

Accessibility Statement for KxProposals

It is a legal requirement for public sector bodies in the UK that “all websites created before 23 September will have to be accessible and have an accessibility statement by 23 September 2020.” See: [The Public Sector Bodies \(Websites and Mobile Applications\) Accessibility Regulations 2018](#).

The UK government have published a [sample statement](#) which can be adapted as required by individual organisations. A full statement is longer than what’s included below, and includes information about the website as a whole. As the supplier of KxProposals, we’ve reviewed the default web pages and have produced the below text that our customers can copy / paste into their accessibility statement. Note that there may be further accessibility issues with the site depending on the bespoke design of the customer’s instance of KxProposals.

The notes in the text below are taken verbatim from the UK government’s sample statement.

How accessible this website is



[Note: use this section to provide information that a disabled user can act on - for example, avoid a particular section of the website, or request an alternative version rather than waste time trying to make it work with their assistive technology. Try to list in order of most impact to least impact.]

We know some parts of this website are not fully accessible:

- the language of the content cannot be programatically determined
 - some of our elements have poor colour contrast
 - there are no first level headings
-

Technical information about this website’s accessibility



[Note: this form of wording is legally required, so do not change it.]

[Name of organisation] is committed to making its website accessible, in accordance with the Public Sector Bodies (Websites and Mobile Applications) (No. 2) Accessibility Regulations 2018.

Compliance status



[Note: say that the website is fully compliant if the website meets WCAG 2.1 AA standard in full. Say that it's partially compliant if it meets most requirements of the WCAG 2.1 AA standard. If it does not meet most requirements of the WCAG 2.1 AA standard, say that it's not compliant.]

If your website is either partially compliant or not compliant WCAG 2.1 AA standard, you'll need to explain why. This will be due to one or both of the following:

- non-compliances - this means the content in question is in scope of the regulations, but there's an accessibility problem with it*
- an exemption - this means the inaccessible content is out of scope of the regulations, or it'd be a disproportionate burden for you to make it accessible*

There's a legally required way of expressing the compliance status of your website, so do not change it. The 3 options are as follows:

- This website is fully compliant with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines version 2.1 AA standard.*
- This website is partially compliant with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines version 2.1 AA standard, due to [insert one of the following: 'the non-compliances', 'the exemptions' or 'the non-compliances and exemptions'] listed below.*
- This website is not compliant with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines version 2.1 AA standard. The [insert one of the following: 'non-compliances', 'exemptions' or 'non-compliances and exemptions'] are listed below.*

This website is partially compliant with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines version 2.1 AA standard, due to the non-compliances listed below.

Non-accessible content



[Note: if the website is fully compliant with the WCAG 2.1 AA standard, you can leave the 'Non-accessible content' section out.]

Otherwise, do not change the 'Non-accessible content' heading or the 'The content listed below is non-accessible for the following reasons' sentence - they're legally required.

Do not change the 'Non-compliance with the accessibility regulations', 'Disproportionate burden' and 'Content that's not within the scope of the accessibility regulations' subheadings: they're also legally required.

But if you need to list a lot of problems, you can break these subsections up with further subheadings - for example, 'Navigation and accessing information' or 'Interactive tools and transactions'.]

The content listed below is non-accessible for the following reasons.

Non-compliance with the accessibility regulations



[Note: In this subsection, list:

- *accessibility problems*
- *which of the WCAG 2.1 AA success criteria the problem fails on*
- *when you plan to fix the problem*

Do not include any problems where you're claiming disproportionate burden, or where the problem is outside the scope of the accessibility regulations (those should go in the subsections below).]

Some images do not have a text alternative, so people using a screen reader cannot access the information. This fails WCAG 2.1 success criterion 1.1.1 (non-text content).

The language of the KxProposals web pages cannot be programmatically determined, which means users of the KxProposals site may not be able to fully understand the content. This fails WCAG 2.1 success criterion 3.1.1 (Language of Page)

Some elements have poor colour contrast which makes them hard to see. This fails WCAG 2.1 success criteria 1.4.3 (Contrast (Minimum))

There are no first level headings on the pages, which means the purpose of each page is not immediately clear to users. This fails WCAG 2.1 success criteria 1.3.1 (Info and Relationships) and 2.4.6 (Headings and Labels)

Disproportionate burden



[Note: in this subsection list accessibility problems you're claiming would be a disproportionate burden to fix

Bear in mind that something which is a disproportionate burden now will not necessarily be a disproportionate burden forever. If the circumstances change, your ability to claim disproportionate burden may change too.]

Because our customers do not maintain the code for KxProposals themselves, it's possible for them to claim that fixing the above issues would currently be a disproportionate burden for them. Below is an example of how this can be explained in the accessibility statement:

Interactive tools and transactions

Some of our interactive forms are difficult to navigate using a keyboard. For example, because some form controls are missing a 'label' tag.

Our forms are built and hosted through third party software and 'skinned' to look like our website.

We've assessed the cost of fixing the issues with navigation and accessing information, and with interactive tools and transactions. We believe that doing so now would be a disproportionate burden within the meaning of the accessibility regulations.