



---

## WP3 Simulation based training package

### Module Title: Module4: Urban Development Audit Tool (UDAT)

---

#### Introduction to the Module

This module is part of the ACT4DYS Simulation-Based Training Package (WP3), developed to empower youth workers, trainers, and young people to become active contributors to disability-inclusive urban development.

Module 4 (Urban Development Audit Tool – UDAT) builds on the knowledge and skills developed in the previous modules and focuses on one of the most critical challenges in inclusive city development: the gap between accessibility policies and their real-world implementation. Although international and European frameworks establish accessibility as a fundamental right, many urban environments remain inaccessible in practice. The Urban Development Audit Tool (UDAT) is introduced as a practical, structured method to address this gap.

Rather than viewing urban barriers as isolated problems, this module enables participants to systematically assess the built environment, transport systems, policy frameworks, and digital services. It transforms everyday observations - such as obstructed pathways, inaccessible transport stops, or non-compliant digital platforms - into objective, measurable evidence aligned with recognised standards. In doing so, it shifts the focus from identifying problems to developing data-driven, actionable solutions that can be understood and implemented by public authorities.

#### Who is this module for?

This module is designed for **youth workers, youth trainers, and practitioners** supporting young people's participation in urban environments. It is also highly relevant for those working in **advocacy, community development, policy-making, or urban planning processes**. No prior technical expertise is required. The module is accessible to practitioners who wish to understand how accessibility is assessed in practice and to develop the skills needed to support young people in **auditing urban environments and advocating for inclusive change**.

#### What will you learn?

By the end of this module, you will be able to:

- Explain the key principles, criteria, and metrics used to assess accessibility in urban environments;
- Analyse accessibility challenges using a **structured, data-driven approach**;
- Identify and document barriers across pedestrian infrastructure, transport systems, policy frameworks, and digital services;
- Apply the **Urban Development Audit Tool (UDAT)** to systematically assess urban environments;
- Translate real-world observations into **standardised metrics and quantifiable impact scores**;
- Interpret the relationship between international/EU accessibility frameworks and local implementation;
- Develop **evidence-based civic proposals** that respond directly to identified barriers;
- Strengthen teamwork, communication, and advocacy skills through a collaborative simulation scenario.

### How is this module structured?

The module is organised into four interconnected sections:

- **Theoretical Knowledge** — introduction to the Urban Development Audit Tool, including its structure (criteria, metrics, evidence, impact scoring, and civic proposals), and the international and EU accessibility frameworks that underpin it;
- **Practical Knowledge & Insights** — real-world experiences of young persons with disabilities, findings from ACT4DYS research, examples of inclusive urban practices, and the role of youth workers in facilitating audits and advocacy;
- **Simulation Scenario** — a collaborative, role-based exercise where participants act as auditors and advocates, assess an urban environment using the Tool, assign impact scores, and develop and present civic proposals;
- **Resources** — supporting materials including a glossary, bibliography, activity sheets, evaluation tools, trainer guidance, and links to further reading and the ACT4DYS e-portfolio.

### **This module in the wider training package**

This module is the fourth and final module of the ACT4DYS Training Package. It builds on:

- **Module 1** — Understanding the Urban Environment: Implementing Universal Design
- **Module 2** — Improving Alternative Transportation: Encouraging Sustainable Practices
- **Module 3** — Creating Youth-Friendly Public Spaces

Module 4 serves as the **practical and methodological culmination** of the training package, introducing a concrete tool that integrates the concepts explored in earlier modules into a structured, evidence-based approach for assessing and improving urban environments.

Together, the four modules provide youth workers and young people with a **comprehensive and practical toolkit** for promoting disability-inclusive urban development. As with all modules in the package, the materials align with European accessibility frameworks and reflect principles consistent with **Universal Design and inclusive learning standards**.

*Module developed by CARDET.*

*This scenario is available under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY 4.0\) license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).*

## **Theoretical Knowledge:**

The heart of this module lies in the ACT4DYS Urban Development Audit Tool, which is used as an auditing and advocacy engine. This tool moves beyond the idea of a simple checklist, serving instead as a structured method for gathering data on exclusion and proposing policy-level solutions. Youth workers, young people and young persons with disabilities who wish to advocate for inclusive and accessible cities can use the Tool to generate clear, measurable data on exclusion and propose practical, feasible solutions to local authorities.

To effectively use the tool, participants must first understand its five-part structure, which works like an auditing matrix. The audit starts with the Criterion (Standard), meaning the rule or requirement that needs to be checked, such as the principle of Universal Design for Movement (UDM). The UDM states that public spaces must be designed so everyone can use them without needing special changes.

Next, the audit checks the Metric (Measurement), which refers to how the check is conducted. This is the specific test performed in the fictional or real urban space. For example, the Passing Path Score measures whether a sidewalk is at least 1.5 metres wide to let two wheelchair users pass safely.

The credibility of the tool relies on documented proof, captured in the Audit Finding/Evidence section, where the participants record exactly what they observe, for instance: "We measured the sidewalk width at 0.8 metres due to café tables blocking the path."

The tool applies this structure across four critical sections of urban life, ensuring every technical check is directly linked to an impact on accessibility, independence, and dignity. Presented below are the four sections, including the Criterion, the Metric and why it is important to audit these sections.

**Section 1: Pedestrian Infrastructure - This section ensures the basic right to safe and independent mobility.**

| Criterion                           | Metric                                                                           | Why it matters                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Universal Design for Movement (UDM) | Ramp Usability Test (Checks maximum 1:12 slope standard).                        | Steep ramps are unusable and pose a safety hazard (risk of tipping or falls).                                                                           |
| UDM                                 | Passing Path Score (Checks if the clear width is at least 1.5m).                 | If the path is too narrow, users are forced into the street or cannot travel together, causing social exclusion and safety issues.                      |
| Tactile & Visual Guidance           | Directional Safety Check (TGSI) (Checks for textured paving at crossings).       | Missing or confusing tactile guidance means blind or low-vision users cannot navigate safely or independently, leading to total exclusion.              |
| Safety                              | Obstacle Impact Score (Measures risk from street furniture like bollards/signs). | Obstacles that blend in (low contrast) or are placed too low (cane traps) are major physical hazards that strip away independence and cause collisions. |

**Section 2: Public Transportation - This section ensures mobility freedom and access to opportunities**

| Criterion                 | Metric                                                                                    | Why it matters                                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| System Accessibility      | Vehicle Access & Gap Check (Checks connection between vehicle and stop).                  | If there's a large gap or a broken ramp, the public transport vehicle is unusable, leading to inaccessibility and missed appointments. |
| Information Accessibility | Journey Info Clarity (Checks if real-time info is available in audio and visual formats). | Without reliable, clear information, users can't plan their journey, leading to confusion, stress, and missed connections.             |
| Sustainability            | Shared Green Transport Score (Checks micro-mobility parking and management).              | Green solutions should not create new obstacles. Poorly managed parking creates new hazards in the accessible path.                    |
| Journey                   | Seamless Transfer Test (Checks accessibility between different transport modes).          | A journey is only as accessible as its weakest link. Difficult transfers create major delays and fatigue.                              |

### Section 3: Urban Policy - This section ensures youth voices are included in the decision-making process

| Criterion | Metric                                                                                                  | Why it matters                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Policy    | Access First Mandate Check (Checks if planning rules require accessibility upfront).                    | If accessibility is an afterthought instead of a mandatory requirement, it signals that inclusion is not a priority in official city planning.                               |
| Finance   | Dedicated Inclusion Budget (Checks if money is set aside for addressing barriers).                      | Without a specific budget, accessible features won't be maintained and necessary new projects won't be funded.                                                               |
| Advocacy  | Advisory Committee Participation (Checks if persons with disabilities are required on planning boards). | If decisions are made about persons with disabilities without input from persons with disabilities, they will lead to flawed designs and continued exclusion, eroding trust. |
| Data      | Targeted Data Transparency (Checks if the city shares data separated by disability type).               | If the city doesn't collect data showing that people with disabilities face barriers, they can claim the problem doesn't exist.                                              |

### Section 4: Digital Accessibility - This section ensures equal access to civic life and information

| Criterion     | Metric                                                                                                    | Why it matters                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| WCAG          | Digital Access Score (Checks website compliance with screen readers).                                     | If online complaint forms or portals are unusable, users are blocked from civic life (e.g., reporting a barrier or accessing essential information).                                                                                            |
| ICT           | Public Screen Usability (Checks height, contrast, adaptability of info screens, ticket machines, kiosks). | Technology should make the city easier, but if screens are too high or too dim, lacking audio output, or using overly complex text, it prevents users with physical, visual, or intellectual disabilities from accessing essential information. |
| Communication | Social Media Inclusion (Checks for captions and alternative text descriptions on official city posts).    | Social media is where youth get news. Lack of captions or descriptions means the city is excluding us from public conversation.                                                                                                                 |

This detailed auditing leads to the Impact Score (1-5). The scoring system is designed to measure exclusion, rather than just technical failure, assigning a number to rate how badly the barrier excludes people and the severity of the impact.

- Score 5 (Model Practice): Signifies inclusion, meaning the area exceeds the minimum standard and promotes the highest level of usability for all.
- Score 4 (Minor Barrier / Acceptable): Indicates the space meets the minimum standard. It is compliant and usable, with no major safety or access issues.
- Score 3 (Moderate Barrier / Partial Compliance): Shows the space is usable but difficult, often failing one metric (e.g., non-critical signage). It requires only minor modifications to achieve compliance.
- Score 2 (Major Barrier / Non-Compliant): Signifies a serious safety or access issue. It fails a critical metric (e.g., inadequate ramp slope or information gap) and requires significant redesign to ensure safety and access.
- Score 1 (High Barrier / Total Exclusion): This is the most severe finding. The barrier is so profound (e.g., stairs with no ramp or a totally blocked path) that a person with disabilities cannot use the space at all, representing a complete denial of rights.

Finally, the process finishes with The Pitch/Civic Proposal, which is the solution, where a specific, practical action for the city is proposed.

To better understand how to use and complete the Urban Development Tool below is a detailed example of a hypothetical audit conducted in the city centre of Nicosia, in Cyprus. This example demonstrates how to translate real-world observations into quantifiable impact scores and evidence-based civic proposals. Use this scorecard model to practice identifying specific criteria failures (e.g., poor ramp slope) and transforming them into professional, actionable recommendations that speak the language of local authorities and contribute directly to the project's policy advocacy goals.



## Section 1: Pedestrian Infrastructure & Public Spaces

| Criterion (Standard)                            | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                     | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                                                                   | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>UDM: Continuous &amp; Unobstructed Paths</b> | <b>Passing Path Score:</b> Measures how often the pedestrian path is wide enough (min. 1.5m) to allow two people, like two wheelchair users or a person and a stroller, to safely pass each other.       | Numerous A-frame advertising signs and café chairs permanently reduce the clear path to less than 1m in five different locations along the stretch.        | 1                  | Enforcement Mandate: Implement a "Zero Tolerance for Sidewalk Obstruction" mandate. Require all businesses to maintain a minimum 1.5m clear path, enforceable by immediate fine, not warning. |
| <b>UDM: Vertical Accessibility</b>              | <b>Ramp Usability Test:</b> Measures the steepness of ramps and curb cuts to ensure they are safe and manageable for unassisted wheelchair use or for persons with mobility disabilities.                | Many older curb cuts are steep (estimated 1:8 slope) or end abruptly in a high lip, making independent or safe use for wheelchairs or scooters impossible. | 2                  | Infrastructure Remediation: Launch a city-wide program to retrofit all non-compliant curb cuts in the city centre to meet the European 1:12 maximum slope standard within 12 months.          |
| <b>TGSI: Tactile &amp; Visual Guidance</b>      | <b>Directional Safety Check:</b> Measures if textured paving (TGSI - Tactile Ground Surface Indicators) is placed correctly to warn of hazards, like crossings, or guide users with visual disabilities. | Tactile ground surface indicators (TGSI) are mostly absent at major street crossings, or, if present, are old, damaged, and obscured by gum or debris.     | 1                  | Safety Audit: Conduct an immediate safety audit of all major intersections and mandate the installation of standardised, high-contrast, high-quality TGSI at every crossing.                  |



| Criterion (Standard)                              | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                                                              | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Safety: Obstacle &amp; Furniture Placement</b> | <b>Obstacle Impact Score:</b> Measures the risk of street furniture (signs, bollards, benches) causing trips, falls, or collisions for users with visual and mobility disabilities. | Multiple metal bollards are placed mid-sidewalk. They are grey/silver (low contrast) and low enough to be missed by a long cane user (a "cane trap"). | 2                  | Upgrade Standards: Require all new and existing bollards to be repainted in high-contrast yellow or equipped with a detectable base that meets minimum height standards for cane detection. |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 1):</b>                   | (Average of the 4 Impact Scores)                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                       | 1.5                |                                                                                                                                                                                             |

## Section 2: Public Transportation & Green Transport

| Criterion (Standard)                            | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                            | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                                                                                            | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>System: Vehicle &amp; Stop Accessibility</b> | <b>Vehicle Access &amp; Gap Check:</b> Measures if the vehicle (bus, tram, metro) and the stop interface safely connect (low-floor, functioning ramp) with minimal gap or step. | The bus stop near the municipal theatre has a small shelter but no raised platform. The bus ramp is deployed manually and slowly, and the gap to the curb remains large and uneven. | 3                  | Infrastructure Investment: Prioritise investment in raising bus stop platforms to match the height of bus entrances on high-traffic lines, minimising the gap and reliance on manual ramps. |

| Criterion (Standard)                             | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                             | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                                                                            | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Information: Multi-Modal Access</b>           | <b>Journey Info Clarity:</b> Measures if real-time travel information (e.g., delays, arrivals) is provided in multiple formats that everyone can use (audio announcements, clear text on high-contrast screens). | Digital real-time screens are present, but no audio announcements are available. The font is thin and low contrast in direct sunlight, failing the visual criteria. | 2                  | Service Upgrade: Integrate a simple, consistent audio announcement system (or QR code link to audio info) at all digital display bus stops to comply with multi-modal information requirements. |
| <b>Sustainability: Green Transport Inclusion</b> | <b>Shared Green Transport Score:</b> Measures if sustainable options like shared e-bikes/scooters are positioned and managed in a way that doesn't create barriers for others (e.g., parked out of the pathway). | Shared e-scooters are routinely left lying down or randomly scattered across the sidewalk, creating continuous, trip-and-fall hazards in the pathway.               | 1                  | Regulate Micro-mobility: Implement mandatory geo-fencing and designated docking zones for all micro-mobility providers, enforcing fines for incorrect parking that obstructs clear pathways.    |
| <b>Journey: End-to-End Experience</b>            | <b>Seamless Transfer Test:</b> Measures the ease and accessibility of moving from one mode of transport to the next (e.g., exiting the train station and finding the right bus stop).                            | The main city bus terminal has no sheltered, marked, or TGSI-guided transfer path from the waiting area to the taxi rank or major city stops.                       | 2                  | Wayfinding Project: Develop a marked, continuous, and tactile-guided pathway (in line with UDM/TGSI metrics) connecting the main transport hub to all onward city transit points.               |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 2):</b>                  | (Average of the 4 Impact Scores)                                                                                                                                                                                 | 2                                                                                                                                                                   |                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

### Section 3: Urban Policy & Community Engagement

| Criterion (Standard)                      | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                                                                            | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Policy: Inclusive Planning Mandate</b> | <b>Policy Integration Index:</b> Measures if the city's official planning rules require accessibility standards to be checked before any new urban project is approved.                                                                                 | No easily found, publicly available checklist or mandate explicitly states "Accessibility Audit Required" prior to approving café licenses or construction permits. | 3                  | Policy Integration: Publish and enforce a pre-approval checklist for all public space permits, making UDM/TGSI compliance the first non-negotiable step.                           |
| <b>Finance: Budget Transparency</b>       | <b>Dedicated Inclusion Budget:</b> Measures if the city has a specific, identifiable amount of money set aside just for accessibility improvements and maintenance.                                                                                     | Accessibility repairs are grouped under general "Maintenance and Roads," making it impossible to track annual spending dedicated to inclusion.                      | 2                  | Budget Transparency: Create a new, mandatory, publicly trackable budget line item titled "Dedicated Fund for Accessibility and Barrier Removal," with a minimum annual allocation. |
| <b>Advocacy: Youth-Led Oversight</b>      | <b>Advisory Committee Participation:</b> Measures if young people and especially persons with disabilities and Organisations of Persons with Disabilities are guaranteed a seat and a formal voice in the city's urban planning decision-making bodies. | Consultation exists but is ad-hoc, invited only by general email announcements, with no mandatory representation from disability or youth organisations.            | 2                  | Formalise Consultation: Establish a permanent Youth & Disability Advisory Committee with mandatory representation to review all major urban projects before they are tendered.     |

| Criterion (Standard)                   | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                             | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                             | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Data: Accessible Data Provision</b> | <b>Targeted Data Transparency:</b> Measures if the city publicly shares information showing <i>who</i> uses services (or cannot use them), separated by age and disability type. | City reports on public transport usage and pedestrian flow do not categorise data by disability status or age range. | 2                  | Data Mandate: Mandate that all future city surveys, public consultation forms, and annual reports include demographic fields necessary to categorise data by disability and age group. |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 3):</b>        | (Average of the 4 Impact Scores)                                                                                                                                                 | 2.25                                                                                                                 |                    |                                                                                                                                                                                        |

#### Section 4: Digital Accessibility & Smart City Features

| Criterion (Standard)                        | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                           | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                                                                        | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>WCAG: Digital Platform Accessibility</b> | <b>Digital Access Score:</b> Measures if the city's key online platforms (website, digital forms, complaint portals) are fully usable by screen readers and conform to digital accessibility rules (WCAG 2.2). | The main municipal complaint form uses unlabeled input fields and poor colour contrast, failing basic WCAG standards and blocking submission via screen reader. | 1                  | Digital Compliance: Dedicate an IT team immediately to audit and overhaul all public-facing portals to achieve WCAG 2.2 Level AA compliance, in line with the European Accessibility Act. |



| Criterion (Standard)                         | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                          | Audit Finding / Evidence                                                                                                           | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal                                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>ICT: Information Kiosks &amp; Screens</b> | <b>Public Screen Usability:</b><br>Measures if digital information screens (ticket machines, maps, info screens) are accessible (appropriate height and reach, colour contrast, screen reader compatibility). | Ticket machines and public maps often lack an accessible lower-height interface option and have screens that wash out in sunlight. | 3                  | User Interface Update: Require all new public screen technology (and major software updates) to include a tactile or audio-prompted menu and a minimum contrast ratio of 4.5:1 on the screen. |
| <b>Communication: Accessible Engagement</b>  | <b>Social Media Inclusion:</b><br>Measures if the city's official social media channels implement accessible media practices (e.g., video captions, image alt-text).                                          | Video announcements rarely include captions, and images posted (e.g., showing new street designs) often lack descriptive alt-text. | 2                  | Content Protocol: Implement a mandatory social media content protocol for all municipal staff requiring 100% closed captions on videos and descriptive alt-text on all images.                |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 4):</b>              | (Average of the 3 Impact Scores)                                                                                                                                                                              | 2                                                                                                                                  |                    |                                                                                                                                                                                               |

## Practical Knowledge & Insights

While theoretical knowledge establishes the essential first step toward understanding inclusive urban development, a deeper comprehension requires examining real-world cases, lived experiences, and proven good practices. This section moves beyond abstract concepts to explore the actual barriers faced by young persons with disabilities in their daily environments, drawing directly from the ACT4DYS transnational research findings and focus group insights, highlighting successful disability-inclusive practices and defining the specific roles of youth workers and stakeholders.

### 1. Insights into the needs of young people with disabilities

The focus groups conducted in the ACT4DYS partner countries (Belgium, Cyprus, Ireland, Portugal, Spain) revealed that barriers consistently compromise the independence and social participation of young people with disabilities, highlighting the following needs:

- **Need for autonomy and dignity:** Participants voiced frustrations about having to request assistance in advance for services or facing "second-rate alternatives" (e.g., side entrances), stripping away their autonomy and dignity. This dependence is heightened by obstacles like Portugal's rigid 6-hour advance booking requirement for train tickets for wheelchair users, significantly impacting spontaneity and flexibility.
- **Need for consistent infrastructure:** Accessibility is conditional and unevenly implemented. Even where laws exist, weak enforcement in places like Cyprus leads to patchy or short-lived improvements, particularly in pavements and inter-city transport.
- **Need for non-physical accessibility:** There is a limited focus on invisible, disabilities in most urban projects. This heightens challenges, such as the need for non-verbal support (e.g. Ireland's JAM Card) and sensory-friendly spaces.

- **Need to address legacy infrastructure:** Older cities, notably in Belgium, Spain, and Portugal, face high costs and technical barriers when retrofitting historic districts. For instance, Portugal's traditional "calçada portuguesa" (mosaic pavement) poses significant mobility challenges for a wide range of users.

## 2. Case studies of successful disability-inclusive urban projects

Youth advocacy gains credibility by showcasing replicable successes from within and outside the partnership. These are some examples of the case studies identified as good practices and included in the ACT4DYS ePortfolio:

- [The city of Córdoba in Spain](#) shows that reversible installations (ramps, tactile paths) can balance historic preservation with access needs. It also leverages technology like NaviLens QR codes for visually impaired users.
- The [Warsaw Program Eliminating Barriers](#) in Warsaw, Poland, achieved 100% accessible buses and metro trains and focused on retrofitting stations with lifts and tactile paths. The Łódź railway went further, proactively offering on-demand online sign language interpretation during travel.
- [The Independent Travel Support \(ITS\) Scheme](#) in Ireland offers free, one-to-one travel training to adults with disabilities until they are comfortable travelling alone, reducing reliance on carers and boosting confidence.

## 3. Role of youth workers and other stakeholders

Youth workers serve as essential facilitators in the auditing and advocacy process. They provide support and guidance to young people to help them masterfully conduct the audit identifying accessibility barriers and develop their own evidence-based civic proposals, and as such empower them to advocate for inclusive and accessible cities. Their responsibilities in this module include:

- Guiding young people on how to use the Urban Development Audit Tool accurately.

- Organising and guiding on-site audits in real environments to document real-world barriers or developing scenarios in which real-world barriers are simulated.
- Helping young people present their Impact Scores and Civic Proposals to public authorities, such as municipalities, and urban professionals, such as city planners.
- Other stakeholders, such as urban planners, municipality representatives and disability experts, collaborate to ensure that these youth-led audit findings are taken into consideration in official technical standards and local budgets.

#### **4. Strategies for sustainable and inclusive urban practices**

To move from isolated improvements to systemic change, strategies focused on accountability and evidence should be adopted:

- **Data-driven advocacy:** Utilise technical tools, like the Urban Development Audit Tool, to quantify the severity of exclusion rather than rely on general complaints.
- **Co-design and co-leadership:** Involve young persons with disabilities as co-councilors in every phase of city planning.
- **Mainstreaming Universal Design:** Ensure that accessibility is a default legal requirement in every new green or mobility project from day one.
- **Sustained monitoring:** Establish regular audit cycles to ensure that infrastructure stays accessible over time and that maintenance is prioritised.

These strategies ensure that urban development is rooted in the actual needs of the community, turning accessibility into a measurable right rather than an optional feature.



## Connection to the Simulation Scenario

The primary purpose of the simulation is for participants to take the technical framework of the Urban Development Audit Tool and put it directly into practice, taking on the role of compliance auditors and disability advocates. This role-play empowers participants to translate their observations of inaccessible infrastructure into measurable data and professional policy demands.

The Tool is integrated into the simulation across three phases:

### 1. Phase I: The audit phase (data collection)

The simulation begins by dividing the participants into teams of 3-5 people and assigning them the role of compliance auditors. Each team is assigned a real urban area or neighbourhood to investigate. If not possible in reality to investigate a real environment, the team is assigned a simulated urban environment scenario (can include written description of the environment, maps, detailed imagery, or virtual simulations). Their task is to systematically audit this environment using the Tool to identify barriers across pedestrian paths, transportation, local policy, and digital access.

Participants are instructed to use the Metric (Measurement) column of the Tool as their guide for assessment. Instead of relying on emotional responses, youth learn to conduct a systematic, technical audit based on European/international standards (e.g., checking ramp slope or clear path width derived from EN 17210 and UDM principles).

This phase also emphasises collecting Audit Finding/Evidence, the crucial "proof." The teams record factual observations, not opinions, by documenting exactly where the accessibility standard fails (e.g., "A-frame sign reduces clear path to 0.7m at bus stop"). This evidence makes the subsequent Civic Proposal credible to decision-makers.

## **2. Phase II: The analysis phase (scoring and interpretation)**

Once data is collected, the team moves to analyse the severity of exclusion. This is the stage where observation is converted into quantifiable data.

Participants apply the Impact Score (1-5) to each barrier recorded. This scoring moves the exercise beyond simply labelling something as "inaccessible" by forcing the team to determine the degree of exclusion. The scores also guide the prioritisation process. Low scores (Score 1 or 2) indicate structural deficiencies and areas of severe compromise of autonomy and independence. This step directly challenges the "implementation gap" by focusing resources where policy is failing most drastically.

## **3. Phase III: The advocacy phase (the pitch)**

The culmination of the simulation is the development and delivery of the Pitch/Civic Proposal and a structured exchange of professional feedback. This phase practices the core advocacy skills the project seeks to build.

The participants switch roles and become disability advocates. Using the impact scores as their starting point, teams complete the "The Pitch/Civic Proposal" column. This requires drafting a feasible, policy-level action, addressing the identified barriers. To draft their proposals, the participants can take inspiration by real-world successful strategies documented in the ACT4DYS ePortfolio and the case studies included therein.

All teams take rounds to present the proposals they developed. The team presenting keeps to the role of disability advocates and presents their findings and proposals to the collective group. They must use the authoritative language of metrics and compliance to justify why their proposed changes are necessary for independence and dignity. While one team presents, the other teams pivot into the roles of municipality representatives and urban planners. From this perspective, they provide

critical feedback on the presentation, evaluating the feasibility, technical accuracy, and policy potential of the proposals.

This collaborative role playing allows young people to learn how to present data-driven evidence in the authoritative language of metrics and compliance, ensuring their voices are heard and taken seriously.

Finally, a concluding debriefing and reflection session provides a structured opportunity for participants to finalise their learning experience. Facilitated by the instructor, the group engages in a discussion regarding:

- The practical challenges encountered while conducting the audit and identifying technical barriers.
- New insights gained into the relationship between standardised metrics and real-world inclusive planning.
- Concrete strategies for using the Tool within their local communities or advocacy efforts.

This process of reflective practice solidifies the module's core learning outcomes, ensuring that participants leave with the confidence and data-driven skills needed to advocate for accessible and inclusive urban environments.



Co-funded by  
the European Union



## Glossary

- **Accessibility:** The design of products, devices, services, or environments so they are usable by people with a wide range of abilities and disabilities.
- **Advocacy:** A deliberate process of using evidence and data to influence decision-makers and public authorities to adopt inclusive urban policies and remove environmental barriers.
- **Audit:** A systematic, objective, and evidence-based investigation of a specific urban environment or service to check for compliance with accessibility standards. Using standardised metrics and measurements to identify physical, sensory, or digital barriers that prevent full participation.
- **Audit Finding / Evidence:** The factual documentation of an observation made during an audit, such as a physical measurement or a recorded service failure, used to provide proof for a claim.
- **Civic Proposal:** A specific, policy-level solution or technical action recommended to public authorities to fix a root cause of exclusion.
- **Compliance auditor:** A role assigned to participants who use the Tool to systematically check urban spaces against technical accessibility standards to identify where regulations are not being met.
- **Criterion (Standard):** The high-level rule, principle, or legal requirement against which an urban environment is measured (e.g., the Universal Design for Movement principle).
- **Disability advocate:** An individual who supports and promotes the rights and inclusion of people with disabilities in society.
- **Impact Score (1-5):** A quantifiable rating system used to measure the severity of exclusion caused by a barrier, ranging from Model Practice (5) to Total Exclusion (1).
- **Implementation gap:** The divide between existing progressive legislation and the actual on-the-ground delivery of accessible services and infrastructure.
- **Metric (Measurement):** A specific, checkable test or physical measurement used in the field to determine if a standard is being met.



Co-funded by  
the European Union



- **Municipality representative:** A role taken on by participants to provide feedback on audit findings from a local government perspective, evaluating the feasibility and policy potential of the proposed changes.
- **Tactile Ground Surface Indicators (TGSi):** Specialised textured paving used to provide sensory warnings or directional guidance to pedestrians with visual impairments.
- **Universal Design for Movement (UDM):** The application of Universal Design specifically to the physical path of travel, ensuring public spaces are usable by everyone without the need for adaptation.
- **Urban planner:** A role simulated during the feedback phase, responsible for designing city spaces and infrastructure; this role assesses the technical accuracy and practical implementation of the civic proposals developed by the audit teams.
- **Urban planning:** The technical and political process of designing and regulating the use of spaces in cities, including infrastructure, transportation, and public spaces.
- **Advocacy:** A process where young people take the lead in collecting data, identifying problems, and proposing solutions to decision-makers to influence the future of their communities.

## Bibliography

Chapman, K., Ehrlich, C., O'Loughlen, J., & Kendall, E. (2024). The dignity experience of people with disability when using trains and buses in an Australian city. *Disability & Society*, 39(9), 2375–2399. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2023.2203307>

DIGNITY Project. (2022). *Literature review: Effects of digitalization in mobility in society*. European Commission. <https://www.dignity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/200519-D1.1-Literature-Review-Final.pdf>

European Commission: Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. (2021). *Union of equality: strategy for the rights of persons with disabilities 2021-2030*. Publications Office. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2767/31633>.

European Commission. (2021). *European Accessibility Act (Directive EU 2019/882)*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019L0882>

European Committee for Standardization. (2021). *Accessibility and usability of the built environment - Functional requirements* (EN 17210:2021). [https://accessible-eu-centre.ec.europa.eu/content-corner/digital-library/en-172102021-accessibility-and-usability-built-environment-functional-requirements\\_en](https://accessible-eu-centre.ec.europa.eu/content-corner/digital-library/en-172102021-accessibility-and-usability-built-environment-functional-requirements_en)

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2024). *Fundamental Rights Report 2024*. [https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/fra-2024-fundamental-rights-report-2024\\_en.pdf](https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2024-fundamental-rights-report-2024_en.pdf)

Eurostat. (2024). *Disability statistics - poverty and income inequalities*. [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Disability\\_statistics\\_-\\_poverty\\_and\\_income\\_inequalities](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Disability_statistics_-_poverty_and_income_inequalities)

Jakub Niedbalski (2025). *(In)Accessibility of urban public transport and transport exclusion in Poland: Perspective of parents of persons with profound intellectual and multiple disabilities*, *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, DOI: 10.3109/13668250.2025.2535874 <https://doi.org/10.3109/13668250.2025.2535874>

TRIPS Project. (2021). *Views of Persons with Disabilities On Future Mobility*. European Commission Horizon 2020. <https://trips-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/D2.1-TRIPS-White-Paper.pdf>

United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD)*. <https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>

---

## Module 4 – SCENARIO

---

Welcome to the change-makers' workshop! Today, you are stepping into the shoes of urban experts to reclaim your city. Over the course of this simulation, you will navigate three distinct roles to turn your observations into professional evidence that decision-makers cannot ignore. Depending on the session setup, you will either audit a real-world environment in your local neighborhood or use a simulated urban environment. Your mission is to prove how specific barriers exclude persons with disabilities and pitch the technical solutions needed to fix them.

Throughout the session, you will evolve through these three perspectives:

- Phase I & II: The compliance auditor – You will start by systematically auditing the environment to transform subjective observations into objective, factual data using the UDAT metrics.
- Phase III (role A): The disability advocate - You will then shift focus to analyse the severity of the barriers found and draft persuasive, policy-level Civic Proposals for change.
- Phase III (role B): The Urban Planning Panel – Finally, you will pivot to the role of a city official or municipality representative, evaluating the feasibility of proposals and providing critical feedback on how they can be integrated into real-world city plans.

**Note for participants:** As you audit barriers, remember that some of these barriers might reflect personal experiences of exclusion. Please prioritise your well-being, take care of yourself and your teammates, and only share or engage at a level that feels safe and comfortable for you.

**Note for instructors:** The durations listed for each phase are indicative. Timing can be adapted based on the participants' needs, the complexity of the environment being audited, or the depth of the group discussions to ensure a meaningful learning experience.



Co-funded by  
the European Union



## 1. Introduction and presentation (15 minutes)

- **Goal:** Introduce the Urban Development Audit Tool (“UDAT” or “Tool”) and the legal frameworks supporting disability-inclusive urban development.
- **Instructor’s role:**
  - Provide a brief overview of European/international legal and strategic frameworks, explaining the implementation gap between policy and practice (Use presentation slides with the content from the ACT4DYS\_WP3\_ThematicModuleContent\_4)
  - Introduce the Tool's purpose, structure, and content, including the Criterion (Standard), Metric (Measurement), Audit Finding/Evidence, Impact Score, and the Pitch/Civic Proposal. Provide examples to illustrate how the Tool is completed and used in practice. Explain why each of the four sections of the Tool is important and how they contribute to the overall assessment process.
  - Highlight key technical standards like EN 17210 and Universal Design for Movement (UDM).
- **Game element:** Encourage enthusiasm and creativity by explaining that teams will be evaluated on the technical accuracy of their audit and the persuasiveness of their policy pitch.
- **Pre-activity question:** "Think of a time you saw a 'green' solution (like a bike-share station) that actually created a new barrier. Why did that happen?"

## 2. Team formation and role assignment (5 minutes)

- **Goal:** Form diverse teams of 3–5 people and assign simulation roles.
- **Instructor’s role:** Ensure the participants understand their assigned tasks and roles during each of the three phases of the simulation scenario.
- **Preparation:** Each team receives the UDAT Activity Sheet and a simulated urban environment scenario (including written descriptions, maps and detailed imagery of a fictional neighbourhood). If it’s possible to audit a real environment, each team is assigned a specific area of the neighbourhood they are in.



### 3. Phase I & II: Audit and analysis (30-40 minutes)

- **Goal:** Systematically audit the assigned urban environment to transform subjective observations into objective data and evaluate the impact of barriers, taking on the role of compliance auditor.
- **Task Breakdown:**

#### Phase I - Audit:

- Identify accessibility barriers across the four UDAT sections: Pedestrian Infrastructure, Public Transportation, Urban Policy, and Digital Accessibility.
- Apply the Metric column to record factual Audit Findings (e.g., measuring ramp slopes or clear path widths).
- Assign an Impact Score (1-5) to quantify the severity of exclusion.

#### Phase II – Analysis:

- Review findings scored 1 or 2 (High Barriers/Total Exclusion).
- Draft feasible, policy-level Civic Proposals for each identified barrier, using successful case studies for inspiration.
- **Instructor's role:** Guide and support participants during the audit and analysis phases as needed. Challenge teams with technical dilemmas:
  - "The city says this historic mosaic pavement is a heritage site. How do you propose making it accessible without destroying the character?"
  - "You found a high-contrast screen that is too high for a wheelchair user. What specific technical standard is being overlooked here?"
  - "The city budget is tight. How do you justify the cost of a dedicated inclusion budget?"

#### Phase transition: from evidence to advocacy and action

Now that you have gathered your factual evidence and scored on the impact of the barriers that have been identified, it is time to stop being auditors and start being advocates. As each team prepares to pitch their proposals, using the data gathered as a lever to demand change, the rest of the group will pivot into their roles as municipality representatives and urban planners to form the "Urban Planning Panel". Your task as the Panel is to shift your perspective: review the audit data and civic

proposals through the lens of feasibility, city budgets, and long-term policy. Prepare to provide critical, constructive feedback on how these designs can realistically be integrated into the city's future plans

#### 4. Phase III: Advocacy - pitch and presentation (15 minutes)

- **Goal:** Teams present their audit data and proposals to influence simulated decision-makers, switching to the role of disability advocates.
- **Task breakdown:**
  - Teams use the language of decision-makers, justifying their proposed changes with technical metrics and compliance data.
  - Justify why high-barrier areas (Score 1) represent a complete denial of rights.
- **Instructor's role:** Act as the head of the "Urban Planning Panel". While one team presents as disability advocates, the other teams, guided by the instructor, pivot into the roles of municipality representatives and urban planners to provide critical feedback on feasibility and policy potential.

#### 5. Judging and evaluation (10 minutes)

- **Goal:** Teams receive feedback on their audit quality and the feasibility of their proposals.
- **Instructor's role:** Guide and support the collective group to assess the presenting team based on technical accuracy (did the team correctly apply the metrics and standardised scoring?), evidence quality (is the Civic Proposal grounded in factual audit evidence?), and policy feasibility (is the proposal actionable and aligned with European standards?).
- **Game element:** Award points for the most data-driven pitch and the team that best identified "hidden" barriers.

#### 6. Debrief and reflection (15 minutes)

- **Goal:** Solidify learning outcomes and discuss real-world application.
- **Discussion points:**
  - Did you encounter any difficulties/challenges during the audit?
  - What was the hardest part about drafting a Civic Proposal that was both realistic and effective?



Co-funded by  
the European Union



- In your presentation, which specific Metric or technical standard (like UDM or WCAG) felt like the strongest "lever" for your argument?
- How can you use the UDAT in your local community?
- **Final knowledge check:** Ask participants:
  - If you were a city official receiving this audit tomorrow, what is the first piece of evidence that would convince you that an upgrade is a human rights necessity rather than just a 'nice-to-have' feature?"
  - Identify one area in your own local neighbourhood that you want to audit using this Tool. What is the first Criterion you will check?"

---

## Module 4 – ACTIVITY

---

**Activity Sheet Title:** Urban Development Audit Tool

**Module/Scenario Title:** Module/Scenario 4: Urban Development Audit Tool (UDAT)

**Assigned Roles:** Compliance auditor, disability advocate, municipality representative and urban planner

**Activity Objective:**

As compliance auditor and disability advocate, your goal is to systematically audit the simulated urban environment using the Urban Development Audit Tool. You will need to observe and identify barriers, write down the barriers into quantifiable data and develop and present evidence-based proposals aimed at influencing policy, in order to advocate for accessibility and the inclusion of persons with disabilities.

As a municipality representative or urban planner, your goal is to critically evaluate the feasibility, technical accuracy, and policy potential of the presented proposals. You will provide professional feedback by assessing whether the proposed solutions align with technical standards, while considering practical municipal constraints such as budgets and existing urban infrastructure.

**Instructions:**

**1. Review the scenario and the UDAT:** Carefully read the description of your simulated urban area (ANNEX I), assigned to you by the instructor. If it's possible to implement this part outdoors, carefully examine your assigned area: pay close attention to infrastructure elements, transportation, and public spaces. Remember to exercise caution and make sure it is safe for you to do so. Familiarise yourself with the Urban Development Audit Tool (ANNEX II), reviewing the "Criteria (Standards)" and the specific "Metrics (Measurements)" for all four Sections (Pedestrian Infrastructure, Public Transportation, Urban Policy, Digital Accessibility).

**2. Identify accessibility barriers and record evidence (Phase I - Audit):**

Take on the role of compliance auditor. Using the UDAT and investigating your assigned area conduct the factual audit. For at least one Metric in each of the four sections, fill in the Audit Finding/Evidence column. Record precise, factual observations, rather than general feelings and impressions (e.g., "The measured clear path width is 0.8m due to café tables," instead of "The path is too narrow").

### **3. Quantify the impact (Phase II - Analysis):**

Based on the factual evidence you recorded, and using the scoring guide to justify your selection, assign an Impact Score (1-5) to each finding. Scores of 1 (Total Exclusion) or 2 (Major Barrier) should be reserved for findings that indicate a major barrier that physically prevents someone from using the space or pose serious safety risks.

### **4. Develop your proposals and presentations (Phase III - Advocacy):**

Switch to the role of disability advocate and discuss your findings within your team. For every barrier scored 3 or below, draft a specific, policy-level Civic Proposal in the final column of the UDAT. Your solution must address the root cause and propose a policy-level action. Frame your proposals around correcting the Metric or by referencing specific EU instruments to ensure they are credible to decision-makers:

Example 1 (physical infrastructure): "We propose a municipal mandate to enforce the max 1:12 slope standard for all public building entrances, in strict accordance with the functional requirements of EN 17210:2021".

Example 2 (policy/legislation): "We propose the establishment of a dedicated inclusion budget for retrofitting transport hubs to meet the accessibility requirements of the European Accessibility Act (Directive EU 2019/882)".

Prepare your pitch: get ready to present your audit data, Impact Scores and Civic Proposals to the "Urban Planning Panel" (the other teams). Ensure your proposals are grounded in the evidence you collected, demonstrating that your solutions are human rights necessities, backed by measurable metrics, and using the official, technical language of city planning.

### **5. Provide feedback on other teams' proposals**

When the other teams are presenting, switch to the role of municipality representative or urban planner, as part of the "Urban Planning Panel". In this role, you must critically evaluate the feasibility, technical accuracy, and policy potential of the other teams' Civic Proposals. Use your understanding of city planning constraints to ask challenging questions about how their design supports specific user groups or how they prioritised their Impact Scores. Offer constructive feedback to help other teams refine their arguments, ensuring their proposals are robust enough to withstand real-world municipal scrutiny.

## 6. Debrief and Reflection

Following the final presentations, the teams will engage in a 15-minute reflective session to solidify learning outcomes and discuss the real-world application of the audit findings. During this time, teams are encouraged to:

- evaluate any technical difficulties or challenges encountered during the audit process
- identify the most difficult aspects of drafting a Civic Proposal that is both realistic for municipal authorities and effective for the end-user
- reflect on which specific Metric or technical standard served as the most powerful "lever" during the pitch to justify design choices
- how the UDAT can be practically implemented within the local community to advocate for the rights and inclusion of young persons with disabilities.

### Additional Resources:

Consult relevant sections of the interactive E-portfolio with case studies and best practices in inclusive urban development.

### Space for Notes and Ideas:

## ANNEX I: Simulated urban environments

**Note to Instructors:** To enhance the immersive nature of these scenarios, it is highly recommended to supplement the written descriptions with relevant visual aids. This may include photographs of similar architectural barriers, topographical maps, or blueprints that reflect the settings described below (e.g., a coastal harbour, a transit hub, or a historic hillside). Providing these visual cues helps participants to "audit" the space and better understand the technical scale of the barriers they are identifying.

**Note to Participants:** Your instructor will assign one of the following five simulated urban environments to your team. Each scenario represents a real-world urban archetype found across Europe, from historic coastal towns to modern tech hubs. While these environments are fictional, the barriers they contain are based on the lived experiences of young persons with disabilities.

Your mission is to "step into" the setting described, visualize the obstacles, and use the Urban Development Audit Tool (UDAT) to transform these observations into professional, evidence-based data.

- **Simulated Environment 1: The Historic Harbour**

**The setting:** You are standing in a beautiful, historic harbour where the turquoise Mediterranean Sea meets ancient city walls. This area is the main social hub of the town, filled with tourists, local shops, and waterfront cafes. The walkway is decorated with traditional limestone "cobblestone" paths and modern solar-powered information kiosks that share the history of the site.

**The experience:** As you try to navigate the promenade, you realise the "charming" cobblestones are very uneven and loose in some places. For someone using a wheelchair or a walker, the constant jarring and bumping makes it painful to move and difficult to steer. You head toward a digital kiosk to find the nearest accessible bathroom, but you find the screen is mounted on a high concrete base with no ramp. You are right in front of the kiosk, but the information is physically out of reach.

**The task:** Using the UDAT, record the specific physical and digital barriers you have identified in this setting. Assign an Impact Score to each barrier to show how much it limits participation for persons with disabilities and draft a Civic Proposal with realistic solutions to make this environment truly inclusive.

- **Simulated Environment 2: The Rainy Transit Hub**

**The setting:** It is a typical grey, rainy afternoon at a major urban transport interchange. This station is a "Smart Hub," a brand-new facility of glass and steel

where buses and light-rail trains connect. It is a vital spot for young people traveling to college, work, or social events.

**The experience:** You are trying to find the correct bus platform as the rain gets heavier. As a person with a visual impairment, you rely on the yellow bumpy tiles on the ground to guide you safely. However, as you walk toward the shelter, the tiles suddenly stop, leaving you in an open concrete space with no guidance toward the entrance. You look up at the digital arrival board to see when the next bus is coming, but the small, light-grey text is washed out by the glare of the wet glass and the dim light.

**The task:** Using the UDAT, record the specific physical and digital barriers you have identified in this setting. Assign an Impact Score to each barrier to show how much it limits participation for persons with disabilities and draft a Civic Proposal with realistic solutions to make this environment truly inclusive.

- **Simulated Environment 3: The Eco-Friendly Nature Park**

**The setting:** You have arrived at a large community park known for its wooded trails, heritage monuments, and "rain gardens" designed to help the environment. It is a peaceful place intended for relaxation and group gatherings.

**The experience:** You want to join your friends at a picnic table on the grassy hill. The main path leading up is much steeper than it looked from a distance, making it nearly impossible to climb without help. To stay sustainable, the park builders used loose wood chips instead of pavement for the side trails. As you try to enter the sensory garden, your wheels or shoes sink into the soft, muddy mulch, and you find yourself stuck and unable to move forward.

**The task:** Using the UDAT, record the specific physical and digital barriers you have identified in this setting. Assign an Impact Score to each barrier to show how much it limits participation for persons with disabilities and draft a Civic Proposal with realistic solutions to make this environment truly inclusive.

- **Simulated Environment 4: The "Superblock" Plaza**

**The Setting:** You are in a modern "Superblock", a residential square where cars are banned so that the space belongs entirely to the people. There are trees, benches, and open areas for children to play and neighbors to talk.

**The Experience:** As you try to walk across the square to meet a friend, you find yourself in a maze. Because there are no cars, local restaurants have placed their





Co-funded by  
the European Union



heavy tables and large flowerpots all over the sidewalk. There isn't a straight, clear path wide enough for two people to pass each other. You head toward a designated "Quiet Zone" to take a break from the crowd, but you find it is located directly next to a noisy playground with clanging metal slides, making it impossible to find any peace.

**The task:** Using the UDAT, record the specific physical and digital barriers you have identified in this setting. Assign an Impact Score to each barrier to show how much it limits participation for persons with disabilities and draft a Civic Proposal with realistic solutions to make this environment truly inclusive.

- **Simulated Environment 5: The Historic Hillside**

**The Setting:** You are in a vibrant, hillside neighbourhood famous for its steep streets and beautiful "Calçada" sidewalks (white and black stones arranged in decorative patterns). It is one of the most famous parts of the city.

**The Experience:** The ground under your feet is beautiful but very slippery, especially with the morning mist. For a young person with mobility challenges, every step feels unsafe. You know there is a public elevator nearby to help people avoid the steepest climb, but when you arrive at the bottom of the hill, there are no signs to tell you if it is working. You struggle halfway up the steep slope only to find a small "Out of Order" note on the elevator door. There was no warning at the start of your journey.

**The task:** Using the UDAT, record the specific physical and digital barriers you have identified in this setting. Assign an Impact Score to each barrier to show how much it limits participation for persons with disabilities and draft a Civic Proposal with realistic solutions to make this environment truly inclusive.

## ANNEX II: Urban Development Audit Tool (UDAT)

### Section 1: Pedestrian Infrastructure & Public Spaces

| Criterion (Standard)                              | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                    | Audit Finding / Evidence | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>UDM: Continuous &amp; Unobstructed Paths</b>   | <b>Passing Path Score:</b> Measures where the pedestrian path is wide enough (min. 1.5m) to allow two people, like two wheelchair users or a person with a stroller, to safely pass each other.         |                          |                    |                |
| <b>UDM: Vertical Accessibility</b>                | <b>Ramp Usability Test:</b> Measures the steepness of ramps and curb cuts to ensure they are safe and manageable for unassisted wheelchair use or for persons with mobility challenges.                 |                          |                    |                |
| <b>TGSI: Tactile &amp; Visual Guidance</b>        | <b>Directional Safety Check:</b> Measures if textured paving (TGSI - Tactile Ground Surface Indicators) are placed correctly to warn of hazards, like crossings, or guide users with visual impairment. |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Safety: Obstacle &amp; Furniture Placement</b> | <b>Obstacle Impact Score:</b> Measures the risk of street furniture (signs, bollards, benches) causing trips, falls, or collisions for users with visual and mobility disabilities.                     |                          |                    |                |



Co-funded by  
the European Union



|                                 |                                  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 1):</b> | (Average of the 4 Impact Scores) |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|

## Section 2: Public Transportation & Green Transport

| Criterion (Standard)                             | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                                | Audit Finding / Evidence | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>System: Vehicle &amp; Stop Accessibility</b>  | <b>Vehicle Access &amp; Gap Check:</b><br>Measures if the vehicle (bus, tram, metro) and the stop interface safely connect (low-floor, functioning ramp) with minimal gap or step.                                  |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Information: Multi-Modal Access</b>           | <b>Journey Info Clarity:</b> Measures if real-time travel information (e.g., delays, arrivals) is provided in multiple formats that everyone can use (audio announcements, clear text on high-contrast screens).    |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Sustainability: Green Transport Inclusion</b> | <b>Shared Green Transport Score:</b><br>Measures if sustainable options like shared e-bikes/scooters are positioned and managed in a way that doesn't create barriers for others (e.g., parked out of the pathway). |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Journey: End-to-End Experience</b>            | <b>Seamless Transfer Test:</b> Measures the ease and accessibility of moving from one mode of transport to the next (e.g., exiting the train station and finding the right bus stop).                               |                          |                    |                |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 2):</b>                  | (Average of the 4 Impact Scores)                                                                                                                                                                                    |                          |                    |                |

### Section 3: Urban Policy & Community Engagement

| Criterion (Standard)                      | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Audit Finding / Evidence | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>Policy: Inclusive Planning Mandate</b> | <b>Policy Integration Index:</b><br>Measures if the city's official planning rules require accessibility standards to be checked before any new urban project is approved.                                                                              |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Finance: Budget Transparency</b>       | <b>Dedicated Inclusion Budget:</b><br>Measures if the city has a specific, identifiable amount of money set aside just for accessibility improvements and maintenance.                                                                                  |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Advocacy: Youth-Led Oversight</b>      | <b>Advisory Committee Participation:</b> Measures if young people and especially persons with disabilities and Organisations of Persons with Disabilities are guaranteed a seat and a formal voice in the city's urban planning decision-making bodies. |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Data: Accessible Data Provision</b>    | <b>Targeted Data Transparency:</b><br>Measures if the city publicly shares information showing <i>who</i> is able to use specific service, are there clear boundaries shown regarding age or disability type.                                           |                          |                    |                |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 3):</b>           | (Average of the 4 Impact Scores)                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                          |                    |                |



Co-funded by  
the European Union



#### Section 4: Digital Accessibility & Smart City Features

| Criterion (Standard)                         | Metric (Measurement)                                                                                                                                                                                       | Audit Finding / Evidence | Impact Score (1-5) | Civic Proposal |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <b>WCAG: Digital Platform Accessibility</b>  | <b>Digital Access Score:</b> Measures if the city's key online platforms (website, digital forms, complaint portals) are accessible and conform to digital accessibility rules (WCAG 2.2).                 |                          |                    |                |
| <b>ICT: Information Kiosks &amp; Screens</b> | <b>Public Screen Usability:</b> Measures if digital information screens (ticket machines, maps, info screens) are accessible (appropriate height and reach, colour contrast, screen reader compatibility). |                          |                    |                |
| <b>Communication: Accessible Engagement</b>  | <b>Social Media Inclusion:</b> Measures if the city's official social media channels implement accessible media practices (e.g., video captions, image alt-text).                                          |                          |                    |                |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE (Section 4):</b>              | (Average of the 3 Impact Scores)                                                                                                                                                                           |                          |                    |                |



Co-funded by  
the European Union



### Scoring Guide (Impact Score)

| Score | Impact Rating                         | Compliance & Barrier Severity                                                                                         |
|-------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5     | No Barrier / Model Practice           | Exceeds minimum metric standard. Highly functional and inclusive design.                                              |
| 4     | Minor Barrier / Acceptable            | Meets minimum metric standard. Fully compliant with no major safety or access issues.                                 |
| 3     | Moderate Barrier / Partial Compliance | Fails one metric (e.g., non-critical signage placement). Requires minor modification.                                 |
| 2     | Major Barrier / Non-Compliant         | Fails a critical metric (e.g., inadequate ramp slope, lack of audible signal). Requires significant redesign.         |
| 1     | High Barrier / Total Exclusion        | Complete failure to meet criteria (e.g., no ramp, total path obstruction). Leads to total exclusion for a user group. |

## Module 4 – RUBRIC

### Rubric for Evaluating Scenario 4: The Urban Development Audit Tool (UDAT)

This rubric is designed as a tool for both continuous learning and final assessment. Beyond providing a score, it is intended to encourage deep self-reflection and constructive peer-to-peer feedback throughout the simulation. We encourage you to use these criteria to evaluate your own progress, and spark team discussions, and refine your design choices to better meet the needs of young persons with disabilities.

| Criteria                                                | 5- Exemplary                                                                                                                                              | 4- Proficient                                                                                                     | 3- Satisfactory                                                                                                        | 2- Needs Improvement                                                                               | 1- Unsatisfactory                                                                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Understanding accessibility criteria and metrics</b> | Demonstrates a deep understanding of how high-level criteria (e.g., Universal Design for Movement) link to specific physical metrics (e.g., ramp slopes). | Clearly identifies criteria and associated metrics for inclusive development with only minor technical omissions. | Provides a basic description of criteria and metrics but struggles to explain the technical relationship between them. | Limited understanding; confuses high-level rules with the specific measurements used for checking. | Fails to identify or explain the criteria and metrics used for inclusive development |
| <b>Data-driven analysis of challenges</b>               | Insightfully analyses current European accessibility challenges using a strictly data-driven approach based on UDAT findings.                             | Analyses challenges with a good understanding of how data-driven evidence supports findings.                      | Offers a general analysis of urban challenges but lacks depth in the data-driven methodology.                          | Provides a superficial analysis with little connection to technical data or recorded evidence.     | Analysis is irrelevant, incorrect, or lacks any data-driven foundation.              |
| <b>Application of regulations in advocacy</b>           | Flawlessly explains how international and European                                                                                                        | Explains the relevance of key instruments to local advocacy                                                       | Mentions relevant instruments but provides a limited explanation of how                                                | Explanations of instruments are vague or fail to link them to the                                  | Fails to explain the relevance of instruments or provides                            |



| Criteria                                   | 5- Exemplary                                                                                                 | 4- Proficient                                                                                       | 3- Satisfactory                                                                                            | 2- Needs Improvement                                                                       | 1- Unsatisfactory                                                                      |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                            | instruments serve as the foundation for local advocacy.                                                      | with a clear understanding of their legal authority.                                                | they empower advocacy efforts.                                                                             | advocacy process.                                                                          | inaccurate information.                                                                |
| <b>Application of the UDAT</b>             | Accurately applies the UDAT to identify complex barriers across pedestrian, transport, and digital services. | Correctly identifies major barriers in most audited sections using the tool's structure.            | Identifies basic accessibility challenges but misses significant barriers in digital or policy categories. | Identifies few barriers and struggles to navigate the specific sections of the Audit Tool. | Fails to identify barriers or cannot apply the Tool to the urban environment.          |
| <b>Technical data translation</b>          | Expertly translates technical observations into precise standardised metrics and quantifiable Impact Scores. | Accurately translates most observations into technical metrics and numerical scores.                | Translates some observations into metrics but lacks consistency in quantifying the severity of exclusion.  | Technical observations are poorly translated into standardised metrics or scores.          | Fails to translate observations into metrics or provide quantifiable data.             |
| <b>Formulation of actionable proposals</b> | Formulates highly actionable, evidence-based proposals grounded in European standards.                       | Develops practical proposals for public authorities that address barriers using technical evidence. | Suggests basic improvements but proposals may lack feasibility or direct grounding in technical standards. | Proposals are vague, impractical, or not clearly linked to the audit findings.             | Does not formulate proposals or suggestions are not grounded in standards or evidence. |