

# Accessibility Summary Report – Harness Portals

## Introduction

This report provides a consolidated evaluation of accessibility across 12 Harness portals, benchmarked against the **Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2 Level A and AA, Section 508**, and **EN 301 549** standards. Testing combined automated audits, in-depth manual inspection, and validation with assistive technologies, including **NVDA, JAWS, and VoiceOver**. Additional verification was conducted using **keyboard-only navigation, browser zoom, and color contrast analysis tools** to ensure comprehensive coverage.

## Overall Conformance Status

The Harness portals are currently assessed as **partially supportive of accessibility standards**. While some foundational accessibility practices are present, a substantial number of critical issues undermine conformance and usability. These deficiencies disproportionately impact:

- **Blind and screen reader users,**
- **Keyboard-only users,** and
- **Individuals with low vision.**

Although the portals are partially navigable, the absence of robust semantic structure, inconsistent labeling, and weak feedback mechanisms create significant barriers. Accessibility maturity across the portals is **low**, and extensive remediation is required before compliance with **WCAG 2.2 AA** and related standards can be credibly claimed.

---

# Key Findings

## 1. Perceivable

- **Non-text Content:** Numerous icons and interactive controls lack alternative text or tooltips, leaving screen reader users without context.
- **Info and Relationships:** Landmark regions, hierarchical headings, and table semantics are inconsistently applied, resulting in poor navigational structure.
- **Color Contrast:** Text, placeholder labels, and icons frequently fail minimum contrast requirements, impairing readability for users with low vision.
- **Text Resize and Reflow:** At 200–400% zoom, layouts break with horizontal scrolling, violating WCAG reflow requirements and creating usability challenges.

## 2. Operable

- **Keyboard Navigation:** While most interactive elements can be accessed, critical modules such as **Pipeline Studio** remain inaccessible by keyboard. Modal dialogs also exhibit focus management issues.
- **Bypass Blocks:** No skip links or quick navigation aids are provided, forcing screen reader users to navigate repetitively through lengthy menus.
- **Page Titles and Focus Indicators:** Many pages lack descriptive titles, and while focus indicators exist, they are inconsistently styled and not always visible.

## 3. Understandable

- **Form Labels and Instructions:** Several input fields lack programmatically associated labels; required fields are not consistently announced by screen readers.
- **Error Handling:** Success and error states are inconsistently communicated, with some workflows providing no confirmation feedback.
- **Consistent Navigation and Identification:** While repeated elements remain visually consistent, missing headings and poor structure undermine predictability for assistive technology users.

#### 4. Robust

- **Name, Role, and Value:** Several elements fail to expose correct ARIA roles, states, and properties, reducing assistive technology interoperability.
- **Status Messages:** Alerts, confirmations, and search results are not reliably announced to screen reader users.
- **Documentation and Support:** No accessibility statement, compatibility notes, or accessible support channels exist, leaving users without clear accommodation pathways.

---

### Impact on Users

- **Blind and Screen Reader Users:** Encounter severe navigation challenges due to missing labels, unstructured content, and unannounced dynamic updates.

- **Low Vision Users:** Struggle with poor color contrast and broken reflow at high magnification, which compromises readability and task completion.
  - **Keyboard-only Users:** Experience barriers in navigating complex modules and modal dialogs where focus is not properly managed.
  - **Users with Cognitive Disabilities:** Benefit from the absence of flashing or auto-playing media but are hindered by inconsistent structure and lack of meaningful feedback.
- 

## Recommendations

1. **Strengthen Semantic Structure:** Define landmarks, apply hierarchical headings, and ensure correct table markup.
2. **Ensure Complete Labeling:** Provide accurate, programmatically associated labels for all interactive elements and forms, with explicit required field identification.
3. **Improve Focus Management:** Correct tab order in modals and ensure focus consistently shifts to active or error states.
4. **Fix Contrast and Scaling:** Adjust text and icon colors to meet WCAG ratios and resolve layout issues at 200–400% zoom.
5. **Announce Dynamic Content:** Ensure alerts, errors, and search results are programmatically exposed to assistive technologies.

6. **Introduce Navigation Aids:** Implement skip links and ensure descriptive, unique page titles for faster orientation.
  7. **Provide Accessible Support:** Publish an accessibility statement, compatibility guidance, and establish clear, accessible user support channels.
- 

## Conclusion

The Harness portals, in their current state, are **not fully accessible** and fall significantly short of WCAG 2.2 AA compliance. While certain accessibility practices are in place, recurring issues—particularly around labeling, semantic structure, color contrast, and dynamic content handling—pose substantial barriers.

To achieve compliance and deliver an inclusive experience, **systematic remediation and a sustained commitment to accessibility governance are required**. Addressing these gaps will not only improve regulatory alignment but also expand usability, trust, and adoption across a broader user base.