

香港視網膜色素病變人士協會

關於低視力人士

使用資訊科技問題

意見書

(二零零一年四月)

索引：

1. 機構簡介.....P.3
2. 殘疾簡介—關於”低視力”.....P.3
3. 低視力人士利用資訊科技面臨的問題.....P.4
 - 3.1 購買力的問題
 - 3.2 應用電腦軟硬件及助視器材的知識問題
 - 3.3 取讀網頁的障礙
4. 我們的建議.....P.5
 - 4.1 政府應調動資源協助有需要人士購置助視器材，
並提供足夠設施適應使用者需要。
 - 4.2 提供及資助合適的培訓課程
 - 4.3 掃除閱取資訊的障礙
5. 總結.....P.7
6. 附件--本會向民政事務署提交有關對政府部門網頁意見的信件

香港視網膜色素病變人士協會
關於低視力人士使用資訊科技問題
意見書

(二零零一年四月)

1. 機構簡介：

香港視網膜色素病變人士協會是一個由遺傳性視網膜退化病患者組成的自助團體，多數會員的視力存在不同程度的缺損，其中大部份屬低視力（low vision），也有一些失明和視力嚴重受損的會員。

2. 殘疾簡介—關於“低視力”：

據文獻解釋，低視力是指患者眼睛的視覺功能減退，而且不能用手術、藥物或常規的屈光矯正方法來改善者。視功能減退臨床表現為視野縮小或視力低於正常，也表現為對比功能（contrast sensitivity function）異常。低視力患者還可能伴有一些其他的眼的功能性損害，包括色覺、暗適應、眼球運動及雙眼視覺，失去立體感等。人群中約有 1% 為低視力，屬於法定失明者約為 0.2%。（註）

低視力（也有市民統稱為“弱視”）人士的視力比視力正常的人為低，但他們還有一些剩餘視力。對於部份低視力人士，如果有合適的光線、顏色、對比度及景物大小（如字體和圖像）等等的視覺環境和條件，他們仍可以利用肉眼或普通矯形眼鏡觀察和閱讀；視力較差者，則可借助放大鏡、望遠鏡、濾光鏡、電子及光學放大系統、電腦上的屏幕放大軟件等閱覽文字和圖像資訊。

因此，在一般情況下，大部份低視力人士取讀資訊時，既無法完全作業於視力正常人士的條件和環境，也無需像失明或視力嚴重受損人士，全部以觸覺或語音作為媒介。

3. 低視力人士利用資訊科技面臨的問題：

現代資訊科技在發放及傳達訊息方面發展迅速，且日趨多元化。除利用傳統媒介，如報章、刊物、單張及電子傳媒如電台、電視台外，近年更廣泛使用互聯網上的網頁及電郵來傳達信息。對於低視力人士來說，助視器材、電腦的硬件及軟件設備是接收資訊的必需品，但可惜大部份低視力人士在購買、使用及取讀資訊方面都存在問題，直接妨礙他們利用資訊科技獲取訊息。

3.1 購買力的問題

3.1.1 不少低視力人士，尤其是中年以上及長期失業的一群，因經濟能力，無法負擔購買電腦的費用，又沒有甚麼途徑可獲得資助購置。在現今資訊改變命運的時代，他們的生活質素及職業技能因無法提高而被進一步邊緣化，亦直接削弱他們重投社會的機會。

3.1.2 就算現時擁有電腦的低視力人士，由於價格昂貴，不少都缺乏必需的助視軟件，例如屏幕放大軟件 Zoomtext，英文閱屏軟件 Jaws for Windows 等，售價分別為\$3,800 及\$6,000。另一個問題是電腦型號太舊，不足以應付日新月異的取讀資訊要求，而大部份人士亦不知道如何安裝軟件及提升電腦硬件。

3.1.3 適用的助視器材其實是低視力人士生活的必需品，但因價格昂貴，資助無門，竟成爲了可望而不可及的奢侈品，非就業人士更難以負擔。(低視力人士常用的助視器材如放大鏡、望遠鏡、濾光鏡、電子及光學放大系統等，價格由百元至數萬元不等。)

3.2. 應用電腦軟硬件及助視器材的知識問題

3.2.1. 不少低視力人士由於視力的限制，加上從未接觸過電腦，而且亦不懂點字，因此需要適合的教材、教授方法以及較常人長的時間，才能掌握利用電腦取讀資訊的技能。但現時一般資訊科技的培訓課程未有考慮切合這些低視能學員的特殊需要。

3.2.2. 現時一些提供這類培訓的資助計劃，亦未有考慮這方面的實際情況。由於資源所限，加上學員的視力問題，一名導師往往要同時照顧太多低視力學員，致令學員難以吸收和掌握課程內容，導師的努力也事倍功半。

3.2.3. 現時亦鮮有機構向低視力人士提供使用閱屏及屏幕放大軟件的培訓課程。

3.3. 取讀網頁的障礙

3.3.1. 網頁設計未有照顧有特殊需要的使用者，如低視力人士的一般準則，包括文字版、顏色、字體大小，對比度等各方面作出考慮，令致低視力人士閱讀網頁資料時困難重重。很多政府部門的網頁亦未見對此問題予以注視。(詳情請參閱附件)

3.3.2. 現時尚未有發展成熟的中文閱屏軟件，試用中的軟件在操作上存在很多問題，使用者往往難以順利操作，更加成爲以中文爲主要媒介的視障人士取讀電子資訊的主要障礙。

4. 我們的建議

就著我們所知低視力人士在利用資訊科技上的三個主要問題，即購買力，應用知識及網頁障礙，我們提出以下意見：

4.1 政府應調動資源協助有需要人士購置助視器材，並提供足夠設施適應使用者需要。

4.1.1 部份助視器材價格高昂，但卻是低視力人士的生活必需品，而非可有可無，現時“尤德爵士基金”只資助全日制學生購置助視器材，“職業復康用具基金”資助在職人士在工作地方購置助視器材，其他人士則不在受惠之列，我們建議特區政府應成立信託基金資助或津貼低視力人士購置助視器材。

4.1.2 政府應該對低視力人士購買電腦提供津貼或資助，尤其應優先惠及失業及貧困者，使他們亦有機會接觸新資訊，提高他們重投社會和就業市場的機會。

- 4.1.3 視障人士，生活開支都比一般人為高，助視器材的開支正是典型的例子。我們要求，視障人士購置助視器材的開支應享有本人或供養者的個人薪俸稅的減免。
- 4.1.4 我們建議特區政府設立更多的低視力數碼站以方便各區的低視力人士使用。如政府市政大樓、各區圖書館、學校及地鐵站、火車站等。
- 4.1.5 政府應承擔或資助視障人士服務機構，向有需要人士提供助視器材、電腦的租借服務。
- 4.2 提供及資助合適的培訓課程
 - 4.2.1 我們要求政府應廣泛聽取低視力人士對電腦軟硬件的應用、安裝及維修方面的需要，並提供培訓。
 - 4.2.2 針對現時適合低視力人士的資訊科技培訓嚴重不足，但低視力人士人數佔視障人士的九成，政府應該增撥資源，協助現時向他們提供資訊科技培訓課程的機構，舉辦更多電腦軟硬件、助視器材的培訓課程。使情況得以改善。
- 4.3 掃除閱取資訊的障礙。
 - 4.3.1 政府部門應該帶頭掃除障礙，製作適合低視力人士取讀資訊的網頁，並且多做宣傳，推動業界在設計網頁時顧及低視力人士的需要。
 - 4.3.2. 長遠而言，政府應向資訊科技界發出指引，在設計網頁及開發軟件時，尤其是中文的輔助軟件，要切合全失明及低視力人士的需要。亦應效法美國，制定法例要求軟件製造商公開部份軟件的原始編碼(source code)，使中文閱屏軟件能夠和其它軟件兼容。
 - 4.3.3. 我們要求政府扮演協調及推動者的角色，公開諮詢視障人士團體對開發中文閱屏軟件方面的意見。以往的事例顯示，單靠大專院校自發或與其他機構合作進行的有關研究，製成品並未能切合使用者的需要。政府對於有關研究應作出資助及監察，將成果轉化成產品，令視障人士受惠。

- 4.3.4. 廣泛使用互聯網以外的傳播媒介如電台、電視台及政府宣傳單張來發放詳盡的政府資訊。
- 4.3.5. 一些重要的政府文件及諮詢公眾意見的政策文件，應製作錄音帶版本，以顧及既失去閱讀能力、又不懂點字的低視力人士的取閱需要。

總結：

就公眾和政府對視障人士利用資訊科技的障礙日漸關注，我們表示欣慰。然而，現時低視力人士在獲取及掌握資訊科技方面，仍是困難重重，期望立法會資訊科技及廣播事務委員會成員，參考本會的意見書，並促使有關部門作出實際回應，早日改善現時低視力人士面臨的困境。

註：低視力解釋是引自胡志城教授所著《低視力保健》一書。胡志城教授現任香港理工大學醫療及社會科學學院院長，眼科視光學講座教授

附件：

本會向民政事務署提交有關對政府部門網頁意見的信件



香港視網膜色素病變人士協會
Hong Kong Retinitis Pigmentosa Society

香港九龍麗閣邨麗萱樓 101 號 101, Lai Huen House, Lai Kok Estate, Kowloon, Hong Kong
電話 Tel : (852) 2708 9363 圖文傳真 Fax : (852) 2708 8915
電子郵件 E-mail : info@hkrps.org.hk 網頁 Web Site : <http://www.hkrps.org.hk>

Our Ref. C/GOV/01/S020

Government Secretariat, Home Affairs Bureau
31 Floor, Southorn Centre,
130 Hennessy Road,
Wanchai, Hong Kong

Attn: Miss M. L. Wu

28 March, 2001.

Dear Miss Wu,

**Re: Accessibility of Government Websites
by People with Disabilities**

I am replying to your letter of 8 March, 2001 on captioned issue.

As a self help organization of patients with retinal degenerations, we appreciate the government to pay attention and effort on accessibility of websites by people of disabilities.

The majority of our members are low vision users. Some of them are still able to access visual information with suitable visual elements e.g. contrast, color, font size, etc.. The severely low vision users can operate personal computer including web browsers with provision of screen enlarging software / hardware and / or screen reading applications. We have tested most of the websites listed in annex B enclosed with your letter with the following conditions:

--We have mainly tested the Chinese parts of the websites because those are more frequently accessed by our members;

--We use screen enlarging hardware / software that are popular among low vision users. These tools have general features for low vision users such as magnifying, background inverting, etc.;

--We also use ASAB98 as a screen reading application that may be needed by patients with severe vision loss. In fact, ASAB98 is not a stable, sophisticated and

fully developed screen reading application under Chinese Windows. However, we have no other alternatives yet.

Our general findings from the tests are:

1. Most of the government websites are accessible to low vision users with screen enlarging and / or reading applications;
2. The text page on the websites is more or less helpful to low vision users and user friendly. Contrast and font size of most of these pages are appropriate to low vision users;
3. The design and contrast of front page of most of the websites are not good to be accessed by low vision users with their remaining eye sight and even with screen enlarging hardware / software;
4. Surprisingly, no alternate text was shown on hyperlinks and graphics on front page of most of the websites. This is a very important issue of websites accessibility to both low vision and blind users indeed.
5. The Chinese contents can not be found in some of the websites.

Enclosed please find our remarks on the list of revamped websites for your reference.

For issues of websites accessibility for low vision users, please contact the undersigned or Ms.Cheen Lin at phone No. 2708 9363.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Yours sincerely,



TSANG Kin-ping
President of HKRPS

Encl.

c.c. Ms. Esther Chan, SEOO, Equal Opportunities Commission

Remarks from Low Vision Users on List of revamped websites

A. Providing additional text-only version

Bureau/Department	Remarks
Auxiliary Medical Service(department)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design and contrast of the front page is not good to be accessed by low vision users; 2. No alternate text on hyperlinks on the front page; 3. Easy to access in the text pages; 4. Contrast of text pages is appropriate to low vision users.
Buildings Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design and contrast of the front page is not good to be accessed by low vision users; 2. No alternate text on hyperlinks on the front page; 3. Contrast of text pages is appropriate to low vision users.
Drainage Services Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design of front page is user friendly to low vision users; 2. Most of hyperlinks and graphics have alternate text, but not all yet; 3. Easy to access; 4. Contrast of text pages should be enhanced.
Government Flying Service	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design and contrast of front page is not good to be accessed by low vision users; 2. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics; 3. Cannot access Chinese content at the front page; 4. Contrast of the text pages is appropriate; 5. Table contents cannot be accessed with ASAB98.
Government Land Transport Agency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of hyperlinks and graphics have alternate text; 2. Chinese contents cannot be found.
Health and Welfare Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contrast of the front page is not good to be accessed by low vision users;

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Contrast of text pages is appropriate; 3. Easy to access in text pages.
Home Affairs Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contrast of front page is not good to be accessed by low vision users; 2. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page; 3. Contrast of text pages is appropriate. 4. Easy to access in text pages.
Information Technology and Broadcasting Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hyperlinks and graphics on front page have alternate text; 2. It would be more user friendly to low vision users if contrast of the front page is enhanced; 3. Contrast of text pages is appropriate; 4. Easy to access in text pages.
Information Technology Services Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front page is user friendly to low vision users; 2. Contrast of text pages is appropriate; 3. Easy to access in text pages.
Office of the Ombudsman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page; 2. Not easy to access with ASAB98; 3. Contrast of text pages is appropriate.
Secretariat of the Standing Committee on Disciplined Services Salaries and Conditions of Service	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chinese contents cannot be found.
Social Welfare Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front page is too fancy to low vision users; 2. Contrast of alternate text on front page should be enhanced, font size should be larger; 3. Contrast of text pages is appropriate.
Territory Development Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contrast of front page is appropriate; 2. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page;

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Not easy to access with ASAB98; 4. Chinese contents cannot be found.
Trade and Industry Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design of front page is not user friendly to low vision users; 2. Should remind ASAB98 users to close the first window before the front page; 3. Too many frames on the front page; 4. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page.
Water Supplies Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page; 2. Easy to access in text pages; 3. Contrast of text pages is appropriate.
Information Services Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page; 2. Easy to access in text pages; 3. Contrast and font size of text pages is appropriate.

B. Including features to facilitate accessibility

Bureau/Department	Remarks
Central Policy Unit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contrast of front page is appropriate; 2. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics of front page; 3. Easy to access in text pages; 4. Contrast of text pages is appropriate.
Civil Service Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternate text shown on hyperlinks and graphics on front page; 2. Easy to access in either front page or text pages; 3. Would be better to low vision users if contrast of front page is enhanced; 4. Contrast of test pages is appropriate; 5. Would be better if font size in text pages is larger.
Constitutional Affairs Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page; 2. Chinese contents cannot be found; 3. Not user friendly to low vision users.
Environment and Food Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternate text on hyperlinks and graphics on front page; 2. Easy to access in text pages; 3. Some contents have no Chinese version provided.
Finance Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front page is user friendly to low vision users; 2. Easy to access in text pages; 3. Contrast is appropriate in text pages; 4. Would be better to low vision users if the font size in text pages is larger.
Treasury	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cannot be accessed.
University Grants Committee, Secretariat	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The front page is user friendly to low vision users; 2. Easy to access in text pages; 3. Contrast is appropriate in text pages; 4. Some contents e.g. Higher Education Forum have no Chinese version provided.

C. Providing additional text-only version and including features to facilitate accessibility

Bureau/Department	Remarks
Education Department	1. Design is not user friendly to low vision users; 2. Not easy to access.



香港視網膜色素病變人士協會
Hong Kong Retinitis Pigmentosa Society

香港九龍麗閣邨麗萱樓 101 號 101, Lai Huen House, Lai Kok Estate, Kowloon, Hong Kong
電話 Tel : (852) 2708 9363 圖文傳真 Fax : (852) 2708 8915
電子郵件 E-mail : info@hkrps.org.hk 網頁 Web Site : <http://www.hkrps.org.hk>

Our Ref : C/GOV/01/S023

Government Secretariat, Home Affairs Bureau
31 Floor, Southorn Centre,
130 Hennessy Road,
Wanchai, Hong Kong

Attn: Miss M. L. Wu

31 March, 2001.

Dear Miss Wu,

**Re: Accessibility of Government Websites
by People with Disabilities**

With reference on our letter of 28 March, 2001 (Ref. No. C/GOV/01/S020) in replying to captioned issue, I am pleased to submit another testing report per enclosure as a supplement.

This report, also in view of low vision users, is focusing on English contents of the government websites provided in your letter of 8 March, 2001.

I hope our reports will be helpful to improve the accessibility of government websites for low vision users in the future.

Thank you for your kind attention. Please feel free to contact us for any queries.

Yours sincerely,

TSANG Kin-ping
President of HKRPS

Encl.

c.c. Ms. Esther Chan, SEOO, Equal Opportunities Commission

Comments on Government Websites

General comments:

- Highly conspicuous 'Text-version' button on top left of cover page is strongly preferable.
- For those of which that a text-version is improbable, larger button with thigh-contrast bold font is needed.

1. Auxiliary Medical Services

This is one of the better homepage for the low vision users. All the fonts are considerably bold. But we hope that the words could be slightly bigger in sizes, maybe 20 pts. or larger. On the other hand, it's better to have the **line closer** up together which is better for people which tunnel vision.

2. Buildings Department <http://www.info.gov.hk/bd>

- The fonts at cover page for (text only) should be bold and bigger.
- There is not enough contrast between the gray background and the links at first page.
- We just click whatever link we found in the first page. As it reveals to us all the fonts should be in bold and preferable at least 18pts in height.
- On the next link we clicked to, it was divided into two frames. Hyperlinks at left frame should be bigger in size and in bold format. But all the contents at the right links are nice. Fonts are nice and clear.

3. Drainage Services Department

- Kind of nice to have the (text only) label at upper left corner. We don't have to waste too much time looking for it.
- Not enough colour contrast between medium gray background and small tiny links at first page. We can only see the words (Drainage services department) and (What's new) since it's black and simple. We find it hard to read the words (tender notice) since it's in italic format. The words are so small, there's no way we can read the links.
- The situation doesn't get any better no matter what link we click to.

4. Government land transport agency

- Could not find (text only version)
- Titles of links on buttons are way too small
- Fonts for contents are generally too small and blurry
- We could only see bigger words such as (you are the ____ visitor) (next) etc.
- Not a friendly homepage for the low vision users.

5. Government Flying Services

Not on-line

6. Health and Welfare Bureau

- The word (text mode) should be bigger and bold placed at the upper left corner. We prefer to change to (text version) just like most other Websites.
- Everything in text mode looks OK.

7. Information Technology and Broadcasting Bureau

- This cover page has lots of graphic design but quiet hard to read for low vision users.
- On the cover page, the buttons are so faint (light blue buttons and text on light blue background),we almost could not find the text version button. Again, if the text version is meant for used by person with impaired vision, graphic design is not as important. Putting the text version button at upper left corner in high contrast font will be better.
- The words in the contents are slightly too small and thin (a bit hard to read).
- When it gets to organization chart, the words on the boxes are too small and too thin. It almost seems like it was scanned with a low resolution.
- The idea of having the left frame is black background and the right frame in white is pretty good. That is very easy for us to distinguish the two different frames. With the logo on the top frame in a bit of colour is very nice. But again, we hope the fonts of the contents and the hyperlinks could be bigger and in bold.

8. Information Technology Services Department

<http://www.info.gov.hk/itsd>

- We would prefer the word (text mode) to be at left upper corner and in 12pts, bold, black or other high contrast colours.
- Everything in the contents looks OK. It's good that the Organization list is in text rather than in chart.

<http://www.digital21.gov.hk>

- Does the word (sitemap) mean text only version? We hope every department call this a standard name.
- Otherwise, everything else looks fine.

9. Office of the Ombudsman

- We would doubt if the web-designer had ever put visually impaired person in mind. It was already very hard to find the (text only) button. Then, no matter which link we clicked to, the contents are all in small faint fonts. We could not read anything in this homepage.

10. Secretariat of the Standing Committee on Disciplined Services 10.Salaries and Conditions of Service

- We couldn't find the button for (text only version) so we clicked the English button instead. Most of the contents are easy to read except for the organization chart, all the boxes are too colourful and difficult to read. Anyway, although it's OK this homepage didn't specially made links for the low vision users, however, we think a text only button placed at the left hand corner (even connects to the same links) will be much less confusing for us.

11. Social Welfare Department

- We sure hope that the (text only) button is placed at the cover page (upper left corner), and every page too. We first thought that there wasn't any text only version in this site, until we clicked the English button.
- The fonts in the contents are barely OK. We wouldn't mind if it was a bit bigger and bolder.

12. Territory Department

- It was so hard to find the (text version) button that we almost give up. Again, a reasonably conspicuous text-only button is very important. The contents in the text version are fine, but bolder fonts are much welcomed.

13. Trade and Industry Department

- Is there a text version consultation pattern?
- We searched for a long time before we found the word (English) on the cover page. We thought foreign traders would like to check this page too. It seems strength that this page put Chinese version up first. Anyway, the idea of red words on orange background is not friendly for low vision users.
- A separated text-version button on the first page and every page is preferable.
- Inside the contents of text-version, there are too many buttons and words that are not in high-contrast. The black words in light background are OK, but bold fonts are preferable.

14. Water Supplies Department

- The first page was in Chinese so we were not able to find the button for text version. We think it's better to put it at all the pages.
- It's very hard to find the word (English), since the font was not crispy and it's not in high-contrast
- Most of the contents look OK except for the organization chart. It's better if there's no colour in the boxed. Also, a bigger font will be good too.

15. Information Services Department

- It took a long time to find the (text version) button. The button was so small and sort of melted in to the background. It's very hard to see any text on the cover page.
- As for the contents in text version, bold and larger fonts are definitely needed.

16. Central Policy Unit

- It's nice that this homepage puts the text-version button at top left corner.
- Background inside the text content (e.g. about CPU, What's new) is not a very good idea. Please omit all backgrounds. Graphic us certainly fun to look at, but when it's behind text, it's disturbing.
- Fonts in the boxed of organization chart is too small.
- Other fonts in the main contents are OK.

17. Civil Service Bureau

- We couldn't find the text-version button at all. Is there one?
- When we click into the English contents, it's not very easy for us to use. The links at the left frame are thin white fonts on medium gray background which is not good.
- The fonts basically look OK.

18. Constitutional Affairs Bureau

- We couldn't find the text-version button on this homepage. Even the sitemap is not very friendly for the low vision users. Contents with big, bold font on white background will be good.
- We couldn't find the text-version button on this homepage too. We'd like to learn about the Basic Law. But the words are way too tiny.

19. Environment and Food Bureau

- This is the same situation with Cons. Affaires Bureau. It's a mystery where the text-version button is. Big and bold fonts are very important.

20. Finance Bureau

- The contents in the English version are basically OK for low vision users. But we hope all the departments standardize a text-version button at top left corner of cover page and every page.
- We could find the text-version button for this homepage. If it means to have the regular contents double up as the text-version contents, then the fonts for the links are too small

21. Treasury

- Unable to understand this homepage.

22. University Grants Committee, Secretariat

- We couldn't locate the text-version button on this homepage. The words in the link buttons are too small and too thin for the low vision users to see.
- There isn't a text-version button on this homepage too. If this homepage means to have the main contents double up as the text version contents, we think the fonts on the left for links are not big enough

23. Information Services Department

- Server unable to connect.

24. Education Department

- We hope the (text version) button is up at top left in larger and highly conspicuous, bold fonts.
- The fonts in the text version contents can be larger and definitely in bold format. The gray background is quite disturbing since it takes away the contrast of the words.

25. Information Services Department

- (1) <http://www.info.gov.hk/isd>
(Information Services Department)
 - Transfer interrupted after clicking English.
- (2) <http://www.info.gov.hk>
(Government Information Centre)
 - There isn't a text-version button for this homepage.
 - Inside the English, there are a lot of small black boxes with small words, which are hard for the low vision users to look at.
- (3) <http://www.info.gov.hk/ce>
 - Could not find text version, i.e. unable to take a look inside the contents.
- (4) <http://www.business.gov.hk>
 - Could not find the text version , i.e. unable to take a look inside the contents.
- (5) <http://www.info.gov.hk/pa00/>
(Policy Address)
 - Same as above.

- (6) <http://www.info.gov.hk/healthyliving>
(Healthy living)
- It's better to put the English text-version at top left.
 - The contents of Health Tips, Newsletter, Healthy Exercise etc. are not text-version. Please double-check.
- (7) <http://www.info.gov.hk/disneyland>
- We couldn't find the text-version button so we don't have much comment. One thing, thin white fonts on orange background is definitely too hard to read.
- (8) <http://www.elections.gov.hk>
(Elections 2000)
- We couldn't find the text-version button for this homepage. It took us a long time to find the English button in orange button. It's not easy to read this homepage since all the buttons are orange colour with thin white fonts.
- (9) <http://www.info.gov.hk/millennium/millen.htm>
(Millennium)
- We hope the text-version button is at top left instead.
 - The text-version contents are basically fine. But it's better if all the texts are in bold format.