



ACCESSTUNE

Website Accessibility Audit Report

Prepared for

Ourselves

accesstune.vercel.app — yes, our own website.

SAMPLE REPORT

Audit date	October 9, 2026
Standard	WCAG 2.2, Levels A & AA
Scope	Our public landing page (single-page site)
Methods	axe-core automated testing · Lighthouse accessibility audit · manual protocol review
Classification	SAMPLE — our own site, published as an example of our work

The result

100 _{/100}	0	0	0
LIGHTHOUSE ACCESSIBILITY	CRITICAL FINDINGS	SERIOUS FINDINGS	OTHER FINDINGS

Why we are showing you a report with zero findings

We turned our own scanner on our own website — the same axe-core engine, the same WCAG 2.2 rule set, the same manual review protocol we sell to clients. It found **nothing**. So this report says nothing. That is the entire point.

Plenty of vendors in this market would have “found” dozens of issues on this page. Inflated findings manufacture urgency, and urgency sells subscriptions and remediation contracts. We do the opposite: when there is nothing wrong, we say so — even though saying so earns us nothing beyond your trust.

An empty findings table is a valid, honest result. If your site comes back clean, we will tell you it is clean and charge you nothing beyond the audit itself. If it comes back with real issues, you will see each one below with its WCAG criterion, a code snapshot from *your* site, and a developer-ready fix — like the examples in our paid reports.

What this sample demonstrates

- **The format you would receive:** scorecard, methodology, findings with code snapshots, and a prioritized fix plan — applied here to our own page.
- **Our standard, applied to ourselves first:** we hold our own site to the same bar we sell. This page scores 100/100 on Lighthouse accessibility.
- **What we refuse to do:** invent findings to justify a remediation upsell.

What we checked

Automated testing

We ran **axe-core** (the industry-standard open-source engine, WCAG 2.0/2.1/2.2 Levels A and AA rules) against the live page, plus the **Lighthouse accessibility audit**. Both are the same tools plaintiff-side scanners and our own client audits use — no proprietary black box, no inflated proprietary “severity scores.”

Manual protocol review

Automated tools catch roughly a third of real accessibility barriers. A human reviewed the following on this page:

- **Document language** — `<html lang="en-US">` present, so screen readers use correct pronunciation.
- **Document title** — descriptive `<title>` ("AccessTune — Website Accessibility Audits").
- **Heading structure** — single `<h1>`, sequential `<h2>/<h3>` order, no skipped levels.
- **Images** — every `<img>` carries meaningful alt text; decorative images are hidden from assistive tech.
- **Keyboard navigation** — skip link present as the first focusable element; all interactive controls reachable and visible on focus.
- **Landmarks** — content wrapped in `<header>`, `<main>`, `<footer>` regions.

Findings

The table below lists every issue the audit found, ordered by severity. It is empty — because the audit found nothing.

#	Severity	Issue	WCAG
---	----------	-------	------

No findings. On a client report, each row here would carry the WCAG criterion, a code snapshot from the client's own site, occurrence counts, and a developer-ready fix with effort estimate.

Scope & limitations

This sample reflects an automated audit plus a manual protocol review of a single page on October 9, 2026. Automated testing cannot catch every barrier — for example, the meaningful quality of alt text, logical reading order in complex layouts, or the usability of custom widgets all require human judgment, which our paid audits include. A clean automated result is strong evidence of a well-built page, not a legal guarantee.

This report is not legal advice. Accessibility obligations depend on jurisdiction, sector, and case law. Consult qualified counsel for legal questions.