

# AUDITZO

## Sample ADA/WCAG-Oriented Technical Accessibility Evidence Review

Short redacted version for prospective clients

|                  |                                                      |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Prepared by      | Auditzo                                              |
| Report type      | Technical accessibility evidence review              |
| Sample scope     | Selected representative pages and user-facing states |
| Sample status    | Demonstration report - not client-specific           |
| Evidence package | Illustrative references only                         |

### Important Sample Notice

This is a shortened, anonymized demonstration report. It shows Auditzo's reporting structure, evidence style, and remediation-focused approach. It is not legal advice, not ADA or WCAG certification, and not a final legal compliance determination.

## 1. Executive Summary

Auditzo performs technical accessibility evidence reviews to help website owners, agencies, legal teams, and implementation teams understand accessibility risks in a practical, remediation-oriented way.

This sample report shows the shorter client-facing version of our ADA/WCAG-oriented accessibility review format. It includes representative findings, evidence examples, recommended fixes, and retest guidance without exposing client-specific website data.

The purpose is not to overwhelm the client with raw scanner output. The purpose is to show confirmed technical observations, explain user impact in plain English, and provide the website team with clear next steps.

### Sample Review Outcome Snapshot

|                          |                                                        |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Sample pages represented | 3                                                      |
| Sample findings included | 6                                                      |
| High priority examples   | 2                                                      |
| Medium priority examples | 3                                                      |
| Low priority examples    | 1                                                      |
| Review type              | Human-reviewed technical accessibility evidence review |

### What This Sample Demonstrates

- Evidence-backed findings instead of raw automated scan exports.
- Plain-English impact explanations for business and legal reviewers.
- Developer-friendly remediation guidance for website teams.
- Conservative WCAG-oriented mapping without legal overclaims.
- Clear separation between confirmed findings, supporting evidence, and retest steps.

## 2. Review Methodology and Evidence Model

Auditzo uses a layered review process. Automated tools may identify candidate issues, but findings are not treated as confirmed until they are reviewed in context and mapped to user impact.

| Review Layer                  | Purpose                                                                                                                  | Output                                                          |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Automated candidate detection | Identify possible accessibility issues such as missing names, low contrast, headings, labels, ARIA, and iframe concerns. | Candidate list for human review.                                |
| Human verification            | Review page behavior, visual context, keyboard paths, and assistive-technology-oriented output.                          | Confirmed, reviewed-not-confirmed, or candidate-only treatment. |
| Evidence curation             | Select screenshots, DevTools captures, keyboard records, and notes that help explain confirmed findings.                 | Client-facing evidence package and report references.           |
| Remediation guidance          | Translate findings into practical website-team actions.                                                                  | Fix recommendation and retest method per finding.               |

### Severity Model

| Severity | Meaning                                                          | Recommended Action             |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| High     | May significantly impair access or operation for affected users. | Prioritize first.              |
| Medium   | May create friction, confusion, or inconsistent access.          | Remediate in main fix cycle.   |
| Low      | Structural or consistency issue worth correcting.                | Address during cleanup and QA. |

### 3. Sample Findings Summary

| Finding ID | Area             | Severity | Issue Summary                                          | Primary Fix Direction                                                     |
|------------|------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SAMPLE-001 | Navigation       | High     | Mobile menu button lacks a meaningful accessible name. | Add clear accessible label and retest with screen-reader-oriented review. |
| SAMPLE-002 | Forms            | High     | Required fields rely on placeholder-only labels.       | Add persistent visible/programmatic labels.                               |
| SAMPLE-003 | Links            | Medium   | Repeated action links do not provide unique purpose.   | Make repeated links destination-specific.                                 |
| SAMPLE-004 | Embedded widgets | Medium   | Icon-only widget controls have unclear names.          | Add labels or coordinate with widget vendor.                              |
| SAMPLE-005 | Visual clarity   | Medium   | Normal text has low contrast in a content block.       | Adjust text/background colors and measure contrast.                       |
| SAMPLE-006 | Semantics        | Low      | Heading structure is not fully logical.                | Normalize heading hierarchy and remove misleading headings.               |

**Priority Remediation Principle**

Fix the highest-impact user barriers first, then address shared templates and repeated patterns. One template-level fix can often resolve multiple page-level accessibility findings.

## 4. Representative Detailed Findings

### SAMPLE-001: Mobile Navigation Toggle Lacks a Meaningful Accessible Name

|                         |                                          |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Page / Area             | Representative home page / mobile header |
| Severity                | High                                     |
| WCAG-Oriented Reference | 4.1.2 Name, Role, Value                  |
| Implementation Priority | Fix first                                |

**Issue:** The mobile navigation control visually opens the site menu, but the accessible name exposed to assistive technology is missing, empty, or unclear.

**Why it matters:** Screen-reader users rely on button names to understand what a control does. An unnamed or unclear menu button can make core site navigation harder to discover and operate.

**Recommended fix:** Add a clear accessible name such as "Open menu" or "Open navigation". Confirm the button exposes the correct role and, where supported, expanded/collapsed state.

**Validation after fix:** Retest with keyboard navigation, DevTools Accessibility pane, and screen-reader-oriented review.

#### Supporting Evidence Example

Evidence SAMPLE-001-E01 would typically include a DevTools Accessibility pane capture showing the menu button role/name. Evidence SAMPLE-001-E02 may include screen-reader-oriented output showing the unclear announcement.

### SAMPLE-002: Required Form Fields Rely on Placeholder-Only Labels

|                         |                                                          |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Page / Area             | Representative contact / registration form               |
| Severity                | High                                                     |
| WCAG-Oriented Reference | 3.3.2 Labels or Instructions; supporting 1.3.1 and 4.1.2 |
| Implementation Priority | Fix first                                                |

**Issue:** Required input fields use placeholder-style text as the main field label instead of persistent visible labels or stronger programmatic labels.

**Why it matters:** Users may lose field context after typing begins. This can affect screen-reader users, users with cognitive needs, low-vision users, and users returning to a partially completed form.

**Recommended fix:** Add visible labels for each required field and programmatically associate labels with inputs. Use placeholder text only as supplemental hint text.

**Validation after fix:** Retest field names using keyboard navigation, DevTools Accessibility pane, and screen-reader-oriented review. Do not submit live production data during validation.

#### Supporting Evidence Example

Evidence SAMPLE-002-E01 would typically show the visible placeholder-only field. Evidence SAMPLE-002-E02 may show the field name/label behavior in the accessibility tree.

**SAMPLE-003: Repeated Action Links Do Not Provide Unique Link Purpose**

|                         |                                     |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Page / Area             | Representative card/listing section |
| Severity                | Medium                              |
| WCAG-Oriented Reference | 2.4.4 Link Purpose                  |
| Implementation Priority | Main remediation cycle              |

**Issue:** Multiple cards use repeated link text such as "View More" without including the related card, project, property, or destination name in the accessible link purpose.

**Why it matters:** Screen-reader users often navigate by link lists. Repeated generic links can make it difficult to know which item each link opens.

**Recommended fix:** Make each repeated link unique, either through visible text or accessible text. Example: "View more about [Project Name]" instead of only "View More".

**Validation after fix:** Retest with links-list review, keyboard navigation, and accessibility-tree inspection.

**Supporting Evidence Example**

Evidence SAMPLE-003-E01 would typically show a screen-reader-oriented links list or Speech Viewer output with repeated link names.

**SAMPLE-004: Embedded Widget Icon-Only Controls Have Unclear Names**

|                         |                                                        |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Page / Area             | Representative embedded listing / third-party widget   |
| Severity                | Medium                                                 |
| WCAG-Oriented Reference | 4.1.2 Name, Role, Value; supporting 2.4.4 Link Purpose |
| Implementation Priority | Main remediation cycle / vendor review                 |

**Issue:** Icon-only controls inside an embedded widget expose missing, generic, or non-descriptive accessible names.

**Why it matters:** Users relying on assistive technology may not know whether a control opens filters, shares an item, moves a carousel, saves a listing, or performs another action.

**Recommended fix:** Add descriptive accessible labels where implementation control exists. If the widget is third-party controlled, request vendor support or configuration options for accessible labels.

**Validation after fix:** Retest affected widget controls with keyboard navigation, DevTools Accessibility pane, and screen-reader-oriented output.

**Supporting Evidence Example**

Evidence SAMPLE-004-E01 would typically include widget-control visual context. Evidence SAMPLE-004-E02 may show screen-reader-oriented output for an unclear icon control.

**SAMPLE-005: Normal Text Has Low Contrast in a Content Block**

|                         |                                |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Page / Area             | Representative content section |
| Severity                | Medium                         |
| WCAG-Oriented Reference | 1.4.3 Contrast Minimum         |
| Implementation Priority | Main remediation cycle         |

**Issue:** Normal paragraph text appears over a colored background with insufficient or weak contrast in the reviewed state.

**Why it matters:** Low contrast text can be difficult to read for users with low vision, color-vision differences, older users, and users viewing the site in bright environments.

**Recommended fix:** Adjust foreground text color, background color, or both. Measure the actual color pair after implementation rather than relying only on visual judgment.

**Validation after fix:** Retest using contrast measurement, computed color inspection, visual review, and responsive state checks.

**Supporting Evidence Example**

Evidence SAMPLE-005-E01 would typically include a screenshot of the affected content block. Evidence SAMPLE-005-E02 may include contrast sample data.

**SAMPLE-006: Heading Structure Does Not Follow a Clear Page Hierarchy**

|                         |                                                                    |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Page / Area             | Representative content page                                        |
| Severity                | Low                                                                |
| WCAG-Oriented Reference | 1.3.1 Info and Relationships; supporting 2.4.6 Headings and Labels |
| Implementation Priority | Template cleanup                                                   |

**Issue:** The page heading structure does not fully match the visible hierarchy. Multiple top-level headings, skipped levels, or heading-like text may make the page outline less predictable.

**Why it matters:** Screen-reader users may navigate by headings to understand page structure. A noisy or inconsistent heading outline can make content harder to scan and understand.

**Recommended fix:** Use one clear page-level H1 where appropriate, H2 for major sections, and H3/H4 for nested sections. Avoid empty headings and avoid using heading tags only for visual styling.

**Validation after fix:** Retest using heading outline review, DevTools Accessibility pane, and screen-reader-oriented heading navigation.

**Supporting Evidence Example**

Evidence SAMPLE-006-E01 would typically include a heading outline or page-structure review note rather than a large screenshot.

## 5. Sample Remediation Roadmap

Auditzo recommends grouping remediation by user impact and implementation efficiency. The goal is to fix the most important barriers first while also addressing repeated templates and shared components.

| Phase   | Focus                                  | Examples                                                            | Retest Required                                      |
|---------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Phase 1 | High-priority barriers                 | Unnamed navigation controls; placeholder-only required form fields. | Keyboard + screen-reader-oriented review + DevTools. |
| Phase 2 | Shared templates and repeated patterns | Repeated links, headings, cards, header/footer components.          | Page-template retest across affected pages.          |
| Phase 3 | Embedded widgets and vendor items      | Third-party listing widgets, iframes, dialogs, icon controls.       | Vendor/configuration review + focused widget retest. |
| Phase 4 | Visual and responsive cleanup          | Contrast, link visibility, reflow, mobile content visibility.       | Contrast tools + 320px reflow + visual QA.           |

## 6. Sample Evidence Package Explanation

A full Auditzo delivery can include a curated evidence package that maps each finding to screenshots, accessibility-tree captures, keyboard records, screen-reader-oriented evidence, notes, or supporting data files.

Example evidence structure:

```
Evidence/  
  01-Navigation-and-interactive-controls/  
    SAMPLE-PAGE/  
      SAMPLE-001/  
        SAMPLE-001-E01-menu-button-accessible-name.png
```

### Evidence Review Note

Evidence files support the technical finding, but screenshots alone are not the full finding. Each evidence item should be reviewed together with the issue explanation, recommended fix, and validation guidance.

## 7. Closing Summary

This sample shows Auditzo's shortened accessibility evidence review format for prospective clients. The full version can include deeper page coverage, more detailed findings, evidence indexes, screenshots, technical notes, and implementation-focused remediation guidance.

A strong accessibility report should not simply list automated scanner errors. It should help the client understand what was reviewed, what was confirmed, why it matters to users, how the website team can fix it, and how the fix should be retested.

## Recommended Next Step for a Client

Start with a focused review of representative pages and high-impact user journeys. After remediation, perform a targeted retest to confirm that fixes work visually, programmatically, and through keyboard or assistive-technology-oriented review.

### Legal and Certification Notice

Auditzo provides technical accessibility observations and remediation-oriented evidence. This sample and Auditzo reports are not legal advice, not ADA or WCAG certification, and not a final legal compliance determination.

**End of Sample Report**  
**Prepared by Auditzo**

