

Accessibility Conformance Report

Based on VPAT® Version 2.5 - WCAG Edition

Product: sagensi.com (public marketing website)

Report Date: April 19, 2026

Prepared by: External reviewer (preliminary draft)

1. Product Information

Name of Product/Version: sagensi.com - public marketing website (pages reviewed: home, /contact.html, /accessibility.html). The Sagen platform product itself, the private-beta application, and developer documentation (/docs.html) are outside the scope of this report.

Product Description: Sagen is a collaboration platform for teams building with geospatial data. The reviewed marketing site describes the platform and its "Polis" address-cleansing product and provides a private-beta access request call-to-action.

Date: April 19, 2026

Contact Information: accessibility@sagen.com (per the published Accessibility statement on sagensi.com/accessibility.html)

Notes: This report reflects an external, limited-scope review performed without access to the raw page source, without automated accessibility tooling (axe, WAVE, Lighthouse), and without manual testing with assistive technology or keyboard-only navigation. Many criteria are marked "Not Evaluated" in recognition of these limits. This document is intended as a starting draft to be completed by Sagen or an authorized third-party auditor after full on-device testing.

Evaluation Methods Used: (1) External review of rendered page content via HTTP fetch for three public pages; (2) heuristic inspection of structure, heading hierarchy, navigation consistency, and link text; (3) cross-referencing against the vendor's self-published Accessibility statement, which claims conformance to WCAG 2.1 Level AA.

2. Applicable Standards / Guidelines

This report covers the degree of conformance for the following accessibility standards and guidelines:

Standard / Guideline	Included in Report
Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2 Level A (published October 2023)	Included
Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2 Level AA (published October 2023)	Included
Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2 Level AAA (published October 2023)	Not included

Vendor self-claim: The Accessibility statement at sagensi.com/accessibility.html (last updated April 6, 2026) states that Sagen aims to conform to WCAG 2.1 Level AA. This report is written against the more current WCAG 2.2 A/AA; all WCAG 2.1 criteria are included in WCAG 2.2, and the nine criteria new to WCAG 2.2 are flagged in-line.

3. Terms

The terms used in the Conformance Level column are defined as follows:

Term	Definition
Supports	The functionality of the product has at least one method that meets the criterion without known defects, or meets it with equivalent facilitation.
Partially Supports	Some functionality of the product does not meet the criterion.
Does Not Support	The majority of product functionality does not meet the criterion.
Not Applicable	The criterion is not relevant to the product.
Not Evaluated	The product has not been evaluated against the criterion. May be used only in WCAG 2.x Level AAA or where otherwise permitted; in this report it is used where external review cannot substitute for manual and/or automated on-device testing.

4. Summary of Findings

Distribution of assessed conformance across the WCAG 2.2 Level A and Level AA criteria included in this report:

Conformance Level	Level A (n=31)	Level AA (n=24)	Total
Supports	2	4	6
Partially Supports	3	0	3
Does Not Support	0	0	0
Not Applicable	8	8	16
Not Evaluated	18	12	30

Interpretation: The high proportion of "Not Evaluated" results is a direct consequence of the external, rendered-only scope of this review. Before issuing a final ACR, each "Not Evaluated" criterion should be re-assessed using a combination of automated scanning, manual keyboard testing, and screen-reader testing (NVDA or JAWS on Windows; VoiceOver on macOS/iOS; TalkBack on Android).

5. WCAG 2.2 Report

Table 1: Success Criteria, Level A

Criteria	Conformance Level	Remarks and Explanations
1.1.1 Non-text Content	Not Evaluated	No meaningful raster images observed in rendered content; navigation uses text links and several decorative Unicode glyphs (◆ ◻ ◎ ▣ ◆ ⊕) as feature icons. Verification required that these decorative glyphs are exposed as decorative (e.g., aria-hidden="true") and that any SVG/logo assets expose appropriate accessible names.
1.2.1 Audio-only and Video-only (Prerecorded)	Not Applicable	No audio-only or video-only content detected on the reviewed pages (home, contact, accessibility).
1.2.2 Captions (Prerecorded)	Not Applicable	No prerecorded video with audio detected on the reviewed pages.
1.2.3 Audio Description or Media Alternative (Prerecorded)	Not Applicable	No prerecorded video detected on the reviewed pages.
1.3.1 Info and Relationships	Partially Supports	A clear heading hierarchy was observed (H1 page title, H2 section titles, H3 footer groupings). Lists are used appropriately for feature bullets. However, confirmation that landmark regions (header, nav, main, footer) use correct HTML5 sectioning elements or ARIA landmarks, and that decorative glyphs are not announced as content, requires DOM inspection.
1.3.2 Meaningful Sequence	Not Evaluated	Requires inspection of DOM order vs. visual order, particularly for CSS-positioned elements such as the code sample block and statistics row on the homepage.
1.3.3 Sensory Characteristics	Partially Supports	The homepage includes a "Scroll" cue that may rely on a visual arrow or motion. Confirm that no instructions rely

Criteria	Conformance Level	Remarks and Explanations
		solely on shape, color, size, visual location, orientation, or sound.
1.4.1 Use of Color	Not Evaluated	Requires visual inspection to confirm that color is not the sole means of conveying information (e.g., link differentiation, status indicators, chart data).
1.4.2 Audio Control	Not Applicable	No auto-playing audio detected on the reviewed pages.
2.1.1 Keyboard	Not Evaluated	Requires manual keyboard-only testing across all interactive elements (nav links, CTA buttons, anchor links, any forms).
2.1.2 No Keyboard Trap	Not Evaluated	Requires manual keyboard-only testing; no custom widgets (modals, date pickers) observed on reviewed pages, which reduces risk.
2.1.4 Character Key Shortcuts	Not Evaluated	Not observed on reviewed pages but cannot be confirmed without script inspection.
2.2.1 Timing Adjustable	Not Applicable	No time limits detected on the reviewed public pages.
2.2.2 Pause, Stop, Hide	Not Evaluated	Homepage visual design suggests possible scroll-linked animations or motion effects ("Scroll" indicator). If any content moves, blinks, scrolls, or auto-updates for more than 5 seconds, a pause/stop/hide mechanism is required. Requires verification.
2.3.1 Three Flashes or Below Threshold	Not Evaluated	No flashing content was apparent from rendered text; requires visual verification if any animations exist.
2.4.1 Bypass Blocks	Not Evaluated	Presence of a "Skip to main content" link could not be confirmed from the rendered output. Verify a skip link

Criteria	Conformance Level	Remarks and Explanations
		exists and is keyboard-focusable at the top of each page, or that proper landmark regions are in place.
2.4.2 Page Titled	Supports	Each page reviewed carries a descriptive <title>: "Sagen - Spatial Infrastructure", "Accessibility - Sagen", and "Contact - Sagen".
2.4.3 Focus Order	Not Evaluated	Requires manual tab-order verification.
2.4.4 Link Purpose (In Context)	Supports	All links observed across the reviewed pages use descriptive, self-explanatory text (e.g., "Request Access", "See the Platform", "Privacy Policy"). No "click here" or "read more" patterns detected.
2.5.1 Pointer Gestures	Not Evaluated	No multi-point or path-based gestures observed on the reviewed pages but cannot be confirmed without interactive testing.
2.5.2 Pointer Cancellation	Not Evaluated	Requires interactive testing of activation behavior on buttons and links.
2.5.3 Label in Name	Not Evaluated	Requires inspection of aria-label values vs. visible text for interactive elements.
2.5.4 Motion Actuation	Not Applicable	No motion-actuated functionality observed on the reviewed pages.
3.1.1 Language of Page	Not Evaluated	Presence and correctness of the <html lang="..."> attribute could not be confirmed without raw HTML access. Content is in English.
3.2.1 On Focus	Not Evaluated	Requires interactive verification that focus does not trigger unexpected context changes.
3.2.2 On Input	Not Evaluated	No forms were observed on reviewed pages; if the "Request Access" CTA reveals a form, this needs verification.

Criteria	Conformance Level	Remarks and Explanations
3.2.6 Consistent Help (WCAG 2.2)	Partially Supports	Contact mechanisms (email addresses for general, sales, support, security) are documented on the Contact and Accessibility pages. Help links in the primary header or footer do not appear to expose support contact information in a consistent location across all pages; verify whether "Contact" or "Support" link placement is identical across every page.
3.3.1 Error Identification	Not Applicable	No input forms with validation were detected on reviewed pages.
3.3.2 Labels or Instructions	Not Evaluated	Depends on the "Request Access" CTA form if interactive; cannot be confirmed from rendered content.
3.3.7 Redundant Entry (WCAG 2.2)	Not Applicable	No multi-step forms observed on the reviewed pages.
4.1.2 Name, Role, Value	Not Evaluated	Requires DOM and ARIA inspection of interactive controls, including the mobile menu toggle (if present) and any custom buttons.

Table 2: Success Criteria, Level AA

Criteria	Conformance Level	Remarks and Explanations
1.2.4 Captions (Live)	Not Applicable	No live audio content detected on the reviewed pages.
1.2.5 Audio Description (Prerecorded)	Not Applicable	No prerecorded video detected on the reviewed pages.
1.3.4 Orientation	Not Evaluated	Requires device testing to confirm content is not locked to a single orientation.
1.3.5 Identify Input Purpose	Not Applicable	No user-input fields for personal information were observed on the reviewed pages.
1.4.3 Contrast (Minimum)	Not Evaluated	Visual contrast ratios must be measured against rendered pages using a contrast analyzer. This is a priority item given the homepage uses decorative typography and a dark theme based on the brand palette.
1.4.4 Resize Text	Not Evaluated	Requires browser zoom/text-resize testing up to 200%.
1.4.5 Images of Text	Not Evaluated	No images of text were observed in the rendered content, but any logotype or hero image usage should be verified.
1.4.10 Reflow	Not Evaluated	Requires viewport-width testing at 320 CSS pixels without two-dimensional scrolling.
1.4.11 Non-text Contrast	Not Evaluated	Requires visual measurement of UI component boundaries, focus indicators, and iconography against their backgrounds.
1.4.12 Text Spacing	Not Evaluated	Requires applying the WCAG text-spacing overrides and verifying no loss of content or functionality.

Criteria	Conformance Level	Remarks and Explanations
1.4.13 Content on Hover or Focus	Not Evaluated	Requires interactive testing of any tooltips or hover-revealed content.
2.4.5 Multiple Ways	Supports	Users can locate content via the primary navigation, the footer sitemap grouping (Product, Company, Resources), and the on-page anchor links / "On this page" navigation on sub-pages. This satisfies the requirement that at least two means of locating a page are provided.
2.4.6 Headings and Labels	Supports	Headings observed on each reviewed page are descriptive and topical (e.g., "Spatial infrastructure", "Meet Polis", "Our commitment", "Measures we take", "Feedback", "Get in Touch").
2.4.7 Focus Visible	Not Evaluated	Requires manual keyboard focus verification; default browser focus rings may or may not be overridden by site CSS.
2.4.11 Focus Not Obscured (Minimum) (WCAG 2.2)	Not Evaluated	Requires keyboard testing, with particular attention to sticky headers/footers that could obscure focused elements during scrolling.
2.5.7 Dragging Movements (WCAG 2.2)	Not Applicable	No drag-based interactions observed on the reviewed pages.
2.5.8 Target Size (Minimum) (WCAG 2.2)	Not Evaluated	Requires measurement of interactive element hit areas; all interactive targets must be at least 24x24 CSS pixels or meet an exception.
3.1.2 Language of Parts	Not Applicable	Content on reviewed pages is entirely in English; no foreign-language passages observed.
3.2.3 Consistent Navigation	Supports	The primary navigation (Platform, Polis, About, Docs, Get Early Access) and the footer column structure (Product, Company, Resources, legal row)

Criteria	Conformance Level	Remarks and Explanations
		appear identically placed and ordered across the Home, Contact, and Accessibility pages reviewed.
3.2.4 Consistent Identification	Supports	Components serving the same function (brand wordmark, primary CTA, legal links) use consistent labels and placement across the reviewed pages.
3.3.3 Error Suggestion	Not Applicable	No validated input fields observed on the reviewed pages.
3.3.4 Error Prevention (Legal, Financial, Data)	Not Applicable	No legal, financial, or data-modifying transactions observed on the reviewed pages.
3.3.8 Accessible Authentication (Minimum) (WCAG 2.2)	Not Applicable	No sign-in or authentication flow observed on the reviewed public pages. This criterion should be re-evaluated when the private beta sign-in is audited.
4.1.3 Status Messages	Not Evaluated	Requires interactive testing to confirm any toast/alert/loading messages expose appropriate ARIA live-region semantics.

6. Key Observations

The following observations are specific to what the external review could confirm or flag for follow-up:

- Positive: The site has a published Accessibility statement with a dedicated contact email, a clearly stated conformance target (WCAG 2.1 AA), and a 5-business-day response SLA for accessibility feedback.
- Positive: Page titles are descriptive and unique per page; headings follow a logical hierarchy; link text is descriptive; navigation structure appears consistent across the pages reviewed.
- Positive: Multiple independent means of locating pages are provided (primary nav, footer sitemap, on-page anchor nav).
- Flag: Decorative Unicode glyphs (◆ ◊ ◎ 田 ◆ ⊕) are used as feature-card icons on the homepage. Unless hidden from assistive technology, screen readers may announce these as "black diamond" / "white hexagon" etc., which is noise for users. Confirm `aria-hidden="true"` (or equivalent) on these glyphs.
- Flag: The homepage includes a "Scroll" cue and brand language that suggests scroll-linked motion. If any motion runs for longer than five seconds or parallaxes in ways that could trigger vestibular issues, ensure a pause/stop mechanism and respect for `prefers-reduced-motion`.
- Flag: The "Request Access" CTA on the homepage targets an in-page anchor (`#cta`) that was not expanded in the rendered capture. If this reveals a form, it must be audited for labels, error handling, and accessible validation.
- Flag: Color contrast is a WCAG 2.1/2.2 AA priority and cannot be assessed without rendering. Given a likely dark-theme design, contrast ratios for body text, link states, placeholder text, disabled controls, and the decorative glyphs should be verified against the 4.5:1 / 3:1 thresholds.

7. Recommended Next Steps

- Run automated scans: axe DevTools, WAVE, Lighthouse Accessibility, and Pa11y across every template (home, platform, polis, pricing, docs, about, careers, blog, contact, security, status, partners, community, privacy, terms, cookies, accessibility, press).
- Manual keyboard pass: Tab through every page confirming visible focus, logical focus order, reachable skip link, no focus traps, and no focus obscured by sticky headers/footers.
- Screen-reader pass: NVDA + Firefox and VoiceOver + Safari on at least the home, contact, and accessibility pages, plus the "Request Access" flow.
- Mobile pass: iOS/Android with VoiceOver / TalkBack, touch target sizing at 24x24 CSS pixels minimum, and orientation lock verification.
- Zoom and reflow: 200% text resize and 320 CSS pixel reflow.
- Color analysis: WCAG Contrast Checker or Stark across all text, icons, and UI boundaries for the dark-theme palette.
- Re-issue the ACR: After the above, convert "Not Evaluated" rows to Supports / Partially Supports / Does Not Support and distribute as a signed ACR.

8. Limitations of This Report

This document is a preliminary external review, not a full accessibility audit. It relies on HTTP-level content extraction of three public pages and does not substitute for hands-on testing with assistive technology. Conformance claims to WCAG 2.1 or 2.2 AA should not be made on the basis of this document alone.

VPAT® is a registered service mark of the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI).