# WCAG-EM Comparison – Report Types

## Basic Report (1st level)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *1b)* Only **identifies whether a website conforms or not without providing additional information**. This type of evaluation is typically carried out when the website is assumed to conform, for example to verify an existing conformance claim, and for large-scale evaluations with less resources to explore the details of individual websites. | *5a)* Captures the successes and failures […] globally for the entire website. For each […] Success Criterion […], the report identifies if it is met or not met in the selected sample of web pages. Where failures […] are identified, at least one example web page from the sample […] has to be indicated in the report. |

## Detailed Report (2nd level)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *1b)* **Identifies whether a website conforms or not**, and **provides** further **information about the conformance of each evaluated web page**. This type of evaluation is particularly useful for instructing web developers and for acquiring statistics for monitoring progress over time. | *5a)* Captures the successes and failures […] for each page. For each […] Success Criterion […], the report identifies if it is met or not met in […] the selected sample of web pages. Where failures […] are identified, each identified occurrence of such a failure has to be indicated in the report. |

## In-Depth Analysis Report (3rd level)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *1b)* **Identifies whether a website conforms or not**, and **analyzes any identified issues in detail**. This **includes descriptions of the errors and suggestions for possible repair options**. This type of evaluation is particularly useful for organizations that want to improve the accessibility of their website and need a detailed analysis. | *5a)* Captures the successes and failures in meeting WCAG 2.0 for each page. For each WCAG 2.0 Success Criterion […], the report identifies if it is met or not met in the selected sample of web pages. Where failures […] are identified, examples of the identified occurrence of such a failure has to be indicated […]. The […] Report includes a summary of the issues identified […], examples of frequently occurring issues and an assessment of their impact on the users of the website in completing tasks, and if possible suggestions for improving the overall accessibility […]. |

So basically, the first two report format are asking for the same kind of information, but one globally for the website, the other one, more granularly, for each selected page from the website. The third report goes deeper than the second, by providing recommendation for remediation for each issue found, as well as an appreciation of the issue impact level.