auditzo

PUBLIC SAMPLE / AUTOMATED ACCESSIBILITY

Automated WCAG 2.2 AA Accessibility Technical Evidence Report

Selected rule signals, review boundaries, and remediation direction

REDACTED EXAMPLE • NOT A CONFORMANCE DETERMINATION

Representative report content

This public sample is adapted from a completed automated single-page scan. Auditzo has removed the target website, URLs, element locators, screenshots, unique IDs, and original diagnostic artifacts. Counts and selected rule signals reflect the source scan, but this PDF is a shortened, reformatted demonstration and is not the original evidence package.

The automated scan did not perform a full manual WCAG review. Human verification is required to determine whether technical signals correspond to actual accessibility barriers.

01 / EXECUTIVE INTERPRETATION

An initial technical picture

The underlying automated scan detected nine rule-level findings needing attention and three additional check groups requiring human judgment.

Metric	Recorded value
Page states captured	One sampled page state
Automated rules evaluated	74
Rule-level findings needing attention	9 (1 critical, 7 serious, 1 moderate)
Additional review checks	3 categories needing human judgment
No automated issue signal	34 rules
Not applicable in captured state	28 rules

How to interpret the result

These are scanner classifications and review priorities, not nine independently confirmed user barriers. Likewise, a rule with no issue signal does not prove the page or site conforms to WCAG 2.2 AA.

The original report included browser observations and technical locators. Those identifying details are intentionally omitted here. A paid report may contain richer reproducibility context than this public sample.

02 / TEST BOUNDARY

What the automated scan actually did

A scoped, technology-assisted review of one captured webpage, with automated and browser-level signals.

Dimension	Captured result
Reference framework	WCAG 2.2 A/AA-oriented checks
Automated engine	axe-core 4.12.1 and supplementary Auditzo checks
Page response	HTTP 200 in captured session
Scan duration	24.82 seconds
Keyboard traversal	149 / 197 expected sequential focus stops observed
Detectable focus style	147 focus stops with a style-change signal
320 CSS px reflow	0 px horizontal overflow in captured measurement
Target-size geometry	30 possible size/spacing conflicts

Limitations

- The automated traversal measurement does not, by itself, prove that 48 controls were inaccessible.
- Style-change detection does not fully assess focus indicator contrast, area, or obscuring.
- A single rendered state cannot cover all menus, dialogs, form errors, pages or assistive technologies.

03 / PRIORITIZATION

Detected findings requiring attention

The table below reflects the nine rule-level signals reported by the automated scan. Counts refer to affected items in the source scan and may overlap across controls.

Ref	Rule-level signal	Items
F-001	Focus styling may not be detectable	2
F-002	Expected keyboard focus stops not reached	48
F-003	Pointer target geometry concerns	30
F-004	Possible text contrast failures	19
F-005	Images missing expected text alternatives	2
F-006	Links without discernible accessible names	2
F-007	Viewport settings may restrict zoom	1
F-008	Scrollable region may need keyboard access	1
F-009	Small touch-target spacing concerns	1

Priority is contextual

The engine marked the image-alternative-text rule as critical. A human reviewer would still examine the image purpose, user impact and actual interface before adopting that severity in a manual audit.

A report must not turn rule counts or flags into a legal violation count, full-site compliance score or a promise that every detected item is a distinct code defect.

F-005: Missing image text alternatives

Selected finding from the source automated scan; original selectors and screenshots withheld.

Field	Finding detail
Automated classification	Critical in source report; context requires review
WCAG-oriented reference	1.1.1 Non-text Content
Affected items	2
Observed technical signal	The engine could not identify an appropriate text alternative for two selected image elements.
What it does not decide	Whether each image is informative, functional or purely decorative.

Why this matters

People who cannot visually perceive an image may miss information or the purpose of a linked control when an appropriate text alternative is absent.

Recommended direction

- For meaningful images, provide a concise alternative conveying their purpose or information.
- For decorative images, use a technique that prevents an unnecessary announcement.

Verification after a fix

Inspect the relevant image context and accessibility tree; test how the resulting text alternative is announced where it affects a user journey.

F-001 and F-002: Focus visibility and reachability

Two kinds of keyboard-related signals were present. Neither should be treated as a completed human keyboard audit.

Signal	Captured observation
Focus visibility (F-001)	Two focused elements did not produce a detectable visual style change under the automated check.
Keyboard reachability (F-002)	48 expected interactive stops were not observed along the tool's sequential traversal path.

What needs human confirmation

- Were the flagged controls actually visible, enabled, and expected to be keyboard reachable in that exact state?
- Could the controls be accessed through a documented keyboard interaction that the traversal did not exercise?
- Was focus styling visible in a way not captured by the style-change heuristic?
- Are the relevant focus order and operation usable across the complete selected journey?

Remediation direction

Inspect markup, native controls, tabindex, disabled states and JavaScript focus management, then test the actual behavior with a keyboard and assistive technology where applicable.

Contrast, target geometry and mobile zoom

Selected measurements show how an automated report can direct development review without overclaiming confirmed failures.

Signal	Example recorded evidence
Text contrast (F-004)	19 elements flagged. Two anonymized measurement examples were approximately 4.47:1 and 2.89:1 against a 4.5:1 normal-text threshold.
Target size (F-003)	30 geometry signals. Some source elements had very small measured hit areas or insufficient surrounding target spacing.
Touch target (F-009)	One further rule finding reported insufficient size/spacing on a selected control.
User scaling (F-007)	One viewport configuration appeared to restrict user zoom.

Suggested verification

- Measure actual rendered contrast with a reliable method in the relevant state.
- Review applicable WCAG 2.5.8 exceptions before treating geometry flags as confirmed failures.
- Inspect the browser and device zoom experience; do not rely on viewport markup alone.
- Retest the revised component and document the result.

07 / HUMAN-REVIEW QUEUE

Three categories requiring human judgment

The source report kept indeterminate checks separate from its automated findings.

Review item	Source count	Human decision needed
M-001: Contrast cannot be fully resolved	43	Determine foreground/background color in real rendered states before classifying.
M-002: Touch target geometry indeterminate	1	Inspect overflow and effective target area in context.
M-003: Video caption requirement	1	Check whether meaningful audio exists and captions are required and present.

These review items are NOT confirmed accessibility failures. A manual engagement may reproduce them, dismiss them, or document conditions that cannot be assessed in the agreed scope.

Why human review adds value

A properly scoped manual review converts technical candidates into defensible user-experience observations through keyboard testing, screen-reader-oriented review, contextual WCAG mapping, and preserved reproduction evidence.

Turn automated signals into verified improvements

The automated report is a useful starting point. Manual investigation is a different level of work.

Stage	Next action
1. Review priorities	Identify main journeys and verify the highest-impact technical signals.
2. Confirm findings	Inspect real controls, keyboard flows, assistive technology output and responsive states.
3. Implement improvements	Correct confirmed issues and coordinate external widget or content owners.
4. Retest	Repeat selected test paths and preserve updated evidence under the agreed scope.

Public sample boundaries

- Redacted, shortened selection from one observed automated scan; not the original 26-page report.
- No client website name, original screenshots, selectors, private artifact IDs or evidence package are reproduced.
- No human-verified conformance determination, ADA certification or legal opinion is represented.

Need a human-reviewed WCAG accessibility assessment?
See auditzo.com/wcag-2-2-aa-website-audit or contact Auditzo for a scoped review.