This document presents a technical accessibility evaluation based on the documented checks and stated limitations. Automated checks cover only part of the WCAG criteria and do not replace human evaluation. It is not an EAA certification, a legal assessment, a guarantee of regulatory compliance, or protection against penalties; EAA applicability has not been assessed. The accessibility statement and the compliance of the service remain the responsibility of the owner of the digital service.

Technical accessibility evaluation of the website

https://www.grupposunino.com/

Gruppo Sunino S.p.A.

Reference standard: WCAG 2.1 level AA • Evaluation date: 09/11/2026 • Pages in the sample: 32

WCAG 2.1 AA technical result: **PARTIALLY CONFORMING** • EAA applicability: not assessed

WCAG 2.1 level AA criteria: 2 criteria not satisfied, 14 with no violations detected by the automated tools, 27 satisfied in the manual review, 0 not assessed, 7 not applicable, out of 50.

Contents

1. **Introduction**
   - Summary for stakeholders and management
   - 1.1 Purpose of the document
   - 1.2 Regulatory framework
   - 1.3 Scope of the audit
2. **Metadata**
3. **Methodology**
   - 3.1 Automated tools used
   - 3.2 Sampling criteria
   - 3.3 Methodological note
4. **Executive summary**
5. **Detailed results by P.O.U.R. principle**
   - 5.1 Perceivable
   - 5.2 Operable
   - 5.3 Understandable
   - 5.4 Robust
6. **Remediation recommendations**
   - 6.1 Priority interventions (critical)
   - 6.2 Structured intervention plan
   - 6.3 Guidelines for the team
7. **Publishable statement**
8. **Appendices**
   - 8.1 WCAG glossary and P.O.U.R. principles
   - 8.2 Glossary of the most frequent WCAG criteria
   - 8.3 Best practices by WCAG area
   - 8.4 Technical annexes
9. **Revision history**

1. Introduction

Summary for stakeholders and management

TECHNICAL QUALITY INDICATOR	URGENCY OF INTERVENTIONS	WCAG CRITERIA NOT SATISFIED
95%	**Medium**	**2**
Synthetic, non-normative indicator, calculated at scan time as 41 criteria passed (no violations detected or satisfied at the manual check) ÷ 43 applicable criteria assessed.	4 issues classified as critical	out of 50 assessed

Recommendations for management:

- **Priority 1:** fix first the issues classified as critical (4), which can block access
- **Planning:** include in the development roadmap the fix of 2 WCAG criteria not satisfied, listed in this document
- **Training:** raise awareness of accessibility principles among the development and content teams
- **Value:** accessibility improves the experience for all users

This document is a technical evaluation of the accessibility of the website **https://www.grupposunino.com/**, carried out with automated tools and with a manual review on the WCAG 2.1 level AA success criteria. Web accessibility is a fundamental right that ensures all people, regardless of their physical, sensory or cognitive abilities, can access information and digital services fairly and without discrimination.

This evaluation is part of the broader inclusive digital transformation promoted by the European Union through Directive (EU) 2019/882, known as the European Accessibility Act (EAA), which sets mandatory accessibility requirements for digital products and services. The analysis presented here identifies the criteria not satisfied and gives guidance for a path of continuous improvement towards full digital accessibility.

The document combines the results of several automated tools, normalized and aggregated, and accompanies them with operational guidance for remediating the issues identified. Each section of the document is designed to be useful both to company management and to the technical teams responsible for implementing the solutions.

1.1 Purpose of the document

This technical accessibility evaluation was generated from analyses carried out with automated validation tools and a manual review. It describes the technical state of the website **https://www.grupposunino.com/** against the WCAG 2.1 level AA success criteria checked. Conformance with the EN 301 549 standard and the applicability of the European Accessibility Act (EAA) are not assessed.

1.2 Regulatory framework

The regulatory framework for digital accessibility includes:

European legislation

- **Directive (EU) 2016/2102** - Web Accessibility Directive, applicable to the websites and mobile applications of public sector bodies
- **Directive (EU) 2019/882** - European Accessibility Act (EAA), applicable from 28 June 2025 to the products and services within its scope
- **Standard EN 301 549 v3.2.1** - European technical standard for ICT accessibility (not assessed in this document)

Italian legislation

- **Law no. 4 of 9 January 2004** - "Provisions to support access to IT tools for persons with disabilities" (Stanca Law)
- **Legislative Decree 82/2005** - Digital Administration Code and subsequent amendments
- **Legislative Decree 82/2022** - Transposition of Directive (EU) 2019/882
- **AgID Guidelines** - Guidelines on the accessibility of IT tools

1.3 Scope of the audit

The analysis covered the website https://www.grupposunino.com/ and was carried out by checking conformance with the WCAG 2.1 level AA success criteria. The automated audit is an essential baseline for identifying technical issues, but it should be complemented by manual audits and testing with users with disabilities to ensure a complete evaluation.

Languages of the pages in the sample, as declared by the `lang` attribute of the `html` element when the pages were identified:

- Italian (it): 22 pages
- Language not detected: 10 pages (added manually, not HTML, or not read during identification)

The attribute is read from the served HTML, before scripts run: a language set by a script does not appear here, and the result for WCAG criterion 3.1.1 is the one detected by the automated tools. The list describes the analyzed sample, not the website: the language versions of the website were not enumerated.

2. Metadata

The metadata of this report provide the essential information to put the analysis carried out into context and to trace the evaluation process. These identifying data document the scope and the time of the analysis.

Together, this information identifies the assessed party, the time of the analysis and the tools used, and is the starting point for planning the interventions.

Client: Gruppo Sunino S.p.A.
Website analyzed: https://www.grupposunino.com/
Evaluation date: 09/11/2026
Contact email: plasticlegno@plasticlegno.com

Phone: +39 0124.51.86.11
Evaluation carried out by: Andrea Vadacchino (Principi S.r.l.)
CMS: WordPress
Tools used: Axe-core, Lighthouse, Pa11y, Playwright, QualWeb
Reference standard: WCAG 2.1 level AA
Pages in the sample: 32

3. Methodology

The methodology adopted for this accessibility evaluation is based on a multi-level approach that combines the most advanced automated testing technologies with analysis protocols established internationally. The coverage of the WCAG 2.1 success criteria is reported in the executive summary, and the list of the criteria not satisfied and not assessed in §5.

The testing architecture uses several specialized scanners at the same time, each optimized to identify specific types of accessibility barriers. This diversity of analysis tools makes it possible to offset the intrinsic limits of each individual scanner.

It is important to stress that, while automation provides a solid basis for systematically identifying technical issues, some aspects of accessibility necessarily require expert human evaluation. For this reason, the results presented in this report must be considered part of a broader evaluation process that includes manual testing with real assistive technologies and, ideally, the direct involvement of users with disabilities in the review.

3.1 Automated tools used

The audit was carried out using the automated tools listed below, each with specific detection capabilities. The criteria not satisfied and not assessed are listed in §5.

Accessibility scanners used:

- **Axe-core:** Analysis of WCAG violations, identifying the problematic elements
- **Lighthouse:** Evaluation of accessibility best practices
- **Pa11y:** Validation of accessibility standards, focusing on HTML5 and ARIA
- **Playwright:** Checks in the browser (keyboard, focus, text spacing, labels). Five checks, tested on test pages, prove that their own criterion is not met (1.4.10, 1.4.12, 2.1.2, 2.4.7, 2.5.3), never that it is met; the other findings are warnings to be verified
- **QualWeb:** W3C ACT rules and WCAG techniques

Aggregation methodology: the results of the tools are normalized into a common format; findings of the same rule of the same tool are grouped, including across different pages, and their instances added up. There is no deduplication across different tools: the same defect reported by two tools appears twice, and the occurrences by criterion add up the reports of all the tools. Violations are the findings that demonstrate a failure of a WCAG 2.1 A/AA criterion; the others are findings to be verified.

3.2 Sampling criteria

The sample consists of the pages listed below, chosen for this evaluation.

The sample of this evaluation includes **32 pages** of the website. The sample is not representative by construction: its size is the one requested for the scan, and the coverage of the website as a whole is not measured. The pages of the sample are:

- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/business-units/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/business-units/food-packaging/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/business-units/promotional-items-toys/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/business-units/sports-footwear/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/business-units/home-garden/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/the-group/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/the-group/who-we-are/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/the-group/our-story/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/plastic-legno/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/dream-plast/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/plastic-technology/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/omniaplast/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/resaplast/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/omnia-technologies/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/formaboots/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/compliance/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/careers/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/news/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/our-clients/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/contatti/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/privacy-policy/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/whistleblowing-policy/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/compliance/sustainability/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/compliance/governance/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/compliance/certifications/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/the-group/our-philosophy/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/companies/omnia-toys/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/nextalia-sunino-insieme-accelerare-sviluppo-plasticlegno/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/galbani-sceglie-plastic-legno-packaging-monomateriale-iml/
- **Page:** https://www.grupposunino.com/search/plastica/

The pages of the sample were chosen by whoever carried out the evaluation, among those identified automatically or added manually. The system does not check that the sample includes all page templates, the interactive features or the complete

processes of the website.

3.3 Methodological note

Important: This automated analysis provides an objective and reproducible evaluation of the technical issues that can be detected automatically. However, some aspects of accessibility require human evaluation and testing with real users. This document should therefore be considered part of a broader evaluation process that includes manual audits and testing with assistive technologies.

4. Executive summary

Technical evaluation outcome

41	2	4	0
WCAG CRITERIA WITH NO VIOLATIONS DETECTED OR SATISFIED	CRITICAL VIOLATIONS	CONTRASTS	IMAGES

Evaluation results:

- **WCAG 2.1 AA criteria with no violations detected or satisfied in the manual review: 41 out of 50 assessed (82.0%): 14 with no violations detected by the automated tools, 27 satisfied in the manual review**
- Automated checks passed: 2436 (summed over all analyzed pages; the number of checks executed is not measured)
- **5 violations of WCAG 2.1 A/AA criteria (393 instances)**
- 26 findings to be verified, which do not demonstrate a criterion violation (12300 instances)
- Severity of violations: 2 critical, 3 high priority, 0 medium priority, 0 low priority
- WCAG coverage: 50 out of 50 criteria assessed (100.0%)

Pages in the sample: 32 — pages identified in the page search: N/D

Technical accessibility evaluation — This document presents a technical accessibility evaluation based on the documented checks and stated limitations. Automated checks cover only part of the WCAG criteria and do not replace human evaluation. It is not an EAA certification, a legal assessment, a guarantee of regulatory compliance, or protection against penalties; EAA applicability has not been assessed. The accessibility statement and the compliance of the service remain the responsibility of the owner of the digital service.

The executive summary is the strategic core of this document, giving an immediate and clear overview of the results of the accessibility audit. This section is specifically designed to give company decision-makers and key stakeholders a quick but complete understanding of the conformance of the website, highlighting the main issues and their potential impact on the experience of users with disabilities.

Business impact and opportunities

Potential user base: In Italy, about **3.1 million people** (5.2% of the population) have disabilities that can affect digital access. An accessible website can reach a significantly wider audience.

Business benefits of accessibility:

- **Wider market:** Access to new customer segments
- **Reputation:** Concrete evidence of social responsibility
- **Better SEO:** Accessibility improvements often improve search engine ranking
- **General usability:** Accessible interfaces are more usable for all users

Risks of non-conformance:

- Exclusion of significant user segments
- Reputational and image damage
- Higher remediation costs if postponed

The data presented in this summary come from the aggregation and normalization of the results of the different tools. The technical quality indicator is a synthetic, non-normative value, calculated at scan time as 41 criteria passed (no violations detected or satisfied at the manual check) ÷ 43 applicable criteria assessed. The criteria not satisfied are listed by P.O.U.R. principle in §5.

It is essential to understand that each violation identified is a potential barrier that can prevent or significantly limit access to the content and features of the website for specific groups of users. Remediating these issues is a concrete opportunity to widen the user base, improve the overall experience of the website and show the organization's commitment to digital inclusion.

Technical result on the WCAG 2.1 level AA criteria: PARTIALLY CONFORMING

The applicability of the European Accessibility Act was not assessed. WCAG 2.1 level AA criteria: **2 criteria not satisfied, 14 with no violations detected by the automated tools, 27 satisfied in the manual review, 0 not assessed, 7 not applicable, out of 50**. The list is in §5. The evaluation refers to the state of the website on 09/11/2026.

How to read the result: with at least one criterion not satisfied the result is “partially conforming”, whatever the number of criteria not satisfied: full conformance has not yet been reached and remediation is needed.

The automated tools detected **5 violations** of WCAG 2.1 A/AA criteria (393 instances across all pages) and **26 findings to be verified** (12300 instances), which do not demonstrate the failure of a criterion. The issues classified as critical by the tools are **4** (2 among the findings to be verified).

95%
TECHNICAL QUALITY INDICATOR

5
VIOLATIONS
(393 instances; 26 findings to be verified)

4
CRITICAL
(2 among the findings)

1/4
PRINCIPLES WITH CRITERIA NOT SATISFIED

2436
AUTOMATED CHECKS PASSED

50/50
WCAG CRITERIA
Coverage 100.0%

5. Detailed results by P.O.U.R. principle

The detailed analysis according to the P.O.U.R. principles (Perceivable, Operable, Understandable, Robust) is the conceptual and operational framework through which the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines structure the requirements of digital accessibility. This section presents an in-depth and systematic analysis of how the website stands against each of these four fundamental pillars, showing for each principle which criteria are not satisfied.

Each P.O.U.R. principle is a critical dimension of accessibility that meets specific needs of users with disabilities. The Perceivable principle ensures that information is presented in ways that can be perceived through different senses; Operable ensures that all features can be used regardless of the input device; Understandable requires information and operations to be clear and intuitive; Robust ensures compatibility with current and future assistive technologies.

Because these principles depend on each other, a failure in a single area can compromise the whole accessibility experience. For each principle the WCAG 2.1 level AA criteria not satisfied are reported, with the number of those with no violations detected by the automated tools and the list of those not assessed.

5.1 Perceivable

Criteria of the principle: 20 — not satisfied: 2; with no violations detected by the automated tools: 4; satisfied in the manual review: 9; not assessed: 0; not applicable: 5.

Criteria not satisfied — Perceivable

CRITERION	NAME	LEVEL
1.3.1	Info and Relationships	A
1.4.3	Contrast (Minimum)	AA

5.2 Operable

Criteria of the principle: 17 — not satisfied: 0; with no violations detected by the automated tools: 6; satisfied in the manual review: 10; not assessed: 0; not applicable: 1.

No criterion of the principle is not satisfied among those assessed.

5.3 Understandable

Criteria of the principle: 10 — not satisfied: 0; with no violations detected by the automated tools: 2; satisfied in the manual review: 7; not assessed: 0; not applicable: 1.

No criterion of the principle is not satisfied among those assessed.

5.4 Robust

Criteria of the principle: 3 — not satisfied: 0; with no violations detected by the automated tools: 2; satisfied in the manual review: 1; not assessed: 0.

No criterion of the principle is not satisfied among those assessed.

6. Remediation recommendations

The recommendations in this section are a structured and prioritized operational roadmap for overcoming the issues detected here. The plan that follows is a general model by priority phase: the figures of each phase come from this evaluation, timeframes and skills are indicative.

The proposed remediation strategy follows an incremental and sustainable approach that makes it possible to achieve tangible improvements in the short term while working towards full conformance in the medium to long term. For each phase the plan indicates approximate timeframes and required skills, to support operational planning and resource allocation.

It is important to stress that accessibility remediation should not be regarded as an isolated project with a fixed end date, but rather as a continuous process integrated into the development and maintenance cycle of the website. Automated checking processes, staff training and accessible development practices from the design stage onwards are essential to maintain the standards reached and to prevent new accessibility barriers from being introduced.

6.1 Priority interventions (critical)

4 issues classified as critical were detected: they should be fixed first.

6.2 Structured intervention plan

Table 6.2: Remediation plan by priority

PHASE	PRIORITY	INTERVENTIONS	APPROXIMATE TIMEFRAME	REQUIRED SKILLS
Phase 1	Critical	Resolution of blocking issues (4 issues)	1-2 weeks	Senior frontend developer
Phase 2	High	Fixing high-impact issues (21 issues)	2-3 weeks	Development team
Phase 3	Medium	Optimizations and improvements (6 issues)	3-4 weeks	Development team + UX designer
Phase 4	Low	Refinements and best practices (0 issues)	—	The whole team

The timeframes are indicative: they do not come from an estimate made on this website.

6.3 Guidelines for the team

For the development team:

- Implement automated code validation in the build process
- Use analysis tools for accessibility and WCAG conformance
- Set up automated accessibility tests in the continuous integration pipeline
- Consider accessibility from the start when designing components
- Ensure compatibility with the main assistive technologies

For the content team:

- Always provide appropriate text alternatives for non-text content
- Use a correct, hierarchical semantic structure
- Write clear, concise and easily understandable text
- Avoid using color alone to convey information
- Ensure that all multimedia content has transcripts or captions

General best practices:

- Train staff periodically on accessibility principles
- Involve users with disabilities in usability testing
- Monitor the level of conformance continuously

- Document design decisions related to accessibility

7. Publishable statement

This evaluation describes the technical state of the website. The statement that the party publishes externally is a separate document, whose content depends on the legislation that applies to the party: the model is downloaded separately, and is generated only when the regime has been declared.

The model leaves to be completed the data that belong to the party and that a technical review cannot establish: who responds to reports, within what time, the outcome of any disproportionate burden assessment and the date of signature.

8. Appendices

The technical appendices that close this report provide essential reference material for an in-depth understanding and the practical implementation of the recommendations presented. This section collects operational resources, technical glossaries and implementation guidelines that form a complete toolkit for the development and maintenance teams responsible for remediating the issues identified.

The material presented here is general reference, based on the established best practices of the international accessible web development community: it is not specific to the issues of this website, whose criteria not satisfied are listed in §5.

This technical documentation also serves as a training resource for the organization's technical staff, helping to build in-house skills in digital accessibility. Investing in the training and awareness of the development team is in fact one of the key elements to ensure that accessibility becomes an integral part of the company culture and of the development processes, rather than a requirement added at the final review.

8.1 WCAG glossary and P.O.U.R. principles

Perceivable
Information and user interface components must be presentable to users in ways they can perceive.
Operable
User interface components and navigation must be operable.
Understandable
Information and the operation of the user interface must be understandable.
Robust
Content must be robust enough that it can be interpreted reliably by a wide variety of user agents, including assistive technologies.

8.2 Glossary of the most frequent WCAG criteria

As general reference, some of the WCAG 2.1 criteria most often violated on the web and their importance for accessibility. The list does not concern this website: its criteria not satisfied are in §5.

Table 8.2: WCAG criteria most often violated on the web (general reference)

CRITERION	NAME	LEVEL	DESCRIPTION
1.1.1	Non-text Content	A	All non-text content presented to the user has a text alternative that serves the equivalent purpose.
1.3.1	Info and Relationships	A	Information, structure and relationships conveyed through presentation can be programmatically determined.
1.4.3	Contrast (Minimum)	AA	The visual presentation of text has a contrast ratio of at least 4.5:1 (3:1 for large text).
2.1.1	Keyboard	A	All functionality of the content is operable through a keyboard interface.
2.4.1	Bypass Blocks	A	A mechanism is available to bypass blocks of content that are repeated on multiple web pages.
2.4.7	Focus Visible	AA	The keyboard focus indicator is visible during navigation.
3.3.2	Labels or Instructions	A	Labels or instructions are provided when content requires user input.
4.1.2	Name, Role, Value	A	For all user interface components, the name and role can be programmatically determined.

Additional details on the criteria:

1.1.1 - Non-text Content (Level A)
All non-text content presented to the user has a text alternative that serves the equivalent purpose, except for specific situations such as decorative content or CAPTCHA. Images must have an alternative description (alt attribute) that conveys the content and function of the image to users with visual impairments.
1.3.1 - Info and Relationships (Level A)
Information, structure and relationships conveyed through presentation can be programmatically determined or are available in text. This ensures that screen readers and other assistive technologies can correctly interpret the structure of the content.
1.4.3 - Contrast (Minimum) (Level AA)
The visual presentation of text and images of text has a contrast ratio of at least 4.5:1, except for large text (at least 3:1), decorative text or logos. Sufficient contrast is essential for users with low vision or color blindness.
2.1.1 - Keyboard (Level A)
All functionality of the content is operable through a keyboard interface without requiring specific timings for individual keystrokes. This criterion ensures full access for users who cannot use a mouse.

2.1.2 - No Keyboard Trap (Level A)

If keyboard focus can be moved to a component of the page using a keyboard interface, then focus can be moved away from that component using only a keyboard interface, without requiring specific timings for individual keystrokes.

2.4.1 - Bypass Blocks (Level A)

A mechanism is available to bypass blocks of content that are repeated on multiple web pages. "Skip links" let screen reader users jump directly to the main content, avoiding repetitive navigation.

2.4.2 - Page Titled (Level A)

Web pages have titles that describe topic or purpose. Descriptive titles help users orient themselves and understand the content of the page.

2.4.7 - Focus Visible (Level AA)

Any keyboard operable user interface has a mode of operation where the keyboard focus indicator is visible. Users must be able to see which element has focus while navigating with the keyboard.

3.1.1 - Language of Page (Level A)

The default human language of each web page can be programmatically determined. The lang attribute on the HTML element lets screen readers use the correct pronunciation.

3.3.1 - Error Identification (Level A)

If an input error is automatically detected, the item that is in error is identified and the error is described to the user in text.

3.3.2 - Labels or Instructions (Level A)

Labels or instructions are provided when content requires user input. Form fields must be clearly labelled, with instructions and correctly associated labels.

4.1.1 - Parsing (Level A)

In content implemented using markup languages, elements have complete start and end tags, elements are nested according to their specifications, elements do not contain duplicate attributes, and any IDs are unique.

4.1.2 - Name, Role, Value (Level A)

For all user interface components, the name and role can be programmatically determined; states, properties and values that can be set by the user can be programmatically set; and notification of changes to these items is available to user agents, including assistive technologies.

8.3 Best practices by WCAG area

Perceivable:

- Provide text alternatives for non-text content
- Ensure a minimum color contrast of 4.5:1 for normal text
- Do not convey information through color alone
- Provide captions for video content

Operable:

- Ensure full keyboard access
- Provide skip links to bypass repeated blocks
- Use descriptive page titles
- Implement a visible focus for keyboard navigation

Understandable:

- Identify the language of the page
- Clearly label all form fields

- Provide clear instructions for input
- Handle errors in a clear and constructive way

Robust:

- Use valid semantic HTML
- Implement ARIA correctly and only when needed
- Test with different assistive technologies
- Ensure cross-browser compatibility

8.4 Technical annexes

Recommended checking tools:

- **Automated testing:** axe DevTools (browser extension), WAVE (WebAIM), Lighthouse (Chrome DevTools)
- **Screen readers for testing:** NVDA (Windows, free), JAWS (Windows), VoiceOver (Mac/iOS, built in)
- **Code validation:** W3C Markup Validator for HTML, W3C CSS Validator for style sheets
- **Contrast checking:** WebAIM Contrast Checker, Colour Contrast Analyser (CCA)
- **Keyboard testing:** Full navigation of the website using only Tab, Shift+Tab, Enter and the arrow keys

Best practices for maintaining accessibility:

- Integrate automated accessibility tests into the development and deployment process
- Train the development team and content editors on accessibility principles
- Set up checklists for every new piece of content published
- Carry out periodic accessibility reviews (at least quarterly)
- Keep up-to-date documentation of the accessibility solutions implemented

9. Revision history

Document revision history with details of changes made.

Document revision history

DATE	RESPONSIBLE	TYPE	VERSION	DESCRIPTION
09/11/2026	Principi S.r.l.	First release	**1.0**	Document automatically generated from EAA Scanner accessibility audit
09/11/2026	Principi S.r.l.	Reissue	**1.2**	New issue of the documents of the same scan, with the rendering rules in force

The integer part of the number counts the scans of the site (X.0 = X-th scan); the decimal part counts the reissues of the documents of the same scan (X.1, X.2…).

Legal note and limitations

Nature of the audit: This document is an automated technical analysis, complemented by a manual review, of the state of digital accessibility, based on objective and measurable checks of the WCAG 2.1 level AA success criteria.

Scope of coverage: The automated audit only identifies issues that can be checked programmatically. The share of barriers that cannot be detected automatically is not quantified. It does not replace a complete evaluation that includes expert manual testing and the involvement of users with disabilities.

Validity over time: The results reflect the state of the website at the time of the analysis. Changes to the content, structure or features may alter the level of conformance. Continuous monitoring and periodic updating of the evaluation are recommended.

Responsibility: The organization that owns the website retains full responsibility for regulatory compliance and for implementing the recommendations. This document provides professional technical guidance within the stated limits and does not replace the relevant legal checks.

Use of the document: This audit is provided to support the process of improving digital accessibility. The implementation of the recommendations must be assessed in the specific context of the organization, taking into account resources, priorities and operational constraints.

Technical Accessibility Evaluation Document

Analysis date: 09/11/2026

Evaluation system: EAA Scanner v2.0

Reference standard: WCAG 2.1 level AA

This document presents a technical accessibility evaluation based on the documented checks and stated limitations. Automated checks cover only part of the WCAG criteria and do not replace human evaluation. It is not an EAA certification, a legal assessment, a guarantee of regulatory compliance, or protection against penalties; EAA applicability has not been assessed. The accessibility statement and the compliance of the service remain the responsibility of the owner of the digital service.