

Statement of Accessibility Conformance

Client: Moodle LMS

Date Accreditation issued: January 24, 2024

Digital Accessibility Conformance Evaluation

A technical evaluation of 20 pages was conducted by AbleDocs' team of trained accessibility auditors. The screens selected constitute an accessibility audit of the mobile application and agreed on by the client as representative of the overall accessibility and functionality of the application.

The evaluation was completed in accordance with the WCAG Evaluation Methodology (WCAG-EM) which can be viewed at <http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG-EM/>.

The pages were audited manually and cross-checked to ensure that the results and comments presented are valid and comprehensive.

Accessibility support baseline:

Website/Application Tested: Moodle LMS

Date Tested: 28 July 2023 – January 24 2024

Scope of test: 20 pages selected as a representation of the website in accordance with the W3C WCAG Evaluation Methodology (WCAG-EM)

Guidelines title, version and URI: Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1 at <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21/>

Conformance Level satisfied: WCAG 2.1 to Level AA

Accessibility support baseline: NVDA with Firefox v115 and Chrome v116 browsers

Platform: Desktop

Valid from: January 24, 2024

Other Standards

WCAG 2.0 also forms the content of the ISO Standard ISO: **IEC 40500:2012** which can be located at <https://www.iso.org/standard/58625.html>

The content of WCAG forms the standard for digital accessibility compliance in **EN 301549** “Accessibility requirements suitable for public procurement of ICT products and services in Europe”

This standard includes:

- web content
- electronic documents
- non-web software, such as native mobile apps

Information can be found at <http://www.w3.org/WAI/news/2018-09-13/WCAG-21-EN301549/> and <http://mandate376.standards.eu/standard>.

Disclaimer

WCAG 2.1 has been designed to be more testable than its predecessor, WCAG 1.0 and WCAG 2.0. However, while some tests can be accurately performed with automated testing, some require a combination of automated tools and human judgement, and others rely solely on human review by knowledgeable website assessors. In such cases, there is always a possibility that results may be disputed among assessors. Every reasonable effort has been made to cross-check findings and ensure the validity of the results presented to mitigate the likelihood of oversights. However, due to the human element of website evaluation, errors may, on occasion, occur. These errors, should they have happened, should not materially affect the information or conclusions outlined in the results presented.