even have to be whole lesson, it can be fragments, so for example you come up to the site and it gives you a set of options in voice xml and then allows you to respond. So, it will you see what it will be like to hear some voice xml options and then do voice in. Yes, sorry [laughs] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes. But in general navigation, shall it be like e-learning? Could we re-arrange our [says something cannot hear. Also, Ronnie and Ben say something, but could not hear that clearly as well]. Do you know what I mean? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: This is just showing people the principles
Annie: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Right. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: how it
Hazel: It can be just tiny little fragments. So for example, imagine
Annie: yes we understood. We were wondering that the scenario part we could deliver it, I do not know, I cannot say a date now, but sooner, I mean March, in our next meeting we could show ***(Sub-state 1.1) verbal and non-verbal)***
Hazel: ok I am working up to a work plan ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes. [Nods her head as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences,)***
Hazel: because then what I would like to, infact that is a good point, what I would like to say is that I think
[Can hear some people having their own conversations]
Hazel: within the group if we discuss this back and forth by e-mail.
[Annie and Christopher nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences)***
Hazel: So, by the time we have our meeting in March, we should have it all, all ready. I do not mean anything highly integrated, because when we sit and do an interview with somebody, it might be we ask them a few questions and then we say try this little bit and we ask them some more questions, and then we say try this little bit, so it can be very fragmentary
Annie. yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (E-learning portal) (2nd meeting) Appendix K

James: So, we are able to cover all aspects indicated in the contract. We must do focus in the point
[Hazel whispering to Mary]
James: that we know positive that the commission is going to analyse. So, we are not, it is impossible to cover all
[Whispering]
James: aspects indicated in the contract in the next two months.
[Whispering]
James: So, this is my proposal. I do not know if there is any other possibility or alternative ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Own discussions taking place]
James: I am willing to [pause] to, from a holistic point of view to [pause] to, I would like to see any, any, any other way, I do not know if it is even
Lucy: was it not partners 1 and 2 who was supposed to
James: sorry
[Someone said portal in the background and others repeat it as well]
Lucy: yes portal, at what month? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

James: yes of course. Ok, according to the contract, everyone knows and has in front, the portal, the activity of the portal is going to start in month 12 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: oh yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: So, this is going to be impossible for that reason, we are going to propose to the commission we conduct the work before,
after that if you want we can see a very brief presentation of this work package, so [pause] the portal is start, the portal activity is start in 12th month, but we are going to study before, in order to have
[Can hear whispering [
James: to have some prototype, some preliminary portal to hve
[Can still hear some whispering]
James: To show the commission, in July.
[Someone says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: So, this is the way, the only way that we observe in the moment that we can in order to solve the situation

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (E-learning portal) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

E-mail messages sent after informing during the face-to-face meeting that some work would be started earlier on than planned.

Source: Message *4* sent by *Adam*Thursday, March 28, 2002 10:39 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk project portal. Appendix J

Source: Message *16* sent by Hazelon Wednesday, April 24, 2002 7:07 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *project portal.* Appendix J

Source: Message *17* sent by Adam on 25 April 2002 11:34 (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *project portal.* Appendix J.

Source: Message *18* sent by Christopher on Thursday, April 25, 2002 12:37 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *project portal.* Appendix J

Source: Message *30* sent by *Morris* on Friday, July 19, 2002 8:08 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *project portal.* Appendix L.

There was no evidence of Annie or her colleagues sending information to the team regarding, the proposal she made to start on some work activities earlier on than planned as she saw that they were useful. This was evidence of **state seven** (no growth in mutual understanding when actions discussed face-to-face are not followed up by e-mail. (In this state the common ground and mutual beliefs have not got larger they have stayed the same)

Guideline number: A7

Guideline type: Circulating draft documents

Description:

- You are encouraged to circulate copies of draft documents and to seek comments on them.
- Rather than saying as soon as possible, it is better to be specific and give an actual date, as team members may fail to recognize the urgency of a request.
- Circulating draft documents may result in final documents fulfilling the needs of the team, as comments would have been sought beforehand.

Rationale:

You should not have to wait until a final document is produced before sharing it with the rest of the team. There are several benefits from sharing this work early with team members, especially getting comments and finding out how you can make improvements.

Sources:

Source: Message *8* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Unmet learning needs.* Appendix H

Source: Message *10* sent by Charles on Tuesday, January 15, 2002 3:08 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Unmet learning needs.* Appendix H

Source: Message *13* sent by Ronnie on Friday, January 18, 2002 9:49 AM (After 1st meeting) Appendix H

Source: Message *14* sent by *Thomas* on 18 January 2002 19:29 (After 1st meeting). Appendix H From textual chunk *Unmet learning needs.* Appendix H

Source: Message *20* sent by Hazel on Tuesday, January 22, 2002 10:38 AM (After 1st meeting). Appendix H. The first part of this message is related to the textual chunk, *unmet learning needs.* The second part of this message is from textual chunk *protocol for evaluation of current e-learning systems.*

Source: Message *25* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, February 06, 2002 7:07 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual *chunk protocol for evaluation of current e-learning systems.* Appendix H

Source: Message *26* sent by *Hazel* on Thursday, February 07, 2002 3:02 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual *chunk protocol for evaluation of current e-learning systems.* Appendix H

Source: Message *32* sent by *Jack* on Friday, February 15, 2002 2:04 PM (After 1st meeting).. From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report.* Appendix H

Source: Message *35* sent by *Jack on* Tuesday, February 19, 2002 11:45 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report.* Appendix H

Source: Message *36* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, February 26, 2002 1:08 AM (After 1st meeting). From textual *chunk Quarterly Management Report.* Appendix H

Source: Message *38* sent by Fabian on Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:06 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report.* Appendix H

Source: Message *39* sent by *Fabian* on Thursday, February 28, 2002 4:19 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report.* Appendix H

Source: Message *42* sent by *Jack* on Friday, March 01, 2002 3:29 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual *chunk Quarterly Management Report.* | Appendix H

Source: Message *44* sent by Mary on Monday, March 11, 2002 9:46 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *E-learning.* Append in H.

Source: Message *45* sent by *Mary* on Monday, March 11, 2002 9:54 PM (After 1st meeting), From textual chunk *E-learning.* Appendix H

Source: Message *24* sent by Charlesmon Friday, February 01, 2002 4:59 PM (After 1st meeting). Fom textual chunk *Report – problems encountered by visually impaired people on website.* Appendix H

Source: Message *30* sent by Thomas on February 2002 18:32 (After 1st meeting), From textual *chunk Report – problems encountered by visually impaired people on websites.* Appendix H

Source: Message *46* sent by Charles on Tuesday, March 12, 2002 2:04 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual *chunk Report – problems encountered by visually impaired people on website.* Appendix H

Source: Message *47* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, March 12, 2002 4:41 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *e-learning.* Appendix H

Source: Message *5* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, March 22, 2002 4:18 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Dissemination and use plan.* Appendix J

Source: Message *7* sent by *Fabiam* on Monday, March 25, 2002 7:38 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Dissemination and use plan.* Appendix J

Source: Message *8* sent by *Adam* on Thursday, March 28, 2002 10:39 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual *chunk project portal,* Appendix J

Source: Message *9* sent by Fabian on Monday, April 01, 2002 6:11 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual *chunk Dissemination and use plan.* Appendix J

Source: Message *15* sent by *Charles* on Wednesday, April 24, 2002 9:45 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Authoring Tools.* Appendix J

Source: Message *16* sent by Hazel on Wednesday, April 24, 2002 7:07 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual *chunk project portal* Appendix J

Source: Message *17* sent by *Adam* on 25 April 2002 10:28 (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Project portal..* Appendix J

Source: Message *18* sent by Christopher on Thursday, April 25, 2002 12:37 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunnk *Project portal.* Appendix J

Source: Message *22* sent by Fabian on Tuesday, April 30, 2002 6:04 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Second Quarterly Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *23* sent by *Jack* on Monday, May 06, 2002 1:20 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual *chunk Second Quarterly Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *23* sent by Jack on Monday, May 06, 2002 1:20 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *24* sent by Fabian on Monday, May 06, 2002 7:08 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *27* sent by Charles on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 9:28 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual *chunk Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *28* sent by *Lucy* on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 9:53 AM (After 2nd meeting) From textual *chunk Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *30* sent by Hazel on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 4:39 PM (After 2nd meeting). Fom textual *chunk Second Quarterly Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *31* sent by *Hazel* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:36 PM (After 2nd meeting). From the textual *chunk Second Quarterly Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *31* sent by *Hazel*on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:36 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *32* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:37 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *34* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 5:28 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *35* sent by *Paul* on Monday, May 13, 2002 1:58 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *38* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, May 16, 2002 2:59 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Authoring tool.* Appendix J

Source: Message *40* sent by *Liz* on Monday, May 20, 2002 1:09 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Authoring Tools.* Appendix J

Source: Message *47* sent by Jack on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:34 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk Review. Review. Appendix J

Source: Message *52* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, June 03, 2002 10:54 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual *chunk Second Quarterly Report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *1* sent by *Charles* on Monday, June 10, 2002 5:16 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the Authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *3* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:00 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated.* Appendix L

Source: Message *4* sent by *Hazel* on Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:46 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Revised work plan for work packages1 and 5.* Appendix L

Source: Message *6* sent by *Jack* on Monday, June 17, 2002 12:17 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated.* Appendix L

Source: Message *7* sent by *Adam* on Monday, June 17, 2002 1:21 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *8* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, June 17, 2002 7:26 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Answers to the reviewers comments.* Appendix L

Source: Message *9* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, June 18, 2002 12:45 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated*. Appendix L

Source: Message *10* sent by *Adam* on Tuesday, June 18, 2002 5:02 PM (After 3rd meeting). Frrom textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool*. Appendix L

Source: Message *11* sent by *Annie* on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 10:02 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool* Appendix L

Source: Message *12* sent by *Kanneth* on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 4:20 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool*. Appendix L

Source: Message *13* sent by Charles on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 5:21 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool*. Appendix L

Source: Message *14* sent by Annie on Thursday, June 20, 2002 11:32 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool*. Appendix L

Source: Message *16* sent by *Charlese* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:08 PM (After 3rd meeting). Fom textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool*. Appendix L

Source: Message *24* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, June 27, 2002 11:07 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool*. Appendix L

Source: Message *28* sent by *Annie* on Tuesday, July 02, 2002 8:19 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *work package 2 Plug-in Dossier*. Appendix L

Source: Message *31* sent by Mary on Monday, July 22, 2002 6:01 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Chapter three*. Appendix L

Source: Message *32* sent by Conwayne on Friday, July 26, 2002 7:50 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *work package 2 plug-in dossier*. Appendix L

Source: Message *33* sent by *Adam* on Tuesday, July 30, 2002 10:05 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk work package 2 plug-in dossier*. Appendix L

Source: Message *34* sent by *Annie* on Tuesday, July 30, 2002 2:00 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk work package 2 plug-in dossier*. Appendix L

Source: Message *35* sent by *Mary* on Wednesday, July 31, 2002 4:45 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk Manual for Accessible Design*. Appendix L

Source: Message *38* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, August 06, 2002 11:58 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Third Quarterly Report*. Appendix L

Source: Message *39* sent by Jack on Wednesday, August 07, 2002 12:27 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk Intention for Dissemination*. Appendix L

Source: Message *41* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, August 13, 2002 11:38 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Manual for Accessible Design*. Appendix L

Source: Message *42* sent by *Mary* on Tuesday, August 13, 2002 2:28 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Revised workplan for work packages 1 and 5*. Appendix L

Source: Message *49* sent by *Adam* on onday, September 02, 2002 10:51 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *project Portal*. Appendix L

Source: Message *50* sent by *Adam* on Monday, September 02, 2002 10:51 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *project Portal*. Appendix L

Source: Message *51* sent by *Mary* on Monday, September 02, 2002 2:04 PM (After 3rd meeting). Fxrom textual *chunk project Portal*. Appendix L

Source: Message *22* sent by *Mary* on Wednesday, June 26, 2002 10:58 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the authoring tool*. Appendix L

Source: Message *2* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, September 24, 2002 11:26 AM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *Amendment number three*. Appendix N

Source: Message *4* sent by *Annie on* Friday, September 27, 2002 6:09 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *work package 3 task schedule*. Appendix N

Source: Message *15* sent by *Annie* on Wednesday, November 13, 2002 2:54 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *work package 3 task schedule*. Appendix N

Source: Message *20* sent by *Fabian* on Wednesday, January 08, 2003 11:27 AM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *Fourth Quarterly Report*. Appendix N

Source: Message *23* sent by *Morris* on Saturday, January 11, 2003 4:10 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *HTML tutorial*. Appendix N

Supporting materials:

From the sources we can see that the team circulated a number of draft documents and artifacts with the intention of seeking comments and suggestions. Only some of the times were an explicit deadline given to the team members. It is important that the final document is also made available to the team as well.

Message *16* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, April 24, 2002 7:07 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) according to my analysis showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton confirmed this when she was asked to sample some of my data.

Message *22* sent by *Jack* on Monday, May 06, 2002 1:20 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) according to my analysis showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton confirmed this when she was asked to sample some of my data. Although their was inter-rater reliability on this coding, Cramton placed a question mark around her answer.

Message *30* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 4:39 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton confirmed this when she was asked to sample some of my data. There was 100% inter-rater reliability when looking at this extract.

Message *31* sent by *Hazel* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:36 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton left this extract blank when asked to validate a sample of my data.

Message *35* sent by Paul on Monday, May 13, 2002 1:58 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton left this extract blank when asked to validate a sample of my data.

Message *6* sent by Jack on Monday, June 17, 2002 12:17 PM (After 3rd meeting, appendix L) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"unevenly distributed information"*. Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Message *9* sent by Hazel on Tuesday, June 18, 2002 12:45 PM (After 3rd meeting, appendix L) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Message *12* sent by *Kenneth* on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 4.20 PM (After third meeting, appendix L) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Message *11* sent by *Annie* on Wednesday, June 19, 2002 10:02 AM (After third meeting, appendix L) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Message *51* sent by *Adam* on Monday, September 02, 2002 10:51 AM (After 3rd meeting, appendix L) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Guideline number: A8

Guideline type: **Summarizing changes**

Description:

- It is important to clearly show what is new since receiving the previous version. This helps to ensure that this new information is not missed.
- For ease of reading the points should be structured by the use of either numbers or bullets.

Rationale:

Long e-mail messages can be difficult to read, when writing a good message, bullet points should be used for ease of reading. In the main body of the message itself it is important to summarize what main changes have been made. This can be particularly useful, especially if the document is long and the track changes facility has not been used in the attachment.

Sources:

Source: Message *5* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, January 08, 2002 3:55 PM (After 1st meeting). F rom textual chunk *detailed work plan.* Appendix H

Source: Message *7* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *detailed workplan.* Appendix H
Source: Message *25* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, February 06, 2002 7:07 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Protocol of evaluation for e-learning.* Appendix H

Source: Message *39* sent by Fabian on Thursday, February 28, 2002 4:19 PM (After 1st meeting). . From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report.* Appendix H

Source: Message *9* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, April 01, 2002 6:11 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Dissemination and use plan.* Appendix J

Source: Message 38 sent by *Charles* on Thursday, May 16, 2002 2:59 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for work packages 1 and 3.* Appendix J

Source: Message *47* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:34 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Review.* Appendix J

Source: Message *49* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:34 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Review.* Appendix J

Source: Message *52* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, June 03, 2002 10:54 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Second quarterly report.* Appendix J

Source: Message *1* sent by *Charles* on Monday, June 10, 2002 5:16 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk Requirements for the Authoring Tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *16* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:08 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Requirements for the Authoring Tool.* Appendix L

Source: Message *22* sent by *Mary* on Wednesday, June 26, 2002 10:58 AM (After 3d meeting). From textual chunk *Project E-learning Requirements.* Appendix L

Source: Message *15* sent by *Annie* on Wednesday, November 13, 2002 2:54 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk work package 3 task schedule. Appendix L

Supporting Materials:

Sources for guideline A7 show in detail when draft documents have been circulated amongst the team.

The following makes reference to messages included in A7.

Message *46* sent by *Charles* (after the first meeting, appendix H) on Tuesday, March 12, 2002 2:04 PM says he is sending a recent version of his draft document. Changes had not been summarized. This is also the case with the following messages: Message *7* sent by Fabian (after the second meeting, appendix J) on Monday, March 25, 2002 7:38 PM, message *22*, sent by *Fabian* (after the 2nd meeting,m appendix J) on Tuesday, April 30, 2002 6:04 PM. Message *23*, sent by *Jack* (after the 2nd meeting, appendix J) on Monday, May 06, 2002 1:20 PM. Message *32*, sent by Jack (after the 2nd meeting, appendix J) on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:37 PM. Message *3* (sent after 3rd meeting, appendix L) by *Jack* on Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:00 AM. Message *8* (sent after third meeting), appendix L by *Jack* on Monday, June 17, 2002 7:26 PM. Message *32* sent by *Conwayne* (after the 3rd meeting, appendix L) on Friday, July 26, 2002 7:50 AM. Message *42* sent by *Mary* on Tuesday, August 13, 2002 2:28 PM (after third meeting, appendix L). Message *22* sent by *Jack* on Friday, January 10, 2003 1:05 PM (after 4th meeting), appendix L)

Message *7* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM is an example of where changes were summarized. Even though bullet points were not used, each point was separately written, supporting the ease in reading the different amendments.

Message *9* by *Fabian* (after 2nd meeting, appendix J) on Monday, April 01, 2002 6:11 PM included what was new in this message compared to the last version which had been circulated. So did Message *38* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, May 16, 2002 2:59 PM, message *52* sent (after 2nd meeting, appendix J) by Fabian on Monday, June 03, 2002 10:54 AM, message *1* sent by *Charles* on Monday, June 10, 2002 5:16 PM (after 3rd meeting, appendix L). Message *16* sent by *Charles* (after 3rd meeting, appendix L) on Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:08 PM. Message *22* sent by *MAry* on Wednesday, June 26, 2002 10:58 AM (after 3rd meeting, appendix L).
Message *25* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, February 06, 2002 7:07 PM mentions that changes have been made, without summarizing how.

Message *39* sent by *Fabian* on Thursday, February 28, 2002 4:19 PM did include what was new since the previous version.

During the face-to-face meetings there were several examples of changes informed to the entire team. For example team members leaving, starting some work earlier than planned…

Message *47* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:34 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton left this extract blank when asked to validate a sample of my data.

Message *9* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, June 18, 2002 12:45 PM (After 3rd meeting, appendix L) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Guideline number: A9

Guideline type: **Sharing relevant information to members of the team**

Description:

- Any information, which would be of relevance to the team, should be circulated.
- This may include
  Any information, which was discussed during the meeting,
  New information, and
- Information, which was captured from media such as a white/black board or flip chart. This is to ensure that team members have access to this information at a later date. If a copy was not made, you may not be able to refer back to it.

Rationale:

Email is a good way of sharing information with the team, which can help them in their work, especially when face-to-face meetings are far apart.

Sources:

Source: Message *1* sent by *Jonathan* on Saturday, December 22, 2001 1:59 AM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *URL*. Appendix H

Source: Message *22* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, January 29, 2002 7:16 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Dreamweaver*. Appendix H

Source: Message *29* sent by *Liz* on Tuesday, February 12, 2002 7:42 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Conferences*. AppendixH

Source: Message *1* sent by *Ronnie* on Tuesday, March 19, 2002 8:14 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Conferences*. Appendix J

Source: Message *10* sent by *Jason* on Friday, April 05, 2002 1:50 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *E-learning*. Appendix J

Source: Message *12* sent by *Charles* on Tuesday, April 16, 2002 1:06 PM (After 2nd meeting). Fom textual chunk *Broswers*. Appendix J

Source: Message *13* sent by *Mary* on Friday, April 19, 2002 5:40 PM (After 2nd meeting). Fxrom textual chunk *Web authoring tools*. Appendix J

Source: Message *14* sent by *Mary* on Friday, April 19, 2002 8:59 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Web authoring tools*. Appendix J. This was the same message as *13*, but sent at a different time.

Source: Message *42* sent by *Liz* on Monday, May 20, 2002 3:03 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Java*. Appendix J

Source: Message *50* sent by *Adam* on Monday, June 03, 2002 10:53 AM (After 2nd meeting) Fom textual chunk *Browsers*. Appendix J

Source: Message *51* sent by *Adam* on Monday, June 03, 2002 10:53 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Web Authoring Tools*. Appendix J

Source: Message *5* sent by *Charles* on Thursday, June 13, 2002 11:16 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Interesting information to share*. Appendix L

Source: Message *6* sent by *Liz* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 11:32 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *project speech recognition*. Appendix L

Source: Message *37* sent by *Charles* on Monday, August 05, 2002 2:11 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *meeting information*. Appendix L

Source: Message *43* sent by *Liz* on Monday, August 19, 2002 11:42 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk Review of Voice XML tools* Appendix L

Source: Message *52* sent by *Morris* on Wednesday, September 04, 2002 4:22 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Interesting information to share*. Appendix L

Source: Message *58* sent by *Liz* on Thursday, June 20, 2002 10:32 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Project speech recognition*. Appendix L

Source: Message *17* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, December 11, 2002 4:22 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *News*. Appendix N

Supporting materials:

There was evidence of information, which was drawn on a flipchart, circulated to everyone after the meeting. This was important, as some of the team members had left the meeting before it had closed.

Through e-mail messages team members circulated information they believed might be of interest to other partners that are also in the project team.

Guideline number: A10

Guideline type: **Sharing information with people outside of the team**

Description:

- In teamwork, it is important that the team members show each other, what information will be shared with people outside of the team.

Rationale:

There may be times when you need to share some of the information that you have been working on with the team, to people outside of the team. In such a situation it is important to obtain consent from all team members. As good practice it is important to show what you will be sharing before the event takes place, and not after.

Sources:

Source: Message *39* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, August 07, 2002 12:27 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk Intention for dissemination.* Appendix L

Source: Message 7 sent by *Mary* on Monday, September 30, 2002 2:30 PM (After fourth meeting). From textual chunk *FTP update.* Appendix N

Supporting material:

Issues related to sharing information outside the team were brought to attention during face-to-face meetings. Main comments were that the team should be informed before events take place and not after. Also the team should be shown in advance what material is going to be used.

Although discussed face-to-face, this did not seem to be an area that was widely discussed when team members were communicating by e-mail. It was after the third and fourth meeting that this area was being looked at.

Message 7 sent by *Mary* on Monday, September 30, 2002 2:30 PM seems to suggest that earlier drafts were not presented to the team for their comments.

.....
Hazel: Was the paper about the project submitted? It is usual for projects that if you are submitting a paper to a conference, you show it to the whole consortium before sending it to them. So we did not see that.
Thomas: I will,
Hazel: could we make that a
Paul: yes, please
Hazel: a procedure
Paul: Yes, a standard procedure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: on the ftp site, yes
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
.....
Mary: mhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: because I am on the organising committee for that conference, so it is a little bit embarrassing [gives a small laugh] that I do not know a project that I am in
[Whispering – think it is the translator for Michael]
Jack: I mean
Hazel: has submitted a paper
[Mary laughs]
Jack: we are, we have to be more co-ordinated
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: because
[Both Mary and Hazel laugh]
Jack: maybe because we are trying to go to the same conference
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I would
Jack: I am sure that more of it, people is preparing these things
Lucy: to send them
.....

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk *(Dissemination)* (2nd meeting) appendix I

Fabian: Ok, as I was saying, um we participated with a conference in
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: the 7th ASPI accessibility in
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: people with disabilities,
[Fabian looks at Annie and Christopher]
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: and um, the conference was in, was about people with disabilities and the need to communicate with information and science technologies. It took place last year, October, towards the end of last year. [Pause] We are, we participated, partners 1 and 2 in the second bit of congress according to dissemination without barriers in the [pause] 21st century and in the UNICORM conference, and other activities have been participation in new technologies in the social
Kenneth: sorry, when you say you, sorry, when you say that these have been participated
Fabian: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in what way?
Fabian: well, [pause] with um, with um in these two activities, the first one with the conference where people have with the one with the conference where people were talking about what the program was about.
Kenneth: Have they, has anything been delivered to these conferences?
Fabian: Papers have been delivered, I do not know about that, I do not think so ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Fabian: yes, just the conference, it is an exhibition
Kenneth: well it would be useful for the consortium to know what is being said at these various places
[Some people say ah in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: oh we can, we can
Kenneth: it should be very, um you know, so we understand what is the participation
Ronnie: that would be very good ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: that is also something we were going to talk, talk about later, to inform all of the consortium about the
[Can hear some whispering]
Fabian: about the dissemination activities, we are making, because I think that is very important.
Paul: We already talked about that in Paris
(Sub-state 5.1)
Fabian: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
.....
Paul: Are you talking about the Broadcasting conference?
Fabian: yeah, yes, I am talking about the broadcasting conference, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: why, there isn't really the [pause] it is not really the project's area of interest, why [pause] do you think of participating there?

Fabian: because it has the [pause] we are participating in the new technology compass which involves several [pause] new technologies about [pause] media, and content distribution and the new ways of disseminating information. And I think we would be [pause] would be very [pause] what is the word, it would be very [pause] suitable for us to be there
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: and I [pause] and we sent a paper to the conference we are going to, going to go there, and by now, partners 1 and 2
[Can hear whispering]
Fabian: and partners 1 and 2 and the thing by now it might be open to other participants
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Yes, there are session, about Internet ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: social applications
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I think that is where the project is
James: Yes, I think this would be there ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Have you distributed that abstract?
Jack: What>?
Kenneth: Have you distributed the abstract?
Jack: No, ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: Because it would really, the consortium should see the abstract before they are sent, [pause]
Fabian: but they asked us this, this project to the very very end, and you know it was very late
Paul: But still, I mean you are doing this in the name of the consortium, so, it is just no way that you could just do something without letting us know, you have to have at least, you have to have, if I understand the procedures correctly, you also have to have the consent, and consensus, so if a partner or one of the partners or partner organisations say it is not agreed, so I do really think that you are compelled to let us know, or to send information to us before hand. So, I ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: Ok, ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: so I really urge you to do this next time as this is not the first time, it is not the first time we have said this, and I think it has been talked about and mentioned in Paris, and it is coming up now, but this is not the first time, and it is coming up over and over again. So, please be sure to inform us of whatever you are sending out, especially to official organisations and to official conferences, this is really necessary. [Pause]
(Sub-state 5.1)
James: Ok, we are going to try, try and communicate in all new events which our partner, which every partner is going to participate
Paul: but try and do this beforehand, not after it is done
James: yeah, yeah, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yeah, yeah we will be happy to receive any comments ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in any way
Fabian: I think in this case, the problem was the time, because we had a very very short time to answer [pause] because they offered us a free stand as the project is a [pause] involved in a social activity, and they offered us a discount, so it was a matter of time, that was the problem. [Pause] Ok, and this is the last point, which is the creation of voice web pages. The first step is to have some pages of the partner 7's portal using voice, which will show how it can improve the interactivity of the user, of the people who are accessing the website

Source: 6.6.02 meeting transcript, discourses chunk (*Work package 6 Dissemination, Standardization and Exploitation*) (3rd meeting), appendix K

Jack: Mary sent that paper yesterday I think
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, now I think it is on the ftp [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *Work package 3 development of the tool (review of work done since the last meeting)* (4th meeting, appedix M)

Guideline number: A11

Guideline type: **Producing reports**

Description:

- One person should either volunteer or be nominated to receive information from all team members to produce a report, so that it can be structured to read like one person has produced it.
- It is important that everyone sends his or her contributions to this person in a timely manner.
- Circulating a template is one way of ensuring that everyone is familiar with its structure, and has knowledge of what information should be covered.

Rationale:

Consistency is important in any written documentation. This can be time consuming to achieve when several partners have made contributions. Therefore information should be requested in advance and monitored.

Sources:

Source: Message *21* sent by *Jonathan* on Tuesday, January 29, 2002 6:28 PM (After 1st meeting). Fom textual chunk *work pacakage 6 (Standardisation, Dissemination and Exploitation)*. Appndix H

Source: Message *27* sent by *Jonathan* on Thursday, February 07, 2002 3:02 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *work package 6 (Standardisation, Dissemination and Exploitation)*. Appndix H

Source: Message *32* sent by *Jack* on Friday, February 15, 2002 2:04 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report*. Appndix H

Source: Message *35* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, February 19, 2002 11:45 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report*. Appndix H

Source: Message *36* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, February 26, 2002 1:08 AM (After 1st meeting) From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report*. Appndix H

Source: Message *38* sent by *Fabian* on Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:06 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report*. Appndix H

Source: Message *39* sent by *Fabian* on Thursday, February 28, 2002 4:19 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report*. Appndix H

Source: Message *42* sent by *Jack* on Friday, March 01, 2002 3:29 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Quarterly Management Report*. Appndix H

Source: Message *2* sent by *Fabian on* Thursday, March 21, 2002 7:31 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *publications*. Appndix J

Source: Message *3* sent by *Desmond* on Friday, March 22, 2002 11:46 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *publications*. Appndix J

Source: Message *4* sent by *Jason* on Friday, March 22, 2002 12:37 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *publications*. Appendix J

Source: Message *5* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, March 22, 2002 4:18 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Dissemination and Use Plan*. Appndix J

Source: Message *7* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, March 25, 2002 7:38 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Dissemination and Use Plan*. Appndix J

Source: Message *9* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, April 01, 2002 6:11 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Dissemination and Use Plan*. Appndix J

Source: Message *22* sent by *Fabian* on Tuesday, April 30, 2002 6:04 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk second *quarterly report*. Appndix J

Source: Message *23* sent by *Jack* on Monday, May 06, 2002 1:20 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *second quarterly report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *23* sent by *Jack* on Monday, May 06, 2002 1:20 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special Report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *24* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, May 06, 2002 7:08 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *27* sent by *Chales on* Wednesday, May 08, 2002 9:28 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *28* sent on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 9:53 AM (After 2nd meeting) by Lucy From textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *30* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 4:39 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *31* sent by *Hazel* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:36 PM (After 2nd meeting) From textual chunk *second quarterly report*. Also, This message is from textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *32* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:37 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *34* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 5:28 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *35* sent by Paul on Monday, May 13, 2002 1:58 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *47* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:34 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *review*. Appendix J

Source: Message *49* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:41 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *review*. Appendix J

Source: Message *52* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, June 03, 2002 10:54 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Second Quarterly Report*. Appendix J

Source: Message *2* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, June 12, 2002 11:16 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated*. Appendix L

Source: Message *3* sent by *Jack on* Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:00 AM (After 3rd meeting). Fom textual chunk *Annex 1 updated*. Appendix L

Source: Message *6* sent by *JAck* on Monday, June 17, 2002 12:17 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated*. Appendix L

Source: Message *8* sent by *Fabian* on Monday, June 17, 2002 7:26 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated*. Appendix L

Source: Message *9* sent by *Hazel on* Tuesday, June 18, 2002 12:45 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated*.

Source: Message *14* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, November 20, 2002 8:13 AM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *Annex 1 updated*. Appendix N

Supporting materials:

Jack, the administrative coordination, or Fabian, his scientific and technical coordinator, was compiling majority of the reports. Contributions were asked for from relevant team members.

During a face-to-face meeting, Elsie was nominated to produce a report by gathering everyone's contributions. An extract can be seen below:

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – Work package 6*)

Jack: I am sure that every partner has been doing some dissemination activity, and we have to collect all this effort, and direct it to the same directions
Elsie: yeah [Elsie nods her head as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Ronnie: I want to propose that we take over this task
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and you send, all, all your material to Elsie
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and she will make um, make a report out of it.
Elsie: yes, I can do it ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: for those that have done dissemination of whatever kind, you should inform us

Message *4* sent by *Jason* on Friday, March 22, 2002 12:37 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. This was confirmed by Cramton when she was asked to sample some of my data.

Message *30* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 4:39 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton confirmed this when she was asked to sample some of my data. There was 100% inter-rater reliability when looking at this extract.

Message *31* sent by *Hazel* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 12:36 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information."* Cramton left this extract blank when asked to validate a sample of my data.

Message *35* sent by *Paul* on Monday, May 13, 2002 1:58 PM (After 2nd meeting), appendix J showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton left this extract blank when asked to validate a sample of my data.

Message *47* sent by Jack on Wednesday, May 29, 2002 5:34 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton left this extract blank when asked to validate a sample of my data.

Message 6 sent by Jack on Monday, June 17, 2002 12:17 PM (After 3rd meeting, aooendix L) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator "*unevenly distributed information*". Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes.

Message *14* sent by Jack Wednesday, November 20, 2002 8:13 AM (After 4th meeting) I rated as showing evidence of avoiding Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information."* and "***difficulty in interpreting the meaning of silence***". Cramton did not validate this particular extract as only a sample was shown to her for validation purposes. Appendix N

Guideline number: A12

Guideline type: **Document formats**

Description:

- To ensure that document formats, which are used for attachments, meet the needs of all team members.
- Document formats should already have been discussed during the meeting.

Rationale:

Generally speaking during the face-to-face meeting it was found out that some people preferred to receive attachments as word or html formats and not PDF, as this caused some difficulty in reading.

Sources:

Source: Message *39* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, August 07, 2002 12:27 PM (After 3rd meeting). Fom textual chunk *Intention for Disemination*. Appendix L

Source: Message *12* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, November 14, 2002 10:39 AM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *Update on annual review*. Appendix M

Supporting materials:

It was during one the face-to-face meeting that document formats were discussed. There was only evidence of two messages which were sent with PDF attachments. Other attachments were saved as.zip, .xls and .doc. Only PDF documents were said to cause a problem reading them.

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (ftp site) Appendix G

Jack: O One point about the ftp site, I will include in the FTP site the documents in the original kind of file. If it is picti I will put it picti, .doc I will put it. I do not know if you would prefer everything to be in pdf mode or also in pdf or both formats. We put the original because we are in the same project. So we can use all these documents. It does not make sense to make them pdf protected or anything.
[Charlotte says yes when Jack is talking about the format and she nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Kenneth: you must not have just PDf it is not accessible. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Annie and Lucy nod their heads] ***(Sub-states 1.2 x 2 as 2 people provide evidence)***
[Ben shrugs]
Jack: that is what I am saying. So if someone wants also the pdf because they use it, it is easy for them, they can use that. Yes [looking at Lucy]
Lucy: I cannot read pdf. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Sorry
Lucy: I cannot read pdf. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: well then we put
Ronnie: We have the same problem. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Elsie: No we can read it. ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Discussions taking place, cannot hear them though]
Jack: Then that is the decision, we ask then if we want pdf we will have it. ....

Guideline number: A13

Guideline type: Notification of new documents

Description:

- Introduce a system to notify everyone that new documents have been added to the store (**guideline number A17**), which contain all relevant documentation for the team.

Rationale:

Informing team members that new documents have been added is useful, as they are aware of the change. If this was not in place they may randomly check and may miss some important information.

Sources:

Source: Message *3* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, December 27, 2001 5:33 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix G

Source: Message *7* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM (After 1st meeting) Fom textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix G

Source: Message *8* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM (After 1st meeting) From textual chunk *FTP site*.

Source: Message *9* sent by *Hazel* on Monday, January 14, 2002 5:11 PM (After 1st meeting). Fom textual chunk FTP site. Appendix G

Source: Message *12* sent by *JAck*on Wednesday, January 16, 2002 10:50 (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix G

Source: Message *16* sent by *Charlotte* on Monday, January 21, 2002 6:27 PM (After 1st meeting) Fom textual chunk *FTP site* Appendix G.

Source: Message *38* sent by *Fabian* on Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:06 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix G

Source: Message *41* sent by *Jack* on Friday, March 01, 2002 3:29 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk FTP site. Appendix G
Source: Message 45 sent by Fabian on 11:33 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Review*. Appendix J

Source: Message *2* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, June 12, 2002 11:16 AM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix L

Source: Message *17* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, June 21, 2002 12:13 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix L

Source: Message *18* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, June 21, 2002 12:20 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix L

Source: Message *29* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, July 05, 2002 10:46 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix L

Source: Message *35* sent by *Mary* on Wednesday, July 31, 2002 4:45 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Chapter three*. Appendix L

Source: Message *42* sent by *MAry* on Tuesday, August 13, 2002 2:28 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *project portal*. Appendix L

Source: Message *7* sent by *Mary* on Monday, September 30, 2002 2:30 PM (After 4th meeting). Fom textual chunk *FTP update*. Appendix N

Supporting materials:

By the time of the fourth meeting the number the number of message sent to the team, to inform them that new documents had been placed onto the FTPsite got smaller in number.

Source: 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Evaluation*) (After 1st meeting) appendix H

Jack: Send anything to me and I will include it in the list and on the FTP site. I will send an email to everyone to say that there is a new document and where it is. Well the FTP site, I sent you an address of the FTP site. I hope that it worked for everyone. I hoped that you have tried to reach it or even to try and get a document from there.
Charlotte nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Guideline number: A14

Guideline type: **Circulating meeting minutes**

Description:

- Meeting minutes should be circulated soon after the meeting.
- Minutes should include constructive information and actions, clearly set with deadlines.
- If you hold a second meeting, any actions from the previous meeting should be referred to.
- It is also important to circulate minutes of any other meetings you may have, even if the whole team was not present, if it provides relevant information to other team members.

Rationale:

Although most team members are likely to make note of important information discussed when face-to-face, it is important to circulate meeting minutes soon after the meeting is closed. The information should be clearly set out and actions which need to be taken should be included with some indication of time.

Sources:

Source: Message *12* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, January 16, 2002 10:50 AM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *meeting minutes*. Appendix H

Source: Message *15* sent by Christopher on Monday, January 21, 2002 6:27 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *meeting minutes*. Appendix H

Source: Message *17* sent by *Annie* on Monday, January 21, 2002 6:27 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *meeting minutes*. Appendix H

Source: Message *19* sent by *Annie* on Monday, January 21, 2002 6:27 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *meeting minutes*. Appendix H

Source: Message *2* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, June 12, 2002 11:16 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix J

Source: Message *18* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, June 21, 2002 12:20 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *FTP site*. Appendix J

Supporting materials:

There were no meeting minutes sent to the team after the second meeting.

Paul: Also, it would be certainly nice for the rest of the partners, to be reminded of things like that in um [pause] through minutes. Maybe, it is, for some reason, I did not receive the London, the minutes of the London meeting.
Jack: it was sent and included on the ftp site ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: was it
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: was it on the ftp server?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Ok, sorry. My fault ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel gives a small laugh]
Jack: Maybe you did not receive it, because you were not on the mailing list
Paul: Maybe, I will go and check, but thank you ***(Sub-state 3.1)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation by Jack on work package 3*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Guideline number: **A15**

Guideline type: **Informing on non-working periods**

Description:

- It is important to let team members know of
  Dates and
  Times

That you will not be available, as this can help others to plan their work around you.

Rationale:

By informing the team when you are not available can be useful, as it allows preparations to be made in advance. It may also explain why you may not be answering to any messages, which were sent.

Sources:

Source: Message *2* sent by *Hazel* on Saturday, December 22, 2001 2:00 AM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Holidays*. Appendix G

Source: Message *5* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, January 08, 2002 3:55 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual *chunk Detailed Work plan*. Appendix G

Source: Message *5* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, March 22, 2002 4:18 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Dissemination and use plan*. Appendix I

Source: Message *4* sent by *Mary* and *Hazel* on Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:46 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Revised work plan for work packages 1 and 5*. Appendix K

Source: Message *19* sent by *Jack* on 21 June 2002 14:20 (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Informs out of office*. Appendix K

Source: Message *30* sent by *Morris* on Friday, July 19, 2002 8:08 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Informs out of office*. Appendix K

Source: Message *36* sent by *Ronnie* on Monday, August 05, 2002 12:57 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Out of office*. Appendix K

Source: Message *56* sent by *Partner 4* on Monday, June 17, 2002 11:18 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual *chunk Out of office*. Appendix K

Supporting Materials:

Source: Message *30* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 4:39 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Special Report*. Appendix I

This message shows that it would have been useful to have informed the team before that work was not being done in this area, due to other commitments. In this message Hazel was also concerned that there had been no communication from the Spanish partners. Although a response to this message was received the next day, it would have been useful if a message had been sent to the team to inform them if they were not working on this particular aspect on that day.

Message *30* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, May 08, 2002 4:39 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendix I) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton confirmed this when she was asked to sample some of my data. There was 100% inter-rater r reliability when looking at this extract.

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 6*) (2nd meeting) appendix I

[Someone says thank you]
[Elsie puts up her hand]
Elsie: I have a question, um for the dissemination plan that you partner 7 is responsible for to transfer, I would like to know when exactly you need to see this, to see our contribution, because as Ronnie said next week we are going to Madrid, so if it has to be done before, and all participants have to contribute, I would say to send it to my email, so that I can work on it during the weekend, or something.
James: Ok, I might, from my personal view is that you might need some contribution in order to write in your document. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Elsie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Guideline number: A16

Guideline type: Next meeting

Description:

- The team should be reminded of what date has been chosen for the next meeting.
- Arrangements should be made if a brief meeting with some of the team members is required before the actual meeting.
- If anyone knows in advance that they cannot make it on the day of the chosen meeting, the team should be informed.
- If any changes are necessary in order for you to present your work, the team should be made aware.
- Arrangements should be made for all team members to stay at the same hotel, if an overnight stay is required
- Details of the venue for the meeting should be circulated in advance

Rationale:

Reaching an agreement to hold another meeting is done best when the team is together face-to-face (proposed guideline D16). However, messages related to the meeting should be sent following the face-to-face meeting.

Sources:

Source: Message *2* sent by *Hazel* on Saturday, December 22, 2001 2:00 AM (After 1st meeting). Fom textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix G.

Source: Message *31* sent by *Lucy* on Friday, February 15, 2002 8:42 AM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Paris Meeting – Booking Hotels*. Appendix G.

Source: Message *34* sent by *French Daillet* on Monday, February 18, 2002 11:24 AM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Paris Meeting – Booking Hotels*. Appendix G.

Source: Message *37* sent by *Christopher* on Wednesday, February 27, 2002 6:42 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Meeting in Paris (Work package 3)*. Appendix G.

Source: Message *43* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, March 07, 2002 7:09 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Paris Meeting – Draft Agenda*. Appendix G.

Source: Message *20* sent by *Jack* on Friday, April 26, 2002 12:51 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix I

Source: Message *25* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, May 07, 2002 12:39 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix I

Source: Message *33* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, May 09, 2002 5:28 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix I

Source: Message *36* sent by *Hazel* on Monday, May 13, 2002 7:16 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix I

Source: Message *37* sent by *Partner 5* on Tuesday, May 14, 2002 8:34 AM (After 2nd meeting).. From textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix I

Source: Message *38* sent by *Jack* on Monday, May 20, 2002 12:42 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix .I

Source: Message *44* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, May 24, 2002 7:08 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Next meeting*. Appendix I.

Source: Message *53* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, June 04, 2002 2:07 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Agenda for Meeting*. Appendix I.

Source: Message *54* sent by *Hazel* on Wednesday, June 05, 2002 10:25 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual *chunk Next meeting date*. Appendix I

Source: Message *37* sent by Charles on Monday, August 05, 2002 2:11 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk Meeting Information. Appendix K

Source: Message *54* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, September 10, 2002 11:47 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *Draft Agenda for Meeting*. Appendix J

Source: Message *16* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, December 10, 2002 12:11 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk Next Meeting. Appendix M

Source: Message *18* sent by *Jack* on Monday, December 16, 2002 2:04 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *Next Meeting*. Appendix M

Source: Message *19* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, January 07, 2003 10:59 AM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *Next Meeting*. Appendix M

Supporting materials:

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Next meeting date)* (1st meeting) Appendix G

Hazel: Are there other issues people would like to address
[Pause]
Ben: can we have a definite meeting date for next
Hazel: I think its March
Lucy: I think its 18th and 19th of March
Ronnie: on the 20th there is a Madrid conference
Hazel: I have the 11th and 12th, I have another meeting, in fact several people in this room have a meeting in London on 18th and 19th of March ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: ah 18th?
Hazel: yes that's right, well ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charlotte says something to Kenneth]
[People engaged in their own conversations]
Lucy: Do you want it Thursday or Friday?
Hazel: Thursday or Friday. I think it should be two days ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***Lucy: then the 14th and 15th
Hazel: 14th and 15th what about 14th and 15th? That is ok with me. What about everyone else? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[People having their own conversations. cannot hear what they are saying]
Hazel: I will send an email to the whole consortium telling them of those dates
Jonathan: ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: so Jack, ok, ok, shall we declare the meeting closed for today, and then the technical partners can have fun tomorrow morning
[Laughter]
Meeting closed at 3.50

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussion on choosing a date for the next consortium meeting*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Lucy: For partner 5 is it possible to have our meeting on the 14th?
Jack: So, this is our suggestion - about 1 month before the end of July to have a meeting. So, partner 5, [pause] for partner 7 it is not possible
Lucy: For 14th it is not ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: How about the others?
Paul: You talking of June now?
Jack: June, yes, meet
[Someone in the background says to meet the day before]
James: 20 and 21?
Jack: 20 and 21 and the week after
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and the week after that
[Pause]
Paul: What about the week before?
Jack: 6th and 7th

Hazel: 6th and 7th no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: No, no we have to go to, partner 7 ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Small discussion between Lucy, Morris and Ronnie to do with the dates]
James: So, there is some problems with this
Hazel: 20th and 21st
[Some own discussions taking place]
Jack: 20th and 21st
James: Is that ok for you?
Ronnie: Where should the meeting take place?
Jack: I would say again Madrid, [pause] lots of technical results should be, so we have all the portal and something [pause]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: there are many, many events in Madrid in June, so, I would, if we decide to have it in Madrid, it is necessary to book already, the hotel rooms
[Someone in the background says uh-huh and yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Ronnie: and
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: and it cannot be on the 18th and 19thJack: 19th and 20th
James: Wednesday and Tuesday ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: For us, it is fine [gives a small laugh]
Hazel: it's ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Does anyone have a problem
Jack: I do not know the problem with travel, including Saturdays and that [pause]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: It is a problem of, it is a problem of ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Elsie: of travel, it is
Ronnie: no, if you have a stick
Elsie: no, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: if you have a Saturday included it is cheaper
Hazel: much, much cheaper ***(Sub-state 1.1)***[Hazel laughs when she said it is much cheaper]
Lucy: no, no you have to have a Sunday, it is maybe cheaper ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Ronnie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Elsie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: Saturday night
Paul: Saturday night ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Lucy: yes, you have to miss ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmm
[Some individual discussions taking place re the choice of dates for the next meeting]
James: So one possibility is 19th and 20,
Jack: Wednesday or Thursday
James: is that ok with every one of you? Or there is the 6th and 7th
Ronnie: Unfortunately on the 6th and 7th we have [pause] we have the partner 7 conference and we cannot go ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: 19th and 20th
Jack: it looks like 20 and 21
Ronnie: what is this weekend [pause] 22 and 23. What is the weekend?
[Someone replies]
Ronnie: So, if we can take 21 and 22 [pause] we can then leave on Sunday
Hazel: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: I think that is ok ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Elsie: no ***(Sub-state 2.3)***
Hazel: no [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 2.3)***
[Mary laughs as well]
Paul: 20th and 21?
Hazel: 20th and 21 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some own discussions taking place]
Desmond: What is the answer?
James: 20 and 21, is that ok for everybody
Ronnie: It's not ok for Lucy unfortunately ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Lucy: no, 19th and 20th
Kenneth: uh-huh 19th and 20th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: Then we will have to stay in
[Some own discussions taking place
Paul: So, which dates do we finally agree on
[Own discussions taking place regarding the suitability of the date for the next consortium meeting]
Jack: I do not think there is an agreement ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Someone in the background laughs]
Hazel: 19th and 20th
Kenneth: 19th and 20th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: 19th and 20, which we can ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: 19 and 20 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Wednesday
Lucy: Wednesday ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel laughs]
Paul: Wednesday's are always difficult for me at least, but if I am the only one do not worry. Thursday and Friday would be better, [pause] but if I am the only one [pause] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: the idea of having
Mary: how about 17th [Mary gives a small laugh]
[Some own discussions taking place again]
Desmond: Thursday and Friday, Thursday and Friday would be better for us
Jack: sorry
Desmond: Thursday and Friday would be better for us
Jack: ah, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some discussions taking place]
Mary: how about Monday and Tuesday [Gives a small laugh as well]
[Hazel: Monday and Tuesday [laughs as well]
James: Ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and the meeting is on Saturday [gives a small laugh]
Mary: ooh good ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: It must be clear that we will have some problems with, with the tickets. It is inevitable
Elsie: yes, it will be expensive ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: it is more expensive anyway
[Can hear some own discussions]
James: Ok, so 20th and 21
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Mary: Yes, but Elsie said that it is a problem ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Hazel laughs]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Desmond: But then partner 5 will not be able to come
James:
Desmond: 20 and 21, partner 5 will not be able to come
James: ok, so ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: It's just Lucy, not the others,
Lucy: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: ah nobody ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James: So it is not ok 20 and 21. We have to look at other dates [pause] 14th and 15th was not available
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: and the weekend after would it be too late?
James: yes, yes, it is just one month before the final submission, and if there is some misunderstanding ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: And I think that is dangerous [Gives a small laugh]
Jack: I think, I think it would be difficult for the technical partners to react
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in one month
Ronnie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: and if we take [pause] the beginning of the week and not the end, 17th and 18th?
Desmond: 17th and 18th?
Hazel: No, I cannot do the 17th and 18th ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: on 18th I have a meeting with my workshop, so no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: 10 and 11th?
[Laughter from some of the partners]
Mary: you decide [gives a small laugh]
James: 10th and 11th?
Michael: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone else said yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: no, ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Mary: no, no [laughs] ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Some other partners laugh as well]
Hazel: [laughs] I have the 20th? [Pause] 3rd and 4th?
Lucy: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Elsie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: No [laughs] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Hazel laughs as well]
Mary: What happened 6th and 7th, did anyone say they cannot do that?
[Some own discussions taking place]
Hazel: or the 6th and 7th?
[Some own discussion takes place]
Desmond: 6th and 7th no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: ok, it is not good [laughs] ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: 3 and 4
Paul: 3 and 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: what about 2005?
[Everyone laughs]
Hazel: Is anyone free?
[Laughter again]
Jack: So, the last 3 and 4?
Hazel: 3 and 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: 3 and 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: 3 and 4?
[Looks at everyone saying 3 and 4 – Mary and Hazel laugh. So do others]
Paul: solved
Hazel: solved ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter from partners again]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Paul: Jack if we say the 3rd and 4th of June, [pause] can we plan it so that we really start on the Monday morning and not just arrive on the Monday
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: would that be possible?
Jack: to start
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: To start from the Monday morning and
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: not to arrive on the Monday and we only have Monday afternoon
Hazel: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and to really say
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: to arrive on the Sunday and say work on Monday morning?
Hazel: yes, I think that is important ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: I have got
[Some laughter]
Elsie: 9 o'clock will be ok [gives a small laugh]
Some own discussions take place]

15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*meeting location*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: and the next question is why should it be Madrid?
[Laughter from some of the partners]
Elsie: because Jack said,

Jack: Because as I said [pause] before that the, for the preparing for the final [pause] deliverables and most of them will be the e-learning portal, evaluations, and so for the technical teams it is important to be there, and to complete all the [pause] and to be able to react and to have all of the [pause] demo's and software.
James: Perhaps we can arrange the follow up meeting, after June in another venue? For example in Germany,
Desmond: It just means that it is very expensive for us
[Some own discussions take place]
James: Verona?
[Some own discussions taking place]
[pause]
[After coffee break]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*A.O.B*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: I guess reasons, unknown to me, but organisational reasons, we all stayed in different place
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Paul: I have always found that at meetings like this, that it would be nice to have all the participants staying at the same place, so you could use the times in the evening, if you wanted to for some informal contacts. SO, I would suggest for future meetings beginning
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Paul: maybe starting with the one in Madrid that if you try and make sure that all [pause] stay at the same hotel. We do not have to [pause] sit on each other's lap
[Laughter – Hazel, Mary and some others]
Paul: but it would be nice to just have the opportunity, that if we want that, to exchange some ideas, just some informal contact over dinner or over drinks, or whatever.
Jack: So, one question of this issue. Do you prefer to be close to the venue of the meeting?
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or
Fabian: or the hotel
Ronnie: which is please sufficiently accessible and is easy to
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and
Jack: ok, so the next question is how about the hotel for the kick off meeting, it was good enough? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: I think most of us
Paul: it was all right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: sorry
Elsie: IT was Alais mos?
Jack: Alais mos [pause ***(Sub-state 1.1)***]
Hazel: yes that was fine ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: That was fine, so we will try to have this one ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear some own discussions]

Source: 7/6/02 discourse chunk *date of next meeting* (3rd meeting) Appendix K

James: … We propose, after consulting with partner 9, we propose to the consortium, that to celebrate the next meeting in September, [pause] in Luevena
Mary: Lueven ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: in Belgium
Annie: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Desmond: yes, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Um, and [pause] and we also [pause] propose this meeting
[Can still hear whispering]
James: all [pause] or perhaps the 11th and 12, or the 18th and 19th, as we have to move several persons to Holland, from Holland to Belgium is not an additional cost for us.
Lucy: the 11th and the 12th, is a Wednesday and Thursday
James: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: so we will have very expensive tickets. Is it not possible to put it on the weekend?
James: the meeting?
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: Beginning on Thursday, and finishing on Friday
Someone: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: because to have an appex ticket,
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: you have to stay one night, from Saturday to Sunday
Mary: yes Saturday ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: to reduce [pause] the costs of the partners [pause] ok, 12th and 13th? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: ok 12th and 13th? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
James: or perhaps 19th and 20th, and perhaps this is to late
[Can still hear whispering]
James: if we have to modify several things
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: for the deliverables
Kenneth: I am at a conference, in Budapest on the 19th and 20th ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: 19th and 20th?
Some people say: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: 12th and 13th is available for everyone?
[Can hear whispering]
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Paul: Did we not just talk about um, [pause] having a Saturday night meeting?
(Sub-state 5.1)
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: so, I do not get it? You are now talking about a Thursday and Friday again, but in order to reduce travel costs, Lucy just pointed
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: that it would be good to have [pause] to have a weekend date. So what about Friday and Saturday?
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: we will
James: This is in the same line, with the proposal with partner 5,
[Can hear whispering]
James: in order to put the meetings, in [pause] Thursday and Friday, and [pause] um [pause] Saturday and Sunday?
[Can hear clicking]
James: is not available for the private companies, because [pause] we are not, it it, is not possible for the private companies, so, [pause]
Lucy: but we have a date on it
James: and what about Thursday and Friday?
Lucy: what about have the date on a Saturday? If we work the whole Friday, and like today, we have half a day on Saturday. Is this not possible?
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Can hear whispering]
James: sorry ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
Lucy: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James: I believe it is not ok for everyone, for [pause] for several partners
Paul: it is possible
James: Thursday and Friday?
[Can hear whispering]
James: Thursday and Friday, in the same way that we have [pause] that we have made today, for example?
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: but why not? I do not understand, why is it not possible to have Friday, and half of the Saturday, I do not get it
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Kenneth tries to speak]

James: because, because
Kenneth: because we do not agree on meetings at the weekends. I am sorry we are working long enough hours, without meeting ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: at the meetings as well. And there is absolutely no need to do so, [pause] and [pause] we should be able to hold these meetings during the week
[Can hear whispering]
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
James: ok, so [pause] trying to use Thursday and Friday?
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some others say yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: we will try to make it on Thursday
[Can hear whispering]
James: and try, to [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
James: What about the 12th and 13th of September
[Can hear whispering]
[Mary and Erin are whispering]
Lucy: Can you say it again?
James: 12 and 13th? [Says it slowly]
Lucy: good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: 12th and the 13th, yep, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Kenneth: I cannot be sure ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
James: ok, ok, so, [pause] thank you ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
(Sub-state 4.1)
[Can hear whispering]

Source: 13/12/02 transcript. Discourse chunk *Date for next meeting* (after 4th meeting) Appendix M

Jack: one more administrative] pause] the next meeting, sorry, I forgot, I do not know if it was decided, Hazel is not here, or the Germans, but we can at least talk about it, we can talk about a draft for the next meeting. You know that we usually [pause] meet every three months or less, so that will be [pause], now it is September, so it will be [pause] will be mid or beginning December. That is our first possible date, or January, or even [pause] beginning of February. As I can see here [pause] but [pause] the next deliverables after the ones we will send to the commission, at the end of September, we have a month 18 [pause] one in [pause] one in work package 3, that is the functional analysis and technical design of the tool, and that is the end of month 18, that is the end of February.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and one for work package 4 that is the portal design [pause] also, at the end of February. Here is the old version of
Kenneth: but you have until month 16 on the evaluation
Jack: two for the evaluation, one is now for the end, [pause] is the first evaluation for the portal, and the other is the first evaluation for the tool
[Can hear clicking]
Jack: Also for the month [pause]
Kenneth: 16
Jack 18
Kenneth: 16, is the end of the year, at the [pause] at the beginning of next year. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: So
James: if you put the meeting in January, you can handle both, the deliverables from month 17 to 18
Jack: so, January, we can meet
Annie: middle January
Jack: we can meet [pause] and before the date, the place, the [pause] we have been
[Ronnie whispering]
Jack: we have been two times, twice in Madrid, [pause] and in London, and in Paris, and in Lueven. And now we have [pause] Verona, and Burn, the Germans are not here, so we do not know if it is possible. [Gives a small laugh] So, it is their problems, so I propose. I already talk to you that [pause] it is ok. What about the other partners do you agree for Verona?
Ronnie: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[James laughs]
Jack: As they say now is the best time to see Verona. [Pause]
James: and anyway it will be better than Leven in that time
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, it is better than Leuven or burn
[Some people laugh]
Jack: ok, so
James: a suggestion for the dates?
Jack: in Verona and the dates?
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: to include a Saturday night for the price of cheap tickets
Jack: yeah, that is the same, [pause] discussion we already had. We can do Thursday, Friday, and if someone wants to use the Saturday night discount then they can stay. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: to use Wednesday and Sunday, it is possible for very low prices for the tickets
James: yes, but it means that the meeting on Tuesday and Friday
Translator: and Saturday for the low price
Jack: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: no, ***(Sub-state 1.2***
Jack: We have already had a discussion, we cannot do a weekend date, [pause] this is for the meeting, not all the partners can do it.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I think Thursday, Friday is the better choice
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: mhhmm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some others say yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, we have
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: 16th and 17th?
[Can hear whispering]
Lucy: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Thursday and Friday?
Jack: Thursday and Friday, yes, 17th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I guess we, [pause] is someone is mind, this date, 16th, 17th of January is impossible.
Ronnie: we need to check ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Ronnie: If you do not hear anything it is ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
(Sub-state 4.1)
Translator: on that day
Jack: sorry,
Translator: 17th is the Friday [pause] to fly the 17th.

Mary: it is a Thursday ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: it is a Thursday ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James: Then people should take an extra holiday
Jack: the 17th
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ah, Friday the 13th [gives a small laugh]
[Other laughs as well]
Jack: 17th on a Friday
Mary: is it unlucky?
Ronnie: it is not all
Jack: in Italy it is bad luck
Annie: ahh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in Spain it is Tuesday the 13th
Annie: Tuesday the 13th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some laughter]
James: ok, I do not think that we should pay attention ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some people laugh]
Jack: So, I think that is why our flights were so cheap
[Laughter]
Jack: this week, no one wanted to fly
Mary: to fly
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, so Morris and the translator told me Verona airport, in the partner 4
Translator: we can check for flying the best flight, we can give you the very [pause] for a direct flight to Verona, and it is cheaper flight from London to Brushia, it is only 50 minutes, and there is connection by bus, and it is very cheaper. And, with Brussels, you can use the [pause] you can use the Wygan and it is one hour 15minutes by train.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: never mention Ryan air.
Translator: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: this company, [pause] makes it very difficult, [pause] it makes you pay for a wheelchair and an assistant. So, [pause] at least do not publicise this
[Some people laugh]
Translator: I went to London with my daughter [pause] and
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and it was very very nice
Morris: she is lucky.
Translator: and there is a direct flight
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: with this, you can do some booking for the special price
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, I think administrative issues is finished.
James: I have to go now.

Supporting materials:

Message *36* sent by *Hazel,* on Monday, May 13, 2002 7:16 PM (After 2nd meeting, appendixn J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton left this extract blank when asked to validate a sample of my data.

Message *37* sent by *Partner 5* on Tuesday, May 14, 2002 8:34 AM (After 2nd meeting, appendix J) showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"unevenly distributed information"*. When Cramton was asked to validate a sample of my data, she said that it showed evidence of *"difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. There was no inter-rater reliability, when looking at this extract.

Guideline number: A17

Guideline type: Encouraging self-testing

Description:
Self-testing should not just take place when team members are together at a meeting.

- You are encouraged to continue self-testing by
  Sending URL's for WebPages, and
  Programs (either developed or found).

Rationale:

Self-testing is important as it allows you to gain an appreciation of what is being described. When you are offered the opportunity, you should take the chance.

Sources:

Source: Message *22* sent by *Hazel* on Tuesday, January 29, 2002 7:16 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *Dreamweaver*. Appendix G

Source: Message *8* sent by *Adam* on Thursday, March 28, 2002 10:39 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Project portal*. Appendix I

Source: Message *13* sent by *Mary* on Friday, April 19, 2002 5:40 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Authoring Tools*. Appendix I

Source: Message *14* sent by *Mary* on Friday, April 19, 2002 8:59 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Authoring Tools*. Appendix I

Source: Message *50* sent by *Adam* on Monday, June 03, 2002 10:53 AM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Browsers*. Appendix I

Source: Message *6* sent by *Adam* on Monday, September 30, 2002 9:54 AM (After 4th meeting). From textual *chunk Update on the project Portal*. Appendix M

Source: Message *23* sent by *Morris* on Saturday, January 11, 2003 4:10 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *HTML tutorial*. Appendix M

Supporting Materials:
Source: 17/12/01-transcript. Discourse chunk (*change to the agenda*) (1 st meeting) Appendix G

Charlotte: so if, who, would people find it useful to go over the technology and try it out for themselves?
Someone: Um
Someone: Um how
Ronnie: we could ask who needs to do it and then see
Paul: Right who actually wants to have some hands on work with the technology this afternoon, who needs that?
[Pause]
Charlotte: who would like to try the technology this afternoon?
[Muttering in the background]
Someone: all the technical partners
Charlotte: ok. 1-2-3-4-5, that is quite a number of people, did you two say yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ben: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: yes ***Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: ok. That is seven people and [pauses] so seven people would like to try the technology. Um I think that since today is the only time the technology available ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I understand that. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: we give people the time to do so
Desmond: the advantage would be that Peter has to leave this evening and I have to leave tomorrow at a quarter to twelve or one o clock and I could not be there
Hazel: can I
Desmond: tomorrow

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: can I, I go to a web address and try this out
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: switching of my screenreader
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and is there a web address where I can try this out?
Annie: yes, yes, the Comploabaras web. But Paul, I just wanted to say something. You are completely right, the technology is there. But what is not there, is this application of voice technology ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk *(Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Annie: what you can do is download a trial from our page and we can give you guidance to use it, so you can see our add value by yourself
Hazel: yes, but at the moment, you cannot even tell us that, while we are here in the meeting ***(Sub-states 1.1 and 2.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: so that is what we want you to
[Whispering]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Desmond: um, how big is the tool? Can you send it by e-mail to us?
Mary: Yes, and I can also include it on the website ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear some whispering]
Mary: and you can download it from the website
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: and there are also links in the report
Desmond: yes, yes that would be very good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Yes, in the report it includes the URL of all the ones, which are included ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: ok, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: you can find the webpages, the demo versions, most of the demo on the website.
[Some own discussions taking place]

Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Demonstration of partner 7's portal*) (3rd meeting). Appendix K

Annie: .... I don't know do you want to make any comments. Yes, many [laughs]
Paul: So, these instructions have been implemented using voice xml,
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and the plug in?
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: And now what happens, um [pause] is that the web site, or part of it, available someplace, so that it can be tried with just screenreader, because I would really like to know, what one of our screenreaders would do in that situation
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: because I just suspect
Annie: yes, sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

[Erin whispers to Mary]
Annie: yes, that is what we are explaining for you to do
[Erin raises her hand]
Annie: You give us the problems, and you can test the solutions with your screenreader
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: to see if it prevented or not
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: That is what we intend to say, when we say that we wanted feedback from the users
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: We have actually tested it with two screenreaders
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***Erin: we tested it with screenreader Jaws. My colleague Ned who is completed blind, tested both examples, examples 1 and 2. It was not quite as advanced as what it is today, as it was a few weeks ago, and I can since see that you have made some changes. Initially I think that example 2 worked slightly better than example 1, because it informed the user a lot more
[Mary whispers something]
Erin: but we tested with the plug in
[Can hear whispering]Erin: I think with one of the attempts we tried, we managed to get the plug in and the screenreader to read at the same time. That was when we did not turn the screenreader off.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: so in general, I think the radio buttons solved the problems of the problems we had in Jaws that when you navigate backwards
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: it does not tell you what radio buttons had been selected, but this time it did. So, that is something, which had improved over the screenreader And um [pause] there are other areas that need further improvements with the refound
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and I think the other thing, is that it needs to be tested with magnification
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: so, we tend to find things that have been centralized, and magnification makes it harder to find
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: So, if it is left centralized, it will be much easier for them to find it in there. I think the hardest thing is to turn of the screenreader, and to put it to sleep in the background
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and to inform how the screenreader can be put back on, because not all users know how to turn the screenreader on and off.
Annie: yes. That is why we said that they must be working together ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]

Annie: so, you do turn the screenreader off, but we still [pause] do not find out, how it can
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: be more comfortable for the user. How they are both working at the same time, and not being confused
[Mary puts her hand up]
Mary: Can I ask two questions.
Voice output: Welcome to the partner 7's page

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *Work package 3* development of the tool (review of work done since the last meeting) (4th meeting) Appendix M

Annie: .... Any questions?
[Mary raised her hand
Mary: Can I ask a question? Will we be able to access the prototype at any point? Will you be distributing it to?
Annie: yes, [pause] by, I think by the end of this month ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, excellent ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because it was in your planificaiton, yes
Mary: hmmm, you will be able to do that? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because right now, since you have to have so many things installed in your computer, it is quite
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: difficult to build
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: auto executable tables
Mary: ok, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and we are building it now and will distribute it.
Mary: ok, great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: by the end of the month
Mary: excellent. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Guideline number: A18

Guideline type: **Storing relevant documentation**

Description:

- All presentations, which are given during the meeting and any of other documentation of interest should be included for future reference in a place, which can store all relevant documentation in one place.
- The store should be available to everyone and have a meaningful structure and not just a linear list
- This can help team members to correctly access the documents that they are seeking, and not having to guess where the information may be found.

Rationale:
Documentation, which would be relevant to the team, should be shared. Placing them in a central place where everyone can have access can be useful. This 'central place'should have a logical store.

Sources:

Source: Message *3* sent by *Jack* on Thursday, December 27, 2001 5:33 PM (After 1st meeting). Fom textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *7* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM (After 1st meeting). Frrom textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *8* sent by *Hazel* on Friday, January 11, 2002 9:16 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *9* sent by *Hazel* on Monday, January 14, 2002 5:11 PM (After 1st meeting) From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *12* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, January 16, 2002 10:50 AM (After 1st meeting). Fom textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *16* sent by *Charlotte* on Monday, January 21, 2002 6:27 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *38* sent by *Fabian* on Wednesday, February 27, 2002 8:06 PM (After 1st meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *41* sent by *Jack* on Friday, March 01, 2002 3:29 PM (After 1st meeting).. From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix H

Source: Message *46* sent by *Jack* on Tuesday, May 28, 2002 5:27 PM (After 2nd meeting). From textual chunk *Review.* Appendix I

Source: Message *2* sent by *Jack* on Wednesday, June 12, 2002 11:16 AM (After 3rd meeting).. From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix J

Source: Message *17* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, June 21, 2002 12:13 PM (After 3rd meeting).. From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix J

Source: Message *18* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, June 21, 2002 12:20 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix J

Source: Message *29* sent by *Fabian* on Friday, July 05, 2002 10:46 AM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix J

Source: Message *35* sent by *Mary* on Wednesday, July 31, 2002 4:45 PM (After 3rd meeting) From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix J

Source: Message *42* sent by *Mary* on Tuesday, August 13, 2002 2:28 PM (After 3rd meeting). From textual chunk FTP site. Appendix J

Source: Message *7* sent by Mary on Monday, September 30, 2002 2:30 PM (After 4th meeting). From textual chunk *FTP site.* Appendix M

Supporting Materials

FTP contents
Source: 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Overview of the market for access technology*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Desmond: ... oh Jack you can have a copy of the presentation if you want ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yeah. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: yeah. You can copy it from disc to the computer, or I can send it to you ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or you can put it on the FTP [pause] address
Someone: put it on the FTP site
Jack: or mailing
Desmond: yes I will put it on the FTP site ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yeah. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Detelf: ok. Ok the complete hardware screen magnification software should be usable with any operating system. Sometimes it does not work but mostly it does work. [Pause] So, common features, magnification up to 16 x 32 times, um coloured version, they all provide and basic screen reader, screen reader functions for example Zoom Text or Una on Magic have integrated doc reader when you navigate through Windows. And um [pause] JAWs screen reader can be added to the application tool. I think most of the tools work together with JAWs. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*FTP site*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Jack: I am sorry to say this is still is the document list. I hope in the next month a lot of documents are sent by so, so we have life in our project. So in our project at the moment we have 14, from the management we already have a lot more documents included in this list and the ftp site. The presentations, amendments, CPS forms, so anything you will think is interesting.
[Desmond nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*FTP site*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Jonathan: Now I want to remind the other partners in the project that presentations must be placed on the ftp site.
[Annie and Christopher nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 as 2 people provides evidence)***
Jonathan: The objective is to share.

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Developing a plan of future work*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Hazel: so, I will be saying right have you done this action comment on this, right. So it will be more driven by the little tasks rather than the period of time. So I will produce a timeline, if I do not put it on the ftp site before Christmas, I will put it on the ftp site before the New Year.
[Annie asks Jonathan something, pointing at the whiteboard Hazel was writing on]
Hazel: and I will send an e-mail saying everyone must look this, because there will be deadlines for everybody. But do you feel with those five parallel actions w are beginning to get a [pause]
Ronnie: I think it's in the right direction. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Annie: and also explaining the different features that the plug in provides, like choosing the type of voice that you can have for your pages, for the text, the speech, but you will see this later on in our demo, and plus we have our initial draft of what we need to provide for output for our work package, and it is being filled up with a couple of screens, and it will be available on ftp site, as soon as we can.
Desmond: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: but more or less all of the documentation's is already available.
[Pause]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning presentation (work package) (* from 1st meeting) Appendix G

Hazel: excellent. [Hazel has a smile on her face when she is saying this] Well, I think that is really interesting information to feed into the project. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Is it possible to include the presentation on the ftp site?
[Own discussions]
Desmond: will you put it on the ftp site? Ok
Thomas: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation by Jack on work package 3*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: Also, it would be certainly nice for the rest of the partners, to be reminded of things like that in um [pause] through minutes. Maybe, it is, for some reason, I did not receive the London, the minutes of the London meeting.
Jack: it was sent and included on the ftp site ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: was it
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: was it on the ftp server?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Ok, sorry. My fault ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel gives a small laugh]
Jack: Maybe you did not receive it, because you were not on the mailing list
Paul: Maybe, I will go and check, but thank you ***(Sub-state 3.1)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Project dissemination: project brochure*) (2nd meeting) Appendix

Paul: Which paper are you referring to Hazel?
Hazel: this is a 2 page [pause] project brochure, which is being circulated.
[Some own discussions taking place]
Paul: Is that available electronically someplace?
Jack: it is not in the ftp but ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Fabian: no, it is not, but we will upload it, [pause] very soon ***(Sub-state 1.2)***

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *Work package 3 development of the tool (review of work done since the last meeting)* (4th meeting) Appendix M

Jack: while Geoff is preparing, I forgot to [pause] in work package 1, Hazel mentioned a paper in London
Hazel: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Mary sent that paper yesterday I think
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, now I think it is on the ftp [pause]

Jack: I asked you for [pause] and um [pause] and for the whole project, I can send you, the, whole lectra
James: yes, I think that makes sense ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: because you have only your part
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, ok, I will ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: you do not have to send it, if you put it somewhere on the ftp site, and we can download it.

Source. 13/9/0/2 Discourse chunk: *Administrative issues* (4th meeting) Appendix M

Mary: going to a conference, yes, an e-learning conference in November, in early November. And I actually tried to distribute the paper, and I do not know if anyone had any problems receiving it
Jack: ya, I received it [pause] um [pause] um, it was this Wednesday ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: and we put it on [pause]
Mary: great
Jack: onto the FTP
Mary: that is great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: You did not receive that e-mail?
Mary: the problem is [pause] I sent it to the entire consortium, but the paper is about 2 megabytes
Jack: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so, maybe the paper, so maybe everyone's server will not accept it. But if it is on the project server, maybe people can download it. It is zipped file and it is still 2 megabytes
Kenneth laughs]
Mary: I know. It is because it is a PDF, and it extends. Maybe I should include or send [pause] the word version, rather than the PDF. It is a word version, sorry, it is a word version

FTP structure

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*FTP site*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Jack: So, this is just an example of how the list of documents is, is structured.
[Christopher, Annie and Fabian are whispering]
Jack: It includes a number of, every document will have a number, the number is just the order we received and included in the list. It would have [pause] the title, so the name of the file, and, no, no, the name, no, no, the title is just explaining what the, what is in the file, and then the name of the file
[Lucy and Hazel whisper]
Jack: and the where can you find such a document, in what folder you can find the document. And, the date it was included in the list and what is the reading of the document, what organisation has sent it [pause] SO, now I think we have 54 documents, um [pause] 50 something documents
[Jack looks at Fabian for confirmation]
Jack: and were not included a lot of the documents which were sent in the last [pause] 3 days
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: easily
Mary: and the report, which I distributed, I did not put it on the web server
Jack: and of course, the list of documents is just in a root
[Hazel whispers to Kenneth]
Jack: folder of the ftp site. So, it is the first thing you find

FTP process

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Evaluation*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Jack: Send anything to me and I will include it in the list and on the FTP site. I will send an email to everyone to say that there is a new document and where it is. Well the FTP site, I sent you an address of the FTP site. I hope that it worked for everyone. I hoped that you have tried to reach it or even to try and get a document from there.
[Charlotte nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Guidelines to promote mutual understanding during a face-to-face meeting

Guideline number: D1

Guideline type: **Reference to terms, which are used**

Description:
To identify what important terms mean to different team members, so that everyone is working towards the same concept. . A project glossary may be useful.

Rationale:
Important for all aspects of communication and collaboration, particularly when you are working in a multidisciplinary team.

Sources:

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I
Mary: the main recommendations were to have accessible templates,
[Translator for Michael asks Hazel what is a template]
Mary: but, we have to make sure that the templates are accessible, and that the developments and the templates are accessible as well. And also, to include
[Hazel explains to the translator by whispering to him, what is a template]
Mary: all the actions that are included. And in terms of the accessibility of the course component, which are produced using authoring tools. We recommend that
[Can still hear Hazel whispering to Michael's translator what a template is]
Mary: the tools, which encourage the creation of text, if we want to includes images in other media in the course, which an authoring tool can do
[Translation to Michael what a template is]
[Hazel draws a diagram to show what a template is]
Mary: Also it can incorporate course content and instructions
[Can hear other people whispering as well]
Mary: in the environment. Also, the tool can incorporate guidelines, guidance on producing effective e-learning components that are accessible to all user. And they can also enable the synchronisation of all the accessibility. And, yeah
Charles: What do you mean by the accessible templates?
Mary: Right, these are
[Can hear Hazel talking about templates in the background as well]
Mary: I do not know if it will be helpful, but I mentioned to some of the other people here, that I have a trial version of one of the e-learning [pause] authoring tools, which has got a template as well. But, basically the templates are like forms for creating the tables
[Hazel nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: which are like multichoice questions, or form filled questions, or different types of questions, and they are very much like visual, visual forms. And, you need to select the components from a combo box or different kinds of box, and as they are very much like on dragging or dropping or clicking on things with the mouse, that makes them inaccessible.
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Mary: I don't know how maybe, or how we can avoid this.
[Can still hear whispering in the background]
Mary: or how the design features can be improved, or the forms need to be simplified, or just presented in a different form, which

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Partner 7 portal*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Kenneth: over and above what a screenreader already does, because, that page as it already stands, [pause] and correct me if I am wrong, it is potentially accessible by a screenreader like yours. So, this project has to do something new, something different. It has got to handle other material, and it has to handle it better. So, the reality is yes, we can certainly put, we can voicify, [pause] for a better word, this material. But, in the end we need to have something else, which in this moment, a screenreader is not going to handle well. And the question is what is that going to be. It has been suggested thoughout this, and it is not, entirely clear, because we get messed around a bit, with what we mean by an e-learning portal, because a portal would not normally contain any [pause] an e-learning portal would not normally contain courses itself, it would be a link to courses. But, if we say that we are going to have [pause] e-learning content on that, we actually have to decide, what is it, about that content, which is going to be [pause] which we are going to present in a way, which is going to be a significant improvement on what a screenreader would already do for us. That is the question. Now, if you are going to simply voicify a page, [pause] an e-learning page, you are still doing what a screenreader does. Now, if you are not going to do that, you are going to add content, you are going to make something different out of it, therefore you are building a different page, and we need to do that in the best way possible. So, the question, whatever way you look at this question, if it is going to simply be that we are going to voicify what we see on screen, then you are doing what a screenreader already does. And, there is nothing more than that, and we will have to re-design. [Pause]
Jack: yes, yes, this is the same, [pause] I remember, that we were discussing in Paris, I think it was Ronnie, where is the innovation here. And, at the end the answer was, that the innovation is the –learning ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: absolutely, therefore it has got to be innovative. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Lucy raises her hand]

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K
Kenneth: Yes, maybe we need to [pause] we all have a common understanding of what is being asked of here, because you used the word integration here, where, this is talking about ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: interaction
Kenneth: interaction, and as I can see, it is to do with [pause] understanding how, yes, a voice recognition system has to recognise a voice, and interpret the words. But, what happens especially in terms of this project that we are looking at any semantic or recognition as well. So, [pause] are we verging on the edges of natural language processing, [pause] we need to at least address that even if we are doing that or not. [Pause] um, and how does that, it is part of what we were talking about earlier on [pause] in terms of recognition, that some of this will [pause] the way that a speech interaction will work, will be different from a screen interaction. So, as we talked about this morning, with the radio buttons, there is some content alteration, which will be required. So, that is my translation of this, that it is some of the interaction, with voice in and voice out, and how the tool, how the plug in is going to help us with that interaction. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: but using voice xml?
Kenneth: based on voice xml, certainly, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: how does voice xml work with all this as well, but this is in part, because at the moment, we although, voice recognition is mentioned several times
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of differences in sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report*) is an example. Translator for Michael asked what a template was, and Charles asked what an accessible template is. It is important that these two questions were asked; otherwise this may have affected their understanding for the rest of the presentation.

Guidelines were also proposed looking at the same sub-states in a discourse chunk. 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*partner 7 portal)* is an example. Kenneth mentioned the word portal and characteristics of an e-learning portal. This was an important term to the project as it was used as part of their aims and objectives of the project.

Another example from 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) is when the terms interaction and integration are used.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D2

Guideline type: Communicating with the team

Description:
To make sure everyone speaks loudly, not too fast and clearly at all times, as English may not be the first language for all team members. If you are told that you are speaking too fast, repeat all of the information you said before the request was made. To also encourage silence when someone is talking, as background noise may be disturbing. Equipment, which is not in use, should also be turned off. To ask if someone can translate for you if you are unable to communicate yourself due to language difficulties. When communicating you must not assume that what you can see on the screen is the same as what others can see. You should not just point at information but also explain what you are pointing to for the benefit of those who cannot see you pointing. When acronyms are used for the first time, it should be explained in full (its name and some background information), so you are not left guessing what the acronym is representing.

Rationale:
Listening to people when they are talking is not an easy job. There are certain things we can do as a speaker to ensure that we can be heard properly at all times. The guideline above includes some simple steps. It is important that you describe things that you may be referring to as there may be people present who may not be able to see that information. This is important to create common ground with all of the people who are together. Acronyms are commonly used in communication, however to be able to recognise them and to be able to interpret them correctly it is important that the other person knows what the abbreviation represents.

Sources:

Speaking loudly and clearly

Source: 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussion*) (1st meeting) Appendix G
Annie: We at partner 2 say that we totally agree with you and were going to bring up that issue tomorrow that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Louder please, sorry
Annie: I will repeat all of it. I would say that from partner 2 we are, we agree with you. And we were going to bring that issue tomorrow, that we feel that maybe the coordination is not being tackled enough and that we are kind of, we need more follow up on the work we are doing each of us and more communication between us ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering in the background]

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months)* (1st meeting) Appendix G

...

Rudolofo: Can you speak a little bit louder please?

...

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 3)* (1st meeting) Appendix G

Ronnie: Can you please repeat, I did not catch your name?Fabian: [speaks slowly and clearly] My name is Fabain
Ronnie: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 1*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: ok, which questionnaire are we talking about? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: well it is a questionnaire partners 1 and 2, I think partner 6 [pause] I think we already have the answers from Desmond
Paul: I did not catch it, I just wanted to follow what you are talking about, that's all ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Fabian: ok ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Fabian: the dissemination plan, to use the plan for dissemination, exploitation plan for
Paul: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: ok and that's it ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 6*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Morris: How do you, how can you put the cursor in by the text?
Annie: how [pause] with a tab key
Charlesr: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: with what?
Annie: tab key [said slightly louder this time]
Charlesr: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering]
[Can hear speech output again]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 3) (2nd meeting)

James: Can you repeat the question please
Lucy: [Speaks louder this time]. I said when partners 5 or 7, we have to do the same work? To put in some people on an e-learning site, how shall we be able to pay such a fee, because we do not have a allowance in our budget, some money for that.
James: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Shall we write to you, and you shall send us money?
[Laughter: Paul laughs, Mary laughs and others join in]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation)* (2nd meeting)
Lucy: Excuse me, did you say, I did not understand well, I did not catch it well.
James: Yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Did you say some minutes ago, you will ask the commission to be able to begin two or three months before
James: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: the preparation of the portal?
James: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Should you write an official letter? [Pause] with agreement of all the partners?
[Pause]
James: Ok, yes this is a process that when we sent a letter or some official communication to the Commission, we must have to have the confirmation of all the partners. [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jack whispers something to Fabian]
James: and if anyone doesn't want to before
[Elsie says something to Michael]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Mary, yes, I have two questions. One, my first question is about work package three, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Louder please, we cannot hear
Mary: sorry,
Lucy: Louder
Mary: I will speak louder, thanks. MY first question is that when you developed the prototype, that you are going to show us, did you consider the requirements which came from Charles, and that are included in the report that came from partner 3. Did you consider the requirements for the authoring tools? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Conwayne says something to Annie in Spanish]
Annie: yes, we did consider those things, but they are prototypes of how you integrate voice ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: in an application, so they do not intend to solve the problems

Mary: sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: just to, yes, so they might not meet all the requirement
Mary: yep, but as long as you considered them that is good. [Pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and in terms of the commission, that is what we have to do, study the integration of voice in a web [pause] in a web environment
Mary: ok, ok, and my other question is about work package 4. …

Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Review of work by work packages 2, 3 and 4*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K
Mary: Can I ask two questions.
Voice output: Welcome to the partner 7's page
Jack: Annie
Mary: Annie
Voice output: push tab to enter,
Annie: I will show you
Jack: [speaks louder this time] Annie
[Mary tries to speak]
Voice output: and then press the ok button. Which HTML is used to create?
[Jack gets up an tells Annie]
Annie: sorry
Mary: Before we go to this example 3, I think I mentioned in my e-mail, in response to example 2, that I find it very slight difference in the way, that you navigate using the plug-in, with the way that people usually navigate using a screenreader. Because the navigation through the four options is through the up and down arrows
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: I think she has updated that
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Can you use that the tab to move between the two?,
Someone: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: because I think that is the standard at the moment
Erin: I think, I think you have just updated that
Lucy: please louder
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and the tabs as well.
Ronnie: we are that far away, we cannot hear you at all
Lucy: we cannot hear you ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: sorry. We have provided some feedback for the navigation
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and we were saying that normally, that the screenreader would normally navigate the
Annie: yes
Erin: page using the cursor keys
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: as well as the tab keys, and if you use a tab key it would not tab through everything on the webpage. It would say for example, only tab through links. It would not tab through paragraph text, and we were saying that screenreaders are used to doing that, and it is important for the plug in to have similar method of navigation
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes you are right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: you have made a few changes already since then
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Review of work by work packages 2, 3 and 4*) (3rd meeting) Appendix L

Adam: We are going to show the web portal
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: You must produce your voice, please
Thomas: So, we are going to present you the portal. Concerning the contents, we evaluated 75 sites. We used [pause] the checkpoints from WAI And we used the [pause] the Cynthia browser. So, [pause],

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Demonstration of partner 7's portal*) (3rd meeting) Appendix L
Mary: yeah. [Pause]. Can I say something in relation to this point? I think this is quite different to what has originally been specified for work package 4. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Mary can you speak up a little?
Mary: Yeah, sure. I just started by saying that what the commission has picked out from our report, is quite different to what we originally proposed to do in work package 4, which is the e-learning portal. Because we did not really talk about, interactivity ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: in the original objective, so, probably, we need to justify why we made the change, because that is clear, we decided to introduce that change based on the problems that came during the evaluations of the existing e-learning courses. And now, I think we have to decide how we are going to implement this change. And probably, the tasks which have been specified in work package 4, need to be clarified at this stage.
Jack: uh-huh. Yes, because in the very beginning, work package 4, was spent just as a demo***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) (3rd meeting) Appendix L

…

Ronnie: I am sorry, can I [pause] ask you, please, since English, is not our, our [pause] mother tongue, we have problems with understanding and translation. And, I would like to ask, you to please, to speak as clearly as possible, um [pause] to, to help us, a little bit
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: otherwise we loose, a bit of what you said.
Erin: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: slow it down a little.

…

Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 1*) (3rd meeting) Appendix L

…

Annie: can you speak a little bit louder?
Translator: what he is not clear, is that before [pause] when you studied the method, the blinds are able to use this method? [Pause] can they use that in the portal? The method of work? And in which way can the blind use this program? And the method [pause]

…

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *demonstration of the prototype* (4th meeting) Appendix M

Translating information

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk – *Demonstration of partner 7's portal* (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Morris: I am going to present the presentation by Adam

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *review of work package one* (4th meeting)

…
[Morris raises his hand]

Hazel: Morris? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: chapter 1
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: when you asked us to incorporate the requirements, you should have seen e-mail earlier on this week, we were not clear, on what to expect from us, what we did. I am speaking on Adam's behalf for language purposes
Mary: hmmm, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
...

Asking for silence/reducing background noise

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

[Some own discussions taking place]
Annie: what I would like to say is that in general the developer
Someone: shh
Annie: the [pause] for the web authoring tool, is to make a web authoring tool, that allows the developer of web pages, to follow, and to help him build pages, that help him to follow the pages, and the WAI and also that also integrates voice on your pages. That is what we have in mind at least, but if you have something different, that you have in mind, so can say it now.
[Own discussions taking place]

Source: 7/6/02 discourse chunk *presentation on discussing plans for deliverables in Work package 1* (3rd meeting) Appendix K

...
Mary: Jacj yesterday emphasized that we need to produce a preliminary version of D1.1
[Can hear whispering]
Someone: shhhh
...

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months)* (1st meeting) Appendix G
Ronnie: Sorry can we make this thing off
[Ben and Fabian give instructions on how to turn it off]
[Kenneth gives instructions as well]

Explaining what you are showing
Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation – partner 8*) (2nd meeting) Appendix H

Mary: It was called making web pages interactive, and it basically covered areas of how to code and develop frames
[Ronnie whispering to Lucy]
Mary: for Java pages. It also included textual information and some html codes, which were again explained.
[Whispering – Lucy, Ronnie and Desmond]
Mary: questions at the end of each unit, and you can see at the bottom right corner, one of the questions, which the participants were asked
[Example of not communicating effectively as visually impaired people will not be able to see the screen]
Mary: The pages were quite linear, they were structured in a [pause] linear way, it was sequential, and the participants were able to go through the course in a way that was suggested by the designers. Um, during the observation we noticed
[Whispering – Lucy and Ronnie]
...

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation – partner 8*) (2nd meeting)

Mary: this is a problem, every student can encounter, it is not applicable to visually impaired students. The answers, the [pause] the feedback given to the students after answering the questions was very often ambiguous, because they [pause] the feedback was given in a graphical and [pause] a textual [pause] let me see if I can go through this here and show you
[Mary starts pointing to the screen]
Mary: So when you click on the submit bit, the button, if the answer was true here there would be a click here and a cross here, and here would be a box explaining what the answer was. But there was a textual or audio output for whether it was correctly answered or not
[Annie and Charlesr whisper]
...
...
...
Annie: and the page we would have created would have looked like this
[Own discussions taking place]
[Can hear output via speaker]
Annie: This is what the page would say and how the code would look like

Supporting readability

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Mary: and the last question is to study the accessibility of the mark, of all the content that is produced using these authoring tools, and asking the question, do these tools encourage these authors to develop accessible e-learning components. So, there are two different types of accessibility. From the review we found that there are currently a wide, [pause] can you read that at the end? Just about
Hazel: just about ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: sorry.
[Hazel laughs]
Morris: no, I cannot read that. ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Hazel laughs again]
Mary: sorry about that. It is the ignorant party.
[Mary laughs and so do some other partners].

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Charles's presentation, partner 9*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Desmond: can you zoom in a little bit for us
Ronnie: I hope you will describe everything, I hope.
Charles: everything ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Paul, Hazel and some others laugh]
Charles: everything that I can think off. [Pause] I go back to the basics, right from the beginning
Hazel: Right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Using acronyms

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Dissemination activities)* (1st meeting) appendix H
Jack: This is the association for paragerpelic and other disabilities. So it was more focussed on parepheblics, but also for blind people and kids with down syndro
[Hazel and Charlotte correct Jack by saying down syndome] ***(Sub-state 2.1 x 2 people provides evidences)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Dissemination*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Jack: well, this, I do not know, if it is work on co-ordination or work package 6, some dissemination that has been done, using co-ordination group or whatever, this [pause] this was already in the kick off, we sent a lot of press [pause] releases and there was a lot of [pause] echo in the media. Now since last February, finally we were in the European Conference of new Technologies and Disabilities and Mr Cattani was [pause] giving a speech there and we had a stand [look s at others for confirmation]
Lucy: stand ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: stand there showing, talking about the project. This was organised by the Spanish presidency of the European Union. This is in the near future in May we have been invited to talk about the project, in our European seminar on Technologies and disabilities [pause] we are going to have a paper in the IBC, in September ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Sorry, what is the
Jack: and this is not complete
Hazel: what is the IBC stand for?
Jack: Ah, Telecommunications [pause] Congress in Amsterdam. IT is in the year [pause] This is know it is Thomas, [pause] will assist in Austria, intentional conference on helping people with special needs

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in discourse chunks. An example of this was on 17/12/01 in the meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussion)* (first meeting, appendix G) when there was a request for the speaker to talk more loudly as hey could not be heard. In order to have reduced the problem of unevenly distributed information all the information which was said before a request to speak louder was made was repeated.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – Work pacakage 1*) is an example of when a request was made to repeat some information as it had not been heard the first time it was said.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done - work package 2)* is an example of when a question was asked and the response which had been given was in a slightly louder tone of voice than what was being used when delivering the presentation to the rest of the team members. This was also the case in 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazels's presentation, partner 8)* when a question was asked and the response was given in a louder voice to assist with hearing what is being said.

15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Charles presentation, partner 9*) when Desmond, who is visually impaired asked for the slide to be zoomed in. Ronnie who is blind said he hopes that everything that will be shown will be explained.

In 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Review of work by work packages 2, 3 and 4*); a request was made for Mary to speak loudly. She acknowledged the request and spoke louder, including information she had said before the request had been made as well. There was also evidence of this in 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Review of work by work packages 2, 3 and 4)* when Lucy and Ronnie informed the speaker they had problems hearing them talk. There was also evidence of this in 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report)* when Mary was asked to speak louder, which she did, repeating what she had said before the request had been made as well.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 1*) when a request was made to speak clearly and slowly as English is not their first language, and speaking too fast can result in some difficulties in understanding what is being said.

12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *review of work package 1* there was an example of having someone translate information to the team, based on information which was shared during e-mail communications which they were not very clear about.

Guideline was also proposed when there were differences in sub-states in a discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – Work package 6*) is an example when Paul asked a question, simply in order to be able to follow what was being discussed as he had not heard it, the first time that it was said. Also, 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) when the speaker was asked to repeat the information which had been said by them.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report)* when asked by Mary if they could see the information on the screen and Desmond who is in the team and is visually impaired said that he could not see properly and asked if the text could be enlarged.

This guideline was proposed when no evidence of the sub-states were applied to the data as well. 18/12/01 discourse chunk (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months*) and (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 3*) is another example when a request to talk louder was made. 7/6/02 discourse chunk *presentation on discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1* when someone said shhh so that they could hear what was being said by the speaker.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk – *Demonstration of partner 7's portal* is another example of where the guideline was proposed that you should ask someone to translate for you if you are unable to communicate to the rest of the team in particular language. There was no evidence of the sub-states applied to the discourse chunk which had been identified.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Demonstration of partner 7's portal)* a request was made for Thomas to increase his voice, which he actioned on and spoke louder after this request had been made.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) is an example when there was a request for their to be silence whilst a discussion was taking place.

18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months*) when Ronnie made a request for the over head projector to be turned off, as it was making too much noise. Instructions on how to achieve this were given by some of the other team members.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation, partner 8)* when Mary was delivering a presentation and showing information, which would not have been appreciated by thosethat are either visually impaired and or blind, and doing the same thing again in the same discourse chunk.

18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Dissemination activities)*asking what an acronym was representing, is an example which shows that to use acronyms effectively, the abbreviations must be explained. There was also example of this in 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Dissemination*)

12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *demonstration of the prototype* is another example when a request to speak more loudly was made. Lastly, 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *demonstration of the prototype* is an example of when failing to explain what you were being shown is.

Evidence of Cramton's indicators

6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Review of work by Work packages 2/3/4*) when Lucy made a request to speak louder, was potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"unevenly distributed information"* as everyone was not able to hear the same information. There was a repeat of this indicator when Luccy again requested another speaker, Erin this time to speak louder (there were some other examples of this as well as can be seen in the examples included above, for example evident in the Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) from the same day of the meeting when Paul made a request for Mary to speak louder). Cramton was not asked to validate this as only a sample of data was given.

There was also potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"Difficulty in communicating the salience of information"* on 12/9/02 in the discourse chunk: *review of work package 1*, Appendix M. This was identified when Morris informed the team that when he was speaking on behalf of Adam, they were unsure of what they were being asked to do. This shows that there was a higher salience for the person making the request, than whom the request was being made too. Cramton had not been asked to validate this particular extract, as only a sample had been provided to her for validation purposes.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation, partner 8)* when Mary makes reference to specific information which is shown on the slides, showed potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"Unevenly distributed information"*. When Cramton looked at this extract she said it showed evidence of *"Failure to communicate contextual information"*, showing that there was no inter-rater reliability when looking at this particular extract.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation, partner 8)* when Mary starts pointing at the screen projecting her slides, showed potential evidence of *"unevenly distributed information"*. When Cramton was asked to validate this extract she did not write down anything.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report)* when Mary asked if the slides she was showing could be seen, I interpreted this as potential evidence of Cramton's *indicator "Unevenly distributed information"*. Cramton did not include what this extract showed evidence of when she was asked during the validation exercise.

There was also potential evidence of Cramton's indicators *"unevenly distributed information"* and *"Difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Unevenly distributed information as if you are blind you will not be able to see what they are referring to if it is being shown visually and no description of what is being shown. Difficulty in communicating the salience of information as there may be differences amongst the person delivering the person and the person receiving the information. Cramton had not been asked to validate this, as a sample was only given to her.

Guideline number: D3

Guideline type: **Establishing who would like to speak next**

Description:

Introduce a system to inform the team that you would like to take the next turn to speak. This is important, as everyone may not be able to see that you have raised your hand, especially if you are blind and/or visually impaired. Clicking your fingers is one technique, which can be used. It is important that everyone knows that this is the cue that you are using, so those team members can make sure that they acknowledge this when you use it.

Rationale:

Introducing a system to organise turn taking can be effective, especially when you cannot see when someone raises their arms etc, to indicate that they would like to speak next.

Sources:

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – Work package 6*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

James: which would be the point of view of you, to, be possible to have one page which would be technology of the project - um, the role of the application is to provide the content and after that it would be provided by both partners 1 and 2. This is the conclusion that I would like to give.

[Can hear Kenneth whispering]
[Paul clicks his finger's to draw attention]
James: sorry, we are going to provide the content in which format? in html or
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yes, and after that to make voice xml and to then carry on with the technological partners ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear Kenneth whispering]
[Paul clicks his fingers again]
Paul: um, so, if I understand you correctly you want to identify a page, a page that is already there?

James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: a page that um [pause] a page that will make it accessible through the voice xml tool and so that we can use that page with the voice?[Can still hear whispering]
Paul: Is that what you want, to take an existing page
[Kenneth is whispering]Paul: Is that, is that what you want? To take an existing page and to let them know if it is accessible or not?
[Fabian nods his head and says yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Hazel: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear Kenneth whispering]
Paul: or is it accessible through voice?
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Hazel: yes, you can add partner 8 to that list, we will be happy to have some pages in voice
[Can still hear some whispering]
Jack: Right now for the next three months, we can do for one ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: right ok, I thought you wanted some volunteers ***(Sub-state 1.2)***[Mary laughs]
[Some others laugh as well]...

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 6*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: and they all got the best approach which is the [pause] for um all of us, not just representing a single national organisation.
[Morris puts his hand up]
Morris: I just wanted to know what are you, what do you expect from us, as the pages are already there?
James: yes, no what I, what we expect is to have one pause] one person which is, the one contact person which is able to provide the contents and to make the elements and to obtain the confirmation that it is possible to make, to this voice xml, this visual um accessible to web pages for everybody ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kenneth is whispering]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 6* (2nd meeting) Appendix I

[Someone says thank you]
[Elsie puts up her hand]
Elsie: I have a question, um for the dissemination plan that you partner 7 is responsible for to transfer, I would like to know when exactly you need to see this, to see our contribution, because as Ronnie said next week we are going to Madrid, so if it has to be done before, and all participants have to contribute, I would say to send it to my email, so that I can work on it during the weekend, or something
James: Ok, I might, from my personal view is that you might need some contribution in order to write in your document. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Annie: I will now show you a demo in Spanish. So, you can see that it is multiple language. We only have English and Spanish version [Can hear speech output in Spanish]
[Mary says something to Kenneth in a whisper]
Annie: yes, well, here we have, we are going to make a, a example in Spanish, of the plug in synthesis system. And, um [pause] here you can see how Compalabras is dynamic. It is not like screenreader. Because it has many pairs, not just plain text
[Jack whispers something to Thomas]
Annie: it is not a real webpage, I still do not have a clear, um an input page which asks you to write a message, and I am going to write something in Spanish.
[Paul clicks his fingers again]
Annie: requirements for the message? And I will ask him to read a cover [Can hear speech output in Spanish]
[Laughter]
Fabian: it says I like the beach
[Laughter again - Elsie, Charlesr, Charles, Morris and Fabian]
Annie: and you can write any text in here
[Can hear speech output again in Spanish]
[Paul clicks his fingers]
[This is not acknowledged and Annie continues with her presentation]
Annie: yes, yes, in this image we have a woman who says something when I drag the mouse over him [can hear speech output – speech is in Spanish]
Annie: I can stop, I can [pause] stop the reading, I just place the mouse outside the image [Can hear speech output]
[Whispering]

Annie: so, you kind of have some control over the text. Um [pause] here I will show you how you can choose the gender and the age for the voice which is going to be the output. I will write another message
[Whispering]
[Morris and Ronnie laugh]
Annie: I will use a female gender, and [Can hear speech output in Spanish]
Annie: and if I choose another type of voice [can hear speech output in Spanish]
Annie: and a child voice [Can hear speech output in a child's voice]
Annie: well it is a cleaner voice
[Laughter]
[Can hear the speech output in the child's voice again]
Annie: so that will be the, how you can select and customise voice output

[Paul looks fed up]
Annie: yes
Paul: This is all very interesting, but I mean, we [pause] already know all that. That is already there, so what have you, you for example, do all this changes by voice control, or I mean use the different elements on the screen by voice control. But this is just, this is [pause] you know, our daily bread and butter. At least it is for blind people, that is what we are doing all day. ***(Sub-states 1.1 and 2.1)***
Annie: yes, well, not, I know, I think, um, I do not know how you work, but I think we are trying to show how screenreaders are ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Annie: I thought, but maybe we were misunderstood
Hazel: I think I said the opposite in fact at the London meeting, that you have to be careful that screenreaders can do these things ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Hazel: can do these things, now
Kenneth: so long as the forms are set up ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
(Sub-state 5.1)
Kenneth: in a way that works with the screenreaders
[Whispering]
[Charles puts his hand up]
Charles: There is one thing, which is possible with Compolabaras as a screenreader and what is can do So, for example when you fill in a form
[Whispering]
Charles: and when you tab to the send key
Lucy: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: compalabaras and the functions. which are available for it
[Whispering]
Charles: can [pause] prompt for confirmation, confirmation and repeat your answers, before it
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: can submit your answers
Mary: oh, right [Mary nods her head as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Charles: that is what screenreaders can't do
Hazel: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhhh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: so, I think you need to be very precise about what [pause] the new system can offer. That is what I asked you before, ho w did you know to say [pause] description I think you said
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: that
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Hazel: your system could
Kenneth: hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: you could offer
Annie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: that a screenreader could not offer, to tell the user you can now
Annie: yes, you can have that in your page***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear Ronnie whispering]
Annie: have
Hazel: uh-huh, uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: somewhere at the beginning of the page it tells you
[Can hear Lucy whispering]
Annie: you can say description together
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: further description of the image
Hazel: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: but we have not developed that
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but you could presumably
Annie: no, no, of course
Hazel: right
Annie: that would be very easy ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: of course your pages must be accessible
[Ronnie is whispering]
Hazel: yes, of course. I appreciate that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering]
Desmond: well as far as I understood it, the difference between those two solutions, is the screenreaders are using Compalabras plug in and the screenreader is always setted up on a webpage, it comes from one side and
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: and the solution for the Compolabaras is in the webpage
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: because as I understand it it is not [pause] something compalabaras delivers. It is something that maybe xml standards deliver
[Whispering – Jack speaking to James]
Desmond. Do you understand what I mean?
[Kenneth is whispering to Hazel]
Desmond. with the kind of coding, you cannot do it with compalabras. The recognition for example of all the tables, or formula of these things, it does not produce an end code to tell me that
Annie: yes, yes
Desmond: a formula
Annie: yes, it does ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: yes, it is not compalabras telling me there is a formula ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: No, compalabras is interpreting it through the voice xml tags ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: ok. That is the difference, a screenreader recognises that ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Hazel whispering to Kenneth]
Desmond: in the same way
Annie: yes [Annie then says something to Charlesr] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Fabian and James whispering]
[Paul clicking his fingers]
[Some own discussions taking place]
[Paul clicking his fingers again]
[Paul clicking his fingers again]
[Paul clicking his fingers again]
[Paul clicking his fingers again]

Desmond: Paul wants to say something
Paul: my question is, hopefully sometimes many pages will be, if the pages are set-up according to WAI standards in html, they are rendered accessible by screenreaders. Now, in order to [pause] give this extra functionality that, that voice xml provides, that means that the pages have to be [pause] prepared for that. Now will developers of web content actually go so far and do that, and conform to WAI standards and html? Plus add some extra um [pause] voice xml features. Because is that really realistic? That is one question. The second question that I have, and that as far as my understanding of this project is that we want to try and place this extra functionality that voice xml offers, into particularly e-learning situations where it would make maybe e-learning experience more [pause] profitable and beneficial. So, isn't that the way [pause] that things should be going in this project, or do you actually for free that a majority of webpages will be [pause] um fitted out that way, with the necessarily voice xml tagging?
[Annie nods her head and looks at Charlesr] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charlesr and Annie and whispering to each other]
Annie: yes, if you do not have voice xml tagging, the plugin will work, but will be the same as the screenreader does, but if you [pause] want your developer to create webpages with voice xml, then they will have to [pause] what they foresee is that they will have to use the web authoring tool they intend to create for this project. And, it will help them for example to add [pause] an image to the page, and will make that image accessible according to the way recommendations, and it will say aloud, something, a description of the image, and it will make easier for the developers to make a [pause] this page um accessible, the web authoring tool that we are going to develop. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kevin sitting with his arms on the table]
Ronnie: I would like to, [pause] very humbly suggest to you, to actually get in contact with the [pause] um, hompage, they have a technical button and they will be able to show you um home in your own language, and um, in your
[Whispering]
...

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Ronnie: Now the philosophy of the project is something very clear. The philosophy of the project is that someone has an idea and this idea is made practical is
[Translator translating for Michael]
Ronnie: is um something to touch and use
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Morris and Elsie are sitting with their arms folded]
Ronnie: and then the touchers and the users arrive and say [Oh it is good – This is said in a silly voice or no – this is said in a silly voice]
[Hazel laughs and nods her head]
[Some others laugh as well]
Ronnie: This is the view of the project. You cannot enter a room and say and as the user what will you need people
[Mary whispers something to Hazel]
Ronnie: because the people do not know exactly where they have to put their answer.
[Mary whispers something to Hazel]
Ronnie: So the philosophy of the project is, is to come with the project. And the reality of the project is to discuss, to test, develop together. The other way round is not productive, I am sorry for this.
[Hazel and Mary still whispering]
Ronnie: it is the project
[Paul clicks his hand]
Paul: if you tell us users what [pause] what voice xml can do, in addition to what we already get from our screenreaders, then we can maybe tell you that yes this feature would be nice, that feature will be nice
[Hazel and Kenneth nod their heads and say hmmm] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 4 –spoken and non verbal evidence from 2 people)***
Paul: Or we do not need that. But you have to, you have to build on what is already there.
[Translator for Michael is translating]
Paul: So you know what current screenreaders can do and now you have to show us, the advantages for voice xml, which I am sure are there. But, I mean we are ignorant users.
[Hazel and Kenneth nod their head] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences, from 2 people)***
[Charles did not get to talk even though he put his hand up]
Hazel: So. partner 3 did the document in January listing the problems, and you can se those by using Jaws. So we need to know what [pause] what are you proposing to add to that
[Kenneth whispering]
Charles: I will just show text jobs, which
Hazel: right, right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: they are the kind of things I had in mind. Um and would like some comment on that. I out that on the mailing list
Hazel: that's this
Charles: it's that one ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: which one was that?
Charles: its title is what voice can do for visually impaired
[Translator translating for Michael]
Paul: oh yeah, but that was only circulated yesterday or the day before ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: oh right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel laughs]
Charles: I sent a first version at the beginning of February to the technical partners, I expected comments but I did not get anything
Ronnie: to get the xml portal to [pause] I did not get the opportunity to read it because, because I was not in the office but [pause] I do not think it is possible to read it now
[Kenneth whispering]
Ronnie: Maybe you should give to all of us a time to read the written research
Mary: maybe tomorrow?
[Hazel laughs]
Charles: It will be nice to have some comments now, sometime sooner
[Hazel laughs]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

James: Regarding when I have listening to the presentation of partner 8,
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Paul: Can I just say something?
[Lucy indicates she wants to speak]
Paul: no, you go ahead. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: Ok, when I have listening to the presentation of partner 8 I have observed that

[Whispering between some of the partners]
James: that some of the training, the e-learning courses that you have the contact is Mindleaders
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and in this moment you have
[Still some whispering in the background between some of the partners]
James: [pause] to put on the table that it is not necessary to buy some of the courses
Mary: No, no it is not ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation (2nd meeting) Appendix I

James: So, this is the way, the only way that we observe in the moment that we can in order to solve the situation
[Paul is clicking his fingers]
James: and any additional alternatives, we are willing to listen.

Thomas: What about the content?
James? The content? Ok, regarding the content ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone knocks on the table to draw attention]
[Whispering between some of the partners again – mainly Annie and Charlesr]
James: Regarding the content, the first step is to start with some work from user
[Can hear whispering amongst some of the partners]
James: available by voice, so in this sense, like we said in the morning we are going to collaborate with partner 7
[someone says yeah] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and after that if it is possible to add any additional features for e-learning capabilities we are going to do
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: If it is possible in this short time we have in front of us
[Can hear whispering]
James: So, what is clear is that the first step is to have partner 7 webpage, accessible by voice
Thomas: by voice?
James: yes, yes of course. So, the first step is to have this webpage available ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Paul has a smile on his face]
[Can hear whispering]
James: If we have time we are going to provide some
[Mary whispers something]
James: calls, calls coming from my leader, another provider
[Can hear whispering]
James: and we are going to include in this trial web page of the partner 7, some content which was considered for the [pause] for the user. So, the first step is to have
[Elsie sitting with her arms crossed]
Paul: which is even preferable since, we have to create an e-learning portal, within the framework of this project anyway, that we find some sort of content that is suitable and to make our own sort of e-learning portal, which we have to do anyway.
[Someone says uh-huh in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: we have to do it anyway. Partner 1 will have to create, if I understand the contract correctly, that they have to, they will have to create an e-learning portal anyway.
James: Yes, but for the seven, for the twenty seventh month what we are casting, in this table, is the weeks, [pause] at this moment, following the commission to close the project. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear some whispering]
James: So, if we are able to pass the evaluation process in July,
[Can hear whispering]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Hazel: But, but, did you not put some money aside for consumables? We just took money out of our consumables.
Lucy: how?
[Morris puts his hand up]
James: Yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Yes, please. Um, [pause] I think Hazel is right, and I would like to raise the point further, because, the idea we had this morning, to have a system tried on [pause] the partner 7 website. With this idea we will face the same concerns as this morning, we will not reduce it [pause]. [Pause] But what would be an advantage is to try Compolabras, or a site, which is reasonably accessible to all sites, designed by blind organisations, because the level of awareness makes it that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering between Annie and Charlesr]
Morris: with our websites, is that they are way conformant, and one way forward with this would be maybe to work on a site
[Hazel whispers something to Mary]
Morris: um, a mainstream sites, um like this, which is not particularly accessible, and I thought this was the original idea. To see what [pause]
Lucy: voice xml
Morris: voice xml and compalabras can do solve certain problems of accessibility, which [pause]
[Whispering in the background]
Morris: without going out of our way. So, I would suggest that we look for another [pause] type of text website.
Hazel: and it is not just the website, it is an e-learning site
[Annie nods her head and says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
[Whispering]
Paul: ok, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: I say that not only because that is the core of the project
[Whispering in the background]
Hazel: but actually, because I think that would be the quickest way to show the added value. I think that is the interactivity
[Whispering]
Annie: and the users are going to [pause] to use the e-learning courses?
Hazel: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: E-learning is, um [pause] I am just a bit concerned that this morning we said we would not have the time in the three months to come,
[Whispering]
Morris: so that would be a good compromise.
Hazel: No, that is why, I am saying we use already existing ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: existing
Morris: yes, ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Lucy: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: e-learning
Morris: e-learning sites
Hazel: e-learning sites. And later in the project we develop our own. We start ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

James: My suggestion remains the same this morning, that I am going to have a view to create a real case, a webpage accessible for [pause] for people using voice technology
Lucy: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and indicating one of the following points will be according to the contract to create an e-learning portal, [pause] an e-learning portal.
[Ronnie tried to say something]
James: Ok Paul
Paul: Judging from what we have been talking about now, I get the impression that we [pause] want to look at different e-learning sites and different e-learning activities to begin with. So, if we want to do that, come up with our own e-learning portal later then I really think what we should do, the first thing is to try and
[Can hear someone whispering]
Paul: to try and make an existing portal, as we agreed this morning
[Can still hear some whispering]
Paul: accessible though voice xml. So, that is where I think we should [pause] stick to what we decided this morning, and then decide on some timeframe, as part of the partner 7 development, of the e-learning portal, after that. We should also maybe, to have some sort of something to show to the commission that if we ever come so far
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: to do something, probably with the partner 7 website, because it would be something which would be beneficial to, to a number of people, and it would not just be one national user organisation. So, I think we should, yes, I would agree that we should stick to this morning's decision.
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: could there be

Paul: For the firststage
Hazel: Could there be an extra page put on the partner 7 website for the project that is, that shows [pause] the beginnings of what an e-learning portal would look like.
Paul: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: which has links for example, particularly if you have [pause] if you can make an arrangement with Mindleaders, that it could be a portal to the Mind Leaders material.
Paul: Yes that would be a good idea. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Annie says yeah and nods her head as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Morris: it is better to have it validated by partner 7. We have very good experts [Laughs]
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Ronnie: It will be much more security for
James: yes, yes, but I am thinking about the first contact. We are not going to call seven different persons. The first contact will be Adam. He will see if they are suitable. We are going to be in contact with the different contact person ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: [pause] different users
Morris: I do not agree with you, we have a communication, it should not be a problem. I think it should be collated work. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: I see much more work as co-ordinating work.
James: Ok, so perhaps, from each user organisation one contact point? It has been made with Adam and partner 7
[Some whispering]
Ronnie: I think the co-ordination will be [pause] will be suitable, not involve all possibilities, as you want
[Annie and Fabian whispering]
Paul: You have the co-ordinator. So, you have the contacts
Ronnie: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: So, what you really need now, is just to make sure that what we are doing, is to start with the first steps towards the e-learning portal and the partner 7 site, or just the possibility to take it from there. Plus, I would like to come back to what you said about Mindleader's before. You wanted to place a link to Mindleader, so that maybe we could make use of the contract if it is still valid, we could all make use and try out the e-learning experience that they um make available.
[Fabian has a pen in his mouth]
Paul: But what I would like to know if whose responsibility is it, to have that out in the open
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: whose responsibility is it? It is partners 1 and 2
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: to start this e-learning portal. The very first steps on the partner 7 website? Will it, is that the way it works?
James: So, [pause] the responsibility of this activity is of the partners who are working on that. [James looks at his sheet of paper] So, according to my information, both partners 1, 2 and 9 and partner 7. Uh-huh, that is the information that I have, and is displayed in the contract.
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: So, this is the initial responsibility of us. And the work is the responsibility of the global project, and everyone on this table is able to participate on that.
Paul: I realise that, but I just wanted to clarify that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: that's fine, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Ok. [Pause]. More or less that is the work of this work package.
[Some own discussions taking place]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I
[Morris is clicking his fingers]
...
[There was no recognition of Moriris clicking his fingers to indicate that he would like to speak]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning presentation (Work package 1)*) (2nd meeting)
[Morris puts his hand up]
Jack: Morris ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: You can ask us because even in the time, [pause] in front of us
[Someone says uh-huh in the background]
Morris: even with the fact that we identified, one major feature, which is [pause] that voice provides a high level of natural interactivity. And, I think that if we want to show something, it should be based on this very last finding, or
[Paul has a smile on his face]
Morris: um, adding just a page of text, with, Umn websites of e-learning, on e-learning. There is not really fit for doing this idea, in this morning
[Lucy nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: So, I think we should, we should adapt it to what we said this morning, and find something where we can show the advantage and that should be something where we need this natural interactivity to be shown
[Jack nods his head and says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2, spoken and non-verbal evidences)***
Jack: um, ok
Ronnie: very good ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice)* (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Hazel: obviously, I just wanted to say, this one just came to mind
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear some individual comments about the agreement]
Hazel: but then, we could, I think you should still make the partner 7 webpage voiced, I think that would be
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: I think that is a good action, and idea But then [pause] when we were talking yesterday we talked about ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Paul is clicking his fingers]
Hazel: but the idea of having of the web partner 7 page , we add another page
[Paul nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: which is the portal
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Now one thing maybe we can have their, is information for authors, e-learning authors about making e-learning materials accessible to visually impaired people
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and we could have some of these examples to show the problems, and then the project solution, if, [pause] if you are doing, well,. [Pause] whether they are all about e-learning or not I keep changing in my mind, so I keep talking about e-learning [gives a small laugh] but it also applies to other areas of the web, maybe we should stick to e-learning But, [pause] if you have a multiple
[Paul clicks his fingers again]
Hazel: choice test or whatever it is, or was
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and this is what the problem was
Annie: this is the solution
Hazel: this is how voice can help. So, I think [pause] for the moment, I think that would be a good thing to start on and having on the portal, and to show at the review, in Brussels. And it would be a good thing for the portal to have in the long run anyway ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Paul: yes [Nods his head as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2, spoken and non-verbal evidences)***
Hazel: information for all authors
Annie: Now I have a much clearer idea
Hazel: yes, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: it is now more concrete to work on
Hazel: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: not just general
Hazel: yes, I should have said obviously with the
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator for Michael]
Hazel: we want to send you the videoclips, but also I think that partner 9 should look at them
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and all the user groups
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: for there comments as well. There should be [pause] particularly given the time there should be time to contribute to the discussions
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and what the best solution is
[Can hear whispering
Annie: And even give, some problems and some sample
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jack talks to Annie]
Ronnie: I would like to [pause] to say something very quickly which has already been [pause] sai to our Spanish colleagues. We, we, [pause] our commission [pause] Adam, has already started working on the portal for the project, because we were very much interested in the [pause] using this project also for [pause] for our purposes, and we are ready to put at the disposal this part of the work, which has been done until now
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator for Michael]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

[Paul clicks his fingers]
Paul: So, can I come back to my previous question?
[Mary still whispering to Hazel]
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Um, what sort of timeframe are we thinking of
[Mary still whispering to Hazel]
Paul: I know the timeframe for the commission is due in July
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: But I think we should certainly [pause] have a look and add the presentation prior to that
[Can hear some whispering]
Paul: and [pause] to have the time to make suggestions for [pause] for changes, improvements, whatever
[Can hear some whispering]
Paul: so
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: So, what is, so what is the timeframe?
[Mary whispers something]
James: it is going to be to create a special page, with the contribution of Paul, Mary, and Adam from partner 7. And from the point of view Annie of partner 2, perhaps you with Fabian take the first action. And at this end the first action is to send all relevant information for next week. After that the feel is [pause] translation or [pause] translation of the webpage can be ready for [pause] in how many weeks?
[Paul clicks his fingers]
[Annie whispers to Christopher]
Desmond: say that again
James: it would be considerable to have the first version of the webpage in 3 weeks
Mary: umm

[Some nodding of heads to indicate agreement to the proposed timeframe of 3 weeks] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: after the commission? In that sense, before
[Mary repeats to Hazel the timeframe for the page to be ready]
James: [pauses] this trial of this integrated webpage
[Mary whispers to Hazel]
James: would be accessible for [pause] sorry, will be available for the rest of the partners to analyse
[Can hear some whispering]
James: Something like that
[Someone says Yup] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: So the objective of this
Translator for Michael: When? When, sorry
James: Mid [pause]
Translator: may?
James: Mid April ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: April [sounds surprised]
[Hazel laughs]
Hazel: one page
Mary: yes, just one page ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel laughs again]
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: you would have to
Translator: one week just to release
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: That is right? If there is not any other questions, or for the plan we can go to partners 1 and 2, if this is possible. I know it is [pause] there are any additional comments in these item of the agenda, we can go through the administrative issues. So, are there any additional comments? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jack, Christopher and Annie are whispering]

James: Ok, so Jack.

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Ronnie: I maybe [pause] I apologise, I, I, I apologise, I am a little bit confused. Is in this [pause] amendment, is it included that partner 7 will extend without changing the amount of money
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator for Michael]
Ronnie. we extend the month of, of participation for the project
Jack: No, no, the last amendment was just that the work which was not expected to be done by partner 8, and by the University of H ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Paul laughs]
[Lucy and Elsie nod their head] ***(Sub-state 1.2 x 2 people provide evidences)***
Jack: Was changed to [pause] to partner 8, and that, but [pause] at the start of the project, instead 1st of September was October
Ronnie: So, I would like
Jack: Because this started a long time ago
Ronnie: This is correct, but I would like to remind you that
[End of tape 5]
[New tape 6 played]
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Lucy: for the whole project and not just the last two months before

Jack: yes, this is very, um it is in the amendment, it is just that you started before and your effort, I mean the
Lucy: I have to find the contacts
Ronnie: The problem is that if you spend some money, outside the official money it could create some problem
[Can hear some whispering]
Ronnie: So, I think it is just to [pause] formalise [pause] you can ask the
Jack: yes
Ronnie: the project manager if you wish, but please [pause] it is, it is necessary to include it in the next [pause]
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: In order for us to [pause]
Jack: ok, ok, yes
Ronnie: be

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation by Jack on work package 3*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

[Morris puts his hand up]
Morris: Jack
Jack: ci ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel Laughter]
Morris: I, concerning the logo of partner 7, I think the logo has two blue stripes [pause] which apparently is not shown here
Jack: blue stripes?
Morris: I sent you a logo by e-mail, and I do not know if you have been able to
James: What is important is that [pause] to have access to the original logo of each partner
Hazel: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 7/6/02 discourse chunk *date of next meeting* (3rd meeting) Appendix K

James: 12th and 13th is available for everyone?
[Can hear whispering]
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Paul: Did we not just talk about um, [pause] having a Saturday night meeting?
(Sub-state 5.1)
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: so, I do not get it? You are now talking about a Thursday and Friday again, but in order to reduce travel costs, Lucy just pointed
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: that it would be good to have [pause] to have a weekend date. So what about Friday and Saturday?
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: we will
James: This is in the same line, with the proposal with partner 5,
[Can hear whispering]
James: in order to put the meetings, in [pause] Thursday and Friday, and [pause] um [pause] Saturday and Sunday?
[Can hear clicking]
James: is not available for the private companies, because [pause] we are not, it it, is not possible for the private companies, so, [pause]

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed even when no sub-states were identified in a particular discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – Work package 6*) shows that Paul, who is blind clicked his fingers to show that he would like to speak, and this was acknowledged and he spoke.

14/03/02 meeting transcript appendix I, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 6*) when Morris, who is blind raised his hand to show he would like to take the next turn to speak, and he did.

On 14/03/02 meeting transcript appendix I, discourse chunk (*E-learning presentation (Work package 1)*), when Morris clicked his fingers to show that he would like to speak next, but this was not acknowledged, and Morris did not get a chance to talk.

This guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. For example, 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 6)* when Elsie who is neither blind nor visually impaired raised her hand to show she would like to take the next turn to speak, and as a result of raising her hand, she was able to speak.
14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 2*) is an example when Paul was clicking his fingers for a while, and this was not being acknowledged by anyone and Annie continued to speak. Paul had a fed up look on his face, and after a while he was able to say what he wanted to contribute towards the conversation. In 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 2*) the example shows that Paulclicked his fingers and was able to speak.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation, partner 8)* when Paul clicked his fingers to show that he would like to speak next, with Lucy trying to speak to well. Paul said Lucy could, but it appeared that James spoke, and neither Paul nor Lucy.

In 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning portal)*, Paul clicked his fingers to show that he would like to take the next turn to speak, having had to wait a while before he spoke.

15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) when Morris put his hand up, with this being acknowledged by Jack, which as a result allowed Morris to speak. There was evidence of this in 15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Project dissemination: project brochure*). The same event took place, Morris raising his hand, with Jack acknowledging Morris s raised hand.

15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix Idiscourse chunk (*E-learning and voice)* when Paul clicked his fingers, but did not get to speak until a little while later due to other people talking. Before Paul could speak again he had to click his fingers to remind the team that he still wanted to contribute something towards the current discussion. Also, 15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) when Paul clicked his fingers this not being immediately recognised and not being able to take the next speaker turn.

7/6/02 meeting transcipt, appendix I discourse chunk *date of next meeting* when Paul clicks his fingers, with an acknowledgement from James, and then Paul taking the turn to speak to the team.

This guideline was also proposed by finding different sub-states in a discourse chunk. For example, 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 2*) when Paul raised his hand to ask a question, and he asked his question. In 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done –work package 2*) Paul had to click his fingers a number of time before he was able to speak.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, apendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning portal)* Paul clicked his fingers to show he would like to speak. James mmediately responded with a *"yes"* and Paul spoke. In this case it appears that if the request to speak is acknowledged you are able to take the next turn to speak more easily. If there are no acknowledgements, like some of the examples before have shown, you have to wait a longer time until you speak, often waiting for a gap before starting to speak.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) gives an example of Morris putting his hand up to show that he would like to engage in a discussion, with successful results.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) is an example of Paul clicking his fingers, and not being able to speak immediately as others were talking and there was no acknowledgement that Paul would like to speak, until a short while later.

15/03/02 meeting transcript, appenedix I, discourse chunk (*Presentation by Jack on work package 3*) when Paul clicked his fingers to draw attention that he would like to speak. In this example, Paul did not speak.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D4

Guideline type: **Discussing document formats**

Description:
Accessibility of document formats should not be assumed as some team members may have different needs. To find out if anyone in the team has any preferences for document formats and to discuss how this can be met. (For example some normally sighted people, visually impaired and blind people prefer to look at Word documents instead of PDF generated documents)

Rationale:
Just because a certain document format may be ok for one person, you cannot assume it will be for everyone. This is especially true when you are visually impaired and/or blind. Sharing documents is common, so it is important to ensure that they are sent in a form that will be accessible to the reader.

Sources:
Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*ftp site*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Jack: O One point about the ftp site, I will include in the FTP site the documents in the original kind of file. If it is picti I will put it picti, .doc I will put it. I do not know if you would prefer everything to be in pdf mode or also in pdf or both formats. We put the original because we are in the same project So we can use all these documents. It does not make sense to make them pdf protected or anything.
[Charlotte says yes when Jack is talking about the format and she nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Kenneth: you must not have just PDF it is not accessible. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Annie and Lucy nod their heads] ***(Sub-states 1.2 x 2 as 2 people provide evidence)***
[Ben shrugs]
Jack: that is what I am saying. So if someone wants also the pdf because they use it, it is easy for them, they can use that. Yes [looking at Lucy]
Lucy: I cannot read pdf. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: Sorry
Lucy: I cannot read pdf. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: well then we put
Ronnie: We have the same problem. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Elsie: No we can read it. ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Discussions taking place, cannot hear them though]
Jack: Then that is the decision, we ask then if we want pdf we will have it. …

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Project dissemination: project brochure*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: Which paper are you referring to Hazel?
Hazel: this is a 2 page [pause] project brochure, which is being circulated
[Some own discussions taking place]
Paul: Is that available electronically someplace?
Jack: it is not in the ftp but ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Fabian: no, it is not, but we will upload it, [pause] very soon ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: is it pdf file?
James: Yes, it s a pdf file ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: Yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, it is better to [pause] in word format for you?
Desmond: yes, please ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: word format?
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: also for me ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone says html]
Jack: ok, maybe I should explain this was created for that European Conference on new technologies and disabilities, which was organised by the Spanish Presidency for the European Union, and you know it is from January to June. So, that is why in June there will be a lot of things in Madrid. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Jack: because it is at the end
Hazel: Right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, partner 1 created this stand, and was included this [pause] for distribution on this stand.
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Jack: And so it was paid for by whole partners 1 and 2, and Alaiz.
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Jack: Finally it was [pause] it arrived very late, but it was not distributed [gives a small laugh] So now there is this version
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
[Kevin says something to Paul]
Jack: SO, it was created with a format which was fit for [pause] I do not know for print company, so I do not know if it is possible to change the word format. It was front [pause]
Fabian: page maker
[Some own discussions taking place]
Jack: But maybe they have a way of saving it in Word, we will try
Paul: PDF would work, but Word is preferable, but I mean [pause] before it is just unavailable, let, let us have it in pdf form.
Fabian: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of different sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. For example, 18/12/01 meeting transcript, appendix G discourse chunk (*ftp site*) when there is a small discussion on preferences of document formats to the reader. It was interesting to note that Kenneth and Lucy who are neither blind nor visually impaired had a preference for not receiving PDF generated documents. This comment was also made by someone who is blind, Ronnie. In 15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Project dissemination: project brochure*) there was evidence of the previous discussion not being salient, as documents were still being produced using PDF. A request was made to distribute the document in its original format if it could not be saved in another form immediately, rather than having to wait a while until the information is available to them. The examples in this section show that document formats are important and must be addressed and monitored to be effective.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D5

Guideline type: Developing presentations and giving demonstrations

Description:
The structure of the presentation or demonstration should be described, giving an outline of what will be covered. At the beginning of any presentation or demonstration you should also make it clear whether you would like to be interrupted during the middle or to wait until the end for any questions to be asked. To set the scene name the sources you used as well. Make it clear if you are looking for a particular discussion around certain aspects of the information, which will be presented or demonstrated.
When showing presentation slides make sure that the text is enlarged for the benefit of those who are visually impaired. If any handouts are produced to make sure they are printed in a high-resolution format to ensure readability of the document. Printouts of slides should also be encouraged.

Rationale:
Simple steps which can be used to support the creation of common ground.

Sources:

Source: 7.6.02 discourse chunk presentation on *discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1* (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Mary: As Jack mentioned yesterday, the preliminary versions of the two main deliverables for work package 5
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: are due at the end of July
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: the final versions are due at the end of September, so I will like to discuss what both of the deliverables should contain today
[Can hear whispering]
...
Mary: I will go through these chapters one by one, and I would like a discussion on something, which has been done, and maybe you do not agree on the distribution
.....

Questions

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 2*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *review of work package 1* (4th meeting) appendix M

Supporting readability
Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Project dissemination: project brochure)* (2nd meeting) Appendix I
Fabian: What is also important is to have [pause] to have the logo in a high-resolution format
[Hazel nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: Because when it is printed in a very high, in a very big format
Mary: uh-huh ***(sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: um [pause] it is not well printed, if it is not a high resolution format
[Mary: uh-huh nods her head as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Kenneth: oh right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: For the stand we had a big
Fabian: we used a gig one
Jack: and we had just a few [pauses] with good resolution
[Hazel whispering to Kenneth]
Jack: I do not know if every one of you have this high resolution?
[Some own discussions taking place]
Jack: A pictorial format is what they use

Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Presentation on Work package 1*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Charles: I am going to briefly present the requirements for the authoring tool.
Desmond: Charles, sorry, can you please enlarge the font
Charles: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charles changes the size of the font on his computer]
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: thanks a lot
Charles: Is that enough, or
Desmond: No, its ok, its ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]

Naming sources

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Annie: to go and navigator environment, and e-learning world, and we will invite you to brainstorm on how voice technology can help visually impaired people to work with the internet and to encourage them to join e-learning courses. This presentation is based on the following documents: partner 3 problems the visually impaired people may have on the websites, and partner 9 documents on what voice can do for visually impaired people

[Can hear whispering]
Annie. which is other side of the problem, [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and the partner 8 slide presentation, that Mary and Hazel held on the situation of current e-learning courses, plus their experience in web technology as applied to
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: that is all information, which we got from the meeting we got yesterday. [Pause] I will continue now, summarising some points, that according to the documents we have been reviewing yesterday, are problems to the user, that the project solution [pause] intends to implement.

Describing structure

Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk – *presentation on Work package 1 - results from the evaluation study.* (Third meeting) Appendix K

Mary: I understand that we have changed the schedule from this morning, and we only have one hour before lunch, and we do have quite a lot of work to do on work package 1. You are most probably aware that [pause] this deliverable finished in month 12. So, first of all we will not have enough time to go through everything that was originally planned.
[Conwayne says something to Annie and Christopher]
Mary: I will cut very short my first presentation, which was supposed to provide a summary of the final results for the [pause] existing e-learning courses.
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: We presented most of our results in the meeting in Paris, so I am not going to repeat any of this. The report was submitted to the commission, and it is also available on the server. And if you would like any more detail, perhaps, we will look at that.
[Continues talking about the user characteristics]
.....

Supporting materials:

This guideline was proposed by identifying evidence of a sub-state in the discourse chunks.

There was evidence of this in the 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 2*) when Annie informed the team when they would be able to ask her any questions that they have. The same also goes for 6/6/02, appendix K Discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 1*) when Erin asked at the end of her section if there were any questions.

This guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in relevant discourse chunks. 15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Project dissemination: project brochure*) is an example. Despite talking about having the logo which was being shown in a high resolution to support readability, it can be generalized that all documents are produced in a high resolution with readability in mind. 6/6/02 Discourse chunk, appendix K (*Presentation on Work package 1*) is another example looking at aspects of readability.

This guideline was also proposed when no evidence of sub-states were applied to the relevant discourse chunk. 15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix Imdiscourse chunk (*Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide*). This is an example of when the documents which were used in the presentation were named. This is important and can help the listener understand what resources you have used in presenting your work.

7/6/02, appendix K , Discourse chunk – *presentation on work package 1* - results from the evaluation study is an example from when the presentation structure was being explained. No sub-states could be applied to this extract as Mart was the only speaker. The same goes for 7.6.02 discourse chunk presentation on *discussing plans for deliverables in Work package 1,* appendix *K* when Mary was explaining what she would like to achieve from her presentation of the work. Also, 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *review of work package 1* when stating when questions should be asked during the presentation could allow no sub-states to be applied as there was only one speaker, appendix M

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D6

Guideline type: **Sharing information by using examples/showing demonstrations**

Description:

You are encouraged to provide examples rather than trying to explain something in words, seeing something the project can often help to appreciate and understand what you are showing. However, you would not benefit from this mode of communication if you were blind. If you have someone who is blind in your team to explain to him or her what is visually represented.

Rationale:
Reports are a good way of sharing information when people cannot meet face-to-face. During face-to-face meetings it can be useful to show demonstrations, because it allows people to see what is happening in real time; it also offers the opportunity for questions to be asked immediately after, and for responses to be received straight away. Seeing information first handed can sometimes be more useful than receiving the same type of information in other forms. In this observed project team there was an understanding of the types of problems encountered by visually impaired and blind people when technical partners saw video clips of real users interacting with technology. Listening to summaries of problems being experienced by them and receiving written reports did not seem to be as effective in reaching this understanding.

Sources:

Source: 17/12/01 transcript, (discourse chunk, *demonstration of screenreader use (Jaws) by a blind person using the Internet)* (1st meeting) Appendix G

Paul: ok, um I am Paul; I have been using the Internet for about six years I think. Um, we are using a standard computer with um JAWS software, which is a well-known speech. Um if you have questions or anything just ask

Source: 18/12/01 transcript, (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 8 on work package 1).* (1st meeting) Appendix G

Hazel: .... So, we have one document, which talks about user requirements. I hope it will now make more sense to people now that they have seen the demonstration yesterday at partner 3, because it talks about things like what we saw yesterday.
Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 6*). (2nd meeting) Appendix I James: so we must, do [pause] what's better, um we invite you if you have time to visit our offices in order to see and understand what we are doing
[Whispering in the background]
James: and to see contributions of all partners
Elsie: well, we have to find a day

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Hazel: and Mary maybe today
Mary: yes
Hazel: can show you a form, in Mindreaders
Mary: on the web browser
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and to see, and at least to describe the problems that the user had
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and that will be good to start
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and then I think it would be interesting for examples
[Some own discussions taking place and someone says shh]
Hazel: and we be told the user organisations, perhaps Paul would like to go and try this form,
Paul: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: mhmm ***(state 1.1)***
Hazel: as well, and what do you think, because you might come up with some interesting solutions or
[Can hear Ronnie whispering]
Hazel: or whatever, so we have different users trying the same problem bits
Paul: Yup ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Mary whispers to Hazel]
Paul: So, if we can given that we the URL or whatever, information [pause] I need that certainly
Hazel: yes we will do that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: we will do that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Mary whispers to Hazel]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Hazel: but I do not think that was not the issue
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kenneth nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: because I think we have a real person and we have this information on videotape
Mary: and we can
Hazel: We can send you the videotape
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Paul and Kevin whisper]
Hazel: and then I think it is the functionality, to say right, designer, a voice based version which would really works
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I think that would be good, because we can see the problem [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: in real-time
Mary: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Describing *problems experienced with an e-learning course*) (2nd meeting)

Hazel: yes, I should have said obviously with the
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator for Michael]
Hazel: we want to send you the videoclips, but also I think that partner 9 should look at them
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and all the user groups
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: for there comments as well. There should be [pause] particularly given the time there should be time to contribute to the discussions
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and what the best solution is
[Can hear whispering
Annie: And even give, some problems and some sample
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jack talks to Annie]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Hazel: Yes. We will send you a first set of examples ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator for Michael]
Hazel: this is Friday, next week
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: We are now just discussing [gives a small laugh] the technicality
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: because these are on VHS tapes
Annie: aha, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but, now, from now on we will do it on digital tapes
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: which will be easier
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: But somehow we may have to send you VHS tape to start with
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1***
Hazel: whatever, we will make a very important that you get some material
Annie: yes, something ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: something ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: right, yes to be working on ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk: Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view (Third meeting)

...

Annie: yes, Kenneth, one thing more we developed the prototype because we thought that we would give a better idea than write a document. We have a feeling that we did not get the idea much of how we can integrate voice in and output in the applications, so that is why we focused on the prototypes that writing the documents, but I will, I will urge all the partners for the next meeting, since we have made these mistakes in this one, you would rather have that type of input from us, tell us before hand

...

Annie: ... Maybe [pause] since we are developers, we are more intended to think that things are more understood when you show a prototype instead of writing something, and expecting people to read it
Kenneth: yes, but most of the people here from the user groups are ***Sub-state (1.1)***
Annie: I know ***Sub-state (1.1)***
Kenneth: are from development or organizations as well, we do understand the technical side
Annie: ok ***Sub-state (1.1)***
Kenneth Not in the detail that you do,
Annie no, no ***Sub-state (1.1)***
Kenneth: but in some detail
Annie: yes ***Sub-state (1.1)***

...

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed when there was no application of sub-states to discourse chunks. 17/12/01 transcript, appendix G (discourse chunk is *demonstration, of screenreader use (Jaws) by a bliind person using the Internet*) is an example. Peter, who is blind, showed how he was able to interact with the Internet using Assistive technology. Also, 18/12/01 transcript, appendix G (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, partner 8 on work package 1*) when Hazel said she hopes that the document on user requirements which has been produced now makes more sense, since the demonstration was seen of a real user interacting with the Internet using assistive technology. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 6*) shows that initiating a visit where people can understand what is being done can be an effective way of conveying information to other team members.

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) is an example where user partners (Hazel and Mary) thought that it would be useful to show some of the information to the technical partner s (Annie) to help them understand the requirements. URL's were to be shared to allow team members to test this material out in their own time.

Also, 15/03/02 meeting transcript,appendix I, discourse chunk (*Describing problems experienced with an e-learning course*) when Annie said it would be useful to receive videotapes to see exactly what were the problems which were being encountered by blind and visually impaired people. Related to this was the example found in 15/03/02 meeting transcript, appendix I discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) where it was identified that some of the other team members, namely Charles would also benefit from seeing the video clips. Charles is working on technical developments as well. Discussing the ease at which tapes can be circulated is also important as seen in 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice)*, appendix I.

7/6/02 Discourse chunk: *Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view* is another example which shows that some disciplines (for example technical in this case) prefer to show something rather than explaining it in words, appendix K

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D7
Guideline type **Making explicit requests**

Description:
It is important to inform the team if any specific guidance is required that will enable you to continue with the work that you are responsible for. To make your request as explicit as possible for full benefit.

Rationale:
Most of the times working in a team means interacting with others. Therefore if you are working on a task and need assistance from others in order to continue with your work, it is important that you tell them exactly what you are looking for, so you receive what you need. If you do not specify you may end up receiving something totally different from what you originally expected.

Sources:

Source: 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Overview of the market for access technology)* (1st meeting) Appendix G

Paul: it would have been nice to have had some more input especially of products that are only nationally available. For example like I would imagine products like the Web Wizard and the Web Formator which are both German products that are being made available through the websites of the respective companies, they may be known in some other countries but I'm almost positive that there are similar developments in other member countries of the project and would have been nice for, or [pause] would still be nice if you do have some information along those lines that you can pass it on, so that we can, the overview will be more complete as time goes on.
[Whispering]

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse *chunk (Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months)* (1st meeting) Appendix G
Hazel: So that is the beginning of our analysis of authoring tools. But I now need some guidance on whether we just want to concentrate on generic web authoring tools, like dreamweaver or do we want to look at specific e-learning oriented authoring tools like Macromedia, authorware, or do we want to look at e-learning authoring tools embedded in the management systems like Blackboard. So there are three levels of doing this. So that is a summary of the three areas which I have been working on and one document will be ready this week, and the other two documents will be ready immediately after Christmas. But I have learnt a lot [laughs]
Jack: Thank you. Any questions?
Jonathan: I want to say something about that, I do not really think we have to have a very good knowledge of the web designing tools because one part of this project is to be able to provide a tool, an authoring tool able to provide an e-learning content. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Hazel says uh-huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jonathan: We are not going to use already existing e-learning material. We will try to use our [emphasis on our] tool to do this. We will have to try this.
Hazel: But when we met in Madrid we talked about generic web authoring tools. But in fact now that I have gone and studied this I discover people say that they do not produce very good e-learning content. That if you want e-learning content we need to go to these more specialized tools, like Micromedia, and authorware
[Kenneth and Christopher nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 people provides evidences)***
Hazel: So, I appreciate that you want to make a tool
Jonathan: Yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: To do e-learning content

Jonathan: Because if you use authorware you cannot provide that viewing material in voice capabilities. That will take longer in project.
[Christopher and Annie whisper something. Cannot hear what was said]
Hazel: yes. But I was not clear where you want us to target our analysis of the mainstream authoring tool. Is it at the level of dream weaver and front-page? or is it at the level of macromedia, authorware and I have a list here of other. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jonathan: I think it is still a problem. Probably with dreamwever [cannot hear the rest of what was said] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Can you speak louder please?
[Ronnie says something to Elsie. Cannot hear what was said]
Jonathan: The role is to provide a tool enabled to design web pages, which are specially focussed on e-learning material It has to be able to integrate with authorware.
Ronnie: Sorry can we make this thing off
[Ben and Fabian give instructions on how to turn it off]
[Kenneth gives instructions as well]
Hazel: Ok so an e-learning portal, we need to discuss this in more detail this afternoon. An e-learning portal is not just a web site with HTML on it That is one of the other things I have been analyzing. It has to have interactivity
[Jack nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: it has to have user engagement. It has to have assessment of the learning. So these are all the things
Jonathan: This is another thing, it is the e-learning platform, it is like an infrastructure, the content must be interactive, provide voice capabilities and for example evaluations of the students. So it is
Hazel. but in your presentation in Madrid you said you were going to evaluate the students
Jonathan: Yes. That is another thing. That is not the tool it is another workpackage. Workpackage 4. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: But the tool must support the development of the assessment process. What
Jonathan: The tool must provide the content, must provide the content, but the infrastructure of the content must be for the other workpackage.
Hazel: Yes it is the goal of workpackage number 4, but I am trying to provide you, I was asked to do an analysis of what the e-learning authoring tools provide and that is what I am trying to do. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jonathan: Yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: it is more than just HTML content, it is the other things as well.
[Kenneth nods his head, Ben nods and Jonathan nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 3 people provides evidences)***

Hazel: The other thing we need to consider is actually three kind of actors in this situation. It is the students, there are the authors of the material, but there are also the teachers who may not be the authors, but the people who are maybe providing the material or managing the system Now does the system also have to be accessible to a visually impaired teacher who might want to use the system.
[Kenneth nods and looks in Hazel's direction] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jonathan: yes as I said, it is the role of the teacher not on the same platform ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Jonathan nods and make some comments on paper] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: right, yeah. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Kenneth nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jonathan: but this is the work in work package 4. We need to work in work package 4 before we can do that.
Hazel: Right. Well ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I think that what you are saying is technically we will do that in work package 4. But now Hazel
Hazel: I am asking
Jack: theoretically
Hazel: I am asking about the user requirements, that I am being asked to provide to work package
[Kenneth and Annie nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x2 people provides evidences)***
Jack: theoretical work of looking at what is in the package, what is the problems, and what is
Hazel: and because I, particularly
Jack: documents
Hazel: after Christmas we want to talk to some potential users and I am not sure what the scope of what we should be asking is
[Kenneth says uh-huh in agreement and nods his head at the same time] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences, verbal and non-verbal)***
Hazel: asking users, potential users is about yet. So, the market analysis is helping me do that
Ben: did you form any ideas to try to limit this study only to authoring tools, which are directed to e-learning
[Hazel says uh-huh and nods her head in agreement] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences, verbal and non-verbal)***
Ben: Otherwise we will get too wide, compared to what the project is about
Hazel: I think that would be good personally. I wonder, by the end of this afternoon, I need a more clearly defined set of objects to studying. So I feel I have made some useful initial investigations. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jonathan: To develop our authoring tool, our web-authoring tool must be a very deep one. It must be a very focussed one. It is something we have to decide.
Hazel: I think more clarification on what is we are supposed to be doing

Jonathan: The idea is that a lot of man month
Hazel: I need a clearer specification on what you want me to do. Because in Madrid you said it was a generic-authoring tool, now you are saying it is e-learning
Jonathan: I am not saying that. [Cannot hear everything which is said after clearly] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
(Sub-state 5.1)

Source: 18/12/01 transcript, *(Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 2 on work package 2).* (1st meeting) Appendix G

Kenneth: can I just before we go on, I think what we need to be a lot clearer here is that what is the information you want for work package 2
Annie: Sure. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: it is not clear to me just reading what work package 2 is about, as to what is the linkage to work package 1 was.
Annie: Yeah. I thought in Madrid that it was clear. Workpacakge 2 is integrating with the plug in and different screen readers. We agree that we could have some information about the different screenreaders that are currently working and how ***(Sub-states 1.1 and 5.1)***
Hazel: That has already been provided to you by Desmond a couple of weeks ago. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Desmond: 21st November
Hazel: 21st November. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Annie and Christopher speak to each other in their own language. Cannot hear what]
Annie: Yes. What Christopher is saying is telling me is that it was not really what we expected. What we really need to know is how these screenreaders work. We do not want our tool to be something that is so dissimilar to screenreaders. We want it to work together. We want to know how screenreaders work. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: What do you mean how screenreaders work?
Annie: it is more not in terms of the user, but technically I guess.
[Annie says something in Spanish to Christopher]
Desmond: You, you have to contact the
Annie: I guess a deeper analysis of the screenreaders
Desmond: you have to
Hazel: You cannot have that from user requirements package. None of the work here is about [pause] analyzing screenreaders in a technical way. It is about analyzing screenreaders from a users point of view. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: You will never understand how a screenreader works if you do not know exactly the technical specification of the bloody, bloody thing ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Laughter when Ronnie says bloody]
Ronnie: I think it is essential that a perfect technical knowledge comes before any consideration of the user requirements. Otherwise
Hazel: I am sorry I disagree entirely with that. [laughs] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Desmond says yes.] ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: I thought we were designing a new system, a new system
Ronnie: No, no, I am sorry ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: called the project system
[Kenneth agrees] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Ronnie: Maybe I did not express myself clearly. If they have to work on, on screenreaders and they wanted to have information about screenreaders. They are technicians, they must [emphasis on the word must] have perfect knowledge of the different technical screenreaders. Otherwise they cannot write.
Hazel: Well that is not what was asked for. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Kenneth agrees] ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: We were asked to do requirements and that is what we are trying to work on.
[Kenneth agrees] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: I mean if you want technical specification, then I have got the manual for JAWs, and I am sure partner 3 actually
Ronnie: That is what I wanted to say it is not our business
[Kenneth says huh, huh in agreement with Ronnie] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Okay. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: there is nothing to stop them contacting
Ronnie: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Jaws or whoever to get that information
Desmond: it is very scientific
Kenneth. and all those
Desmond: I have that technical information for you
[Kenneth says huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: About the manual we have asked for it a few times but we have not received it. Plus it is only the technical part we did not know
Hazel: I have got the manual sitting in my office if you asked for it. I could have e-mailed it [laughs] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ben: I do not think we are speaking about manuals ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: Right. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Ben: A manual is a way of telling the user, how the damn thing works
[Hazel laughs]
[Jonathan agrees] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ben: it does not tell the technician how it technically works
Hazel: but is that information
[Annie and Christopher nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 peoples provides evidences)***

Ben: information from the screen, on the level of an operating system it operates. So how you can interact with it and so on.
Ronnie: Yes, but when we were studying this for our technical unit, we have simply asked those who are producing, who are producing the tool to give us this information. It is simple. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Ben nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Annie is twirling her fingers around when Ronnie is talking]
Ronnie: Yes it is absolutely simple. You know only what you have to ask for. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I cannot believe that you do not know for example the difference between text and links for an output for a voice output. But you do not know how to program this and this is just a requirement. And the technical knowledge is by you. It is your thing, and of course you could ask
Annie: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: us to provide such software, to give you the sourcecode of these things or something like that. But that cannot be our job.
Annie: Yes. We are going to do the technical job. But we do not know what to do and so we need to know with our technical knowledge what we are going to do. ***(Sub-state 5.1)***
Desmond: Yes. I ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: what this tool is going to do. How people can um [pause] get something more from the interaction between the screenreader and the GUI. What it has to do when it is interacting with the screereader and the tool, because we do not know what we have to do.
[Kenneth says huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: So we will apply this to our technical knowledge with the tool. But we need to know what it is going to be. So
Desmond: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: we want it to be useful and usable with a screenreader, both at the same time
[Kenneth says huh.] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and we do not know how how they want it to work
[Ronnie is saying something to Elsie. Cannot hear what it is]
Annie: that kind of information
Ben: I do not think anyone knows. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Annie and Christopher nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.2 x 2 people provides evidences)***
[Laughter]

Source: 18/12/01 transcript,*(Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, from Partner 7).* (1st meeting) Appendix G

...
Morris: Generally speaking we need more technical guidance as to how work package 4 will be organized. Thank you

...

Source: 18/12/01 transcript, (*Developing a plan of future work*). (1st meeting) Appendix G

Hazel: ok, I think the other thing that is concerning me is that, um [pause] understanding screenreaders and voice xml. Clearly partners 1 and 2 has expressed the need for understanding more about how screenreaders work and how it is going to interact with, with the project application.
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: I think I would like to propose that I, I realize that it is very naughty of me to propose people who have already left work [laughter]
[Laughter from other team members as well]
Hazel: but it seems to me that partner 6 has a lot of technical knowledge about screenreaders. Maybe partner 3 can also support this
[Kenneth nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but I think partners 1 and 2 need to aciculate what they need to know.
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Annie says something to Christopher]
Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Work package 6 Standardization, Exploitation....)* (3rd meeting) Appendix
Fabian: ok. Is it possible to have some information from you or about this group? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: well I think it is all
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Ronnie: I think what I have said is will be enough, because they, you want ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering in the background]
Ronnie: because you want me to, to write down something, something for you?
Fabian: yes, [pause] do you have any directions in which we can, um, I mean an Internet direction, where can find out more ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I, I, will let you know ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: ok, thank you. ...

Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Demonstration of partner 7's portal*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

...
Morris: So, in the next few months we are trying to develop new functions, and functionalities. For example exchange of files, automatic change of files, and of course we are open to any suggestions, and we would like to remind you that this is something we are doing on behalf of the consortium, so that [pause] the portal is available for your comments online, so, it is important that we also hear from you If you have good suggestions, new functions [pause]
[People having own discussions]
...

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 1*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K
Kenneth: can you not therefore, give us an earlier, some type of response to this document today, to tell us, what it is that you can deliver against this. If you have got as far as a Gantt chart, surely, you can tell us more than what you have told us so far, what are the plans for the development of this tool.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: Because. I am sorry, but what we heard yesterday, was so sketchy, we, I do think we need to know.
[Geoff tries to say something to Annie and Christopher]
[Own conversations taking place]
Source: 7/6/02 Discourse chunk – presentation on *work package 1 - results from the evaluation study*. (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Annie: in order to do so, the samples we have been developing were a number of screenshots, where the user enters with voice the commands, [pause] the age, and things like that. That is what we are experimenting on. We must get some feedback, as we do not know, [pause] what will be useful for the user. To reduce the commands or not? Or to have both
[Can hear whispering – Lucy says something to Ronnie]
Kenneth: But one of the elements of the overall design must include the ability, to modify the voice recognition system, to take into account o new vocabularies and new grammars
Annie: you will, you can create your own grammars ***(sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you as your own designer, I mean, [pause] the designer of the web page
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: can create his own grammar.
Paul: specification of
Annie: of the web-authoring tool, he can define grammar, and [pause] and he can also use voice with the tool, to define that grammar. So, he must input type that way, and the token, which is the voice, which is going to be recognised, and the end user says it, and he can define the grammar, and the amount of words which are going to be recognised, and will be stored in the style,
[Can hear whispering – the German partners are having their own conversation]
Annie: so you can use them further on, in your design, but that way, instead of the user clicking on a button to say ok [pause] you do the same actions. Is that, is that, what you [pause]
Kenneth: it is in part what I mean, but [pause] it is from the work we are doing in other projects, that is very complex area. It is a specialism in its own right
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: it is just, it was not included in the list of things [pause] and what would be very useful now, is to have that, written up, in that form
Someone: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in a document
[Can hear whispering]
Geoff: we have to think [pause] these are just ideas
Kenneth: fine ***(Sub-state 1.1***
Geoff: we will have to put in, and this takes time
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, but for the annex one, that is what we said yesterday, Thursday or
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: a summarised this
Annie: yes, and Kenneth, one thing more, we, we developed the prototypes because we thought it would give a better idea, than if we write our documents Because in Paris, we got the feeling that, we did not get the idea, of how we could integrate voice input and output applications.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: so that is why we focussed on the prototypes, instead of writing the documents, but I, I, I will urge all the partners for the next meeting, since we have made the mistake in this one, that you, that you would rather have that kind of input from us
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you tell us, before hand, so that we can prepare something and show it
[Can hear whispering]]
[Paul sounds fed up, huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: We want to understand the scope of what you are doing
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and you need to understand the scope of what we are doing. And that is in part, what you have been doing
Annie: yes
Kenneth: because all we asked for [pause]
Annie: yes, yes
Kenneth: we are not asking you to do anything extra.
Annie: no, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: it is just
Annie: no, no, it is just the
Kenneth: the way you think
Annie: the way that you display it
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you better have a judgement, because, since we are developers, we feel that things are more likely to be understand a prototype, instead of writing something for people to read
Kenneth: yes, but [pause] most of the people here from the user groups ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes, I know ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: are from development organisations as well. We do understand the technical side.
Annie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: not in the detail that you do, but,
Annie: no, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in some detail.
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: so, we are going to circulate a document, which has been explained by Geoff.
[Can hear whispering]
James: this, [pause] will be done next week. And something
[Can hear whispering]
James: considering that we have to develop the new technical annex, for the Vision, we are going to
[Can hear whispering]
James: include a summary of these documents in the technical annex. Of course,
[Can hear whispering]
James: all types of comments not just from the technical partners, but [pause] also from the rest of the partners
[Can hear whispering]
James: will be welcome. Ok, [pause] I believe shortly the presentation [pause] for a bit late, but it would be better to show before, but it is important in this moment, that the situation has been more clarified for the partners. Perhaps, if there is no additional questions, you can follow up with Mary presentation. Ok, Mary, thank you.

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *demonstration of the prototype* Appenedix M

Jack: I would like to know from the users [gives a small laugh] how it looks, how it sounds, or if it is an improvement of the [pause] to previous versions. Now we have compatibility with screenreaders
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I do not know what you think
Kenneth: I think it is very difficult to have [pause] a much of an opinion on two very short, [pause] demonstrations like that ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Kenneth: it would have been very nice to have seen a demo, a live demo, in other words [pause] actually doing something
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and that is what I think, [pause] that was interesting, but it is very difficult to make much comment, on that basis. First hearing it like that seems like their was a lot of repetition, and at times, [pause] it kept on saying tag
Mary: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and then especially, when you got to tag, tag, tag, it [pause] I think if I had not been able to see what was on the screen, I think I would have been completely and utterly confused, by that point. [Pause] I t
Jack: I think that is
[Annie tries to speak to as well]
Annie: that is the screenreader
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: the one that says tab, tab
Kenneth: mhhhm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: the plug in and if we had produced a version [pause] you would not have had that much repetition.
Kenneth: sorry, [pause] that is certainly, that is certainly the screenreader which is speaking it, and the arrangement of the page has actually caused it to say say
Annie: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: to have, to repeat [pause] tag 4 times. Um [pause] it is not, [pause] we know that is what a screenreader would do, so we need to make sure that the content does not force that to happen
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but, the [pause] but the really, the one thing from having seen that short demonstration [pause] is that it would be very interesting to see how someone who is not looking at the screen, or has turned the screen off, and can you actually follow what is happening? And I [pause] and I was just thinking as I was hearing it [pause] I do not think that I would have been able to have followed, if I had not been able to see it. I would be very interested to hear from those who could not see, and to see if they could understand what was going on.
Morris: very difficult for me to say, because I am not eligible ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: what struck me at one point was [pause] was the selection of the key [pause] I mean how can you select, if you cannot see? How can you select a key that includes colour?
Jack: no, arrow ***(Sub- state 2.1)***
Annie: arrow ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Morris: oh arrow key ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: arrow ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: sorry.
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: you use the arrow key ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Ronnie says arrow in an American accent and Annie gives a short laugh]
[Others laugh as well]
Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *annual review* (4th meeting) appendix M

Jack: So, [pause] we have three weeks from now, from today, till this review, and so every, everyone [pause] that is participating in the review or not, please participate in the preparation of the [pause] of the defense. We will try to send you [pause] presentations and how we can [pause] and when I say we, it is whole project, how we are thinking of defending and [pause] with any suggestions you will have. Oh, I think it is going to have one of these demos of today, or please do one of these things [pause]. My J or example has asked if we are going to have one demo, and I said yes, [pause] and he was very happy and impressed. Oh, you have already got things to show, please do that, and do you need some special [pause] things for the demo [pause] I said no
Annie: speaker
Hazel: speakers yes [laughs] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: what?
Annie: speakers
Jack: ah, yes, I said that ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter from some team members]
Jack: I don't know, maybe people who have gone through this process [pause] can explain us, [pause] what is, what was their experience, some recommendations.
[Pause]
Jack: for example Kenneth?

Source: 13/9/0/2 Discourse chunk: A*dministrative issues* (4thmeeting) Appendix M

Jack: where it is stated the [pause] the effort [pause] the personal effort, [pause] the personnel effort, for the [pause] for your company in that period. This is [pause] this will be used by the commission, to calculate how much [pause] you have used, all the [pause] all the cost, all the money for the personnel in the project. And also [pause] it will be used in the annual review, [pause] and see what we have used, and what was supposed [paused] according to the annex, according to the technical annex, to be used, and we say ok, you are not using all the effort that you were supposed to be using
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and what is happening
[One person laughs]
Jack: and you are using more people, explain that]
[The same person laughs again]
Jack: Also, by now, we are very close to the cost statement, and this will be used, during the money counts. Please I will suggest to do that, and in case

[Can hear whispering]
Jack: you detect that something is not ok, we will [pause] try to amend it, these things

...

Source: 13/9/02 Discourse chunk: *work package 6* (4th meeting) Appendix M
Jack: I will ask you, [pause] as I said, you have to sign the [pause] you should sign the amendments, just in case, you agree with that is in the amendment. For this previous amendment, number 2; was [pause] is here just the change of names, and [pause] very administrative issues. Now, [pause] as Kenneth is seeing, we will have the money [pause] we will have the money with the table [pause] and we can spend, till the end of the project. So, please check the [pause [what is there is what you expected. I will check that [pause] with the Electra copy. Please if something is wrong [pause] I do not know, few things appear in the amendment. For amendment number 2, I am telling you about the change for PARTNER 3, and the change for [pause]
James laughs

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of no sub-states in revenant discourse chunks. Explicit requests were made in the following discourse chunks. 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Overview of the market for access technology*)appendix G, receiving information from other European countries in over for their overview to be more complete.

18/12/01 transcript, (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, from Partner 7*), appendix G when Morris said he needed technical information into how their work package was organized.

18/12/01 transcript, (*Developing a plan of future work*) also shows evidence of HAZEL saying that the technical partners, Annie and co had to be tell them what they need to articulate what they need to know before any help can be given.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Demonstration of the partner 7's portal*) when Morros said he wants to receive comments and suggestions about the work which had been presented during this meeting.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 1*) when Kenneth clearly stated what information he would like to know regarding the work that is undertaken by the technical partners, and their plan of development for this work.

13/9/0/2 Discourse chunk: *Administrative issue* is another example, Jack provided clear instructions on what must be done after receiving the named document by e-mail, and highlighted the importance of this document as well.

13/9/02 Discourse chunk: *work package 6* when Jack said the team should provide other related information, using the information given by Morrisas an example.

Guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of different sub-states in revenant discourse chunks. 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months*) is an example where Hazel said she would like to hear from the others in the project, where her focus should be.

18/12/01 transcript, (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 2 on work package 2*). Where Kenneth identified that the technical partners need to be clearer about the information they need and want from the other partners. Also discussions related to documents which had been circulated to all partners, and some of this information not having been used, even though it would have been expected.

6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*work package 6 Standardization, Exploitation ...)* when Fabian asks for more information on the subject of discussion, and Ronnie believing that he had already shared the relevant information with the team. Following this a short discussion took place where Ronni e realized that he was being asked to provide some written material

Guideline was also found by finding evidence of same sub-states in relevant discourse chunks. Although there were several things discussed in this discourse chunk one of the most relevant was being informed before the meeting what is expected from them allowing preparations to be made. 7/6/02 Discourse chunk – *presentation on work package 1- results from the evaluation study.*

12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *demonstration of the prototype* shows Kenneth making comments on what he saw. Main things were that the number and types of examples which had been given were small. Also, tried to give some information to make clear and to explain some of the difficulties which he had observed whilst watching the presentation.

Guideline was also found by finding evidence of one sub-state in the relevant discourse chunk. 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *annual review* is am example where Jacknformed the team, that even if they are not directly involved with the annual review they are requested to provide some assistance to the rest of the project team in this task.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline

Guideline number: D8

Guideline type: **Informing on changes**

Description:
If there are any changes, to notify everyone not just whom it may concern

Rationale:
Changes should be summarised to the whole team and not just whom it concerns. Changes can be to the goals and team members. To introduce new people who may have joined the team, and to inform of people who have also left the team. To inform every one of any new roles you may have taken on, due to changes in circumstances as well. Team members sometimes leave the project before it is completed, and new ones can join. It is important that everyone in the team is kept up to date with what members there currently are working in the team, and the roles of the new people.

Sources:
Project specific

Source: 18/12/01 transcript, (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 5*). Appendix G

Jonathan: We have changed the structure of the duration of the months for the workpacakges, because the workpackage in number 4 probably must begin before
Lucy: I think this is a common feeling. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Team members

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (***Informing of late arrival***) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Jack:.... And just one more thing, maybe you can see that Jonathan is missing here. He is technical co-ordinator. I would say he is I should say he was technical co-ordinator. He has left us, our company, he went to Italy, and now he is working on Telecom Italia, Lab, so in research and development. The reason is a very common one, an illness called love
[Hazel laughs]
[Others laugh as well]
[Could hear the whispering while Jack was talking]
Jack: His girlfriend is in Italy
[Elsie says something to Michael. Was to do with Jonathan not being here]
Jack: So he will still be in contact with us, and will be happy to receive any information, but he is working now since today or tomorrow for Telecom Italia. So, in the meantime, maybe from today Fabian will help us with the technical support.
[Can still hear whispering while Jack is talking. Cannot hear exactly what is being said]
Jack: We will let you know any news about this.
...

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: review of work package one (4th meeting) Appendix M

Hazel: of work in work package 1, in the last year..., like to thank Mary, for her hard work, and I am very sad that Mary is leaving the the project project at the end of the first year, so thank you very much Mary for your efforts.
Jack thank you
...
Jack: and I am sorry also that Mary
Mary: it's ok
Jack: leaving us, because she has contributed a great job. [Pause] are you going to be around?
[Hazel laughs]
Mary: till the end of this month, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and then you are leaving partner 8 as well?
Mary: yes, I am leaving Partner 8 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, it is not only the project?
Mary: Hazel will give you the name of the new contact [pause]
Hazel: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ok, so one question from what you have to [pause] said, the deliverable is going to be finished on time ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: by the end of the month
Jack: well, because you read it [pause] it looks like it is almost finished
Mary: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Roles

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 1*) (2nd meeting) appendix I

Fabian: Ok, so everyone please, we can start with the presentation on work package 6.
[Conversation between Morris, Desmond and Kevin]
Fabian: Well, first of all bonjour
[Laughter]
[Can still hear whispering]
Fabian: I would like to introduce myself, as Jack has said Jonathan has left for Italy. So, I will be making the role of the technical co-ordinator from now on.
[Charlesr and Annie are whispering to each other. Cannot hear what is being said]
Fabian: I hope I will be able to do it as well [small laugh] as he has been working. And, since now I have been working with Jack into prepare all the idea activities, I hope to work in preparing the project documentation from the technical point of view and administrative point of view, point of view, especially in Jack's side, the telematics side. Well, I will be focussed now much more in the project. Ok now so we can start with the workpackage 6. Work package 6
[Lucy is speaking to Ronnie. Cannot hear what is being said]

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of one sub-state in relevant discourse chunks. 18/12/01 transcript, (*Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months, Partner 5*) is an example when everyone was informed that the structure of the work had been changed.

Guideline was also proposed when their was no evidence of sub-states in the relevant discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing of late arrival*') is an example when the team was informed that Jonathan had left the project team. This is the first time this information was made known to the team. Also in 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 1*) when Fabian informed everyone that he would be taking over from Jonathan's job.

Guideline was also proposed when their was evidence of same sub-states in a relevant discourse chunk. 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *review of work package 1* is an example of when the team was informed that Mary was leaving the project, and she was thanked for all her hard work.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D9

Guideline type: Making decisions

Description:
The team should make decisions and not just one or two individuals.

Rationale:
It is important that when any changes are proposed that there is agreement from the team. Agreement must also be sought when changes have not been made, but at all other times as well.

Sources:

Hazel: As far as I can see, it is a question of transferring man months from work package 6 to work package 4 and or work package 1. Then I think that's, as long as everyone from the consortium is in agreement I do not see that as being a problem.
Ronnie: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Because I mean
Ronnie: we do not ask for an increase. It must be an official decision I mean, it cannot be done simply
Jack: ok, yeah. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: you understand what I mean?
Jack: uh-huh. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: it is not a problem or practicing it, it is a problem of officially deciding.
[Pause]
[Whispering i the background]
Jack: do we all agree that?
[Agreement in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so that we produce a document that will say we have decided to do that and will be signed by everyone and sent, ok
[Agreement in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: ok. Thank you very much ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering in the background]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 6* (2nd meeting) Appendix I

James: This is the scope that in principle it could be possible to give. Regarding this certification, um, it will be interesting to know what is the point of view. So certification of related policies, but trying to comply with our commitments we should make some kind of certification. Is that alright by everybody?
[Most people nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: No, no. It does not answer my question, for me it does not As many people have pointed out, the certificate of whatever kind requires an incredible amount of work and will take a long time. So, what do we really need a certificate for ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Kenneth and Hazel whisper something. Cannot hear what is being said]
Paul: if we can prove that we can collaborate with the different groups working towards recommendations, guidelines, I am hesitant to call the standards
[Can still hear Kenneth and Hazel whispering]
Paul: Um, would that not be insufficient? Coz, I mean this will take an awful lot of work and who is going to do it? And are we going to achieve it in the timeframe that we have?
James: So, do you think it is possible to make this certification by all standardisation's?, all [pause] with, so our intention is to try this um process and if it could be possible, it is quite difficult, by every department, but we can indicate to the commission that this initial objective seems to be very difficult to realise, so this is the approach, I can take a look
Kenneth: But
[Paul tries to talk as well, he said but]
Kenneth: there is a huge problem round this as to what are we certificating? What is the actual standard, in so far as the work we have already done in work package 1, as we will be talking about later on is exactly how difficult it actually is
[Whispering between Paul and Kevin]
Kenneth: to look at accessibility when you consider the range, for instance, visual conditions, the range of access technologies, the range of content, the range of what people are trying to
[Can still hear whispering in the background]
Kenneth: achieve with their content. And to actually put a certificate on which said something is or is not accessible is actually probably, there is um extremely difficult if not impossible to do.
[James nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Kenneth: However, um, I think it is important that we continue this work in so far as, to look at [pause] the possibilities and therefore the contacts with people like WAI and other bodies and um, views to um, what degree can we look at, um, sometime of certification, um, it will be, it is valuable in terms of helping um, the wider community to understand some of the issues, but, um we already find that some of those sites that are certificated with one of the standards, which has been around for a long time, like Bobby for instance. There are still people who will say well yes it has got a certificate, but I cannot actually access it um, for various reasons. So, I think we have to be careful. Another thing we have to be careful about is standardisation and certificates, is that we are in an area of extremely fast moving technology and what you standardise and certificates today, will be um [pause] old technology tomorrow and infact the new techniques that people are using to present information will have to be re-looked at.
[Can still hear whispering in the background]
Kenneth: So, I am, we have to do this part of the work. Not least because it is in the project programme
[Ronnie says something and Hazel laughs]
Kenneth: but I also think we have to be aware that we need to understand what this actually means. That is one of the learning points that we need to go forward with.
[People having own discussions]
Fabian: Ok, any other comments on this points?

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) (2nd meeting) appendix I

Lucy: Is it not necessary, or is it not possible to have a decision now?
[Hazel laughs]
[Hazel looks at Kenneth]
Lucy: Because how can you take the decision, without your partners? You need the decision of the partners
[Can hear some whispering]
James: but regarding,
Lucy: but regarding the fact we will put an e-learning exercise on our [pause] on our presentation
James: Yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: and
Hazel: I am sorry, but I do not think that addresses the problem ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: that we are facing at the moment. What we need is a lot of examples of the kinds ewe discussed on current e-learning practice.
[Elsie is whispering to Michael
Hazel: so that partner 2 can look at what the problems are and to propose a solution to them. I think having one exercise on the [pause] on the partner 7 website
Lucy: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: is not, it is not going to do that at all. It is not going to solve this problem. What you are proposing is a fine thing to do for the project
[Elsie is again whispering to Michael]
Hazel: But I think we need to, um, [pause] the only quick way, to come up with some solutions is to look at a range of current e-learning courses and to see what problems do they have
[Can hear whispering]
Hazel: and what problems you can suggest.
[Someone says yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: and yes that comes back to our question: how shall we pay for the e-learning courses. How do we have to pay for it?

[Own discussions taking place]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice)* (2nd meeting) Appendix I

James: So as a starting point, or input, is of course the information of the partner 7 by Adam and also
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: from partner 8, ok. Everyone agreed
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (Demonstration of partner 7's portal) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Jack: So, [pause] is everyone, everyone agrees with this picture? Yes, please, this is the moment, [pause] to say no, [gives a small laugh] that this is not what you [pause] or to [pause] it is ok?
[Team members say yes in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: So, that is [pause] so everyone has here the objectives. ...

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Jack: I would suggest that, maybe we can try to prepare, [pause] an answer, a document answering these questions, and try to put these comments into the annex 1, for [pause] next Tuesday.
[Annie positively nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: To circulate this, and of course everyone is thinking about this, at the same time, and circulate the version, and the comments, and the corrections in a couple of days, lets say Thursday, in order to send to Friday, the final version, the next version.
Kenneth: is there any reason, why we cannot use the rest of our time today, to address these questions?
Jack: yes, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: then come to a consortium agreement,
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: which will be much quicker doing it around the table
[Partners including Annie and Desmond say yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 from 2 people)***
Jack: yes that is great. We have a coffee break, and then we can do it shorter, but, yes, can [pause] do you have actually the review here? Everyone has it? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Supporting materials:
Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Evaluation*) is an example when Hazel makes it clear that the propose change will not be a problem if there is agreement from all team members.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Demonstration of the partner 7's portal)* when Jack asked if everyone agreed to what had been shown to the team in the form of a demonstration.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*discussion of review questions from review report*) when there was agreement to a proposal which had been suggested by one of the team members.

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence differences in sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done – work package 6)* is an example when Jonathan asked if there was agreement by everyone, and Ronnie said that he disagreed with what had been said. This resulted in a discussion emerging.

15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning and voice*) when there was agreement to a proposed change.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) when there was a need to reach a decision, and again there were some evidences of disagreements on the discourse chunk.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D10

Guideline type: **Establishing regular reporting periods**

Description:
Communication in the team is important, and if the team is going to work together for more than one meeting a regular period for reporting on progress should be set up. To be effective this must be monitored.

Rationale:
Reporting to the team is important and to be effective, all team members should be made aware from the start of their work together, what the expectations of the team are in terms of regular reporting. If the team is going to be together for a longer period of time and they cannot always meet face-to-face, other modes of communication and reporting should be considered. E-mail is one way of staying in touch with the team.

Sources:
Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (communication amongst the team) (1st meeting) Appendix G

[This comment was made as Jack was leaving the meeting]
Jack: I have to leave now. But I think many of the issues we have discussed today here are to do with communication. I think we have to send emails, maybe not general to everybody, I need something like that, but asking oh Hazel I need this, do you have this kind of documentation of to Ronnie or whoever, or ever can have the documentation or to everyone, I remind I ask this to you can you send me that I need it, more life because if not this is just, things are waiting there and days are going on.
Annie: But, but
Jack: Communication is always important
Annie: That is true, but there is no point in asking for documentation if no-one gives it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: No. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: so we must
Jack: that's why
Annie: communicate ourselves
Jack: I said to send to us and to explain things and
Annie: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: to ask for anything and if you receive an email and you do not understand what is going on, what do you want or more communication
[Annie and Christopher say something. Cannot hear what is said]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation by Jack on work package 3*) (2nd meeting) appendix I
Jack: From my side I will try to [pause] to improve communications maybe with [pause] maybe send more communications, in more [pause and then asks something in Spanish]
Lucy: Interactive
Jack: um more interactive ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Paul laughs]
Jack: I was going to say use voice xml
[Laughter – Fabian, Paul and some others]

Source: 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussion*) (1st meeting) Appendix G
Jonathan: I think every 15 days everyone should provide a report of there work.
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Lucy is sitting with her hands on her mouth]
Hazel: No, not every 15 days ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Jonathan: 3 weeks maybe
Hazel: once a month ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Kenneth nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jonathan: once a month ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I agree with Jonathan, the 15 days interchange of documentation with the partners. I believe that all the packages last at least 2 or
3 months and for example our work package 2 which started 20 days ago we have a 20 day delay because we are expecting the input from the partners that people are making and we have not received anything yet. So, we are doing our best here working with one person with Jaws and the wider documentation, but we are not experts on accessibility and we need your information and documents. We do not have anything now. We do not know what people are working on, or anything. We believe that we need to put more more strength into interchanging documentation. I think that every 15 days it is better than just once a month. ***(Sub-state 2.1)*** ***(Sub-state 4.1)*** ***(Sub-state 5.1)***

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Reporting*) (1st meeting) Appendix G
Hazel So, I will produce by the end of the week, a detailed timeline with lots of little deadlines. That is the way I would rather do it, rather than try and report every 15 days. I have a deadline every week of something happening
[Laughter – Hazrl, Charlotte and Lucy]

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Developing a plan of future work*) (1st meeting) Appendix G
Hazel: so, I will be saying right have you done this action comment on this, right. So it will be more driven by the little tasks rather than the period of time. So I will produce a timeline, if I do not put it on the ftp site before Christmas, I will put it on the ftp site before the New Year.
[Annie asks Jonathan something, pointing at the whiteboard Hazel was writing on]
Hazel: and I will send an e-mail saying everyone must look this, because there will be deadlines for everybody. But do you feel with those five parallel actions w are beginning to get a [pause]
Ronnie: I think it's in the right direction. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes, I also am beginning to think, although I am not the going to be very involved in this one, I will be watching it, but I think it is very important because this is where we need to develop the specific vision of what the project is going to offer to people. Well they are all very important in different ways, and if you solve of those problems that is fine, but it would give you a new set. Let's take some problems that visually impaired people are going to immediately relate too. I think the forms one is a good one, the blind people I know if I said to them, look here is a really good way that is going to make forms easier for you to use on the web, they are going to say great, yes I will have that. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: a lot of problems are design related, in web problems. So, I mean we need to make that clear.
Hazel: yeah, ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*communication amongst the team*), looks at communication and problems associated with communication when requests are not met.

18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Developing a plan of future work*) is an example of looking at some of the issues which were raised in 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Reporting*) for regular reporting periods. Annie had said that every 15 days would be useful, and Hazel said she was taking this into account when developing the plan.

Guideline was also proposed by finding no evidence of sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation by Jack on work package 3*) is an example, where an important point regarding interactivity was raised.

Guideline was also proposed when one sub-state was found in a particular discourse chunk. 17/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussion*) is an example where Annie says that she agrees that co-ordination is not been talked enough in the project. This raises an important point to remember, for communication to be effective, their needs to be some co-ordination in place.

Guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of differences in sub-states of a particular discourse chunk. 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Reporting*) is an example where they were looking at establishing a regular reporting period and a decision was not eventually reached as their was no consensus of what this period should be.

Evidence of Cramton's indicators
The above extract when Annie mentions that she agrees with the 15-day interchange of documents with all partners was interpreted as potential evidence of Cramton's *"Difficulty in interpreting the meaning of silence"*. There was 100% agreement with Cramton when looking at her interpretation of the same extract. When Annie mentioned that "I think that every 15 days it is better than just once a month" I interpreted this as *"Failure to communicate contextual information"*. Cramton did not validate this separately.

Guideline number: D11

Guideline type: **Summarizing information**

Description:
When you close the meeting, to summarize what were the main points covered. If there will be another day dedicated to the meeting to summarize what will be covered. Once the meeting has closed and if time permits a short planning meeting should be encouraged to develop a work plan on how team members can work together, towards joint tasks/activities.
Rationale:
Summaries are important. When certain partners will be working together on a particular task and/or activity, before they leave the meeting they should arrange a quick meeting to review exactly what they will be doing together and to make a work plan.

Sources:

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Closing for first day of the meeting*) (2nd meeting) Appendi I

James: Ok, so thank you to all the partners, for the presentations today, and it has been very interesting
[Some own discussions taking place]
James: and perhaps it could be worthy, to try, to try and make a summary of the conclusions, I hope. Um [pause] I have some ideas on mine, and I am going to tell you, so that we are all in the same line
[Someone in the background says uh-huh] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: And we have identified some important topics, for example that we are, in front of us, a period of three months for the success of the project. In the same way, we have identified that we have around 15 days to prepare and present one of the most important deliverables of the project, which is the dissemination plan.
[Elsie has a smile on her face]
James: Um [pause] in that way, the session has been interesting, and has been identified some individual
[Some whispering in the background]
James: some possibilities of this deliverable. And, for example the standardisation, we have been
[Can hear some whispering]
James: some possibilities taken by Hazel,
[Hazel nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: in the second case, regarding the activities regarding standardisation, Elsie, from partner 7 is going to, going to take that issue
[Elsie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Regarding clustering, following the suggestion of the project officer, we are going to, we are going to assist one of the openings in April, May or June, and finally, regarding the webpage has been assumed that [pause] we are going to make the partner 7 page accessible, has been identified., Adam
Ronnie: It is accessible, it is accessible. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear people whispering]
Elsie: For blind people
Lucy: Yes for blind people ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some people laugh]
James: Also, this morning, we have seen one of the demo's of partner 2, [pause] um regarding the work package 2, the plug in, it is not the final tools, [pause] that the project wants to develop.
[Charlesr and Annie nod their heads] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 evidences from 2 people)***
James: more or less, we are using, [pause] from, in the afternoon their have been very interesting presentations from several user requirements, [pause] it has been agreed that it is also important for the project
[Can hear some whispering]
James: Not only to do the web page accessible, but also to include let's say a gate for
[Can still hear whispering]
James: e-learning creating capabilities, the project has to do, if the commission gives us the time necessary. And also, has been an important, [pause] interesting discussion, um regarding the portal. Um, [pause], I must recognise that um perhaps, that the technological partners, um to say the partners 1 and 2, we have been not able to convince the users absolutely about the suitability of voice xml
[Can hear some whispering]
James: solutions that we are proposing, for, for [pause], for the difficulties, that the blind people have at the moment, for the reason that tomorrow morning, like an initial point we are going to make a presentation
[Can hear some whispering]
James: That that, the [pause] with your participation of course, indicating, if [pause] or if it is not worth it, we are going to use the reference document
[Annie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: for the presentation of Mary and Hazel informing of some difficulties, [pause] and we hope that tomorrow the opinion of the project will be more better
[Can hear whispering]
James: Than we see this morning, and pause [ok]
[Can hear some whispering]
James: that is more or less the main conclusions of the successful meeting of today
[Can hear some whispering]
James: and just to thank your patience, collaboration and especially [pause] partners 5 and 7 for [pause] hosting. And the time for the starting meeting tomorrow Jack
Elsie: 9
James: 9 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some people say yes in agreement in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and we will start with the presentation of partner 9.
Meeting closed.

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Conclusions from the meeting - AOB*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Jack: Now maybe we can [pause] I can try to review all of the action we have [pause] talking about these two days
[Mary whispering to Hazel]
Jack: The first is not an action, it is a conclusion that this next three months, again to remind, is that the next three months are very [pause] important for the success of this project. So, we should be aware of that, and to act in that way, towards the more efficient [pause] kick [pause] efficient and so this critical period start with the deliverable 6.4 – the dissemination and use plan. So, we decided to first action was to, was to Elise and to [pause] to send to Elsie the dissemination actions in order to have one document
[Hazel whispering to Kenneth]
Jack: resuming all of these actions and maybe [pause] I want to have this clear, not only to Elsie this information, but to us. The questionnaire that was sent to you
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Jack: a few weeks ago, so please this is for the deadline for that action is next Tuesday
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: and the dissemination?
Jack: To Elsie the dissemination, but the questionnaire was complete, dissemination, exploitation, to answer all the [pause]
[Some own discussions taking place]
James: Yesterday, was divided into different possibilities over the six points for the deliverables. There were five main tasks
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
James: one was standardisation in which [pause] Hazel is going to take an active role. We have to send some proposal for the meeting, for the meeting in Los Angeles and we have to act quickly
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Hazel: I have already e-mailed the person, this guy who is going to the meeting to ask
Desmond: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: them to introduce the project

James: Regarding the exploitation plan, this activity will be conducted by commercial companies, both partners 1 and 2 regarding clustering indicating the things by FJ, which we must participate in these kinds of meetings, perhaps in may or something when there is the final date. Another very important activity is the [pause] dissemination of the project tool and certificate, is the name. Yesterday it was decided that Elsie is going to take the responsibility of this task. Yeah?
[Elsie nods her head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: and this task, the last task is the creation of the voice pages, that this has more or less agreed, ok. Regarding the start time of the schedule plan [pause] there [pause] the proposal that we must try and comply with to ensure that this critical deliverable is going to be end at the month mach
[Brief discussion between Paul, Desmond and Kevin]
James: and finally to take it to this end, the first week of April. For, this the item indicated can be [pause] can be sent on the screen. All the communications and contributions from all partners before the 18th of March. After that we are going to provide a draft report with a version for comments, before the 22 of March. So, before that [pause] the technical advantage of Elsie to Madrid we are going to [pause] to work together and these versions for comments is going to be ready for the 22nd of March. So, we will say to all partners, they must meet the final comments over the deliverables before the 28th of March, after that the final iteration will be made before the 4th of April, Tuesday I believe, and will be sent to FJ
[Mary whispering to Hazel]
James: Other conclusions agreed in the meeting, in this plenary meeting [pause] made a review of work package 6, we also made a review of work package 2, which is some [pause] frame of the plug in, we had some very interesting discussions yesterday afternoon regarding work package 1- user requirements.
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
James: Also, we analysed the work currently involved in workpackage 4. So, the conclusion point of view are combining each of the different work packages and [pause] and also considering the conversation of this morning, more or else could be as follows, we must work in the implementation of [pause] partner 7 portal and also [pause] showing some [pause] real cases of e-learning assisting web pages
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
James: that were not accessible at all, and show how can be more accessible using voice XML and Compalabras technology
[Discussion between Annie, Christopher and Charles]
James: For the wizard [pause] we are going to be, a close critical co-ordination, between [pause] French, partner 7, Adam and Thomas and [pause] um Charles from partner 9 and [pause] partners 1 and 2 with Annie and Christopher, with [pause] with us and the participation of Paul. Paul from the German side, and um [pause] in the scheduled plan we agreed for this work, is to receive the information in one week coming from partner 8, and from partner 7, and after that in three weeks we will be available the first version using Voice and Compalabras. This will be expected to be ready for the meeting, and the conclusions the date of this meeting, with some difficulty we have been able to pass. I do not know if there are any additional comments? Or the administrative issues regarding partner 8 to receive the paper this morning. And, also we need to do some modification with partner 7 and answer the potential name, also change of money, and answer the possible change of the name from partners 1 and 2, the review of work package 6, and also we made a review of work package 2, and we some frame of the plug in, and we have seen some very interesting discussions yesterday afternoon
[Can hear some whispering]
James: Regarding work package 1, user requirements and also [pause] we analysed the work carried out in work package 4. So, the conclusion [pause] from our point of view is combining all the needs of the different work package [pause] and also considering the conversation of this morning and more or less to be as follows, to work in the implementation of the partner 7 portal, [pause] and also showing some real cases of e-learning assisting in webpages that at this moment are not accessible at all, and also show how can be more accessible to use the voice xml and Compalabras technology. [Pause] for the admission it is going to be critical that the close co-ordination between the French relation, partner 7and Adam and Thomas, [pause]
Ronnie: And the extension of [pause] working with
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: to say that we do not want to change the amount, it will be very important

James: ok, any additional comments?
Jack: Are we missing something?
Ronnie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: any comments for discussion for this conclusion
Lucy: I think we had a very good meeting, difficult perhaps, but very interactive
Jack: It was necessary

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation, partner 8* (2nd meeting) Appendix K

Hazel: Ok that is a very brief introduction to the survey. I think the survey is worth continuing with, I do not think that we could give much weight to the results from 13 people. Um, I regard that almost as a pilot, and right now I would like to refine questions we asked and add some kind of demonstration or description of how voice xml could help visually impaired people to access e-learning. But
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: this kind of survey is only going to answer rather high level general questions, about what topics people would like, what is there level of interest, it is not going to answer the specific questions we were getting bogged down with this morning, of exactly how voice xml [pause] people who have never tried e-learning are not going to be able to answer those kinds of questions. But I was pleasantly surprised, that it is a useful thing and I think the commotion, if we keep going and have information, if we have each user group partner and university and tries to actually get 15-20 people to do a slightly better questionnaire and then for the review we would have
[Whispering]
Hazel: and for the review aim to have 75 people. I think this will be interesting data perhaps.
[Whispering]
Hazel: Does anyone want to ask questions about that? Comments?
Hazel: hmmm
Adam: Do we have to ask people?
Hazel: yes, I mean the, we should have a discussion some point tomorrow before we leave the meeting ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering]
Hazel: and see everything to make a concrete plan and decide what is reasonable, and what we want to do in work package 1

Source: 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *Review of agenda for tomorrow's meeting* (4th meeting) Appendix M

Jack: tomorrow I said, most of the things have been talked today, I will go for administrative issues
[Can hear Ronnie whispering]
Jack: and we will [pause] have to talk about work package 6
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and then it is time for any other business
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I think we have lots of time to talk
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: that's all folks
[Laughter from team members]

Planning a short meeting
Hazel: Would it be possible to have a short meeting after lunch, with user groups partners, to discuss exactly how we are going to do this and what we need before we all leave
Paul: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: so we all agree, ok.
James: before lunch?
Hazel: I would say after lunch, but depending on ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: even before if we get through ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Paul: depending on when you finish?
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: if we finish before or if not after lunch
Hazel: yes, yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Thomas: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Closing for first day of the meeting*) is when the main points of the meeting were summarized. This was also true for 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Conclusions from the meeting + AOB)* and 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation* where Hazel summarized the main pieces of information she had been talking about.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) is when Hazel proposed a short meeting with those working on a particular task together.

Guideline was also proposed when there was no evidence of sub-states applied to the discourse chunk. An example from our data is 12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *Review of agenda for tomorrow's meeting* when Jack was closing the meeting.

Hazel circulated the timeplan to the team using e-mail, which was discussing during the face-to-face meeting.
There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D12

Guideline type: **Updating on progress**

Description:
If you are attending another meeting looking at the same goals as a previous meeting, to provide an update of what progress had been made in your work since the last time you met.

Rationale:
It is useful to know what people have been working on in order to track progress.

Sources:
As this would result in a lot of transcript data, only the sources are provided.

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Informing others of the work, which has been done, work package six) (S2nd meeting)

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done, work package two*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work, which has been done, work package one*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Annie's presentation, work package two*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Charles presentation*, partner 9) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Project dissemination*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Standardization, Exploitation…) (3rd meeting) Appendix K
Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Review of work by work packages 2, 3 and 4) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Demonstration of partner seven's portal*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussion of the tool*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 7/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 1*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 7/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 7/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 1 – results from the evaluation study*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 7/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 7/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on work package 5*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 7/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Presentation on work package 1) (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Review of work package 1*) (4th meeting) Appendix K

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse *chunk (Work package 3 – Development of the tool. Review of work done since the last meeting)* (4th meeting) Appendix M

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning portal*) (4th meeting) Appendix M

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Work package 5 – Review of the evaluation part of the e-learning portal*) (4th meeting) Appendix M

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Review of the evaluation for the project authoring tool*) (4th meeting) Appendix M

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Demonstration of the prototype*) (4th meeting) Appendix M

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation by partner 4*) (4th meeting) Appendix M

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Demonstration on parser*) (4th meeting) Appendix M

Source: 13/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Work package 6*) (4th meeting)

Supporting materials:

Overall, the meetings were structured to include discussions and to inform on progress which had been made on work since they were all last together. The number of discourse chunks identified support this. The discourse chunks contained various sub-states.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline

Guideline number: D13

Guideline type: **Consulting the agenda once everyone has arrived to the meeting**

Description:
To inform the team if you know someone is going to be late arriving to the meeting. Once all members have arrived the agenda should be consulted to establish if there are any necessary changes and to decide whether any items need to be swapped around due to team member constraints.

Rationale:
It is important to inform the team when you know that someone is going to be late. A decision will need to be made on whether to wait for them or to start the meeting without them. This may depend on how long they will be before arriving to the meeting, and the time constraints of the other team members. If a meeting is already started, it is important to summarize any information they had missed at the next available opportunity, for example when a break is taken. Although agendas are useful to plan how time is going to be divided during the meeting, it is important to remain flexible, as sometimes an unexpected event can lead to a change in the circulated agenda.

Sources:
Informing of late arrivals

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing of late arrival*) (2nd meeting)

Hazel: Mary is coming, but we can start without her.
Jack: ah.
Hazel: She will be making one of the presentations
Jack: huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: about workpackage 1
Jack: okay ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: but she will be here by the coffee break, but that is not important to wait for her.

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing of late arrival*) (2nd meeting)

Jack: Ok, how I think we are all here. Paul?
Desmond: Paul is still missing. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: Paul is still missing. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: There were problems with the taxi. We were waiting for about ¾'s of an hour
[Laughter]
Jack: ¾'s oh an hour for a taxi? Oh
[Hazel is whispering to Kenneth]
[Laughter]
Ronnie: you use your white Kane at the airport
[Hazel laughs]
[Others laugh as well]
Ronnie: I did, I did use it for 30 seconds
[Laughter from partners]
Jack: okay so we can wait a few minutes more
[Can hear Lucy talking to someone in the background]
Desmond: you can start
Jack: we can start ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear individual discussions]
Jack: Then we will talk about the work package 6.
[Can hear people having individual discussions. Cannot hear what is being said]

Consulting the agenda

Source: 14/03/02 in the discourse chunk (*Review of meeting agenda)* of the transcript (2nd meeting)

Jack: Ok, how I think we are all here. Paul?
Desmond: Paul is still missing. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: Paul is still missing. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Desmond: There were problems with the taxi. We were waiting for about ¾'s of an hour.
[Laughter]
Jack: ¾'s oh an hour for a taxi? Oh
[Hazel is whispering to Kenneth]
[Laughter]
Ronnie: you use your white Kane at the airport
[Hazel laughs]
[Others laugh as well]
Ronnie: I did, I did use it for 30 seconds
[Laughter from partners]
Jack: okay so we can wait a few minutes more
[Can hear Lucy talking to someone in the background]
Desmond: you can start
Jack: we can start ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear individual discussions]
Jack: Then we will talk about the work package 6.
[Can hear people having individual discussions. Cannot hear what is being said]

Supporting materials:
Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing of late arrival)* (2nd meeting) is an example of when Hazel informed the team that Mary was going to be late, and that the meeting could be started in her absence.

There was also evidence of finding the same sub-states in 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing of late arrival)* when Desmond informed the team that Paul was still missing from the meeting, but could start without him as there had been some problems with getting a taxi that morning.

Evidence of this in 14/03/02 in the discourse chunk (*Review of meeting agenda*) of the transcript (2nd meeting) as well, when Jack was summarizing what was going to be covered during the two days of the meeting.

Generally changes were proposed during the meeting, and not identified at the outset, when consulting the agenda at the start of the meeting.

Evidence of Cramton's indicators

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing of late arrival*) when Hazel says that they can start the meeting without Mary, I interpreted as potential evidence of Cramton's indicator as "*unevenly distributed information*" as Mary would miss what Jack would be reporting to the team. Cramton did not write her interpretation of this indicator when a sample of my data was sent to her for validation. The other examples which were included where team members were going to be late arriving to the meeting would have been interpreted as the same indicator.

Guideline number: D14

Guideline type: **Structuring the meeting**

Description:

Team members should feel that they could propose a change to the agenda at any time during the meeting. For example noticing that something was missing from the circulated agenda or after watching a presentation identifying a need to allocate some time to discuss other issues which may have emerged from it.

Rationale:
As mentioned in D13 agendas are useful to plan how time is going to be divided during the meeting, however it is important to remain flexible. If you identify anything additional that should be added to the agenda the team should be informed. Depending on how the meeting has been structured may influence when additional items can be incorporated into the existing agenda.

Sources:

Change in agenda

Source: This was observed on 17/12/01 in the discourse chunk (*change to the agenda*) of the transcript (1st meeting)

Jack: Then in the meantime I can just um review what we are going to do.

[Jack is standing up while he is talking]
Jack: today and tomorrow we will wait for the real start. So the first thing is just to welcome
[Laughter as the light is switched on]
Jack: you to Paris, and to thank the people from partners 5 and 7 for the meeting. And, um so, just reviewing what I would like to do today. Today we will start of with a review of work package 6 and 2. And then a presentation of a demo that was agreed in the last meeting in London to create a small demo for the users so that they can start thinking and seeing what the prototype can be. This is a very preliminary [pause demo]
[Whispering between Michael and his translator]
Jack: And in the afternoon we will dedicate the whole afternoon to workpackage one. That is the workpackage that is now more advanced and developed
Desmond: Hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: And then tomorrow we will start with a very short explanation of what work package 3 is going on
Desmond: hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Ronnie arrives at the meeting]
Jack: I would like to remind you that yesterday afternoon we had our first working session, about work package 3, which started this month. Yesterday we were talking about a few things. Tomorrow we will explain to you what the plan is.
Hazel: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Lucy arrives]
[Whispering between Desmond and Kevin]
[Lots of small chatter between small groups]
Jack: So we will close the morning tomorrow with a short description about the administrative issues. What is needed, what was done, and then after all this discussion about the work, the different work package, we will have a more clearer idea about what is going on, so we can discuss and see what is the actions we will [pause] need to take and what the project is, how we are doing
[Can hear Ronnie whispering to someone]
Jack: we will have the next hours for deciding this things, and what is the work for the next future. I will also say that the next three months are very very important, and that maybe the [pause] or maybe it is of use to me, the future of the project will depend on the work done in the next three months
Desmond: hmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: I remind you that we have money for 12 months
[Whispering between Desmond and Kevin]
Jack: we will send documentation, in month 10 to the commission so that they can analyse what the project is, how the project is doing and they will [pause] decide if we have more money for the project for the next 15 months. The next three months are really important. And just one more thing, maybe you can see that Jonathan is missing here. He is technical co-ordinator. I would say he is I should say he was technical co-ordinator. He has left us, our company, he went to Italy, and now he is working on Telecom Italia, Lab, so in research and development. The reason is a very common one, an illness called love
[Hazel laughs]
[Others laugh as well]
[Could hear the whispering while Jack was talking]
Jack: His girlfriend is in Italy
[Elsie says something to Michael. Was to do with Jonathan not being here]
Jack: So he will still be in contact with us, and will be happy to receive any information, but he is working now since today or tomorrow for Telecom Italia. So, in the meantime, maybe from today Fabian will help us with the technical support.
[Can still hear whispering while Jack is talking. Cannot hear exactly what is being said]
Jack: We will let you know any news about this.
Charlotte: ok there is a slight change to the agenda that I sent around and in that we need to be out of this room earlier, um so Desmond will do and Paul will do their presentation on screen readers and after that there will be more opportunities for people to try out the speech and magnification systems themselves and um anyone who did not see quite what they wanted to this morning or try something out there will be more of a chance to do that. And um that will finish at four and then we can have any other further questions until half past four and then we need to finish in this room at half past four. I will now hand over to Desmond and Paul
Ronnie: Can I say something please before they start, I think there is a need to um to spend at least half an hour of the afternoon discussing the general structure and the general problems of the project, [pause] I will tell you later on the reason for this, I think um this kind of exercise to look at these special technologies etc is not for all of us. We have already spent some of the time during the morning [pause]. It was an exercise that I do not think was useful for all of us and I think we should really use part of our time in the afternoon to discuss very very important and, and essential issues for our project, because I think there must be some rethinking and there must be some suggestions to put forward in order to clarify at, at least um from a general point of view some aspects of the project from our point of view are not sufficiently clear. So I think that we should leave the exercise of the technology and straight after the presentation go onto discuss those methods. Thank you.
[Michael's' translator and him are whispering to each other]
Charlotte: Hazel do you want to comment on that or sort of, I do not know what we are discussing tomorrow so, ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Hazel: yes. I mean I did not set the agenda for tomorrow so given that this afternoon is the only time we have to have to spend more time looking at the technology, I am not really sure what the best plan is. I think we [pause] because I agree with both sides of the story is the problem. ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
[Ronnie laughs]
Hazel: I am modestly taught, so Jack
Jack: err I said in the agenda tomorrow afternoon is this work package 1 follow up and conclusion, that was the point where we had to discuss how the project is going, what the problems are, so more in the sense of your suggestions
Charlotte: and this afternoon is the only other time we will have the machines with access technology on there
Somone: Uh-huh. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: so if, who, would people find it useful to go over the technology and try it out for themselves?
Someone: Um
Someone: Um how
Ronnie: we could ask who needs to do it and then see
Paul: Right who actually wants to have some hands on work with the technology this afternoon, who needs that?
[Pause]
Charlotte: who would like to try the technology this afternoon?
[Muttering in the background]
Someone: all the technical partners
Charlotte: ok. 1-2-3-4-5, that is quite a number of people, did you two say yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ben: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: yes ***Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: ok. That is seven people and [pauses] so seven people would like to try the technology. Um I think that since today is the only time the technology available ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Desmond: I understand that. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: we give people the time to do so
Desmond: the advantage would be that Peter has to leave this evening and I have to leave tomorrow at a quarter to twelve or one o clock and I could not be there
Hazel: can I
Desmond: tomorrow
Hazel: can I suggest a compromise and suggest that we swap the morning and the afternoon around for tomorrow, so that,
Fabian: no, no, not possible for me I have to leave also at one or so tomorrow ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: right. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Somene: this small coordination points and then the more technical focus for the afternoon
Paul: But for future meetings like that I would really would suggest, that if there should arise the necessity to look at technology again from some other point of view then we really should try and plan things differently. Because I know that for some of us it has really been, I am sorry to say that but straight up and straight forward this, this morning has been a waste of time. I realize that some of you really need to know the technology and need to look at it but I really think that this is not the way to really deal with it while there are several people here who had to travel here yesterday and spend time, and we all do other things and we are all on busy schedules, so I really think this needs to be planned a little more carefully, so we will not have another meeting like this, if ever um [pause] opportunity should, necessity should arise to look at technology again. I am not going to say more, I do not want to take more time away from you
Ronnie: so lets organize if possible the afternoon that we have at least half an hour before leaving open for discussion
Someone: Uh-huh. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: to concentrate on the technology
Someone: Yeah. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: moment and then from four o'clock to half past four to make a general discussion because we are all here. Many of us will not be there tomorrow, even some from Spain who are the project leaders, so I think we must do it.
Jonathan: that is not a problem, half an hour ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: is that a problem?
Kenneth: Male: I would suggest that we are going to do that, it would be better to follow immediately after the presentation, with that discussion
Hazel: I would agree. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: then it would allow those people that want to stay on and look at technology can and those that don't can go back to their hotels and whatever
Charlotte: we can look at the technology till half past four, I just need to pack up the computers and everything for um five, so, um we can still do that.
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: And can we make sure that we break that discussion um after half an hour, then there will still be time to look at the technology
Ronnie: but we really do it in the interest of the project
Peter: ok. Lets get started *[pause]* ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Proposing a change in the agenda*) (2nd meeting)

Ronnie: Can I interrupt you for a minute
Fabian: Yes of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: this um last item it takes us to a connection, it is a connection with some work we have done
[Whispering between Kevin and Lucy. Cannot hear what was said]
Ronnie: in package four.
Fabian: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I did not see on the agenda any indication relating package 4, so I would like to propose that we [pause] more or less try to take the effort, because we have work [pause] on the concept. We would like to give some information on this as well.
Fabian: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Fabian: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Ok we are going to consider the proposal. My name is James, I am from partner 1. I think it would be better to decide in this moment where we can introduce this discussion regarding work package 4 This afternoon would it be possible to have a small time? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Just after one
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: before the coffee break.
Annie: Or you can do it first?

Ronnie: I think, I am not sure, but I think it would be interesting ***(Sub-state 3.1)***

Fabian: Ya ***(Sub-state 1.3***
Ronnie: to put it after the creation of the tables
[Can hear whispering in the background. Cannot hear what is said]
Ronnie: Maybe from the technical point of view it should be … what do you think about it?
Hazel: Tin of sardines
[People seem to be having their own discussions]
Ronnie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1***)
ames: one of you is in directive, so why don't you connect the work
[Everyone seems to be having their own discussions]
Ronnie: whatever you wish, it is not difficult for us ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
James: Is it possible after 1.1?
(Sub-state 4.1)
[People have their own discussions – cannot hear what is being said]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk *(E-learning presentation (work package 1))* (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Adam: I think [pause] this classification, we had [pause] we have taken at least [pause] things that exist on the website, on the Internet. But the difficulty is to classify them, because each site, give, provides a services which is, [pause] which can be [pause] be classified in one of these categories
Mary: or more ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Pause]
Ronnie: In my opinion we have to become very clear [pause] a very clear area of work
[Can hear Mary whispering]
Ronnie: and this cannot be done excluding, [pause] it must be done selecting
[Can still hear Mary whispering to Hazel]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: let's digest the question and take a bit of time
[Some laughter from partners]
James: in any case we can consider this point [pause]
Hazel: but can we come back to this question in the morning, because I think we are all getting tired, and I would like to hear about what Thomas has to say, and then what Mary has to say in her presentation on authoring tools is actually related to this question as well.
[Can hear some whispering]
Ronnie: So
Hazel: So, if we have all the material and then go away and digest it, and think and perhaps discuss over dinner and drinks and come back fresh in the morning.
Ronnie: Ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: have a huge
[Laughter from Hazel, Mary and some other]
Hazel: Find a solution [laughs]
[Paul laughs as well, and so do some others, including Annie]
Hazel: yes partners 1 and 2 has the solution.

Source: 06/06/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*informing of change to the afternoon session)* (3rd meeting) Appendix K

Jack: We have made a change in the afternoon session. We will start with the demo, a demo by the partner 5 on the portal.
Lucy: partner 7 name said***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Morris: partner 7 name said ***(Sub-state 2.1)***

Jack: ok [gives a small laugh] sorry, [gives a small laugh again]. And then instead of doing what was prepared before, the demo of this morning, is start, I think we should talk and discuss about what was started this morning, and what was the objectives, the, the [pause] the objectives of the future, and what are the things we should do. It is important that we all agree today, on this point, so we all know exactly where we are going. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: Jack. Jack
Ronnie: Just to clarify please
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: we had during the morning, the change, of [pause] of views, but I would like to make it clear that our point does not substantially differ from yours
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: there is no conflict there
Jack: hmmm, no, no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: no just making clear. I do not think that we need to start again the long discussion of the, [pause] what are our goals, aims, etc, we need to discuss some of the details
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I would like to acknowledge some of the good work we have done, and just to clarify, that there is no critical position, ok, clear?
Jack: hmmm, yeah, but ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Adam and Morris are talking]

Source: 6/6/02 Discourse chunk, (*Demonstration of partner 7's portal*) (3rd meeting) Appendix K
Morris: Sorry, we have a technical problem here. [Pause] apparently our friends here have a technical problem. I do not know if it would be possible, to show this to you, at a later stage, may be tomorrow morning, to try and fix, to try and fix it
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: will there be time to do that tomorrow?
Jack: Tomorrow?
Morris: yes, because there is a problem with Cynthia. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: There is work package one, how long, would it be? 20 mins, I am asking Mary
Mary: maybe the second slot, that is discussion of work package 1, which is between 11.30 and 12.30
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: mhm hmm, after the coffee break ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk.

Evidence of this in 14/03/02 in the discourse chunk (*Review of meeting agenda*) of the transcript (2nd meeting) as well, when Jack was summarizing what was going to be covered during the two days of the meeting.

Also on 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning presentation (work package 1)*) when Ronne suggested that people take time to think of what was discussing during the first day of the meeting and to consider it again on day two. This was proposing a change in the agenda.

15.03.02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Project dissemination: project brochure) shows an example of when a change to the agenda was made, by re-arranging the timings of some of the items to be discussed during the meeting.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk, (*informing of changes to the afternoon session*) (3rd meeting) is another example of a change in the agenda.

6/6/02 Discourse chunk (*Demonstration of partner 7's portal)* (3rd meeting) when Morris asked if they could change the agenda and to show their demonstration on day two of the meeting due to some technical problems which were being experienced. This led to a small discussion detailing when this demonstration could be shown.

Guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of differences in states and sub-states in a discourse chunk. For example, on 17/12/01 in the discourse chunk *(change to the agenda*) of the transcript when Ronnie suggested including something into the agenda and a discussion on when and where it should be included.

Also, on 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Proposing a change in the agenda*) when Ronnie mentioned what he would like discussed during the meeting and a discussion emerging on when it could be incorporated into the meeting.

Guideline number: D15

Guideline type: **Making presentation preparations**

Description:
If you are not happy with any presentation, which is given, to offer those team members more time, resources and support in preparing for another presentation. If you have made a presentation to the team, which may be useful to someone else in making preparations for their presentations, you should find a way of transferring files from one computer to another, if it cannot be placed immediately onto a central store for sharing with the entire team.

Rationale:
Sometimes presentations can be delivered which do not meet your expectation. For this reason if time permits, they should be able to re-present their work. For this to be effective the partners must be told what they should present by making it clear what you were expecting to see.

Sources:

During a presentation on 14.3.02 when the technical partners were showing a demonstration of their prototype, there was some reaction from the blind members in the team, saying that what they were proposing was already on offer. The day next another presentation was delivered, and one of the partners commented that they were still not happy with the presentation which was delivered.

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Annie: Good morning as we promised yesterday [pause] we will be giving a presentation, please excuse the spelling mistakes, and if it is not very nice, but, anyway what we try and intend to do in this presentation is to clarify a bit more, what [pause] the project voice solution could provide. Um [pause] and our value. to current screenreaders. This presentation will go on as follows [pause] first of all, we will talk a little bit about the objectives of the presentation, then we will go to the add value which
[Ronnie and Lucy Whispering - Lucy has a smile on her face]
Annie: the project voice interaction, [pause] will provide to the existing web design components. And, we will make a list of the general advantages that we, voice input and voice can from you voice can from your point of view, you
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: any ideas, you think we could make [pause] useful in our project. And, then a very brief review of the, of work package 3, that we started, [pause] this month. Partner 9 is the leader, we are working with IPT,
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and us (partners 1 and 2), [pause] and our Belgium friends and our Italian friends. [Pause] The objectives of this presentation is to get a better understanding of the add value that the project solution would provide to screenreaders
[Paul whispers something to Kevin]
Annie: [pause] we will make a list of advantages that the voice solution will provide
[Can still hear Paul whispering to Kevin]
Annie: to go and navigator environment, and e-learning world, and we will invite you to brainstorm on how voice technology can help visually impaired people to work with the internet and to encourage them to join e-learning courses. This presentation is based on the following documents: partner 3 problems the visually impaired people may have on the websites, and partner 9 documents on what voice can do for visually impaired people
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: which is other side of the problem, [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: and the partner 8 slide presentation, that Mary and Hazel held on the situation of current e-learning courses, plus their experience in web technology as applied to
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: that is all information, which we got from the meeting we got yesterday [Pause] I will continue now, summarising some points, that according to the documents we have been reviewing yesterday, are problems to the user, that the project solution [pause] intends to implement.
[Can hear whispering]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide*) (2nd meeting)

Ronnie: Can I make a point
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: um [pause] I still see that their are still some details which are a little bit [pause] unclear. There is a very important document, which has not been considered for your presentation, for any reasons it may happen. Personally, I think we should identify [pause] a [pause] strategy to solve, improve the situation. We all have a very, very great interest [pause] in making this project progress
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Annie and Christopher whispering]
Ronnie: To go to the evaluation with something, which is innovative. Because, if it is not innovative, they will not [pause] accept the continuation of the project, in my opinion. [Pause] The situation, where you are now is not novel, and this is the danger for the whole project, because this project has very good possibilities to develop, and it would be a pity, you would [pause] technical problems it would be. So, in order to progress with the project, [pause] would like to propose two possible proposals. Come back to the proposal I made yesterday to liase and have a practical, a practical understanding of what screenreaders do, shown by blind people.
[Kevin whispers to Desmond]
Ronnie using them, it should have been done in London, but apparently it was not enough, it may happen in life, not in the project. I think the other possible solution is that you organise a technical meeting with some of the user groups, for example our German colleagues, and whoever would to participate, the French people for example. [Pause] You take these technicians, these experts, to Madrid, to your, to your premises, and there you have a technical session at your expense, and you [pause] you clarify once forever, this situation.
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: Because until now there are some details which are not clear. I think if we go, if we continue to take, making this presentation
[Mary is whispering to Hazel]
Ronnie: which is made on incomplete set of data, we are loosing our time and we should concentrate our time on issues where we can progress. [Pause] and to leave this aside, take one month time to clarify the situation and you still have two months to implement that, [pause] the solution of this project. This is a strategy, which could help to solve the problem. I see the need of [pause] collaborating altogether to solve the project, because otherwise we will probably not continue working after the evaluation. Thank you very much.
James: Ok, thank you for you information. This is [pause] this is the point of view of the ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I have consulted with the German colleagues before speaking, I know that the French user groups agree
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: I do not know what partner 3 think about this, sorry, I could not ask them. ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Kenneth: That's ok, I would totally agree with you, I think it is desperately necessary, although as user groups, as user groups our key interest is in users, we do have a substantial amount of technical knowledge we could bring and help to move the whole discussion up. ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
[Kevin speaks to Desmond]
[Ronnie asks Michael and Michael replies]
Translator: Yes we agree ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: Can I just make one slight change, a proposal, given that the entre is not part of the project, and we have [pause] in the project, a number of user groups who have a great deal of knowledge about how blind user use the web and these problems, and I think within the project we need to train [pause] um our colleagues to be expert blind users of the web, because I think this discussion is at the, is to much at the level of generality. [Pause] And by working a longside
[Ronnie whispers something to Lucy]
Hazel: a blind users, using the web, how that can be arranged
Desmond: with the presentation, something's
James: Sorry Charles, sorry
[Can hear some whispering
James: Sorry, one moment,
Charles: Well, I just wanted to know if you are going to listen to the rest of the presentation or some of my own ideas presented.
James: Ok, perhaps [pause] it could be directed to see the point of view of partner 9, and after that we can [pause] take the decision ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Paul: ok ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
[Can hear some whispering]

James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
[This presentation from the Spanish partners was not completed]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's presentation, partner 8*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Hazel: Excellent. It seems to me, listening and hearing about this, it might be very useful ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: to have this presentation
Hazel: No, no, no, more than that, to have the e-learning courses ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: they, that you, um these are important, these are not just websites, these are important e-learning courses you have to pay for
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: they are not very expensive
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: What did they cost us?
Mary: $110
Hazel: $110 America
Mary: for each course
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Discussion – can hear asking about course]
Hazel: So, you can really get to the e-learning u functionality
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Others say yes and uh-huh in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 spoken evidences)***
Hazel: and you can go through, looking, immediately, send you more details
[Whispering]
Hazel: about this, but looking at the problems and thinking what about
[Whispering]
Hazel: how can voice do this better?
Annie: it would be very useful ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: I think this might be the real solution
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: real solution
Annie: Actually I have, have some solutions to the problems
[Whispering]
Hazel: right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[mhmm said in the background] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: I ask you for this presentation
Hazel: absolutely ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: for tomorrow to prepare for the presentation
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes. We transfer it ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: from mine to yours. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning presentation (work package 1)*) (2nd meeting)

Desmond: Could you send us your presentation?

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of no sub-states in relevant discourse chunks. 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide*) is an example of a second presentation being prepared as the first one did not meet the expectations of the team members. Also in 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*E-learning presentation (work package 1)*) when Desmond asked if he could have a copy of the presentation.

The guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in relevant discourse chunks. 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide*) is an example.
The guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of different sub-states in a discourse chunk. 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Hazel's's presentation, partner 1 8)* is an example. Here Annie asked for a presentation from one of the other partners as she believed that it would help them in their preparation of a presentation for day two of the meeting, as the original presentation which was planned did not meet the needs of some of the team members.

Evidence of Cramton's indicators

The extract from 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on what the Project voice solution can provide*) when Ronnie mentions some things still being unclear to him, shows potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"Difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not write down what this extract showed evidence of when she was asked to validate a sample of my data.

15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide*) when Charles asked if the rest of the presentation was going to be listened to, I interpreted this as potential evidence of Cramton's indicator *"Difficulty in communicating the salience of information"*. Cramton did not write down what this extract showed evidence of when she was asked to validate a sample of my data.

However, the two potential indicators identify the need to explain things clearly when someone is still unclear about what you are referring to, and to remain calm at all times whilst repeating and explaining the information again. Also, to offer support when a presentation is delivered which does not meet your expectations.

Guideline number: D16

Guideline type: **Selecting a date for a next meeting**

Description:
To arrange a date for a next meeting while team members are still together. To hold an optimal meeting, team members should arrive the night before if they are not in easy travel distance and should be encouraged to stay at the same hotel if their atttendance to the meeting requires an over night stay. This is to encourage informal discussions during their own time.

Rationale:
Deciding on a date to suit all parties can be a difficult job to do, by doing this face-to-face hopes to be easier than communicating by e-mail for example.

Sources:

Source: 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Next meeting date*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Hazel: Are there other issues people would like to address
[Pause]
Ben: can we have a definite meeting date for next
Hazel: I think its March
Lucy: I think its 18th and 19th of March
Ronnie: on the 20th there is a Madrid conference
Hazel: I have the 11th and 12th, I have another meeting, in fact several people in this room have a meeting in London on 18th and 19th of March ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: ah 18th?
Hazel: yes that's right, well ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Charlotte says something to Kenneth]
[People engaged in their own conversations]
Lucy: Do you want it Thursday or Friday?
Hazel: Thursday or Friday. I think it should be two days ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh. ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Lucy: then the 14th and 15th
Hazel: 14th and 15th what about 14th and 15th? That is ok with me. What about everyone else? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[People having their own conversations. cannot hear what they are saying]
Hazel: I will send an email to the whole consortium telling them of those dates
Jonathan: ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: so Jack, ok, ok, shall we declare the meeting closed for today, and then the technical partners can have fun tomorrow morning
[Laughter]
Meeting closed at 3.50

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Discussion on choosing a date for the next consortium meeting*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I
Lucy: For partner 5 is it possible to have our meeting on the 14th?
Jack: So, this is our suggestion - about 1 month before the end of July to have a meeting. So, partner 5, [pause] for partner 7 it is not possible
Lucy: For 14th it is not ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: How about the others?
Paul: You talking of June now?
Jack: June, yes, meet
[Someone in the background says to meet the day before]
James: 20 and 21?
Jack: 20 and 21 and the week after
Hazel: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and the week after that
[Pause]
Paul: What about the week before?
Jack: 6th and 7th
Hazel: 6th and 7th no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: No, no we have to go to, partner 7 ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Small discussion between Lucy, Morris and Ronnie to do with the dates]
James: So, there is some problems with this
Hazel: 20th and 21st
[Some own discussions taking place]
Jack: 20th and 21st
James: Is that ok for you?
Ronnie: Where should the meeting take place?
Jack: I would say again Madrid, [pause] lots of technical results should be, so we have all the portal and something [pause]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: there are many, many events in Madrid in June, so, I would, if we decide to have it in Madrid, it is necessary to book already, the hotel rooms
[Someone in the background says uh-huh and yes] ***(Sub-state 1.1 x 2 –spoken and non verbal evidence)***
Ronnie: and
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: and it cannot be on the 18th and 19th
Jack: 19th and 20th
James: Wednesday and Tuesday ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: For us, it is fine [gives a small laugh]
Hazel: it's ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: Does anyone have a problem
Jack: I do not know the problem with travel, including Saturdays and that [pause]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: It is a problem of, it is a problem of ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Elsie: of travel, it is
Ronnie: no, if you have a stick
Elsie: no, ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: if you have a Saturday included it is cheaper
Hazel: much, much cheaper ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel laughs when she said it is much cheaper]
Lucy: no, no you have to have a Sunday, it is maybe cheaper ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Ronnie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Elsie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Hazel: Saturday night
Paul: Saturday night ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: yes, you have to miss ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: hmm
[Some individual discussions taking place re the choice of dates for the next meeting]
James: So one possibility is 19th and 20,
Jack: Wednesday or Thursday
James: is that ok with every one of you? Or there is the 6th and 7th
Ronnie: Unfortunately on the 6th and 7th we have [pause] we have the partner 7 conference and we cannot go ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: 19th and 20th
Jack: it looks like 20 and 21

Ronnie: what is this weekend [pause] 22 and 23. What is the weekend?
[Someone replies]
Ronnie: So, if we can take 21 and 22 [pause] we can then leave on Sunday
Hazel: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: I think that is ok ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Elsie: no ***(Sub-state 2.3)***
Hazel: no [gives a small laugh] ***(Sub-state 2.3)***
[Mary laughs as well]
Paul: 20th and 21?
Hazel: 20th and 21 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some own discussions taking place]
Desmond: What is the answer?
James: 20 and 21, is that ok for everybody
Ronnie: It's not ok for Lucy unfortunately ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Lucy: no, 19th and 20th
Kenneth: uh-huh 19th and 20th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: Then we will have to stay in
[Some own discussions taking place
Paul: So, which dates do we finally agree on
[Own discussions taking place regarding the suitability of the date for the next consortium meeting]
Jack: I do not think there is an agreement ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
[Someone in the background laughs]
Hazel: 19th and 20th
Kenneth: 19th and 20th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: 19th and 20, which we can ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: 19 and 20 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: Wednesday
Lucy: Wednesday ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Hazel laughs]
Paul: Wednesday's are always difficult for me at least, but if I am the only one do not worry. Thursday and Friday would be better, [pause] but if I am the only one [pause] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: the idea of having
Mary: how about 17th [Mary gives a small laugh]
[Some own discussions taking place again]
Desmond: Thursday and Friday, Thursday and Friday would be better for us
Jack: sorry
Desmond: Thursday and Friday would be better for us
Jack: ah, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some discussions taking place]
Mary: how about Monday and Tuesday [Gives a small laugh as well]
[Hazel: Monday and Tuesday [laughs as well]
James: Ok. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: and the meeting is on Saturday [gives a small laugh]
Mary: ooh good ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: It must be clear that we will have some problems with, with the tickets. It is inevitable
Elsie: yes, it will be expensive ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: it is more expensive anyway
[Can hear some own discussions]
James: Ok, so 20th and 21
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Yes, but Elsie said that it is a problem ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Hazel laughs]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Desmond: But then partner 5 will not be able to come
James:
Desmond: 20 and 21, partner 5 will not be able to come
James: ok, so ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: It's just Lucy, not the others,
Lucy: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: ah nobody ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James: So it is not ok 20 and 21. We have to look at other dates [pause] 14th and 15th was not available
[Some own discussions taking place]
Ronnie: and the weekend after would it be too late?
James: yes, yes, it is just one month before the final submission, and if there is some misunderstanding ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: And I think that is dangerous [Gives a small laugh]
Jack: I think, I think it would be difficult for the technical partners to react
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in one month
Ronnie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: and if we take [pause] the beginning of the week and not the end, 17th and 18th?
Desmond: 17th and 18th?
Hazel: No, I cannot do the 17th and 18th ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: on 18th I have a meeting with my workshop, so no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: 10 and 11th?
[Laughter from some of the partners]
Mary: you decide [gives a small laugh]
James: 10th and 11th?
Michael: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Someone else said yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: no, ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
Ronnie: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Mary: no, no [laughs] ***(Sub-state 2.2)***
[Some other partners laugh as well]
Hazel: [laughs] I have the 20th? [Pause] 3rd and 4th?
Lucy: no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Elsie: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: No [laughs] ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Hazel laughs as well]
Mary: What happened 6th and 7th, did anyone say they cannot do that?
[Some own discussions taking place]

Hazel: or the 6th and 7th?
[Some own discussion takes place]
Desmond: 6th and 7th no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: ok, it is not good [laughs] ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Hazel: 3 and 4
Paul: 3 and 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: what about 2005?
[Everyone laughs]
Hazel: Is anyone free?
[Laughter again]
Jack: So, the last 3 and 4?
Hazel: 3 and 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: 3 and 4 ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: 3 and 4?
[Looks at everyone saying 3 and 4 – Mary and Hazel laugh. So do others]
Paul: solved
Hazel: solved ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Laughter from partners again]
[Some own discussions taking place]
Paul: Jack if we say the 3rd and 4th of June, [pause] can we plan it so that we really start on the Monday morning and not just arrive on the Monday
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: would that be possible?
Jack: to start
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: To start from the Monday morning and
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: not to arrive on the Monday and we only have Monday afternoon
Hazel: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and to really say
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: to arrive on the Sunday and say work on Monday morning?
Hazel: yes, I think that is important ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James. I have got
[Some laughter]
Elsie: 9 o'clock will be ok [gives a small laugh]
[Some own discussions take place]

Source: 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*A.O.B*) pg (2nd meeting) appendix I

Paul: I guess reasons, unknown to me, but organisational reasons, we all stayed in different place.
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]Paul: I have always found that at meetings like this, that it would be nice to have all the participants staying at the same place, so you could use the times in the evening, if you wanted to for some informal contacts. SO, I would suggest for future meetings beginning
[Can hear whispering – think it is the translator]
Paul: maybe starting with the one in Madrid that if you try and make sure that all [pause] stay at the same hotel. We do not have to [pause] sit on each other's lap
[Laughter – Hazel, Mary and some others]
Paul: but it would be nice to just have the opportunity, that if we want that, to exchange some ideas, just some informal contact over dinner or over drinks, or whatever.
Jack: So, one question of this issue. Do you prefer to be close to the venue of the meeting?
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or
Fabian: or the hotel
Ronnie: which is please sufficiently accessible and is easy to
Mary: hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and
Jack: ok, so the next question is how about the hotel for the kick off meeting, it was good enough? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***Mary: I think most of us
Paul: it was all right ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Hazel: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: sorry
Elsie: IT was Alais mos?
Jack: Alais mos [pause ***(Sub-state 1.1)***]
Hazel: yes that was fine ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: That was fine, so we will try to have this one ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear some own discussions]

Source: 7/6/02 discourse chunk *presentation date of next meeting* (Third meeting) Appendix K

James We propose, after consulting with partner 9, we propose to the consortium, that to celebrate the next meeting in September, [pause] in Luevena
Mary: Lueven ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: in Belgium
Annie: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
Desmond: yes, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: Um, and [pause] and we also [pause] propose this meeting
[Can still hear whispering]
James: all [pause] or perhaps the 11th and 12, or the 18th and 19th, as we have to move several persons to Holland, from Holland to Belgium is not an additional cost for us.
Lucy: the 11th and the 12th, is a Wednesday and Thursday
James: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: so we will have very expensive tickets. Is it not possible to put it on the weekend?
James: the meeting?
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: Beginning on Thursday, and finishing on Friday
Someone: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Lucy: because to have an appex ticket,
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: you have to stay one night, from Saturday to Sunday
Mary: yes Saturday ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: to reduce [pause] the costs of the partners [pause] ok, 12th and 13th? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Lucy: ok 12th and 13th? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can still hear whispering]
James: or perhaps 19th and 20th, and perhaps this is to late
[Can still hear whispering]
James: if we have to modify several things
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: for the deliverables
Kenneth: I am at a conference, in Budapest on the 19th and 20th ***(Sub-state 2.1)***

James: 19th and 20th?
Some people say: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: 12th and 13th is available for everyone?
[Can hear whispering]
[Paul clicks his fingers]
Paul: Did we not just talk about um, [pause] having a Saturday night meeting?
(Sub-state 5.1)
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Paul: so, I do not get it? You are now talking about a Thursday and Friday again, but in order to reduce travel costs, Lucy just pointed
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: that it would be good to have [pause] to have a weekend date. So what about Friday and Saturday?
James: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: we will
James: This is in the same line, with the proposal with partner 5,
[Can hear whispering]
James: in order to put the meetings, in [pause] Thursday and Friday, and [pause] um [pause] Saturday and Sunday?
[Can hear clicking]
James: is not available for the private companies, because [pause] we are not, it it, is not possible for the private companies, so, [pause]
Lucy: but we have a date on it
James: and what about Thursday and Friday?
Lucy: what about have the date on a Saturday? If we work the whole Friday, and like today, we have half a day on Saturday. Is this not possible?
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Can hear whispering]
James: sorry ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
Lucy: no ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James: I believe it is not ok for everyone, for [pause] for several partners
Paul: it is possible
James: Thursday and Friday?
[Can hear whispering]
James: Thursday and Friday, in the same way that we have [pause] that we have made today, for example?
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: but why not? I do not understand, why is it not possible to have Friday, and half of the Saturday, I do not get it
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Kenneth tries to speak]
James: because, because
Kenneth: because we do not agree on meetings at the weekends. I am sorry we are working long enough hours, without meeting ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: at the meetings as well. And there is absolutely no need to do so, [pause] and [pause] we should be able to hold these meetings during the week
[Can hear whispering]
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
James: ok, so [pause] trying to use Thursday and Friday?
Mary: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some others say yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: we will try to make it on Thursday
[Can hear whispering]
James: and try, to [pause]
[Can hear whispering]
James: What about the 12th and 13th of September
[Can hear whispering]
[Mary and Erin are whispering]
Lucy: Can you say it again?
James: 12 and 13th? [Says it slowly]
Lucy: good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: 12th and the 13th, yep, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
[Own discussions taking place]
Kenneth: I cannot be sure ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
James: ok, ok, so, [pause] thank you ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
(Sub-state 4.1)
[Can hear whispering]

Review report

Kenneth: um, just
James: Yes, just one
Kenneth: just going back to the review report
[Fabian nods his head] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
James: yup ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: one of the things that they pick up is, is the exploitation plan should be developed the risk assessment, should be carried out, and the business plan needs to be developed.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: When are we going to.[pause] when are they going to be done, because they would be expected to certainly be [pause] be part of the annual report.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: the exploitation, [pause] the development on the exploitation plan, risk assessment of the project, and [pause] um the business plan, should be developed [pause] should be developed.
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: And by including them in this review, the commission, is going to actually expect a response to those
James: One second.
Jack: My, my understanding is this [pause] is that um [pause] as, in the executive summary that they say the same thing, but [pause] they explain the exploitation plan is very general, and should be developed throughout the course of the project. I do not expect that right now [pause]
Kenneth: but, I think you need to check with the commission, but I [pause] from other projects, I would expect that they would want an updated version [pause] as part of the annual report
Jack: ah, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but the annual report
Jack: ah, you mean the annual review, at the end of the
Kenneth: at the end of the first year
Jack: ah, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: in other words, when we do the [pause]
Jack: I thought you meant now
Kenneth: no, [pause] by the end of September ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Kenneth: we need to be looking at [pause] at addressing those points
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Kenneth: So, that is another part of the deliverable which were not included as part of your earlier list.
James: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
James: Ok, so now we [pause] we will update the exploitation plan, as part of the deliverable for
[Can hear whispering]
James: um
Kenneth: and again it will need to be noted in the technical annex, because, again, in order to address the review comments
Jack: ya ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: we need to say [pause] what are we going to do about it
James: ok, thank you, very much for these useful comments. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 13/9/0/2 Discourse chunk: *Date of next meeting* (4th meeting) appendix M

Jack: one more administrative] pause] the next meeting, sorry, I forgot, I do not know if it was decided, Hazel is not here, or the Germans, but we can at least talk about it, we can talk about a draft for the next meeting. You know that we usually [pause] meet every three months or less, so that will be [pause], now it is September, so it will be [pause] will be mid or beginning December. That is our first possible date, or January, or even [pause] beginning of February. As I can see here [pause] but [pause] the next deliverables after the ones we will send to the commission, at the end of September, we have a month 18 [pause] one in [pause] one in work package 3, that is the functional analysis and technical design of the tool, and that is the end of month 18, that is the end of February.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: and one for work package 4 that is the portal design [pause] also, at the end of February. Here is the old version of
Kenneth: but you have until month 16 on the evaluation
Jack: two for the evaluation, one is now for the end, [pause] is the first evaluation for the portal, and the other is the first evaluation for the tool
[Can hear clicking]
Jack: Also for the month [pause]
Kenneth: 16
Jack 18
Kenneth: 16, is the end of the year, at the [pause] at the beginning of next year. ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: So
James: if you put the meeting in January, you can handle both, the deliverables from month 17 to 18
Jack: so, January, we can meet
Annie: middle January
Jack: we can meet [pause] and before the date, the place, the [pause] we have been
[Ronnie whispering]
Jack: we have been two times, twice in Madrid, [pause] and in London, and in Paris, and in Lueven. And now we have [pause] Verona, and Burn, the Germans are not here, so we do not know if it is possible. [Gives a small laugh] So, it is their problems, so I propose. I already talk to you that [pause] it is ok. What about the other partners do you agree for Verona?
Ronnie: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[James laughs]
Jack: As they say now is the best time to see Verona. [Pause]
James: and anyway it will be better than Leven in that time
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, it is better than Leuven or burn
[Some people laugh]
Jack: ok, so
James: a suggestion for the dates?
Jack: in Verona and the dates?
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: to include a Saturday night for the price of cheap tickets
Jack: yeah, that is the same, [pause] discussion we already had We can do Thursday, Friday, and if someone wants to use the Saturday night discount then they can stay. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: to use Wednesday and Sunday, it is possible for very low prices for the tickets
James: yes, but it means that the meeting on Tuesday and Friday.
Translator: and Saturday for the low price
Jack: no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
James: no, ***(Sub-state 1.2***
Jack: We have already had a discussion, we cannot do a weekend date, [pause] this is for the meeting, not all the partners can do it.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I think Thursday, Friday is the better choice
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: mhhmm hmmm ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some others say yes in the background as well] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: so, we have
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: 16th and 17th?
[Can hear whispering]
Lucy: no ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: Thursday and Friday?
Jack: Thursday and Friday, yes, 17th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I guess we, [pause] is someone is mind, this date, 16th, 17th of January is impossible.
Ronnie: we need to check ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Kenneth: yes ***(Sub-state 1.3)***
Ronnie: If you do not hear anything it is ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
(Sub-state 4.1)
Translator: on that day
Jack: sorry,
Translator: 17th is the Friday [pause] to fly the 17th.
Mary: it is a Thursday ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Ronnie: it is a Thursday ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
James: Then people should take an extra holiday
Jack: the 17th
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ah, Friday the 13th [gives a small laugh]
[Other laughs as well]
Jack: 17th on a Friday
Mary: is it unlucky?
Ronnie: it is not all
Jack: in Italy it is bad luck
Annie: ahh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: in Spain it is Tuesday the 13th
Annie: Tuesday the 13th ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some laughter]
James: ok, I do not think that we should pay attention ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Some people laugh]
Jack: So, I think that is why our flights were so cheap

[Laughter]
Jack: this week, no one wanted to fly
Mary: to fly
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, so Morris and the translator told me Verona airport, in the partner 4
Translator: we can check for flying the best flight, we can give you the very [pause] for a direct flight to Verona, and it is cheaper flight from London to Brushia, it is only 50 minutes, and there is connection by bus, and it is very cheaper. And, with Brussels, you can use the [pause] you can use the Wygan and it is one hour 15minutes by train.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: never mention Ryan air.
Translator: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: this company, [pause] makes it very difficult, [pause] it makes you pay for a wheelchair and an assistant. So, [pause] at least do not publicise this
[Some people laugh]
Translator: I went to London with my daughter [pause] and
[Can hear whispering]
Translator: and it was very very nice
Morris: she is lucky.
Translator: and there is a direct flight
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: with this, you can do some booking for the special price
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: so, I think administrative issues is finished.
James: I have to go now.
Jack: so, we will go for [pause] about work package 6, dissemination issues and [pause] the first thing is the last, in the last month, in the last 3 months, have you been in any dissemination activities, [pause] when you have talked about the project.
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: I do not know if it is worth mentioning that [pause] we heard about a event
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: in the south of France, and [pause] well it was in fact, the conference was about very specialised aspects of e-learning. It had nothing to do with accessibility, [pause] and disability, and we tired to flag up, the accessibility issue. It was not very well attended seminar, it was mainly students from that university. But, at least we tried to make available, and tell
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: and on the 16th of July, I gave some information on the project, on the occasion of [pause] of the [pause] for the ordinary meeting, of the [pause] um, [pause] seminar of the [pause] of the SEN ISSS sem, sorry, workshop, on design for all
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: and together with some [pause] with some other information concerning the Lambda project, and [pause] and others. So, this was [pause] on the preparation [pause] probably, and over the next week, I will invite, you after the annual report has been completed, I will invite you to make a presentation to this workshop
Jack: when, when is the workshop?
Ronnie: I do not know exactly, the date will be fixed next week, I will tell you.
Jack: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: um, so, we were going to mention that [pause] today, is starting in Amsterdam the IBC conference, [pause] international broadcasting conference, that is the biggest conference [pause] of the [pause] of broadcasting, that includes many many things. The Internet, web [pause] and digital TV, radio, multimedia and everything. And [pause] we presented a paper, that was selected as one of the six papers on [pause] which is called the new technology campus. And, so we will have a speech about this one, and they also gave us a stand for the project.
[Lucy nods] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and Fabian is now their opening the stand that is why he is not here. This is for 5 days.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: maybe, [pause] it is not the best conference for the dissemination of disabled technologies or [pause] or e-learning, but it is a place where to disseminate technology, and also there is [pause] Microsoft, IBM, dreamweaver and it is this
Conwayne: Macromedia
Jack: kind of people, to be in touch with their, and we will try to do more, in the exploitation plan
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and of course from the speech, what is maybe not, [pause] not devoted disabled technologies, but we will do [pause] to do that, to explain to the audience why it is important to have accessibility and usability.
Ronnie: are you going to put the document
[Jack: yes, yes, I think it is already there. As [pause] as was agreed, sorry, that the paper was already sent and approved, so what is there was approved. We are sorry [pause] we did not distribute it before sending it, for the next time, we will do it. Now [pause] ***(Sub-state 1.1)***]
(Sub-state 5.1)
[Morris raises his hand]
Jack: Morris ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: I sent you an e-mail last week,
Jack: yes, I have it here ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: yes, do you intend to go?
Jack: that is something [pause] we can,
Morris: I looked at the program and [pause] a sizeable part of the conference will be developed to e-learning
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: and it would be a good opportunity for partners 1 and 2
Jack: yes, you remember [pause] Morris sent an e-mail, to the project.. mailing list, that learntech 2003, was the 11th European conference and educational and informational technology. It is February 2003, and in Germany, so I think, at least we should try to contact them, and to have a conference. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, [pause] if there is, [pause] if there is one partner, who is especially interested in going their, not only for being about the project, but if it interesting for them for the e-learning issues, we can go as, just as the project.., [pause]
Mary: when is the conference?
Jack: February 2003
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: maybe we can do the approach
Ronnie: maybe we can do the approach
Jack: yes
Ronnie: and then
Jack: and then we can decide if there is a success, we have [pause] because in February, I do not know if there is a chance
Mary: yes, to submit ***(Sub-state 3.1)***
Jack: in [pause] at the end of November, in Madrid, there is going to be a two days conference, in general about research and development in Spain, so [pause] companies, big companies and universities go together in a place where you can talk to each other and [pause] and projects, and running projects. So, we [pause] tend to present our project.., [pause] and Annie will do that. Is that [pause] it is local dissemination. The audience will be [pause] will be big companies, including Microsoft [pause] and IBM, and Motorola
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: and [pause] and small Spanish press, it is easy to go there, and it is a good place to see these sorts of things. And we will distribute, [pause] it is a presentation, not a paper.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: it is a presentation, maybe next week as it is being prepared. Also, I think that [pause] partner 1, maybe you are going to [pause] a conference in Tenerife. Maybe you can explain [pause] what all I know is that the orgnanziation, is all the technologies for the disabled and accessibility to the net, and to see that, it is a very important [pause] institute. It is located in Valencia, and it is in Spain. And they work a lot with uMfere, and they invited [pause] usto explain the project. That will be [pause] October, I think it is the end of October.
Annie: I think it is mid October ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Jack: mid October ***(Sub-state 1.2)***

Jack: I would like to go there. And [pause] please, I will ask you about the past, and if you have plans for the near future for dissemination, [pause] and
Ronnie: we were organising a seminar for PARTNER 7 members in November
[Can hear whispering]
Morris: we are arranging e-learning, and it is a very important event, and is very much appreciated by blind people is the international computer camp [Pause] it takes place once a year, around June or July and we are approaching the organisers to see if something can be done, but that could be very interesting.
Jack: international computer camp?
Morris: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: where is the?
Morris: we will send you an email to tell you about the exact venue
Jack: ok, ok, so that will be for mid ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Morris: next year, yeah
Ronnie: in 6 months time
Morris: it is usually about July, June, June, July.
Jack: and I forgot you are [looks at Mary]
Mary: going to a conference, yes, an e-learning conference in November, in early November. And I actually tried to distribute the paper, and I do not know if anyone had any problems receiving it
Jack: ya, I received it [pause] um [pause] um, it was this Wednesday ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.2)***
Jack: and we put it on [pause]
Mary: great
Jack: onto the FTP
Mary: that is great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: You did not receive that e-mail?
Mary: the problem is [pause] I sent it to the entire consortium, but the paper is about 2 megabytes
Jack: ah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so, maybe the paper, so maybe everyone's server will not accept it. But if it is on the project server, maybe people can download it. It is zipped file and it is still 2 megabytes
Kenneth laughs]
Mary: I know. It is because it is a PDF, and it extends. Maybe I should include or send [pause] the word version, rather than the PDF. It is a word version, sorry, it is a word version
Someone: with video?
Mary: there is no video, there are some graphics though, it is a word version though, sorry ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Someone: it is this
Mary: yes, so you did receive it. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: accessibility problems with e-learning
Mary: yes, [pause] it is around 15 pages ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: yes, no, I was looking at
Mary: I do not know why
Jack: how many images
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, so
[Kenneth raises his hand]
Kenneth: An interest has been shown in the survey that we did around authoring tools, and people want to have that disseminated
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: and we have some issues that we are trying to change at the moment, because, it is really useful, as it names particular authoring tools
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: but there is the problem of libel. So we are having to check the legal position of that fairly carefully. [Pause] but at the same time we will be talking about that at the PARTNER 3 technshare conference in November, [pause] in Birmingham. And as an advance on that, I would suggest that the Techshare conference in November 2003, would be a very good platform for [pause] for the latest stages of the project. [Pause] so their will be that opportunity
Kenneth: and that has a very wide audience around visually impaired people
[Can hear whispering]
Kenneth: with an international audience
Jack: international ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: very much so ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: but then I do not remember, but it was [pause] an, I do not remember the dates, but their was a very important conference that we had here, [pause] and it was about disabilities, and it was in Germany, and our partners were going to be there [pause] and [pause] but, I remember that they were invited to be at the conference. We will try to do that, to talk about the project,
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: at least to give some information. [Pause]
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok, I think
Mary: can I mention something?
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: something else, I just remembered
Jack: sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: I um [pause] I do not know if you have all heard about the IMS accessibility guidelines for online learning, and I think that they are mentioned in our deliverable 1.1. Basically, the IMS is [pause] is a wordwide consortium and they have been developing different standards, and at the moment they are working on developing guidelines for online learning and for [pause] and for different people with [pause] for different people with special needs. And um [pause] they had an open house event, which we attended [pause] and sometime in august. And, basically what they are looking for, is for people to provide feedback to them. [Pause] So, their guidelines are similar to the WAI, although, a bit at a different level, although they are more specific for online learning. So, [pause] what was proposed, that if we [pause] if we are able to implement some of their guidelines, we can handle the project as a testbed for this guideline, and collaborate with IMS and provide [pause] feedback
Jack: I think that would be interesting ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: because they are a worldwide organization, basically, and they are working on that.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: So, that [pause] that gives me a chance to ask about standardisation
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: or that, maybe both
Mary: I think it was mentioned in the commission's report [pause] on the first page
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: they wrote
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: IMS has
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: so, we can collaborate with IMS, and the project can act as a testbed to their guidelines, and to provide feedback. [Pause]
Jack: Do, we have any news about [pause] W3C or WAI or [pause] or other organizations that you have made contacts to them.
Ronnie: they were, they were [pause] present at this [pause]
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: some of them were present at this meeting on the 16th of July, and um [pause] and so information was given. We have a meeting next week again [pause] and um [pause] and I will come back to the project, about giving information on them, on the project. And those that are interested can go directly to the web site [pause] and to see what is available. [Pause]
Jack: so, that is the IMS
Ronnie: they know, sorry?
Jack: is that the ISS?

Ronnie: this is [pause] I will give you the [pause] the exact [pause] the name of the project. This is SEN and ISSS WS, this is workshop, DFA, design for all
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: So, SEN is the European standardisation body. ISSS is information society, [pause] um, systems standardisation. WS is workshop. DFA is design for all.
Jack: it is easy to remember [gives a small laugh] Ok, I think you are
Ronnie: their will also be a [pause] I do not remember exactly [pause] but their will be a meeting for [pause] of standard boards of [pause] of the organizations and standardizations organizations, and their will be most probably be given information about the project myself. Next year, in march their will be a conference on standardization, and that will be [pause] the standardization concerning the persons with disability, and then we will have the opportunity to come back [pause] back on the basis of the results, we will have to show [pause] the very careful, and um [pause] and we will talk about the project, on the occasion of results. Because if we do not have anything to show, it makes no sense to go and talk about a project, which is [pause] which is starting its activity. So, we [pause] in my opinion when we go to the standardization organization [pause] we must not have [pause] we must not have just [pause] theoretical declarations, we must also have something to show. And that would be possible, as soon as [pause] as soon as the tool will be ready. With out the tool, it is difficult to make a presentation
Jack: yeah. I hope by March next year, we will have many more things ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: the second prototype
Jack: the second prototype yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: I think that is all. [Pause] I will ask that if you find information [pause] please whether we can present the project, to let the consortium know. If for example it is of interest to you, then you go, if you think that other partners should go, or us as coordinators should go, [pause] we will [pause] it will be best to tell us. Of course money is limited for travels and dissemination, but we are open, now, at the moment for any possibility.
[Kenneth raises his hand]
Jack: yes, Kenneth ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: Can you comment on [pause] on anything going on task 6.1.2 on exploitation
Jack: exploitation, yes that is part of work package 6 [pause] but, I would say that [pause] it is just studying, I have to say that, not a lot has been done
Kenneth: I am thinking here of the annual review, because [pause]
Jack: yeah, yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: looking at
Jack: now [pause] I was, we was [pause] have to take someone from our company who is a specialist in exploitation and marketing and also started for us last weeks and [pause] we will have more on that. I am aware that this is a very important issue, and I am also aware that the technical annex, that there is not much explained, and it is a very general view, broad view, and now [pause] now that the tool is more defined, now that we know better, identifying the user, so [pause] we will [pause] we will inform you of that. Of course, for the annual review that is very important. And [pause] that comes back to the agreement of the consortium agreement, and now that we have the [pause] amendment number 3, the prolongation report, it was this [pause] is this starting to work on that, and I will probably have a draft in the next few [pause] now it is an important document
Ronnie: Jack
Jack: in the project, it looks like this till the end now
[Can hear whispering]
Ronnie: Jack
Jack: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: I think, [pause] I think we will have to take one, to take one of our meetings to [pause] to make an extended discussion about the problem of exploitation
Jack: uh-uh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: because I think this is something that we have to discuss, and to go very deep into this, this important task. Because up to now, [pause] for us, it is not very clear, how [pause] this [pause] the result of our activity will be exploitable or exploited. And um we cannot [pause] we cannot wait until the last minute to discuss the issues
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: because I, I think we have [pause] some important considerations regarding exploitation. There will be probably be a different view, among the partners, because I had already, yesterday some smell, some smelling of [pause] of different approaches. And, [pause] this will have to [pause] this will have to flow into a position of our, [pause] of our group, in order to come to an common interpretation, a common solution, because I think that will be better. But that needs clarification, discussion and maybe also [pause] um, also some programming. So, I think it would be better to put, [pause] the item of exploitation in one of our meetings.
Jack: um, I agree with you, so of course, that will be as soon as we agree that. So, in Verona [pause] will spend [pause] a whole morning or evening, [pause] so an action will be to have for them, some weeks before to have some drafts ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ronnie: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: about [pause] to be viviaously to the meeting. But of course, some discussions will arise in the next weeks, because the annual review [pause] we have to show some exploitation, so I will ask you, when we show you, what will [pause] what our, what is our presentation that we are going to show, and to check exploitation. And now we do not have to show them the final decision, we can show them different ideas and different approaches.
Kenneth: I, from previous experience, I would not be at all surprised if one of the outcomes of the review, is actually to produce an exploitation paper, a preliminary exploitation paper
Jack: ah ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: within a month of the review. Because this is, this has been done many times before, and as far as the commission is concerned and the reviewers are concerned, it usually is, that by this stage in the project, we should have an idea, what it is, that is in in fairly concrete terms what we are looking to exploit.
Jack: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: um, that I think, I would think, that would help us all, if we can begin draft that paper, it will help us all to understand what it is [pause] but I agree, that I think that there are different set of understandings of what the outcome of this project really is. We need to really be clear, and thereby better work towards 1A. So, I think this is a helpful process, you will find we will have to be doing something more specific as an outcome of the review. Um [pause] and then the general type of what we have done so far
Jack: uh-huh. You asked us to send us the name of the deliverable, at the end of month 18, about the exploitation plan ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: to say every other, to say that is the result of the [pause] next month that is a very important issue. And as you say, [pause] start thinking about what is the [pause] in terms of the product
Kenneth: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Jack: what is the better idea, of what is the end of the [pause] of course there are many results, and many deliverables in work package 1, and the project product.
Kenneth: the question we have been asked in the past is for each partner, to actually reflect on what are they going to get out of the project. In other words, [pause] although we appreciate that the industrial partners are going to be looking at a specific commercial outcome [pause] we are all putting a lot of resource into the project, and we all need to see something coming out of the project [pause] out of that, and then be able to explain something to the commission, um [pause] and that is something we have been asked to do, quite specifically, about mid term in the the project, so [pause] this is not [pause] this is not just a re-send. We should not be looking at you, as the commercial partners to be doing this
Jack: no, no, no ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Kenneth: but we have all got to contribute, even though it may not be in a commercial term, terms.
Jack: there are no more comments, we will have coffee [pause] and after the coffee, there is a discussion and conclusions, and I do not know if there are further discussions. I am going to stay here and if there is [pause] if you want to leave that is ok, and if you want to stay, we can talk till lunch. [Pause] in a more informal way.
[Can hear whispering]
Jack: ok. In case you leave thank you very much [pause]. For some of you we will see you in Brussels
[New tape]
Jack: that is what we must do
Translator: clustering is important, can you give us some concrete examples
Jack: the cluster
Translator: it is important to hear
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: trying to discuss with some project
Jack: in fact, as Fabian told in Madrid, we tried to contact some of the projects, without any results,
Translator: and no information
Jack: and [pause] but Mr J has sent us the names of two projects that are interested.
Translator: IRIS?
Jack: sorry?
Translator: the
Jack: www aic, that is web accessibility arrears, it is on the first page
[Can hear whispering]

Translator: another technical question, why the blind use compalabras with via voice? Why do not use via voice alone? And also, according to navigation in the web page, you have to Via voice, it is possible for web advice, and possible on screen to make a macro? Why compabaras? And the other thing I found, is that Jaws and campalabras, using the voice?
Jack: compatibility was one of the main [pause]
Annie: deliverables
Jack: work package 2
Translator: yes, yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: compatibility of the plug in with the tool and the browser
Jack: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: one point of view I found [pause] don't they don't like to get permission to get this information in another softer [pause] in compalabras it is different object. [Pause] we do not want to create another software like Jaws
Jack: of course ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Translator: we want to be different
Jack: It is important that they have the idea why it is novelty
Translator: why is there novelty?
Jack: not research project. Thank. Ok, we will have the coffee
[Coffee break]
Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 18/12/01 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Next meeting date*) shows an example of agreeing on a date for the next meeting relatively easily. It also shows that a separate meeting was held for the technical partners, separate to the meeting where the whole team was present. Everyone was invited to attend this meeting.

15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*A.O.B*), Paul requested that everyone stay at the same venue to encourage informal get togethers before and after the meeting. This was a relevant point and was included in the guideline.

Guideline was also proposed by finding evidence of differences in sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk 15/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk *(Discussion on choosing a date for the next consortium meeting)* illustrates that agreeing on a date for another meeting was a time consuming activity. It took a lot longer than that in the first meeting, 18/12/01

7/6/02 discourse chunk *presentation date of next meeting* also shows another time consuming activity in deciding a date for the next meeting. So does 13/9/0/2 Discourse chunk: Date of next meeting.

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Guideline number: D17

Guideline type: Encouraging self testing

Description:
If time permits and technology is available, self-testing should be encouraged (interacting with a piece of software or technology to gain an appreciation of how it works). This may make a difference from just receiving the information from other team members. Obviously the benefit which is gained will be determined by the length of time which is available to do it. Even if a small amount of time is available this activity is encouraged.

Rationale:
Sometimes being able to have a little play around with certain software and/or technology, especially if you are not familiar with it can allow you to see for yourself the kind of functionality it offers the potential user. This can be another way of finding out information, and should be used in conjunction to just receiving written information. This can be particularly important when you are using something, which you would not normally use. During the observed project, time was made available for partners to use technology normally used by blind and/or visually impaired people. At other times information for self-testing was sent by other means, for example URL's and written programs.

Sources:

Source: 17/12/01-transcript Discourse chunk (*change to the agenda*) (1st meeting) Appendix G

Charlotte: so if, who, would people find it useful to go over the technology and try it out for themselves?
Someone: Um
Someone: Um how
Ronnie: we could ask who needs to do it and then see
Paul: Right who actually wants to have some hands on work with the technology this afternoon, who needs that?
[Pause]
Charlotte: who would like to try the technology this afternoon?
[Muttering in the background]
Someone: all the technical partners
Charlotte: ok. 1-2-3-4-5, that is quite a number of people, did you two say yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Ben: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charles: yes ***Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: ok. That is seven people and [pauses] so seven people would like to try the technology. Um I think that since today is the only time the technology available ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Desmond: I understand that. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: we give people the time to do so
Desmond: the advantage would be that Peter has to leave this evening and I have to leave tomorrow at a quarter to twelve or one o clock and I could not be there
Hazel: can I
Desmond: tomorrow

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 22*) (2nd meeting) Appendix I

Paul: can I, I go to a web address and try this out
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: switching of my screenreader
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and is there a web address where I can try this out?
Annie: yes, yes, the Comploabaras web. But Paul, I just wanted to say something. You are completely right, the technology is there. But what is not there, is this application of voice technology ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Whispering]
Annie: to provide an added value to the screenreader, which can be used as a plug in. But maybe it is useful
[Whispering]
Paul: What you have been doing, I can do with my screenreader, can do ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
[Whispering]
Paul: For this time being, I do not see, [pause] I do not see any progress from what we already have
Ronnie: This is the reason why we are ***(Sub-state 2.1)***
Annie: what
[Mary is whispering to Hazel]
Ronnie: please do not take it as too strong a criticism, it seems you are not completely aware of what blind people are doing using a screenreader
[Kenneth is whispering to Hazel]
Annie: this is what, what we
Ronnie: you cannot develop something without knowing where to start
Annie: yes, I know, I know, that is why we have the requirements from the users point of view, but, but, the plug is is not
Charlotte: we can look at the technology till half past four, I just need to pack up the computers and everything for um five, so, um we can still do that.
Hazel: yes. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Charlotte: And can we make sure that we break that discussion um after half an hour, then there will still be time to look at the technology
Ronnie: but we really do it in the interest of the project
Peter: ok. Lets get started *[pause]* ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (Work package 1, Overview of circulated report) (2nd meeting) Appendix I
Desmond: um, how big is the tool? Can you send it by e-mail to us?
Mary: Yes, and I can also include it on the website ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear some whispering]
Mary: and you can download it from the website
Desmond: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Mary: and there are also links in the report
Desmond: yes, yes that would be very good. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: Yes, in the report it includes the URL of all the ones, which are included ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Desmond: ok, ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: you can find the webpages, the demo versions, most of the demo on the website.
[Some own discussions taking place]

Source: 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Work package 1 continued - overview of circulated report*) (2 nd meeting) appendix I

Annie: ...I don't know do you want to make any comments. Yes, many [laughs]
Paul: So, these instructions have been implemented using voice xml,
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: and the plug in?
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Paul: And now what happens, um [pause] is that the web site, or part of it, available someplace, so that it can be tried with just a screenreader, because I would really like to know, what one of our screenreaders would do in that situation
[Can hear whispering]
Paul: because I just suspect
Annie: yes, sure ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Erin whispers to Mary]
Annie: yes, that is what we are explaining for you to do

[Erin raises her hand]
Annie: You give us the problems, and you can test the solutions with your screenreader
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: to see if it prevented or not
Paul: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: That is what we intend to say, when we say that we wanted feedback from the users
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: We have actually tested it with two screenreaders
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: we tested it with screenreader Jaws. My colleague Ned who is completed blind, tested both examples, examples 1 and 2. It was not quite as advanced as what it is today, as it was a few weeks ago, and I can since see that you have made some changes. Initially I think that example 2 worked slightly better than example 1, because it informed the user a lot more
[Mary whispers something]
Erin: but we tested with the plug in.
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: I think with one of the attempts we tried, we managed to get the plug in and the screenreader to read at the same time. That was when we did not turn the screenreader off.
Someone: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: so in general, I think the radio buttons solved the problems of the problems we had in Jaws that when you navigate backwards
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: it does not tell you what radio buttons had been selected, but this time it did. So, that is something, which had improved over the screenreader. And um [pause] there are other areas that need further improvements with the refound
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: and I think the other thing, is that it needs to be tested with magnification
[Can hear whispering]
Mary: uh-huh ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Erin: so, we tend to find things that have been centralized, and magnification makes it harder to find
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: So, if it is left centralized, it will be much easier for them to find it in there. I think the hardest thing is to turn of the screenreader, and to put it to sleep in the background
[Can hear whispering]
Erin: and to inform how the screenreader can be put back on, because not all users know how to turn the screenreader on and off.
Annie: yes. That is why we said that they must be working together ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: so, you do turn the screenreader off, but we still [pause] do not find out, how it can
[Can hear whispering]
Annie: be more comfortable for the user. How they are both working at the same time, and not being confused
[Mary puts her hand up]
Mary: Can I ask two questions.
Voice output: Welcome to the partner 7's page

Source: 12/9/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (work package 3 development of the tool (review of work done since the last meeting) (4th meeting)
Appendix M

Annie: ....Any questions?
[Mary raised her hand
Mary: Can I ask a question? Will we be able to access the prototype at any point? Will you be distributing it to?
Annie: yes, [pause] by, I think by the end of this month ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, excellent ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because it was in your planificaiton, yes
Mary: hmmm, you will be able to do that? ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: yes ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Mary: ok, great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: because right now, since you have to have so many things installed in your computer, it is quite
Mary: yeah ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: difficult to build
Mary: ok ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: auto executable tables
Mary: ok, yep ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: and we are building it now and will distribute it
Mary: ok, great ***(Sub-state 1.1)***
Annie: by the end of the month
Mary: excellent. ***(Sub-state 1.1)***

Supporting materials:

Guideline was proposed by finding evidence of same sub-states in part of a particular discourse chunk. 17/12/01-transcript. Discourse chunk (*change to the agenda*) shows that people were interested in trying out the technology which was demonstrated to them on their own. In this example it was mainly the technical partners of the project who showed interest in participating in this activity

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – Work package 2*) when Paul asked if there was a way of testing this information out on his own, via a website or other sources.

Annie proposing on 14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Informing others of the work which has been done – work package 2*) that she can send the program to allow the team to see the added value by testing it out themselves. After this suggestion was made, Hazel stated that they were not able to describe what the added value was. Maybe testing it out on your own may help to see where this value is.

14/03/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*work packagee 1 continued - overview of circulated report*) shows an example of a discussion of where and how the tool will be made available. It also shows that URL's which have been included as points of reference in written documents can be typed in onto a computer and tested out, in order to see the added value on your own.

6/6/02 meeting transcript, discourse chunk (*Demonstration of partner 7's portal*) where Paul said he would like to try out what was being explained to see the benefits. Erin shared some comments on her findings of using the proposed technology.

12/9/02 Discourse chunk: *Work package 3 development of the tool (review of work done since the last meeting*) also shows that other partners, in this case Mary was interested in receiving a version of the prototype. This highlights the need to distribute work with other partners even though it may not be completed yet

There was no potential evidence of any of Cramton's five indicators in the sources for this guideline.

Student Researcher's Name: Miss Sajal Patel

Address: Centre for HCI Design, City University, Northampton Square, London, EC1V, OHB

TO ALL PARTICIPANTS

Purpose of this validation exercise: To identify the *usefulness* and *utility* of *thirty-eight* guidelines, which have been proposed to increase *growth in mutual understanding* in team interactions. Guidelines focus on two forms of interactions, attending face-to-face meetings and sending e-mail messages to the team before and after attending a face-to-face meeting.

Procedures:

You will be asked to do the following:

- Read through proposed guidelines *(B1-B3)* and (D1-D17) before attending the *first and second* face-to-face meeting.
- Complete a questionnaire after the *first and second* face-to-face meeting
- To read proposed guidelines *(A1-A18)* before leaving the face-to-face meeting, so any questions can be answered.
- To copy me on all e-mails that are sent to the team after the *first and second face-to-face meeting.*
- Complete a questionnaire, which will be circulated by e-mail after the second face-to-face meeting.

I intend to do the following:

- Attend two project meetings as a silent observer
- Draw seating plans
- Audio tape the meetings
- Produce handwritten notes to record my observations
- To analyse the questionnaires to identify the *usefulness* and *utility* of the thirty-eight proposed guidelines.

Possible risks or discomfort: There are no risks associated with participating in this validation exercise.

Confidentiality: Your identity in this study will be treated as confidential. The results of this validation exercise may be published but will not give your name or include any identifiable references to you.

Termination of study: You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this validation exercise. You may also withdraw at any time.

AUTHORISATION: I have read and understand this consent form, and I volunteer to participate in this validation exercise. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form.

Participant name:

Participant signature:

Date:

Signature of person obtaining consent:

Date:

Expectations of team members

Guideline Number	Guideline type	Own use	Other team member use
D1	Reference to terms, which are used		
D2	Communicating with the team		
D3	Establishing a system to identify who would like to speak next		
D4	Discussing document formats		
D5	Developing presentations and giving demonstrations		
D6	Sharing information by using examples/showing demonstrations		
D7	Making explicit requests		
D8	Informing on changes		
D9	Making decisions		
D10	Establishing regular reporting periods		
D11	Summarizing information		
D12	Updating on progress		

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Planning and structuring activities

Guideline Number	Guideline type	Own use	Other team member use
D13	Consulting the agenda once everyone has arrived to the meeting		
D14	Structuring the meeting		
D15	Making presentation preparations		
D16	Selecting a date for a next meeting		

Using technology

Guideline Number	Guideline type	Own use	Other team member use
D17	Encouraging self testing		

Expectations of team members

Guideline Number	Guideline type	Own use	Date	Other team member use	Date
A1	Circulating information to the entire team				
A2	Monitoring reporting periods to the team				
A3	Keeping team members up to date with whom they are working with				
A4	Project glossary				
A5	Informing with your plans before starting on work/giving a summery of what has been achieved				
A6	Starting on work earlier than planned				
A7	Circulating draft documents				
A8	Summarizing changes				
A9	Sharing relevant information to members of the team				
A10	Sharing information with people outside of the team				
A11	Producing reports				
A12	Document formats				
A13	Notification of new documents				

Planning and structuring activities

Guideline Number	Guideline type	Own use	Date	Other team member use	Date
B1	Circulating a draft agenda				
B2	Back up plans for not being able to participate during the meeting				
B3	Sending documentation(s) before a meeting, to be referred to during the meeting				
A14	Circulating meeting minutes				
A15	Informing on non-working periods				
A16	Next meeting				

Using technology

Guideline Number	Guideline type	Own use	Date	Other team member use	Date
A17	Encouraging self-testing				
A18	Storing relevant documentation				

Work package 2: Plugins for speech recognition and synthestis integration, with the possibility of adjusting the speed of the synthisiser

	Time plan
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 9 (18/12/01)	Long term
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 2 on work package 2 and 6 (18/12/01)	Long term
Developing scenarios (18/12/01)	Long term
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Screenreader functionality questions	Long term
Discourse chunk From the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Review of work for work package 2 (14/3/02)	Long term
Presentation of a demo (14/3/02)	Long term
Closing for first day of the meeting (14/3/02)	Medium term
Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide (15/3/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Compalabras plug-in	Long term
Discourse chunk From the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Review of work by work packages 2/3/4 (6/6/02)	Long term
Discussion of review questions from review report (7/6/02)	Long term
Summary of documents to be sent(7/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Project speech recognition	Long term
New voice xml tool	Long term
Work package 2 – plug-in dossier	Long term

Discourse chunk, Partner 9, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Charles provided a presentation on voice mark up languages. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk. There was also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4– all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3- all spoken evidences
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	83 – all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	2 – all spoken evidences
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	1 – spoken evidence
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 2 situations

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Not being aware of the limits and disagreeing to what has been said. There was evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Not being aware of limits and agreeing to a given answer. There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about VoiceXML limits; referring to examples; checking understanding; talking about complexity; concerns and vision; re-prompting; demonstrations and a proposal to discuss items the next day. There was evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situation – it was too early to give responses. There was evidence of sub-state *1.3* in the following situations. Recognising that there is a big problem and the to delay the discussions until the following day. There was evidence of sub-state 2.2 in the following situation – reacting to what had been said. There was evidence of sub-state 5.1 in the following two situations. One, talking about the project vision and two when questioning the screen reader and the user interaction.

There was growth in mutual understanding when the team was informed by Charles his presentation on voice mark up languages and the discussions emerging from this presentation. As a result salient information was shared to the team. This salient information established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team members belief states altering. In this themes there was evidence of team members holding a mutual belief and mutual beliefs altering.

There was also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Kenneth was talking about the project vision and when Hazel spoke about the screen reader and user interaction. In both situations those areas had already been brought to attention, therefore displaying evidence of no growth in mutual understanding.

The next theme is a short presentation from partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6.

Discourse chunk, Partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Annie informed the team of what they had been working on in the last 3-months. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk. There was also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency

1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	65 – spoken evidences 62 – non verbal evidences, head nods
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 2 situations
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	14 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3- spoken evidences 3 – non verbal evidences, head nods
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – all spoken evidences
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	1 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Presentations; information required for work package 2; information from Desmond; designing a new system; manual for Jaws and its role for the user; technical job; finding out what users lack with their current screenreaders; demonstrations; project adding to what existing screenreaders offer in terms of functionality; recommendation of the IBM homepage reader; voice navigation is not easy; providing an illustration of prototypes; voice xml; using the website of the project as a prototype; producing scenarios; course interests; suggesting possibilities to examine and online language learning

Evidence of sub-state *5.1* in the following situations Not clear about linkages between work packages 1 and 2 and not being clear about how the project system will interact with the screenreader. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations Information Desmond provided, not receiving technical information from the user requirements work package; information that was asked for; not knowing what users want; users informing technicians on what the tool can do for them; showing prototypes to users; work package arrangements and blind specialists Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations Supporting a reaction received that said users do not know what they want. Showing prototypes to users Not changing the arrangements of the work package and reaction to blind specialists. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations Accessibility of online web tutorials and Evidence of sub-state *1.3* when looking at the reactions of team members to the accessibility of online web tutorials.

There was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed about the salient information regarding this work package Receiving information from partners, discussing how manuals can support technical work activities Discussion on undertaking technical work for the project, and how user requirements can assist them in this work Recommending to partners sources of information Looking at prototypes, examples and scenario's and planning work activities. The salient information established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme There was also evidence of team members belief states altering in this theme. At the end of this theme the utterances showed that team members held a mutual belief on what could be done in the project. This was achieved by sharing information and ideas to the team. In this theme there was also evidence that team members did not hold mutual beliefs on other issues discussed in this theme as well Refer to the transcript for more examples.

There was evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Annie *said 'Yeah, I thought in Madrid it was clear '* Annie made this comment after Kenneth had said *'It is not clear to me just reading what work package 2 is about, as to what is the linkage to work package 1'*. In this situation it is assumed that the common ground and mutual beliefs did not increase after the kick off meeting. September 2001 In the same theme another situation which displayed evidence of no growth in mutual understanding, when Annie said that she does not know how the user partners want the system to work.

The next theme is developing scenarios

Discourse chunk, Developing scenarios, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme there were talks on voice XML and the project plug-in and talking about the structure of websites There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	12- non verbal evidences, head nods 10 – spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1-all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1-all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation when looking at advantages of using voice xml Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation when not talking about the contents of websites Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when not talking about website contents

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information on voice XML and the plug-in and talking about the structure of websites was discussed amongst the team. This information was salient to the team because it would help the team work towards it's objectives. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme There was also evidence of team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual belief s on all the issues in this theme

The next theme is developing a plan of future work.

Discourse chunk, Developing a plan of future work, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Hazel was developing a plan on how to tackle the work in this area There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	5 - non verbal evidences, head nods

	3 - spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Talking about the pre-prototype and assisting partners 1 and 2 on their knowledge for screenreaders. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* when it was said that they were not talking yet about the portal

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because this information was salient to the team, and this theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief state altering. Utterances led to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual belief s on all the issues in this theme.

The next theme is screenreader functionality questions.

Textual chunk, Screenreader functionality questions

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Annie	11	15/1/02
Desmond	18	21/1/02

There was evidence of State *1* (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2* (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding when questions on screenreader functionality had been developed There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is not known if team members had sent their answers individually to Annie and not to the mailing list. Only Desmond sent his answers to the team.

The next theme is review of work for work package 2.

Discourse chunk, Review of work package 2, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Annie informed the team of what work had been done for work package 2 since the last meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	20 – spoken evidences 2 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Sound cards and voice integration; a list requested by Ronnie; tests; demonstrations; Web Wizards; referring to information mentioned at the London meeting; sharing information with team members via the FTP site and useful answers to questions answered by partners 5 and 6. There was evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when Annie did not explain something right Evidence of sub-state *2.2* when Annie reports that she was not aware of Web Wizards

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because Annie had informed the team what would be included in this presentation and Desmond had shared some information with Annie which would help her in their work. This information was salient to the task that Annie was working on There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering However, there were issues which led to team members believing that they held mutual belief.

The next theme is presentation of a demo.

Discourse chunk, Presentation of a demo, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme, Annie presented the demo of the speech recognition There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this theme and evidence of no growth in mutual understanding over time

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	31 – all spoken evidences
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	101– spoken evidences 10 – non verbal evidences, head nods
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding agreement to a disagreement)	9 – all spoken evidences
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 2 situations

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Not experiencing technical difficulties; questioning voice input; limitations of the prototype; already know what is shown; cannot make comments; see no progress being made; form filling is not difficult; formulas; not being able to show the added value of the technical development and not using the users point of view Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Explaining grammar use; need for training; using their own system, example of speech output in English; demonstration in Spanish; trying out

information on own; form set up, explaining what screenreaders cannot do; explaining that everything is not yet developed; voice xml tagging; users require something that can be shown to people; outlining what is required; user groups can provide information if shown what voice xml can do, in addition to what screenreaders deliver and having a break. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* when Annie did not know the answer to Ronnie's question. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Comments cannot be made; interpretation is via voice xml tags, not formulas; cannot tell what the added value is in the work which has been developed; everyone was shown the limitations of Jaws 3.7 at the December meeting. Evidence of sub-state 5.1 in the following situations. Form filling is not difficult. At the December meeting the team was informed that form filling was an area of difficulty encountered. Also, technical partners not knowing what they had to do for their technical work provided evidence of sub-state *5.1*.

There was growth in mutual understanding when salient information was shared to the team by showing demonstrations in English and Spanish with English translations given. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

Overall, this discourse chunk showed evidence of situations where there was no growth in mutual understanding, between the first meeting and the second meeting reported. At the December meeting technical partners were informed that form filling was difficult. Prototypes were developed to overcome problems with form filling, and at this meeting they were informed that form filling was not difficult. Technical partners reported that they do not know what to do for their task.

The next theme is closing for the first day of the meeting.

Discourse chunk, Closing for first day of the meeting, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme James summarised what was discussed during the day one of the 2-day meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – spoken evidences 2 - non-verbal evidences, head nods

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* when James said he is going to summarise the outcomes of the meeting so that everyone has the same understanding. Also, that the partner 2 demonstration seen that morning is not the final tool that the project wants to develop.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because the summary provided salient information to team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is also assumed that team members accepted that partners 1 and 2 were unable to convince the users absolutely about the suitability of voice XML and that he hopes that the opinions of the project members will be better when another presentation is shown the following days. This is because there were no reactions after James made these points.

The next theme is a presentation on what the project voice solution can provide.

Discourse chunk, Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Annie delivered a presentation to show what the project voice solution can provide. There was evidence of both growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and mutual understanding not getting larger.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	24 – spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	10 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding agreement to a disagreement)	4 – all spoken evidences
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	2 – all spoken evidences
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation. Answering a closed question from a partner and referring to existing documents. Some other situations showed evidence of this sub-state as well. There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation. Switching modes; screenreaders not reading lists properly; training and learning. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation. Read about switching modes in a document and disagreeing to what has been said. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* in the following situation. Ronnie said that he was still unclear about some details, particularly the document which was not considered during the presentation. Evidence of sub-states *3.1* and *1.3* when Ronnie said he did not know partner 3's opinion regarding the outcomes after the review and whether the team was going to listen to Annie's remaining presentation. James said a decision would be taken after partner 9's presentation.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the presentation was relevant to the aims and objectives of the project. Salient information was both shared and exchanged with the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

There was also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding. When Ronnie said that he was still unclear about some project details, following questions and answers to Annie. In this situation common ground and the number of mutual beliefs remained the same, and did not get larger.

The next theme is the Compalabras plug-in.

Textual chunk, Compalabras plug in

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	41	20/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding in this theme. There was also increased mutual belief in this theme.

The next theme is review of work from work package 2 in the review of work package by work packages 2/3/4.

Discourse chunk, Review of work done for work package 2/3/4, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Annie presented the review of work packages 2, 3 and 4. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and mutual understanding not growing.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1– spoken evidence 1 – non verbal evidences, head nod

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation. It is important to get feedback from the users to see what other solutions can be found out.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, regarding what had been done in work packages 2. That is the team was told of the objectives for this work package and what they propose to do. There was evidence of mutual belief in this theme.

The next theme is discussion of review questions from the review report.

Discourse chunk, Discussion of review questions from review report, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme there was a discussion of actions that are required in order to work more productively on work package 2. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	16 – all spoken evidences
2.1(growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1– all spoken evidences
1.2(growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Introducing a new task; using voice XML; defining what comes later and delivery of the deliverables. Evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when talking about interaction not integration.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The discussions which took place were relevant to the work in work package 2. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is summary of documents to be sent.

Discourse chunk, Summary of documents to be sent, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James summarized documents that need to be produced relevant to work package 2. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. It was useful to remind team members of what documents had to be sent and when. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue.

The next theme is the project speech recognition.

Textual chunk, Project speech recognition

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Erin	15	20/6/02
Erin	58	20/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge

from the original message). No discussion thread formed in this theme as only a duplicate message had been sent after the initial message and no further messages associated with that theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as team members received salient information in the form of a URL on a topic that was relevant to the goals and objectives of the project. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is the new voice XML tool.

Textual chunk, New voice XML tool

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Charles	26	28/6/02
Erin	43	19/8/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as Charles provided salient information to the team in the form of a document, in order to make it clearer what had to be done for his task. Erin also provided information she believed might be of interest to the team by sending a URL with a summary of what the site covered in the main body of the message. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is work package 2 Plug-in dossier

Textual chunk, Work package 2 – Plug in dossier

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Annie	28	2/7/02
Genevieve	32	26/7/02
Adam	33	30/7/02
Annie	34	30/7/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as draft documents was shared with the team, and questions were asked on it, which were answered. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme and team members holding mutual belief on the issues discussed.

The next section looks at work package three.

Work package three: Tool development

Discourse chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	Time plan
Discussion (17/12/01)	Long term
Change to the agenda (17/12/01)	Short term
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 2 on work package 2 and 6 (18/12/01)	Long term
Developing scenarios (18/12/01)	Long term
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)	Long term
Textual chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Paris meeting (Arranging a meeting with those working in work package 3)	Medium term
Voice solutions	Long term
Textual chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Presentation by partner 9 (15/3/02)	Long term
E-learning and voice (15/3/02)	Long term
Textual chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Browsers	Long term
Authoring tool	Long term
Textual chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Review of work by work packages 2/3/4 (6/6/02)	Long term
Discussion of the tool (6/6/02)	Long term
Discussion of the review questions from the review report (6/6/02)	Long term
Presentation on work package 1 (7/6/02)	Long term
Discussion on issues emerging from work package 1 (7/6/02)	Long term
Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view (7/6/02)	Long term
Summary of documents to be sent (7/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Authoring tool requirements	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Work package 3 – development of the tool. Review of work done since the last meeting (12/9/02)	

Demonstration of the prototype (12/9/02)	Long term
Creating a link for stylesheets (12/9/02)	Long term
Presentation of partner 4 by Michael's translator (12/9/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After the 4th technical face-to-face meeting	
Work package 3 description	Long term
Work package 3 task schedule	Long term
Guidelines for software accessability	Long term

Discourse chunk, Discussion, 17/12/01 transcript

In this theme Paul expressed some of his viewpoints on the project which were relevant to work package 3. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	2- all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1- all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. EU projects do not work in a certain way. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation when Kenneth said that they have signed up to a project already, so cannot change the objectives.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team following the comment made by Paul. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief states altering. Some utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which are discussed in this theme. However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual beliefs on all the issues in this theme. At other times team members held mutual belief(s) on issues being discussed, for example, EU projects do not work like that.

The next theme is change to the agenda.

Discourse chunk, Change to the agenda, 17/12/01 transcript

In this theme Charlotte was informed that the technical partners would like to interact with the technology, which had been shown and demonstrated earlier in the day, allowing self-testing to take place.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	4– all spoken evidences

Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the situation when Charlotte is informed that the technical partners would like to spend time looking at and interacting with the technology. Seven team members showed an interest to look at the technology.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because Charlotte was informed that there were seven people interesting in interacting and looking at the technology. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme that time would be made available for interacting with the technology.

The next theme is a short presentation by partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6, but contained some information relevant to work package 3.

Discourse chunk, Partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Annie informed the team of relevant information to work package 3. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	10 – spoken evidences 5 – non verbal evidences, head nod
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3- spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Project planning; Requiring a prototype of something which can be the end result; Showing users a prototype; Providing examples of how prototypes can work. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation, Showing prototypes to users. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation, Not talking about the prototype.

There was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed about the salient information regarding this work package. The salient information established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team members belief states altering in this theme.

The next theme is developing scenarios.

Discourse chunk, Developing scenarios, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme there were some issues which were relevant to work package 3. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 - all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 - all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 - all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	7 - spoken evidence
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	1 - spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about screenreaders and sequentiality. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Talking about help systems and how they work with Jaws and sequentialityy. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when talking about sequentiality. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* when mentioning not understanding. Evidence of sub-state *1.3* when another team member said that they did not understand either

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because information which was salient to the team was shared regarding work package 3. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme. However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual belief s on all the issues in this theme

The next theme is developing a plan of future work.

5.2.1.3.8 Discourse chunk, Developing a plan of future work, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Hazel was developing a plan on how to tackle the work in this area. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	8 - non verbal evidences, head nods 2- non verbal evidences, smiles 9 - spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about voice XML output; form filling is hard; establishing deadlines; showing principles; showing work; establishing a plan and agreeing to the plan

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because there was salient information shared with the team, and this theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief states altering

The next theme is arranging a meeting with those working in work package 3.

Textual chunk, Paris meeting (arranging a meeting with those working in work package 3)

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Christopher	35	27/2/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding when everyone was informed that a meeting was proposed to discuss the work for work package 3 before the consortium meeting. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held a mutual belief on this issue as no additional messages were sent in response to it using the mailing list, or made reference to this issue in any other messages sent to the mailing list

The next theme is voice solutions

Textual chunk, Voice solutions

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Charles	23	1/2/02
Thomas	28	14/2/02
Charles	44	3/3/02

Messages showed evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding when everyone was provided with documents on what solutions can be provided for people using voice XML and Compalabras

The next theme is the presentation by partner 9.

Discourse chunk, Presentation by partner 9, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Charles delivered his presentation to inform the team what work partner 9 had been doing. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	36– spoken evidences 9 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1- spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding agreement to a disagreement)	2– spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	1– spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Charles will explain everything in the presentation; talking about voice xml and what it can offer; heart of the project; levels of interactivity; difference in design for voice and graphical user interfaces; information making sense; Kenneth is not an expert in e-learning and a proposal on how to tackle the e-learning problem. Evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when mentioned that mobile browsers is a new area. Evidence of sub-state *2.2* when Paul said that the information presented did not make sense to him. Kenneth reported that Hazel's information had made sense to him.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, regarding what had been done by Charles and how it would contribute towards the work of the project. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is E-learning and voice.

Discourse chunk, E-learning and voice, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme there was a discussion on e-learning and voice. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	85 – spoken evidences 11 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence 2 – non verbal evidences, head nods

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about help; use for not only blind people but everyone; project does not require you to produce a new authoring tool; producing an authoring tool for voice; differences between VUI and GUI; branching off visually and non visually impaired persons; information is clear; showing natural interactivity; finding more examples; voicifying partner 7's webpage and adding the portal; demonstrating how voice can help problems; clearer idea for the technicians on how to work on their tasks; sharing information; must be ready for submission in July to the commission and having a first version available in 3 weeks time. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Rejecting Jack's proposal; not good idea to just take partner 7's webpage and demonstrate voice on it and time frame was April not May. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Jack's proposal was rejected and not demonstrating voice on partner 7's webpage.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Team members were happy to receive information on video as well. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. However there was evidence that team members held mutual belief that video information would be shared with the partners.

The next theme is browsers.

Textual chunk, Browsers

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Charles	12	16/4/02
Adam	30	3/6/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as information on browsers was salient information to share with the team. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief in this theme.

The next theme is the authoring tool.

Textual chunk, Authoring tool

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mark	13	19/4/02
Mark	14	19/4/02
Charles	15	24/4/02
Hazel	30	8/5/02
Charles	38	16/5/02
Erin	40	20/5/02
Adam	51	3/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as issues concerning the authoring tool was continued to be discussed by e-mail following a face-to-face meeting. There was increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs in this theme. No messages were sent in reaction to the messages sent in this theme from other team members.

The next theme is review of work by work package 3 from the discourse chunk, review of work by work package 2/3/4

Discourse chunk, Review of work done for work package 2/3/4, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Annie presented the review of work packages 2, 3 and 4. However, only the discussions relevant to work package 3 are included here. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and mutual understanding not growing.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	62 – spoken evidences 4 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
5.1 (No perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 3 situations

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations: Importance for customization; speaking louder; prototype of the tool; showing the architecture; providing feedback; project objectives and schedule plan. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations: The technical work is not to substitute the use of a screenreader and Annie explaining what they are intending to do. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* in the following situations: Not understanding why the team is being shown how the plug-in provides speech synthesis to the page; being shown what current screenreaders offer, so cannot see the project innovation and expectations of the project solution.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, regarding what had been done in work packages 3 and how to make progress in those area of work. There was also evidence of mutual understanding not growing. This concerned the technical work which was the theme of the project, and team members not being able to see the innovation in the work which the technical partners were producing. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme. However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual beliefs on all the issues in this theme as a result of spoken utterances.

The next theme is a discussion of the tool.

Discourse chunk, Discussion of the tool, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack started of the discussion on the tool which team members had been presented with. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	29 – spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2– spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	4– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations: Agreement on the authoring tool focus; adding to the plug-in; innovation; providing examples; agreeing with other team members; tool development and a viewpoint on approaches. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations: To not work with a specific company; and holding a different viewpoint to others. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation where team members said working with the named company was not the best approach to take.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Jack had also re-stated the objectives of this tool, where no team members disagreed. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

Discourse chunk, Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James informed the team that Geoff would present a review of their technical work. No specific documentation had been prepared for this presentation, as Geoff did not know in advance that he would be giving this presentation. Kenneth said that this presentation would be useful to

the team. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and evidence of no growth in mutual understanding too

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	26 –spoken evidences 2- non verbal evidences head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 –all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	3 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 –all spoken evidences
5.1 (No perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation.

Formatted

Formatted

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Answering question on behalf of Paul; validating other webpages; voice xml tool; grammars; producing a written document based on what has been explained face-to-face and justifying why prototypes can be useful. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Validation of webpages not to be actioned by work package 5 and grammar files are not complex. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* when not understanding what is being said. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when mentioning self- error. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when Paul reports that he does not get what Annie is saying.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding and no growth in mutual understanding when looking at this theme.

There was growth in mutual understanding as a result of salient information shared with team members. This included Geoff outlining the requirements of the tool from a technical viewpoint, and benefits of using protoypes than demonstrating code

No growth in mutual understanding occurred as a result of Paul saying that he did not understand what was being said. In this situation the common ground and mutual beliefs remained the same and did not get larger for Paul. Annie said that she could explain it again later on. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme. This theme had not been included in the agenda. Although a slot had been allocated for team members to talk about this work, team members did not use the opportunity to do so on day 1 of the meeting. James following a conversation with Kenneth identified that this presentation would provide useful information for team members. Especially to hear what the technical partners were doing in their work and how.

The next theme is presentation on work package 1

Discourse chunk, Presentation on work package 1, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary, Erin and Charles presented their work on this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	32 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1– spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Surprising results; enlarging font size for the presentation; using keywords, types of manuals to consider; asking question; lot of work to be completed in a short period of time and not understanding why Charles did not receive comments from partners firs time round. Evidence of sub-state *2.1*, that there were no questions to be asked, as information was clearly presented

The next theme is a discussion of the review questions from the review report

Discourse chunk, Discussion of review questions from review report, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack started off the discussion. The outcomes of the review would determine whether the project would continue into its second year. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	30 – spoken evidences 2 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1(growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	3 – all spoken evidences
1.2(growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Updating the plan; integrating voice XML into a web page; project demands; circulating documents and integrating ides into the work plan. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Not changing the themes of the project; not working screenreader independent and that Annie will have to produce a replacement for work package 3. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation when Charles understands what Paul was not saying something

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The comments which were received from the review report were important and their was evidence of discussions taking place. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the presentation on work package 1

Discourse chunk, Presentation on work package 1, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary, Erin and Charles presented their work on this work package. However, only Charle's work is relevant to this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	18 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. There are comments to be made, identifying features to be included; identifying different types of manuals to consider; there is a lot of work to be completed in a short period of time and Charles not understanding why no responded to his request first time. It was only partner 3 who responded second time round

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Charles's contribution was also relevant to this package. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is discussion on issues emerging from work package 1.

Discourse chunk, Discussion of issues emerging from presentation in work package 1, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James initiated the discussion. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	13 – spoken evidences 3 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Information on what the tool will deliver cannot come from the user requirements work; importance of face-to-face meetings; to present what technical work is being done and checking what the deadline for the competition of the prototype is. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Unacceptable to not hear what the tool will do in some level of detail; development times and not working on work package 3 for 6 months, only 3.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Having a discussion on this work package was important and Kenneth said to James that it would be useful to hear in detail what the technical partners have been working on and what they are proposing. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme. However there is evidence that team members held mutual belief on the issue raised by James that *'face-to-face meetings are a better way to resolve misunderstandings*

The next theme is requirements for the tool from a technical point of view

Discourse chunk, Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James informed the team that Geoff would present a review of their technical work. No specific documentation had been prepared for this presentation, as Geoff did not know in advance that he would be giving this presentation. Kenneth said that this presentation would be useful to the team. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and evidence of no growth in mutual understanding too.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	29 –spoken evidences 2- non verbal evidences head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 –all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	4 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 –all spoken evidences
5.1 (No perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Answering question on behalf of Paul; validating other webpages, voice xml tool; grammars; producing a written document based on what has been explained face-to-face and justifying why prototypes can be useful. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Validation of webpages not to be actioned by work package 5 and grammar files are not complex. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* when not understanding what is being said. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when mentioning self- error. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when Paul reports that he does not get what Annie is saying. Overall there was growth in mutual understanding and no growth in mutual understanding when looking at this theme.

There was growth in mutual understanding as a result of salient information shared with team members. This included Geoff outlining the requirements of the tool from a technical viewpoint, and benefits of using protoypes than demonstrating code.

Formatted

No growth in mutual understanding occurred as a result of Paul saying that he did not understand what was being said. In this situation the common ground and mutual beliefs remained the same and did not get larger for Paul. Annie said that she could explain it again later on. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is summary of documents to be sent.

Discourse chunk, Summary of documents to be sent, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James summarized all deliverables to be sent to the commission during the periods of June to September. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. It was useful to remind team members of what documents had to be sent and when. James also mentioned that he would send an e-mail to the team to inform them of the dates nearer the time as well. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue.

The next theme is authoring tool requirements.

Textual chunk, Authoring tool requirements

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Charles	1	10/6/02
Adam	7	17/6/02
Adam	10	18/6/02
Annie	11	19/6/02
Kenneth	12	19/6/02
Charles	14	20/6/02
Annie	14	20/6/02
Charles	16	20/6/02
Charles	24	27/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*. (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*. (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as issues concerning the authoring tool was continued to be discussed by e-mail following a face-to-face meeting. There was increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs in this theme. No messages were sent in reaction to the messages sent in this theme from other team members.

The next theme is work package 3- development to the review, a review of work done since the last meeting.

Discourse chunk, Work package 3, development of the tool (Review of work done since the last meeting), 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme the team was informed of Christopher's absence to the meeting. Alicia also provided a review on their technical work. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	36 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	5 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – all spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Christopher not attending the meeting as he got married last week; distributing the prototype to team members; showing a prototype later on in the evening; talking about the plug-in dossier and training the recognition. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Not talking about recognition and no need to purchase ViaVoice. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when mentioned that ViaVoice does not need to be purchased.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, regarding what had been done for work package 3. Team members were also excepting a demonstration later. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is demonstration of the prototype.

Discourse chunk, Demonstration of the prototype, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme there was a presentation given by Annie demonstrating the prototype they had developed. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	80– spoken evidences 2- non verbal evidences, head nods
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	4- all spoken evidences
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	4- spoken evidence
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4- all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	4- all spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Question on speech synthesis; use of a screenreader; version of screenreader used; expectations of a demonstration; observed repetition in the demonstration; using the arrow keys; interaction methods; triggers; parser; navigation; working on a difficult task and mentioning accessibility. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations Difficulty in holding an opinion for small examples; not eligible to make comments; talking about the method; information that would not make sense and not knowing if the technicians are working in the right direction. Evidence of sub-state *1.3* in the following situations Difficulty in holding an opinion for small examples; agreement that certain information would not make sense and not knowing if the technicians is working in the right direction Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Not talking about colour; talking about the prototype and having no reliance on voice. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations Agreement on what was said about the prototype and not talking about arrow keys not coloured keys

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team The demonstration of the prototype was useful for the team to see where the technical partners had expended efforts and for those partners to receive feedback from other team members There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering

The next theme is creating a link for stylesheets.

Discourse chunk, Creating a link for stylesheets, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Geoff presented the work on stylesheets There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Talking about website palette names and requesting Geoff to speak in English, not Spanish There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation when team members wanted Geoff to speak in English There was evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the situation when a team member agreed that they also wanted Geoff to speak in English, not Spanish

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The team were shown what work had been undertaken by the technical partners in relation to the work on the e-learning portal There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs and belief states altering Verbal utterances show team members held mutual belief on the issues raised in this theme.

The next theme is presentation of partner 4 by Michael's translator

Discourse chunk, Presentation by partner 4's translator, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Morris's translator provided a presentation. Elsie, from partner organization 7, also read out a document to the team prepared by partner 4, as she was a more confident English speaker There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this theme and evidence of mutual understanding not becoming larger

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	8 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	5 – all spoken evidences
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	50– spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod
5.1 (No perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations Using a wrong name to call Elsie; users learning HTML; stylesheets; non expert users; that Elsie was reading a report, not just a document and when the translator said that in Verona what Hazel was presenting was not the picture, and that maybe it was only true in the United Kingdom and not generalisable to other countries Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Using a wrong name to call Elsie; users learning HTML and referring to non expert users Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Elsie reading the report; evidence of the translator providing the missing word following a pause by Elsie (a try-marker); referring to examples; asking and answering questions; talking about wizards; layout information and evaluations. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when the translator was still referring to using MS Word to author e-learning content Hazel explained the limitations of using MS Word and named other software which could be used

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team Information was conveyed to the team by listening to a report read out to them No demonstrations were used. This is the first time during a face-to-face meeting where the Italian partners presented their work There was evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when the translator was referring to using Ms Word to author e-

learning content. The translator was not part of the team, and did not discuss these comments with Michael. In this situation common ground and mutual beliefs remained the same as Hazel mentioned other tools which can be used for authoring e-learning content. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering

The next theme is work package 3 description.

Textual chunk, Work package 3 description

Team member	E-mail number	Date
[redacted]	10	11/11/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as this theme provided salient information to Michael concerning the tasks he was responsible for This message was sent to the team and provided salient information regarding the nature of that task. There was increased mutual belief in this theme

The next theme is work package 3 task schedule.

Textual chunk, Work package 3 task schedule

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Annie	4	27/9/02
Annie	8	7/10/02
Annie	15	13/11/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message) Annie was responsible for sending the first message to the team, and thereafter creating a discussion thread from it

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the task schedule for responsible partners for work package 3 was salient information that was shared There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next theme is guidelines for software accessability.

Textual chunk, Guidelines for software accessibility

Team member	E-mail number	Date
[redacted]	11	11/11/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as Annie shared with the team information that she thought would be of interest to team members There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next section looks at work package 4.

Work package 4: Creation of an accessible e-learning portal

[redacted]	Time plan
Discussion (17/12/01)	Long term
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 8 on work package 1(18/12/01)	Long term
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 5 (18/12/01)	Long term
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 7 (18/12/01)	Long term
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)	Long term
[redacted]	
E-learning	Long term
[redacted]	
Review of work package 6 (Dissemination activities) (14/3/02)	Long term
Overview of evaluation sessions (14/03/02)	Long term
E-learning portal (14/3/02)	Long term
Work package 1 –E-learning presentation (14/3/02)	Long term
E-learning and voice (15/3/02)	Long term
Conclusions from the meeting (15/3/02)	Medium term

Textual chunk after 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Project portal	Long term
E-learning	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Review of work by work package 2/3/4 (14/3/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Demonstration of the partner 7 portal (6/6/02)	Long term
Discussion of the tool (6/6/02)	Long term
Discussion of review questions from the review report (7/6/02)	Long term
Presentation on work package 1 – discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1 ((7/6/02)	Long term
Summary of documents to send (7/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Project portal	Long term
Interesting information to share	Long term
Work plan for work package 4 (E-learning portal)	Long term
E-learning requirements	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 4th face-to-face meeting	
E-learning portal (12/9/02)	Long term
Demonstration on parser (12/9/02)	
Textual chunk After the 4th face-to-face meeting	
Update on the project portal	Long term
HTML tutorial	Long term

Discourse chunk, Discussion, 17/12/01 transcript

In this theme Ronnie started of the discussion Ronnie was responsible for proposing to the team that the meeting agenda is re-structured to allow discussions to take place relevant to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and evidence of no growth in mutual understanding as well.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – non verbal evidences, head nods 25 - spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 - all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations This is not the way that European projects work; surprised that they just talk about user needs about technology, and not about e-learning; findings out about user needs for e-learning for visually impaired students will be useful; demonstrating e-learning; the work plan and producing an official documentation for the commission to inform them of changes Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Signing up to a project and they are nottalking about the situation being discussed

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because discussions relevant to work package 4 took place This theme established common ground There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief states altering Some utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which are discussed in this theme. However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual beliefs on all the issues in this theme At other times team members held mutual belief(s) on issues being discussed

The next theme is a short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 8 on work package 1

Discourse chunk, Partner 8 on work package 1, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme, Hazel summarized what work she had done in the last 3-months. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and evidence of no growth in mutual understanding

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	13 – spoken evidences 19 non-verbal evidences, head-nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2- all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Interesting survey findings concerning the use of authoring materials for producing e-learning; proposal of areas to look into; discussion on tools; E-learning portals; user requirements and talking to potential users Evidence of sub-state *2.1* when Jonathan said that he did not think that they had to have good knowledge of authoring tools and evidence of sub-state *1.2*, Hazel's reaction to Jonathan's comment Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when Hazel reported that she required a clearer specification on what she was required to do It appears that at the kick off meeting she had been asked to look at what which she had done, and when she was reporting the results back to the team, she is now being told about something else

In this theme there was evidence of growth in mutual understanding and no growth in mutual understanding. Growth in mutual understanding was observed when salient information was shared to the team concerning the authoring tools for e-learning. This information established common ground with team members. There was evidence of increased mutual belief as well based on the evidence of utterances in the transcripts.

There was evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Hazel reported that she had only done what she had been asked to do at the kick-off meeting, however, this is not what she was being asked to do during the face-to-face meeting. There was evidence of Jonathan's *utterance 'I am not saying that... '* leading to further belief that members of the team do not hold this belief (they do then hold a mutual belief that they don't hold mutual beliefs on this issue). Over the 3-month period, common ground and the number of mutual beliefs did not become larger but stayed the same.

The next theme is a short presentation from partner 5.

Discourse chunk, Partner 5, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme, Lucy briefly summarized the work activities that partner 5 had been involved in. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation that work for work package 4 must being before the scheduled plan.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because the need to change the structure of work package 4 was established. This is salient information that was shared amongst the team. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. An utterance provided by Lucy *'I think this is a common feeling'* showed evidence of mutual belief in reference to the change Jonathan made.

The next theme is a short presentation from partner 7.

Discourse chunk, Partner 7, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Morris informed the team of what work they had done in the last 3-months and their interest in work package 4. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	5- non verbal evidences, head nods 4 – spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Someone can be hired to start work on the project; transferring contents and talking about voice xml documents.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners were informed of what activities partner 7 had been involved. This is salient information that was shared amongst the team members. This theme established common ground. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme, regarding employing someone to start work on the project, using existing content, continuing with their research, and using voice xml.

The next theme is developing a plan of future work.

Discourse chunk, Developing a plan of future work, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Hazel was developing a plan on how to tackle the work in this area. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – non verbal evidences, head nods 6 – spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about lessons; showing principles with the user and for users to get questionnaires completed. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* when it was said that they were not talking yet about the portal.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners working together to develop a plan for work activities relevant to the project. Information was salient to the team, and this theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme. However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual belief s on all the issues in this theme.

The next theme is e-learning.

Textual chunk, E-learning

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Thomas	6	11/1/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3* (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as documents related to e-learning was circulated amongst the team. E-learning is important to the project. It is assumed that there was increased mutual belief in this theme as there were no further messages sent or received looking at this theme.

The next theme is review of work package 6(dissemination activities).

Discourse chunk, Review of work package 6, dissemination activities, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Fabian informed the team on what work had been done in this work package. He also informed everyone that he is now working with Jack on this area, as Jonathan left the project. In this theme there discussions related to work package 4 which is examined here. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	5 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – al spoken evidences
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	30 – spoken evidences 6 – non verbal evidences, head nods

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Requiring only one example for the webpage; partner 8 is not the volunteer; no need for Annie's presentation to be shown now and Ronnie's viewpoint on what Elsie can do. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when understanding is reached that their only needs to be one example for the webpage. Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about HTML webpages; working with an existing web page and to look at it's accessibility; to use the partner 7 webpage and that later on in the project all the languages of the project partners will be represented.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because their were discussions relevant to work package 4. This information was salient to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme. However, there were some issues which demonstrated team members holding mutual belief.

The next theme is an overview of the evaluation sessions.

Discourse chunk, Overview of the evaluation sessions, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Mary presented an overview of the evaluation sessions, which were held. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	49 – spoken evidences 7- non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation. Strange message on the screen; plug-in potentially improving the problems experienced with Jaws; findings from the session; results from the evaluation feeding into the development of the portal; paying for e-learning courses; solutions to the problems; providing this presentation to Annie to make preparations for her presentation tomorrow and Mary requiring a variety of problems. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation. To go onto the conclusion slide and talking about more than just the presentation. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when mentioned to have e-learning courses, and not just the presentation.

Overall, in this discourse chunk there was evidence of growth in mutual understanding. Findings from the evaluation provided salient information. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the e-learning portal.

Discourse chunk, E-learning portal, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme the e-learning portal was discussed. The portal was one of the objectives of the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	104 – spoken evidences 23 – non verbal evidences, head nods
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	4 – spoken evidences
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	7 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding agreement to a disagreement)	5 – spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Generalized results; portal activity to begin in month 12; showing portal to the commission in July; talking about content; starting work on the portal a few months early; accessibility of e-learning sites; learning; to work on pages which were a problem for users; figuring out what to show the commission; survey findings; need to discuss an e-learning portal; Mindleaders; summary of responsible partners in this task and a request to re-send the questionnaire. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations. Not understanding what is being said; not knowing if there are other possibilities or alternatives to what has been proposed; not remembering if the commission was told in the last quarterly report about the change and not knowing if James has answered the question he was asked. Evidence of sub-state *1.3* when Jack said he could not remember if the commission was told about the change to start work earlier than planned in the last quarterly report. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. The change of starting work earlier was not a formal change; not addressing the problem; using existing e-learning sites; not calling it *'portal'* but *'gateway'*; timing of decisions made and not agreeing with what had been said. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. The change of starting work earlier was not a formal change; not addressing the problem and to use existing e-learning sites

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the e-learning portal was discussed. Salient information was both shared and exchanged with the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. However there were some situation which did highlight that team members held mutual belief on some of the issues which were discussed in this theme. For example making arrangements with Mindleaders.

The next theme is work package 1 – E-learning presentation.

Discourse chunk, Work package 1, e-learning presentation, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme, Adam presented his work on e-learning. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	40 – spoken evidences 5- non verbal evidences, head nods
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	3 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	3 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Presentation by Adam was on e-learning presenting results on their study; confirmation of words used; summary of findings; discuss findings later on once everyone has a chance to read the report explanation of problems; summary of accessibility findings and answering a question on the language of the sites. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations. Paul not being sure about virtual libraries and Desmond not understanding what Adam had said. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Mary suggesting classifications can belong to more than 1 category; Braille software and talking about other screenreaders. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when Braille software was mentioned and referring to other screenreaders.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team on the e-learning presentation. Adam and Thomas explained their findings. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is e-learning and voice.

Discourse chunk, E-learning and voice, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme there was a discussion on e-learning and voice. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	85 – spoken evidences 11 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence 2 – non verbal evidences, head nods

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about help; use for not only blind people but everyone; project does not require you to produce a new authoring tool; producing an authoring tool for voice; differences between VUI and GUI; branching off visually and non visually impaired persons; information is clear; showing natural interactivity; finding more examples; voicifying partner 7's webpage and adding the portal; demonstrating how voice can help problems; clearer idea for the technicians on how to work on their tasks; sharing information; must be ready for submission in July to the commission and having a first version available in 3 weeks time. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Rejecting Jack's proposal; not good idea to just take partner 7's webpage and demonstrate voice on it and time frame was April not May. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Jack's proposal was rejected and not demonstrating voice on partner 7's webpage.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Team members were happy to receive information on video as well. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. However there was evidence that team members held mutual belief that video information would be shared with the partners.

The next theme is conclusions from the meeting.

Discourse chunk, Conclusions from the meeting, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack and James summarized the main outcomes from the 2-day meeting. The summary for work package 4 was relevant and is included here. There was growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement	1 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation when Ronnie was talking about the extension

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because team members were informed of the main points discussed during the last 2-days, relevant to work package 4 and who was responsible for actions that had been agreed. This was salient information that was shared to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is the project portal

Textual chunk, Project portal

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Adam	8	28/3/02
Hazel	16	24/4/02
Adam	17	25/4/02
Christopher	18	25/4/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as partners were made aware that the portal which was being developed was made available to the team. Comments on improvements were also received by the developers from team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

The next theme is e-learning.

Textual chunk, E-learning

Team member	E-mail number	Date
James	10	5/4/02
Mary	29	8/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as e-learning was an important part of the project and information was shared to the team on it. There was increase mutual belief in this theme. There was no evidence of team members belief state altering, and it is assumed that team members held mutual belief as no messages were sent in reaction to it

The next theme is review of work by work package 4.

Discourse chunk, Review of work done for work package 2/3/4, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Annie presented the review of work packages 2, 3 and 4. It is only work package 4 which is examined here. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and mutual understanding not growing

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	61 – spoken evidences 4 – non verbal evidences, head nods
3.1(growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – all spoken evidences
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	1-spoken evidence
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	6 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about the prototype of the tool; using the partner 7 web page; partner 7 have made their work available for team members disposal; understanding how partner 2 are developing items for the portal; importance of learning experiences; feedback based on a usability perspective and agreement on the viewpoint of Ronnie. Evidence of sub-states *3.1* and *1.3* when a team member said that they were not sure what question was being asked. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Noticing a misunderstanding; links not yet developed; the page demonstrated is not part of the e-learning portal and that Kenneth was not 100% certain on what had been said. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when informed that the page being shown is not part of the e-learning portal

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, regarding what can be done to progress in work package 3 There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual beliefs on all the issues in this theme as a result of spoken utterances

The next theme is demonstration of the partner 7 portal

Discourse chunk, Demonstration of partner 7's portal, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Adam presented a short presentation on the portal they were developing. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	55– all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	2– all spoken evidences
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	1– spoken evidence
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	6– all spoken evidences
1.2 growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Stylesheets; WAI guidelines; rating system and guidelines used; suggestions for improvements; rearranging a demonstration due to technical problems, customization and direction to take using partner 7's webpage. Evidence of sub-states *3.1* and *1.3* when reported that a team member did not know what the stylesheet has been set up to read Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Difficult to believe that someone can find the chosen colours easy to read; difficulty to use the keyboard as it is in Spanish; use of 'hard' colours; restriction as to what can be shown during the meeting and not using the plug-in for implementation. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. difficulty to use the keyboard as it is in Spanish; not using the plug-in for implementation

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The demonstration on the portal was useful to team members and comments on how to improve this work was offered by team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. However team members held mutual belief that a demonstration would be shown on day 2 of the meeting due to technical problems.

The next theme is discussion of the tool

Discourse chunk, Discussion of the tool, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack started of the discussion on the tool which team members had been presented with There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1- spoken evidence
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1– spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1– all spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation when talking about writing an e-learning course. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation when reporting that they do not feel there is anyone with relevant skills and experience to write an entire e-learning course Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation that there is no one who can produce an entire e-learning course.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is discussion of review questions from the review report.

Discourse chunk, Discussion of review questions from review report, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack started off the discussion. The outcomes of the review would determine whether the project would continue into its second year. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	38 – spoken evidences 9 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1(growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
1.2(growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Talking about work package 4; looking at changes and examining resources in the project. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Talking about the comments and disagreeing with a proposed procedure Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation when talking about comments.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering

Presentation on work package 1 – discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1.

Discourse chunk, Presentation on work package 1 – Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary went through the plan for the two deliverables that had been distributed a couple of days prior to the meeting by Hazel. Hazel was unable to attend this meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	10 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation when discussing that the work of partner 7 should belong to work package 4

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme as well.

The next theme is the project portal

Textual chunk, Project portal

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Morris	30	19/7/02
Mary	42	13/8/02
Adam	49	2/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the project portal was an important part of the project and salient information on it was sent. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme, and evidence that team members held mutual belief on the issues discussed in this theme

The next theme is interesting information to share.

Textual chunk, Interesting information to share

	Team member	E-mail number	Date
	Charles	5	13/6/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as information that may be of interest was shared to team members. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on the issues covered in this theme as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering

The next theme is work plan for work package 4, the e-learning portal

Textual chunk, Work plan for work package 4 (E-learning portal)

	Team member	E-mail number	Date
	Fabian	18	21/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as information that may be of interest was shared to team members. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on the issues covered in this theme as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering

The next theme is e-learning requirements

Textual chunk, E-learning requirements

	Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary		22	26/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as information that may be of interest was shared to team members. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on the issues covered in this theme as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering.

The next theme is the e-learning portal.

Discourse chunk, E-learning portal, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Geoff presented a demonstration on the e-learning portal. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	6 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* when talking about interactivity and the manual. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Referring back to a particular slide and work will not exist in two different servers.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team on work package 4, and the demonstration was a useful way of showing what work had been done. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is demonstration of the parser.

Discourse chunk, Demonstration of parser, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme there was a short demonstration delivered by Charles using his laptop with a projection on the white screen. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this theme.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – spoken evidences 2 – non verbal evidences, head nods
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Referring to Java classes; easy navigation and J-tidy. Evidence of sub-states *3.1* and *1.3* when mentioned that navigation would potentially be easier, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with what had been said on this issue.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The parser was relevant to working towards the project goals. Showing the demonstration provided more salient information to team members than showing code. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the update on the project portal.

Textual chunk, Update on the project portal

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Adam	6	30/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team, regarding the accessibility of the portal. Team members were also informed that they could test the portal. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next theme is the HTML tutorial.

Textual chunk, HTML tutorial

Team member	E-mail number	Date

Michael	23	11/1/03

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information regarding the tutorial was shared by Michael. The URL was made public URL allowing team members to access their work. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next section looks at work package 5.

Work package 5: Evaluation

Discourse chunk from the 2nd face-to-face meeting	**Time plan**
E-learning portal (14/3/02)	Long term
Review of work package 1, Questionnaire data gathered (14/3/02)	Long term
Overview of evaluation sessions (14/3/02)	Long term
Textual chunks after the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
E-learning	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Presentation on work package 1 – Results for evaluation study (7/6/02)	Long term
Presentation on work package 1 (7/6/02)	Long term
Presentation on work package 5 (7/6/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view (7/6/02)	Long term
Presentation on work package 1, Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1 (7/6/02)	Long term
Summary of documents to be sent (7/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Revised work plan for work packages 1 and 5	Long term
Evaluation of the e-learning portal	Long term
Textual chunk after the 4th face-to-face meeting	
Evaluation of portal	Long term
Evaluation plan	Long term
News	Short term

Discourse chunk, Review of work package 1, questionnaire data gathered, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Hazel informed the team of the responses she had to the questionnaires and preliminary conclusions drawn from it. Here included is relevant information to work package 5. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared with the team regarding offering payments to the subjects taking part in the evaluations. It is assumed that team members accepted what was said on this point as there was no evidence to suggest otherwise. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is overview of the evaluation sessions.

Discourse chunk, Overview of the evaluation sessions, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Mary presented an overview of the evaluation sessions, which were held. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	**Frequency**
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	46 – spoken evidences 7- non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation. Strange message on the screen, plug-in potentially improving the problems experienced with Jaws; findings from the session; results from the evaluation feeding into the development of the portal; paying for e-learning courses; solutions to the problems; providing this presentation to Annie to make preparations for her presentation tomorrow and Mary requiring a variety of problems. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation. To go onto the conclusion slide and talking about more than just the presentation. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when mentioned to have e-learning courses, and not just the presentation.

Overall, in this discourse chunk there was evidence of growth in mutual understanding. Findings from the evaluation provided salient information. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the e-learning portal

Discourse chunk, E-learning portal, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme the e-learning portal was discussed. The portal was one of the objectives of the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	10 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations: To use the protocol that partner 8 distributed; using incentive payments may help find subjects; using incentive payments would have yielded a higher response rate; experts took part in the evaluations and to re-send the evaluation protocol.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as points relevant to evaluation were discussed in e-learning portal. Salient information was both shared and exchanged with the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

The next theme is e-learning.

Textual chunk, E-learning

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	29	8/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as e-learning was an important part of the project and information was shared to the team on it. There was increase mutual belief in this theme. There was no evidence of team members belief state altering, and it is assumed that team members held mutual belief as no messages were sent in reaction to it.

The next theme is requirements for the tool from a technical point of view.

Discourse chunk, Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James informed the team that Geoff would present a review of their technical work. No specific documentation had been prepared for this presentation, as Geoff did not know in advance that he would be giving this presentation. Kenneth said that this presentation would be useful to the team. Included here are the discussions which are relevant to work package 5. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Formatted

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations: That the tool will have to validate other web pages and not just report on the accessibility of web pages and when Geoff reported that he could not say the word accessibility.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding when looking at this theme.

There was growth in mutual understanding as a result of salient information shared with team members. This included information relevant to evaluation and understanding that the tool will have to validate other web pages and not just report on the pages accessibility.

The next theme is the presentation on work package 1.

Discourse chunk, Presentation on work package 1, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary, Erin and Charles presented their work on this work package. However, only Mary and Erin's presentations were relevant to this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	32 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1– spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations: Surprising results; enlarging font size for the presentation; using keywords; types of manuals to consider; asking question; lot of work to be completed in a short period of time and not understanding why Charles did not receive comments from partners firs time round. Evidence of sub-state *2.1*, that there were no questions to be asked, as information was clearly presented

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Three members from different partner organization informed everyone on what they had been working on in terms of this work package. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is a presentation on work package 1 –results for the evaluation study.

Discourse chunk, Presentation on work package 1 – results for evaluation study, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary presented the results from the evaluation study. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* when Mary was talking about the navigation category.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, based on the results of the evaluation study. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue or any of the points identified from the evaluation study.

The next theme is a presentation on work package 1, discussing plans for deliverables in this work package.

Discourse chunk, Presentation on work package 1 – Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary went through the plan for the two deliverables that had been distributed a couple of days prior to the meeting by Hazel. Hazel was unable to attend this meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	74 – spoken evidences 11 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 – all spoken evidence
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	1- spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Everyone had received Hazel's plans by e-mail; extra copies were available; contributing partners to chapters in the deliverable; proposals on re-structuring some of the work; Desmond will try to provide input; identifying problems; talking about questionnaires; conducting evaluations; establishing who will put the report together; submission of documents to the commission and reminding the team that they are working on a preliminary document. There was evidence of sub-states *2.1*, *2.2* and *1.2* in the following situations. Not able to provide inputs yet and Annie's task has not been documented.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The discussion on the work plan was important, as it was one of the deliverables to be sent to the commission. The team was reminded of what chapters this deliverable would include, and the partners responsible for producing it. Establishing who would put the entire deliverable together was useful as well. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. However, team members held mutual belief on who was responsible for contributing towards each chapter Mary mentioned.

The next theme is a presentation on work package 5.

Discourse chunk, Presentation of work package 5, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary delivered the presentation on work package 5. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	67 – spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
3.1(growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	2– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Evaluations; authoring tools; prototype deadline; validation plan; letting Hazel take responsibility for what the commission wants; identifying an incorrect partner listed on the slides; feasibility of the evaluation schedule; initial prototype will have limited functionality and establishing the type of user required to participate in the evaluation. Evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when using an incorrect name to refer to partner 4. There was evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations. Not making a decision until knowing all the information on the plan and stating that a decision will need to be made.

Overall,there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, regarding what had been done for work package 5. The plan was important, and so was seeking consensus on it from team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme a few occasions where team member belief states altered.

The next theme is summary of documents to be sent.

Discourse chunk, Summary of documents to be sent, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James summarized all deliverables to be sent to the commission during the periods of June to September. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation when Jack said that partner 8 are going to be producing two documents. One the manual for accessible design, and two, the dossier.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. It was useful to remind team members of what documents had to be sent and when. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

The next theme is the revised work plan for work packages 1 and 5.

Textual chunk, Revised work plan for work packages 1 and 5

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	4	13/6/02
Mary	42	13/8/02

There was evidence of State *1*. (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message) Mary was the only person to create a discussion thread when looking at this theme

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was made aware of Hazel's plan to check her mail in the evening and that a draft version had been placed onto the FTP site. Comments were still requested from team members as this was still a draft. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering.

The next theme is evaluation of the project portal.

Textual chunk, Evaluation of the project portal

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Morris	30	19/7/02
Morris	50	2/9/02
Mary	51	2/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*. (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was made aware that the evaluation of the portal was underway. Also informing everyone of the confusion that was noticed. Lastly providinf feedback on the evaluations which were provided. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering

The next theme is evaluation of the portal.

Textual chunk, Evaluation of the portal

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Morris	1	18/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was made aware that the evaluation of the portal was underway. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering

The next theme is the evaluation plan.

Textual chunk, Evaluation plan

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	7	30/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and state *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was made aware that on the server there was the latest version of the evaluation plan in the work package 5 directory. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering.

The next theme is news.

Textual chunk, News

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	7	30/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and state *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed that Mary was leaving the project team. This was salient information shared to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next section looks at work package 6.

Work package 6: Dissemination, Standardisation and Exploitation

Discourse chunk from the 1st face-to-face meeting	Time plan
Discussion (17/12/01)	Long term
Dissemination activities (18/12/01)	Long term
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have been doing in the last 3 months - partner 2 on work package 2 and 6 (18/12/01)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 1st face-to-face meeting	
Conferences	Long term
Plan for work package 6	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Review of work package 6, dissemination activities (14/3/02)	Long term
Closing for first day of the meeting (14/3/02)	Long term
Dissemination (15/3/02)	Long term
Project brochure (15/3/02)	Long term
Conclusions from the meeting (15/3/02)	Medium term
Textual chunk after the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Dissemination and use plan	Long term
Publications	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Work package 6: Dissemination, Standardization and exploitation (6/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Intention for dissemination	Medium term
Conferences	Long term
Discourse chunk from the 4th face-to-face meeting	
Review of work package 1 (12/9/02)	Medium term
Work package 6 (13/9/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After the 4th face-to-face meeting	
Invitation	Medium term
Conference paper	Medium term

Discourse chunk, Discussion, 17/12/01 transcript

In this theme Ronnie started of the discussion. Here only the points which were raised relevant to work package 6 are included. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners all heard the point that Ronnie made that it is not important now to work on dissemination as there is currently nothing to disseminate. As a result, Ronnie proposed to spend efforts on work package 4. Salient information was shared to the team. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members accepted this point as all discussions were looking at work pack package 4 and included in work package 4, not here

The next theme is looking at dissemination activities.

Discourse chunk, Dissemination activities, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team of the dissemination activities that had been made. Other information on conferences was also shared as a result of this theme being discussed. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	8 – spoken evidences 2 non-verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2- all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1- spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Jack talking about press releases and reporting to the team that news about the project is still appearing in Spanish newspapers and also when talking about conferences. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* when two team members corrected Jack when he wrongly used a word and evidence of sub-state *1.2* when Jack was informed that he had used the wrong word in his talk.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners were informed of dissemination activates performed in the past and opportunities for the future. This was salient information shared to the team. This theme established common ground by sharing this type of information to team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team members belief state altering. The utterance *'release'* displayed evidence of mutual belief and that members of this team held this mutual belief. There was evidence of mutual belief not being held when Hazel and Charlotte corrected Jack, when he said *'syndro'*, by saying *'syndrome'*. Overall in this theme there was mutual beliefs as further utterances led to mutual beliefs, for beliefs which were not previously held

The next theme is a short presentation from partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6 to show what work they have been doing in the last 3 months.

Discourse chunk, Partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Annie informed the team of what they had been working on in the last 3-months. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations when Annie said that they delivered a presentation.

There was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed about the salient information regarding this work package. That is partner 2 delivered a presentation. Receiving information from partners, discussing how manuals can support technical work activities. The salient information established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

The next theme is conferences

Textual chunk, Conferences

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Erin	12	12/2/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it

The next theme is the plan for work package 6.

Textual chunk, Plan for work package 6

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jonathan	21	29/1/02
Jonathan	26	7/2/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message) No discussion thread was formed as an identical message was re-sent, and no new information was communicated to the team

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to partners involved in work package 6. The allocated months for each of the partners which would be involved was also included in the message It is not known why the same message was sent twice. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent

The next theme is a review of work package 6, dissemination activities

Discourse chunk, Review of work package 6, dissemination activities, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Fabian informed the team on what work had been done in this work package. He also informed everyone that he is now working with Jack on this area, as Jonathan left the project There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk and no growth in mutual understanding

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	17 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	9 – spoken evidences 1-non verbal evidence, head nod
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	115 – spoken evidences 38 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	6– all spoken evidences
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	4 – all spoken evidences
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Partner 6 is not a member of WI; interests and certificates; dissemination's numbers; discussion on clusters; requiring only one example for the webpage and the project officer is not new Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations Partner 6 not a member of WI, dissemination numbers; need only one example for the webpage and the project officer is now new. Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Written submission to WAI, WAI problems, process to follow, potential reactions from the commission; standardization; follow up proposals; WAI meeting; project officer reminders; clustering; reports; reports; dissemination plan; working on the webpage and referring to the project officer. Evidence of sub-state *2.2* in the following situations. Question not being answered and not stimulating the commission further. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations Not sure about responses, exact meeting date and responsibilities; unaware of a meeting; lack of clarify on creation of pages with voice and not following what is said Evidence of sub-state *1.3* in the following situations Not sure about exact meeting date; lack of clarify on creation of pages with voice and not following what is said There was evidence of sub-state *5.1* when Ronnie reported that it will be difficult for them to look at the proposed document because they will be attending a conference There was agreement by another team member that this date was suitable for and could look at the document.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because all partners were informed of Fabian's new role in the project, and everyone was reminded of the importance of the activities of work package 6, and the deadlines, which had been set. This information was salient to the team There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme However, there were some issues which demonstrated team members holding mutual belief

There was evidence of no growth in mutual understanding and this was demonstrated almost immediately during this face-to-face meeting This was observed when Ronnie reported that it will be difficult for them to look at the proposed document because they will be attending a conference. However, there was agreement by another team member that this date was suitable for and could look at the document

The next theme is closing for the first day of the meeting

Discourse chunk, Closing for first day of the meeting, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme James summarized what was discussed during the day one of the 2-day meeting There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	2- non-verbal evidences, head nods

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Hazel has identified some possibilities for standardization and that Elsie from partner 7 is going to take the issue for standardization.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because the summary provided salient information to team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

The next theme is dissemination

Discourse chunk, Dissemination, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about dissemination There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	13– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Using the term provided by another team member when a try marker is displayed; processes to follow for dissemination and outline of when documents need to be sent

Overall, all there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Dissemination was important to the project and had one work package dedicated to it. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme

The next theme is the project brochure

Discourse chunk, Project brochure, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about the project brochure which was related to the dissemination theme. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	37 – spoken evidences 3 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. File preferences; following clear print guidelines; comments for improving the brochure; using logos and printing resolutions. There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Not in FTP and cannot see the logo. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when informing everyone that the paper will be put onto FTP.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Team members also suggested improvements for the brochure. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Team members held mutual beliefs on issues including preference for file formats and the use of logos

The next theme is conclusions from the meeting.

Discourse chunk, Conclusions from the meeting, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack and James summarized the main outcomes from the 2-day meeting. There was growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement	1 – spoken evidence 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Hazel saying that she has e-mailed her contact and that Elsie s going to take responsibility for the report

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because team members were informed of the main points discussed during the last 2-days, and who was responsible for actions that had been agreed. This was salient information that was shared to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is the dissemination and use plan.

Textual chunk, Dissemination and use plan

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	2	21/3/02
Fabian	5	22/3/02
Fabian	7	25/3/02
Fabian	9	1/4/02

There was evidence of State *1* (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). The discussion thread which emerged was from Fabian sending messages to this team on this theme

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as various versions of the dissemination and use plan were produced. The final version would be sent to the project officer in the event if there were no further comments from team members. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme.

The next theme is publications.

Textual chunk, Publications

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	2	21/3/02
Desmond	3	22/3/02
James	4	22/3/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as publications formed a salient part of the dissemination and use plan. There was evidence of increased mutual belief, and team members belief state altering in this theme.

The next theme is work package 6: Dissemination, standardization and exploitation

Discourse chunk, Dissemination, standardization and exploitation, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Fabian informed the team of what had been done for work package 6, Dissemination, standardization and exploitation. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and situations where there no increase in mutual understanding

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	70 – spoken evidences 2– non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1(growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – non verbal evidence, head nod 4 – spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	5- all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3- all spoken evidences
5.1 (No perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 2 situations

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Requests to repeat information; members of organizations; ongoing work; memberships to organizations; relevant meetings; requesting information; clustering; relevant conferences and attending conferences; offering assistance to write papers; informing the team of events before an event, not after and mentioning the pilot tool. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Organizations members; relevant information has already been provided; papers not delivered; making submissions and the abstract referred to had not been distributed. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations. For Ronnie not to worry about inviting Fabian to the meeting and not a team member not being sure about their partner organizations membership to an official organizations. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when discussing that the team should be informed of information shared outside the project team. This issue was also covered at the previous face-to-face meeting. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when the German partners inform the team they did not submit a paper to the Austrian conference.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Administrative issues were important to the project, and more specifically work package 6. There was also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when referring to sharing information outside the project team. This issue had been discussed during a previous face-to-face meeting as well. As a result common ground and mutual beliefs on this issue did not get larger but remained the same. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is intention for dissemination

Textual chunk, Intention for dissemination

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	39	7/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed of Jack's intentions to disseminate information about the project at the IBC event in September. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is conferences.

Textual chunk, Conferences

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Morris	52	4/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*. (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is the review of work package 1.

Discourse chunk, Review of work package 1, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Hazel and Mary reviewed the work which had been done in work package 1. The paper which was produced was relevant to this work package so is included here. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this theme.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. That is Hazel and Mary have written a general paper which is going to be presented at the European Conference on E-learning. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed team members held mutual belief on this point as there were no other evidences to suggest otherwise.

The next theme is work package 6.

Discourse chunk, Work package 6, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack discussed what progress had been reported in work package 6. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and a situation where mutual understanding stayed the same.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	48 – spoken evidence 1- non verbal evidence, head nod
5.1 (No perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Informing the team about events; talking about standardization; version 2 of the prototype; discussing the annual review and talking about compatibility. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when it was mentioned that information shared to people outside of the team should be shown to team members first. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* when a team member reported that she did not know if there would be a chance to submit to the conference they were talking about. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Wrongly mentioning a time period; experiencing no problems receiving the paper Mary sent and no video material was included in the paper. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Wrongly mentioning a time period and no problems receiving the paper Mary sent.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, regarding what had been done for work package 6. Informing team members of future events also provided salient information. There was evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when team members reported that the project team should see the information which is shown to people outside of the team. This situation shows that common ground and mutual beliefs on this issue did not get larger but remained the same. A similar discussion took place at a previous face-to-face meeting. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is an invitation

Textual chunk, Invitation

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	17	11/12/02

There was evidence of State *4*. (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed of Jack's invitation to a concertation meeting. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next theme is a conference paper.

Textual chunk, Conference paper

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	7	30/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*. (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *6*. (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed of Jack's invitation to a concertation meeting. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next work package is 7.

Work package 7: Project management

FTP site	
[illegible]	**Time plan**
FTP site (18/12/01)	Long term
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)	Long term
[illegible]	
FTP site – addition of new documents	Long term
[illegible]	
Work package 1. e-learning presentation (14/3/02)	Long term
FTP site (15/3/02)	Long term
[illegible]	
E-learning problems	Long term
FTP site	Long term
[illegible]	
FTP site	
[illegible]	
FTP update	Long term

Project logo	
[illegible]	**Time plan**
Project logo (18/12/01)	Short term

[illegible]	
[illegible]	**Time plan**
Reminder of roles in the project (18/12/01)	Long term

[illegible]	
[illegible]	**Time plan**
Communication amongst the team (18/12/01)	Long term

[illegible]	
[illegible]	**Time plan**
Project website address (18/12/01)	Medium term
[illegible]	
Project website	Long term

[illegible]	
[illegible]	Time plan
Project mailing list address (18/12/01)	Long term
E-mail address for mailing list	

Reporting	
[illegible]	**Time plan**
Reporting (18/12/01)	Long term
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)	Long term

Review	
Discourse chunk From the 1st face-to-face meeting	**Time plan**
Discussion (17/12/01)	Long term
Discourse chunk From the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Presentation of a demo (13/3/02)	Long term
Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide	
Textual chunk After 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Review	
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Review of agenda for the day's meeting (6/6/02)	Short term
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Review report (7/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After the 3rd face-to-face meeting	

Annual review in Brussels	Long term
Letter for prolongation of contract	Long term
Discourse chunk From 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues – amendments (12/9/02)	Medium term
Review of work package 1 (12/9/02)	Medium term
Annual review (12/9/02)	Medium term
Textual chunk after the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Update on the annual review	Medium term

Review report for the review	
Textual chunk after 2nd face-to-face meeting	**Time plan**
Special report	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Review report(7/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Comments on the review report	Long term
Answers to the reviewers comments	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term

Quarterly reports	
1st report	
Discourse chunk From the 1st face-to-face meeting	**Time plan**
Quarterly reports (producing and sending them to the commission) (18/12/01)	Medium term
Textual chunk After 1st face-to-face meeting	
Quarterly management report	Medium term
2nd report	
Textual chunk after 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Quarterly report	Medium term
Discourse chunk From the 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
3rd report	
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Summary of documents to be sent (7/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Third quarterly report	Medium term
Discourse chunk From the 4th face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term
4th report	
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	**Time plan**
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term
Textual chunk After 4th face-to-face meeting	
Cost statements	Medium term
Fourth quarterly report	Medium term

Annex	
No. 1	
Textual chunk after the 2nd face-to-face meeting	**Time plan**
New Annex 1	Medium term
Discourse chunk From the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Discussion of the tool (6/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk after the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Annex 1 updated	Long term
Discourse chunk From the 4th face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term
No. 2	
Textual chunk after 2nd face-to-face meeting	
New annex 2	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Review of agenda for the day's meeting (6/6/02)	Medium term
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	

Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term
CPF's	
[redacted]	
Updated CPF	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term
[redacted]	
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term
[redacted]	
Advance payment	Long term
Cost statements	
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Medium term
[redacted]	
Cost statements	Medium term
[redacted]	
Partner 8	
[redacted]	**Time plan**
Signed amendment	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 2rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (15/3/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Long term
Change of name in the project (13/9/02)	Short term
Partner 1	
Discourse chunk From 2ndface-to-face meeting	
Change in partner 1 company structure (14/3/02)	Short term
Administrative issues (15/3/02)	Long term
[redacted]	
Acceptance of new name	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	
Change of name in the project (12/9/02)	Short term
Partner 3	
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	
Change of name in the project (12/9/02)	Long term
No changes in the contract	
[redacted]	
Amendment letter	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (13/9/02)	Long term
[redacted]	
Discourse chunk From 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (15/3/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
[redacted]	
Discourse chunk From 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (15/3/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
[redacted]	
Discourse chunk From 2nd face-to-face meeting	
Change in consumables (15/3/02)	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	

Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Ammedments	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Letter for prolongation of the contract	Long term
Discourse chunk From 4th face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues-Ammedments (12/9/02)	Medium term
Annual review (12/9/02)	Medium term
Textual chunk After 4th face-to-face meeting	
Amendment number 3	Medium term
Discourse chunk From 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Administrative issues (6/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Amendments	Medium term

	Time plan
Next meeting date (18/12/01)	Medium term
Next meeting date	Medium term
Paris meeting (booking accommodation for the meeting)	Medium term
Paris meeting (draft agenda)	Medium term
Discussion on choosing a date for the next meeting (15/3/02)	Medium term
Meeting location (15/3/02)	Medium term
Any other business (15/3/02)	Medium term
Next meeting date	Medium term
Agenda for the meeting	Medium term
Date of next meeting (7/6/02)	Medium term
Leuven meeting	Medium term
Meeting information	Medium term
Draft agenda for the meeting	Medium term
Date for next meeting (13/9/02)	Medium term
Next meeting	Medium term
Agenda for the next meeting	Medium term

	Time plan
Meeting minutes (17/12/01)	Long term
Meeting minutes	Long term
Meeting minutes (15/3/02)	Long term
Meeting minutes	Long term

Other

	Time plan
Closing for holidays	Medium term

[illegible]	
Unable to send and receive emails due to power cut	Medium term
Out of the office	Medium term

Glossary	
[illegible]	**Time plan**
Project glossary	Long term
[illegible]	
Discussion of the tool (6/6/02)	Long term
Discussion of review questions from review report (6/6/02)	Long term
Textual chunk After the 3rd face-to-face meeting	
Glossary	Long term

FTP site.

Discourse chunk, Project FTP site, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke to the team about the FTP site, the documents on it and its structure. Some team members brought to attention that they had difficulty viewing PDF generated documents. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	6 – non verbal evidences, head nods 7 –spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	1 – spoken evidence
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – non verbal evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. What information should be kept in the site; process to follow to add documents to the site; having access to FTP; structuring the site; team members informing of their problems in reading PDF generated documents and reminding the team to include presentations which are delivered during the face-to-face meetings on the site.

Evidence of sub-state *2.1*, when a comment was made that numbering documents is not practical. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when other team members supported the viewpoint that PDF documents are not accessible to everyone. Evidence of sub-state *2.2*, when another team member said that they have no problems viewing PDF documents. There was evidence of sub-state *3.1* when one team member neither agreed or disagreed that PDF documents were difficult for him to read.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding because partners were informed of the FTP site and the documents which should be placed on there. The process to follow in order to place documents on the site was also shared to team members. The team was also reminded of how to access this site. A discussion also took place regarding the structure of the site and a suggestion was proposed to make the site more usable. A few team members also raised the point that they found it difficult to view PDF generated documents. This was all salient information that was shared to the team. This theme established common ground by sharing this salient information. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team members belief state altering in this theme. Utterances in this theme showed that team members did not mutually believe that the structure of the site was effective to access documents and that PDF generated documents can cause problems to some. The utterances then led to further belief that the structure of the site can be changed to make it more effective to access, and that PDF documents will be used only if the team members want to receive documents in that format.

The next theme is developing a plan of future work.

Discourse chunk, Developing a plan of future work, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Hazel was developing a plan on how to tackle the work in this area. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners were working together to develop a plan for work activities relevant to the project. Information was salient to the team, and this theme established common ground. Hazel informed the team that she would produce a timeline and if this is not put on the FTP site before Christmas, it will be put on there before the New Year. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held belief on this issue as there were no other evidences from team members.

The next theme is FTP site and the addition of new documents.

Textual chunk, FTP site, Addition of new documents

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	3	27/12/01
Hazel	7	11/1/02

Hazel	8	14/1/02
Hazel	9	14/1/02
Jack	12	16/1/02
Charlotte	16	21/1/02
Fabian	36	27/2/02
Jack	39	1/3/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team by including it onto the FTP site. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue. There was no evidence of team members belief states altering.

The next theme is work package 1, e-learning presentation.

Discourse chunk, Work package 1, e-learning presentation, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Adam presented his work on e-learning. Included here is a point raised that is relevant to work package 7. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation that the presentation just delivered will be included onto for the FTP site.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, that the presentation would be included onto the FTP site. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is the FTP site.

Discourse chunk, FTP site, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme the topic of the FTP site was covered. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	7 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when the team was informed that the FTP site had not changed. Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Hoping that the site is being use; change in the procedure; process to follow to add new documents onto the site; Desmonds file had not been put onto the site and checking names on the list.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team regarding the process for using the FTP site and the process which is to be followed. Jack said he would add Paul onto the site as well. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering than Jack.

The next theme is e-learning problems.

Textual chunk, E-learning problems

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	11	5/4/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*. (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as Mary fulfilled an action which was decided during the face-to-face meeting, sending video clips to technical partners. Salient information was shared to the team, especially partners who said that they would find this information useful in their work. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed team members held mutual belief as no messages were sent in reaction to it.

The next theme is the FTP site.

Textual chunk, FTP site

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	45	27/5/02
Jack	46	24/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as informing the team of new documents that were placed on the site. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering in this theme.

The next theme is FTP site again.

Textual chunk, FTP site

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	2	12/6/02
Fabian	17	21/6/02
Fabian	18	21/6/02
Fabian	29	5/7/02
Mary	35	31/7/02
Mary	42	13/8/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as informing the team of new documents that were placed on the site and where they could be found was salient information shared with the team. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering in this theme.

The next theme is FTP update.

Textual chunk, FTP update

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Mary	7	30/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared with the team that new documents had been placed on the FTP site. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next theme is project logo.

Project logo.

Discourse chunk, Project logo, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme there was a short discussion on how the logo, which was designed for the project, would appear in Braille form. Jack, started this discussion. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1- non verbal evidence, head nod 7- spoken evidences
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	1- spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. There was a designer in the team. The logo which was being referred to could not be seen and informing the team and showing them how the project logo would appear in Braille. Evidence of sub-state *2.2* when one team members reported that it was not true that this team included a designer.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding when Jack was informed how the designed logo would appear in Braille. Morris used his Braille machine to show how the characters in the project name would appear in Braille providing salient information to the team, and to Jack in particular. Charlotte was also able to contribute to this discussion, as she was could read Braille. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. This theme showed evidence of team members belief states altering. The utterances *'it is not true'* by Fabian shows that the belief previously believed to have been mutually believed is not. This belief was that their was a designer in the team. However, there were mutual beliefs that the logo being shown by Jack could not be seen and Morris informing Jack how the project logo would appear in Braille after Morris used his Braille machine to provide salient information to create common ground for team members.

A reminder of the roles in the project.

Discourse chunk, Reminder of roles in the project, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack reminded the team of his and Jonathan's role in the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because team members were informed of Jack and Jonathan's role in the project. This was salient information which was shared to the team. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. As no utterances were said after Jack informed the team of this information, it is assumed that members of this team held mutual beliefs on this issue.

Communication amongst the team

Discourse chunk, Communication amongst the team, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack before he was leaving the meeting, spoke about the importance of communication in the team, summarizing that many of the issues that were dealt with during the 2-day meeting were to do with communication. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* when Jack said that communication is important, it is important to receive documentation when requests have been made and if problems are encountered to inform him.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding because team members were provided with salient information, that communication in the team is important. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. The utterances were evidence that the beliefs believed previously were still believed, that there is no point in asking for documentation if requests are not fulfilled and that Jack should be informed of problems that are encountered in requesting information from team members. He should also be informed if anyone receives an e-mail that is not understood.

The project website address

Discourse chunk, Project website address, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team that they were in the process of booking an address for the project website. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – non verbal evidence, head nod 1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* following a question asked if the domain address for the website was being selected for the project. Also when Jack informed the team of the name that he felt was the best bet to use, xxxxxxprojeject.org.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as Jack informed the team of what addresses they had found for the project website which were on sale. This was salient information shared to the team to establish common ground amongst team members. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. The grounding utterances are evidence that the beliefs believed previously are still held at the end of the discourse chunk, therefore the members of the team believe that that they hold mutual belief that the most suitable name for the project would be xxxxxxproject.org.

The next theme is the project website.

Textual chunk, Project website

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	23	27/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as from the message sent, the team was informed that a second version of the project website had been produced. This was salient information shared with team members, including the URL to access it, and log in name and password. There was evidence of increase mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

Project webpage.

Discourse chunk, Project webpage, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about the project webpage. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because team members were informed that Jack was working on making more interactive, interesting webpages and an outline of the documents which could be placed on the website. This was salient information which was shared to the team. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. As no utterances were said after Jack informed the team of this information, it is assumed that members of this team held mutual beliefs on this issue.

The next the is the web page for the project

Textual chunk, Web page for the project

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	39	20/5/02
Mary	41	20/5/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information regarding some of the difficulties which were encountered in accessing the web page was shared to the team. There was an increase in mutual beliefs when looking at this theme. There was no evidence of altering belief states in this theme.

The next theme is the project website

Textual chunk, Project website

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	23	27/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as from the message sent, the team was informed that a second version of the project website had been produced. This was salient information shared with team members, including the URL to access it, and log in name and password. There was evidence of increase mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it

Project mailing list address

Formatted

Discourse chunk, Project mailing list address, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about the current mailing list. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	11 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Jack questioning the partner organization of a team member. Deleting a duplicate e-mail address from the list. Including in the list the names of Paul and Sajal by changing the set up of the list during the meeting. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* when Hazel informed Jack that all the necessary names were not on the list that he was displaying. Sajal, the researcher had to be added to the list to receive e-mails for this investigation.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners were all given the chance to review the current mailing list and to propose changes. In addition two extra persons were added onto this list. This information was salient to the team, allowing team members to know who their message is received by when a message is sent via the mailing list. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief states altering. The utterances made are evidence that the partner organization is correct, the duplicate e-mail address for partner 3 should be removed, and two persons should be added to the list.

The next theme is the e-mail address for the mailing list.

Discourse chunk, E-mail address for the mailing list, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme the topic of the e-mail address for the mailing list was covered. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	8– all spoken evidences
3.1(growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Server seems to have increased the name of the mailing list address; problems were encountered sending messages using the longer address; and informing the team of new people who was placed onto the list. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* when Jack said he did not know why two e-mail addresses were used for the mailing list.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The address for the mailing list had been checked and Paul was added to it. Team members were also informed of other new names added to the list as well.

Reporting

Formatted

Discourse chunk, Reporting, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jonathan proposed a regular reporting period to the team. There was no evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	2 – non verbal evidences, head nods 1- spoken evidence
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	1- spoken evidence
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2- spoken evidences
4.1(growth in mutual understanding and no eventual agreement)	Observed in 1 situation
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* when 15 days and 1 monthly reporting periods were suggested. Evidence of sub-state *2.2* when the 15 day reporting period was suggested. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* when a 3-week reporting period was proposed and another team member suggested once a month instead. Evidence of sub-state *4.1* as no eventual decision had been made, informing the team of what was going to be the regular reporting period. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when team member were not informed of what the regular reporting period would be.

Overall, there was no growth in mutual understanding, common ground did and mutual beliefs did not get larger in this theme. Although salient information was shared to the team, that there should be a regular reporting period, no eventual decision was made. There was evidence of team members having altering belief states in this theme. Grounding utterances provided evidence that the belief of having a 15-day reporting period was not held by all team members. The utterances then lead to further beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on the issue as a 1-month reporting period was proposed, which all team members did not accept. There was evidence that team members hold a mutual belief that they don't hold mutual beliefs on this issue.

The next theme is developing a plan of future work.

Discourse chunk, Developing a plan of future work, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Hazel was developing a plan on how to tackle the work in this area. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners working together to develop a plan for work activities relevant to the project. Information was salient to the team, and this theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Hazel reported that she preferred to have lots of little deadlines than trying to report every 15 days what has been done in that area of work. This way there is a deadline of something happening every week.

Review

Discourse chunk, Discussion, 17/12/01 transcript

In this theme Ronnie started of the discussion. Ronnie was responsible for proposing to the team that the meeting agenda is re-structured to allow discussions to take place relevant to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and evidence of no growth in mutual understanding as well.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	2 – non verbal evidences, head nods

	17- spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	6- all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1- all spoken evidences
5.1 (no perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 1 situation

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Not how European projects work; not cutting down the project; project review is at month 12; getting a continuation for the project; work continued; showing progress in the project and presenting relevant work.

Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Not the situation being discussed and continuing the work. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when mentioning that it is not the situation being discussed. Evidence of sub-state *5.1* when talking about reducing the work from 27 months to 12.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners were involved in the discussion which Ronnie felt was important to discuss whilst all team members were together face-to-face. Salient information was shared to the team. This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member belief states altering. Some utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which are discussed in this theme. However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual beliefs on all the issues in this theme. At other times team members held mutual belief(s) on issues being discussed.

There was evidence of no growth in mutual understanding in the discussion which involved team members discussing that the work was not being reduced from 27 months to 12. At one point is was agreed that this was not the situation. However, shortly after Ronnie reported that '*...we have to do the whole work?*', demonstrating that over time, which was a few minutes common ground and mutual beliefs did not get larger but remained the same.

The next theme is a presentation of the demonstration.

Discourse chunk, Presentation of a demo, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Annie presented the demo of the speech recognition. In this theme there were some discussions related to work package 7. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this theme.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	3 – all spoken evidences
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	7 - all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. The demonstration is not a prototype of the web authoring tool and cannot see any progress to what is already available. Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Remaining silent will cause the project to breakdown when asked on views of the project and requiring something which enhances e-learning content.

There was growth in mutual understanding when salient information was shared to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is a presentation on what the project voice solution can provide.

Discourse chunk, Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Annie delivered a presentation to show what the project voice solution can provide. However, a comment was made by Ronnie that was relevant to the project review. There was evidence of both growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation. James thanking Ronnie for his viewpoints. Partners 5, 3 and 4 also agree with Ronnie's viewpoint.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the comment made by Ronnie was relevant to the review. He said that if they do not show something which is innovative during the evaluation the continuation of the project will not be accepted. Salient information was both shared and exchanged with the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the review.

Textual chunk, Review

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	19	25/4/02
Jack	21	29/4/02
Jack	34	9/5/02
Jack	43	24/5/02
Hazel	44	24/5/02

Fabian	45	27/5/02
Jack	46	28/5/02
Jack	47	29/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information regarding the review was shared with team members. This included forwarded messages from the commission; requests for information and results of the review meeting in Brussels. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. There was evidence of mutual belief when Jack informed the team about the good news regarding the review and Hazel reacted to that message, sending congratulations to the team. Also when Hazel requested a final copy of the report and Fabian informed everyone where it could be found.

The next theme is review of agenda for the day's meeting.

Discourse chunk, Review of agenda for the day's meeting (current and next day), 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team of what to expect for this 2-day meeting. Information related to work package 7 is included here. An agenda had been circuited in advance of the meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team members. Everyone was informed that they have a report from the experts recommending the continuation of the project. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to work package 6. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	13 – all spoken evidences
2.1(growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Recognition of some of the names mentioned from the review report; mention of some of the documents sent; need to still send the preliminary versions as they were stated in the contract and need documents by July in order to send the full version by September. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation that preliminary documents need to be sent to the commission and not the full versions.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included names of the review experts for the project and a summary of documents to be sent. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the review report.

Discourse chunk, Review report, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Kenneth identified the need to look back at this issue. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	8 – spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Returning back to the review report; commission expecting an updated version and identifying a deliverable missing from the earlier list which was discussed. Evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when referring to the annual review at the end of September not now.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The review report was important and by Kenneth returning back to this theme, new information was shared with the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the annual review in Brussels.

Textual chunk, Annual review in Brussels

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	20	21/6/02
Jack	53	10/9/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack was the only person who resulted in the discussion thread being formed on this theme.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was sent a message originally sent to only Jack regarding the annual review, and another message sent by Jack informing the team of the date and a proposal for who should attend the review. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it, particularly the proposal made by Jack for who should attend the meeting.

The next theme is the letter for the prolongation of the contract.

Textual chunk, Letter for prolongation of contract

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	21	21/6/02
Jack	44	23/8/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed of what action is required to extend the project duration and the information that the commission requires. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is administrative issues – amendments.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues - amendments, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team that although administrative issues were going to be discussed during day 2 of the meeting, he had some important information on the amendments. Points raised relevant to the review are included here. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	8 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Only need to include the work done until 31st July, which are the preliminary versions sent and that everything must be sent to the reviewers within 1 month. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* when reported that the review will not be for all the work, only up until the end of July.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding because salient information regarding administrative issues were shared with the team. This issue was important, as the project was a European research project. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is the review of work package 1.

Discourse chunk, Review of work package 1, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Hazel and Mary reviewed the work which had been done in work package 1. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this theme.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	10 – all spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Providing new and relevant information to the commission and talking about the defense and what information will be presented during the review.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Hazel and Mary reviewed the work that they had both been working on and summarized what information would be presented at the defense. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is the annual review.

Discourse chunk, Annual review, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about the annual review. He was aware that Hazel had to leave the meeting by 6pm. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	9 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Time Hazel had to leave the meeting; holding a contract for 27-months; information to send to the commission; reaction of the project officer; suggestions on how to handle the review speaking from past experiences and hearing information.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The annual review was a very important part of the project. Team members also shared their relevant experience with the team as well in this theme which was important, especially to team members who had not participated at reviews in the past. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is the update on the annual review.

Textual chunk, Update on annual review

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Anne	8	7/10/02
Jack	9	9/10/02
Jack	12	14/11/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed of the outcomes of the annual review meeting in Brussels. This was salient information shared to the team, and a copy of the official review report also provided salient information to team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is the special report for the review.

Special report

Formatted

Textual chunk, Special report

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	23	6/5/02
Fabian	24	6/5/02
Thomas	26	7/5/02
Charles	27	8/5/02
Someone working in partner 5	28	8/5/02
Hazel	30	8/5/02
Hazel	31	9/5/02
Jack	32	9/5/02
Jack	34	9/5/02
Paul	35	13/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding because salient information was shared regarding the special report. Contributions and comments were requested from team members. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. There was also evidence of belief states altering in this theme.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to work package 6. However, Jack talking about the special report was relevant to work package 7. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. That is team members were informed that the second quarterly report was used as a base for the special annual review. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering

The next theme is the review report

Discourse chunk, Review report, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme Kenneth identified the need to look back at this issue. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	8 – spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Returning back to the review report; commission expecting an updated version and identifying a deliverable missing from the earlier list which was discussed. Evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when referring to the annual review at the end of September not now.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The review report was important and by Kenneth returning back to this theme, new information was shared with the team. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is comments on the review report

Textual chunk, Comments on the review report

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	6	17/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as information which was discussed face-to-face was continued by e-mail. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. No further messages were sent looking at this issue.

The next theme is answers to the reviewers comments

Textual chunk, Answers to the reviewers comments

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	8	17/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as information which was discussed face-to-face was continued by e-mail. Answers to the reviewers comments was important and issues raised had to be actioned. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members sent Fabian comments and contributions and that this document was sent to the commission. No further messages were sent looking at this issue.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. Talking about the report was relevant to this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. It is assumed that team members accepted the point that they will use the special report from May and all the new deliverables to make one report which covers everything they did in the first year There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

1st quarterly reports

Discourse chunk, Quarterly reports (producing and sending them to the commission), 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Jack reminded the team that the first quarter for the project would be at the end of December, and a quarterly report should be produced and sent to the commission. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	2 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1*, following a request that was made to receive a template of this report

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because Jack informed the team of salient information that the quarterly report had to be produced and sent to the commission by end of the February The team was also reminded of what information it should include This theme established common ground. There was also evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme The utterances which provided evidence of grounding, led to the mutual beliefs that the report had to be produced, and a template should be sent to team members, so the structure of the report could be identified

The next theme is the quarterly management report

Textual chunk, Quarterly management report

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	30	15/2/02
Jack	33	19/2/02
Jack	34	26/2/02
Fabian	36	27/2/02
Fabian	37	28/2/02
Jack	40	1/3/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed that they had to show the progress that their partner organization had made during October and November. Salient information, only the content was important and not formatting, and a precise summary of what information was required in this report was provided to team members. Draft versions of the report were also circulated to everyone before the final version was sent of to the commission. In addition a copy of the final document was circulated to everyone. There was increased mutual belief in this theme

2nd quarterly report

Textual chunk, Quarterly report

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	22	30/4/02
Jack	23	6/5/02
Hazel	30	8/5/02
Hazel	31	9/5/02
Fabian	52	3/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as this theme resulted in a discussion thread. Salient information was shared in the messages that were sent to the team New versions were sent including comments received There was increased mutual belief in this theme

The next theme is administrative issues

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to work package 6. Points raised to do with the second quarterly report are relevant to this work package so have been included here. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	– spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation that the deadline for the missing information to be completed is for next week.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. That is the team was informed that the second quarterly report was sent to the European Commission on May 10th and that a new version of this quarterly report was sent by Fabian because the experts have asked that the table at the end of the report is filled in as it was not completed when sent. Team members were requested to check and complete this missing information. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

3rd quarterly report

Discourse chunk, Summary of documents to be sent, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James summarized all deliverables to be sent to the commission during the periods of June to September. Quarterly report number three was relevant to this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1(growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation that if the document is circulated around the 15th of August this will not be suitable. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* that this would be suitable for team members

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Team members were informed that this quarterly report has to be made by partner 1 and circulated to the team. James who raised this point was also informed that some dates in August would not be suitable for it to be circulated to the team. Also that in the next meeting time should be spent looking at the quarterly report. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and also of mutual beliefs altering

The next theme is the third quarterly report

Textual chunk, Third quarterly report

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	38	6/8/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was provided with a first draft of the report. This message clearly identified what was required from team members to complete this report and when Jack would send it to the commission. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it

The next theme is administrative issues

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. The quarterly report was relevant to this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. That is the team was informed that the quarterly report was sent to the commission after comments were received. Also, team members were reminded to check the table that is included at the end fo the quarterly reports. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there were no evidences to suggest otherwise from team members

4th quarterly report

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	7– all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	3- all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1- spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about budgets; the statement is for September and the new deadline is the end of November. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Producing cost statements and the date not being October. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation that they are stating incorrect dates

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Administrative issues are very important. Jason also mentioned some relevant information, which the team should consider in relation to what is included in cost statements. In addition dates for the cost statement periods were reviewed. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is cost statements

Textual chunk, Cost statements

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	14	20/11/02
Jack	24	10/1/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack was responsible for sending the first message in this theme, and creating a discussion thread out of it.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed of a salient request to send Jack cost statements for each partner organization. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There is also evidence of Jack's belief states altering as he was still reminding the team to send him the requested information after a period of time. It is assumed that following message *24*, contributions for the cost statement were received as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is the fourth quarterly report

Textual chunk, Fourth quarterly report

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	20	8/1/03

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the draft report was salient information shared with the team. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on this issue as no further messages were sent in response to it.

Annex 1

Formatted

Textual chunk, New annex 1

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	23	6/5/02
Jack	32	9/5/02
Jack	34	9/5/02
Jack	46	28/5/02
Jack	47	29/5/02
Jack	49	29/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack was responsible for creating the first message for this theme, and resulting in a discussion thread forming.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed about salient information. Revised versions of the annex were produced. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next theme is administrative issues

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to work package 6. However the points raised on annex 1 were relevant to this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning annex 1 was shared with the team members. That is annex 1 is the technical annex and this was produced and sent to the commission. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on what was said as there were no reactions from team members to suggest otherwise.

The next theme is the discussion of the tool.

Discourse chunk, Discussion of the tool, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme there was some discussion on annex 1 which is relevant to this work package. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	9– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations: Annex 1 was sent one week ago; to tell where changes have been made in relation to its previous version; time frame to send a new annex and to look at the questions raised by the reviewers.

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team regarding annex 1. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is annex 1 updated

Textual chunk, Annex 1 updated

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	2	12/6/02
Jack	3	13/6/02
Jack	6	17/6/02
Fabian	8	17/6/02
Hazel	9	18/6/02

There was evidence of State *1* (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message)

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team. This included circulating draft reports to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme, and team members belief state altering.

The next theme is administrative issues

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Administrative issues are very important. Jack mentioned that the quarterly report will look to see what you used, against what was supposed to be used according to the technical annex. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members accepted what was said on this point as there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.

Annex 2

Textual chunk, New annex 2

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	43	24/5/02
Jack	46	28/5/02
Jack	47	29/5/02
Jack	49	29/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack was responsible for creating the first message for this theme, and resulting in a discussion thread forming.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed about salient information. Revised versions of the annex were produced and team members were informed when this document would be sent to the commission. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next theme is the review of the agenda for the day's meeting.

Discourse chunk, Review of agenda for the day's meeting (current and next day), 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team that Kenneth wanted to talk about the annex. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. That is Kenneth wanted to walk about the annex that had been sent and to look at the changes the commission and the experts have asked for. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to work package 7. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk. There was also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1– spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation that a description of how you are going to manage with less money is required by the commission.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included the commission requiring a description of how team members will cope with less money in there travel. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation that they are not talking about a new contract.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Administrative issues are very important. Jack summarized the changes that were in the annex. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

CPFs

Textual chunk, Updated CPF

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	43	24/5/02
Jack	46	28/5/02
Jack	47	29/5/02
Jack	49	29/5/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack was responsible for creating the first message for this theme, and resulting in a discussion thread forming.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed about salient information. Team members were requested for their input and everyone was informed when this document would be sent to the commission. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to work package 6. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk. There was also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	10 – spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidences, head nods
2.1(growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1– non verbal evidence, head nod
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. There is a need to provide better explanations to the commission; request for signatures and changing the person who signed the amendment. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situation that there is no change in person who signed the last amendment. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when a team member reported that their was no change in person who signed their last amendment

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included information on the CPF. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is administrative issues

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Talking about the CPF file which was sent to everyone and Jack receiving the CPF for partner 5.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Administrative issues are very important. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme

Advance payment

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to work package 6. However, discussion on the advance payment was relevant to work package 7 so is included here. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Good news that a complimentary advance payment could be set and information required from the German partners

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the the possibility of receiving an advance payment was shared with the team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	5 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. German partners have the advance payment of the first year and will not receive the advance payment of the propagation.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Administrative issues are very important. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering

The next theme is advance payment

Textual chunk, Advance payment

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	21	10/1/03

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed about salient information regarding payments. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it.

Bank guarantee

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issue related to the bank guarantee. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. That is team members were kept updated and were informed that for the first time the bank guarantees for partners 1 and 2 were almost done. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there were no other evidences to suggest otherwise.

The next theme is the annual review.

Discourse chunk, Annual review, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack mentioned issues related to the bank guarantee for the prolongation of the contract. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team regarding the bank guarantees for the prolongation of the contract. The team was informed that the German partners are trying to still solve their problem. There was also evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. As no utterances were made, it is assumed that the members of this team held mutual belief on this issue.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	4– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Guarantee is the right term to use; proposing a question and why should the Germans be asked for a bank guarantee.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Administrative issues are very important. The team was informed that they have encountered some problems with the bank guarantee. The German partners have said that they are not going to do the bank guarantee. Other partners doing the bank guarantee are partners 1 and 2. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

Cost statements

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about some of the administrative issues related to the project. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	15 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 –spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 –spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. When the cost statements need to be produced; providing details in the cost statement for travel; the new deadline; periods to be included in the cost statement; draft available of the financial tables and sending the electra. There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Time periods for the cost statements and not finding the financial information for the whole project. There was evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situation when agreeing that the mentioned time period was incorrect.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team regarding cost statements. Also, relevant information was shared with the team on how to fill in cost statements and a decision to send a copy of the electra was established during the discussion in this theme. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and belief states altering.

The next theme is cost statements.

Textual chunk, Cost statements

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	14	20/11/02
Jack	24	10/1/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack was responsible for sending the first message in this theme, and creating a discussion thread out of it.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed of a salient request to send Jack cost statements for each partner organization. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There is also evidence of Jack's belief states altering as he was still reminding the team to send him the requested information after a period of time. It is assumed that following message *24*, contributions for the cost statement were received as no further messages were sent on it.

Amendments

Change of name for partner 8

Textual chunk, Signed amendments

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	12	16/1/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed of the importance of the signed amendment. Jack also informed everyone of whom he had received it from, and who was still outstanding. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no other messages were sent looking at this theme.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Amendment, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about the amendment which has to be sent to the commission. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1(growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2– non verbal evidences, head nods

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Reasons for requiring the amendment; importance of the piece of paper and wanting to ask a question. There was evidence of sub-state *2.1*when Ronnie spoke about extending the participation of man months in the project. Evidence of sub-state 1.2 when Jack said that this was not true, explaining why the amendment was required by partner 8.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Informing the commission of changes was important, as the project was a European research project with funding from the European Union commission. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, in particular the change in partner 8's name took place. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included giving partners copies of the signed amendment which had the change of partner 8's name and informing everyone that partner 8 could now be paid. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on these points as there were no reactions to it.

The next theme is change of name in the project.

Discourse chunk, Change of names in the project, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team of the change in name for partner 8. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. It was important that team members were aware of this change, especially to correctly refer to the company name when referring to it in their work. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

Change in partner 1 structure

Discourse chunk, Change to partner 1, company structure, 14/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team of the change in company structure for partner 1. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners were all informed of the change in company 1's situation. The team had already been informed of this change at the December 2001. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that mutual belief was held on this issue as no further questions were asked concerning it.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack reminded the team about the change in partner 1 and 2's company structure. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. That is partners 1 and 2 are now part of a new organization. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is acceptance of the new name.

5.2.6.2.4 Textual chunk, Acceptance of new name

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Fabian	25	27/6/02
Jason	27	1/7/02
Fabian	29	5/7/02

Jack	44	23/8/02
Jack	45	28/8/02
Jack	47	29/8/02
Jack	48	29/8/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed of what action was required for partner 2's change in name. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. There was evidence of team members holding mutual belief that an acceptance statement was required to change partner 2's name. There was evidence of altering belief states as well. This was observed when Jack mentioned in message *48* that partner 3 noticed a typo error.

The next theme is change of name in the project.

Discourse chunk, Change of names in the project, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team of the change in name of the Spanish partners company. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	4– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* when the team was told the new name of the Spanish company and the difficulty in explaining the change of name to the commission.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. It was important that team members were aware of this change, especially to correctly refer to the company name when referring to it in their work. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

Change of name for partner 3

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about informing the commission of the change in name for partner 3. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included the change of name in the legal address for partner 3 that was already communicated to the commission in the amendment. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed team members held mutual belief as there was no evidence to suggest otherwise.

The next theme is change of name in the project.

Discourse chunk, Change of names in the project, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team that partner 3 changed there name. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence to suggest otherwise.

No change in the contract

Textual chunk, Amendment letter

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	31	15/2/02
Jack	33	19/2/02

Jack	34	26/2/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack produced a discussion thread to this theme

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as the letter which had been forwarded by the commission to Jack was sent to all project partners The importance of the letter was suggested by Jack's request to send it by courier. There was increased mutual belief in this theme However, there was evidence of Jack's belief state altering, as message 34 indicates that everyone did not follow this up.

The next theme is administrative issues

Start date

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack reminded the team that the amendment included the change in the project start date. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because team members were reminded of salient information. That is the amendment included that the start date of the project was 1st October, not 1st September. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief as no team members had reacted to what Jack had said

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team that he had copies of the amendment which included the change in the project's start date. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included the change of start date for the project and this being reflected in the signed amendment which each partner will receive for their records. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

Changing involvement in the work package

Discourse chunk, Amendment, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about the amendment which has to be sent to the commission. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation to include the change in work package for partner 7 in the next amendment.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Identifying changes to inform the commission is important, as the project was a European research project with funding from the European Union commission. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues related to the amendment which was sent to the Commission. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included reminding the team that their was a request to inform the project officer that the effort of partner 7 in work package 4 had been brought forward. This was informed to the project officer. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.

Change in consumables

Discourse chunk, Change in consumables, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack spoke about changes in the consumables. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – spoken evidences 1 – non verbal evidence, head nod

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Partner 8 using consumables money and partners 5 and 6 changing their money from travel to consumables.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team, and some team members decided to change their costs in consumables to allow them to work more effectively. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme.

The next theme is administrative issues.

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to the change in consumables. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation that the commission requires a description for the change in budget for consumables.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. This included informing the team that the amendment included a change in the budget from travel to consumables for partners 6. 5 sand 7. Also that the commission wants to know how they will deal with the change in the budget. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

Signature for amendment

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issue related to the signature for the amendment. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	4 – spoken evidences 1 –non verbal evidence, head nod
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 - spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. There was a question to be asked; changes can be made in the CPF; problems are likely to be faced if signatures are required in September and need to inform ahead of time when signatures are required. There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the situation when Jack was informed by a team member that there was no change in the person who will be signing the document. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when there is agreement that there is no change in the person who will be signing the document.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. That is team members were informed about the procedure for signing the amendment. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and evidence of altered belief too.

The next theme is amendments.

Textual chunk, Amendment

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	2	12/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed that partner 1 can sign the amendment for all partners as this can make the process easier. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no other messages were sent looking at this theme

Extension for the contract

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues related to extension of the contract. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, salient information concerning the administrative side of the project was shared with the team members. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue.

The next theme is the letter for the prolongation of the contract

Textual chunk, Letter for prolongation of contract

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	21	21/6/02
Jack	44	23/8/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed of what action is required to extend the project duration and the information that the commission requires. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it

The next theme is looking at amendments, which is related to the administrative issues

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues - amendments, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack reminded the team about the administrative issue related to the extension of the contract. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because team members were all informed of what would be discussed next according to the agenda. This was salient information shared to the team, which established common ground. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. As no utterances were made, it is assumed that the members of this team held mutual belief on this issue that partner organizations would each present a 10-minute presentation.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding because salient information regarding administrative issues were shared with the team. This issue was important, as the project was a European research project. The team was told that the next amendment will include the prolongation of the contract and also other items related to the prolongation of the contract. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that the members of this team held mutual belief on this issue as there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.

The next theme is the annual review

Discourse chunk, Annual review, 12/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack mentioned issues related to the prolongation of the contract. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team regarding the financial situation for the prolongation of the contract. There was also evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. As no utterances were made, it is assumed that the members of this team held mutual belief on this issue.

The next theme is amendment number 3.

Textual chunk, Amendment number 3

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	2	24/9/02
Jack	3	25/9/02
Jack	5	30/9/02
Jack	13	20/11/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack sent all messages on this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as Jack requested information from team members to produce amendment number 3 which he finally received. This was salient information and important for the administrative activities of the project. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

Partner 1 signing amendments

Discourse chunk, Administrative issues, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team about the administrative issues, related to this work package. That is issues related to signing the amendments. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. The team were informed of Jack's proposal to sign amendments on behalf of partners as this can make the process easier. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue.

The next theme is amendments.

Textual chunk, Amendment

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	2	12/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed that partner 1 can sign the amendment for all partners as this can make the process easier. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no other messages were sent looking at this theme.

The next meeting

Discourse chunk, Next meeting date, 18/12/01 transcript

In this theme Hazel asked if team members had any other issues that they would like to discuss. Ben asked if there could be a definite date for the next meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2– all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. The 18th of March would be a problem for some team members to attend the meeting. The next meeting will be held on the 14th and 15th March and an e-mail would be sent to the consortium to inform them of those dates for the next meeting. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. A team member informing another team member that she has a different date for the next meeting and that meetings should be for 2-days, not just 1-day. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when another team member agreed that 2-day meetings should be held.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because partners were informed that the next meeting date would be the 14th and 15th March 2002. This was salient information that was shared with the team, and resulted in this theme establishing common ground. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. There was also evidence of team member's belief states altering. Hazel's utterances *'I have the 11th and 12th... '* in relation to what dates she had for the next meeting, revealed that Hazel did not hold the same mutual belief as Yvonne, who believed that the next meeting date was the 18th and 19th of March. In this theme team members still held the overall mutual belief on the discussion on the next meeting date.

The next theme is the next meeting date.

Textual chunk, Next meeting date

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Hazel	2	22/1/01
Desmond	4	7/1/02

Messages in this theme displayed evidence of state *1* (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding when all partners were informed that the date that had been selected on day two of the meeting was 14th and 15th March, not the 11th and 12th. It was important to share this information as some members had left the second day of the meeting before the meeting was closed. This was salient information, which was shared to the team. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. However the text in message *4* suggests that what was previously mutually believed in message *2* is no longer believed. There was evidence that belief states had altered.

The next theme is booking accommodation for the Paris meeting.

Textual chunk, Paris meeting (booking accommodation for the meeting)

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Tracy	29	15/2/02
Other (Not working on the project, France Daillet	32	18/2/02

Messages were evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding when partners were informed that a hotel had been recommended for team members to stay at. This was salient information to the team members as partners of the project were not all from France. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. There was also evidence of belief states altering. Message *32* is an example.

The next theme is the draft agenda for the Paris meeting.

Textual chunk, Paris meeting (draft agenda)

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	38	1/3/02
Jack	41	7/3/02

This message was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack sent the initial message to the team on this theme, and provided a discussion thread on it as well.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team. The meeting agenda showed how time would be spent during the 2-day meeting. Details on the venue which would be hosting the meeting and the hotel which was recommended for the partners to stay at was also included. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on the issues covered in this theme as no additional messages were sent mentioning what this theme covered.

The next theme is discussion on choosing a date for the next meeting.

Discourse chunk, Discussion on choosing a date for the next meeting, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Jack suggested holding the next meeting in June. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	42– all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	14– all spoken evidences
2.2 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to an agreement)	4– all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	5–all spoken evidences
3.1(growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	2– all spoken evidences
2.3 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement to a neutral position)	2– all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Certain dates not convenient to team members; difficulties in booking hotel rooms; Saturday night stays for cheap tickets; other dates which team members can attend; allowing for reaction times for the technical partners; 3rd and 4th June are the dates for the next meeting and starting meetings on Monday mornings. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations Not able to attend certain dates; Sunday stay's not making ticket prices cheaper and difficulties to attend meetings on certain days Evidence of sub-state *2.2* in the following situations. Believing a stay Sunday would make it cheaper for tickets and problems regarding dates for some team members Evidence of sub-state *1.2* when some team members could not attend a proposed date. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* in the following situations Thinking that a proposed date is ok and no agreement yet reached on dates for the next meeting Evidence of sub-state *2.3* when a proposed date may not be ok for some team members

Overall, there was growth in mutual understanding. Salient information was shared, including the date of the next meeting, 3rd and 4th of June and to start meetings in the morning. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme However, team members held mutual beliefs on the date of the next meeting and the need to start the meetings in the morning

The next theme is the meeting location

Discourse chunk, Meeting location, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme Paul questioned why the meeting location for this meeting should be Madrid. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team It is assumed that their was shared mutual belief as no team members had reacted to what James had said, and Jack's rationale for why the next meeting should be in Madrid

The next theme is any other business.

Discourse chunk, Any other business, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme James asked if team members had any additional comments to make. There was growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	18 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* when a team member reported that there was nothing missing in the agenda and the meeting was not going to held at partner 1 office. Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations Discussing the meeting venue, hotel, and going to visit the offices of the Spanish partners

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team Paul made a proposal for everyone to stay at the same hotel; Ronnie proposed a visit to the office of the Spanish partners; staying close to the venue of the meeting and the hotel used for the kick-off meeting was comfortable for team members. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme There was mutual beliefs concerning the following two issues One, team members would like to stay close to the venue of the meeting, and two, the hotel used for the kick-off meeting was satisfactory to use again

The next theme is the next meeting date.

Textual chunk, Next meeting date

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	20	26/4/02
Jack	25	7/5/02
Jack	33	9/5/02

Hazel	36	13/5/02
Lucy	37	14/5/02
Jack	39	20/5/02
Hazel	54	5/6/02

There was evidence of State 1: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State 2: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding because salient information was shared to the team regarding this theme. Message *20* sent by Jack indicated that partners 3 and 8 could not attend the original dates, and proposed 6th and 7th instead. Hazel and Lucy both mentioned that the 3rd and 4th was better for them, than the 6th and 7th. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. There was also evidence of belief states altering in this theme.

The next theme is agenda for the meeting.

Textual chunk, Agenda for the meeting

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	48	29/5/02
Jack	53	4/6/02

There was evidence of State 4: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State 5: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). A discussion thread emerged where Jack was the only one contributing to the thread.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed of salient information before the meeting, in terms of what it would cover. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief that message 53 was the final agenda that the meeting would be based on.

The next theme is the date of the next meeting.

Discourse chunk, Date of next meeting, 7/6/02 transcript

In this theme James tried to find out from team members what dates would be convenient to hold the next face-to-face meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk and also evidence of no growth in mutual understanding.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	6– all spoken evidences
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	15 – all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	3 – all spoken evidences
5.1(No perceived growth in mutual understanding)	Observed in 3 situations
3.1(growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1- spoken evidence
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	1- spoken evidence
4.1(growth in mutual understanding and no eventual agreement)	Observed in 1 situation

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Holding weekend meetings and not able to attend certain dates which were proposed. Evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. To hold the next meeting in Leuven; buying appex tickets for cheap travel; holding meetings on Thursday's and Fridays and possibility of holding the meeting on 12 and 13th September. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Holding meeting half day on Saturday and not agreeing to weekend meetings. There was evidence of sub-state *5.1* when holding weekend meetings was brought to discussion after team members reported that this was not convenient for them. Evidence of sub-states *3.1* and *1.3* when a team member reported that he was not sure if he could attend the meeting on 12th and 13th. Finally evidence of sub-state *4.1* in this discourse chunk as no decision was made regarding the date of the next meeting.

Overall there was growth and no growth in mutual understanding in this discourse chunk. For growth in mutual understanding salient information was shared to the team, regarding the country hosting the next meeting, and decision to hold meetings on Thursdays and Fridays. There were evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when requests to hold weekend meetings were put forward. Team members were informed in this meeting and previous meetings that consortium meetings should not be held on the weekend. Common ground and mutual beliefs did not get larger but remained the same. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering.

The next theme is Lueven meeting.

Textual chunk, Leuven meeting

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	35	10/9/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as the German partners informed Jack ahead of the meeting that they would not be able to attend. Jack forwarded their message to the team. This provided salient information, informing the team who would not attend the next face-to-face meeting. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is meeting information.

Textual chunk, Meeting information

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Charles	37	5/8/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team, particularly to Annie who asked questions in a one-to-one e-mail sent to Charles. Charles sent his reply to the whole team. Although all team members would not be travelling from Amsterdam, other salient information in this message included, URL's for train timetables and hotels. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is the draft agenda for the meeting.

Textual chunk, Draft agenda for the meeting

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	44	23/8/02
Jack	46	29/8/02
Jack	54	10/9/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). A discussion thread emerged in this theme with Jack sending all the messages.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information was shared to the team concerning what would be covered during this meeting and that Hazel would not be present on day 2 of the meeting. As a result Jack proposed a change in the agenda. There was increased mutual belief in this theme.

The next theme is date for the next meeting.

Discourse chunk, Date for next meeting, 13/9/02 transcript

In this theme Jack informed the team that selecting a date for the next meeting was another administrative matter which had to be covered as part of that meeting. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing discourse chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	13 – all spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	4 –all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence
1.3 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a neutral position)	2 –all spoken evidences
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	2 – all spoken evidences
4.1 (growth in mutual understanding and no eventual agreement)	Individual grounding evidence was not identified. The discourse chunk was used to reach this interpretation. Identified in 1 situation.

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. To hold the next meeting in Verona, Italy; including Saturday night stay for cheap tickets; holding meetings Thursday's and Friday's; will be ok to attend the proposed dates if Jack hears nothing from Ronnie; superstitions regarding certain dates in the calendar and not mentioning particular travel companies. Evidence of sub-state *2.1* in the following situations. Referring to different months; not holding weekend meetings; unable to attend proposed dates and incorrectly relating days of the week to calendar dates. Evidence of sub-states *3.1* and *1.3* when mentioned that certain members will need to check if the proposed dates are suitable to attend or not. Evidence of sub-state *1.2* in the following situations. Not holding weekend meetings and incorrectly relating days of the week to dates. Evidence of sub-state *4.1* as team members had to check and inform Jack if the proposed dates were acceptable to attend the next meeting. In this discourse chunk team members did not leave the meeting knowing the precise dates of the next meeting.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Jack proposed the dates of 16th and 17th of January to hold the 5th formal face-to-face consortium meeting. Lucy said that this date was not convenient and Ronnie said that he would have to check and that if Jack did not hear anything he should assume that this date is ok for them to attend. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in

this theme and team member belief states altering. Utterances lead to beliefs in the members of the team that they do not hold mutual beliefs on all the issues which were discussed in this theme. However, team members do hold a mutual belief that that they don't hold mutual belief s on all the issues in this theme as a result of spoken utterances. Team members held mutual that meetings should be held on Thursday's and Friday's.

The next theme is the next meeting

Textual chunk, Next meeting

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	16	10/12/02
Jack	18	16/12/02
Jack	19	7/1/03

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *2*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message). Jack was responsible for creating the first message for this theme, and resulting in a discussion thread forming.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as the team was informed about the date of the next meeting. This was salient information to share with the team, as everyone did not attend the 4th face-to-face meeting. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on these issues as no further messages were sent in response to it, particularly the date of the next meeting.

The next theme is agenda for the next meeting

Textual chunk, Agenda for the next meeting

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	18	16/12/02
Jack	22	10/1/03

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as salient information regarding what was going to be discussed during the 2-day meeting was shared with team members in advance. The original agenda was revised based on comments which Jack had received. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual beliefs on the revised agenda as no further messages or versions were sent in response to the last message sent looking at this issue.

Meeting minutes

Formatted

Discourse chunk, Meeting minutes, 17/12/01 transcript

In this theme Desmond raised the point about meeting minutes, also sharing with the team when he would like to receive them.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	1 – non verbal evidences, head nods 8 – spoken evidences
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1- spoken evidence
1.2 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement to a disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situations. Receiving minutes soon after a meeting and informing the team that changes can be made to minutes once circulated to the team. Evidence of sub-states *2.1* and *1.2* when a request to receive the minutes 1-week later, which would be Christmas Eve, was made. The team member who made this request had forgotten.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because team members were informed that minutes would be circulated following the close of this meeting. This theme established common ground. There was evidence of mutual beliefs in this theme and also altering beliefs too.

The next theme is meeting minutes.

Textual chunk, Meeting minutes

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	12	16/1/02
Christopher	15	21/1/02
Annie	17	21/1/02
Annie	19	21/1/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as all partners had documented minutes of actions and discussions which took place during the 2-day meeting. In addition the minutes from the meeting the technical partners held was also sent to the partners. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. There was evidence of belief states altering in this theme (everyone did not receive the original message)

The next theme is meeting minutes

Discourse chunk, Meeting minutes, 15/3/02 transcript

In this theme the topic of meeting minutes was covered. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
2.1 (growth in mutual understanding and disagreement)	1 – spoken evidence
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences
3.1 (growth in mutual understanding holding a neutral position)	1 – spoken evidence

There was evidence of sub-state *2.1* and *1.1* when mentioned that the minutes of the December meeting were sent and included on the FTP site. Evidence of sub-state *3.1* when Paul said that he would go and check the site. Jack mentioned that he might not have received them if he was not on the mailing list. At the December meeting, Desmond had asked Jack to include Paul on the mailing list.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Jack was informed by Paul that minutes ware good to remind people of items discussed during the meeting and actions agreed. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme and team member belief states altering. Members of this team held mutual belief that minutes were placed onto the FTP site for the December meeting.

The next theme is meeting minutes.

Textual chunk, Meeting minutes

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	2	12/6/02
Fabian	18	21/6/02

There was evidence of State *1*: (Growth in mutual understanding as the message is sent to the entire group, following a face-to-face discussion. This state focuses on the initial message that is sent to the team) and State *3*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as all partners had documented minutes of actions and discussions which took place during the 2-day meeting. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. There was evidence of mutual belief in this theme as there was no evidence to suggest otherwise.

Other

Availability

Formatted

Formatted

Textual chunk, Closing for holidays

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Hazel	2	22/12/01

The message for this theme was evidence of state *4* (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions. which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message). During the face-to-face meeting, partners were all aware that the Christmas holidays were approaching.
Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as partners were made aware that partner 8 would not be working on the project from 22nd December to 2nd of January. This was salient information that was shared with the team. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this themeas no further messages were sent on this issue.

The next theme is unable to send and receive e-mails due to a power cut.

Textual chunk, Unable to send and receive e-mails due to power cut

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Partner 4	56	17/6/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as informing the team of when they (partner 4) were unable to send and receive e-mail from the team was salient information which was shared. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

The next theme is out of the office

Textual chunk, Out of the office

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Jack	19	21/6/02
Morris	30	19/7/02
Ronnie	36	5/8/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *5*: (Growth in mutual understanding as discussion threads emerges from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as team members were informed when individuals would not be in the office or contactable. This was salient information to share, in order to avoid team members thinking you were ignoring requests. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as there was no evidence of team members belief states altering.

Glossary

Formatted

Textual chunk, Project glossary

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Charles	6	25/3/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message).

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding because salient information was shared to the team to avoid miscommunication, by creating a glossary. There was increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent.

The next theme is discussion of the tool.

5.2.5.3.5 Discourse chunk, Discussion of the tool, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Kenneth mentioned the portal that was being developed. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

There was no grounding evidence for this theme.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Kenneth mentioned that they seem to be messed around with what is meant by an e-learning portal. To increase understanding Kenneth mentioned that an e-learning portal would not normally contain any courses itself, it would b a link to courses. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further utterances were made in relation to this issue.

The next theme is discussion of review questions from the review report.

5.2.5.3.1.1 Discourse chunk, Discussion of review questions from review report, 6/6/02 transcript

In this theme Mary mentioned the term e-learning. There was evidence of growth in mutual understanding in this ensuing dialogue chunk.

Evidence of sub-states

Sub-State	Frequency
1.1 (growth in mutual understanding and agreement)	3 – all spoken evidences

There was evidence of sub-state *1.1* in the following situation when Mary was talking about her understanding of what an e-learning portal is.

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding, because salient information was shared to the team. Mary said that from the discussion today it seems that perhaps different partners have different understanding of what an e-learning portal is. What was shown by Adam and partner 5 is an e-learning portal. There was evidence of increased mutual beliefs in this theme.

The next theme is the glossary.

Textual chunk, Glossary

Team member	E-mail number	Date
Charles	16	20/6/02

There was evidence of State *4*: (Growth in mutual understanding as a message is sent to the group, but not following discussions which took place when together at the face-to-face meeting) and State *6*: (Growth in mutual understanding even when no discussion threads emerge from the original message)

Overall there was growth in mutual understanding as the team received the most recent version of the glossary which had been proposed by Charles to avoid misunderstandings concerning the use of terms in this project. There was evidence of increased mutual belief in this theme. It is assumed that team members held mutual belief on this issue as no further messages were sent on it.

Work package 1

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says that he has a question to ask. Charlotte agrees with Ronnie.
2.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte explains that speech is the main thing being shown. Ben agrees with Charlotte.
3.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says to ask if you have any questions. Ben and Jack agree with Peter.
4.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if Jaws is not only for the Internet it is for everything. Peter agrees with Ben.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that Jaws is a screenreader. Ben agrees with Peter.
6.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Peter says yes and no to Ben's question regarding screens.
7.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that if there is any graphics Jaws will misinterpret it. Ben agrees with Peter.
8.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he is interested in shopping and names some of the areas he uses it for. Ben and Jack agree with Peter.
9.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he is able to use the Internet to find information, especially for electrical shopping. Ben agrees with Peter.
10.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he was able to save money shopping on the Internet and that this is a good thing. Jack agrees with Peter.
11.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says the search will take you to the first thing that comes up with the search entry. Ben agrees with Peter.
12.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if you use the old description. Peter agrees with Ben.
13.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that Jaws will start reading the page from top to bottom. Ben agrees with Peter.
14.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asks if it is prepared for accessibility. Peter disagrees.
15.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asks if there are sites which are particularly easy. Peter disagrees saying that what he is being shown is a standard site.
16.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that the site being shown is a standard one. Ben agrees with Peter.
17.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says with good design sites are easy. Ben agrees with Peter.
18.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if you leave the speakers on as he has a blind colleague who puts them off as he does not want to see the description and to him it does not matter. Peter agrees with Ben.
19.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says some people say it is better to leave speakers on and that with high access it does not matter. Ben agrees with Peter.
20.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asks if it is not necessary to leave the speakers on with Jaws. Peter disagrees saying that it is better to leave them on.
21.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says it is better to leave the speakers on because sometimes you miss out if you do not. Ben agrees with Peter.
22.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he uses the Tesco website, once a week or once every two weeks and orders 99% of his shopping through it. Ben agrees with Peter.
23.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says as him and his wife are blind they do not have to go to a shop and ask for assistance. Ben agrees with Peter.
24.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks Peter if the Internet is a great thing for him. Peter agrees with Ben.
25.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that the Internet has revolutionized his life, because sometimes in shops people provide assistance, at other times they do not. Ben agrees with Peter.
26.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says the Internet is fantastic. Ben agrees with Peter.
27.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter describes how he accesses listings. Ben agrees with Peter.
28.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben ask if Peter uses a braille device. Peter agrees saying he has one at work.
29.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he has a braille device he sometimes uses at home. Ben agrees with Peter.
30.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if it is faster to have information read to you. Peter agrees with Ben and Ben agrees with Peter.
31.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he is a fast braille reader, but it is still not fast like using speech. Ben agrees with Peter.
32.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says the sound here is not good as it is coming from a laptop. He says you would usually have it coming out of headphones or more powerful speakers. Ben agrees with Peter.
33.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says you can search for specific information. Ben agrees with Peter.
34.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he can do his shopping in 30 minutes. Ben agrees with Peter.
35.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben refers to a table and Peter agrees with Ben that it is a table.
36.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben says the column and Peter agrees with Ben.
37.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter shows how you get to the actual output field. Ben agrees with Peter.
38.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says you can go straight to information by entering it in the search function. Ben agrees with Peter.
39.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that the information is in the cell and that Jaws is smart. This is based on a question that Ben asked.
40.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asked if it was not just line per line. Peter disagreed, saying that it does so some conversion.
41.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben says to Peter he understands what he is saying about being able to do some conversion.
42.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asked if partner 3 worked with Tesco. Peter agreed with Ben saying that partner 3 worked with Tesco. Ben agreed with Peter as well.
43.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asked if they (partner 3) reviewed the Tesco site. Peter agreed with Ben.
44.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that one of the keywords used by Peter is that he is an experienced user. Peter agreed to this.
45.	Evidence of mutual belief that Peter will show a site that causes problems. This was based on a question from Ben.
46.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that if you have a site designed by Flash then it is inaccessible. However, you can have a Flash link on the front page. Ben agrees with Peter.
47.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks Peter if the Tesco and Amazon sites are familiar to him. Peter agrees with Ben.
48.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says the page reads out everything on it. Ben agrees with Peter.
49.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that he listens to audio on the Internet as well, which can be quite useful. There are lots of stations around the world that broadcast and that he has an account with an audio book publisher. Ben agrees with Peter.
50.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks Peter if there is a better way of working that. Peter agrees with Ben.
51.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if you can be told if something is bold. Peter agrees with Ben saying you can be told, but would only be useful if you were doing Word Processing. Ben agrees with Peter as well.
52.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Charles asks Peter if he has power. Peter says that he does not know.
53.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he does not know if he has power. Ben agrees to this point.
54.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben says that there is an alert box in the middle of the screen. Peter agrees with Ben.
55.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that blind people use Google as it is straightforward. Ben agrees with Peter.
56.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if frames need to be placed and if you can move from one frame to another. Peter agrees with Ben.
57.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben says to Peter he is in the right frame and Peter says you should be able to with Jaws.
58.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben says he does not think it is frames. Peter disagrees with Ben saying that it is a

	frame.
59.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone agreed with Peter that there was a frame.
60.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if they use the table to navigate. Peter agrees with Ben.
61.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter said that if there were frames toy could control tab to different frames. Ben agrees with Peter.
62.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles says that what is being shown is convenient. Jack agrees with Charles.
63.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asks if this is better for him than frames. Peter says that it does not really matter.
64.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says it does not matter as long as the frames are labelled. Jack agrees with Peter.
65.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says it does not matter where things are on the screen. To him visual layout is not important. Someone agreed with Peter.
66.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks Peter if he can enter a new page. Peter agrees with Jack.
67.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben suggests they go to the Ryanair.com site. Peter agrees with Ben.
68.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben says there is a scroll bar. Charles agrees with Ben.
69.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if it is a Java applet. Someone agrees with Ben's question.
70.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter asks if it is identifying frames. Someone agrees with Peter's question.
71.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles says the problem is likely to be because of the data that is behind and because Ryanair only flies from Gatwick to Dublin. However, more results would have been matched if you had gone to Stanstead Peter agrees with Charles.
72.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Peter ask if it would show you that on the screen (options). Charles disagreed with Paul saying that it would not show you on the screen.
73.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles says that it does not show you on the screen. Two people whose identity was not revealed agreed with Charles.
74.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter said it would be better if it was highlighted in a different colour and the clever aspects of the design. Charles agreed with Peter.
75.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks regarding accessibility if there was a Flash page if Jaws would work on it. Peter said yes if it was commonplace.
76.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asked if you could take text out of the Flash image. Peter disagreed with Ben.
77.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that the Internet and the technologies around the Internet are moving very fast. Peter agrees with Ben.
78.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asks if he does not like the change. Peter says he does and does not.
79.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that there is another product called Windows Eye and that Jaws brings out new versions once or twice a year. Ben agreed with Peter.
80.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says you can make use of information that is not pure text and that Jaws works well with forms. Also that it is a case of knowing what you are looking for and knowing what to expect. Ben agrees with Peter.
81.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks Peter if this way of working is unnatural to him. Peter agreed with Ben.
82.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asks Peter of having easier ways. Peter disagreed with Ben saying that you can do things as software is becoming sophisticated.
83.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter asks for 20 seconds more. Charlotte agrees with Peter. Peter also agrees with Charlotte
84.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he is an expert user. Ben agreed with Peter.
85.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if you have to learn the concepts. Peter agrees with Ben.
86.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben said if you would have to learn what a tab is. Peter disagreed with Ben.
87.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben gives the example of his mother using Tab. Peter agrees with Ben.
88.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says he has used his computer for different things. Ben agrees with Peter.
89.	Evidence of mutual belief that Peter has a book that describes Windows from a visually impaired person's point of view. Ben agrees with Peter.
90.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says it is better they can do what they can with what is available, rather than having a special authoring system designed for blind people. Ben agrees with Peter.
91.	Evidence of mutual belief when Peter says that a lot of sites on the Internet are already accessible. Ben and Jack agree with Peter.
92.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Charlotte asked Hazel for her comments as she did not know what was going to be covered on the following day.
93.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel agrees with Charlotte for her comments.
94.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that today is the only other time that the machines will have access technology on there. Someone agrees with Charlotte.
95.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone says all the technical partners would like to try the technology. Charlotte agrees.
96.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte asked if they said yes. Ben and Charles agrees with Charlotte. Charlotte agrees on this too.
97.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte says that today is the only time the technology is available. Desmond agrees with Charlotte.
98.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel suggests swapping the morning and afternoon sessions around. Fabian disagrees with Hazel.
99.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel agrees with Fabian not to swap the sessions around.
100.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie suggests having at least half an hour open before leaving open for discussions to concentrate on the technology. Someone agrees with Ronnie.
101.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says we must do that as many people are not there tomorrow. Jonathan agrees with Ronnie.
102.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said it would be better to follow the discussion immediately after the presentation. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
103.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte says they can look at the technology till 4.30pm, and will then need to pack up. Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
104.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said it is important that the discussions are in the interest of the project. Paul agrees with Ronnie.
105.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond talks about Braille displays. Charlotte agrees with Desmond.
106.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they do not know much about an area, so should not really talk about it. Desmond agrees with Paul.
107.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that the displays should be adapted. Paul agrees with Desmond.
108.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond said sentence and someone disagreed with this and said paragraph.
109.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone said paragraph and Desmond agreed.
110.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said it should be desirable. Desmond agrees with Paul.
111.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ned says that he does not think Super Nova is Internet ready. Ben agrees with Ned.
112.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ned says you can use Super Nova in combination with Web Formatter as he has heard people do that. Paul agrees.
113.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul says that Lookout sells for £49 pounds. Jack agrees with Paul.
114.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack says if there are no questions then they can go on with the agenda. Paul agrees with Jack.

115.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy says she is talking about partner 5. Jack agrees with Lucy.
116.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if partner 5 is involved in work package 1. Lucy agrees with Jack. Jack also agrees with Lucy.
117.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack says that they want to be in user requirements. Hazel agrees with Jack.
118.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie disagrees that they want to be in user requirements.
119.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that 85% of people produced their e-learning material in Word. Desmond agrees with Hazel.
120.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that e-learning material must be highly interactive. Desmond, Kenneth and Elsie agree with Hazel.
121.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that FrontPage critics argue that it does not have e-learning support. Desmond agrees with Hazel.
122.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentions what areas they should have a look at. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
123.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says that there is some advantage. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
124.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben talks about finding interested persons. Hazel agrees with Ben.
125.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy says she does not think she will find people interested in learning how to use XML.
126.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy says they can try and find people interested in other areas. Ben agrees with Lucy.
127.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy says they will try and find people not interested in computers. Ben, Jonathan, Fabian and Annie agree with Lucy.
128.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said learning to use computers would be a double handicap. Ben agrees with Lucy.
129.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris says one of the major difficulties is finding the right e-learning content. Desmond agrees with Morris.
130.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris talks about the investigations for the demonstration purposes and language learning. Hazel agrees with Morris.
131.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris proposes ideas. Desmond agrees with Morris.
132.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben talks about the contents of e-learning sites. Hazel agrees with Ben.
133.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel disagrees with Annie that the information they want cannot be from the user requirements package.
134.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says that before they can continue with task 1.1 is a demonstration of what the project can do. Ben agrees with Hazel.
135.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie disagrees with Hazel, saying that is not the way.
136.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond says that the users will tell you what they want the tool to do. Annie agrees with Desmond.
137.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel talks about going to the users and users needs. Lucy and Annie agree with Hazel.
138.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she does not understand the limit of the user requirements work. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
139.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles proposes to give the users a better idea of VoiceXML, to show them some of the promises. Hazel and Ronnie agree with Charles.
140.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben says that they can provide the VoiceXML document. Hazel and Annie agree with Ben.
141.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says that she cannot go on with task D1.1 until she knows the vision of the project. Jonathan and Annie agree with Hazel.
142.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that blind people do not know about e-learning and have not used it. Annie agrees with Hazel.
143.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy proposes to have a sample and to ask for views on it. Annie and Ben agree with Lucy.
144.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that you should look at assessment as well. Ronnie agrees with Lucy.
145.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that they will have samples. Annie and Christopher agree with Lucy.
146.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that there are already lots of online tutorials out there. Lucy agrees with Ben.
147.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben proposes to find out how accessible existing tutorials are. Hazel agrees with Ben.
148.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says that it would not be a simple user analysis, it is more than that. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
149.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if what he is saying is clear. Charles agrees with Ronnie and Ronnie agrees with Charles. Elsie, Ronnie, Hazel and Annie agree as well.
150.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel says they need to find people who are interested in taking a tutorial in VoiceXML. Ben disagreed with Hazel saying that he does not think it matters if the tutorial is in VoiceXML or not.
151.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel agreees with Ben that the tutorial does not just have to be in VoiceXML.
152.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that the tutorial just needs to be e-learning. Hazel and Jonathan agree with Ben.
153.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they need to find people who are interested in taking a course. Lucy and Ronnie agree with Hazel.
154.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says that there is some advantage. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
155.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Hazel said that she does not understand what the limits of the user requirements need to be.
156.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that all the results were given in the file of documents shared by the German partners on the previous day. Annie, Christopher and Jonathan agree with Lucy.
157.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says to look at the advantages of voice in and the advantages of VoiceXML output, opposed to a screen reading output. Kenneth and Charles agree with Hazel.
158.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel reports that forms are hard. Charlotte agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
159.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says if the project can find a way of improving forms using voice in that will be a winner. Charles agrees with Hazel.
160.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if anyone had a diary. Lucy agrees with Hazel as she has a diary.
161.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says that version 1 will be available by the 11th. Annie agrees with Hazel.
162.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says to discuss the plan back and forth by e-mail. Annie and Christopher agree with Hazel.
163.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it can be fragmentary. Annie agrees with Hazel.
164.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says that they can plan the testing till the end of June. Lucy and Elsie agree with Hazel.
165.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel suggests that the user partners conduct 12-20- short questionnaire. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
166.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel propose that they try and undertaken some evaluations of current e-learning applications using screen readers or Braille devices. Questions that ease or difficulties as she does not know the accessibility of online applications. Elsie agrees with Hazel.
167.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if anyone has a blind programmer at the moment. Desmond agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Desmond.
168.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says to ask questions on tediousness and for them to keep a diary on their experiences. Charlotte agrees with Hazel.
169.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks for a change in dates. Hazel agrees with Lucy, Lucy agrees with Hazel and Hazel

	agrees with Lucy.
170.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte says that they have looked at the accessibility of web authoring tools, but have not done much on it yet. Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
171.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes that this is something partners 3 and 8 can do. Kenneth and Charlotte agree with Hazel.
172.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says this is something that Mary can be set and that she is happy to buy a demo version. Kenneth agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
173.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that partners 8 and 3 will take some action and will set some deadlines. Kenneth and Jonathan agree with Hazel.
174.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says it feels like they are in the right direction now. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
175.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that a lot of problems are design relation, so that needs to be made clear. Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
176.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that something that is a problem on one site is not on another. Hazel and Kenneth agree with Hazel.
177.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel questions what the project can do. Kenneth agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
178.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that the tables should have a good mark up. Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
179.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if you ask all the partners to do that they will come up with the heart of the project. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
180.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asks if one person should do the first cut and then everyone to make comments. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
181.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if partner 3 would do the first cut. Kenneth and Charlotte agree with Hazel. Also, Hazel says that they will help them as well.
182.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks about the tasks. Hazel and Kenneth agree that they have not looked at the tasks.
183.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan asks if the tasks are flexible and if they are talking about the deliverable. Hazel agrees with Jonathan.
184.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2* was sent by Hazel, mentioning this theme. In message *4*, Desmond sent his comments. In message *5* – Hazel sent her feedback on comments received. In message *7* – Hazel informed the team that the plan was updated.
185.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *1*, sent by Jonathan contained a link with relevant information.
186.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 6, sent by Thomas, his report and conclusions on the problems encountered by visually impaired people on the web. Message *16*, sent by Charlotte on the same theme. Message *23*, sent by Charles on a relevant document that he has produced. Message *28*, sent by Thomas with his comments on Charles document in message 23.
187.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *6*, sent by Thomas, on his first impressions on e-learning. Message *25*, sent by Hazel, on the suggestions from Desmond. Messages *42* and *43*, sent by Mary, a draft on the features of e-learning authoring tools. Message *45*, sent by Hazel, a draft chapter on the problems of access to dialogue and digital resources for visually impaired people.
188.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *8*, sent by Hazel informing everyone that she is working on this. Message *20*, sent by Hazel with the protocol attached. Message *24*, sent by Hazel with the final version of the protocol. Message *25*, sent by Hazel answering the questions that Desmond has asked.
189.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *8*, sent by Hazel with the first draft on the questionnaire on unmet learning needs. Message *10*, sent by Charles, with his comments. Message *13*, sent by Ronnie, with his comments. Message *14*, sent by Thomas, with his comments. Message *20* sent by Hazel, thanking everyone for the comments.
190.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *22*, sent by Hazel, with relevant information that Mary found on accessibility kit extensions for making web pages accessible.
191.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that Mary will be late, but will be making a presentation on work package 1. Jack agrees with Hazel.
192.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks Hazel for her to repeat the age. Hazel agrees and Ronnie agrees to the age Hazel said.
193.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie thanks Hazel for repeating the age. Elsie agrees with Ronnie.
194.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they thought about the problems they had with diagrams and statistics. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
195.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes something that the project can work on. Someone agrees with Hazel.
196.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she thought she found astronomy interesting. Jack agrees with Hazel.
197.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel reported some of her findings with people using e-learning. Mary agrees with Hazel.
198.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned environmental studies, which she assumes has lots of diagrams, maps and figures. Mary agrees with Hazel.
199.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she could like to refine the questions that they asked and to add some kind of demonstration or description of how VoiceXML can help visually impaired people to access e-learning. Mary agrees with Hazel.
200.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam asked if they have to ask people and that they have nothing to show. Hazel agrees with Adam.
201.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asked if they preferred e-learning and Hazel disagreed, as users have no experience.
202.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that he is different. Hazel agrees with Adam.
203.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she was not sure what every person needed. Someone agreed with Hazel.
204.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will start with how accessible e-learning courses are and problems people have using them and then to pass onto Mary. Also that Mary will describe those courses later on. Mary agrees with Hazel.
205.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said if Thomas could talk about the work that they have been doing in France. Thomas disagreed, saying that he would not be speaking, Adam would.
206.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas said that Adam would speak not him. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
207.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that there was a strange message on the screen. Hazel agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Hazel.
208.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the courses contained mainly textual explanations of the concept. Someone agrees with Mary.
209.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary says that maybe the technical partners can think of some points about the plug-in and how the plug-in can probably improve the problems that were being experienced with Jaws. Annie agrees with Mary.
210.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asks if she can go back to the previous slide. Mary agrees with Thomas.
211.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that sometimes the instructions were misguiding, because the participants made a small error. Someone agrees with Mary.
212.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she has covered the learning perspective and in that sometimes the users were making learning mistakes. Christopher agrees with Mary.
213.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary was speaking about emotional aspects. Hazel agrees with Mary.
214.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asks if they should go through a slide. Hazel disagreed with Mary.
215.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the results from this evaluation could feed into the development of the portal. Christopher agrees with Annie.

216.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary proposes an idea and Hazel agrees with it.
217.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asks if she should have this presentation. Hazel disagrees, saying that they should have the e-learning courses.
218.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel talks about the e-learning courses and Annie agrees with Hazel.
219.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says that they are not websites, they are important e-learning courses that you have to pay for. Also that they are not very expensive. Mary agrees with Hazel.
220.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if the costs was per course. Hazel agrees with Mary.
221.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the courses are good so you can really get to the e-learning functionality. Annie and others agree with Hazel.
222.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to think about how voice can makes things better. Hazel said that she feels that this could be the solution. Annie agrees with Hazel.
223.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she has the solutions. Hazel and others agree with Annie.
224.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asks if the costs you pay is for one year. Mary agrees with Thomas.
225.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary mentions that this is for 80 courses. Hazel agrees with Mary.
226.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy says that they do not have an allowance in their budget to pay for the courses. James agrees with Lucy.
227.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy asks if she should write to them and ask for more money. Paul disagrees with this.
228.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy was going to say something, but Paul said that she could go ahead as he also wanted to say something
229.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that he heard that they have some contact with Mindleaders.
230.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they did not have to buy some of the courses. Mary agrees with James.
231.	Evidence of mutual belief when James talks about the collaboration agreement which was signed by partners 1 and 2. Mary agrees.
232.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they are looking for a number of courses to identify a number of problems, and not just all of them from Mindleaders. Hazel agrees with Mary.
233.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said looking at different courses is to get a broader view of the problems. Annie and Hazel agree with Mary.
234.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that if they all look at Mindleaders they will all get the same problems. Hazel agrees with Mary.
235.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that that they want to find a variety of problems. Elsie agrees with Mary.
236.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that this is one of the points to bear in mind when looking at e-learning courses. James agrees with Mary.
237.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they are going to review the current situation. Mary and Hazel agree with James.
238.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they will have some preliminary work in this work package. Mary and Hazel agree with James.
239.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that Adam's presentation is about e-learning. Adam and Thomas agree with Jack.
240.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if they will present their results. Thomas agrees with Lucy.
241.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam uses the term encyclopaedia. Thomas agrees with Adam and Adam agrees with Thomas.
242.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam uses the term accessible. Desmond agrees with Adam.
243.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam talks about rights. Someone agrees with Adam.
244.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that area does not come under copyright anymore. Adam agrees with Thomas.
245.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam uses the term methodology. Someone agrees with Adam.
246.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam talks about what you can find. Desmond agrees with Adam.
247.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam talks about recent findings regarding French encyclopaedias. Desmond and Annie agree with Adam.
248.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that the last category is professional training at business and employees. Desmond agrees with Adam.
249.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that is all on typologies. Thomas agrees with Adam.
250.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks a question on what categories should be included. Paul agrees with Morris that categories should be added.
251.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul suggests adding the encyclopaedia entry straight away. Thomas agrees with Paul.
252.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks about virtual libraries. Paul agrees with Morris to add this category too.
253.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul talks about the existing encyclopaedia's so that they do not have to make use of their own. Lucy agrees with Paul.
254.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy ask if the courses have links. Paul agrees with Lucy.
255.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that he is not sure if they have an answer to a question.
256.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Adam said that they could classify according to one category. Mary disagreed saying that there could be more categories.
257.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel suggests returning to the discussions in the morning. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
258.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas spoke about making image maps accessible. Mary agrees with Thomas.
259.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas said that they will need partnership with the commission to get contents to make the portal more interesting. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
260.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas repeats the number of accessible sites. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
261.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks Paul if she can quickly say something. Paul agrees with Hazel.
262.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes that they add the seven existing sites onto the portal. Thomas and others agree with Hazel.
263.	Evidence of mutual belief that Paul wanted to ask a question and was allowed to do so by Hazel acknowledging that he wanted to take the next turn to speak.
264.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul asked if the screen reader they used to assess the sites was Braille Net Software. Adam disagreed with Paul.
265.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul agreed that the screen reader is what Adam said and not the one that he said.
266.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond said that they still do not understand what is being said.
267.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam proposes work. Desmond agrees with Adam.
268.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if the sites were accessible with all priorities of WAI. Adam agrees with Desmond.
269.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if they accessible for web tools. Thomas agrees with Desmond.
270.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if the tools were something you could use with Jaws. Paul agrees with Hazel, saying that you can do. Hazel also agrees with Paul.
271.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul names other tools that already do that.
272.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul mentioned the other tools. Hazel agrees with Paul.
273.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel talks about accessibility levels. Paul agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Paul.
274.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas answers the number of sites accessible in English. Thomas also mentions that the virtual libraries are in Spanish. Hazel agrees with Thomas.

275.	Evidence of mutual belief that they can see ok. Hazel agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Hazel.
276.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary says that she will present a high level summary of the recommendations that can be presented and can be used for developing e-learning. Desmond agrees with Mary.
277.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if they can just about read what is on the screen. Hazel agrees with Mary, that they can just about read it.
278.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Morris said that he cannot read the information that Mary was referring too.
279.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary talks about generic presentations. Paul agrees with the examples Mary provides.
280.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary talks about some of the courses. Also when Mary mentions that the tools are quite easy to use. Annie agrees with Mary.
281.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond indicated that he would like to ask a question to Mary. Mary agrees with Desmond and allows him to speak.
282.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asks about the tools and the WAI guidelines. Mary says that they have both been evaluated and WAI guidelines were used. Desmond also agrees with Mary.
283.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that there are links in the reports for the findings. Desmond agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Desmond.
284.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said what a template is. Hazel agrees with Mary.
285.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she does not know how to avoid making items inaccessible. Hazel agrees with Mary.
286.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if the took can be sent by e-mail. Mary agrees with Desmond.
287.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said the tool can be downloaded from the website or from the links in the report. Desmond agrees with Mary. Mary agrees with Desmond as well.
288.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they should look at things together because of the overlap. Someone agrees with Hazel.
289.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *10*, sent by Jason, referencing an interim e-learning report. Message *29*, sent by Mary, with an attached evaluation on e-learning.
290.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *11*, sent by Mary, with descriptions of the problems.
291.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the users from work package 1 are doing all the user requirements. Mary agrees with Jack.
292.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the dossier should include the requirements. Someone whose identity was not revealed and Desmond agree with Jack.
293.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary mentions more general web interactions. Someone whose identity was not revealed agrees with Mary.
294.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she will now hand over to Erin. Erin agrees with Mary.
295.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie requests that Erin speaks slower. Erin agrees with Ronnie.
296.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin mentioned the findings she found surprising and that they assumed the tool developed by W3C would be accessible. Someone whose identity was not revealed agrees with Erin.
297.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if this included version 5 as well. Erin and others agree with Paul.
298.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said that the features from the dialogue box were the best that they have seen. Someone whose identity was not revealed agrees with Erin.
299.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Erin asked if there were any questions. Morris disagreed, saying that everything was very clear.
300.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked Charles to enlarge the font size. Charles agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Charles.
301.	Evidence of mutual belief that Desmond had a comment. Charles agrees with Desmond.
302.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he is typing in the right keyword, but nothing is happening, and that there is no help function. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Desmond.
303.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles asks if they are referring to an index. Desmond agrees with Charles.
304.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he thinks the help function should be a feature. Charles agrees with Desmond.,
305.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said access is via the file, help menu. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Charles.
306.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles is talking about links. Paul agrees with Charles.
307.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentions that column that partner 3 suggested. Kenneth agrees with Charles.
308.	Evidence of mutual belief when James tells Charles that he has one question. Charles agrees with James.
309.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul talks about having the manual available in other formats as well. Charles agrees with Paul.
310.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they would need at least a month to analyse Charles' document. Charles agrees with Annie.
311.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that some of the information they are talking about, will not be found in the user requirements document. James agrees with Kenneth.
312.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if they do not give the information about designs and proposals, then they cannot respond. James agrees with Kenneth.
313.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that one of the reasons why face-to-face meetings are important is because it is a better way of resolving misunderstandings. Christopher, Conwayne and Annie agree with James.
314.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if everyone got Hazel's e-mail. There was agreement in the background.
315.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he had copies of Hazel's e-mail and the plan. Mary agrees with Jack.
316.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary talks about chapter 2. Desmond agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Desmond.
317.	Evidence of mutual belief when Demsond said he made a presentation in London, but that some of the document is still missing. Mary agrees with Desmond.
318.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked Desmond if they were happy to contribute. Desmond agrees with Mary.
319.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asked if there are another comments, but Desmond disagreed and said that is all.
320.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that there were no more comments. Mary agrees with Desmond.
321.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said chapter 2. Desmond agrees with Mary.
322.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that they had lots from partner 3. Morris agrees with Desmond.
323.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary reads out the title for chapter 4. Erin agrees with Mary.
324.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary added what this chapter will include. Erin and Kenneth agree with Mary.
325.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked Thomas if he completed seven questionnaires. Thomas agrees with Mary.
326.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin says that they will be able to produce few questionnaires as well. Mary agrees with Erin.
327.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary says the questionnaires will be need to be done in the next few months. Erin agrees with Mary.
328.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that they have 12. Mary agrees, saying any number would be good.
329.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks another partner if they can also complete questionnaires and they agree.
330.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if partner 3 were going to do some of the evaluations. Erin agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Erin.

331.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie wants to ask a question and asking the question. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
332.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said to inform him Mary disagreed saying that the evaluations had actually started a few months ago.
333.	Evidence of mutual belief that Ronnie was talking about the evaluation phase. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
334.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that he was talking about the evaluation of the final result.
335.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he was talking about the evaluation of the final result. Mary agrees, saying that she will talk about this.
336.	Evidence of mutual belief that Charles will put the current version of the requirements on the mailing list by Monday. Mary agrees with Charles.
337.	Evidence of mutual when Jack says that the work of Thomas on the analysis of accessibility should be work package 1. Lucy agrees with Jack.
338.	Evidence of mutual belief that Annie has a question to ask Mary. Mary agrees with Annie.
339.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks if Mary is referring to the same thing. Mary agrees with Annie.
340.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul asks if the time frame is realistic. Mary said that she will discuss that now.
341.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asked how realistic the time frame was. Mary said not realistic based on feedback that she received.
342.	Evidence of mutual belief that they have to submit both deliverables by that date. Jack agrees with Mary.
343.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they are talking about the preliminary deliverable and not the final one. Mary agrees with James.
344.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asked if work package 1 were producing two of the documents. Mary agrees with James.
345.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said to send proposals or documents at least ten days before the deadline. Mary agrees with James.
346.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *35*, sent by Mary, talking about the questionnaire responses. Message *40*, sent by Hazel, reminding teams members of their commitments to the questionnaire.
347.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *31*, sent by Mary, thanking everyone for their documents to be included in this deliverable. Message *35*, sent by Mary saying this document was placed onto the FTP site. Message *41*, sent by Hazel, giving feedback provided by a research fellow at the partner organisation.
348.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *4*, sent by Mary, talking about Hazel's plans. Message *42*, sent by Mary, informing everyone that the plan was updated.
349.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *3*, sent by Mary, attaching a draft copy of this chapter. Message *35*, sent by Mary, requesting contributions.
350.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *26*, sent by Charles, referring to the report the reviewers suggested. This report was a review of existing authoring tools for work package 1.
351.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it was lots of paper used for D1.1 Mary agrees with Hazel.
352.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that this deliverable was 150 pages. Hazel agrees with Mary.
353.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that chapter 2 needs more work. Mary agrees with Hazel.
354.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel thanks Mary for her hard work in work package 1. Jack agrees with Hazel.
355.	Evidence of mutual belief hat Morris had a question to ask regarding chapter 1. Hazel agrees with Morris.
356.	Evidence of mutual belief that Morris is speaking on Adam's behalf because of language purposes. He said that they reviewed the requirements. Mary agrees with Morris.
357.	Evidence of mutual belief that what Adam did Mary required. Mary agrees with Morris who was speaking on behalf of Adam for language purposes.
358.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack congratulated Hazel on this work package as it had many contributions. Hazel agrees with Jack.
359.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if Mary will still be around and will leave partner 8. Mary agrees and says until the end of the month and will then leave partner 8.
360.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that Hazel will give the name of the new contact. Hazel agrees with Mary.
361.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if this deliverable will be finished on time. Hazel agrees with Jack.
362.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that this deliverable already looks like it is almost finished. Also that the version the expert has is the preliminary one. Mary and Hazel agree with Jack.
363.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *7*, sent by Mary, informs the team of her last day on the project.

Work package 2

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that before they go on everyone needs to be clearer what is the information they (technicians) want for work package 2. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
2.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it was not clear when reading work package 2, what the linkage to work package 1 was. Annie agrees.
3.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Kenneth reported that he was not clear what work package 2's linkage with work package 1 was. Annie said that she thought it was clear in Madrid at the kick-off meeting
4.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they could have some information about the different screen readers that are currently working and how. However, Hazel said that this had already been provided a couple of weeks ago.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that had provided this information a couple of weeks ago. Desmond agrees with Hazel.
6.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said it was on the 21st of November. Hazel and Annie agree with Desmond.
7.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they would like a deeper analysis of screen readers. However, Hazel disagrees saying that they cannot have this from the user requirements work package.
8.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that you will never understand how a screen reader works s if you do not exactly know the technical specification.
9.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that he believes a perfect technical knowledge comes before consideration of the user requirements. Hazel disagrees with Ronnie.
10.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she disagrees with Ronnie. Desmond agrees with Hazel.
11.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie disagrees when Hazel said that she thought they were building a new system.
12.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they were designing the project system. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
13.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that the technicians must have perfect knowledge of the different screen readers, otherwise they will not be able to write. Hazel disagrees with Ronnie saying that is not what was asked for.
14.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that is not what was asked for. She said that they were asked to do the requirements and that is what they have done. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
15.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is not their business. Kenneth and Hazel agree with Ronnie.
16.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that there is nothing to stop them contacting. Ronnie and Annie agree with Kenneth.
17.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he has that technical information for her (Annie). Kenneth agrees with Desmond.
18.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they have asked for the manual a few times but have not received it. Hazel disagrees saying that she has the manual in her office and could have e-mailed it to her.
19.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that she has the manual in her office. However, Ben disagrees saying that he does not think that they are speaking about manuals.
20.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that he does not think they are talking about manuals. Hazel agrees with Ben.
21.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that a manual tells you how something works. Jonathan agrees with Ben.
22.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that a manual does not tell the technician how something technically works. Anne and Christopher agree with Ben.
23.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said something about interactions. Ronnie agrees with Ben.
24.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that when they were studying this for their technical unit, they simply ask those that are producing the tool to give that information. Ben agrees with Ronnie and Ronnie agrees with Ben.
25.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he does not understand that they do not know things that they need to program and they are providing the technical knowledge. He said that they could ask. Annie agrees with Desmond.
26.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are going to do the technical job, but they do not know what to do and so they need to know with their technical knowledge what they are going to do. Desmond agrees with Annie.
27.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they do not know what to do. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
28.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are going to apply their technical knowledge with the tool, but they need to know what it is going to be. Desmond agrees with Annie.
29.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they want the tool to be useful and usable with a screen reader at the same time. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
30.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said how she would like the tool to work. Ben disagrees with Annie saying that she does not think that anyone knows.
31.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that he does not think anyone knows how the tool should work. Annie and Christopher agree with Ben.
32.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when discussions take place on what the tool will or can do.
33.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that there is the issue that the project has made an assumption that the plug-in will give some value to the user over a screen reader. Ben and Jonathan agree with Kenneth.
34.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they need to find out from users this without making any claims. Hazel, Desmond and Jack agree with Kenneth.
35.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said to find out from users what they are currently lacking. Kenneth and Hazel agree with Ben.
36.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said this is in terms of their screen readers. Jack and Desmond agree with Ben.
37.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that if at the moment the screen reader is working well and webpages are well formed, then the screen readers can read out what is on the page. Annie agrees with Hazel.
38.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the blind person can control, interact and navigate with the information. Lucy and Annie agree with Hazel.
39.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel questions what is it that the project can add. Ben agrees with Hazel's question.
40.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie checks his understanding of what the project is trying to achieve. Annie, Jonathan and Ben agree with Ronnie.
41.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said without using his screen reader to access e-learning activities and materials.
42.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said voice. However, someone in the team whose identity was not revealed disagrees with Ronnie, saying speech instead.
43.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if he is thinking right or wrong. Annie and Christopher agree with Ronnie.
44.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that she thinks that Jaws 3.7 does try and interpret some of the things on a website. Ben agrees with Charlotte.
45.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben gives an example. Charlotte agrees with Ben.
46.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that there is no need to have just what is on the screen, it is a voice, dialogue version of what is on a screen. Annie, Fabian and Jonathan agree with Ben.
47.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond recommends the IBM Homepage Reader. Ben agrees with Desmond.
48.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that a 30-day trial can be made from the IBM page and have access to the manual as this could be a good step for them. Annie agrees with Desmond.
49.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they did not know this and that this is the type of information that they expect. Desmond said that he provided exactly the same information on 21st November.
50.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that they provided this information on the 21st of November. Annie agrees with Desmond.

51.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that there is a lot of work needed around the voice input, as this is not a simple area. Lucy and Desmond agree with Kenneth.
52.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they need to be clear about what they want to realise. Also, giving an example too. Kenneth agrees with Ronnie.
53.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said to have a prototype and that the users can then make comments based on it. Christopher and Desmond agree with Ronnie.
54.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it is important to not spend too much time on development effort so changes can be made. Lucy and Ronnie agree with Hazel.
55.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel provided an example of going to users when trying to establish their requirements. Annie, Jonathan, Desmond and Ben agree with Hazel.
56.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she hopes things become clearer in the afternoon as she is not yet very clear how the project system is going to interact with the screen reader. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
57.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if when you come to the project website will the screen reader be turned off so that the project system is in control. Annie agrees with Hazel.
58.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel suggested using a Wizard of Oz prototype for the users to illustrate how things can be better from their current situation. Lucy, Annie, Jonathan and Desmond agree with Hazel.
59.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan said that the website of the project can be a prototype. Hazel and Ben agree with Jonathan.
60.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that they can provide the VoiceXML page so that they have a real working example. Hazel agrees with Ben.
61.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that they will have an example of VoiceXML. Annie and Hazel agree with Ben.
62.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that they are giving an introduction today and then hopefully things will become clearer. Hazel agrees with Ben.
63.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that they will show some samples in the evening. Charles agrees with Ben.
64.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel speaking about limits to the telephone. Charles agrees with Hazel.
65.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said yes if it allows voice input. Hazel and Charlotte agree with Charles.
66.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said now they are mostly concentrated on telephone conversations. Charles agrees with Ben.
67.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said in the United States it is not too expensive. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
68.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said it is not the intention of the project to have a web page talking to the telephone. Ronnie agrees with Ben.
69.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy asks about the length of a prompt. Ben disagrees saying that he does not think that there is a limit.
70.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that he does not think that there is a limit. Charles agrees with Ben saying this he is not aware of any limits.
71.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said it would depend on your application and that VoiceXML does not limit it. Lucy agrees with Ben.
72.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben describes how VoiceXML is only the enabler Annie, Christopher, Lucy and Ronnie agree with Ben.
73.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel raises one of the areas that she is confused about. She was asking if someone would still be able to use their screen reader commands or if the project will provide a separate set of commands. Ben said that it was a bit too early to say.
74.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that it was a bit too early to say. Hazel agrees with Ben.
75.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that the expression attribute of the value element responds to the name attributes of the fields. Hazel and Charlotte agree with Charles.
76.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asked if it does value handling or errors. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
77.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that there is no match to one of the inputs. Ben, Fabian, Christopher and Annie agree with Charles.
78.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentions the language attribute you can set. Hazel agrees with Charles.
79.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said tutorials teaching you language (French and Spanish). Hazel agrees with Ben.
80.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that you would need the French and the Spanish plug-in. Annie and Hazel agree with Ben.
81.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that they need to think how they can do it technically. Annie and Hazel agree with Ben.
82.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said to install the plug-in. Annie agrees with Ben.
83.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Charles said that he thought that this was something else. Jonathan disagrees with Charles.
84.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that was a bad sign. Charles agrees with Ben.
85.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Charles asks a question. However, Ben said that he thinks that this should be delayed until tomorrow.
86.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben proposes to delay something's until tomorrow. Annie and Christopher agree with Ben.
87.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that he does not know if anyone is interested in this. Annie agrees with Ben.
88.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they answer the technical questions. Ben agrees with Annie.
89.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that there is a question of what grammar is supported. Annie agrees with Charles.
90.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they did not prepare something. Hazel agrees with Annie.
91.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that his understanding is that VoiceXML is around telephone dialogues and pure voice-in and voice-out. Ben agrees with Kenneth.
92.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that his understanding of the project was that they are in a situation where they had a screen based system even though it was voice-in and voice-out. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
93.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that you have to issue a command to hear things again. Hazel and Ben agree with Kenneth.
94.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth spoke about spatial arrangements. Annie and Fabian agree with Kenneth.
95.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth spoke about re-hearing information. Ben agrees with Kenneth.
96.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said the use of voice-in and some keyboard command. Lucy agrees with Kenneth.
97.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentioned things that would not be feasible in VoiceXML. Ben agrees with Kenneth.
98.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that things are getting more complicated. Hazel and Lucy agree with Kenneth
99.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the concept is to do with the vision. Ben agrees with Kenneth
100.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Kenneth said that what is being said is making the vision less remote than what was already said.
101.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that they want a sufficient literature user. Kenneth agrees with Charles.
102.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that for some dialogues natural language gives you greater freedom. Charles agrees with Kenneth.
103.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth talks about having deep menus. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
104.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentioned the problems with natural recognition systems. Kenneth agrees with

	Charles.
105.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles provided an example. Annie and Christopher agree with Charles.
106.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth spoke about having a language interpreting system. Ben agrees with Kenneth.
107.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles talks about language interpreting systems. Kenneth agrees with Charles.
108.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth sad it looks like they are moving towards a natural recognition system. Charles agrees with Kenneth.
109.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles talks about the problems. Lucy agrees with Charles.
110.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentions problems from the users point of view. Ben agrees with Kenneth.
111.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that what is being described is still in a dialogue system. Kenneth, Ben, hazel, Christopher and Jonathan agrees with Ben.
112.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that it is more intelligent. Annie and Kenneth agree with Ben.
113.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that the principles remain the same. Charles agrees with Ben.
114.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth spoke about having more freedom. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
115.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she is loosing vision. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
116.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth talks about general environments. Hazel and Annie agree with Kenneth.
117.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth mentioned voice-in and voice-out dialogues being able to be carried out by the telephone. Hazel disagrees with Kenneth.
118.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth spoke about moving between the general and the embedded environment.
119.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth spoke about changing the dialogue concept. Christopher agrees with Kenneth.
120.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that last week she was struggling to write the user requirements spec of how this would work, looking at the interactions. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
121.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said looking at who has control. Kenneth, Annie and Christopher agree with Annie.
122.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when talking about loosing the vision.
123.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ben asks if normal screen readers have voice input as well. Hazel disagrees.
124.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel disagrees when Ben asks if normal screen readers have voice input. Ben agrees with Hazel.
125.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that you can have a screen reader which has voice input as well.
126.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that you can have a screen reader which has voice input as well. Ben agrees with Annie.
127.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that this is three pieces of software. Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
128.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it was demonstrated. Charlotte agrees with Hazel.
129.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the demonstration was successful. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
130.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the demonstration was effective. Charlotte and Hazel agree with Kenneth.
131.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that you were driving a standard application. Hazel and Charlotte agree with Kenneth.
132.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the keystrokes were being replaced. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
133.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said the replacements are with voice commands. Charlotte agrees with Kenneth.
134.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentioned speech applications as well. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
135.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that it was having more than DragonDictate and Jaws. Kenneth agrees with Charlotte.
136.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte said that this is called the JawBone and that this handles interactions. Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
137.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel asked if the project is doing to be able to deal with everything. Jonathan disagrees with Hazel.
138.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said voice input and Hazel agrees with Ben.
139.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asked if this was a smarter navigation system. Annie and Hazel agree with Ben.
140.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie gives an example of what the project can offer. Hazel agrees with Annie.
141.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said search and Hazel agrees with Ben.
142.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that help systems seem to work quite well with Jaws and current speech synthesis systems. Jonathan disagrees with Hazel.
143.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said the screen reader and asked if it would be a two-way exchange of information. Hazel agrees with Annie.
144.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that she thinks that the screen reader is sequential. Annie agrees with Lucy.
145.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that search is not sequential.
146.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that search is not sequential. Lucy agrees with Annie.
147.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said if they are talking about voice, how can it not be sequential. Lucy disagrees with Hazel.
148.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth spoke about using voice input. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
149.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth questions the benefit because screen readers are powerful. Ben agrees with Kenneth.
150.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the project is important for those that do not use the keyboard. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
151.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that he does not think the project is about talking to machinery. Hazel agrees with Charles.
152.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that the example that has been mentioned already exists.
153.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben gives an example using Word. Kenneth agrees with Ben.
154.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie mentions something that the present system does not do. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
155.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that this can be easily developed with VoiceXML. Lucy agrees with Charles.
156.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel asks is it voice-on or voice-out. Jonathan disagrees with Hazel, saying that it is both, not just one.
157.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan said voice-in and voice-out. Hazel agrees with Jonathan.
158.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if sighted people still use the mouse. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
159.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben mentions the structure of sites which are designed fore sighted people. Hazel agrees with Ben.
160.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that it is easy for sighted people to pick things out of websites, however, for blind people it is more difficult. Hazel and Ronnie agree with Ben.
161.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if they are talking about the structure of the website. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
162.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie asks if they are talking about the content of the website. Ben disagrees with Ronnie.
163.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that he is not talking about the content of the website. Annie agrees with Ben.
164.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie talks about the e-learning initiative. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
165.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that what makes a good website is different to what makes a good VoiceXML dialogue. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
166.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that it too difficult and too time consuming to produce websites for only blind people. Jonathan, Lucy, Ben and Charlotte agree with Hazel.
167.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles outlines the advantages for using VoiceXML. Ronnie agrees with Charles.

168.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asks if this is content for all. Ronnie agrees with Ben.
169.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben mentions single source. Hazel, Kenneth, Jonathan and Annie agree with Ben.
170.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if files need to be restructured. Ben agrees with Lucy.
171.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben describes how to re-structure files. Jonathan, Annie, Lucy and Hazel agree with Ben
172.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if it is sequential. Hazel agrees with Lucy.
173.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentions the advantages of using lists. Hazel agrees with Charles.
174.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentions situations which can be slower. Hazel agrees with Charles.
175.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan asks if they are talking about the pre-prototype. Hazel and Annie agree with Jonathan and Jonathan agrees with them.
176.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jonathan asks if this is the portal. Hazel disagrees.
177.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan asks if it is like a lesson. Hazel agrees with Jonathan.
178.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that partners 1 and 2 have expressed the need for understanding more about how screen readers work and how it is going to interact with the project application. Annie agrees with Hazel.
179.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if partner 3 can provide support. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
180.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that partners 1 and 2 need to articulate what they need to know. Annie agrees with Hazel.
181.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *11* sent by Annie answering questions. Message *18* sent by Desmond with his answers on Jaws.
182.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that after there is a demonstration of the voice solution. Annie agrees with Jack.
183.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said sound card. Annie and someone in the background whose identity was not revealed agree with Paul.
184.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if she (Annie) means voice input. Annie agrees with Hazel.
185.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that it is voice input and voice output. Christopher and Hazel agree with Annie.
186.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie apologises. Hazel disagrees, saying that it is ok.
187.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie asks about the evaluation of the user needs. Annie disagrees with what Ronnie said.
188.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she did not explain things right. Ronnie agrees with Annie.
189.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if they were looking at Jaws. Annie agrees with Paul.
190.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if they can have a list. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
191.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks how many items were tested. Annie agrees with Ronnie's question and provides an answer.
192.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that Desmond sent some things to be downloaded and that their technical people are working on those.
193.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he does not think that an NT version is available. Annie agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Annie
194.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said web wizards and Desmond agrees with Annie.
195.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond said web wizards and Annie said that they were not aware of that.
196.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that a demo is only a screen reader and also mentions what a web tool is. Annie agrees with Desmond.
197.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that what was said was already mentioned in London. Annie agrees with Paul.
198.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie describes the draft that they will produce and will place onto the FTP site. Desmond agrees with Annie.
199.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that it was useful for them for their screen reader analysis, the questions answered by partners 5 and 6.
200.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they also have a list of questions concerning the web authoring tool, that might not be useful for work package 2, but will be useful for work package 3. Christopher agrees with Annie.
201.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James asks if there is a technical difficulty. Annie disagrees with James.
202.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks how she knew to say description. Annie agrees that this is the question asked and provides her answer.
203.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that you first describe the grammar with the keywords being used. Hazel agrees with Annie.
204.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if this is their own system that they are using or one that is commercially available. Annie agrees that is their own system that they are using.
205.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they are using their own system However, Paul disagrees saying he is asking about the voice input.
206.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks if they are talking about the recognition. Paul agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Paul.
207.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asks if they are talking about the recognition. Ronnie disagrees with Annie.
208.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asks if they are talking about voice. Paul disagrees with Annie
209.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said she does not know then as the suggestions she have been given have been rejected.
210.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie checks if that is what the question being asked is. Paul disagrees with Annie.
211.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that what is being shown has already been done with Dragon. Kenneth agrees with Paul.
212.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if they are using ViaVoice. Annie and Christopher agree with Ronnie.
213.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are integrating their voice input with the voice navigation system. Paul agrees with Annie.
214.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if you can ask it to say it again. Annie agrees with Ronnie that you can.
215.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that what they are presenting is not accessible. Hazel agrees with Annie.
216.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that at least it is tagable. Annie agrees with Hazel.
217.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Morris asks a question about entering. Annie disagrees.
218.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said with a tab key. Christopher agrees with Annie.
219.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if this is an example of an accessible webpage and how voice can improve the interaction and to communicate with the webpages. Also that this technology is currently used in a technical way. Annie agrees with James.
220.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if it is possible to see voice increase the interactivity for people. Annie and Paul agree with James.
221.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that what has been shown is very interesting, but they already know that.
222.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that what has been shown is what blind people do daily.
223.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that what has been shown is what blind people do daily. Annie agrees with Paul.
224.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that screen reader only read plain text. Paul disagrees with Annie, saying it does not.
225.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that she could not see the interaction.
226.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if this was an XML feature. Annie agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Annie.
227.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that what has been shown is not the final version. Paul agrees with James.

228.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that what is being demonstrated is something that is already available.
229.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that he would like to remind everyone that they have a short demo to show the functionality of VoiceXML. Paul agrees with James.
230.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said to not take what he is going to say as too strong a criticism. James agrees with Ronnie.
231.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that what has been developed they have not understood.
232.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that they are showing things to get comments. However, Ronnie disagrees and said that they cannot make comments.
233.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he cannot make comments. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
234.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if he can do to a website and to try this out switching of his screen reader. He asked for the address where this could be found as well. Annie agrees with Paul.
235.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that what has been shown is maybe useful. However, Paul disagrees, saying that what has been shown he can already do with his screen reader.
236.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said he does not see any progress from what they already have. However, Ronnie disagrees saying that is why that they are there.
237.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they cannot develop something without knowing where to start. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
238.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that the plug-in is not supposed to replace the screen reader.
239.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that you are filling in a form. Annie agrees with Paul.
240.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that he fills out forms daily on the Internet. However, Paul disagrees that filling in forms is difficult when asked by Annie.
241.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that Hazel had said that form filling is difficult, Hazel disagrees, saying that she said the opposite.
242.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth agrees with Hazel that forms as long as forms are set up this can be achieved. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
243.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Annie said that she thought form filling was difficult based on information provided by Hazel. However, hazel said that she said the opposite.
244.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles provides an example. Lucy, Hazel and Mary agree with Charles.
245.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles explains what screen readers cannot do. Hazel and Mary agree with Charles.
246.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks how she (Annie) knew to say description. Annie agrees with Hazel.
247.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that you can have that in your pages. Hazel agrees with Annie.
248.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they have not developed certain things, but they could. Hazel agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Hazel.
249.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the pages need to be accessible. Hazel agrees with Annie.
250.	Evidence of mutual understanding when Desmond checked his understanding on the solution. Annie agrees to what Desmond said.
251.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond mentioned a formula. However, Annie disagrees with what Desmond said.
252.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond agrees to what Annie said about the formula.
253.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that it was not Conpalabras telling him there was a formula. Annie agrees with Desmond.
254.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that Conpalabras was interpreting it through the VoiceXML tags. Desmond agrees with Annie, Annie agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Annie.
255.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that a screen reader recognises that in the same way. Annie agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Annie.
256.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks a question on VoiceXML tagging. Annie agrees with Paul.
257.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that they are not getting anything different.
258.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they are not getting anything different. Annie agrees with Paul.
259.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said to find out where their work actually goes beyond what they already have. Hazel agrees with Paul.
260.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that this is something that they need to continue with their user requirement work. Annie agrees with Hazel.
261.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that as they will see that afternoon, non eof the people that they have talked with have any experience of e-learning, so they need something to show them. Mary agrees with Hazel.
262.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it does not need to be big, but enough to show and make clearer what it is the project will do that a screen reader cannot do. Paul agrees with Hazel.
263.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that the problem with access sites has to be solved in advance. Hazel disagrees saying that is harsh.
264.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that you do not need to go out there and solve all of the access problems. Paul agrees with Hazel.
265.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie proposes an idea. Also, when he reminds the team that this is a research project. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
266.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said the demo is only a possibility of some ideas. Hazel agrees with James.
267.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that maybe they are wrong. Ronnie disagrees with Ronnie.
268.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that you will have to remember that the problem is there for them. James agrees with Ronnie.
269.	Evidence of mutual belief when James summarises what he has heard. Hazel agrees with James.
270.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said what versions of Jaws she is using. Hazel agrees with Annie.
271.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he thinks that they should concentrate on e-learning activities. There is agreement in the background to this proposal. Hazel also agrees to this.
272.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they need to find out what version 3.7 of Jaws could not do and to build up from there. Paul agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Paul.
273.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said at the moment it seems that the demo is doing less than version 3.7 of Jaws. Also, when she said that she would expect to hear the typing echo. Annie agrees with Hazel.
274.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that are saying that they will offer something more than their screen reader, but they are not sure what they should be saying to people that this should offer. Kenneth, Annie and Michael agree with Hazel.
275.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they can download a trial from their page to see the added value themselves. Hazel agrees with Annie.
276.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that Annie cannot tell them at the meeting what the added value is.
277.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that Annie cannot tell them what the added value is. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
278.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that there are a few things that the Conpalabras screen reader cannot do. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Charles.
279.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles suggests having a help command implemented. Christopher agrees with Charles.
280.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they do not know the users point of view.
281.	Evidence of altered belief when Annie said that they do not know the needs of the users. However, Hazel said that the users have never used anything like this before.
282.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the users have never used anything like this before. Kenneth agrees with

	Hazel.
283.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are asking the technicians to provide them something. Hazel agrees with Annie.
284.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Annie said that they do not know what to do.
285.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that they were shown what Jaws 3.7 can do in London.
286.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they were shown in London what Jaws 3.7 can do. Now what they need are some ideas for what is being offered in addition to that so that they can check with the users if those are the kinds of things that they need. Annie agrees with Hazel.
287.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they keep on saying they are not offering anything. Annie agrees with Hazel.
288.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that are providing a technical solution. However, Hazel disagrees, saying that it is too general and that they cannot go to the users with something so broad.
289.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said the user should have something to touch and feel. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
290.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said only by giving them something can they give feedback. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
291.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said if the users can be told what VoiceXML can offer in addition to what they get from their screen readers, the they can analyse the features and provide comments. Hazel and Kenneth agree with Paul.
292.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they (Annie) know what current screen readers can do and now they have to show the advantages for VoiceXML, which he is sure there will be some. At the moment they are the ignorant users. Hazel and Kenneth agree with Paul.
293.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said he will show text jobs. Hazel and Mary agree with Charles.
294.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Charles said he put a document on the mailing list. Hazel showed one, however, Charles disagrees with the one that Hazel had, showing another one instead. Hazel then agrees with Charles.
295.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles read out the name of the document. Paul agrees with Charles.
296.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said this document was only circulated yesterday or the day before. Hazel, Mary and Kenneth agree with Paul.
297.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie proposes giving time to people to read the document. However, Charles, disagrees saying that it would be nice to have some comments sooner.
298.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said to take a break. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
299.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks Charles to present his proposals. Charles agrees with hazel.
300.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles asks if it should be that afternoon. Hazel agrees with Charles.
301.	Evidence of no overall agreement reached on when Charles should present his work as Hazel said he could present it the following day as well.
302.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said he is going to make a summary so that everyone is in the same line. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with James.
303.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they saw the work of work package 2 in the morning, however the plug-in is not the final version the project wants to deliver. Christopher and Annie agree with James.
304.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they are going to use the reference document. Annie agrees with James.
305.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie explained what the user can do to check the information entered. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Annie.
306.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if she (Annie) was referring to the voice application through spell checking. Annie agrees with Paul.
307.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul requests Annie to say what she just said again. Annie agrees with Paul.
308.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie described what a screen reader would do based on what she read. Desmond disagrees with Annie.
309.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond said that screen readers can switch into the forms mode.
310.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that she thought only some screen readers can switch into the forms mode.
311.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that some of the screen readers can switch into forms mode, but not all of them. Desmond agrees with Annie.
312.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie proposed that is something the project solution can do to cover that problem, for those that do not use a screen reader. Desmond agrees with Annie.
313.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that some things were mentioned in November. Annie agrees with Desmond.
314.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that Annie should have looked at the document. Paul agrees with Desmond.
315.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they (Annie) should have looked at this document before and not just now. Annie agrees with Paul.
316.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if this document is available. Paul agrees with James.
317.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks Paul if that is the document which was circulated in November. Paul agrees with Haze and Hazel agrees with Paul.
318.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said drop down list. Christopher agrees with Annie.
319.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that the screen reader does not currently read lists properly. Kenneth and Paul disagree with Annie.
320.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks if they disagree. Paul and Hazel agree with Annie that they disagree.
321.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said to Annie that maybe they did not see partner 3's document. However, Annie disagrees, saying that she based this presentation on it.
322.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if it was according to WAI. Kenneth, Mary and Annie agree with Paul.
323.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asks how they will use their guidelines. However, Annie disagrees saying that they are not providing guidelines.
324.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said if they know where they are going they can type in a search command, using the screen reader. Annie agrees with Paul.
325.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie talks about using voice and its dynamism.
326.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that one of the issues of having keywords is that the user must know the possibilities and that this can be a slow and tedious process. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
327.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that you have to train the computer to recognise your native language. Kenneth disagrees with Annie.
328.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth talks about having a lot of learning to do. Annie disagrees with Kenneth.
329.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said single words. However, Kenneth disagrees saying that they are talking about dialogues.
330.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they are building a corpus of information. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
331.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if he can make a point. Annie agrees with Ronnie's request.
332.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Ronnie said that things are not clear and an important document has not been considered.
333.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles asks if they are going to listen to his ideas. James agrees with Charles.
334.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they will look at the point of view of partner 9. Paul agrees with James and James agrees with Paul.
335.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *41* sent by Mary, informing the team that she could not download the plug-in, asking if there was another site that she could try.
336.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said Java. Annie agrees with Paul that she said this.

337.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they must get feedback from users to see what offer solutions that they could find out. Erin agrees with Annie and so does someone in the team whose identity was not revealed.
338.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if they can expect to have a deliverable by the end of August. Annie agrees with Jack.
339.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they think it might be more suitable to have a new task. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
340.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that Annie used the work integration. However, Annie disagrees saying that she said interaction.
341.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie used the term interaction. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
342.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said using VoiceXML. Kenneth agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Kenneth.
343.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that voice recognition is mentioned several times, however, there is no real suggestion of what they mean by voice recognition and the level of recognition. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
344.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that you have to find that out. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
345.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that will help them define what comes later. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
346.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if a new task can be added as they are only three weeks away from this work package ending. Annie agrees with Jack.
347.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that there is a deliverable due at the end of the month, which they have not yet seen. Someone in the background whose identity is not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
348.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when James said that they would circulate the first version of the plug-in compatibility document on the 20th of June. This is because there was no other evidence found to suggest otherwise.
349.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *15* sent by Erin included a URL for relevant information on this theme. Message *58* sent by Erin with the same contents as message 15.
350.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *43* sent by Erin with a URL included in the message on VoiceXML studios.
351.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *28* sent by Annie with the first version of the plug-in dossier. Message *32* sent by Conwayne with the second version of this document. Message *33* sent by Adam with two questions from in message 32. Message *34* sent by Annie answering the questions asked in message 33.

Work package 3

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that they should re-consider the objectives of the project. Kenneth disagrees with Paul.
2.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that European Union projects do not work in this way. Ronnie and Ben agree with Kenneth.
3.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte asks who would like to try the technology that afternoon. Someone in the background whose identity was not revealed said all the technical partners. Charlotte agrees with them.
4.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charlotte asks two team members is they said yes. Ben and Charles agree with Charlotte.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they were going to say that they the prototype was going to start in March. Jack agrees with Annie.
6.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the project is not well planned. Lucy agrees with Annie.
7.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that you first need a prototype to show it to the people. Lucy disagrees with Annie.
8.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy disagrees with Annie that you first need a prototype to show to the people. Jack agrees with Lucy that they are not talking about the prototype of the tool. Hazel agrees with Jack too. Also, Annie agrees with them all.
9.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they are building a prototype of something which can be the result. Annie agrees with Jack.
10.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to Jack that they understand what he is saying.
11.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to Jack that they understand what he is saying. Jack agrees with Annie.
12.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the project should be planned so that they first make a prototype and then show it to the users to see how they react. Jack agrees with Annie.
13.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that when they talk about the prototype, it is not the real prototype that they want to give to the commission. It is something which has some relationship with what they want to build up. Fabian, Jonathan, Annie and Kenneth agree with Annie. Some others in the team agree with Annie as well, but their identity was not identified.
14.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said but reflecting that she also had something else to say. Annie agrees with Hazel.
15.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it would be difficult to make a prototype because it is a physical object. Lucy agrees with Annie.
16.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that as this is web technology they could go one step further. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
17.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they could have something on the web which illustrates principles. Charlotte agrees with Hazel.
18.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that until they have a vision of what the project is offering, then they cannot make the scenario or the website. Lucy, Charlotte and Kenneth agree with Hazel.
19.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said a scenario plus something. Hazel and Kenneth agree with Lucy.
20.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that it was too early, however, still needed some testing material for the plug-in. Hazel agrees with Ben.
21.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said it was just rearranging the work packages. Hazel disagrees with Annie.
22.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel disagrees with Annie that they are rearranging the work packages. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
23.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked Annie if they could give the scenario, to not develop anything, but to be told what scenario that they are thinking off. Annie agrees with Hazel.
24.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel provided an example, saying that she turns on her computer and she is blind and will be the project be able to deal with everything. Jonathan disagrees with Hazel.
25.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said voice input. Hazel agrees with Ben.
26.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben asked if it would be a smarter dialogue system. Annie and Hazel agree with Ben.
27.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that you integrate with Flash images, so some pages may not be available to you right now using your screen reader, but would be available if they were using the project tool. Hazel agrees with Annie.
28.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said search. Hazel agrees with Ben.
29.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that it seems to her that the help systems work quite well with Jaws and current speech synthesis systems. Ronnie disagrees with Hazel.
30.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said the screen reader and that it is a two-way exchange of information. Hazel agrees with Annie.
31.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that she thinks that the screen reader is sequential. Annie agrees with Lucy.
32.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy said the screen reader is sequential. Annie disagrees with Lucy.
33.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie disagrees with Lucy that the screen reader is sequential. Lucy agrees with Annie.
34.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said it is voice, so how can it not be sequential. Lucy disagrees with Hazel.
35.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie was talking. However, Ronnie neither agreed nor disagreed with Annie, instead saying that he felt stupid because he did not understand.
36.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he did not understand. Hazel agrees with Ronnie saying that she does not understand either.
37.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they need to break up a little bit what they are saying. Also, saying that voice input in any form is only going to produce the voice recognition system, a string of commands, which will then be used by the application to do something. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
38.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that screen readers are jolly powerful. Ben agre3es with Kenneth.
39.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he thinks that project is useful for those that do not use the keyboard. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
40.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie talks about how telephone is useless. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
41.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that as far as he knows the project is not actually about talking to machinery, and doing things at the level of the operation system, it is about a web application. Hazel agrees with Charles.
42.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that the example that was being referred to already exists. Kenneth agrees with Ben.
43.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that in present the actual system does not do something. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
44.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that it could be easily developed with VoiceXML. Lucy agrees with Charles.
45.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel asked if it was voice in or voice out. Jonathan disagrees with hazel, saying that it is both voice in and voice out.
46.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan said that it is both voice in and voice out. Also, when Jonathan questions the accessibility of voice. Hazel agrees with Jonathan.
47.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if sighted people still used the mouse. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
48.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said at the moment the main difference between the project tool and the screen reader is that you now have a webpage which is designed for sighted people, because it has a lot of information on it. Hazel agrees with Ben.
49.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that is easy for sighted people to pick out information from the site, but that it is harder for blind people to do this. Hazel and Ronnie agree with Ben.

50.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if they were talking about the structure of the website. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
51.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie asked if they were talking about the content of the website. Ben disagrees with Ronnie that they are talking about the contents of the website.
52.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that they were not talking about the contents of the website. Annie agrees with Ben.
53.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that an e-learning site is an important site. Ben agrees with Ronnie.
54.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that Charles presentation mentioned that what makes a good website is different to what makes good XML dialogue. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
55.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is too difficult and time consuming to produce websites for blind people only. Jonathan, Lucy, Ben and Charlotte agree with Ronnie.
56.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles highlighted the advantages of using VoiceXML. Ronnie agrees with Charles.
57.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said content for all. Ronnie agrees with Ben.
58.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben talks about single source and mentions what this is. Hazel, Kenneth, Jonathan and Annie agree with Ben.
59.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that what he is saying is not only useful for blind people; it can be used for any purpose. Ronnie agrees with Ben.
60.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if you would have to restructure files. Ben agrees with Lucy.
61.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben talks about restructuring and how this can be achieved. Jonathan, Annie, Lucy and Hazel agree with Ben.
62.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy talks about it being sequential. Hazel agrees with Lucy.
63.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben mentions speed, and that surfing on the website would become faster, but can be slower for ordering groceries. Hazel agrees with Ben.
64.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned the advantages of VoiceXML output as opposed to a screen reading output. Kenneth and Charles agree with Hazel.
65.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that forms are hard. Charlotte agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Charlotte.
66.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that as forms are hard, if the project can find a way of improving them using voice in, that would be a winner. Charles agrees with Hazel.
67.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if anyone had a diary. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
68.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said the first version will be available by the 11th. Annie agrees with Hazel.
69.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan asks if they are talking about the pre prototype. Hazel and Annie agree with Jonathan. Jonathan also agrees with them.
70.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jonathan asked if that was the portal. Hazel disagrees with Jonathan.
71.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan asked if it is a lesson. Hazel agrees with Jonathan.
72.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel gives an example of a fragment of a lesson. Annie agrees with Hazel.
73.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it is just showing people the principles. Annie agrees with hazel and Hazel agrees with Annie.
74.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel continues talking about the fragments of a lesson. Annie agrees with Hazel.
75.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said what they could show. Hazel agrees with Annie.
76.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she is working towards a work plan. Annie agrees with Hazel.
77.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they could discuss this back and forth by e-mail. Annie and Christopher agree with Hazel.
78.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they could develop something which can be very fragmentary. Annie agrees with Hazel.
79.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned the time plan. Elsie and Lucy agree with Hazel.
80.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *35* sent by Christopher requesting a brief meeting in Paris to discuss the schedule for this work package, before the main meeting.
81.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *23* sent by Charles informing the team of a draft document he is preparing. Message *28* sent by Thomas with his comments and conclusions. Message *44* sent by Charles sending the same version sent in message 23.
82.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he hopes everything will be explained. Charles agrees with Ronnie.
83.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that he will go back to basics and explain everything from the beginning. Hazel agrees with Charles.
84.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that they have Conpalabras and VoiceXML. Annie agrees with Charles.
85.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he could turn the typing echo on and having information repeated back. Charles agrees with Paul.
86.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles talks about having information entered by the keyboard and then talks about voice recognition. Paul agrees with Charles.
87.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if he can ask a question or clarification. James agrees with Ronnie's request.
88.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said if he understood the presentation correctly and if they are talking about VoiceXML can offer. Also, when Ronnie said that they need to aware of what already exists and that they know exactly where and how they want to make an improvement. Charles agrees with Ronnie.
89.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that what Ronnie explained only exists in telephony applications.
90.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Charles said that mobile browsers was a new area and was not mentioned when Ronnie was speaking.
91.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that mobile browsers was new. Christopher and Ronnie agree with Charles. Charles agrees with them too.
92.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if they could address that situation in a slightly different way. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
93.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they spoke about the natural interactivity of voice. Charles agrees with Hazel.
94.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said rather than the keyboard. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
95.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel outlined the argument she felt would be the strongest. Paul agrees with Hazel.
96.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentions what the heart of the project should be. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
97.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel said high interactivity will be difficult for visually impaired people. Mary and Kenneth agree with Hazel.
98.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that one of the things that worried her when she read the document on the previous day, was that designing a voice interface is completely different from designing a graphical user interface or webpage. Kenneth agrees with hazel.
99.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel said that she does not think that you give to w webpage designer a voice application because it is different. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Hazel.
100.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned the small additional overhead. Kenneth agrees with hazel.
101.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if what she said made sense. Someone agrees, saying a little bit with Hazel. However their identity was not revealed. Hazel agrees with them too.
102.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks Kenneth if what she said made sense to him. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
103.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that what Hazel said did not make sense to him.
104.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentioned that he was not an expert in an area. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.

105.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that what Hazel just spoke about gives a huge overall benefit. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
106.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said if she could just make another quick point about Mindleaders. Mary agrees with hazel.
107.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that Mindleaders do not know how to give interactivity. Mary and Christopher agree with Hazel.
108.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel questions what is the point in Mindleaders turning off interactivity. Mary agrees with Hazel.
109.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they must capitalise on Mindleaders turning off interactivity. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Hazel.
110.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she does not think the way to do interactivity for visually impaired people is tinkering around how you would navigate in a form or something. Paul agrees with Hazel.
111.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel talks about using the project wizard. Mary agrees with Hazel.
112.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel talks about using your voice. Paul agrees with hazel.
113.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to show users that authors could really produce natural voice based interaction. Mary agrees with Hazel.
114.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she thinks it would make the developer task easier, because they can go for the advantages of voice. Annie agrees with Hazel.
115.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that this is a very important moment and to correct him when he is speaking. Hazel agrees with Jack.
116.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth talks about aspects of e-learning. Lucy agrees with Kenneth.
117.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentions voice. Hazel and Jack agree with Kenneth.
118.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that voice interactivity is important. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
119.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he feels that voice would provide help for everyone. Hazel, Kenneth and Lucy agree with Jack.
120.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that what was said was ok for her.
121.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that what he was saying was for everyone and not just blind people. Hazel agrees with Jack.
122.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asked if they should just concentrate on e-learning and forget about an authoring tool for a general webpage. Ronnie disagrees with Jack.
123.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie disagrees with Jack who asked if they should just concentrate on e-learning and forget about an authoring tool for a general webapge. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
124.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said as long as they use the tool to produce XML content. Kenneth agrees with Paul.
125.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that the Spanish partners do not have to make a completely new authoring tool. James agrees with Paul.
126.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that from his original understanding they wanted an authoring tool for voice. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Paul.
127.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that as Charles said a visual user interface is significantly different to a graphical user interface. Charles agrees with Kenneth.
128.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the authoring tool would be aimed at the visual user interface. Paul agrees with Ronnie.
129.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said Charles spoke about voicifying. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
130.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentioned what the project is not about. Ronnie and Hazel agree with Kenneth.
131.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel spoke about separating out the sighted and visually impaired people. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Hazel.
132.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to do what Charles has suggested, needing the voice applications in the webpages at the appropriate points.
133.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that to keep everyone at the same application and just branch of people where they really need to. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
134.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they are quite different solutions to what other people have tried. Kenneth and Paul agree with Hazel.
135.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that things are now clear and that they know where to go. Annie agrees with Jack.
136.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris raises his hand indicating that he would like to take the next turn to speak. Jack agrees with Morris.
137.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they could be asked in the time ahead of them. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Morris.
138.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that if they want something to show it should be based on their last finding. Paul agrees with Morris.
139.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that the idea of that morning was not fit. Lucy and Jack agree with Morris.
140.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they should adapt to what they said that morning and to find something where they can show the advantage of natural interactivity. Jack and Ronnie agree with Morris.
141.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they would get them (technical partners) some material. Annie agrees with Hazel.
142.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they would be given something. Hazel agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Hazel.
143.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that Mary can show something. Mary agrees with Hazel.
144.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she can show something on the web browser. Annie agrees with Mary.
145.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to see and describe the problems that the users had. Mary agrees with Hazel.
146.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that would be a good place to start. Annie agrees with Hazel.
147.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that maybe Paul would like to go and try this form out. Paul and Mary agree with Hazel.
148.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they have different users trying the same problem bits. Paul, Kenneth, Annie and Mary agree with Hazel.
149.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he will need the URL. Hazel and Mary agree with Paul.
150.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if he could come back to his previous question and that the timeframe for the commission was July. James agrees with Paul.
151.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they need to have the tome to make suggestions for changes and improvements. Hazel agrees with Paul.
152.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if it would be possible to have the first version of the webpage available in 3-weeks. Mary agrees with James. There was agreement was others in the background too.
153.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that it would be available for the rest of the partners to analyse. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with James.
154.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator asked if it was May. James disagrees saying that it is Mid April.
155.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if it will be just one page. Mary agrees with Hazel.
156.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said it would give them just one week to release. Hazel, Mary and James agree with the translator.
157.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed that there are no comments when asked by James. This is because no one made any

	comments and James handed over to Jack.
158.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *12* sent by Charles with information on the Cynthia browser. Message *50* sent by Adam informing the team that Opera were offering a free version of their browser to visually impaired people.
159.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *13* sent by Mary sharing with the team some interesting information that she had found. Message *14* sent by Mary which had identical contents to message 13. Message *15* sent by Charles with a Zipped file to the message, containing documents on the requirements for the authoring tool and other documents for reference. Message *30* sent by Hazel with a web authoring tool accessibility report. Message *38* sent by Charles informing the team that the document on the requirements for the authoring tool had been updated. Message *40* sent by Erin reminding the team that they were still updating their document. Message *41* sent by Erin, addressed to Charles, but sent to the team, with a conversation on Java and accessibility. Message *52* sent by Adam informing the team that the last version of the accessibility requirements was attached to the message.
160.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that work package 3 is the development of the web authoring tool and that a high level of customisation is required. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Annie.
161.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy made a request for Mary to speak louder. Mary agrees with Lucy.
162.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if she (Annie) considered the requirements for the authoring tool. Annie agrees with Mary.
163.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are the prototypes of how to integrate voice in an application so they do not intend to solve the problem, so they might not meet all the requirements. Also when Annie said that they have to study the integration of voice in a web environment. Mary agrees with Annie.
164.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said yes to Kenneth and Annie that they could say something. Kenneth agrees with Jack that he will take the next turn to speak.
165.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they were going to show it now. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
166.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond asks if they (Annie) have made a program to say that there is a link. Annie disagrees with Desmond saying that they do not have a program yet.
167.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul clicks his fingers to draw attention that he would like to take the next turn to speak. Annie agrees with Paul's request.
168.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that what they have been hearing is the same, except with a few limitations of what a screen reader can do and it is less than what they have already. Annie disagrees with Paul saying that the tool is not supposed to be something which substitutes the screen reader.
169.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that now they will see a sample which shows how the plug-in can give an advantage to the screen reader. Paul agrees with Annie.
170.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if the instructions have been implemented using VoiceXML and the plug-in. Also when he said that he would like to see what the screen reader would do in a particular situation. Annie agrees with Paul.
171.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they (users) give them the problems and they can test the solutions with their screen reader to see if it is prevented or not. Paul agrees with Annie.
172.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they have tested it with two screen readers. Annie agrees with Erin.
173.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin spoke about her findings and the need to be tested with magnification. Also that not all users know how to turn screen readers on and off. Annie agrees with Erin.
174.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the navigation is through the four options through the up and down arrows. Annie agrees with Mary.
175.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said that she thinks that Annie has updated that. Mary and Annie agree with Erin.
176.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if you could use the tab key to move between the two. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Mary.
177.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy makes a request for Annie to speak louder. Annie agrees with Lucy.
178.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they couldn't hear them. Lucy agrees with Ronnie.
179.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said that they have provided some feedback for the navigation and that the screen reader would normally navigate the pages using the cursor keys. Mary agrees with Erin.
180.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said that it is important for the plug-in to have a similar method of navigation and that they (Annie) have made a few changes since then. Annie and Mary agree with Erin.
181.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that they have not used image in that way, they are using images provided by HTML elements. Mary agrees with Geoff.
182.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if something can be changed. Geoff agrees with Mary.
183.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam asks if they are being shown the logo. Annie agrees with Adam.
184.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Adam asks if they are being shown instead of voice capability which is the way that e-learning websites should be. Annie disagrees with Adam.
185.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said not to provide the structure of the feedback and that web masters should include in the development the features to say that they have the wrong answer. Annie agrees with Adam.
186.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked a question on the sample being shown, entering numbers and characters. Annie agrees with Paul.
187.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that to make a letter validation they need to prompt the user. Paul agrees with Annie.
188.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if he can come back on two things. Annie agrees with Morris.
189.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Morris said he had problems what the plug-in could do that a traditional screen reader cannot.
190.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that he had problems what the plug-in could do that a traditional screen reader cannot. Mary and Erin agree with Morris.
191.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said how the page should be and if it would be possible to do with the plug-in. Annie agrees with Morris.
192.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they should not get themselves mixed up between what the plug-in is doing and what the design of the information is doing. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
193.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that a lot of work has been done in access and natural language areas. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
194.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that those are the questions that they still need to address. Lucy agrees with Kenneth.
195.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding. Ronnie said that he was expecting something different.
196.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said easier. Paul agrees with Desmond.
197.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said a web authoring tool, compatible with the technical solution already existing screen readers, for the creation of webpages. Kenneth agrees with James.
198.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that what they have spoke about they have not developed. Kenneth agrees wit Geoff.
199.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that if there are no further questions that they can go to lunch. Jack agrees with James and James agrees with Jack.
200.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked if everyone agrees with the picture which has been presented. There is agreement in the background from team members.
201.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said part of the question is that if they have the plug-in what is it that is going to add to that. Also when Kenneth said that they have to redesign. Jack agrees with Kenneth.

202.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the innovation is e-learning. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
203.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the innovation is e-learning. Lucy agrees with Jack.
204.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles raises his hand indicating that he would like to take the next turn to speak. Annie agrees with Charles.
205.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that as he saw in the demo that morning. With Conpalabras, he thought that they were inventing the wheel a second time round. Kenneth agrees with Desmond.
206.	Evidence eof mutual belief when Desmond asked a question on the demo and the user being told that they had four questions but were not told of the page. Annie agrees with Desmond.
207.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond said that the tool should see how many questions that there are and not the webpage. Annie disagrees with Desmond that they do.
208.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie mentions that they do with the plug-in. Desmond agrees with Annie.
209	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said why could the plug-in not tell you how many formula elements there are. Annie agre4es with Desmond.
210.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie indicated that Desmond would like to take the next turn to speak. Desmond agrees with Annie.
211.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the plug-in only recognises and synthesises speech. Also when Annie mentioned some of the things that were being brought up. Desmond agrees with Annie.
212.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that is what he meant. Also when he said that Kevin had said that VoiceXML has to start at the point where a screen reader is too passive and to see the interaction between the screen reader and the person because sometimes direction could matter. This is where the advantage could be. Annie agrees with Desmond.
213.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that visually impaired user sonly has access to a very small portion of the content. Therefore to make life easier the interaction the VoiceXML tool gives and should give extr4a information as the point where a screen reader is too passive. Annie agrees with Paul.
214.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they need to find out how to interact with the screen reader. Also, that they want to make an adaptation of Jaws and to add a script to Jaws. Desmond agrees with Annie.
215.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond suggested that they could work together with Freedom Scientific. There is disagreement in the background from some team members.
216.	Evidence of mutual belief when there is disagreement in the background from some team members that they should not go and work with Freedom Scientific. Paul agrees that he does not think this is the right approach to take.
217.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he does no think that you can go and work with one screen reader manufacturer. Mary and Desmond agree with Paul.
218.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he does not think you can go and work with one screen reader manufacturer. Desmond agrees with Paul and Annie agrees with Desmond.
219.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they do not know the technical approach for the project. Someone in the project whose identity was not revealed agrees with Jack.
220.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they cannot say if they are going to succeed or not because they do not know what kind of problems that they face now, because they do not have technical knowledge on screen readers. Desmond agrees with Annie.
221.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that all the features of the screen reader must be implemented in the authoring tool and the development of the modern screen reader. Also to do something new. Annie agrees with Desmond.
222.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they intend to have a web authoring tool for a web developer to create accessible pages. Also that they do not intend to do what a tool that is in the market already does. Desmond agrees with Annie.
223.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie shares his views. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
224.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie shares his views. Paul disagrees with Ronnie saying that he would take a different approach.
225.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that the examples of the tools he mentioned are accessible. Annie agrees with Paul.
226.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that what he said would that not be an approach. Annie agrees with Paul.
227.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that what Paul said does not go against what Ronnie said. Paul and Ronnie agree with Annie
228.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth speaks about what the project review report included. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
229.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the commission is expecting them to look at tools for producing webpages including VoiceXML, HTML and XML. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
230.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the commission is asking an update to the work plan. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
231.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul called out Kenneth's name to draw attention that he would like to take the next turn to speak. Kenneth agrees with Paul.
232.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he is simply talking about work package 3, tool development. Paul agrees with Kenneth.
233.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul talks about the tool reacting to the events. Kenneth agrees with Paul.
234.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie talks about the preliminary version of deliverable 3.1. Kenneth agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Kenneth.
235.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to have the comment of the users. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Annie.
236.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asked if they would be integrating VoiceXML into a HTML type of page. Also, when Kenneth said that VoiceXML was developed as a language which stays on its own and suggesting that they turn it into an integrate language and HTML or XML page. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
237.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the commission is saying that they have put in a lot of effort and that this should be reflected in the work plan. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
238.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they know what functions they will have. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
239.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that as they have said around the table they would not be developing a web authoring tool from scratch. Also, that the first five objectives for work packager 3 are huge. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
240.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they need to be spelling out more clearly how they will be meeting the objectives. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
241.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they definitely said that they were going to be developing a web authoring tool.
242.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asks if they should change their goals. Kenneth disagrees with Annie.
243.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if they look at the promises in the work plan and the ones which the reviewers have picked up, they have got a demand which they cannot meet. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
244.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they need to define which part of that demand they are going to meet. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
245.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that at this stage they need to agree with the commission that this is what they are going to deliver. Lucy and Kenneth agree with Kenneth.
246.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said at the moment the promises and the capabilities seem to be a long way apart. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.

247.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks Paul if what he said was correct. Paul agrees with Ronnie.
248.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond names some of the things he would expect an authoring tool to do. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
249.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Charles makes a remark on the screen reader. Paul disagrees with Charles saying that he did not say that.
250.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he did not say that. Charles agrees with Paul.
251.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they will circulate that document with all the functionality. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
252.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that Annie circulating the document with the functionality would be a helpful way forward. Someone in the team whose identity was nor revealed agrees with Kenneth.
253.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that would need to be summarised into the work plan for work package 3. Annie agrees with Kenneth and Paul and Fabian agree with Annie.
254.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth asked if they had some new text for work package 3 produced Annie disagrees that it is already produced. She said that they will produce it.
255.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that it is a Gantt chart. Annie agrees with Jack.
256.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that it is a planification of all the tasks that they have to do. Kenneth agrees with Mary.
257.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if it would include integrated functionalities. Annie agrees with Desmond.
258.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asks Charles to increase the size of the font. Charles agrees with Desmond.
259.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles asks if the enlarged size is ok. Desmond agrees with Charles and Charles agrees with Desmond.
260.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he has a comment talking about missing the keywords. Charles agrees with Desmond.
261.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he is typing in the right keyword but nothing is still happening and there is no help function for the keyboard which has already been written into the program. Someone in the team whose identity was nor revealed agrees with Desmond.
262.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles asks if they meant index of keywords. Desmond agrees with Charles.
263.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond named a feature he said to be included. Charles agrees with Desmond.
264.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said you can access it through File and the Help menu. Someone in the team whose identity was nor revealed agrees with Charles.
265.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentioned the two things it could mean. Paul agrees with Charles.
266.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentioned that partner 3 said to consider what other software is necessary to work with the tool. Kenneth agrees with Charles.
267.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack told Charles he had one question. Charles agrees with Jack.
268.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul proposes that they add that a text-based manual should be presented on the CD ROM and a Braille or taped manual as well. Charles agrees with Paul.
269.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that what was said sounds like a lot of work. There was agreement in the background.
270.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said that there is further research going on and as they have done more research since the document was produced, there will be a second version of the report. James agrees with Erin.
271.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said that maybe this report is something to being with. Jack and James agree with Erin.
272.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said to then incorporate all the other features. Someone in the team whose identity was nor revealed and James agree with Erin.
273.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that when he looks at the list he sees 10 years worth of work, but they only have only 18 months Erin agrees with Kenneth.
274.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the commission may say that here is the list of requirements, but you are not delivering against them all. Someone in the team whose identity was nor revealed agrees with Kenneth.
275.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they had already considered Charles' document. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
276.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul indicated he would like to take the next turn to speak by saying Jack's name, saying that he would like to make a general comment. Jack agrees with Paul.
277.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that the requirements were alright and were substantial. Charles agrees with Paul.
278.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said 1-month. James agrees with Annie.
279.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that he finds it completely unacceptable top set the contract for the next 15-months without being able to say in detail what the tool will do.
280.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they are in a position there they have done 9-months of work but still cannot get beyond a generalised statement of what they will do. Also, why they cannot be more specific about what the tool will include. James agrees with Kenneth.
281.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that they (technical people) are saying is that they need 18 months to get to the point to produce a functional analysis and technical design and 6 months to actually develop it. James disagrees with Kenneth.
282.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they have the user requirements document that they have seen today, but the basic design and the heart of the high level design is already there and it is not something that they have to wait for Also, things that they will not find in the user requirements document. James agrees with Kenneth.
283.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if they are not given information on the design and the proposals then they cannot respond. James agrees with Kenneth.
284.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that in the comment of Kenneth, this is why face-to-face meetings are important, to reduce misunderstandings. Christopher, Conwayne and Annie agree with Kenneth.
285.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they show the work. Kenneth agrees with James.
286.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that consortium meetings are to understand the work that people are doing. James and Annie agree with Kenneth.
287.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that they (technical partners) have had 6-months work on work package 3. Annie disagrees with Kenneth.
288.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said March. However, James disagrees saying that work package 3 started in December.
289.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that the prototype of the integration of the tool should be finished after 10 months, because this is at the end of July. James and Jack agree with Desmond.
290.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that this should be delivered at the end of July. James agrees with Desmond.
291.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if he could answer for Paul. Annie agrees with Desmond.
292.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond asked if they could input things in the windows. Annie disagrees with Desmond.
293.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that did not understand what Desmond meant.
294.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond asked if in their presentation they showed the code of the webpage. Annie disagrees with Desmond.
295.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie disagrees with Desmond. Desmond agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Desmond.
296.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that he still did not get what was being said.
297.	Evidence of no growth when Paul said that he still does not get what is being said.

298.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin raised her hand indicating that she would like to take the next turn to speak. Fabian agrees with Erin.
299.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said accessibility. Geoff agrees with Lucy.
300.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if they were talking about the evaluation of the accessibility tool. Geoff agrees with Mary.
301.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary said that this is covered by work package 5. Geoff disagrees with Mary.
302.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that it is validating web pages. Mary agrees with Geoff.
303.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the tool has to be able to validate other web pages. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
304.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said and not just report on the accessibility of webpages. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
305.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said he had some questions to ask, saying that they were only told about HTML. Erin agrees with Desmond.
306.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James asked if he meant considered their format. Desmond neither agrees nor disagrees with James saying that he did not understand what was said.
307.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said HTML is correct.
308.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said they tried to develop a VoiceXML tool. Kenneth agrees with Desmond.
309.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that to open a document it does not need grammar. Desmond agrees with Geoff.
310.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that this was a complex area and to say that you will handle grammar files is complex in its own right. Geoff disagrees with Kenneth.
311.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentioned own grammars. Annie agrees with Kenneth that you can create your own grammar.
312.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said as the designer of the webpage. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
313.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that this was not included in the list of things and that it would be useful to have what was said written up in some form. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed and Annie agree with Kenneth.
314.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that they will have to think as what was said were just ideas. Kenneth agrees with Geoff.
315.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that this takes time. James agrees with Geoff.
316.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to inform them beforehand if the team expect to see something so that they can prepare for it. Paul agrees with Annie.
317.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he wants to understand the scope of what the technical partners are doing and that they are not being asked to do anything extra. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
318.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that since they are developers they feel that things are more likely to understand a prototype instead of writing something for people to read. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
319.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that most of the people are there from user groups are from development organisations as well, so they do understand the technical side, but not in the same level of detail ass the technicians. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
320.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when James said that regarding work package 3, the prototype of the integration of the plug-in of the tool has to be delivered by July. Also that partner 2 will circulate a version by the 20th of July. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
321.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *1* sent by Charles with the current version of the requirements for the authoring tool. Message *7* sent by Adam with comments and with the priority levels assigned. Message *10* sent by Adam answering the questions raised by Charles. <Message *11* sent by Annie with a summary of the focus on the web authoring tool. Message *12* sent by Kenneth thanking Annie for the document, also raising concerns that this was not the same version as that presented during the face-to-face meeting. M<Essage *13* sent by Charles referencing the document that was sent by Annie. Message *14* sent by Annie explaining how the list of the requirements for the authoring tool evolved. Message *16* sent by Charles with the fourth version of the requirements attached to the message. Message *24* sent by Charles answering the questions on work packages 1 and 3, which were raised by Erin.
322.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that Christopher was unable to come to this meeting as he is on his wedding. Jack agrees with Annie.
323.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack agrees with Annie that Christopher was unable to come to this meeting as he is on his wedding. Annie agrees with Jack, saying that Christopher got married last week.
324.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if the prototype is going to be distributed by the technical partners. Annie agrees with Mary.
325.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they hope to distribute the prototype by the end of the month, because this is what was included in the planification. Mary agrees with Annie.
326.	Evidence of mutual belief when Marty asks if they (technical partners) will able to do that. Annie agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Annie.
327.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that now they need to have many things installed on their computer and that it is quite difficult to build auto-executable tables. Also, that they are building the auto-executable tables and will distribute it by the end of the month. Mary agrees with Annie.
328.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that he has quickly read the plug-in dossier document. Annie agrees with Adam.
329.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said he thinks it is the recognition. Annie disagrees with Jack.
330.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said using it. Annie agrees with Adam.
331	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the VoiceXML document could have the same text and content as the webpage. Adam agrees with Annie.
332.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks if they meant the application. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
333.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that most voice recognition for more complex operations is now beginning to move forward from natural language because that means that the user does not have to remember that many things. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
334.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said for that evening they have prepared a presentation with a list of basic functions of the tool and she feels that this will cover that. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
335.	Evidence eof mutual belief when Annie said that she could show it now, but that she thinks it will be better in the evening. Mary agrees with Annie.
336.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam mentions what he read in the plug-in dossier. Annie agrees with Adam.
337.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they have to download Viavoice, because part of Viavoice is very big. Adam agrees with Annie.
338.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Adam asks if they have to buy Viavoice. Annie disagrees with Adam.
339.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they do not need to buy Viavoice. Adam agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Adam.
340.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Adam asked if the user would have to pay for it (Viavoice). Annie disagrees with Adam.
341.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam asks if they will have to teach Viavoice. Annie agre4es with Adam.
342.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that you would have to train the r3econgition. Mary agrees with Annie.
343.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that related to work package 3, that afternoon they have a demonstration of the prototype configuration and after that some demos of the different functionality's of the stylesheets and the integration of

	voice. Annie agrees with Jack.
344.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks if they need to see that in the prototype. Jack agrees with Annie.
345.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they are going to show a demo. Charles agrees with Jack.
346.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said that they have spoken to Michael and they will show them some of this work. Jack agrees with the translator.
347.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator was asking if they would be able to download from the website. Annie disagrees with the translator.
348.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if there is a developer. Annie agrees with Jack.
349.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that it is the biggest part of Viavoice. Jack agrees with Annie.
350.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said that something that has already Viavoice needs to do something. Annie disagrees with Jack.
351.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that you need to download Conpalabras. Ronnie agrees with Annie.
352.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie talks about events and actions Ronnie agrees with Annie.
353.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks if that was Ronnie's question. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
354.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said the Compalabras engine as was explained in the morning. Ronnie agrees with Annie.
355.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said Jaws. Annie agrees with Mary.
356.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said most was the screen reader, but some was Jaws. Annie agrees with Jack.
357.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said version 4. Annie agrees with Mary.
358.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they have version 4 because they did not buy it. Mary agrees with Annie.
359.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he would like to hear from the users how it looks, feels and sounds, and if it is an improvement of the previous version now that they have compatibility. Mary agrees with Jack.
360.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said that he would like to hear from the users how it looks, feels and sounds and if it is an improvement of the previous version. Kenneth said that it was difficult to have an opinion on two short demonstrations.
361.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it was difficult to have an opinion on two short demonstrations. Also, that it would have been nice to see a live demo. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
362.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that there was a lot of repetition and that it kept on saying tag. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
363.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that was the screen reader. Jack agrees with Annie.
364.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said when it was saying tab. Kenneth agrees with Annie
365.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it was certainly the screen reader which was speaking and it was the arrangement of the pages that was causing it to say that. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
366.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said it is important to make sure that the content does not force the repetition Jack agrees with Kenneth.
367.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that he would be interested to hear from those that could not see if they could understand what was going on. Morris neither agreed nor disagreed, instead saying that it was very difficult for him to say because he was not eligible.
368.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Morris said how could you select a key that includes colour. Jack disagrees with Morris and said arrow, not colour.
369.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said arrow. Annie and Morris agree with Jack. Jack agrees with them too.
370.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asked if they meant the manual. The translator for Michael disagreed with Annie, saying the method, not the manual.
371.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he will try and translate the question of the translator and he thinks that he understands what they are asking for and is one of the questions he had. How much of the control of the application will be through voice and how much will be through other methods? Morris and the translator agree with Kenneth.
372.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that the interaction does not rely on voice. Hazel disagrees and asks why not because that is what she thought was part of what they were doing.
373.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she couldn't just sit there and say table and the table will be brought up. Annie agrees with Hazel.
374.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said it is the trigger action. Annie gave some examples too. Hazel agrees with Annie.
375.	Evidence eof mutual belief when Annie said that actions will be triggered with common keys or buttons and trigger actions. Hazel and Mary agree with Annie.
376.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asked if they were the only voice actions on the active page. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
377.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth asked if they could not say table if that was not one of the active buttons on the page. Annie disagrees with Kenneth.
378.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that just as short keys are attached to a certain window, these are attached to a certain framework. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
379.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that he couldn't say at some point you want to insert a table. Annie said that it would depend, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with Kenneth.
380.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said for example, if you were consulting the manual and you said insert table, and then that would not make sense. Hazel and Kenneth agree with Annie.
381.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they may say anything, voice commands and the list of commands will be described and will do it. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
382.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel gave an example, saying that if they do not want to use buttons because they do not want to use a mouse, but they are in a menu and have wizards. Annie agrees with hazel.
383.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said it she could say insert table or form or whatever and then she would proceed to the dialogue box. Annie and Kenneth agree with Annie.
384.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she would then have the available commands. Annie agrees with hazel.
385.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to imagine you are over in the and Wizard says to insert this. Hazel agrees with Annie.
386.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asked if it does not make sense. Hazel disagrees with Annie saying that it was ok.
387.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel disagrees with Annie saying that it was ok what was said. Kenneth agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
388.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked when they were demonstrating the end result of developing the HTML code or the grammar and they had to go and open another window. Annie agrees with Mary.
389.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asked how that would be implemented. Annie disagrees with Mary.
390.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that what Mary said will be built in. Mary agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Mary.
391.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they do not have the parser but they will. Also, saying that in the application there will be an open dialogue box and it will open the grammar file. Mary agrees with Annie.
392.	Evidence eof mutual belief when Jack said maybe in the same way that blind people can navigate. Mary agrees with Jack.
393.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said maybe the user has to have in mind what wizards he has opened or where he is. Hazel and Kenneth agree with Jack.
394.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said like in a map. Annie, Kenneth and Hazel agree with Jack.

395.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he did not know how but for there to be something to remind. Also, that he has seen it in the name of the Window. Annie agrees with Jack.
396.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said it was more or less like a directory. Annie and Hazel agree with Jack.
397.	Evidence of mutual belief when he said that maybe the user can be lost. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
398.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that it could be fixed. Mary agrees with Annie.
399.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said otherwise it would be confused. Hazel agrees with Annie.
400.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they would like to use wizards. Jack and Hazel agree with Annie.
401.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that things like that (wizards) they would like to use. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
402.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that if you want to do something else, the application will remind you that something is open and to save it. Jack and Mary agree with Annie.
403.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that is ok until you have embedded areas and that is when you may want to potentially embed elements in another. Annie and Jack agree with Kenneth.
404.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said to insert another embedded object. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
405.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they were thinking in what way they could show the page. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
406.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to show the page in a separate element, so that the user can access each of the elements separately. Mary agrees with Annie.
407.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are still figuring out how to do this. Mary and Kenneth agree with Annie.
408.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that it is difficult. Kenneth and Mary agree with Annie.
409.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that if they are thinking about that it is in the right direction. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
410.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that if they are thinking about it, it is in the right direction. Annie neither agrees nor disagrees with hazel, saying that she does not know.
411.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she does not know. Mary agrees with Annie.
412.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they know it needs to be accessible. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
413.	#Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that what screen readers normally have is a command with which you can bring all the hyperlinks in one list and can probably have a similar function to the main elements. Hazel agrees with Annie.
414.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary adds to what she said same elements as well. Annie agrees with Mary.
415.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that something which worries her is how the user will have the list of elements and do not know how they are arranged. Mary agrees with Annie.
416.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she is talking about on the page. Kenneth agrees with Mary.
417.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks how they can tell the user no, asking if they have any ideas. Mary agrees with Annie.
418.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that not all website palettes have a name. Mary agrees with Geoff.
419.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Geoff continued his presentation in Spanish. Jack disagrees with Geoff, asking him to speak in English instead.
420.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks Geoff to speak in English. Annie agrees with Jack.
421.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator said he asked for Emmanuel. Elsie disagrees with the translator, saying it is Elsie.
422.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said that it is Elsie not Emmanuel. The translator agrees with Elsie.
423.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said that she (Elsie) is very nice to read the report. Elsie agrees with the translator.
424.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie asks if it is easier for her to go to the translator. The translator agrees with Elsie.
425.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said website. Elsie agrees with the translator.
426.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said that they have to try and show them an example Hazel and Elsie agree with the translator.
427.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said you can decide to divide the first column into two or three columns. Also that you can insert text. The translator agrees with Elsie.
428.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said that this was an example. Elsie agrees with the translator, saying that it is a very small example.
429.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he has one question. The translator agrees with Jack.
430.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that maybe this question is more for work package 1. Mary agrees with Jack.
431.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said most of what is presented was information that was in D1.1. Jack and Mary agree with Hazel.
432.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said D1.1 was circulated a few weeks ago. Also, that it would have been good if they could have used that information in their presentation, but it did not look like they did. Mary agrees with Hazel.
433.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said that to realise the interface, knowing without what the project will do is not easy. Also, it is impossible to build an interface without knowing what the program will do. Mary and Hazel agree with the translator.
434.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that blind users want to learn HTML. The translator agrees with Hazel.
435.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator said that learning HTML is programming and the users would not want to do this. Kenneth disagrees with the translator.
436.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said users want to learn HTML. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
437.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator asks if blind people want to learn HTML. Hazel agrees with the translator.
438.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the users are not programmer, but they can learn and have learnt using the tools which are there to support them. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
439.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator asked if maybe the users work with other people. Hazel and Kenneth disagree with the translator.
440.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator said that the content type is not necessary to be a programmer. Hazel disagrees with the translator.
441.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator asked if then you do not need another program with the editor. Kenneth agrees with the translator.
442.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator asks if the users are experts. Hazel disagrees with the translator.
443.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the users are not expert. Kenneth agrees with Kenneth.
444.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that some meta codes as described by Annie earlier on, with the wizards are a meta code. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
445.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if you do not describe something as a radio button, you will have a great problem talking about it to someone else. There is agreement in the background.
446.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel provides an example. Jack and Annie agree with hazel.
447.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when she thought let's do it with the wizard first and to see how it does. Annie agrees with Hazel saying that they could do this.
448.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if they could do this as well. Kenneth agrees with Hazel. Annie also agrees, saying this is because they have access. Kenneth agrees with Annie.
449.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel asks if they could do that (what Annie described). Annie agrees with hazel.
450.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she finds it harder. Hazel agrees with Annie.

451.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that it seems like the wizards are addressing the problem, that if you do not want to use the HTML code, you can do it with the wizards. Kenneth and Annie agree with Hazel.
452.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if the wizards just ask you for that piece of information. Annie agrees with Hazel.
453.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if the wizard really asks some thing when translating HTML. Mary agrees with Hazel.
454.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if the wizard is like a human. Annie agrees with Hazel.
455.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator said what has been said is not the picture in Verona. He said maybe the users are more expert in England.
456.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said that mental extraction is very difficult. Hazel agrees with the translator.
457.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she agrees that there is still a problem of what the exact layout will look like. The translator agrees with Hazel.
458.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said it depends on the market that you are aiming for. Annie agrees with Hazel.
459.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they (technical people) need to be careful about the graphical layout, because it is those pages on the web which have a strong graphical layout, which cause the most problems when users decide to change the size of the font or other things in the browser. Annie agrees with Kenneth.
460.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth continues talking about the graphical user interface. The translator agrees with Kenneth.
461.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said that the point of view of the blind in Verona is the same as what Kenneth just said. Kenneth agrees with the translator.
462.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asked if it was the document which Elsie read. The translator disagrees with Annie saying it was a report, not just a document.
463.	Evidence of mutual belief when The translator said that if they try and use the prototype they can try and get an idea or some other solution of what they need. Hazel agrees with the translator.
464.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned the iterative development. Annie agrees with Hazel.
465.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if it is the evaluation. Hazel and Annie agree with Jack.
466.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles spoke about separating the content from the layout. The translator agrees with Charles.
467.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talks about the interface for work package 3. Annie agrees with Jack.
468.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that for the method they need to decide what the visually impaired users would like to have and not to have, and that is what they are asking for, to be told about their experienced. The translator agrees with Annie.
469.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when the translator cannot see the need to have other packages as MS Word can be used so why should they change to another package.
470.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *10* sent by Annie, addressed to Michael, but sent to the team saying that she was re-sending the description of work package 3 to them in case they did not receive it before.
471.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *4* sent by Annie with a preliminary version of the technical work for work package 3. Message *8* sent by Annie informing the team that the plan for work package 3 must now be realised. Message *15* sent by Annie informing the team of the re-schedule with partners 1 and 2
472.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *11* sent by Annie with guidelines that the technical partners are going to use.

Work package 4

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said he urges as he did in Madrid a few weeks ago that they either drop the web-authoring tool idea all together or to at least put it in the back burner and to really do something in order to move the project more forward and to give more importance to the e-learning part of the project. Kenneth disagrees with Paul saying that they have signed up to a project.
2	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that is not how European Union projects work. Ronnie and Ben agree with Kenneth.
3.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that when they are talking about user needs, she is surprised that they do not speak about user needs for e-learning. There is agreement in the background.
4.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she has been considering user needs for e-learning for visually impaired people and that this will be presented tomorrow. Lucy and Ronnie agree with Hazel.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that if they are going to make a demonstration they will need some e-learning to demonstrate. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
6.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that e-learning content is going to be demonstrated in the project. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
7.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Kenneth said that he could see no reason why work package 1 cannot extend the investigation into e-learning or to bring the start date of work package 4 forward. This is because there wad no other evidence found to suggest otherwise.
8.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he sees the important concern that they have the e-learning content. Lucy agrees with Paul.
9.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that if they are going to have a review at month 12 of a 27-month project, they ought to have something to demonstrate in terms of e-learning content or to have some concrete plans to demonstrate soon after that. Ronnie and Paul agree with Hazel.
10.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that work package 4 starts around month 8 but they feel they need to start work on it earlier. Hazel agrees with Morris.
11.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said why should the London Society for the Blind give access to their e-learning system when they are not in the project and it is already accessible. Morris agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Morris.
12.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie talks about changes. Hazel agrees with Ronnie saying that she sees it as a question of transferring man months from work package 6 to work package 4 and or work package 1. Also, saying that as long as there is agreement from everyone in the consortium this should not be a problem. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
13.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they are not asking for an increase and that it must be an official decision. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
14.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if everyone agrees. There is agreement in the background.
15.	Evidence of mutual beleuif when Jack said that they will need to produce a document to say this decision has been made and that everyone will need to sign it. Agreement in the background and Ronnie agrees to it as well.
16.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel reported that 85% produced their e-learning content in Word. Desmond agrees with Hazel.
17.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel said that one of the key principles of e-learning activities is that it must be highly interactive. Desmond, Kenneth and Elsie agree with Hazel.
18.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the critics of Frontpage argue that it does not have e-learning support, but they are still to validate this. Desmond agrees with Hazel.
19.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentions areas that they should look at. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
20.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that would be an advantage. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
21.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said that he does not know if you can find people that are interested in it. Hazel agrees with Ben.
22.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy said that she does not think she will be able to find people who are interested in learning how to use XML.
23.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy said that she does not think she will be able to find people who are interested in learning how to use XML. Hazel disagrees with Lucy.
24.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy mentions areas that she thinks she might be able to find people that are interested in. Ben agrees with Lucy.
25.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that she would not be able to find people interested in using computers. Ben, Jonathan, Fabian and Annie agree with Lucy.
26.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that is a double handicap. Hazel agrees with Lucy.
27.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that when they have been looking at work package 4, one of the difficulties that they have found is finding the right e-learning content. Desmond agrees with Morris.
28.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris provides an example of learning a foreign language. Also, that there is one foreign language learning course online. Hazel agrees with Morris.
29.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said pronounced. Morris agrees with Hazel.
30.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they need to provide something which is missing in life. Hazel agrees with Morris.
31.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposed conducting a survey on educational needs. Ben agrees with Hazel.
32.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan said that they have changed the structure of the duration of the months for work packages because work package 4 must begin sooner. Lucy agrees with Jonathan.
33.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they have been preparing for the first stage. Also, that it is now clear that they can start work and hire someone to work more effectively on the project. Jonathan agrees with Morris.
34.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asked if they could use already existing content. Jonathan agrees with Morris.
35.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that what they can do for them in Leuven is to take the content and to covert it into VoiceXML. Jonathan agrees with Charles.
36.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles spoke about VoiceXML dialogues. Kenneth agrees with Charles.
37.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said they are going to need to understand what VoiceXML gives and where its constraints lie. Jonathan, Hazel and Charles agree with Kenneth.
38.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan asked if they were talking about the pre-prototype. Hazel, Annie and Jonathan agrees with Jonathan.
39.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jonathan asked if that was the portal. Hazel disagrees saying that it is not even the portal, it is a little bit of code, similar to what Charles had shown.
40.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan asked if it was like a lesson. Hazel agrees with Jonathan.
41.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that this is just showing the principles. Annie agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Annie.
42.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel said that it could be tiny fragments. Annie agrees wit Hazel.
43.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel said that she though each user partner can conduct 12-20 short questions. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
44.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she does not know how easy or difficulty the proposed task is going to be. Elsie agrees with Hazel.
45.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if Desmond has a blind programmer working with them at the moment. Desmond

	agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Desmond.
46.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *6* sent by Thomas with a document that had his first impressions of e-learning. Message *25* sent by Hazel acknowledging the suggestions Desmond gave. Messages *42* and *43* sent by Mary with a draft on the features of the e-learning authoring tool. These two messages had identical contents. Message *45* sent by Hazel a draft on the problems of access to dialogue and digital resources for visually impaired students.
47.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie mentioned aspects which were not clear to him. Also when he asked if the pages existed already or not. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
48.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said to have one page that is accessible to show. Ronnie agrees with James.
49.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if they have to have the whole software developed. James agrees with Ronnie.
50.	Evidence eof mutual belief when James asks what format they are going to provide the content, asking if it was going to be HTML. Annie agrees with James.
51.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if they want to identify a page which is already there. James agrees with Paul.
52.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they want to take an already existing page to see if it is accessible or not. Fabian and Hazel agree with Paul.
53.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that they could provide pages too. However, Jack disagrees saying that for the next 3-months they will only have one page.
54.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that for the next 3-months they will only have one page. Hazel agrees with Jack.
55.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asks if Hazel is the volunteer. Hazel disagrees with Jack.
56.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that she thought they wanted many volunteers. Jack disagrees with hazel.
57.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he is happy with the way that things are (only to have one page). Hazel agrees with Jack.
58.	Evidence of mutual beleuif when Hazel said at the end. Jack agrees with Hazel.
59.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said to take the partner 7 page. Hazel agrees with Paul.
60.	Evidence of mutual belefi when Morris said that they just want to know what is expected from them as the page is already there. James agrees with Morris.
61.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul mentioned the HTML page. James, Annie and Desmond agrees with Paul.
62.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks with VoiceXML content. Paul agrees with James and James agrees with Paul.
63.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie indicated that he would like to say something next. He mentioned the partner 7 webpage. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
64.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if the languages of the partners are going to be included, giving examples of some of the languages which should be included. James agrees with Ronnie.
65.	Evidence of mutual belief when James mentioned from his point of view to have the webpage accessible by different languages. Elsie agrees with James.
66.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that she share the prepared document with them now. Ronnie disagrees with Annie.
67.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that now it is English and Spanish only. Ronnie agrees with Annie.
68.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the first sample would be in English. He wanted a decision to be taken James and Annie agree with Ronnie.
69.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if it will be on partner 7's webpage and will done by the co-operation of all the user organisations. James agrees with Ronnie.
70.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Elsie proposes herself to do something, even though she is not a technician. Ronnie disagrees with Elsie.
71.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if what he said was ok for Germany. Paul agrees with Ronnie and Ronnie agrees with Paul.
72.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he needed some clarification, that if he understood correctly, they were talking about taking one existing page which is already on the partner 7 website. There is agreement in the background.
73.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that if he understood correctly they wanted just one language for the first cloud for the first 3-months. James agrees with Morris.
74.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that later on they would need to have all of the partner languages to be represented. James, Ronnie and Fabian agree with Paul.
75.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she thinks that the results from the evaluation can feed into the development of the portal. Also, the e-learning portal could provide the technical partners as to what the plug-in could provide. Christopher agrees with Mary.
76.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary mentions improving the interaction. Hazel agrees with Mary.
77.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie asked if it would be useful for them to have this presentation. Hazel disagrees with Annie.
78.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel said that it would be useful for them to have the e-learning courses. Annie agrees with Hazel.
79.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they are not just websites, they are e-learning courses which must be paid for, but are not very expensive. Mary agrees with Hazel.
80.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said it cost them $110 dollars. Hazel agrees with Mary.
81.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if this was for each course. Hazel agrees with Mary.
82	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said by this they could really get to the e-learning functionality. Annie agrees with Hazel, so do others in the background.
83.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to look at the problems and to see how voice could do it better as she believes this could be the solution. Annie agrees with Hazel.
84.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she has some solutions to the problems. Hazel agrees with Annie.
85.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks for this presentation to make preparations. Hazel and Mary agree with Annie.
86.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they would transfer it. Annie agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Annie.
87.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asks if you buy the courses for one year. Mary agrees with Thomas.
88.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said you get 80 courses. Hazel agrees with Mary. Also, Annie agrees with Hazel.
89.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said how could they pay for the courses as they do not have this accountable in the budget. James agrees with Lucy.
90.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that what she proposes seems a way. Paul agrees with Lucy.
91.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy asks if she can write to the co-ordinator of the project asking for some money. Paul disagrees with Lucy.
92.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy indicates that she would like to speak. Paul agrees with Lucy that she can go first.
93.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asked if they had the contract for the Mindleaders course. Mary agrees with James.
94.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that it was said that it is not necessary to buy some of the courses. Also, that partners 1 and 2 have signed a collaboration agreement some time ago to commercialise the e-learning contents. Mary agrees with James.
95.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that he had to view the current situation on the collaboration agreement with the leader of partner 1. Mary and Hazel agree with James.
96.	Evidence eof mutual belief when James mentioned what they have to review. Mary agrees with James.
97.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said they are looking at varying the courses and the reasons for doing so. Hazel agrees with Mary.

98.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they are doing this to get a broader view of the problems. Annie and Hazel agree with Mary.
99.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that if everyone looks at the Mindleaders course they will come up with the same problems. Hazel agrees with Mary.
100.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they want a variety of problems. Elsie agrees with Mary.
101.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that is one of the points which need to be beard in mind. James agrees with Mary.
102.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they are going to review the current situation. Mary and Hazel agree with James.
103.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul mentions getting generalised results. James agrees with Paul.
104.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that he is not sure he exactly understands what was said, neither agreeing nor disagreeing with what has been said.
105.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that what was agreed that morning was to make the partner 7 page accessible. Mary agrees with James.
106.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said he does not know if there is any other possibility or alternative.
107.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone in the team whose identity was not revealed said portal. Lucy and James agree with them.
108.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said month 12. Mary agrees with James.
109.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said to show the commission in July. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with James.
110.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asks about the content. James agrees with Thomas.
111.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said as they said that morning they are going to collaborate with partner 7. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with James.
112.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that after would add any additional features for e-learning. Mary agrees with James.
113.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asks if partner 7's page is going to be accessible by voice. James agrees with Thomas.
114.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they have to create an e-learning portal and talking about finding contents for the portal. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Paul.
115.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that if he understood the contract correctly partner 1 will have to design the e-learning portal. James agrees with Paul.
116.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that it is a 27-month project and they will have to cover some functionality's in the early demo for month 12. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with James.
117.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that she did not catch well what was just said. Asking if they had said that they would ask the commission to begin work 2 or 3 months before for the preparation of the portal. James agrees with Lucy.
118.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if they should write an official letter with agreement of all of the partners. James agrees with Lucy.
119.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said that he cannot remember if in the last quarterly report they told the commission about this change, starting work on work package 4 earlier.
120.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentioned informing the commission. Lucy agrees with Jack.
121.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that it is not a formal change to the contract.
122.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it is not a formal change to the contract. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
123.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said to start on some work earlier than planned is not a problem. Jack and Lucy agree with Kenneth.
124.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that you inform the commission of this change the quarterly report. Kenneth agrees with Jack. James agrees too.
125.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if there are any additional questions. Thomas agrees with James that he has a question to ask about the portal.
126.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that he does not know if he is answering the question which is being asked or not.
127.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that say after two weeks they have solved the problem of translating partner 7's page into voice. Also, when she said that they would put an e-learning exercise on their presentation. James agrees with Lucy.
128.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that she does not think what is being said addresses the problem.
129.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she does not think that what is being discussed addresses the problem. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
130.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said for partner 2 to look at the problems and to suggest solutions to them. The webpage for partner 7 was mentioned as well. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
131.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes to look at a number of e-learning courses, problems they have and proposing solutions to those problems. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Hazel.
132.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris raised his hand to draw attention to the fact that he would like to take the next turn to speak. James agrees with Morris's request and Morris agrees with James that he can take the next turn to speak.
133.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said VoiceXML. Morris agrees with Lucy.
134.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said it is not just a website it is an e-learning site. Annie and Paul agree with Hazel.
135.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks if the users are going to use the e-learning courses. Hazel agrees with Annie.
136.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if what has been said would be a good compromise. Hazel disagrees with Morris.
137.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to use already existing contents. Lucy and Morris agree with Hazel.
138.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said e-learning sites. Morris agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Morris.
139.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie indicated that she had a question to ask. James agrees with Elsie.
140.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie asked if the e-learning sites which were examined were already accessible. Mary and Hazel agree with Elsie. Elsie agrees with them too.
141.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that some of the issues which Mary realised in her presentation were to do with the poor use of HTML. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
142.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said not necessarily an issue that VoiceXML can help with. Hazel and Elsie agree with Kenneth.
143.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said if they could redesign some of the HTML, things would be better. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
144.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said to identity a problem. Hazel disagrees with Kenneth, saying that a number of problems need to be identified, not just one.
145.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said a number of problems. Mary agrees with Hazel.
146.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that not problems simply because of the e-learning material that they have got at the moment.
147.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that not problems because of the e-learning material that they have got at the moment. Hazel, Mary and Elsie agree with Kenneth.
148.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes that she thinks the solution and the way forward is for everyone in the project to have access to the e-learning, to see it and to apply the WAI guidelines. Mary and Kenneth agree with Kenneth.
149.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned if a problem was not made WAI conformant was that the actual problem.

	Annie agrees with Hazel.
150.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that at the review if they had a set of allegedly accessible e-learning materials. Elsie agrees with Hazel.
151.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they do not have to offer a voice solution to every problem that they find. Annie and Elsie agree with Hazel.
152.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentions the task that they are talking about. Hazel agrees with Kenneth
153.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said because something is accessible, it does not mean that it is suitable for learning. Annie and hazel agree with Kenneth.
154	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that even it was accessible, did it support the user in learning. Annie agrees with Hazel.
155.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel questions if voice can better support the user in learning. James and Adam agree with Hazel
156.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam proposes a solution. Hazel agrees with Adam.
157.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she told Mary not to let users use an e-learning course which was completely inaccessible. Mary agrees with Hazel.
158.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentions letting users in the project team test the courses. Mary and Annie agree with Hazel.
159.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that this was a complementary activity. Mary agrees with Hazel.
160.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if the technical work of the deliverables will be done by partners 1 and 2. Annie agrees with James.
161.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they now need to decide on what website that they wanted tested Hazel agrees with Morris.
162.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that he thinks across the board it has been said that the site should be an e-learning one.
163.	Evidence eof mutual beleuif when Morris asks Hazel if the findings from he short survey can be transferred across the different countries. Hazel agrees with Morris.
164.	Evidence of mutual belief when hazel said that they are not just talking about testing one website, they want to test a number of courses. Fabian agrees with Hazel.
165.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that there is going to be an e-learning portal. Charles, Fabian, Christopher, Lucy and Morris agree with Hazel.
166.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when someone in the team whose identity was not revealed said portal. However, Hazel disagrees saying gateway instead.
167.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she did not see it as a problem to be using other people's contents at the moment. Desmond agrees with hazel.
168.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she did not think that there was any other way in the time that they have. Morris agrees with Hazel.
169.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel asked if what was said was a demonstration of e-learning. Ronnie disagrees with Hazel.
170.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris raised an issue that they need to discuss. James agrees with Morris.
171.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that the first thing to agree on is what is going to be the first real case that they are going to show to the commission. Hazel agrees with James.
172.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that like that morning his suggestion is to have a view to create a webpage accessible for people using voice technology. Lucy agrees with James.
173.	Evidence of mutual belief when James agrees with Paul that he can take the next turn to speak.
174.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said he agrees to stick to that morning's decision. James agrees with Paul.
175.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel suggests if there could be an extra page put on partner 7's website to show the beginnings of what an e-learning portal would look like. Paul and Annie agree with Hazel. Also, Hazel agrees with them too.
176.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said to use Mindleaders as they are. Hazel and James agree with Jack.
177.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said like the kind of work which has to be developed in the second year. Hazel agrees with James.
178.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said even though they had problems with Mindleaders people could still use the course; whereas with some web e-learning sites, visually impaired people could not use them at all. Mary agrees with Hazel.
179.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel spoke about having a relationship with Mindleaders. Mary agrees with Hazel.
180.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they had a relationship. Hazel agrees with James.
181.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if they should continue to look at e-learning and take time to see if it is interesting for blind people or not. James, Fabian, Jack and Ronnie agree with Lucy.
182.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said the decision of tomorrow morning. Ronnie disagreed saying this morning.
183.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that it would be interesting to consider the proposal of Hazel in order to show one additional page which can be considered to take for the future e-learning capabilities of the portal what they are going to develop. Hazel agrees with James.
184.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that he thinks the results will be validated by users or the user organisations. James agrees with Morris.
185.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie spoke about security. James agrees with Ronnie.
186.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Morris said that he did not agree with what was said by James.
187.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said as the co-ordinator he has the contacts. Ronnie agrees with Paul.
188.	Evidence of mutual belief when James summarises the responsibility. Paul agrees with James.
189.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he just wanted to clarify things. James agrees with Paul and Paul agrees with James.
190.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that Adam's presentation was about e-learning. Adam and Thomas agree with Jack.
191.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks Thomas if he will present his results. Thomas agrees with Lucy.
192.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said encyclopaedia. Desmond agrees with Adam and Adam agrees with Desmond.
193.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that you have to make the site accessible. Desmond agrees with Adam.
194.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam spoke about some of the problems with sites. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Adam.
195.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that the public domain is no longer under copyright. Adam agrees with Paul.
196.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said methodology. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Adam.
197.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said what types of things you can find. Desmond agrees with Adam.
198.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that you could now get French enclylopedia which is a recent finding. Desmond and Annie agree with Adam.
199.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that the last category they looked at was training at business and employees. Desmond agrees with Adam.
200.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that was all for typologies. Thomas agrees with Adam.
201.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul proposes to add the enclyopedia entry straight away. Thomas agrees with Paul.

202.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks about virtual libraries. Paul agrees with Morris.
203.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said to make use of what is already there so they do not have to make their own. Lucy agrees with Paul.
204.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if they have links. Paul agrees with Lucy.
205.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if they can introduce an input in the study they are carrying out. Mary agrees with James.
206.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that he was not sure if he had an answer at that time.
207.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Adam mentioned one category. Mary disagreed with Adam saying you should look at a number of categories.
208.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes to return to the discussion when they are fresh in the morning. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
209.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas spoke about image maps. Mary agrees with Thomas.
210.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas spoke abut how to get contents and to make the web portal more interesting. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
211.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said users. Thomas and Hazel agree with Ronnie.
212.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas said seven. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
213.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel indicated to Paul that she quickly wanted to say something. Paul agrees with Hazel.
214.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes that they put the seven onto the portal immediately. Thomas agrees with Hazel.
215.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that this is because they worked. There was agreement in the background.
216.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul asked if the screen reader that they used to assess the sites was BrailleNet software. Adam disagrees with Paul.
217.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said he thinks it was Braille. Paul agrees with Adam.
218.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that he thinks the limit of the test is a problem. Desmond agrees with Adam.
219.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond said that they still do not understand what is being said, so they can neither agree nor disagree with what has been said.
220.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if the accessibility was in all priorities of WAI for three times the criteria. Adam agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Adam.
221.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked if they were talking about web tools. Thomas agrees with Desmond.
222.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks if they are referring to Jaws. Paul agrees with Hazel.
223.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that Jaws had the new virtual; cursor built in. Hazel agrees with Paul.
224.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to the best level that you might expect from Jaws. Paul agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Paul.
225.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas said five in English and the languages that the virtual libraries were in. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
226.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said there are aspects of e-learning. Lucy agrees with Kenneth.
227.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentions voice. Hazel and Jack agree with Kenneth.
228.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that there are aspects of voice interactivity which is important. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
229.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that voice would help everyone. Hazel, Kenneth and Lucy agree with Jack.
230.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that what Jack had said was ok.
231.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentioned another advantage is that it is not just for blind people it is for everyone. Hazel agrees with Jack.
232.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said to take the page of partner 7 and to put voice. Ronnie disagrees with Jack saying that would not be very interesting.
233.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said to take the page of partner 7 and to put voice to it would not be very interesting. Lucy agrees with Ronnie.
234.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentions Mary's example. Mary agrees with Jack.
235.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that her and Mary need to find a number of examples like what have been shown. Annie and Lucy agree with Hazel. So do others in the background.
236.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said this one just came to mind. Mary agrees with Hazel.
237.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she still thinks that the webpage of partner 7 should be voicified. Annie agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Annie.
238.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they add another page to the partner 7 page. Paul and Annie agree with Hazel.
239.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the extra page would be the portal. Annie agrees with Hazel.
240.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel named some types of information which could be presented on the portal. Paul agrees with Hazel.
241.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to keep it multiple choice. Annie and Mary agree with Hazel.
242.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that this is the solution. Hazel agrees with Annie.
243.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that would be a good thing for the portal to have and to show at the review. Also, it would be good for the portal to have it in the long run. Paul agrees with Hazel.
244.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she now has a clearer idea and that it is more concrete to work on. Adding that it is not general as well. Hazel agrees with Annie.
245.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she wants to send them (Annie and colleagues) the videoclips but that she thinks that partner 9 should have them too. Mary agrees with Hazel.
246.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel added that all the user groups should look at the videoclips for their comments to be received as well. Annie agrees with Hazel.
247.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to look at the problems and to propose solutions. Hazel agrees with Annie.
248.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that if they (Annie and colleagues) want to use what they have they done, they could put it at their disposal. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
249.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said he had a draft. Ronnie agrees with Adam.
250.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said to work in the partner 7 portal using voice capabilities and to have another accessible e-learning page. Mary agrees with James.
251.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if this has to be ready for the submission to the commission in July. Hazel and Mary agree with James.
252.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that the starting point and the input is from partner 7. Hazel agrees with James.
253.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said the contributions will also be from partner 8. Annie and Hazel agree with James.
254.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said by Friday next week. Annie agrees with Hazel.
255.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they are discussing the technicality. Mary agrees with Hazel.
256.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said this is because they are on VHS tapes, but from now on they will them do them on digital tapes. Annie agrees with Hazel.
257.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said this is because it will be easier. Mary agrees with Hazel.
258.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will send VHS tapes to start with. Mary and Annie agree with Hazel.
259.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will make sure that they get some material. Annie agrees with Hazel.
260.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie mentioned the extension. James agrees with Ronnie.

261.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *8* sent by Adam informing the team that the portal was placed online. Message *16* sent by Hazel with comments on the portal. Message *17* sent by Adam reacting to Hazel's comments in message 16. Message *18* sent by Christopher listing what they were proposing to do.
262.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *10* sent by Jason informing the team of the interim report on e-learning he found. Message *29* sent by Mary with a report on the evaluations conducted at partner 8's organisation.
263.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Annie talks about work package 4 and who is involved in it. This is because there was no other evidence found to suggest otherwise.
264.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks a question on work package 4, saying that the portal pages were going to be developed using the authoring tool. Annie agrees with Mary.
265.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the pages that they are showing are not going to be the final ones. Mary agrees with Annie.
266.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are going to try and make sure that the needs of the portal are going to be fulfilled by the web authoring tool, but that this is complicated with how you want to move on with the work in the portal. Mary agrees with Annie.
267.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that she is not sure with the answer, as she is not sure with what the question is.
268.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks what is the question being asked. Also, when she said that she intended to say that. Morris agrees with Annie.
269.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they were studying the architecture of the portal in terms of how you can integrate voice on it and how voice can be useful. Morris agrees with Annie.
270.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if it should be a link to the partner 7 page. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Jack.
271.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if the e-learning portal part 3 will be the end result. Jack agrees with Morris.
272.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that were told that this would create some confusion and it does. Also, proposing that analysis is performed in more detail. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
273.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they were working on a portal with partner 7. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Ronnie.
274.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they have given their availability to put their work at the projects disposal to allow the team to benefit from it. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Ronnie and so does Annie.
275.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they (technical partners) could benefit from their work on the portal. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
276.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that she thinks that there has been a misunderstanding.
277.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they (technical partners) were doing research work which has been put forward by partner 8 and others. Also that this research should be the solution and should be used with existing work. Annie agrees with Ronnie and Ronnie agrees with Annie.
278.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that issues are now clarified. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
279.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if there are only two elements which will not be free. Annie agrees with Morris.
280.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the elements could be different. Morris agrees with Jack.
281.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if they are going to look at a voice-based e-learning portal, the most important thing will be around the learning experience. Lucy and Conwayne agree with Kenneth.
282.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they present everything visually so that people can see what is being shown. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
283.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that simply making a web page accessible does not make a learning page usable. Also, when he said that they were looking at designing interactions. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
284.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary mentioned things that are important to consider when developing the solutions. Annie agrees with Mary.
285.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks Mary to repeat what she just said. Mary agrees with Morris's request and repeats everything that she had just said.
286.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary spoke about looking at developing e-learning portals and material. Morris agrees with Mary.
287.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asked to be given a better understanding of what is more usable. Mary agrees with Annie.
288.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary mentioned that it is important to keep pages consistent from a usability perspective. Annie agrees with Mary.
289.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they did not spend time on consistency as already mentioned. Mary agrees with Annie.
290.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie mentioned those areas that she would need to change. Mary agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Mary.
291.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asks if the two pages are part of developing the e-learning portal. Annie disagrees with Mary.
292.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the two pages were just something to show what they could do and are available. Mary agrees with Annie.
293.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary suggests that it might be useful to the presentation to the commission to include in the e-learning portal examples that are connected to e-learning. Erin agrees with Mary.
294.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the examples that Annie is showing are not connected to e-learning and that that effort should be spent on developing the examples. Annie agrees with Mary.
295.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary said that the examples should be tied up with the main idea of the project. Annie disagrees with Annie.
296.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that there is no need to do this at this time. Mary agrees with Annie.
297.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that Annie said that the plug-in provides vice recognition. Annie agrees with Mary.
298.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if they were planning to develop examples that incorporate that feature. Annie agrees with Mary, Mary agrees with Annie and Annie agrees with Mary.
299.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they did not show all the examples that they made for the web authoring tool. Although they will recognise the voice Annie said that they decided not to show them as they are not very well done at the moment. Also, when Annie said that if you say OK is does the same action if you press the OK button. Mary agrees with Annie.
300.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they have got the design of an e-learning application and as Mary has been saying to produce a learning environment in which someone can gain some knowledge in some way. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
301.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack summarised some of the issues which were being shared and potential solutions to them. Mary agrees with Jack.
302.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asks if maybe that is the way. Kenneth disagrees with Jack.
303.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they are producing extra information in the voice which is not on the screen so it would not work. Jack agrees with Kenneth.

304.	Evidence of mutual belief wen Kenneth said that they need to be careful because for the validation if they go down that route and start asking about learnability for someone who is dependent on voice, that is one of the thing they know from some of the work that they have looked at for e-learning courses is that when they are accessible, it does not mean that they are learnable. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
305.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth gives as example of not being effective in the learning capability. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
306.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it is important that they produce something which is effective and not something which meet their needs as developers to achieve a solution. Lucy agrees with Kenneth.
307.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Kenneth said they are not moving beyond what screen reader technology will do and what screen reader technology will be doing in the very near future.
308.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they are not moving beyond what screen reader technology will do and what screen reader technology will be doing in the very near future. Paul agrees with Kenneth.
309.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack refers to Paul who would like to take the next turn to speak. Lucy agrees with Jack that Paul would like to take the next turn to speak.
310.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that it is a difficult question asked by Paul. The question was that they have to try and figure out do they want to try and use their screen reader technology with just a traditional VoiceXML assistance or do they want to switch of the screen reader completely and have a totally screen reader independent audio environment. Paul agrees with Morris.
311.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that he does not know if they agree that the general objective of the project must be to create a voice tool in order to facilitate the access of the Internet to the user, especially for the e-learning portal. Paul and Ronnie agree with James.
312.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks he does not know if his stand point is clear. Mary and James agree with Ronnie.
313.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James asks if everyone agrees, especially asking Kenneth. Kenneth disagrees with James, saying that he is not 100% certain.
314.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that one of the objectives of the project as it was agreed some time ago is the creation of an accessible portal showing the capabilities of the voice especially for e-learning functionality's. Kenneth agrees with James.
315.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that information was provided by members of the consortium, their friends from partner 9. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Paul.
316.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if default is the right word to use. Kenneth agrees with Morris. Other team members agree with Morris as well in the background.
317.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas mentioned 16 sites out of 75 were inaccessible. Morris agrees with Thomas.
318.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if she can ask a question. Morris agrees with Mary.
319.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they have WAI guidelines which are generally believed to be a bit complicated and that more user friendly guidelines have been developed in a number of countries. He also said that they based their rating system on the BrailleNet guidelines and that is how they developed it. Morris also said that the guidelines are developed in French and they look at aspects of the WAI guidelines. Mary agrees with Morris.
320.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth refers to something on the page, giving directions on the page. Mary said it was underneath and Morris agrees with Mary.
321.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Morris explained the choice of colours used was to suit Adam's need. Kenneth disagrees with Morris saying that he finds that very difficult to believe.
322.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if what has been said is clear. Kenneth agrees with Morris.
323.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it helps to demonstrate things and that it is important that those of things get dealt with. Morris agrees with Kenneth.
324.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said to just finish what he was saying when Desmond said he would like to ask a question. Desmond agrees with Morris.
325.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that there is always scope for improvement. Kenneth agrees with Morris.
326.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said he does not know the scope of improvement as he has not seen what the sylesheet is set up to be.
327.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he does not know the scope of improvement as he has not seen what the stylesheet is set up to be.
328.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that for someone who is sighted they want a fair amount of white background. Morris agrees with Kenneth.
329.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that he does not know how the portal was set up.
330.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asks if it is possible to set up pages where they stylesheet only affects part of the page and that is what concerns him. Morris agrees with Kenneth.
331.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond asks if they can be shown how to navigate. Thomas disagrees with Desmond.
332.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas said that it will be difficult for him to show the navigation as the keyboard is in Spanish. Desmond agrees with Thomas.
333.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said tomorrow. Morris agrees with Jack.
334.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary suggests the second slot, which is the discussion of work package 1. Jack agrees with Mary, Mary agrees with Jack and Mary agrees with Jack.
335.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said after the coffee break. Morris agrees with Jack.
336.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin asks would it be possible to use her own browser settings if she did not want to use the stylesheet. Also, when she asked if that would override all of the other settings including the menu settings. Morris agrees with Erin.
337.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Erin asks if they can demonstrate overriding other settings. Charles disagrees with Erin.
338.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said in England it would be Tools and Options. Fabian agrees with Erin.
339.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin explains how you can change the settings. Morris agrees with Erin.
340.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that the stylesheets are available, but you would not necessarily have to use them. Mary agrees with Morris.
341.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris explains how the link colours change and asks if what he has said makes sense. Kenneth agrees with Morris.
342.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth refers to something on the page. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
343.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said underneath an area on the page. Kenneth agrees with Mary.
344.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary finds what was being referred too. Kenneth agrees with Mary.
345.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary finds what was being referred too. Desmond agrees with Mary that it was not accessible.
346.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it seems that there is an area of background, no matter what you do it does not seem to change colour. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
347.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that the area of background that does not seem to change colour no matter what is done seems to suggest that it is a hard colour. Adam disagrees with Kenneth.
348.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if they have dark text they would always have that problem. Morris agrees with Kenneth. Adam agrees with Kenneth in the background too.

349.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth talks about what they have asked them to do. Morris disagrees with Kenneth saying that they are not in a position to do that there.
350.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that it is because they have been included in the design of the page. As already mentioned early on what they had in mind was to combine the accessibility and attractiveness of sighted people. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Morris.
351.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that means that page is inherently inaccessible. Morris agrees with Kenneth.
352.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that Charles had a question. Charles agrees with Lucy.
353.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they must fix part of the background. Adam agrees with Kenneth.
354.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that you could use your own parameters. Mary agrees with Morris.
355.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said to customise. Morris and Mary agree with Annie.
356.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that after the meeting in Paris he though that the technical partners would be integrating voice as an example in the partner 7 page. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Jack.
357.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asks in relation to what Jack said would that be implemented using the plug-in. Jack disagrees with Mary.
358.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said what Mary said would not be implemented using the plug-in because it is totally independent. Therefore the idea was that they would be implementing the plug-in over an existing page, which was the partner 7 page. Mary agrees with Jack.
359.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if they are referring to a particular page which he is indicating. Jack agrees with Morris.
360.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he thought this was his (Morris's) intention. Morris agrees with Jack.
361.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they would send all the recommendations to everyone and to put the information on the FTP site. Mary agrees with Jack
362.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that is the direction he thinks that they can take. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Jack. Others agree with Jack in the background too.
363.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if they need to register first. Lucy agrees with Mary, Mary agrees with Lucy, Lucy agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Lucy.
364.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they would have to write a whole e-learning course. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
365.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth asks if they have someone who is able and capable and has the expertise to write a quality e-learning course. Lucy disagrees with Kenneth.
366.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy disagrees with Kenneth that they have someone who is able and capable and has the expertise to write a quality e-learning course. Kenneth agrees with Lucy.
367.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that related to work package 4, he thinks that the comments by Kenneth are linked to in. That is looking at how the interaction will help in e-learning and how they can address this. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
368.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks Mary to speak up a little. Mary agrees with Paul's request.
369.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the tasks which have been specified in work package 4 need to clarified at this stage. Jack agrees with Mary.
370.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that at the very beginning, work package 4 was spent just as a demo instead of part of the investigation. Also, when Jack said that the portal is a gateway of courses, but instead of normal courses to develop one or two courses with a voice interaction, stressing on the interactivity. Mary agrees with Jack.
371.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they pushing them towards having a very focussed act of learning. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
372.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asks if they are going to accept what the commission have said as a change focus how are they going to deal with it. Fabian, Mary and Erin agree with Kenneth.
373.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that have they actually promised something that they are going to regret. Ronnie agrees with Kenneth.
374.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that somewhere it is mentioned that the contents should be provided. Paul disagrees with Ronnie.
375.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said he does not think the comments at any point mentioned that they are going to produce an e-learning mark up because that would mean creating a whole set of specifications. Mary agrees with Paul.
376.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that what was being discussed would be a task that they could not do. Ronnie agrees with Paul.
377.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said he does not find the point in looking through the documentation.
378.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that he agrees with Kenneth that he does not know where the reviewers got a point from.
379.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said at that point all he is saying is that they have to address the comments made by the commission. Paul agrees with Kenneth.
380.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that otherwise if the comments by the commission are not addressed the commission will think that they are accepting them. Paul and Jack agree with Kenneth.
381.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they have to go back to the project officer. Fabian agrees with Kenneth.
382.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they have to tell the project officer that what they have said is way beyond the scope of the project. Christopher. Fabian and Conwayne agree with Kenneth.
383.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they have to be clear on the basis of which they are going forward with the new part of the contract. Fabian agrees with Kenneth.
384.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they were denied a debate in the original negotiation because of the fast track. Paul, Fabian and Desmond agree with Kenneth.
385.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they need to go back to the commission and say what they have written is not what they expected to give them Also negotiation must take place. Jack agrees with Kenneth. Others agree with Kenneth in the background too.
386.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asks what is it that they are going to do in terms of the original request in terms of section 4 – e-learning through interactive web pages. Also, that they will have to mention some of the things as they cannot say no to everything. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
387.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that Paul mentioned to involve scenarios for e-learning or to implement existing ones. Jack and someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agree with Mary.
388.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he thinks that they can assume that with e-learning to identify problems of the users and to offer solutions to them. Also, that they are not creating a theory about e-learning. Mary agrees with Jack.
389.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they are not creating a standard. Also, when Mary said that they need to be very clear as to how the portal stands above what screen readers can do at the moment. Jack agrees with Mary.
390.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the benefit is the voice input. Kenneth agrees with Mary.
391.	Evidence of mutual belief asks if they (Technical partners) can produce any demos of voice input. That is something Mary believes a screen reader as far as she is aware at the moment cannot provide at the moment. Annie agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Annie.
392.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said Mary to indicate that he would like to take the next turn to speak. He mentioned that the specification should be more part of D1.2 for the design, otherwise it will not fit into the manual neatly. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
393.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if user group partners are ok with providing input. Erin and Lucy agree with Mary.

394.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asks if user group partners are ok with providing input. Desmond disagrees with Mary.
395.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said they are not yet ok to provide input. Also, that he will try. Mary agrees with Desmond.
396.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks looking at the French partners. Thomas agrees with Mary.
397.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they have a problem. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
398.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary reads the title for chapter 4. Erin agrees with Mary.
399.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary mentions the work that will be covered, the responsible partners and the views which were presented. Erin and Kenneth agree with Mary.
400.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he would like to remind about the fact that they have done work on portals. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
401.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone in the team whose identity was not revealed said work package 4. Ronnie and Mary agree with them.
402.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris asks if the portal by Adam can be used to show the basics in terms of checking or evaluating the accessibility requirements as this would be good for work package 4. Mary agrees with Morris.
403.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy suggests that what Morris mentioned is included in chapter 9, because in chapter 9 they are talking about the input. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Lucy and so does Mary.
404.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if the design of the portal was more work package 4. Mary agrees with Jack.
405.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said the final version of the deliverables. Mary agrees with James.
406.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding- message *30* sent by Morris asking if it is known when Conpalabras would be installed on the project portal. Message *42* sent by Mary informing the team that the French partners were evaluating the first version of the portal. Message *49* sent by Adam which was addressed to Erin, but sent to the mailing list explaining why a problem had been encountered.
407.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *5* sent by Charles with an article on website usability resources.
408.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *18* sent by Fabian informing the team that the work plan for work package 4 had been updated and was on the FTP server.
409.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *22* sent by Mary with an updated document on the user requirements for e-learning applications.
410.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Geoff asks if it was the last one. Hazel disagrees with Geoff saying that it is that one.
411.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they agreed that for deliverable 4.3, the learning portal was going to show the project.org site ad was going to include a link to the examples of how to solve problems as some examples. Also, when Jack said what they are showing now is not an e-learning course, it is just a manual, version 0.1 and that you do not have interactivity. Mary agrees with Jack.
412	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she can see some overlapping information that is included in the portal. Jack agrees with Mary.
413	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asks if the two portals are going to exist in different server. Jack disagrees with Mary.
414.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if the two portals are going to exist together. Jack agrees with Mary.
415.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie asks about the Java classes which were used. Charles agrees with Annie.
416.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if he understood from the tree which was shown that it could be used for the parser, but also for extracting the structure and making navigation easier. Conwayne and Annie agree with Jack.
417.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth neither agrees nor disagrees when Jack mentioned making navigation easier.
418.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said potentially making navigation easier. Also, that the approach is the most important thing. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
419.	Evidence if mutual belief when Charles said it has nothing to do with J-tidy. Annie and Jack agree with Charles.
420.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *1* sent by Adam addressed to Mary, but sent to the whole team informing everyone that version 0.2 of the portal is online. Message *6* sent by Adam informing the team that the portal meets the AAA accessibility requirements.
421.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *23* sent by Michael informing the team that the first draft of the tutorial was online.

Work package 5

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas says to continue with the protocol that was delivered. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
2.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that they could change the protocol if people think it is too complicated. Paul disagrees that it needs changing.
3.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that protocol did not need changing. Hazel agrees with Paul.
4.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said it takes time to convince people. Mary agrees with Paul.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul mentioned during the break they said that offering incentives can help find people to participate. Ronnie agrees with Paul.
6.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said that she thought there would have been more participants. Hazel and Mary agree with Elsie.
7.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asked if some of the evaluators were experts. Hazel agrees.
8.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie asked if the questionnaire could be re-sent as Michael could not find it. Also, when Elsie proposed for the questionnaire to be sent to her, so she could translate it into Italian for Michael. Hazel agrees to Elsie's requests.
9.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks Hazel for her to repeat the age. Hazel agrees and Ronnie agrees to the age Hazel said.
10.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie thanks Hazel for repeating the age. Elsie agrees with Ronnie.
11.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they thought about the problems they had with diagrams and statistics. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
12.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes something that the project can work on. Someone agrees with Hazel.
13.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she thought she found astronomy interesting. Jack agrees with Hazel.
14.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel reported some of her findings with people using e-learning. Mary agrees with Hazel.
15.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned environmental studies, which she assumes has lots of diagrams, maps and figures. Mary agrees with Hazel.
16.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she could like to refine the questions that they asked and to add some kind of demonstration or description of how VoiceXML can help visually impaired people to access e-learning. Mary agrees with Hazel.
17.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam asked if they have to ask people and that they have nothing to show. Hazel agrees with Adam.
18.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asked if they preferred e-learning and Hazel disagreed, as users have no experience.
19.	Evidence of mutual belief when Adam said that he is different. Hazel agrees with Adam.
20.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she was not sure what every person needed. Someone agreed with Hazel.
21.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will start with how accessible e-learning courses are and problems people have using them and then to pass onto Mary. Also that Mary will describe those courses later on. Mary agrees with Hazel.
22.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said if Thomas could talk about the work that they have been doing in France. Thomas disagreed, saying that he would not be speaking, Adam would.
23.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas said that Adam would speak not him. Hazel agrees with Thomas.
24.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that there was a strange message on the screen. Hazel agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Hazel.
25.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the courses contained mainly textual explanations of the concept. Someone agrees with Mary.
26.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary says that maybe the technical partners can think of some points about the plug-in and how the plug-in can probably improve the problems that were being experienced with Jaws. Annie agrees with Mary.
27.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asks if she can go back to the previous slide. Mary agrees with Thomas.
28.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that sometimes the instructions were misguiding, because the participants made a small error. Someone agrees with Mary.
29.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she has covered the learning perspective and in that sometimes the users were making learning mistakes. Christopher agrees with Mary.
30.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary was speaking about emotional aspects. Hazel agrees with Mary.
31.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asks if they should go through a slide. Hazel disagreed with Mary.
32.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the results from this evaluation could feed into the development of the portal. Christopher agrees with Annie.
33.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary proposes an idea and Hazel agrees with it.
34.	Evidence of altered belief when Annie asks if she should have this presentation. Hazel disagrees, saying that they should have the e-learning courses.
35.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel talks about the e-learning courses and Annie agrees with Hazel.
36.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel says that they are not websites, they are important e-learning courses that you have to pay for. Also that they are not very expensive. Mary agrees with Hazel.
37.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if the costs was per course. Hazel agrees with Mary.
38.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the courses are good so you can really get to the e-learning functionality. Annie and others agree with Hazel.
39.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to think about how voice can makes things better. Hazel said that she feels that this could be the solution. Annie agrees with Hazel.
40.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that she has the solutions. Hazel and others agree with Annie.
41.	Evidence of mutual belief when Thomas asks if the costs you pay is for one year. Mary agrees with Thomas.
42.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary mentions that this is for 80 courses. Hazel agrees with Mary.
43.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy says that they do not have an allowance in their budget to pay for the courses. James agrees with Lucy.
44.	Evidence of altered belief when Lucy asks if she should write to them and ask for more money. Paul disagrees with this.
45.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy was going to say something, but Paul said that she could go ahead as he also wanted to say something
46.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that he heard that they have some contact with Mindleaders.
47.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they did not have to buy some of the courses. Mary agrees with James.
48.	Evidence of mutual belief when James talks about the collaboration agreement which was signed by partners 1 and 2. Mary agrees.
49.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they are looking for a number of courses to identify a number of problems, and not just all of them from Mindleaders. Hazel agrees with Mary.
50.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said looking at different courses is to get a broader view of the problems. Annie and Hazel agree with Mary.
51.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that if they all look at Mindleaders they will all get the same problems. Hazel agrees with Mary.
52.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that that they want to find a variety of problems. Elsie agrees with Mary.
53.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that this is one of the points to bear in mind when looking at e-learning courses.

	James agrees with Mary.
54.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they are going to review the current situation. Mary and Hazel agree with James.
55.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they will have some preliminary work in this work package. Mary and Hazel agree with James.
56.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 29, sent by Mary, with an attached evaluation on e-learning.
57.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary is talking about the navigation category. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Mary.
58.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she will now hand over to Erin. Erin agrees with Mary.
59.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie requests that Erin speaks slower. Erin agrees with Ronnie.
60.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin mentioned the findings she found surprising and that they assumed the tool developed by W3C would be accessible. Someone whose identity was not revealed agrees with Erin.
61.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if this included version 5 as well. Erin and others agree with Paul.
62.	Evidence of mutual belief when Erin said that the features from the dialogue box were the best that they have seen. Someone whose identity was not revealed agrees with Erin.
63.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Erin asked if there were any questions. Morris disagreed, saying that everything was very clear.
64.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asked Charles to enlarge the font size. Charles agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Charles.
65.	Evidence of mutual belief that Desmond had a comment. Charles agrees with Desmond.
66.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he is typing in the right keyword, but nothing is happening, and that there is no help function. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Desmond.
67.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles asks if they are referring to an index. Desmond agrees with Charles.
68.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he thinks the help function should be a feature. Charles agrees with Desmond.,
69.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said access is via the file, help menu. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Charles.
70.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles is talking about links. Paul agrees with Charles.
71.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles mentions that column that partner 3 suggested. Kenneth agrees with Charles
72.	Evidence of mutual belief when James tells Charles that he has one question. Charles agrees with James.
73.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul talks about having the manual available in other formats as well. Charles agrees with Paul.
74.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they could move onto the presentation of work package 5. Mary agrees with James.
75.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that Hazel has specified how the evaluation could proceed on both types. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Mary.
76.	Evidence of mutual belief that Ronnie would like to say something. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
77.	Evidence of mutual belief that Paul would like to say something.
78.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris says the end of July. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
79.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they must provide a document indicating what kind of measurement is going to be done when the portal and the tool is going to be available. Mary agrees with James.
80.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asks for ten months the prototype of the integration. Mary and James agree with Desmond.
81.	Evidence of mutual belief when James mentions the evaluation and the work which needs to be done. Mary agrees with James.
82.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if the prototype will be available by the end of the next month. James agrees with Mary.
83.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said to correct him if he is wrong. Mary agrees with James that she will correct him whenever necessary.
84.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the initial part of the evaluation dossier has to be presented. One is the evaluation plan what is being seen now. James agrees with Kenneth.
85.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it will also be an outline of what the final validation will look like. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
86.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentions what the commission will not be expecting and cannot expect. James agrees with Kenneth.
87.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that Hazel must be trusted on this as she has done this lots of times already and the responsibility should be left to her. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
88.	Evidence of altered belief when Mary asks a question related to timing. Kenneth asks if there is an earlier timing.
89.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie indicates that she would like to speak and asking about partner 2's role. Mary agrees with Annie.
90.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the project portal is not part of work package 5. Mary agrees with Jack.
91.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the portal will be evaluated and is an input from work package 4. Jack agrees with Mary.
92.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth asks if the responsible partner should be partner 1. Jack, Annie and Mary agree with Kenneth.
93.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the contributing partners are 9, 2 and 7. Mary agrees with Jack.
94.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that something can be found at the beginning of the document. Ronnie agrees with Mary.
95.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they have been jumping around in the presentation. Mary agrees with Morris.
96.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if this is for end of July. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
97.	Evidence of mutual belief that Mary asked about the first version of the portal that needs evaluating. Morris agrees with Mary.
98.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said the end of July. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
99.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they would go through the evaluation of the portal first and then the evaluation. Ronnie agrees with Mary.
100.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if the specifications would be provided to the technical partners, which will be provided by each of the user groups. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Mary.
101.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that partner 1 are responsible. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
102.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that partner 1 is also responsible for planning the evaluations. Ronnie agrees with Mary.
103.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie raises a concern. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
104.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that things are now clear. Mary agrees with Ronnie.

105.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said the change that she had proposed regarding the change in partners. There was agreement in the background.
106.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asked if what was being said was coming from the portal. Mary agrees with James.
107.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary suggests that they go together with the schedule. James agrees with Mary.
108.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that the preliminary version of the portal is already agreed and that they will analyse it for the date that is being suggested. Mary agrees with James.
109.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary requests for the feedback to be received soon. James agrees with Mary that it will be.
110.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that the preliminary version would be provided as soon as possible. Mary agrees with James.
111.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they do not need the final version to start evaluating. James agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with James.
112.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it is important that a plan is established. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
113.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the final version of the tool cannot be accepted later than set out in the work plan, because otherwise they will not able to carry out the evaluations as required in the contract. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
114.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the plan for work packages 3 and 4 must be established to work in the same way. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
115.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they would identify any problematic points. Mary agrees with James.
116.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they will be making contributions to the evaluations. Also asks if anyone has done any similar work or has comments. Also, that herself and Hazel will produce the initial tasks. Paul agrees with Mary.
117.	Evidence of mutual belief that what Mary is proposing is good.
118.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when partner 4's name is referred to incorrectly by Jack.
119.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy gives the correct name for partner 4. Kenneth and Ronnie also agree.
120.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the initial prototype should contain limited functionality. Jack agrees with Mary.
121	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that partner 7 would work on the methodology. Mary and Lucy agree with Ronnie.
122.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if what he proposed is ok. Mary agrees with Ronnie and Ronnie agrees with Mary.
123.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the recruitment would be done by the national organisation. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
124.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said he had a question to ask, asking if the users had to be blind. Mary agrees with Ronnie and Ronnie agrees with Mary.
125.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the tool has to be able to validate other pages. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
126.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said not to just report on the accessibility of the webpages. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
127.	Evidence of mutual belief when Geoff said that he cannot say the word internationalisation. Some team members agree with Geoff.
128.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said if user partners could contribute to the evaluations. Erin and Lucy agree with Mary.
129.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond said that at the moment he could contribute.
130.	Evidence of mutual belief that Desmond cannot contribute at the moment. Mary agrees with Desmond.
131.	Evidence of mutual belief that Desmond will try to contribute. Mary and Thomas agree with Desmond.
132.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they had a problem and spoke about the criteria. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
133.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the work for task 1.8 will cover the work presented by Erin. Erin and Kenneth agree with Mary.
134.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that partner 3 were going to do some of the evaluations. Erin agrees saying that they are going to do three. Also, Mary agrees with Erin.
135.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he would like to say something. He said that they should not be involved in the compilation of the questionnaires, just the evaluations. However, they did participate in the compilations too. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
136.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said to inform him when the evaluation process starts. Mary said that it had already started a few months ago.
137.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the evaluation of the existing courses started a few months ago.
138.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that he was talking about the evaluation of the final result.
139.	Evidence of mutual belief that Ronnie is asking about the evaluation of the final result. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
140.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that they would talk about this as part of work package 5. Mary agrees with Ronnie.
141.	Evidence of mutual belief when James that the there are two deliverables for partner 8, the manual for accessible design and the dossier. Mary agrees with James.
142.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *4*, sent by Mary, talking about Hazel's plans. Message *42*, sent by Mary, informing everyone that the plan was updated.
143.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *30*, sent by Morris informs Jack that the evaluation of the portal is underway. Message *50*, sent by Morris outlining the confusion he noticed. Message *51*, sent by Mary informing Adam that the tests that they were performing were necessary.
144.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *1*, sent by Morris informing everyone that version 0.2 of the portal was online.
145.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *7*, sent by Mary, informed everyone that the server had on it the latest version of the evaluation plan in the work package 5 directory.
146.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *7*, sent by Mary, informs the team of her last day on the project.

Work package 6

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy asked if the man months for work package 6 were at the end. Jack disagreed with Lucy.
2.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the man months for work package 6 for Ronnie's partner organization were not at the end of the project. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
3.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that maybe the question that Ronnie is asking is that he feels that the man months for work package 6 could be used better in other work packages and that they could talk about this. Ronnie agrees with Jack.
4.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is not important to work on the dissemination of nothing, because there is currently not a lot to disseminate on now.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said release and Hazel, Fabian and Jack agree with Lucy.
6.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talks about the press release to the Spanish ministry and the success that they have in terms of the press they have received. Lucy and Charlotte agree with Jack.
7.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack says that this release is also in the paper. Elsie agrees with Jack.
8.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack says syndro. However, Hazel and Charlotte disagree that this is the correct term to use, instead correcting him, and informing him that the term he should use is syndrome.
9.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel and Charlotte say the term syndrome and Jack agrees with them.
10.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says that they are already invited to the event Jack mentioned. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
11.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks Ronnie to send him more information. Ronnie agrees with Jack.
12.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack checks the size of the conference and Ronnie agrees with Jack.
13.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked Annie if they had a presentation. Annie agrees with Jack that they had a presentation.
14.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *27*, sent by Erin includes a URL with information on a conference.
15.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *21*, sent by Jonathan with a plan to launch work package 6. Message *26*, sent by Jonathan, containing the same contents as message 21.
16.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian repeats his name, following a request by Ronnie. Ronnie agrees with Fabian after he repeats his name.
17.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asks if partner 7 is a member of WI. Ronnie disagrees with Jack.
18.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie says that partner 7 is not a member of WI. Lucy agrees with Ronnie. Ronnie agrees with Lucy too.
19.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel suggests making a written submission to the director of the WAI as they have a lot of activity going on. Also, to ask them if they would be willing to add e-learning to those activities. Paul, Fabian and James agree with Hazel.
20.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that WAI does not do standardization. Fabian agrees with Hazel.
21.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that WAI has recommendations. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Hazel.
22.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel asks Kenneth for his comments on WAI. Kenneth says that he does not think that they would be interested.
23.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth talks about WAI and W3C. Fabian agrees with Kenneth.
24.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth says that from what he has seen he does not think they would formally recognise a project certificate.
25.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the process would be lengthy. Hazel and Fabian agree with Kenneth.
26.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that WAI works slowly, so this must be beard in mind. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
27.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel suggests an approach which can be followed. Kenneth agrees with Hazel's proposal.
28.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel suggests finding out who is on the management committee at the moment that they know and to talk to them. James agrees with Hazel.
29.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth talks about interesting areas. Fabian and Hazel agree with Kenneth.
30.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth talks about the involvement of partner 3 in the process. Hazel and Fabian agree with Kenneth.
31.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that WAI is not active in all of the areas. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
32.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel makes a proposal. Kenneth agrees with Hazel's proposal.
33.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that they are the liaison between WAI and the VoiceXML working group. Annie, Fabian, Kenneth and James agree with Hazel.
34.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if the letter can be done for the next phase. Hazel agrees with James.
35.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if the letter can be sent to the commission as well. Hazel and Paul agree with James.
36.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he would like to say something before taking a final decision. James agrees with Ronnie.
37.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that Hazel correctly stated that standardization is not an activity of W3C.
38.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone in the team whose identity was not revealed said WI. Ronnie agrees with them.
39.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that this is SEN. Paul agrees with Ronnie.
40.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he happens to be a chairman of the ISSS workshop, which is like a working group. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
41.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that he was not sure if a response already exists.
42.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie proposes to take the same action as Hazel with WAI to SEN. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Ronnie.
43.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if he can ask a question. James agrees with Paul and Paul agrees with James and asks his question.
44.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she can contact herself and say that it is important that the project has some input in what they are doing. Fabian agrees with Hazel.
45.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she proposes to add EPSI to the list and will take responsibility of that. James agrees with Hazel.
46.	Evidence of mutual belief when James summarizes the actions. Paul and Hazel agree with James.
47.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they should make some kind of certification and asks everyone is this is ok. There is agreement in the background.
48.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that it does not answer his question regarding certification.
49.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that to put a certificate on something which is not accessible if extremely difficult to do, if not impossible. James agrees with Kenneth.
50.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth reports on the points that they need to go forward with. Fabian agrees with Kenneth.
51.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian asked if there were any more comments. Hazel agrees that she would like to add something.
52.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said something to the team, mentioning that Kenneth might not know that. Kenneth agrees with Hazel that he did not know that. Hazel also agrees with Kenneth.

53.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will ask the representative from partner 3 to talk about the project. Fabian agrees with Hazel.
54.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that there should then by a follow up with a formal letter from the project leader of the project to the director of WAI. Paul agrees with Hazel.
55.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will liase with Jack. Jack agrees with Hazel.
56.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that meeting was in conjunction with SCISO. Hazel and Kenneth agree with Paul.
57.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she might have the exact date wrong, but that it is definitely before Easter and it is in conjunction with CJUN. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
58.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that the organisations will be contacted and he will then inform everyone. Fabian agrees with James.
59.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian mentions what the project officer reminded them off. Lucy and Kenneth agree with Fabian. Some others in the background agree with Fabian too.
60.	Evidence of mutual belief when James mentions that approach. Annie and Hazel agree with James.
61.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that clustering is a pool of European projects working in similar matters. Fabian agrees with Jack.
62.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that was a little bit confused before. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
63.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the report was sent. Elsie and Fabian agree with Ronnie.
64.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie asks Elsie if it was version 6.2. Elsie disagree saying that it was version 6.4.
65.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian and Ronnie agree with Elsie. Elsie also agrees with them too.
66.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said it was more or less to the response to the questionnaire that they sent. So, it was what the organisations had prepared. James agrees with Elsie.
67.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie mentions the dissemination plan. Kenneth agrees with Elsie.
68.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he is sure that all partners have been doing some dissemination activities. So, what is important now is to collect all this effort together and to direct it in the same directions.
69.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie proposes to take over this task on collecting dissemination efforts together. Also, that all the material must be sent to Elsie. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
70.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that Elsie will make a report out of the material. Elsie agrees with Ronnie.
71.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said that she can do to the report. James agrees with Elsie.
72.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie asked if the discussion on cluster was closed. James disagrees.
73.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentions what the commission will do. Kenneth, Fabian and James agree with Hazel.
74.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he is not talking about the usefulness of the activity. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
75.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie proposes that Hazel can provide assistance to them. Hazel disagrees saying that she does not think that it is their responsibility.
76.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the commission would organise this. Fabian agrees with Hazel.
77.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that a consultation meeting for the clusters is being organised. James agrees with Hazel.
78.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that a consultation meeting for the clusters is being organised. Ronnie said that he was not aware of this.
79.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that is what is normally done. Hazel and Ronnie agree with Kenneth.
80.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said to stimulate the commission. Hazel disagrees, saying that the commission should not be stimulated anymore.
81.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the project officer would get a list of the projects. Fabian agrees with Hazel.
82.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie mentions that the two full strands must be examined. James agrees with Ronnie.
83.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack proposes that a search can be done. Fabian agrees with Jack.
84	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that deliverable 6.4 is considered by the commission to be one of the more important items. Mary agrees with James.
85.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel was clarifying when partner 7 said that would prepare a report, if this was deliverable 6.5, the dissemination plan, or if that was a different report. Ronnie disagrees saying that they were talking about the report about ongoing dissemination activities.
86.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that this is one of the tasks which must be included in the deliverable. Hazel agrees with James.
87.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that for the standardization activity, for this to be distributed between herself and partner 7. Hazel agrees with James
88.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that some of the letters should come from the project leader, but she is happy to take care of the activity. James agrees with Hazel.
89.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said to liase with everyone. James agrees with Hazel.
90.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if the webpages exist or not. James agrees that the pages do not exist.
91.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said it is important to have a practical source to show that one page is accessible Ronnie agrees with James.
92.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if the whole software must be already developed to have a voiced web page. James agrees with Ronnie.
93.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks what format the content is going to be in. Annie agrees with James that it will be in HTML. James also agrees with Annie.
94.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul was checking if he had correctly heard that they wanted to identify a page that is already there. James agrees with Paul.
95.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if they wanted to take an existing page and to let them (the commission) know if it was accessible or not. Fabian and Hazel agree with Paul.
96.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that partner 8 can be added to the list, as they would be happy to have some of their pages in voice. Jack disagrees with Hazel sating that for the next three months they are only looking to have one page.
97.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that in the next three months they are only looking to have one page. Hazel agrees with Jack.
98.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asked if Hazel was the volunteer for the one page. Hazel disagrees with Jack.
99.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that she thought they wanted many volunteers. Jack disagrees saying that they are happy as it is.
100.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they are happy as things are. Hazel agrees with Jack and Jack agrees with Hazel.
101.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul proposes that the partner 7 page is used. Hazel agrees with Paul.
102.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that he wanted to know what was expected from them as the pages are already there. James agrees and explains to Morris.
103.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul mentions the HTML page. James, Annie and Desmond agree with Paul.
104.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks a question on VoiceXML content. Paul agrees with James and James agrees with Paul.
105.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie indicated that he would like to talk next and mentioned the point that he would like to clarify. Jack agrees with Ronnie.

106.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that are they using just representative user organisations from the project or for everyone. James agrees with the later.
107.	Evidence of mutual belief when James mentions his point of view. Elsie agrees with James.
108.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they should move the discussion on. However, she could read what was prepared for it now. Ronnie disagrees that the information should be read now.
109.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that the version now has English and Spanish. Ronnie agrees with Annie, saying that things are now clear.
110.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that things are now clear. Annie agrees with Ronnie.
111	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if a decision could be taken for the first sample to be in English. James and Annie agree with Ronnie.
112.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that if will be on partner 7's webpage. And will be done in co-operation with all user organisations. James agrees with Ronnie.
113.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Elsie said that she could co-operate with all user organisations for that. Ronnie disagrees with Elsie.
114.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if it was ok with Germany. Paul agrees with Ronnie and Ronnie agrees with Paul.
115.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that if he understood correctly, were they talking about taking one existing page, which is already on the partner 7 website. There is agreement from team members in the background.
116.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that if he understood correctly, they want just one language for the first cloud. James agrees with Morris.
117.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that later on they would need all languages of the partners to be represented. James, Fabian and Ronnie agree with Paul.
118.	Evidence of mutual belief when James proposes to move onto the next point, which is the actual plan that they are proposing. Elsie agrees with James.
119.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that each partner must review if they have made a contribution, because it will be used for this and other deliverables. Paul agrees with James.
120.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks what questionnaire they are talking about. Fabian mentions to Paul what questionnaire is being referred too.
121.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said he just wanted to follow what was being said. Fabian agrees with Paul.
122.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie repeats 19th March which she heard. James agrees with Elsie this is the correct date.
123.	Evidence of mutual belief wen Paul said that the 2nd was a Friday. James agrees with Paul that this day is a Friday.
124.	Evidence of mutual belief when James proposes that it is better to have the comments for the 28th of March. Annie, Christopher and Ronnie agree with James.
125.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the 28th would be ok because many of them will be in Madrid for a visibility conference. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
126.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie that they will have some problems to look at the data for the 28th of March.
127.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they would have some problems looking at the data for the 28thof March. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
128.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding regarding the 28th of March and whether or not it will be ok for Ronnie to make comments by then.
129.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he had a question. James agrees with Ronnie.
130.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if they knew who there project officer was. Jack agrees with Ronnie, providing the name of the project officer.
131.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack provides the name of the project officer. Fabian agrees with Jack.
132.	Evidence of altered mutual belief wen Ronnie questions if this project officer is new. Jack disagrees, saying that it is the same project officer from the start.
133.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the project officer is the one from the start. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
134.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks if the project officer is from the beginning. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
135.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said he did not know whether or not the project officer got changed. Jack disagrees with Ronnie, regarding the change in project officer.
136.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that they have received some private information this week. Jack disagrees with James that it was this week.
137.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said to send information to her Hotmail account so she can work on it when free. James agrees with Elsie.
138.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said in his personal view he feels that she might need some contributions in order to write the document. Also, that they must take advantage of travelling to Madrid Elsie agrees with James.
139.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie gives the dates that they are staying in Madrid. Elsie agrees with Ronnie.
140.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said that they are staying in Madrid from Wednesday to Sunday. James agrees with Elsie.
141	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Morris spoke about the submission dates. Ronnie disagrees that they are talking about the submission dates, informing him that they are talking about the questionnaire.
142.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they are talking about the questionnaire. Morris agrees with Ronnie.
143.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentions the timeframe. Morris agrees with Jack.
144.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris mentions the deliverable the project officer is expecting for dissemination and exploitation. Elsie agrees with Morris.
145.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that this is an important deliverable. Elsie agrees with Fabian.
146.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie gives the times to receive the contributions. Jack and James agree with Ronnie.
147.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that he is going to tell everyone his summary so that they are all in the same line. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with James.
148.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that Hazel will take some possibilities. Hazel agrees with James.
149.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that Elsie is going to take the activity regarding standardization. Elsie agrees with James.
150	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentioned that they had a stand at the conference of New Technologies and Disabilities. Lucy agrees with Jack and Jack agrees with Lucy.
151.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentioned that he thinks that Charles is attending a conference or someone from partner 9. Charles agrees with Jack.
152.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes that a procedure is made. Paul and Ronnie agree with Hazel that a standard procedure should be made.
153.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie proposes the FTP site. Kenneth agrees with Ronnie.
154.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said the procedure allows everyone to know what is going on. Mary agrees with Hazel.
155.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they need to become more co-ordinated. Hazel and Mary agree with Jack.
156.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said especially if they are trying to go to the same conference. Hazel agrees with Jack.
157.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack points out the Spanish ministry visiting the project stand. Mary agrees with Jack and Jack agrees with Mary.
158.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that most of the documents are preliminary. Hazel agrees with Jack

159.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentioned the dates of the documents. Mary agrees with Jack.
160.	Evidence of mutual belief when Charles said that there were comments on the project brochure. Hazel agrees with Charles that she has comments on it.
161.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks about a paper and Hazel agrees with Jack.
162.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul asked if the paper is available electronically somewhere. Jack disagrees, saying that it is not available in the FTP site.
163.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the paper is not in the FTP site. Fabian agrees with Jack, saying that it will uploaded onto it very soon.
164.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond asks if the file is PDF. James and Fabian agree with Desmond that it is a PDF file.
165.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked Desmond if Word format is better for him. Desmond agrees with Jack.
166.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that Word format is better for him. Lucy agrees with Desmond.
167.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when someone whose identity was not revealed said that they preferred HTML documents, following a proposal made by Jack to have Word document files.
168.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone whose identity was nor revealed proposed HTML documents. Jack agrees with them.
169.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talks about Madrid having many things on in June. Hazel agrees with Jack.
170.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that PDF format would work, but that Word is more preferable. However, rather than information being unavailable, the PDF format was requested. Fabian agrees with Paul.
171.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked for comments. James agrees with Jack that comments are sought.
172.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack and James asked for comments. Kenneth agrees that he has a comment to offer.
173.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it is important to follow clear print guidelines. Fabian agrees with Kenneth.
174.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes brining in e-learning and accessibility. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
175.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel reported that there was no project website listed. James agrees with Hazel.
176.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the total funding from the EU and the total funding from the project was listed. However, the whole world should not be told about this. Paul agrees with Hazel.
177.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if funding is information the commission likes to be everywhere. Jack agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Jack.
178.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said he thought the commission just wanted to know the funding for their reference for the evaluation. Hazel agrees with Morris.
179.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that there was no need to give the amount of money. Paul and James agree with Hazel.
180.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said that the commission's logo is required to as well. Hazel agrees with Elsie.
181.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if it is there logo (commissions). Elsie agrees with Jack.
182.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that they have the commission's logo. Elsie disagrees because she cannot see it.
183.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie acknowledges the logo that Hazel is referring too.
184.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris indicated that he would like to take the next turn to speak. Jack agrees with Morris.
185.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that it is important to have access to the original logo of each partner. Hazel and Kenneth agree with James.
186.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian and Kenneth were both going to say something. Kenneth agrees with Fabian that he can be ahead.
187.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that partner 3's logo was used incorrectly and that there are strict requirements to using the logo. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
188.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said you need to get permission before their logo (partner 3's) can be used on newsletters. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
189.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if Kenneth wants to provide it. Kenneth agrees that he can provide it.
190	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said it id important to have the logo in a high resolution format. Hazel agrees with Fabian.
191	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that the printing quality is not high if it is not printed in a high-resolution format. Mary and Kenneth agree with Fabian.
192.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel mentioned a document format that she has not heard of before. Jack agrees with Mary.
193	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she has already e-mailed the person who is going to go to the meeting. Desmond agrees with Hazel
194.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that Elsie was going to take responsibility for the dissemination task. Elsie agrees with James.
195.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2*, sent by Fabian informing the team of contributions received. Message *5*, sent by Fabian with a draft version of the document. Message *7*, sent by Fabian with a second version of the draft. Message *9*, sent by Fabian, with the third version of the draft.
196.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2*, sent by Fabian regarding contributions for publications. Message *3*, sent by Desmond, informing of the difficulties encountered. Message *4*, sent by Jason, with his comments on lack of contributions for publications.
197.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul ask Fabian to repeat what he just said. Fabian agrees with Paul's' request.
198.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian repeated what he just said, following a request made by Paul Paul agrees with what Fabian repeated.
199.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said thank you to Fabian for repeating the information. Fabian agrees with Paul.
200.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Fabian said that he did not know if partner 8 is a member of W3C. Mary disagreed with what Fabian said.
201	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that he checked partner 8's website, but could find no information relating partner 8 belong to W3C. Mary agrees with Fabian.
202.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that he thought that partner 8 was assisting with a meeting and that the planned presentation could not be delivered. Mary agrees with Fabian.
203.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said with regards to the web access initiative, it is difficult to contact them Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth. Kenneth also agrees with them.
204	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said he would make sure that Fabian received an invitation. Fabian said no to worry about it.
205.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he was supposed to be on holiday, but will still attend the event. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
206.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Fabian asks if Jason is a member of an organisation. Charles said that he did not know exactly.
207.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he is a member of this group. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
208.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian asks if there are any possibilities to make something similar with this workshop. Ronnie agrees with Fabian.
209.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he believes the next meeting is in October. Fabain agrees with Ronnie
210.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the meeting is certainly not earlier than October. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Ronnie.
211.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the meeting would most probably be in France as well and that he is also a

	member of this group. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
212.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that the E-accessibility committee is a technical advisory committee, not a standardization body. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed and Fabian agree with Ronnie.
213.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Fabian asks if he can have some information from him (Ronnie) on that group (E-accessibility). Ronnie disagrees, saying that what they have said will be enough.
214.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks Fabian if he wants him to write something down for him. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
215.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian asks for any directions in which they can find out more. Ronnie agrees with Fabian's request.
216.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he will let Fabian know. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
217.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if he could interrupt for a moment. He suggests that Fabian looks at the Internet, for the website of the Institute of Design and Disability. Fabian agrees with Ronnie.
218.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said he could not remember the name, but will send an e-mail with the name on there. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed and Fabian agree with Paul.
219.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if they could just come back to the February conference. He asked about the Onser president and if they tried to establish any contact with them regarding the project. Fabian agrees with Paul's request and the questions he asked.
220.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that they did try and establish some contact with the conference. James agrees with Fabian.
221.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they have not been able to obtain any positive answers in order to start any work together. Fabian agrees with Paul.
222.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian starts talking about the event on people with disabilities. Annie agrees with Fabian.
223.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth asks if anything has been delivered to these conferences. Fabian disagrees saying he does not think so.
224.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Fabian said that he does not think anything has been delivered to those conferences. Jack said that nothing has been delivered.
225.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it would be useful for people in the consortium to know what is being at the various places. People in the background agree with Kenneth.
226.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the purpose of this is to understand what their participation is. Ronnie agrees with Kenneth.
227.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Fabian said that they were going to tell the team on the dissemination that they made. The team had said before to be informed before and not after.
228.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they already spoke about that in Paris. Fabian agrees with Paul.
229.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he was going to say something. Fabian agrees that Kenneth wants to say something.
230.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if they were aware of a conference in Austria. Kenneth and Fabian agree with Paul.
231.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul asked if they were going to present a paper there. Fabian said that they were not going to present a paper.
232.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian mentioned a name, saying that he thinks that is the name. Paul agrees with Fabian.
233.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian asks if partner 6 is going to be participating in the event. Paul agrees with Fabian, saying that partner 6 are certainly going to be there. Fabian agrees with Paul too.
234.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that there are going to b a number of organisations sharing an exhibition area. Fabian agrees with Paul.
235.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul proposes that they have a presentation on the project. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Paul.
236.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said to at least have a project description as there might not be time to present a paper and also the areas that they will need to look at. Fabian agrees with Paul.
237.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris indicated to Jack that he would like to say something. Jack agrees with Morris.
238.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris talks about the conference that partner 6 is holding and how this would be a good opportunity to show to the end user what is on offer. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Morris.
239.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said hands on. Morris agrees with Paul that this is the expression that he was looking for.
240.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said this would be a good thing to do. Fabian agrees with Morris.
241.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said November and Paul agrees with Ronnie.
242.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asked if Adam or Thomas were preparing something. Thomas disagrees with Jack that they were preparing something.
243.	Evidence f mutual belief when Thomas said what was there. Fabian agrees with what Thomas said.
244.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that they have participated through events and have made paper, so can always help with this type of activity if they are interested. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Fabian.
245.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they could distribute information on the project at an event they are attending. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Ronnie.
246.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said to improve the dissemination activities, they can contact him and send him the help that they need, which they will try and provide. There was agreement in the background.
247.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian talks about an event that is going to be held in September. Jack agrees with Fabian.
248.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said to Charles that they could speak directly about an event if they would like to have their presence there. Charles agrees with Fabian.
249.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if they are talking about the broadcasting conference. Fabian agrees with Paul.
250.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that it would be suitable for them to be there. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Paul.
251.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that partners 1 and 2 sent a paper to the event, but now it might be open to other participants. Ronnie and Jack agree with Fabian.
252.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that there is a session on the Internet. Fabian agrees with Jack.
253.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said there is a session on social applications. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Jack.
254.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he thinks the project fits in with the session on social applications. James agrees with Jack.
255.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth asked if the abstract had been distributed. Jack said no.
256.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Fabian said by the time they were asked it was very late. Paul disagrees with Fabian, saying that they should inform the team beforehand.
257.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they should be informed beforehand. James agrees with Paul.
258.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when looking at when the team is informed of discussing the project outside of the team.
259.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that it is necessary to inform everyone of what is being sent out, especially to official organisations and conferences. James agrees with Paul.
260.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said this should be done before and not after. James and Jack agree with Paul.

261.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they would be happy to receive any comments. Fabian agrees with Jack.
262.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said the intention was to have a pilot, to see the portal in the website. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Morris.
263.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that he thinks that they are going to have to write some examples. Morris agrees with Fabian.
264.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *39*, sent by Jack, informing the team of an event that they would like to distribute information about.
265.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *52*, sent by Morris, informing the team on the LearnTech conference.
266.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that he did not know if it would be worth mentioning about an event they had heard about. Jack agrees with Morris to inform the team of that event.
267.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie informed the team of the dissemination he did on 16th June. Also, that he will inform the team of the date when it is fixed next week. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
268.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentioned the stand that they received for the project. Lucy agrees with Jack.
269.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they would try and do more in the exploitation plan. Mary agrees with Jack.
270.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if the document was going to be placed. Jack agrees, saying that the document has already been placed.
271.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when the need to show team members information to be shown outside of the project first, and not after.
272.	Evidence of mutual belief that Morris would like to say something. He mentioned that e-mail that he sent last week. Jack agrees with Morris and Morris agrees with Jack.
273.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he had Morris's e-mail there. Morris agrees with Jack.
274.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that he looked at the program, and that a sizeable part of the conference will be on e-learning and that it would be a good opportunity for partners 1 and 2. Jack agrees with Morris.
275.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie suggests that they can do the approach. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
276.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he does not know if there is a chance. Also when mentioning the audience that will presents. Mary agrees that there is a chance and the companies which will form the audience.
277.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack mentions the timeframe as the end of October. Annie disagrees with Jack, saying that she thinks it is Mid October.
278.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said Mid October. Jack agrees with Annie.
279.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack mentions the International Computer Camp. Morris agrees with Jack.
280.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that they would send an e-mail with details on the exact venue. Jack agrees with Morris.
281.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary said that she did not know if anyone had any problems receiving the paper she had sent. Jack disagrees, saying that he had received it.
282.	Evidence of mutual belief that Jack had received the paper that Mary sent and that it was placed onto the FTP site. Mary agrees with Jack.
283.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that this paper was 2 megabytes. Jack agrees with Mary.
284.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone in the team whose identity was not revealed asked if the paper had video. Mary disagrees with them saying that there was no video.
285.	Evidence of mutual belief when someone in the team whose identity was not revealed showed Mary a paper and asked if this is what was being referred too. Mary agrees with them.
286.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said the paper was looking at accessibility problems with e-learning. Mary agrees with Jack.
287.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the paper is around 15 pages. Jack agrees with Mary.
288.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that an interest had been shown in the survey that they did around authoring tools and people want to have that disseminated. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with them.
289.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that there are some things that they are trying to change at the moment. However, it is really useful as it names particular authoring tools. Mary agrees with Kenneth.
290.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked if it was international audiences which Kenneth was referring to. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
291	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talks about an invitation they have received for a conference and will try to talk about the project there. Mary agrees with Jack.
292.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary indicated that she would like to say something. Jack agrees with Mary.
293.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary proposes that if they are able to implement some of the IMS guidelines, and then they can use the project as a test bed for the guidelines. Also, collaborating with IMS and providing feedback. Jack agrees with Mary's proposal.
294.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he has a chance to talk about standardization and that this was mentioned of the first page of the commission's report. Mary agrees with Jack.
295.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that some of the names which were mentioned were present at the event he just mentioned. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
296.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie gives the exact name of the project. The workshop Design For All. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Ronnie.
297.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that without a tool it is difficult to make a presentation. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
298.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they hope to have the second version of the prototype by March next year. Jack agrees with Annie.
299.	Evidence of mutual belief that Kenneth wants to say something, as he raises his hand. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
300.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie called out Jack's name as he wanted to say something. He proposed taking one of their meetings to make an extended discussion about the problems of exploitation, as they cannot wait until the last minute to discuss the issues. Ronnie proposed that the item of exploitation was added into one of the next meetings. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
301.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that in Verona, they will spend a whole morning or evening on this (exploitation). Ronnie agrees with Jack.
302.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he would not be surprised if one of the outcomes of the review is to produce a preliminary exploitation paper. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
303.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they were asked to send the name of the deliverable, at the end of month 18, about the exploitation plan. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
304.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that they should not be looking at them (Jack) as the commercial partners to be doing it. Jack disagrees with Kenneth.
305.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said it is important to hear about clustering. Jack agrees with the translator.
306.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *17*, sent by Jack informing the team that he has been invited to a meeting.
307.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding, message *7*, sent by Mary, informing everyone that a copy of the paper that they are presentation at the conference is on the FTP site.

Work package 7

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack gives examples of the types of documents which are in the FTP site. Desmond agrees with Jack.
2.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he hopes team members have reached the FTP site or at least tried to get documents from there and that partner 3 has a limit on the size of files which can be sent. Charlotte agrees with Jack.
3.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said to Jack that he has seen that the documents were numbered. Jack agrees with Ben.
4.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said that the documents were numbered. However, Ben said that this is not very practical. He proposes naming the document and placing a number next to it.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ben said to create sub-directories, rather than numbering in just one directory. Jack agrees with Ben.
6.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he will use the original document format. Lucy agrees with Jack.
7.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that you should not just have PDF, as this is not accessible.
8.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that you should not just have PDF, as this is not accessible. Annie and Lucy agree with Kenneth.
9.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that you should not just have PDF, as this is not accessible. However, Ben just shrugs with this comment, neither agreeing or disagreeing.
10.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that she cannot read PDF. Ronnie agrees with Lucy.
11.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that he couldn't read PDF. However, Elsie said that she could read it.
12.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack sums up the decision. Desmond agrees with Jack.
13.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan said that he his reminding partners that presentations must all be placed in the FTP site. Annie and Christopher agree with Jonathan.
14.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *3*, sent by Jack informing the team that he had placed the project presentation on the site. Message *7*, sent by Hazel, saying that the timetable had been placed on there. Message *8*, sent by Hazel, informing the team of some other additional documents which had been placed on there. Message *9*, sent by Hazel, saying that the encyclopaedia entry had been placed on there Message *12*, sent by Jack, saying that the minutes were placed on there. Message *16*, sent by Charlotte, saying that a document on the problems visually impaired people face when using websites was placed on there. Message *36*, sent by Fabian, saying that that the site had been revised and other new documents added to it. Message *39*, sent by Jack, with a request for all team members to send documents to him, so he could place them onto the FTP site.
15.	Evidence of mutual belief when James and Desmond ask if it would be possible for the presentation to be included onto the FTP site. Thomas agrees.
16.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond asked if the FTP site has changed. Elsie said no, disagreeing with Desmond's question.
17.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said that the FTP site had not changed. Jack agrees with Elsie.
18.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he hopes that everyone is using the FTP site or that at least everyone knows how to do it. Also when Jack said that there was a change in the procedure. Elsie agrees with Jack.
19.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talks about the new system. For them to be sent to him and then he will send an e-mail to everyone telling them that a new document has been added to the list. Ronnie agrees with Jack.
20.	Evidence eof mutual belief when Desmond said to Jack that he sent him his file to be added to the site, but it was not, so he did it himself. Jack agrees with Desmond.
21.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said a lot of the documents received in the last 3-days have not been added to the site. Mary agrees with Jack.
22.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack shows the names of people on the mailing list. Hazel agrees that the list is ok.
23.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *11*, sent by Mary, said that she had placed the video clips in the server as they takes up lots of space.
24.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *45*, sent by Fabian, informing the team where they can find the document in the server. Message *46*, sent by Jack, informing the team where version 14 of annex 1 can be found on the server.
25.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2*, sent by Jack, informed the team of what presentations were included onto the site. Message *17*, sent by Fabian, to announce that the site had been updated. Message *18*, sent by Fabian, to say that other documents had been added to the list. Message *29*, sent by Fabian to say that the list had been updated again. Message *35*, sent by Mary, to say that the manual for accessible design was placed onto the site. Message *42*, sent by Mary to say that the evaluation plan was placed onto the server.
26.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *7*, sent by Mary, to inform the team of what documents she had placed onto the site.
27.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they have got a designer in the team. Desmond agrees with Jack.
28.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack and Desmond say that there is a designer in the team. However, Fabian, disagrees, saying that it is not true.
29.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that what Jack is showing cannot be seen. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
30.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris explained how the logo should appear in Braille. Charlotte agrees with Morris.
31.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said that he can write it down. Charlotte agrees that she can read Braille too.
32.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris writes the name of the project in his Braille machine. Jack agrees with Morris when he is shown it.
33.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack reminds the team or his role and Jonathan's role in the project. They were told this in Madrid as well. However, it is assumed that everyone here agrees with it, as there was no evidence to suggest otherwise.
34.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that communication is always important. Annie agrees with Jack.
35.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said that communication is important. However, Annie said that there is no point in asking for documentation if no-one gives it.
36.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that there is no point in asking for documentation if no-one gives it. Jack agrees with Annie.
37.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that is why he asks for everyone to send him an e-mail to explain things. Annie agrees with Jack.
38.	Evidence of mutual belief when Christopher asked if they were looking at names for the project. Kenneth agrees with Christopher.
39.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said the name that was the best bet to use for the project. There was agreement in the background.
40.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *23*, sent by Fabian, informing the team that the new version of the official site is now available.
41.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack talks about the project webpage. It is assumed everyone agrees with what he is saying, as there was no evidence to suggest otherwise.
42.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 39, sent by Jack, informing the team that some partners had difficulties in using the webpage. Message 41, sent by Mary, saying that problems were only experienced when using different versions of the browsers.
43.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *23*, sent by Fabian, informing the team that the new version of the

	official site is now available.
44.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if G is partner 7 or 5. Lucy agrees that what Jack has is ok, as he is in partner 5.
45.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that is why they have got partner 5 listed. Jack agrees with Lucy.
46.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack proposes that he only sends mail to the mailing list address for partner 3 and not to their e-mail as well, otherwise they will receive duplicate messages. Charlotte agrees with Jack and Jack agrees with Charlotte.
47.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks as Paul is not there is anyone knows his e-mail address. Desmond agrees with Jack.
48.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond says to Jack that he can write it down as it is very easy. Jack agrees with Desmond.
49.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked how to change it on the set-up. Ben agrees that the button Jack was showing was the right one to use.
50.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said to make sure that everyone's name is on the list. Hazel disagrees with the list, saying that Sajal needs to be added onto it.
51.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asks Sajal for her e-mail address. Sajal agrees with Hazel's request, telling her what her e-mail address is.
52.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel repeat's Sajal's e-mail address. Jack agrees with Hazel.
53.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that Paul's e-mail address was very sophisticated. Jack agrees with Hazel.
54.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he should include Paul Brass. Mary agrees with Jack.
55.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asked if she could ask a question. Jack agrees with Mary's request.
56.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asked if there was a difference in who receives the e-mail in the two addresses that there are. Jack disagrees with Mary.
57.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he saw an e-mail sent, with a reply from her or from someone working with her. Mary agrees with Jack.
58.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he noticed the different address and that it might be because of the server. Hazel agrees with Jack.
59.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that she had problems replying to that one. Jack agrees with Mary.
60.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he included KC. Hazel agrees with Jack.
61.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that Conwayne and Sajal were two names added to the list. Hazel and Mary agree with Jack.
62.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jonathan proposes that every 15-days everyone provides a report of their work. Annie agrees with Jonathan's proposal.
63.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jonathan proposes that every 15-days everyone provides a report of their work. Hazel disagrees with Jonathan's proposal.
64.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel said that disagrees with Jonathan's proposal to report every 15-days. Jonathan proposed every 3-weeks instead.
65.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jonathan proposed that reporting takes place every 3-weeks. Hazel disagrees, proposing every 4-weeks instead.
66.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes reporting every 4-weeks. Kenneth and Jonathan agree with Hazel.
67.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel proposes reporting every 4-weeks, with Kenneth and Jonathan agreeing with her proposal. However, Annie disagrees saying that she thinks reporting every 15-days is better than reporting just once a month.
68.	Evidence of no eventual agreement reached on what the reporting period should be.
69.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding on what the reporting period should be.
70.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Hazel said that she will make sure her plan has lots of little deadlines, rather than reporting every 15-days. She also said that an e-mail will be sent to everyone asking them to look at the plan. It is assumed that everyone agrees with what Hazel said as there was no other reaction to suggest otherwise.
71.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie spoke about the evaluation committee. Kenneth agrees with Ronnie.
72.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said the review will want to see that they have made progress towards each of the objectives. Ronnie agrees with Hazel.
73.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that as Jack said there will be certain deliverables which are due at month 12 that will need to be presented. Jack agrees with Hazel.
74.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that according to the work plan they do not have a lot which is going to be delivered to be reviewed. Ronnie agrees with Kenneth.
75.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they are going to be reviewed against what they have delivered. He said that they need to be clearer to represent all of the work they have done in the deliverables they put forward. Hazel agrees with Kenneth.
76.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that one of her concerns at the moment is that the deliverable out of work package 1, does not have the user requirements document as such. Lucy agrees with Kenneth.
77.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if they are not clear where they are aiming for in those documents, neither will be the reviewers, or have that confidence. Ronnie agrees with Kenneth.
78.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that he does not think what they are being shown should be shown to the commission at the review. However, Annie disagrees saying that what they are showing is not a prototype of the web authoring tool or what an accessible webpage is going to be.
79.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they are showing a prototype of what the technology is offering. Ronnie agrees with Annie.
80.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Annie said that they are showing a prototype of what the technology is offering. Ronnie disagrees saying that they are showing something that they already know very well.
81.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that they are being shown something that they already know very well. Annie disagrees, saying that they are trying to show the Conpalabras plug-in.
82.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that they need something extra, something which enhances e-learning content for example. Mary and Hazel agree with Paul.
83.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they might not continue working together after the evaluation. James agrees and thanks Ronnie for his comments.
84.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he could not ask partner 3 for their opinion. Kenneth said that he agrees with what Ronnie has said.
85.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks Michael as well and the translator agrees with what Ronnie said.
86.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *19*, sent by Jack, saying that he was expecting to receive information from the commission today. Message *21*, sent by Jack, with official documentation sent by the commission. Message *32*, sent by Jack saying that there will be no review meeting in Brussels. Message *34*, sent by Jack, informing the team that he will be sending information to the commission at the time stated in the message. Message *43*, sent by Jack, informing the team that the commission have said that they have received continuation of the project. Message *44*, sent by Hazel, saying that this is excellent news. Message *45*, sent by Fabian, informing Hazel and the team where copies of the relevant documents could be accessed.
87.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack mentions the good news that the project has passed its evaluation and for this reason they will have a different type of meeting to what was originally planned. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.

88.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack gives a name of an external expert. Paul agrees with Jack that he is well known and Jack agrees with Paul and Paul agrees with Jack.
89.	Evidence of muutual belief when Paul said that this expert has been in the field for a number of years. Jack agrees with Paul.
90.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack mentions that names of the documents which must be sent for the review. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
91.	Evidence of mutual belief that Mary wants to ask a question. Jack agrees with Mary.
92.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary asked if they need to submit the full version at the end of September to the commission. Jack disagrees saying that they need to send the preliminary version.
93.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said preliminary version and Jack agrees with Mary and Mary agrees with Jack.
94.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the submission should be made to the commission of all the documents. Jack agrees with Mary.
95.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he would like to go back to the review report. Fabian and James agree with Kenneth.
96.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said to check with the commission, because from his experience on other project's, the commission would expect an updated version as part of the annual report. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
97.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he is talking about the annual review at the end of the first year. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
98.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said he thought that the update had to be done now. Kenneth disagrees with Jack.
99.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said the update does not need to be now, it is at the end of September and also that they will need to start addressing those points. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
100.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *20*, sent by Jack, with the date sent by the commission for the annual review. Message *53*, sent by Jack regarding the annual review and a list of proposed names of who should attend this meeting.
101.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *21*, sent by Jack, saying he needed agreement that everyone agrees to the extension of the project. Message *44*, sent by Jack, listing the additional information that the commission requires.
102.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they will talk about the annual review in the afternoon because this is important. Hazel agrees with Jack.
103.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel shows that she would like to say something. Jack agrees with Hazel.
104.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel shared her concerns with the date the documents would be sent to the commission and the date of the review and if this would give them enough time to read it. Jack disagrees that the review will only be for the work done until July.
105.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said July. Jack agrees with Hazel and said 31st July. Hazel also agrees with Jack.
106.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said preliminary. Jack agrees and said that the preliminary versions were already sent last week. Hazel also agrees with Jack.
107.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said everything needs to be sent to the commission within one month. Hazel agrees with Jack.
108.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that what was delivered was what was done until July. Hazel agrees with Jack.
109.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Hazel said that the presentation she is giving can be used as the basis of the presentation she can give in Brussels. There was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
110.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that if she finished the survey chapter next week and feels that there is something interesting, they can send it separately to the commission. Jack agrees with hazel and Hazel agrees with Jack. Jack also agrees with Hazel.
111.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talks about the defence. Hazel agrees that she will mention it in the dense.
112.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said if they do a presentation at the review, she can use those overheads, but that each overhead will say more about the contents of each of the chapter Mary agrees with Hazel.
113.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said she will provide more detail at the review as she did not do this here. Mary and Jack agree with Hazel. Hazel agrees with them too.
114.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will have to leave by 6pm. Jack agrees with Hazel.
115.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they have the contract for 27 months. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Jack.
116.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the review will be 3rd October in Brussels and they have asked to send five copies of the documentation's. Mary agrees with Jack.
117.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he knows some of the experts. Lucy agrees with Ronnie.
118.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he remembered one of the experts. Hazel agrees with Jack.
119.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack mentioned an expert name he was not sure of. Jack disagrees with this name.
120.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said no to the name Jack mentioned. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
121.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the commission might say not to do anymore. Jack agrees with Hazel.
122.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that a remedial action might be to change people from one work package to another. Mary agrees with Jack.
123.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said he was asked if they need anything special for the review and he said no. Annie disagrees and said speakers.
124.	Evidence of mutual belief when Annie said that they need speakers for the annual review. Hazel agrees with Annie.
125.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they need speakers for the review.
126.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that you need to be positive at the review as it is not a defence. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
127.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said to be prepared on questions on exploitation. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
128.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said to make sure that you give equal weights to the parts of the presentation and that the time you have used effectively. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
129.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said to send comments and suggestions for the review. Mary agrees with Jack and Jack agrees with Mary.
130.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that Hazel is on time to leave. Hazel agrees with Jack.
131.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *8*, sent by Annie, informing the team of the success of the review. Message *9*, sent by Jack, informing the team of the outcomes of the review. Message *12*, sent by Jack, with the official report from the review attached.
132.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *23*, sent by Jack, informing the team that the second quarterly report is going to be used for the special report. Message *24*, sent by Fabian, with the first version of this report. Message *26*, sent by Thomas, which was a blank message on this theme and without any attachments attached. Message *27*, sent by Charles, with his comments. Message *28*, from someone at partner 5, with a proposal written by Lucy. Message *30*, sent by Hazel, informing the team of her progress and her intentions to continue with her contributions. Message *31*, sent by Hazel, with her contributions to the report. Message *32*, sent by Jack, answering some questions Hazel asked in message 31. Message *34*, sent by Jack, informing the team that he was going to send the report to the commission on the following day. Message *35*, sent by Desmond with his comments on the report.
133.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that the second quarterly report can be used a base for the special report and the items which were still outstanding and required contributions from team members. This is because there was no other evidence found to suggest otherwise.

134.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he would like to go back to the review report. Fabian and James agree with Kenneth.
135.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said to check with the commission, because from his experience on other project's, the commission would expect an updated version as part of the annual report. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
136.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that he is talking about the annual review at the end of the first year. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
137.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said he thought that the update had to be done now Kenneth disagrees with Jack.
138.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said the update does not need to be now, it is at the end of September and also that they will need to start addressing those points. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
139.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *6*, sent by Jack, with a forwarded message from Charles on the review report.
140.	Growth in mutual understanding – message 8, sent by Fabian, attaching a draft version of the document with answers to comments in the project review report. Message 19, sent by Jack, informing the team that the document answering the reviewers comments was sent to the commission.
141.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked for a template with how they want the report for the quarterly report Jack agrees with Hazel and Hazel agrees with Jack.
142.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *30*, sent by Jack , including information shared during the London meeting. Message *33*, sent by Jack, asking partners for their contributions. Message *34*, sent by Jack, informing the team that he had not received many contributions. Message *36*, sent by Fabian, with a draft of this report. Message *37*, sent by Fabian, with a second draft of this report. Message *39*, sent by Jack, informing the team that the report was on the FTP server. Message *40*, sent by Jack, informing the team that the report had been sent to the commission.
143.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *22*, sent by Fabian, with a draft attached to the message. Message *23*, sent by Jack, with the last version of this report. Message *30*, sent by Hazel, informing everyone of her progress with her contributions. Message *31*, sent by Hazel, with her contributions to the report. Message *32*, sent by Jack, thanking partner 8 for their comments. Message *52*, sent by Jack, with the last version of the second quarterly report attached to it.
144.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that the second quarterly report was sent to the commission on May 10th. There was no other evidence found to suggest otherwise.
145.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that the quarterly report which is going to be made by partner 1 will be circulated around the 20th of August. He said he did not know how this date would suit everyone. Lucy said the 15th of August would suit nobody.
146.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said the 15th of August was not a suitable date. Ronnie and James agree with Lucy.
147.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 38, sent by Jack, with the first version of this report attached.
148.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that the quarterly report was sent to the commission after comments were received on it. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
149.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said to check the table that is at the end of the report. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
150.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said to check the table that is at the end of the report. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
151.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *14*, sent by Jack, a reminder to the team that some contributions were still required. Message *24*, sent by Jack, with another reminder to the team for their contributions to this report.
152.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *20*, sent by Fabian, with a preliminary version of this report.
153.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *23*, sent by Jack, including a work plan for the new annex 1. Message *32*, sent by Jack, thanking partners for their contributions and comments. Message *34*, sent by Jack with the deadline for receiving contributions and comments. Message *46*, sent by Jack, informing the team of the slight changes which are required. Message *47*, sent by Jack, stating that a new version of annex 1 had been prepared. Message *49*, sent by Jack with the same details sent in message 47.
154.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that the commission asked for a new annex 1, the technical annex. They are in the 14th version and this version was sent to the commission.
155.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that version 15 of the annex was sent a week ago. Desmond agrees with Jack.
156.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth proposes that he is told where the changes were made. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Kenneth.
157.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that they are referring to page 23. Lucy agrees with Fabian.
158.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said Kenneth had already sent his comments and asks Kenneth to summarise the content or explanations. Kenneth agrees with Jack.
159.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth picked up that no time scale was mentioned for tasks 3.3 and 4.1. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
160.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the technical partners can demonstrate something, but they need the option of the user groups to agree what it does. Fabian, someone in the team whose identity was not revealed and Annie agree with Kenneth.
161.	Evidence of mutual belief when Fabian said that he was not going to teach them. Kenneth agrees with Fabian.
162.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that there is no link between the tasks. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
163.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they need to have something to suggest that if this does not work out in that way, there is an alternative which will take account of that and will continue that process. Fabian agrees with Kenneth.
164.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that Annie rightly said that they are not going to redesign an authoring tool after it has taken years to build.
165.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth mentions areas that they should be concentrating on. Also, that this deliverable has to be sent very soon in a form that the commission will approve. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
166.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said they have to address what is said or to say to them that we understand the point that they are making, but that it is outside of the scope of the project. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
167.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2*, sent by Jack informing the team when they will receive the document and when comments should be sent by. Message *3*, sent by Jack with version 16 attached to the message. Message *6*, sent by Jack, with a forwarded message from Charles. Message *8*, sent by Fabian with the latest version of the annex attached. Message *9*, sent by Hazel with her concerns outlined. Message *19*, sent by Jack to inform the team that the last version of annex 1 was sent to the commission.
168.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that during the review they will use the annex, the technical annex to look at the efforts which are being used and for explanations why not if necessary. This is because there was no evidence to suggest otherwise.
169.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *43* sent by Jack, informing the team of the contributions which are required for this annex. Message *46* sent by Jack reminding the team that this annex is required today. Message *47*, sent by Jack reminding partners who had not sent their contributions to do so urgently. Message *49* sent by Jack, with the same contents as message 47.
170.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that Kenneth wants to talk about the annex that has to be sent. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
171.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that he had requested an updated annex 2, this is the financial information. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
172.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that annex 2 was sent last Friday. This is because there was no other

	evidence to suggest otherwise.
173.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth talks about extension to the contracts. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
174.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if it is an amendment to the contract it should include the whole contract. James agrees with Kenneth.
175.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *43*, sent by Jack informing the team that an updated CFP is required Message *46*, sent by Jack reminding team members of their contributions which should be received on that day. Message *47*, sent by Jack reminding those that have not sent their contributions to do so urgently. Message 49 sent by Jack, with the same contents as message *47*.
176.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that they have requested an update4d CPF. They are now in version 31. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
177.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that the CPF was sent last Friday. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
178.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said to explain things better. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
179.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he will try and ask partners for their signatures. Lucy and Desmond agree with Jack and Jack agrees with them..
180.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talked about the CPF and the structure that it has. James agrees with Jack when he talked about the structure.
181.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack talked the CFP form. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
182.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said the good news is that a complimentary advance payment could be set. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Jack.
183.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack spoke about the financial information the German partners need for 2001. Desmond agrees with Jack.
184.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack spoke about the process that needs to be followed if they want the advance payment. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
185.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the German partners will have to let them know if they accept the bank guarantee or to not receive the advance payment. James agrees with Jack.
186.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said it is not a problem to not receive the advance payment. Mary agrees with Jack.
187.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the German partners have received the advance payment of the first year. James agrees with Jack.
188.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that after the first cost statement they will receive 60% of the first year, but will not receive advance payment of the propagation. James agrees with Jack.
189.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 21, sent by Jack informing the team that the advance payment for the next 15 months has been received.
190.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he thinks that they will get their money after the first cost statement. James agrees with Jack.
191.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that 12 cost statements have to be produced. James agrees with Jack.
192.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that means that they have to produce the cost statement now and then again after 3 months. Jack agrees with James.
193.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they would not want to do that as the final one would be the final cost statement. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
194.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they want the cost statement for the 24th period. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
195.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks about the payments and Jack agrees with James.
196.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that they are very close to the cost statement and if anything is detected that is not ok, they will try to amend it. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
197.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said what he had just described had to be done. Jack agrees with James.
198.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator mentioned the 1st of October. Jack disagreed saying that was totally wrong.
199.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said what the translator said was totally wrong. James agrees with Jack.
200.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that they have October or November. Jack agrees with James.
201.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James and Jack say that they have till October or November. However, Desmond disagrees, asking if it is not till September.
202.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks if it is then one month earlier. Jack agrees with James.
203.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the new deadline is at the end of November. James agrees with Jack.
204.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator asked if this was starting in the 1st of October. James agrees with the translator.
205.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator asked if not October. Ronnie disagrees with the translator.
206.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said September. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with the translator.
207.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said it is from 1st October from last year to 30th September this year. James agrees with Jack.
208.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks Jack if a draft is available with the financial tables for the extended project and if this is on the FTP site. Jack agrees with James.
209.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James asks if there is one table with all of the financial information for the project. Jack disagrees with James saying that he will not find this.
210.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said it would be the new electra and that he can send this. James agrees with Jack.
211.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said he would send the new electra. However, James disagrees, proposing instead to put it on the FTP site, so that they can download it themselves.
212.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *14* sent by Jack reminding team members that he required the cost statement of partners.
213.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *9*, sent by Jack, informing the team that partner 6 had solved their situation.
214.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack spoke about the bank guarantee. This is because no evidence was found to suggest otherwise.
215.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack talks about the bank guarantee. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
216.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *12*, sent by Jack confirming receipt of the signed amendment and asking for outstanding actions to be dealt with immediately.
217.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that partner 8 needed the amendment for the transfer of their money. Mary agrees with Jack.
218.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that as long as her partner organisation has the piece of paper to say that the money is coming then that is ok. Jack agrees with Hazel.
219.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that partner 8 had a change in name and change in company. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
220.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that partner 8 had a change in name. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.

221.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that partner 1 had a change in company structure. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
222.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that partner 8 had a change in name. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
223.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *25*, sent by Fabian, informing the team that partner 2 is now part of a bigger company and have changed their name. Partners require confirmation of acceptance of the new name. Message *27*, sent by James contained his acceptance to the change of name. Message *29*, sent by Fabian was a reminder for the acceptance to be sent. Message *44*, sent by Jack informed the team that he expecting the amendment to be signed next week. Message *45*, was sent by Jack, informing the team that that the draft amendment was received and included instructions on how to complete it. Message *47*, sent by Jack said that he hoped the team received the documents he sent by courier. Message 48, sent by Jack, showed that partner 3 had noticed a typing error.
224.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that they no longer have their old name for the project used. Mary and Hazel agree with Jack.
225.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said the new name. Annie agrees with Jack.
226.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that partner 8 had a change in name. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
227.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that he has communicated to the commission the change of name and change in legal address for partner 3. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
228.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that partner 3 have changed their name. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
229.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *31* sent by Jack is a forwarded message from the commission. Message *33* sent by Jack is a reminder for the letter to be sent. Message *34* sent by Jack is informing the team that he is still waiting for the statement. A request for this to be sent urgently is also made.
230.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the start date of the project is 1st September, not October. Ronnie agrees with Jack.
231.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that there was a change in the commencement of the project. The contract said the first of September, however, the amendment said the first of October. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
232.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said to formalise the process the project manager can be asked. However, there is a need to include the change in involvement of the work packages in the next amendment. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
233.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that he is reminding everyone that one of the requests was to inform the project officer that the effort of partner 7 in work package 4 has been brought forward, however, it was not a change in the money. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
234.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack spoke about partner 8 using consumables. Mary and Hazel agree with Jack.
235.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he is talking to Lucy about the numbers- to change 20% from travel costs to consumables. Lucy agrees with Jack.
236.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he will also ask the German organisation if they want to change 20% of their costs from travel to consumables. Desmond agrees with Jack.
237.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that he will write to Mr J regarding the change in costs. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
238.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said that there was a change in the budget changing the costs from travel to consumables, for partners 6, 5 and 7. He also said that there was a change of budget for partner 8. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
239.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said that Mr J has asked him to check that if there are any changes in who signed the last amendment , Lucy disagrees with Jack that they have any change.
240.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that they have no change in who signed the last amendment. Ronnie agrees with Lucy and Jack agrees with Ronnie.
241	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond indicated that he had a question to ask. Jack agrees with Desmond that he can ask the question.
242.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that they had two people signing the amendment, but would like to only make one person sign it now. He asks if this change can be made. Jack agrees with Desmond's request.
243.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that this change can be done in the CPF. Desmond agrees with Jack.
244.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that partner 9 changed their signatures. Desmond agrees with Jack.
245.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they will have a problem if the contract amendments come out in July or August. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
246.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said this is because the signatories are likely to be away or unavailable. Lucy agrees with Kenneth.
247.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that if they are asked for the signature in one week and the director is on holiday for three weeks, then this will cause problems. Jack agrees with Ronnie.
248.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that the commission do need to let them know when the signatures are required. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed and Jack agree with Kenneth. Kenneth agrees with them too.
249.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that otherwise there are going to be difficulties. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
250.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he remembers the difficulties that they had last year Kenneth agrees with Jack. Jack agrees with Kenneth as well.
251.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that this needs to be clarified. Jack agrees with Paul.
252.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2* sent by Jack asking everyone to confirm that the person who will sign this amendment is the last as the first.
253.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack talks about the propagation to the contract. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
254.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that it is worth taking the point that even if the commission is not going to prolong the contract, most of what Jack talked about it required to get the final payment for the next 12 months. Jack agrees with Kenneth.
255.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *21* sent by Jack informs the team that he required an e-mail saying that they agree for the project to be extended. Message *44* sent by Jack, informing the team that the commission now requires further information.
256.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the next amendment will include the prolongation of the contract and the change in costs required as this was not included in number 2, so will need to be included in number 3. Hazel agrees with Jack.
257.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack spoke about their financial situation to do with the prolongation of the project. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
258.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2* sent by Jack with a preliminary version of this document. Message *3* sent by Jack to inform the team that he has received the draft amendment. Message *5* sent by Jack asking the team to inform him of their situation. Message *13* sent by Jack informing the team that contributions from the partners had been received and all the problems had been solved.
259.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack said spoke about the signature representations. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.

260.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Jack spoke about the signature mandate. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
261.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2* sent by Jack, informing everyone that they can sign amendments on their behalf.
262.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she thinks the next meeting is in March. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
263.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said the dates she believed for the next meeting. However, Ronnie disagrees with Lucy, saying that he has other dates.
264.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel agrees that it is the date that Ronnie said.
265.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy asked if team members wanted the meeting on a Thursday or Friday. Hazel disagrees with Lucy saying that is should be a 2-day meeting, not just one.
266.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes a 2-day meeting, not just one. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
267.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks for availability on the 14th and 15th of March. Hazel agrees with Lucy that those dates are ok for her.
268.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Lucy asks for availability on the 14th and 15th of March. This is because there was no evidence to suggest otherwise.
269.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that she will send an e-mail to the entire consortium telling them the date that has been selected fore the next meeting. Jonathan agrees with Hazel.
270.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *2* sent by Hazel, with dates for the second face-to-face meeting. Message *4*, sent by Desmond suggests moving the dates for the next meeting.
271.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *29* sent by Lucy, a forwarded message concerning booking hotel rooms for the meeting. Message *32* from France Daillet, reminding the team that they still are waiting to hear from them regarding booking hotel rooms.
272.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *38* sent by Jack with a preliminary agenda for the second meeting. Message *41* sent by Jack with another version of the agenda sent to the team.
273.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack talks about some dates not being suitable for partners 5 and 7. Lucy agrees with Jack that the 14th does not suit her either.
274.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if they are now talking about dates in June. Jack agrees with Paul.
275.	Evidence of mutual belief when James suggests the 20th and 21st. Jack agrees with James.
276.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asks about dates one week after that proposed. Paul disagrees with after, and asks about dates one week before the ones proposed.
277.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack proposes the 6th and 7th. Hazel disagrees with Jack.
278.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel disagrees with the 6th and 7th. Lucy agrees with Hazel.
279.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that there are many events in Madrid in June, so if they decide to have the meeting in Madrid, it will be necessary to book the hotel rooms Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed and Annie agree with Ronnie.
280.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack proposes the 19th and 20th. James agrees that this is a Wednesday and Tuesday.
281.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that the proposed dates fall on a Wednesday and Tuesday. Agreement that those dates are ok with Jack and Hazel.
282.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he does not know the problems on travelling on a Sunday. Ronnie agrees with Jack that there is a problem.
283.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is a not a problem to travel if you have a stick.
284.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is not a problem to travel if you have a stick. Elsie agrees with Ronnie.
285.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is cheaper if you have a Saturday included in the stay. Hazel agrees with Ronnie.
286.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie and Hazel said that it is cheaper if you have a Saturday included in the stay. Lucy disagrees and Ronnie disagrees with Lucy, saying it is Sunday.
287.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie disagrees with Lucy that you need to stay a Sunday to make the stay cheaper. Elsie and Hazel agree with Ronnie.
288.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that a Saturday night stay is required to make it cheaper. Paul and Lucy agree with Hazel.
289.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James proposes the 6th and 7th. Ronnie disagrees with those dates that have been proposed.
290.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie proposes the 21st and 22nd, leaving on a Sunday. Hazel disagrees with Ronnie.
291.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel disagrees with leaving the meeting on a Sunday. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
292.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is ok to leave on Sunday. Elsie disagrees with Ronnie too.
293.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie says no to leaving on a Sunday. Hazel and Mary agree with Elsie.
294.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes the 19th and 20th. Kenneth agrees with Hazel.
295.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul asks what were the dates that were agreed on. Jack said that he does not think that there has been an agreement.
296.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes the 19th and 20th. Jack and Lucy agree with Hazel.
297.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if this is a Wednesday. Lucy agrees with Paul.
298.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that Wednesday's are difficult for him. However, for people to still go ahead, as he is the only one.
299.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that a Thursday and Friday would be better for him. Jack agrees with Desmond.
300.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary suggested Monday's and Tuesdays. Hazel and James agree with Mary.
301.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that the meeting is on a Saturday. Mary agrees with Hazel that this is good.
302.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they will have problems with the tickets. Elsie agrees with Ronnie
303.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie said that tickets will be more expensive. Ronnie agrees with Elsie.
304.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asks about the 20th and 21st. Hazel and Mary agree with James.
305.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel and Mary said that the 20th and 21st was ok for them, but it was a problem with Elsie.
306.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said if the 20th and 21st is selected, then partner 5 will not be able to attend the meeting.
307.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that it is just Lucy who cannot attend and not the others. Lucy disagrees with Ronnie.
308.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that it is not only her with the problem. Ronnie agrees with Lucy, that is a problem for everyone.
309.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asked if the weekend after would be too late. James and Mary agree with Ronnie.
310.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that he thinks it will be difficult for the technical partners to react if there is a problem. Mary, Annie and Ronnie agree with Jack.
311.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy suggests the 17th and 18th. Desmond agrees with Lucy.
312.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy and Desmond said that the 17th and 18th was ok for them. However, Hazel and Ronnie disagree with the choice of proposed dates.
313.	Evidence of mutual belief when James proposes the 10th and 11th. Michael agrees with James. Others agreed with James too

	in the background.
314.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Michael and others agree with the 10th and 11th. However, Hazel disagrees with the choice of proposed dates.
315.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel disagrees with the 10th and 11th. Ronnie agrees with hazel.
316.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Mary said that she could also not attend on the 10th and 11th.
317.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel proposes the 3rd and 4th. Lucy disagrees with Hazel.
318.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy disagrees with the 3rd and 4th. Elsie and Mary agree with Lucy that those dates are not suitable.
319.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy, Elsie and Mary said that the proposed dates were not suitable for them. Desmond disagrees saying that they are ok for him.
320.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel proposes the 6th and 7th. Desmond disagrees with Hazel.
321.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that the 6th and 7th were not good got him. Mary agrees with Desmond.
322.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel proposes the 3rd and 4th. Paul and Mary agree with Hazel.
323.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul said that it is solved that the next meeting date will be on the 3rd and 4th.
324.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul requests that they actually start the meeting on the Monday morning and not to just arrive on that day. Hazel agrees with Paul
325.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul suggests that everyone arrives on the Sunday and start work on the Monday Hazel and Kenneth agree with Paul.
326.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Paul questions why the meeting needs to be held in Madrid. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
327.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack asked if they were missing something. Ronnie disagrees with Jack.
328.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked if everyone likes to stay close to the venue. Hazel and Paul agree with Jack.
329.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie mentioned accessibility. Mary and Jack agree with Ronnie
330.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asks if the hotel for the kick-off meeting was ok for everyone. Paul and Hazel agree with Paul.
331.	Evidence of mutual belief when Elsie asked if she had the right name in mind for the hotel which was being referred to. Jack and Hazel agree with Elsie.
332.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said that hotel was fine. Jack agrees with Hazel.
333.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Hazel asked if they would meet at their office (partners 1 and 2). Jack disagrees with Hazel.
334.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel asked if they would meet at that place. Jack and Mary agree with Hazel.
335.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie asks would it not be interesting to visit their offices. Jack, Annie, Fabian and Hazel agree with Ronnie.
336.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he would like to visit everywhere. James agrees with Ronnie.
337.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *20* sent by Jack informing the team that partners 8 and 3 cannot attend the meeting. Message *25* sent by Jack informing the team that the new proposed dates seem ok with everyone Message *33* sent by Jack, informing the team that they would send the booking information to the hotel the next day Message *36* sent by Hazel said that she did not say that the original dates were a problem for her. Message *39* sent by Jack said that the final dates for the meeting was 6th and 7th. Message *54* sent by Hazel informed the team that she could not attend this meeting, but would circulate two documents which Mary would discuss in her absence at the meeting
338.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *48* sent by Jack with the first version of the agenda attached. Message *53* sent by Jack included the final version of the agenda.
339.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said Luevena. Mary disagrees with the name because it is incorrect.
340.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said this was in Belgium. Annie and Desmond agree with James.
341.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy asks if the 11th and 12th is a Wednesday and Thursday. James agrees with Lucy.
342.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy asks if the meeting can be held on a weekend. Kenneth disagrees with Lucy's proposal.
343.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy proposes that the meeting begins on a Thursday and finished on Friday. Someone in the team whose identity was not revealed agrees with Lucy.
344.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy talks about Apex tickets. James agrees with Lucy.
345.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy said that with an Apex ticket you have to stay one night from Saturday to Sunday. Mary agrees with Lucy.
346.	Evidence of mutual belief when James proposes to move the dates to the 12th and 13th to reduce costs for the partners. Lucy agrees with James
347.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that the dates he suggest4ed for one week after might be too late if they have to modify several things. Desmond agrees with James.
348.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that he cannot attend the meeting on the 19th and 20th.
349.	Evidence of mutual belief when James asked if members could attend the 19th and 20th. There was some agreement in the background.
350.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul asked were they not just talking about having a Saturday night meeting. Kenneth disagrees with Paul.
351.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul proposes a Friday and Saturday meeting. James agrees with Paul.
352.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Lucy proposed working the whole day on Friday and half day on Saturday. James disagrees with Lucy.
353.	Evidence of mutual belief when James disagrees to working the whole day on Friday and half day on Saturday. Kenneth and Lucy agree with James.
354.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when James said that he believes that a weekend meeting is not ok for several partners. Paul disagrees saying that it is possible for him.
355.	Evidence of no growth in mutual understanding when Paul said he could not understand why there could be no meeting on the weekend.
356.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said that they do not agree to meetings on the weekend.
357.	Evidence of mutual belief when Kenneth said that they should be able to hold these meetings during the week. James agrees with Kenneth.
358.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said trying to use Thursday and Fridays for potential dates to hold the meeting. Mary agrees with James. Others agree with this in the background too.
359.	Evidence of mutual belief when Lucy requests James to repeat what he said. She agrees with him.
360.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary agrees with James' proposed dates of 12th and 13th.
361.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Ronnie said that he cannot be sure of the proposed dates.
362.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that he cannot be sure of the proposed dates. James agrees with Ronnie.
363.	Evidence of no eventual agreement reached for the date of the next meeting. This is because Ronnie could not be sure of his availability for the proposed dates.
364.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *5* sent by Jack was a forwarded message explaining why Desmond, Keith and Paul could not attend this meeting.
365.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *37* sent by Charles addressed to Annie, but sent to everyone as it contained information others may find relevant to attending the meeting.
366.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *44* sent by Jack with his intentions to send the agenda for the

	meeting. Message *46* sent by Jack with a draft attached. Message *54* sent by Jack informing the team of the change in agenda.
367.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Kenneth said 16. However, Jack disagreed with this and said 18.
368.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said 18. However, Kenneth said 16.
369.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked if they can meet in January. Annie agrees with Jack, saying middle of January.
370	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack asked the partners if they agree that the next meeting should be in Verona. Ronnie agrees with Jack.
371.	Evidence of mutual belief when James said that Verona would be better than Leaven at that time. Jack agrees with James.
372.	Evidence of mutual belief when the translator said for Saturday nights to be included for the price of a cheap ticket. Jack agrees with the translator.
373.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that this is the same discussion that they have already had. They can do Thursday and Friday for the meeting and if someone wants to use the Saturday night discount then they can stay. Mary agrees with Jack.
374.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator said you have to have Saturday for the cheap price. Jack disagrees with the translator.
375.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said no to having to stay the Saturday for a cheap price. James agrees with Jack.
376.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said he thinks that Thursday and Friday is the better choice. Mary and Ronnie agree with Jack. So do some other team members in the background.
377.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack proposed 16th and 17th. Lucy disagrees with this proposal.
378.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris proposes Thursday and Friday. Jack agrees with Morris and suggests the 17th.
379.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack proposes 16th and 17th. However, Ronnie said that they will need to check.
380.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that they will need to check that the proposed dates are ok for them. Jack and Kenneth agree with Ronnie.
381.	Evidence of mutual belief when Ronnie said that if they do not hear anything from them, then the 16th and 17th is ok for them.
382.	Evidence of no decision reached on what the final date for the meeting should be.
383.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when the translator said the 17th was a Friday. Mary disagrees, saying that the 17th is a Thursday.
384.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary said that the 17th is a Thursday. Ronnie agrees with Mary.
385.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary asks if the 17th is unlucky. Jack agrees, saying it is bad luck in Italy.
386.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that Friday the 17th is bad luck in Italy. Annie agrees with Jack.
387.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said Tuesday 13th is bad luck. Annie and James agree with Jack.
388.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that is why flight prices were so cheap that week, because no one wanted to fly. Mary agrees with Jack.
389.	Evidence of mutual belief when Morris said never to mention RyanAir. The translator agrees with Morris.
390.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding - message 16 sent by Jack, reminding the team of the date and venue of the next meeting. Message 18 sent by Jack with information sent by Michael on hotels. Message *19* sent by Jack with further information on the venue and on hotels.
391.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *18* sent by Jack, with a preliminary version of the agenda for the meeting. Message *22* sent by Jack with a revised version of the agenda.
392.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that the minutes for this meeting should be earlier. There is agreement in the background from team members to Desmond's request. Paul also agrees with Desmond.
393.	Evidence of mutual belief when Jack said that the minutes can be changed if anything is detected, for example, something is missing. Desmond agrees with Jack.
394.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that he could not find the presentation he just made. Jack agrees with Desmond, Desmond agrees with Jack and Jack agrees with Desmond.
395.	Evidence of mutual belief when Desmond said that they need the minutes earlier. Jack agrees with Desmond and Desmond agrees with Jack.
396.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Desmond proposed the minutes to be received in one week. Hazel disagrees saying that would be Christmas Eve.
397.	Evidence of mutual belief when Hazel said in one week it would be Christmas Eve. Desmond agrees with Hazel.
398.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *12* sent by Jack requesting everyone to look at the minutes. Message *15* sent by Christopher with minutes of the technical meeting they had. Message *17* sent by Annie, with the same contents as message 15. Message *19* sent by Annie with the same contents as messages 15 and 17.
399.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Paul said that he did not receive the minutes for the London meeting. Jack disagrees saying that the minutes were placed onto the FTP site.
400.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asks if the minutes were placed onto the FTP site. Annie agrees with Paul.
401.	Evidence of mutual belief when Paul asked if they were on the FTP server. Jack agrees with Paul and Paul agrees with Jack.
402.	Evidence of altered mutual belief when Jack said that maybe he (Paul) did not receive the minutes because he was not on the mailing list. Paul said this maybe the case, however, will go and check.
403.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 2 sent by Jack, with his intentions on producing the minutes. Message 18 sent by Fabian informing the team that the minutes were placed onto the FTP server.

Category other

Identifier	Evidence
1.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 2 sent by Hazel informing the team that her organisation will be closed for the Christmas holidays.
2.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message 56 sent by partner 4 informing that they will not be able to send and receive e-mails.
3.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *4* sent by Mary informs the team that Hazel is out of the office. Message *19* sent by Jack informs the team when he is out of the office. Message *30* sent by Morris informs the team when he is out of the office. Message *36* sent by Ronnie to inform the team that partner 7's office will all be on holiday.
4.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *6* sent by Charles said to prevent misunderstandings with terms he has created a project glossary.
5.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Kenneth said that they get messed around a bit with what they mean with the term e-learning portal. He then explains what a portal means to him. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
6.	Evidence of mutual belief is assumed when Mary said that from the discussions that they have had today it seems that different partners have different understandings of what an e-learning portal is. This is because there was no other evidence to suggest otherwise.
7.	Evidence of mutual belief when Mary explains what an e-learning portal is. Jack agrees with Mary.
8.	Evidence of growth in mutual understanding – message *16* sent by Charles including the current version of the glossary. Message *17* sent by Fabian informing the team that the project glossary was placed onto the project server.

Work package 1: Usability requirements of accessibility and web authoring tools

Discourse chunk	Textual chunk	Timescale	Stage	Behaviour/Evidence
Overview of access technology and some of the issues and opportunities faced by visually impaired people using the Internet (17/12/01)		Long term	Performing	Charlotte informs of issues and opportunities relevant to this work package.
Demonstration of screen reader use (Jaws) by a blind person using the Internet (17/12/01)		Long term	Performing	Peter explains how to use the Internet using Jaws.
			Norming	Charlotte asks Peter if it is to swap groups around.
Change to the agenda (17/12/01)		Short term	Storming	Ronnie says that the task of looking at technology is not for everyone.
			Norming	After asking who would like to try the technology, seven people including the technical people say yes.
			Storming	Paul says future meetings require different planning, especially if there is a need to look at technology again.
			Norming	Proposal to hold discussions after the presentation and then let whoever wants to look at the technology to do so.
Overview of the market for access technology (17/12/01)		Long term	Forming	Desmond introduces himself.
			Performing	Desmond and Paul deliver their presentation.
			Norming	Desmond will send a copy of the presentation he and Paul are delivering by putting it on the FTP server.
			Storming	Paul said it would have been nice to have had more input on products nationally available
Discussion (17/12/01)		Long term	Norming	Hazel mentions the work that will be presented tomorrow – user needs for e-learning for visually impaired students
			Norming	Hazel suggests extending the investigation into e-learning with work package 1.
			Norming	Transferring money from partner 7 to work on work package 4 or 1. There was agreement from the consortium.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months - partner 8 on work package 1 (18/12/01)		Long term	Storming	Lucy says that she does not think that she will be able to find people interested in XML.
			Storming	Lucy suggests some other areas that she might be able to examine.
			Performing	Talking about what work was done in this work package.
			Norming	Providing examples of areas that can be examined.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6 (18/12/01)		Long term	Storming	Hazel says she does not know how she can go to the users without a vision Hazel is not asking the technicians to collate user requirements. Hazel says she does not understand the limit of what the user requirements needs to be.
			Norming	Ben proposes to give the VoiceXML document to provide a real working example of VoiceXML in the prototype. Hazel said that this will help her with task 1.1
			Storming	Hazel says that she cannot go ahead unless she knows the project vision.
			Norming	Lucy suggests having a sample to show blind users on e-learning. Ben suggests looking at existing e-learning courses to establish the

				requirements.
			Norming	Ben says it is not important to look at VoiceXML. The only thing that is important is e-learning.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 3 (18/12/01)		Long term	Performing	Charlotte provides an overview of what partner 3 have been working on – literature review and looking at general web authoring tools.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 5 (18/12/01)		Long term	Performing	Lucy provides an overview of what they have been working on.
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)		Long term	Norming	Hazel said for the user partners to come up with a list of problems for visually impaired people at the moment.
			Norming	Hazel said that they would need a mixture of scenarios and demonstrations to do user requirements.
			Norming	Hazel proposes testing March/June.
			Norming	Hazel proposes to draft a questionnaire on unmet learning needs.
			Norming	User partners will need to complete the questionnaires.
			Norming	Hazel proposes that each user organisation find people to spend time on e-learning applications of their choice.
			Norming	Hazel to develop the protocol.
			Norming	Hazel talks more about understanding and about authoring tools.
			Norming	Partner 3 agrees to do the first cut with input from partner 8.
	Detailed work plan for the next three months (Typed up plan discussed during the second day of the face-to-face meeting)	Medium term	Long term	Messages 2, 5 and 7
			Storming	Message 4 – Desmond suggesting more time for the user partner group activities.
			Norming	Message 7 –Hazel had adjusted the plan.
			Storming	Message 7 – Hazel requests for partner 4 to let her know that they are receiving the e-mails.
	Authoring too accessibility guidelines	Long term	Performing	Message 1 – URL sent in the message.
	Reports on problems encountered by visually impaired people on websites	Long term	Performing	Message 6– Report attached Messages 6, 16, 23 and 28
	E-learning	Long term	Performing	Messages 6, 25, 42, 43 and 45.
	Protocol for evaluation for e-learning	Long term	Performing	Messages 8, 20 and 24
			Storming	Message 25 – Desmond sent e-mails to Hazel
			Norming	Message 25 – Hazel responds to Desmond's mail which was raised individually to her.
	Questionnaire on unmet learning needs	Long term	Performing	Message 8
			Storming	Message 10 – mentions other markets to consider
			Performing	Messages 13, 14 and 20 – Sends comments.
	Dreamweaver	Long term	Performing	Message 22 – Sends URL.
Informing of late arrival (14/3/02)		Short term	Norming	Hazel says that Mary will be late so that they can start without her
Review of work package 1, Questionnaire data gathered		Long term	Storming	Hazel mentions that the responses were less than expected

(14/3/02)				
			Performing	Hazel summarises what had been done at their partner organisation.
Overview of the evaluation sessions (14/3/03)		Long term	Performing	Mary provides a summary of the evaluations.
			Storming	Lucy says that partner 5 have no money to pay for the e-learning courses.
			Norming	Mary mentions that there are some free courses as well.
			Norming	Mary says to evaluate a number of course s and not just Mindleaders courses.
Work package 1, E-learning presentation (14/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Hazel proposes to take the material to read in the evening and continue the discussions in the morning.
			Norming	Thomas says that he needs the co-operation of everyone to find contents and to make the web portal more interesting.
			Norming	Paul suggests looking at other tools freely available. Hazel joins in the discussions as well.
			Norming	Asks if this presentation will be included on the FTP site.
			Performing	Producing an overview.
Work package 1, Overview of circulated report (14/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Mary asks if everyone can see ok.
			Norming	Mary asks if everyone can see at the end of the presentation.
			Norming	Mary to send the tool which is the trial version of one of the e-learning authoring tools to see a template.
				Mary mentions that the report contains URL links as well.
			Norming	Questioning terms used, templates and accessible templates
			Performing	Mary provides an overview of the report circulated by e-mail.
	E-learning	Long term	Performing	Message 10 – URL for the report. Message 29 – Report on e-learning evaluations for work package 1
	E-learning problems	Long term	Performing	Message 11 – Sending descriptions of problems. Message 11 – The videos have been placed online Message 11 – Asks for the ratings.
Discussion of the tool (6/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Jack says that work package 1 is identifying requirements and will; produce the specifications dossier.
Presentation on work package 1 – Results for evaluation study (7/6/02)		Long term	Performing	Provides an overview of existing e-learning courses
Presentation on work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Storming	Ronnie asks Erin to speak clearer as English is not their first language Paul asks Erin to slow down.
			Norming	Desmond asks to enlarge the font.
			Norming	Charles to provide his work to work package 3.
			Norming	Erin will be producing a second version of her report.
			Storming	Charles does not know why no one responded for comments on the requirements. Charles said only partner 3 prioritised the requirements, no one else did.
			Performing	Erin and Charles provide a summary on what they have been working on.
Discussion on issues emerging from presentation on work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Performing	James summarises this work package and comments on the good deliverables for it.
			Storming	Kenneth's reaction to James's suggestion to send to the commission a user requirements document explaining the global point at which the tool has to be

				focussed, without explaining up to what point the tool will be developed.
			Storming	Kenneth said that the technical partners did not have to wait for the requirements to produce the web authoring tool.
Presentation on work package 1, Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Jack distributing copies of the plan Hazel sent for the discussion
			Norming	Desmond will contribute the missing information to Mary.
			Norming	Charles will put the current version of the requirements on the mailing list on Monday.
			Norming	Mary and Jack talk about the deadlines for the deliverables. Also, informs that the document has to be the preliminary one, not the final one.
Summary of documents to be sent (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	James asks Mary if they will be producing two of the documents.
			Norming	James will send an e-mail with a reminder of all of the deadlines
	Unmet learning needs questionnaire	Medium term	Storming	Message 35- Mary mentions no questionnaires have been received since the last meeting.
			Storming	Message 40 –Still has a poor response rate to the questionnaire.
	D1.1 Manual for accessible design	Medium term	Performing	Message 31 – Thanks those who sent material to be included in this deliverable. Message 35 – Draft version is on the FTP server Message 41 – KC has commented highly on this document
	Revised work plan for work packages 1 and 5	Long term	Norming	Messages 4 and 42 - Plans are sent and comments and input is sought from the partners
	Chapter 3	Long term	Performing	Message 31 – Draft questionnaire circulated, and input is requested Message 35 – Mary asks for country specific information.
	Review of VoiceXML tools for work package 1	Long term	Storming	Message 31 – Charles said that there is still no plan to the review comments.
			Performing	Message 31 – Charles had a short document to give an idea for the task
Review of work package 1 (12/9/01)		Medium term	Performing	Hazel provides an overview.
			Norming	Morris clarifies with Mary what Adam should be doing.
			Norming	Mary said that Hazel would provide details on new contact as she is leaving the project.
	News	Short term	Performing	Message 7- Mary said final versions on deliverables D1.1 is in the server.
			Norming	Message 7 – To contact Hazel in the time being for any work in this work package as Mary is leaving the project team.

Work package 2: Plug-ins for speech recognition and synthesisers investigation, with the possibility of adjusting the speed of the synthesiser

Discourse chunk	**Textual chunk**	**Timescale**	**Stage**	**Behaviour/Evidence**
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6 (18/12/01)		Long term	Storming	Annie said in Madrid she thought they were clear v this work package is about
			Storming	Kenneth said that it is important that partner 2 know v they want for work package 2.
				Hazel and Desmond said that Desmond already prov the information which was requested by Annie to them
			Storming	Hazel and Desmond said that you couldn't get from

				user requirement package how screen readers work.
			Norming	Hazel said to contact Jaws for technical informat Desmond said he had that technical information Annie.
			Storming	Annie said she had asked for the manual but had received it. Hazel said that she could have e-mailed the manual, was in her office.
			Norming	It is difficult to find out if the plug-in has any added v over and above a screen reader.
			Storming	Kenneth raises his concerns on voice in and voice out.
			Norming	Ronnie talks about developing prototypes. Hazel said they should not go down to the developr route, so you should be flexible to make any change the development.
			Storming	Kenneth raises his concerns on voice and langu recognition. Kenneth is worried about the understanding so far and time planned for the technical development.
			Norming	Charles said to show the promise of VoiceXML. H suggests a wizard of oz prototype and Jonathan sugg using the website of the project as a prototype.
			Norming	To have testing material for the plug-in based on B suggestion.
			Storming	Annie said they have very few people who are traine start work on the development.
			Norming	Hazel suggests providing scenarios.
Developing scenarios (18/12/01)		Long term	Norming	Charles speaks about VoiceXML and the plug-in. Talks about the structure of the website.
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)		Long term	Norming	Hazel talks about the prototype. Talks about voice in t
			Norming	Hazel said that partners 1 and 2 have expressed the r for understanding how screen readers work and ho will interact with the project application. Partners 3 a are to support partners 1 and 2.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – partner 9 (18/12/01)		Long term	Norming	Charles presents his work on voice and mark languages.
			Norming	Ben answers Lucy's question on prompt lengths.
			Storming	Hazel outlines her confusion.
			Norming	Agreement when Ben said need to discuss the technic of doing the work.
			Storming	Hazel asks Charles if he has any examples of VoiceX actually working – because in Madrid they did not l any voice output applications.
			Norming	Agreement that the work is getting complicated.
			Storming	Kenneth questions the vision of the project.
			Storming	Hazel mentions the struggles she experienced w writing the user requirement spec – questioning the and the screen reader interaction.
	Screen reader functionality questions	Long term	Performing	Message 11 – Question on screen reader function questions are circulated. Message 18 – Desmond's answers.
Review of work for work package 2 (14/3/02)		Long term	Forming	Annie introduced herself.
			Norming	Annie said she had a document which is being transl which shows what screen readers that they have l looking at.
			Performing	Annie provides a review of the work undertaken for work package.
Presentation of a demo (14/3/02)		Long term	Storming	Paul asks if they (technical partners) are using their system for the voice recognition and why because t are already existing systems available.
			Norming	Agreement that partner 2 is using Viavoice from IBM.
			Performing	Shows the tools which have been developed.
			Storming	Paul said that they already know what is being shown. said that it is daily bread and butter for him and o blind people.
			Storming	Annie said that she does not know how he (Paul) w who is blind.
			Storming	Annie said that she is just showing screen readers, Paul said that it does not just read plain text.
			Norming	Agreement that what is being shown is not the f

				version.
			Storming	Paul said again that what is being demonstrated is alre something which is available.
			Norming	Paul asks if there is a website he can go to, to test this without using his screen reader.
			Storming	Paul said that his screen reader could do the innovat that Annie said that they are providing (applicatio voice technology).
			Storming	Ronnie said Annie does not seem to be aware what b people can do with screen readers.
			Storming	Annie said that they thought forms were difficult for b people. Annie said that Hazel had told her.
			Storming	Hazel said that she said the opposite.
			Norming	Charles explains what the proposed tool can do w screen readers cannot.
			Norming	Hazel said need to be precise about what the new sys can offer.
			Norming	Annie said she has not yet developed what Hazel mentioned, but it might be easy for them.
			Norming	Annie and Desmond establish what Conpalabras can d
			Storming	Ronnie suggests that Annie gets in touch with Homep Ronnie suggests that what is shown today is not show the review.
			Storming	Annie said that it is not a prototype of the web autho tool, it is a prototype of what the technology is offerin
			Storming	Ronnie said that they are being shown things that already know very well.
			Storming	Paul said that he is not being shown anything different
			Norming	Hazel said that she needs something to show peop something which shows what the project can do, existing screen readers cannot.
			Storming	Hazel disagrees over Ronnie's proposal to solve all ac problems.
			Norming	To have the partner 7 webpage made accessible.
			Norming	Paul said that do not need a server based screen reac they need something which will enhance e-lean content.
			Norming	Hazel gives suggestions on progress – improving J 3.7.
			Storming	Hazel comments that what she is being shown is less what the current Jaws can deliver.
			Norming	Annie said that she can give the website for their wor the added value can be shown on their own.
			Storming	Hazel said that during the meeting they cannot ever told the added value.
			Storming	Hazel said that they need a list of features identifie Charles that screen readers cannot do.
			Storming	Annie said that they still do not know what to do.
			Norming	Hazel proposes ideas on how to develop what was sh at the London meeting.
			Norming	Paul said that comments can be given if they are told is what VoiceXML can do, in addition to what sc readers can do.
			Norming	Hazel said to find out what is being added to document for partner 3.
			Storming	Charles said he sent his first version of the documer the technical partners, but they did not receive comments.
Closing for first day of the meeting (14/3/02)		Medium term	Norming	James said that they saw the demo, but reinforce th not the final tool which the project wants to develop.
			Storming	James said the technical people have not been abl convince the users of the suitability of VoiceX solutions that are proposed.
			Norming	Tomorrow another presentation will be delivered.
Presentation on what the project voice solution can provide (15/3/02)		Long term	Storming	Desmond and Paul refer to an existing document, sa that Annie should have looked at it
			Storming	Paul disagrees on Annie's comments about drop d menus and lists.
			Storming	Annie said that they are not giving guidelines to be t by web developers.
			Norming	Kenneth said that they need to look at the advantage voice input and voice output. Annie said that she will skip the next slides.
			Storming	Kenneth talks about learning to be done and talks al dialogues, not single utterances.
			Storming	Ronnie said that there is an important document that not been considered.
			Norming	Ronnie provides his suggestions to Annie.
			Storming	Ronnie suggests that the presentation is not continued
			Norming	Ronnie said that he has spoken to other partners share the same point of view.
			Storming	Charles wants to know if the presentation will be liste

				too Annie did not continue with the rest of presentation.
	Conpalabras plug-in	Long term	Storming	Message 41 – Mary said that she cannot download plug-in. She asks if there is another site it can downloaded from
Review of work by work packages 2/3/4 (6/6/02)		Long term	Forming	Annie introduces herself for the benefit of those tha not know her.
			Performing	Annie provides a review of items for work packag Annie said that they now require feedback from use see what other solutions that they (technical partn could find out
Discussion of review questions from review report (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Annie and Kenneth talk about the task in work packa and if a new one is required.
			Norming	Kenneth said that it is important to look at level interaction.
			Norming	Kenneth suggests sending documents for work packa as they have a promise to send an amendment later.
Summary of documents to be sent (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Discussion of when to produce the draft documents comments and when it will be ready to send to commission.
	Project speech recognition	Long term	Performing	Messages 15 and 58 contain URLs with fur information.
	New VoiceXML tool	Long term	Performing	Message 43 – A URL is included in the message ' details on what the new tool can do.
	Work package 2 – Plug-in dossier	Long term	Performing	Messages 28 and 32 – First and second version of document circulated.
			Storming	Message 33 – Adam asks two questions.
			Norming	Message 34 – Annie answers Adams questions.

Work package 3: Tool development

Formatted

Discourse chunk	Textual chunk	Timescale	Stage	Behaviour/Evidence
Discussion (17/12/01)		Long term	Storming	Paul said that as mentioned during Madrid he does not the need for another web authoring tool, as there plenty what already exists. Paul mentions choice – saying that even if the pr develops an accessible one, who will use it? Kenneth said that everyone has signed up to the pr program.
			Norming	Ronnie and Ben agree with Kenneth view on how project works.
Change to the agenda (17/12/01)		Short term	Norming	Technical partners would like to try out the speech magnification systems themselves.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months — partner 2 on work packages 2 and 6 (18/12/01)		Long term	Storming	Annie talks about the organisation of web pages and according to the plan, the development should sta March. Annie proposes developing earlier (although if will nc the final tool) to gather requirements from the user.
			Norming	Lucy provides an example developing software to read page of the link.
Developing scenarios (18/12/01)		Long term	Storming	Hazel has not understood why help should be inclu but that she is still happy to put it down
			Storming	Annie has not understood when Hazel reports that voi sequential.
			Storming	Ronnie and Hazel said that they do not understand v Annie is saying.
			Norming	Ronnie said as a blind user the project is important people who do not use the telephone and keyboard
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)		Long term	Norming	Agreement that forms are difficult and that the pr should find a way of improving forms using voice-in.
			Norming	Discussion on when input by user partners on area difficulty will be available by.
			Norming	Hazel talks about the pre-prototype
			Norming	Annie said that she would like to have something to s at the March meeting.
	Paris meeting (Arranging a meeting with those work working in work package 3)	Medium term	Norming	Message 35 – Christopher lists the partners involved suggests a meeting to discuss the delivery of tasks for work package.
	Voice solutions	Long term	Performing	Message 23 – Charles informs everyone that he is dra a document.

				Message 28 – Thomas sent his comments and conclusi
			Norming	Message 28 – Thomas said it is important to concent on what Charles is proposing to make progress in work.
			Performing	Message 44- Send comments and requests comments
Presentation by partner 9 (15/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Charles agrees to explain everything, following Ronr request.
			Norming	Charles informs Paul why there is a need to re information.
			Norming	Ronnie asks Charles if what he is saying can be offere VoiceXML
			Norming	Hazel reports that what she believes what the heart of project should be.
			Storming	Hazel expresses her worries after reading the documer Charles.
			Norming	Explains the added value of the tool
			Storming	Paul said that Hazel's explanations did not make sense to him
			Norming	Hazel said to capitalise on what Mindleaders have done. For example, including interactivity for the blin
E-learning and voice (15/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Establish that voice can help everyone and not just blind.
			Storming	Jack proposes to leave the web authoring tool. Paul you should have one to produce e-learning content.
			Norming	Paul said there is no need to make a completely authoring tool just for HTML.
			Norming	Kenneth said not to just voicify what is found c graphical user interface. There is agreement from som the partners when he said this.
			Norming	Hazel gives an example of Windows 3.1 interface. said only provide something for the blind when there need for it, otherwise to keep it the same as the sig person's interface.
			Norming	Jack said things now appear to be clear and that A knows what direction to go in
			Norming	Jack feels that the work can now be improved as they beginning to understand the needs of blind people and state of art of the equipment that they use.
			Norming	Morris suggests finding something which can show advantage of natural interactivity.
			Storming	Ronnie and Lucy agree it would be uninteresting to partner 7's page and to put voice on it
			Norming	Hazel said to still make the partner 7 page vocified, bi add another page which is the portal.
			Norming	Annie has a clearer idea of the work that she is require do.
			Norming	Hazel said to send videoclips to partner 9 and user gr too for their comments
			Norming	Discussion on sending copies of the video tapes to relevant persons.
			Norming	Hazel suggests that Mary shows a form in Mindleade describe problems that a user can have.
			Norming	Paul said to try out the Mindleaders form and to ga views and comments.
	Browsers	Long term	Performing	Message 12 – Report on the Cynthia browser. Message 50 – URL for the Opera browser.
	Authoring tool	Long term	Performing	Messages 14 and 15 – information on web autho facilities which may be of interest. Message 15 – List of requirements for the authoring to Message 30 – Hazel sends a report on the accessibilit web authoring tools. Message 38 – Updated requirements document Message 40 – A reminder that the document is b updated Message 51 – Message on authoring tools accessibility
Review of work by work packages 2/3/4 (6/6/02)		Long term	Performing	Annie said that they have been working on work pack 3 and 4 at the same time.
			Norming	Annie said that work package 3 will be multiple langı and offer high levels of customisation.
			Performing	Annie said that she will show some experiments an explain them.
			Norming	Mary asks Annie a question on work package 3. She if Annie considered the requirements that Charles sent
			Norming	Kenneth asks a question on when the architecture wil shown.

			Storming	Paul's reaction to the first sample shown/
			Norming	Paul said that he would like to try something out himse
			Performing	Mary and Erin provide comments on their testing.
			Storming	Ronnie and Lucy said that they cannot hear what is b said.
			Storming	Ronnie said that he is confused and is hearing someth different to what he had expected.
			Storming	Lucy informs Mary that she cannot hear.
			Storming	Annie said the demonstration is not something wh substitutes the screen reader, it is simply a sample of the plug-in provides speech synthesis to the page.
			Performing	Erin gives an overview of the testing she performed. mentions some of the improvements over screen rea as well.
			Norming	Mary provides comments from a usability perspectiv the structure of the pages.
			Norming	Agreement that Annie will develop examples incorporate the plug-in and voice recognition. This not shown at the meeting, as it was not well developed
			Norming	Paul clarifies with Annie issues on validation.
			Storming	Morris has problems on what the plug-in can do th traditional screen reader cannot.
			Norming	Annie said that you have the tool tell you how m options that there are, following a proposal from Morr
			Norming	Kenneth outlines the kinds of questions which need t addressed to see what the heart of the project is about.
			Storming	Kenneth said that they are not moving beyond v screen reader technology will do or can do in the futur
			Storming	Kenneth gives an example of what would happen if user is deaf.
			Norming	Ronnie said what needs to be done to reach the goal the project; otherwise it will not meet them.
			Norming	James checks that agreement that the project is creati tool, compatible with the technical solution alre existing screen readers for the creation of web pages.
			Norming	Geoff said it is a tool which will produce new pages, that this tool still needs to be developed.
Discussion of the tool (6/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Agreement on what the project should deliver.
			Storming	Kenneth said that the page they are being shown potentially accessible by a screen reader.
			Norming	Innovation of the tool is e-learning.
			Norming	Desmond proposes how to work before – Annie confi her understanding.
			Norming	Kevin suggests that the VoiceXML starts where screen readers are too passive. Annie said that thi useful information.
			Storming	Annie said they need to find out how to interact with screen readers because they do not know how.
			Storming	Rejection to Desmond's proposal to work with Free Scientific.
			Norming	Desmond agrees with Paul that you should not just work with one screen reader manufacturer. Desmond that he was only providing an example.
			Norming	Annie said that they will not develop a tool whic similar to what is already on the market – do not have same sort of development time.
			Norming	Paul makes a suggestion for the tool development. Annie said that what Paul is saying does not go agai what Ronnie said, it is simply a different point of view.
Discussion of review questions from the review report (6/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Annie said that she will produce a report outlining functionality of the tool.
			Norming	Kenneth said that the more they are shown the more they can help.
			Norming	Kenneth said that there is a need to understand how project promises will be met.
			Storming	Kenneth said that he is not telling Annie to change t goal on developing a web authoring tool.
			Norming	Kenneth said that there is a need to define what demo of the project will be met, as there is a lot of w involved in the project.
			Storming	Paul said that in the morning he did not have a conc idea on what was being discussed. Paul said that he needs to know what those workin work package 3 have in mind.
			Norming	Paul said that the new tool should be screen re independent.
Presentation on work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Charles mentions the requirements for the pro authoring tool.
			Norming	Paul suggests other formats that the manual should available in.
			Norming	Desmond and Charles have a discussion on what the should offer.

			Norming	Agreement that Charles has presented a nice array requirements for the tool The requirements will take a lot of work.
			Storming	Kenneth said that he is confused with the Gantt chart Annie said that she had Kenneth said that he has detected confusion which n to be sorted out quickly.
			Storming	Annie said that they have already considered document of Charles.
			Storming	Kenneth is asking Annie why they cannot receiv response today for the work package 3 schedule.
			Storming	Kenneth said that what they had heard yesterday was sketchy – so they do need to know what is happening.
			Storming	Paul said that the development have come to this mee without any concept Paul wants to know why the developers are not reactin
			Storming	Paul said that the developers should put more effor answering the questions asked as the authoring tool i the heart of the project.
			Storming	Charles said that he does not understand why responded to his comments on the requirements It only partner 3 that did.
Discussion on issues emerging from work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Storming	Kenneth feels that it is unacceptable to set up a contract for 15 months of work, without being able to in detail what the tool will do.
			Storming	Kenneth feels that they will hear the sort of discussior the next meeting too.
			Storming	Kenneth asks the technicians to be more specific He that they have a Gantt chart, so why can they not be n specific about what the development will include.
			Storming	Kenneth said that the web authoring tool does not dep on user requirements.
			Storming	Kenneth said the questions he is posing will not be fc in the user requirements document.
			Norming	James mentions that face-to-face meetings are impor to solve misunderstandings.
			Storming	Kenneth said why is information delivered today presented yesterday when there was time dedicate them in the agenda.
			Norming	Agreement that the prototype of the integration should be finished by the end of July.
			Storming	Paul said that they are only asking for an outline of v the deliverable will be like.
Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view (7/6/02)		Long term	Storming	Annie said that she thought that there were no quest when asked about the tool on the previous day of meeting.
			Storming	Desmond and Annie talk about the information requ and Paul saying that he still does not understand wh being discussed.
			Performing	Geoff outlines the ideas for the tool development.
			Norming	Kenneth said they need to say thank you to Geoff. It exactly the kind of information that they have been as for.
			Storming	Kenneth mentions some areas of concern he has on handling VoiceXML.
			Norming	Kenneth said it will be useful to have written up what explained at this meeting.
			Storming	Annie said that in future meetings to inform t beforehand if there is something which is expected f them.
			Norming	Annie said that they are showing a prototype Ken said that some people have technical understanding, not at the same level of understanding as the technicia
Summary of documents to send (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	James mentions when the plug-in compatibility docur has to be sent.
			Norming	Jack summarises another document.
	Authoring tool requirements	Long term	Performing	Message 1 – current version of the requirements Message 7 – Adam sends his comments. Message 10 – Adam answers Charles's question Message 11 – Project authoring tool requirements is se
			Storming	Message 12 – Kenneth said that the document in mes 11 did not present the same level of detail which presented during the Madrid meeting Kenneth also for more specific and detailed information.
			Norming	Message 13 – Charles said that he did not integrate comments from the Madrid meeting He will send team an updated document tomorrow Message 14 – Annie addresses this message to Ken

				but it is sent to everyone with a list of functions requirements for the tool.
			Performing	Message 16 – The fourth version of the requiremen circulated to the team.
			Performing	Message 22 – Updated document for user requirem for e-learning applications is sent. Message 24 – Charles answers questions raised by I but this message was sent to the team, not just to Erin.
Work package 3 – development of the tool. Review of work done since the last meeting (12/9/02)		Long term	Performing	Annie talks about what they have been doing for v package 3.
			Norming	Annie said the prototype will be distributed, followi question asked by Mary.
			Norming	Kenneth asks a question about the command sizes Annie said that she has prepared a prototype to show t in the evening.
			Norming	Annie answers questions on buying Viavoice.
			Norming	Annie talks about having Viavoice, following a ques asked by Adam.
			Norming	Adam gives an overview of what else is going to sh related to work package 3, and some of the contributio other partners.
Demonstration of the prototype (12/9/02)		Long term	Norming	Annie shows the prototype.
			Norming	Agreement that the Conpalabras engine was used for development.
			Storming	Ronnie asks why a nice British voice was not selec using an American voice instead.
			Norming	Aware that Jaws could be heard. Also, that version Jaws is being used.
			Storming	Kenneth said that it is difficult to give his opinion on two short samples.
			Storming	Kenneth said that it would have been nice to have se live demo.
			Norming	Agreement that it is the screen reader which is saying t
			Norming	Kenneth said to Annie that it is the arrangement of pages which is causing it to say tag.
			Norming	Morris becomes aware that Annie was talking about arrow key.
			Storming	Annie asks the translator to speak louder.
			Norming	Kenneth interprets the question that the translator is tr to ask Annie.
			Norming	Annie talks about trigger actions and voice.
			Norming	Hazel checks her understanding of the tool.
			Norming	Agreement that what Annie is describing is difficult.
			Norming	Kenneth proposes that those who cannot see to comr on what is being shown.
			Storming	Kenneth proposes those who cannot see to commen what is being shown. Hazel had proposed this alr during the December meeting.
Creating a link for stylesheets (12/9/02)		Long term	Storming	Mary and Hazel ask if the volume can be turned up.
			Storming	Geoff starts speaking in Spanish which all team mem cannot understand.
			Norming	Geoff starts to speak in English again.
			Performing	Geoff gives an overview on the work he has done stylesheets.
Presentation of partner 4 by Michael's translator (12/9/02)		Long term	Forming	Translator introduces himself, and brings to attention he is not personally involved in the project.
			Norming	Elsie will read the report the translator has, due language barriers. Providing a report on what partner 4 has been working
			Storming	Hazel said most of what is presented was presented as of the material for D1.1.
			Storming	Does not look like partner 4 and the translator used an the information from D1.1.
			Storming	Translator finds it difficult to accept that blind peopl Britain want to learn HTML.
			Storming	Trying to find out what package would find the report the translator has brought to the meeting useful.
			Storming	Annie tells the translator what kind of information are excepting.
			Storming	Kenneth reports on the problems of having text disap at the bottom of the page.
	Work package 3 description	Long term	Performing	Message 10 – Annie has re-sent a message in problems were encountered receiving the first mess This message included the task description.
	Work package 3 task schedule	Long term	Performing	Message 4 – Annie sends the task schedule.

				Message 8 – More details on the tasks for the partners are involved in this work package. Message 15 – New planification is sent to reflect changes in partners 1 and 2's contributions
	Guidelines for software accessibility	Long term	Performing	Message 11- Annie send she guidelines that the techr partners are going to use.

Work package 4: Creation of an accessible e-learning portal

Discourse chunk	Textual chunk	Timescale	Stage	Behaviour/Evidence
Discussion (17/12/01)		Long term	Storming	Ronnie said that e-learning at present is at the end of project and that his participation is limited and would a reallocation of tasks
			Storming	Paul said to place more emphasis on the e-learning pa the project, rather than the web authoring tool.
			Storming	Kenneth said that the project was awarded on the basi what was included in the proposal.
			Norming	Kenneth said that changing the proposal is not European Union projects work.
			Storming	Lucy said that partner 5 also wants to make e-lean accessible for blind people Lucy said that she is surprised that user needs do focus on e-learning.
			Norming	Hazel will present work on needs for e-learning visually impaired students.
			Storming	Ronnie said that without payment they will not be abl work.
			Storming	Ronnie said that hr feels that the work on work packa accessible portal should begin before.
			Norming	Agreement that they require some e-learning demonstrate.
			Norming	Agreement that accessible e-learning content needs t demonstrated.
			Storming	Morris said that they would like to start working on v package 4 sooner.
			Norming	Hazel said that it is fine to start work on work packa sooner.
			Storming	Hazel does not understand why the London Society the Blind give access to their e-learning system.
			Norming	Hazel summarises Ronnie would like to transfer months from work package 6 to work package 4.
			Norming	Agreement from all when Jack said that they nee document to be signed by all to agree to the chai which have been proposed.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – Partner 8 on work package 1 (18/12/01)		Long term	Performing	Hazel talks about the work she has been doing on framework for e-learning. Hazel also presents interesting survey results
			Storming	Hazel proposes to look at websites and Morris reacts negative manner. He said that this is what they have b doing for work package 4.
Short presentation by each of the partners on what work they have done in the last three months – Partner 7 (18/12/01)		Long term	Performing	Morris said that they are interested in work packa which begins in months 7 or 8 They have already start on work package 4.
			Norming	They can hire someone to start working n productively on the project.
			Norming	Morris said that they need more technical guidance or organisation of work package 4.
			Norming	Morris said to look at the content and to negotiate with owners. Charles said that he can turn the content VoiceXML.
Developing a plan of future work (18/12/01)		Long term	Norming	Agreement that the pre-prototype is not a portal, bit like a little bit of running code, similar to the con explained by Charles.
			Norming	To conduct questionnaires on unmet learning needs fo learning Undertake evaluations of current e-learning applicat by visually impaired people.
			Storming	Potentially having a problem as Hazel proposed work people who had already left the meeting.
	E-learning	Long term	Performing	Message 6 – Thomas sends a document on his impres about e-learning. Thomas also asks a question about portal.
Review of work package 6 (dissemination activities) (14/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Agreement that by July there needs to be at least one p that is accessible in VoiceXML (providing content for portal).
			Norming	Only one page is required. Hazel's offer is not neces either.

			Norming	There is agreement that this one page should be partner 7 webpage.
			Storming	Ronnie said using the partner 7 page restricts it to just language.
			Norming	James said the final deliverable should be for languages, this is just for one demonstration.
			Norming	Annie proposes to show the demonstration r agreement that is can wait till later on as planned.
Overview of evaluation sessions (14/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Mary believes that the results of the evaluation can into the development of the portal Hazel said that it would be useful to have the e-lean courses.
			Norming	Hazel tells Thomas and Lucy the number of cou available and the amount of time that it is available for
			Storming	Lucy asks how partners 5 and 7 will be able to pay such courses, as they have not budgeted for it
			Norming	Mary said that the free courses are also available.
			Norming	Ames to view the collaboration agreement with his le from partner 1 – when talking about the e-lean contents.
			Norming	Mary said that it is important to look at a numbe courses and not just Mindleaders.
E-learning portal (14/3/02)		Long term	Norming	James said need to make some complementary activ to show the commission that work has been c according to the scheduled plan.
			Norming	James repeats that partner 7's page must be n accessible.
			Norming	Agreement that according to the contract, portal acti will begin in month 12
			Norming	However, will start work on this earlier as there is s work to show to the commission in July.
			Norming	Agreement that there should be agreement from all of partners.
			Norming	Kenneth said that it is not just a formal change to contract to start work earlier.
			Norming	Jack said that he would inform the commission that s work started earlier in the quarterly report
			Storming	Thomas asks about content for the website for the po Lucy asks about e-learning and asks why it is not poss to take a decision with all of the partners present.
			Storming	Hazel said that she does not think the discussions addressing the problems that they are having
			Storming	Hazel and Lucy have a discussion on consumables –I asks how they can pay for it.
			Norming	Hazel said that the website should not just be a websi should be an e-learning site.
			Storming	Morris raises his concerns regarding the actual t available to work on this
			Norming	Hazel proposes to currently use already existing avail e-learning sites and then later on to develop their own.
			Norming	Poor use of HTML discussion. Important to identity real problems and not just sim based on the e-learning material that they currently hav
			Norming	Annie confirms that the technical work for the portal come from partners 1 and 2.
			Norming	Morris asks questions to help them select websites for portal.
			Norming	Hazel said it is not only the website which requ testing, it is a number of websites
			Norming	Discussion on what a portal means to Hazel.
			Norming	Hazel said that they do not have to create e-lean material at the moment Cannot see any other way of tackling the work in the t that they have.
			Norming	To agree with the plans made in the morning to l partner 7's page voicified. Hazel proposes an extra page showing the beginnin what an e-learning portal would look like.
			Norming	Lucy asks if they continue looking at e-learning and to if it is interesting for blind people or not.
			Storming	Morris does not agree with James's view on validating portal.
			Norming	James looks at the project documentation and informs team on who is working on this task.
			Norming	Hazel said that they could use the protocol that partn distributed to evaluate the site.
Work package 1, E-learning presentation (14/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Thomas will present the results, but not the system
1			Performing	Thomas presents his findings.
			Norming	To include the encyclopaedia category in the portal

			Norming	To take material away, to digest it and to come back to discussions, the following morning
			Performing	Thomas outlines technical problems found out.
			Norming	Thomas said need input from everyone to have interes websites.
			Norming	Can put the seven sites which were accessible onto portal.
			Norming	The seven sites were accessible in all priorities of WA
			Norming	Hazel said 'excellent' when Thomas outlines languages of the sites that he looked at.
E-learning and voice (15/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Voice could be useful for everyone and not just the bl
			Norming	To voicify partner 7's webpage. To add another page, the portal To include information on making e-learning mate accessible to visually impaired people. Annie has a clearer idea which is more concrete to v on.
			Norming	Ronnie said that Adam has already started work on portal. He tells Annie he can put it at their disposal.
			Norming	James summarises what the portal will include and n to be ready for submitting to the commission in July.
Conclusions from the meeting (15/3/02)		Medium term	Norming	James summarises that they need input from all for portal. James talks about who will be involved in working the wizards
	Project portal	Long term	Performing	Message 8 – Adam puts the portal online for comment
			Storming	Message 16 – Hazel gives comments
			Norming	Message 17 – Adam reminds everyone of the goals f the last meeting
			Performing	Message 18 – Charles sent comments for the website
	E-learning	Long term	Performing	Message 10 – Jason sends a working paper on e-learni Message 29 – A report on e-learning evaluation sen Mary. It was for work package 1, but it is also rele for this work package
Review of work by work packages 2/3/4 (14/3/02)		Long term	Forming	Annie introduces herself and said that she will talk al work package 4
			Performing	Annie said that they are working on work packages 3 4 together.
			Norming	Annie said that the pages that they have are not goin be the final ones.
			Storming	Ronnie said that the discussions are confusing
			Storming	Ronnie does not see the need for partner 2 to develop t own portal.
			Norming	Ronnie said as said before to give Annie the porta work on.
			Norming	Ronnie is now able to understand more clearly – A has clarified issues, that they are not developing their portal. They are currently just doing research work.
			Norming	Kenneth said that the most important thing would be learning experience when looking at a voice–base learning portal Mary talks about building e-learning websites and importance of learnability.
			Storming	Mary mentions that it is best to keep the two p consistent
			Norming	Mary suggests keeping the two pages consistent
			Norming	Mary suggests as the examples Annie is now showing not to do with e-learning. For the presentation to commission to include examples in the portal whic connected to e-learning
			Norming	They are producing a e-learning environment, w knowledge can be gained
			Storming	Kenneth said that e-learning courses are not working with visually impaired people. If the project does address relevant issues it is failing
			Storming	Kenneth said that he has concerns from the beginnin e-learning is a specialist area. And, if they talk to who does lots of work in that area, they will no amused with what they come up with, and this may c damage to the project
			Norming	James re-iterates the objectives of the project to cre voice tool in order to facilitate access of the internet t user, especially for the e-learning portal.
Demonstration of the partner 7		Long term	Storming	Ronnie said that Adam must speak louder

portal (6/602)				
			Norming	Mary asks a question on accessibility ratings, w Morris answers.
			Storming	Kenneth disagrees over the choice of colours.
			Norming	Kenneth is told that using stylesheets can change colours.
			Storming	Kenneth raises his concerns about the stylesheets and white space
			Norming	Morris said that they have taken note on Kenne comments and will improve it
			Norming	Presentation will be shown after the coffee break on d of the meeting due to technical difficulties.
			Norming	Can use browser settings to override all other settings.
			Storming	Gives examples of text that is currently inaccessible.
			Storming	Morris said that they cannot change the set-up as Ken has asked to do.
			Norming	Morris takes Kenneth's point and said that the cha with the dark text will be made.
			Norming	Morris said that you can use your own parameters customisation.
			Norming	Mary asks if the implementation will be using the plug The answer is no, because it is independent.
			Norming	To voicify partner 7's webpage.
			Norming	To also include the project website and FTP access t the portal.
			Norming	Agreement that you need to first register to use the por
Discussion of the tool (6/6/02)		Long term	Storming	Kenneth said that what is meant by an e-learning port messing them around.
			Storming	Kenneth questions whether this consortium actu includes anyone who can write a quality e-learn course.
Discussion of review questions from the review report (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Mentioning how interactivity will be handled
			Storming	Different partners have a different understanding on v an e-learning portal is.
			Norming	An e-learning portal is what Desmond and Adam show
			Storming	Kenneth said he does not think that the consortium the resources to address the changes proposed by commission.
			Norming	Jack and Mary decide to provide solutions for th learning problems which are found.
Presentation on work package 1 – Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Agreement that the work of the partner 7 portal is work package 4
Summary of documents to send (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Annie to produce documentation for work package 4.
	Project portal	Long term	Performing	Message 30 – Asking a question when Conpalabras be installed on the project portal. Message 42 – Evaluation of the portal is underway Message 49 – Explains the reasons for why an error detected.
	Interesting information to share	Long term	Performing	Message 5 – Information on website usability resourc useful for design of pages in the portal.
	Work plan for work package 4 (E-learning portal)	Long term	Performing	Message 18 – Fabian informs the team that the work is on the FTP server.
	E-learning requirements	Long term	Portal	Message 22 – Mary sends requirements for the proje learning portal They are seeking comments suggestions.
E-learning portal (12/9/02)		Long term	Performing	Geoff explains work which has been done on the porta
			Norming	Jack said the work shown by Geoff and performec Adam would exist in one server, not two.
Demonstration of the portal (12/9/02)		Long term	Performing	Charles explains the work that he has done
			Norming	Agreement that the parser can potentially make structure and navigation easier.
	Update on the portal	Long term	Performing	Message 1 – Adam said that version 0.2 of the port online. Message 6 – Adam informs everyone that the portal m the AAA Accessibility Requirements. The other feat what were added, such as voice recognition were added.
	HTML tutorial	Long term	Performing	Message 23 – Everyone is informed that the first dra

				the HTML tutorial is online.

Work package 5: Evaluation

Discourse chunk	Textual chunk	Timescale	Stage	Behaviour/Evidence
E-learning portal (14/3/02)		Long term	Norming	Thomas asks about the evaluation system to evaluate site.
			Norming	As mentioned providing payments may act as an incer to participate.
			Norming	Elsie asks for the questionnaire to be re-sent, as Mic could not find it. She suggests translating questionnaire into Italian for him as well.
Requirements for the tool from a technical point of view (7/6/02)		Long term	Storming	Kenneth said that the tool has to validate other web p and not just to report on their accessibility.
			Norming	Geoff briefly outlines the procedure.
	E-learning	Long term	Performing	Message 29 – Report on e-learning evaluations.
Review of work package 1, Questionnaire data gathered (14/3/02)		Long term	Performing	Giving payment to the volunteers.
Overview of the evaluation sessions (14/3/02)		Long term	Performing	A summary of findings is provided.
Presentation on work package 1, Results for evaluation study (7/6/02)		Long term	Performing	Provides evaluation results on existing e-learning cour
			Storming	Talking louder requests are made.
			Storming	Enlarging font request is made.
Presentation on work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Performing	Erin and Charles provide a summary of their evaluatio
Presentation on work package 5 (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	Agreement that the prototype must be available by the of July.
			Norming	Agreement that they do not need the final version of portal to begin the evaluations.
			Norming	Ronnie receives agreement that the evaluations need t conducted to blind and/or visually impaired people.
			Performing	Overview provided by Mary on how to proceed with v package 5.
Presentation on work package 1, Discussing plans for deliverables in work package 1 (7/6/02)		Long term	Performing	Mary mentions the two main deliverables for v package 5.
			Norming	Ronnie raises the problems he foresees with evaluation criteria.
			Norming	Ronnie wants to be involved in the evaluation. Mary toy would talk more about this in work package 5.
Summary of documents to be sent (7/6/02)		Long term	Norming	James summarises the dates for this work package.
	Revised work plan for work packages 1 and 5	Long term	Norming	Message 4 – Informing on availability.
			Performing	Message 42 – Updated plan on FTP server.
	Evaluation of the project portal	Long term	Performing	Message 30 –Evaluation is underway. Message 50 – Talks about the evaluation. Message 51 – Feedback to message 50 is sent.
	Evaluation of portal	Long term	Norming	Message 1 – Informs everyone that the evaluations begin.
	Evaluation plan	Long term	Norming	Message 7 – The latest version of the evaluation plan.
	News	Short term	Norming	Message 7 – Mary said it is her last day on the pro TO contract Hazel for any problems.