



WEBSITE HEALTH CHECK REPORT

BY AKAL SOFTWARE

SAMPLE

Prepared by: **Michael Barnet (Senior Consultant)**

For: **example.com**

Date: **20 October 2020**

Summary

Domain: EXAMPLE.COM

Here is a summary of the overall health of the website in each of the major categories analysed within the report.

● PASS ● IMPROVE ● FAIL



Contents

Executive Summary	4
Performance	5
Accessibility	12
Design	20
Usability	21
Security	22
Errors / Observations	24
Sustainability	25
References	26

SAMPLE

Executive Summary

The performance of the website was generally found to be extremely poor on mobile, and several important recommendations have been provided to help improve the performance.

Accessibility wise, the website has fallen short of the minimum WCAG level A standard, achieving only partial compliance. Within the recommendations, some of the major issues identified are relatively easy to fix, so achieving the minimum WCAG level A standard should be straightforward. To help achieve the recommended WCAG level AA standard, all recommendations should be implemented.

Regarding design no major issues were found, and the website works well across mobile, tablet and desktop. However some key usability issues were discovered, particularly affecting mobile and tablet - with desktop generally found to be fine. Paying more attention to the above the fold experience will be important.

There are several severe security issues found on the server-side which should be addressed urgently.

Very little has been able to be determined regarding the hosting and sustainability of the hosting. However we do encourage finding out more on these matters from your website hosting provider for contact.

Overall, several issues have been covered during this report. However these can be addressed with some of these report. Thought about how best to meet the needs of various users visiting the website.

Please see the reference section for the exact URLs analysed in this report.

Performance

Check how fast the website loads on mobile? Since mobile is slower than desktop, a good performance on mobile generally translates into great performance on tablet and desktop.

Criteria: Which resources take the most time to load? Are there any quick wins here to help improve both the first and subsequent page load times?

Top performance facts:

- If a site takes >1 second to become interactive, users lose attention, and their perception of completing the page task is broken [Source: Google Developers Blog]
- 53% of all site visits are abandoned if page load takes more than 3 seconds [Source: Google DoubleClick blog]
- Walmart saw a 1% increase in revenue for every 100ms improvement in page load [Source: WPO Stats]

Performance test configuration:

- Location: California
- Network: ScientiaMobil
- Network technology: 4G
- Browser: Chrome

First Contentful Paint (FCP)

First Contentful Paint measures perceived load speed because it marks the first time at which the user can see any text or image on the screen.

To provide a good user experience, sites should strive to have First Contentful Paint occur within 1 second of the page starting to load.

A fast FCP helps reassure the user that something is happening.

Load Time: **14.5 seconds**

Largest Contentful Paint (LCP)

Largest Contentful Paint (LCP) measures perceived load speed because it marks the time at which the largest text or image is painted on screen i.e. when the page's main content has likely loaded.

To provide a good user experience, LCP should occur within 2.5 seconds of when the page first starts loading.