Accessibility Evaluation Report

Investment Solver Ltd (Inbest)

October 2023

Contents

1. Executive Summary

This report describes the conformance of the Inbest website with W3C's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG). The review process is detailed in Section 5 below and is based on the evaluation described in Accessibility Evaluation Resources.

Based on this evaluation, the website meets WCAG 2.2 conformance levels A, AA and AAA. Detailed review results are available in Section 6 below. Resources for the follow-up study are listed in Section 7 below. Feedback on this evaluation is welcome.

The accessibility standards experienced during the audit were very good. Manual testers have complimented the inclusive design, ease of use, navigation, and correctly functioning features in their site experience.

There are no current failures identified under the WCAG principles.

This report delivers the information needed to implement a clear accessibility statement and a process to maintain content accessibility.

2. Methodology

The methodology for this audit was based on discussions that took place with the Inbest team. These were the steps that were followed:

1. Measure the number of website pages and analyse the audit sample, including Google Analytics data
2. Assign testers according to the website project length for automated tests
3. Run Automated Accessibility Tests to gather raw accessibility data
4. Interpret and consolidate automated data into individual reports
5. Identify pages by priority fixes
6. Determine User Journey (using pages with highest priority fixes and most visited pages)
7. Assign testers with disabilities for manual tests following the User Journey
8. Assign simulation testers following the User Journey
9. Generate User Journey Report (identifying the persona)
10. Consolidate Automated and Manual report
11. Produce the Final Report, and also suggest Accessibility Statement inclusions based on the results

3. Scope of Review

The following websites were included in this review:

https://benefits.inbest.ai/

Automated tests: 21 pages and files scanned
Manual tests: 20 steps in the user journey

The evaluation results in this report are based on tests conducted on dates in July - September 2023. The website may have changed since that time.

4. Reviewers

Manual Tests:
Tester A (Navigability and simulated evaluation)
Tester B (JAWS evaluation)
Tester C (Neural and motor disability evaluation)
Tester D (Dyslexia and ADHD evaluation)

Organisation with which reviewers are affiliated: **Passion4Social CIC**

Contact information: **Thiago Carmo**, thiago@passion4social.com

Natural language(s) with which reviewer(s) is/are fluent: **English (All), Spanish (Tester D)**

5. Review Process

WCAG Tested Level: **WCAG 2.2 Level A, AA**

Automated Testing Tools:

- **Tenon**
- **SortSite**
- **aXe**
- **Chrome Accessibility Developer Tools**
- **DynoMapper**
- **WAVE**

Which reviews all WCAG 2.2 Success Criteria.

Manual Testing Tools:

- **JAWS**
- **Keyboard**
- **Web Disability Simulator**
- **Disability Simulator (SilkTide)**
- **Funkify**

Which review navigability and different disability experiences, covering:

- Keyboard testing: navigation and focusable items, quality and accuracy of link text and image attributes
- Check for links with ambiguous link text, spelling mistakes and reading order
- Zoom readability/usability
- Accessibility of dynamic changes: predictive search, page content that changes on activation, filtered listings
- Page structure: landmarks and headings

During manual testing, reviewers gave feedback on their experience of understanding the content, as well as simply accessing it.

6. Results and Recommended Actions

Overall summary of findings

WCAG principles

The WCAG 2.2 standard is based on the four core principles that a website should be perceivable, operable, understandable and robust. The following is a summary of issues found during the tests completed.

Perceivable

There were no apparent failures in this area.

Operable

There were no apparent failures in this area, including for screen readers and keyboard-only users.

Understandable

There were no apparent failures in this area.

Robust

There were no apparent failures in this area.

Communicating accessibility

Sitemaps and Accessibility Pages or Statements are key for users with a range of disabilities. Making these easy to find and access, and of consistent quality, will greatly improve the experience of users with disabilities.

Summary of the website

This summary brings together the results of manual and automated testing and highlights the key points for the website.

For the purposes of creating an Accessibility Statement, there are no issues found on the website under the conformance A, AA and AAA levels.

https://benefits.inbest.ai/

- Positive highlights
    - Simple structure which is logical and easy to follow.
    - Easy to understand language and the font is easy to read.
    - Information is easy to access, with clear prompts, and the form is easy to use.
    - Links, buttons and combo boxes are well described and features work correctly.
    - A great example of inclusive design and previous recommendations have clearly been taken on board and acted on.

Accessibility statements

All websites require an Accessibility Statement to highlight the areas where there are known accessibility issues, and what is being done about them.

The recommended structure for an Accessibility Statement can be generated automatically using this tool:

https://www.w3.org/WAI/planning/statements/generator/#create

A full example Accessibility Statement can also be found here:
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sample-accessibility-statement

Using the summary of the website section above as a starting point, key failings can be added to the Accessibility Statement where they have not yet been resolved.

The Accessibility Statement should be implemented on a page which is easy to reach. On many websites, the accessibility statement is only linked in the footer of the page where tabbing through links can take a very long time to reach. We recommend that the accessibility statement link should be positioned near the top of the page and clearly labelled.

As well as this key page, notifying users when content is not accessible, and signposting alternatives, will make a significant difference. This could be a notice before the affected content advising what is and is not accessible on the page and providing links to more details or accessible versions. This approach is appreciated especially by users of assistive technology.

PDFs

PDFs are less accessible than HTML pages by nature, as the content is in a fixed format. For example, text does not reflow when zoomed in.

However, most methods of generating a PDF (e.g. exporting from a Microsoft Word document) include accessibility features by default. For example, making text accessible to screen readers. Additional features increase the accessibility of a document, for example adding bookmarks to make navigation easier and adding descriptions for images and diagrams.

We recommend, where possible, that information be presented within the website rather than on PDFs, to increase accessibility and increase ease of use. The Inbest website presents
information to users well in this way which eased the navigation and usability of the information in our tests.

Where PDF documents continue to be used, the following points should be noted and actioned, or included in accessibility statements:

- PDFs should include bookmarks - these greatly aid accessibility and should be added whenever a PDF is generated. For details please see https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG20-TECHS/pdf#PDF2
- PDF generation should include all accessibility features available in the generating application. For guidance see https://webaim.org/techniques/acrobat/converting
- A description of the PDF file should be inserted beside the link, which could be just a few words, or ideally a bulleted list of the main contents of the file.

Real-world accessibility

The ultimate aim of compliance with WCAG 2.2 is not a box-ticking exercise, but instead to make the lives of real people easier when they use websites which contain information important to them.

It is not usually practicable to meet every aspect of the standards fully, and automated tests in particular will uncover technical non-compliances which do not actually affect the real-world experience of users with disabilities.

This is the reason for the approach taken in this accessibility review - using manual testers with disabilities as well as automated scans.

The **Public Sector Bodies (Websites and Mobile Applications) (No. 2) Accessibility Regulations 2018** legislation reflects the real-world limits on what is practicable with the inclusion of the Disproportionate Burden clause:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2018/852/regulation/6/made

The summary provided above for the website aims to highlight the non-compliances which should be corrected because they are likely to have a real-world impact on users. Other technical non-compliances in the automated test reports are likely to have little to no impact on real users. This was verified by the fact that manual testers did not encounter issues in these areas.

Another factor is that users with certain disabilities may not require access to all the content included in this audit. It is impossible to tell from an external perspective whether this is the case or not, but it is not a good use of resources to correct technical non-compliances which will never impact a real user.

The real-world approach we recommend is as follows:

1. Proactively correct the major issues highlighted as a first priority.
2. Implement accessibility statements making clear that some aspects of the sites are less accessible. Actively encourage user feedback in these statements and elsewhere on the site to gather data on what content is least accessible and most in demand.
3. Have a reactive approach to the incoming feedback, implementing fixes and changes where there is demand.
4. Implement processes to ensure new content and new websites are compliant from the beginning.

Monitoring and maintaining compliance

In order to maintain compliance with the WCAG standards, a process will be required for approving all content before it is published. Trained individuals can use a checklist to ensure all key requirements are met, and content can be modified before it is published.

An example checklist, based on the most common issues found would be:

- Ensure new images always have descriptive alt text
- Ensure new page titles and labels are always unique and descriptive
- Ensure all labels clearly and unambiguously describe the purpose of the form field, and where possible include instructions and tips for filling in fields
- Ensure all interface components and images essential for understanding the content have a contrast ratio of at least 3:1 between the foreground and background
- Ensure headings in HTML are never empty (not used for spacing)
- Ensure links and linked images have correct alt text so screen readers can use them to navigate and identify the link purpose
- Ensure tables are correctly marked up if used in HTML content
- Ensure bold text is marked using “strong” in the HTML so that the emphasis can be understood by screen readers
- For all rich media or interactive content, plan an accessible alternative at the same time, or as a minimum, a notice on the page describing the content and signposting alternatives
- Update the Accessibility Statement page if new content is added that does not have alternative formats

A process of this kind needs to be ever-evolving, with a checklist and methodology at its core which is continually improved. Practically, it will require:

- A process management system where the process can be easily followed for each piece of new content and the checklist easily amended or added to when new issues arise which need to be checked on future content.
- A core checklist like the one above.
- Trained individuals with the skills to edit HTML content who take each piece of new content on a web platform and work through the checklist before it is published.
- Optionally, and depending on the publishing platform, software can be used to automatically check for some accessibility requirements and flag up issues during the content editing process. However, this cannot fully replace a human editor, in particular for ensuring descriptions are appropriate.

This process would only be effective if it is consistently adopted, otherwise, content which is added without accessibility checks would need to be checked and edited after publishing which means inefficient double-handling and leaves windows where content is published but may not be fully accessible.

This may require a restructure of existing content publishing processes to incorporate an accessibility editing stage, however, it is essential if ongoing compatibility with WCAG standards is to be maintained.

7. References

Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) Overview
https://www.w3.org/WAI/intro/wcag

Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1
https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/

Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2
https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/

Techniques for WCAG 2.1
https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG21/Techniques/

Accessibility Evaluation Resources
http://www.w3.org/WAI/eval/

Web Accessibility Evaluation Tools List
https://www.w3.org/WAI/ER/tools/

Using Combined Expertise to Evaluate Web Accessibility
https://www.w3.org/WAI/eval/reviewteams