DIGNITY

Digital transport in and for society

D. 4.2 Pilot cases evaluation Report

Date: 7 October 2022   **Version:** Final

Author(s): Boris Lazzarini, Elisabet Roca (UPC)
Contributor(s): Joy Deane (UCAM); Ingo Kollosche (IZT).

Executive summary

This deliverable describes the evaluation of the DIGNITY pilot demonstrations, carried out by the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC). The evaluation process has been applied to the five project pilots across the four DIGNITY pilot regions: Barcelona (ES), Flanders (BE), Ancona (IT), and Tilburg (NL). As part of the bridging phase of the DIGNITY approach, the five projects used complementary methodologies and processes to develop ideas and concepts to bridge the gap at the local/regional level and promote more inclusive digital transport systems, starting from the experience of each case study. Specifically, the processes of Scenario Building (coordinated by the Institute for Futures Studies and Technology Assessment – IZT) and the Inclusive Design Wheel (coordinated by the University of Cambridge – UCAM) were adapted and applied, respectively in relation to the macro and meso/micro level of analysis of the pilots. These participatory-oriented methodologies guided DIGNITY local experiences to identify concepts and services to move towards a more inclusive digital transport environment.

The evaluation process has been based on an ex-post assessment that has been applied transversally to each pilot. The data gathering process integrated quantitative and qualitative information collected from all parties involved (end-users, stakeholders, partners and pilots responsible), specifically through questionnaires addressed to workshop participants and pilot partners, semi-structured interviews and participant observation. The evaluation has been conducted against a concrete set of indicators and KPIs, specific for each methodology employed, previously defined by consensus among the partners involved. The document presents detailed tables (one for each pilot and methodology employed), describing the assessment of each indicator extensively. The final remarks sections summarise the main outcomes and lessons learnt from the pilots.

The evaluation process highlights that, overall, the pilots could correctly apply the two bridging methodologies, despite the complexity and complications arising from COVID restrictions in most partners' countries during the first part of the project. The outputs of the local demonstrations offer relevant and useful insights to understand and improve further applicability of the specific set of tools and methodologies in a different context. Specifically, the evaluation process reveals that the results of local projects can impact the respective local mobility systems to reduce exclusion, promoting improvements of existing services (e.g. in terms of usability and accessibility). Besides, the pilot experiences produced new concepts, integrating inclusive digital and non-digital solutions useful for the vulnerable-to-exclusion groups. This information is valuable to promote advances for upscaling and integrating these methodologies more systemically into the design processes of public transport services.

Document History

Date	Person	Action	Status
09/06/22	Boris Lazzarini	Draft of Scenario Building section	Sent to IZT
15/07/22	Ingo Kollosche	Feedback on Scenario Building section	Sent to UPC
20/09/22	Boris Lazzarini	Draft of Inclusive Design Wheel section	Sent to UCAM
28/09/22	Joy Deane	Feedback on Inclusive Design Wheel section	Sent to UPC
30/09/22	Boris Lazzarini	Draft sent for internal review before submission	Sent to BUAS
03/10/22	Nick van Apeldoorn	Draft reviewed	Sent to UPC
12/10/22	Boris Lazzarini	Final draft	Submitted

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. Dignity Project Summary

The overarching goal of DIGNITY is to foster a sustainable, integrated and user-friendly digital travel ecosystem that improves accessibility and social inclusion, along with the travel experience and daily life of all citizens. The project delves into the digital transport eco-system to grasp the full range of factors that might lead to disparities in the uptake of digitalised mobility solutions by different user groups in Europe. Analysing the digital transition from both a user and provider's perspective, DIGNITY looks at the challenges brought about by digitalisation, to then design, test and validate the DIGNITY approach, a novel concept that seeks to become the 'ABCs for a digital inclusive travel system'. The approach combines proven inclusive design methodologies with the principles of foresight analysis to examine how a structured involvement of all actors - local institutions, market players, interest groups and end users - can help to bridge the digital gap by co-creating more inclusive mobility solutions and by formulating user-centred policy frameworks.

The idea is to support public and private mobility providers in conceiving mainstream digital products or services that are accessible to and usable by as many people as possible, regardless of their income, location, social or health situation or age; and to help policy makers formulate long-term strategies that promote innovation in transport while responding to global social, demographic and economic changes, including the challenges of poverty and migration.

By focusing on and involving end-users throughout the process of designing policies, products, or services, it is possible to reduce social exclusion while boosting new business models and social innovation. The aim of DIGNITY is to provide an innovative decision support tool that can help local and regional decision-makers formulate digitally inclusive policies and strategies, and digital providers design more inclusive products and services.

1.2. Objectives of this deliverable

The deliverable D4.2 aims to present the evaluation of the results and the potential impacts of the different DIGNITY pilot demonstrations, throughout a specific assessment of the activities and actions promoted at a local/regional level to foster more inclusive digital environments and transport services.

The evaluation has been applied transversally to each of the pilots executed, based on the local/regional perspectives, gathering the information from an ex-post assessment. The evaluation process has promoted the involvement of all partners through activities, interviews and the participation of the evaluating team in different local activities. The overall assessment is based on the analysis of the results of the main methodologies employed in the framing phase of the project, namely Scenario Building and Inclusive Design Wheel.

The analysis of pilot experiences, together with the concepts and strategies produced throughout the bridging methodologies is aimed at identifying key aspects for the promotion of further applicability and upscaling of the set of tools and the overall DIGNITY approach. This will contribute to the development of more inclusive transportation systems.

1.3. Outline of this deliverable

This deliverable consists of five sections, including the introduction you just read. The other sections are:

- Section 2 describes the methodology applied to the evaluation process.
- Section 3 details the evaluation related to the application of the Scenario Building methodology.
- Section 4 reports the analysis of the evaluation related to the implementation of the Inclusive Design Wheel process.
- Section 5 includes an overall conclusion of the analysis of pilot cases.

2. Methodology

2.1. Introduction

The evaluation of the results of each case study has been carried out against a concrete set of indicators and KPI, defined by consensus with the research partners of the consortium, respectively related to the methodologies applied in the bridging phase of the project, namely the Scenario Building and the Inclusive Design Wheel. The data collection has been carried out through surveys and semi-structured interviews

The assessment results are described in detail in the KPI tables presented in the following sections, which include a comprehensive evaluation of each KPI of the two methodologies employed. Besides, the tables include emoticons, specific smileys to frowny faces, accompanying the descriptive text. Their function is basically to give the reader a more general impression of the overall performance of each indicator in parallel to the linguistic description. The legend below gives a brief description of the meaning of each emoticon.

Legend - Emoticons		
No particular problems/issues identified - no further action needed	Minor problems/issues identified - specific improvements are suggested	Important problems/issues identified - lack of relevant data/information
🙂 (green)	🙂 (yellow)	☹ (red)

Furthermore, at the end of the assessment of each pilot demonstration, general remarks are reported.

The results of the present evaluation will help to understand and improve the applicability of the tools and methodologies applied at a local level, providing evidence of the barriers and opportunities detected, as well as inputs and suggestions for further advances.

2.2. Scenario Building

The evaluation of the implementation of the Scenario Building (SB) methodology in the four DIGNITY pilots, has been based on specific KPI, included in Table 1. The data to be analysed have been collected from different assessment activities that involved the majority of project partners, as well as external stakeholders, specifically:

i)   Evaluation survey addressed to the participants of the different SB workshops (the structure of the survey can be found in Annex 1);

ii)   Semi-structured interview with project pilots, aimed at discussing aspects related to the SB process as well as aspects specifically related to the assessment of KPIs detailed in Table 1 (the guiding questions of the interview can be found in Annex 2);

iii) Final interview with IZT, who is responsible for implementing SB activities.

In addition, the partners in charge of the evaluation participated in different workshops and activities as observers, in order to get a more precise overview of this methodology and to collect useful information for the assessment.

Table 1. Aspects and KPI related to the assessment of the SB

Specific Objectives	Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*
Involve key stakeholders in the SB process	Have key stakeholders participated in the workshops?	KPI 1.1) **Number** of **key stakeholders** attending the activities. KPI 1.2) **Relevance** of stakeholders attending the activities.	Main key stakeholders (including public administration, transport operators, web/app developers, data management companies, representatives of groups at risk of exclusion, etc.) have attended the workshops.	List of participants in the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys
	Are stakeholders involved, diverse and representatives of different groups at risk of targeted exclusion?	KPI 2) Stakeholders **diversity** and **representativeness**	Representatives of all target groups attended the workshops	List of participants in the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys
	Have the process contributed to the strengthening of cooperation among stakeholders?	KPI 3.1) number of **agreements** among stakeholders. KPI 3.2) number of **extra activities conducted** with vulnerable-to inclusion groups and other stakeholders.	Collaboration among key stakeholders is consolidating around key issues.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.
	Gender representativity	KPI 4.1) **Number of women representatives** of product/ service **providers and public entities**.	Women are well represented among the different stakeholders involved.	List of participants in the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys

| | | KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of **groups at risk of exclusion**.

KPI 4.3) **gender leadership.** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ensure overall quality of scenario results | Are scenarios developed well designed and understandable? | KPI 5) **Clarity/transparency** of scenarios developed | Scenarios are clear and understandable | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. |
| | Are scenarios developed consistent? | KPI 6) **Consistency** scenarios developed | No logical contradictions in the designed scenarios | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. |
| | Are scenarios developed plausible and realistic? | KPI 7) **Plausibility** of scenarios developed | Scenarios are possible, convincing and reasonable | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. |
| | Are strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios relevant to target groups for a digitally inclusive mobility system? | KPI 8) **Relevance of strategies** and **policy recommendations** developed. | Strategies and policy recommendations proposed are focused on groups at risk of exclusion. | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. |
| | To what extent has the process led to the development of relevant tools, policy recommendations or strategies for a digitally inclusive mobility system? | KPI 9) **Relevance** of the SB **process** to develop substantial results. | SB process facilitates the development of relevant results. | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. |

	Have the results been shared transparently and clearly? Has the SB process facilitated collaboration and co-creation activities?	KPI 10.1) Number of **reports/ documents with the results/conclusions** released. KPI 10.2) Number of **return sessions/follow-up meetings** organised	SB process provides insightful results/conclusions that are available/shared with the stakeholders SB process facilitates the creation of alliances/agreements for further collaboration	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.
Foster social learning and empowerment	Have the activities helped participants get a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and its future challenges?	KPI 11) Perception of **personal understanding of mobility ecosystem** and its present and future challenges.	SB provided a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and future challenges.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.
	Have the activities provided participants new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility?	KPI 12) Perception/ appreciation of **new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility**.	SB provided new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.
	Have the activities helped participants learn or better understand the perspective of the other stakeholders involved?	KPI 13) Degree of awareness/ understanding of the **perspectives of the other stakeholders**.	SB fostered learning and understanding of other stakeholders' perspectives.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.
	To what extent do participants feel empowered by the process of managing future planning challenges and tasks?	KPI 14) Perception/appreciation of **empowerment/ capacity** to manage future planning challenges/tasks.	SB process facilitates the development of skills and capacities for future planning management.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.

2.3. Inclusive Design Wheel

The evaluation of the Inclusive Design Wheel (IDW) was based on specific KPIs, described in Table 2. Data for these KPIs were collected using a variety of evaluation activities involving the majority of the pilot partners and external stakeholders (mainly members of the vulnerable-to-exclusion groups targeted in the pilot projects). The evaluation activities were:

i)   Co-creation questionnaire: A questionnaire addressed to participants (end-users) in the co-creation workshops (part of the Stimulate Ideas activity of the IDW), conducted at the end of or soon after the workshops (Annex 3).

ii)   IDW process questionnaire 1: A questionnaire addressed to pilot partners, conducted partway through the IDW process (usually somewhere in the Create phase) (Annex 4).

iii) IDW process questionnaire 2: A questionnaire addressed to pilot partners, conducted at the end of the IDW process (Annex 5).

iv)   Interviews with the pilot: Semi-structured interviews with pilot partners were conducted at the end of the IDW process and aimed at clarifying or deepening the understanding of specific aspects of the process.

Furthermore, the partners in charge of the evaluation analysed the feedback provided by the UCAM team during the different phases of the IDW process.

Table 2. Aspects and KPI related to the assessment of the Inclusive Design Wheel

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*
To what extent has the IDW process been useful for the development of relevant and inclusive digital mobility services?	KPI 1) **Overall Usefulness** of the IDW process by pilot partners for the development of inclusive digital mobility solutions.	The IDW process was useful for helping the pilot teams to develop high quality, relevant and inclusive digital mobility services.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots
To what extent has the material provided been appropriate and helpful for the overall quality of the process and results?	KPI 2) **Usefulness** of the material provided by UCAM (**guidelines D.2.2** and the design **log).**	The material provided to project pilots was appropriate and helpful to ensure the overall quality of the process and the results.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots
Was the support and guidance provided by Dignity partners satisfactory?	KPI 3) Level of satisfaction with the **support and guidance** provided by Dignity partners.	The support and guidance provided by Dignity partners to the different pilots were satisfactory.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots
Are participants in the IDW process representatives of the end user group(s) targeted during the IDW process?	KPI 4) How well was the **target end user group represented during the IDW process?**	Overall, the IDW process ensured a good representation of the targeted group(s).	List of participants in the co-creation workshops Co-creation questionnaire Interviews with pilots
Was the co-creation experience useful/relevant for all actors involved in the workshop?	KPI 5) **Level of satisfaction with the overall co-creation**	All actors involved perceived the overall co-creation	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interview with pilots

	workshop experience for all actors involved.	experience as useful, rich and productive.	
Are the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops useful for addressing inclusiveness?	KPI 6) **Usefulness of the ideas and insights produced** in the co-creation workshops by the different pilots.	The ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops were useful.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interview with pilots
To what extent the concepts/services produced during the IDW can be considered inclusive and appropriate for the needs of the region and target group?	KPI 7) How **inclusive and appropriate are the concepts and services produced** during the IDW process?	The concepts and services produced through the IDW process are inclusive and have the potential to reduce the digital gap.	Interview with pilots/ UCAM IDW deliverables

3. Evaluation of Scenario Building activities

3.1. Ancona
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods	Evidence	Commentaries
Have key stakeholders participated in the workshops?	KPI 1.1) **Number** of **key stakeholders** attending the activities. KPI 1.2) **Relevance** of stakeholders attending the activities.	Main key stakeholders (including public administration, transport operators, web/app developers, data management companies, representatives of groups at risk of exclusion, etc.) have attended the workshops.	List of participants in the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 1) In total, 18 stakeholders participated in the three workshops. Specifically, workshops 1 and 2 counted 12 participants, and workshop 3 counted 14 participants, according to the participant list. KPI 1.2) Overall, the majority of key stakeholders involved represent important categories relating to mobility and digitalisation, specifically: public administration (2 in total, 1 female), transport operators (9 in total, 5 female), web/app developers (1 in total, 0 female) representatives of groups at risk of exclusion (2 in total, 1 female) other business: tourism	The survey was conducted at the end of the second workshop and was completed by 10 people. As for the relevance of stakeholders, all the mentioned categories have key competencies to explore future inclusion trends in mobility. However, the private sector seems overrepresented in public administration. Representatives of the municipality of Ancona's social services / social policy might have contributed with a perspective more focused on broad aspects of inclusion.

				management, sales (3 in total, 2 female), sales and tourism management (3 in total, 1 female). According to the evaluation survey, most respondents (70%) perceived that all relevant stakeholders were present at the workshops."	

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are stakeholders involved diverse and representatives of different groups at risk of exclusion? :-)	KPI 2) Stakeholders' **diversity** and **representativeness**	Representatives of all target groups attended the workshops	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 2) Participant list (comprising total attendants of the 3 workshops): - myCicero- service provider - Head of Department (female) - Comune Ancona - Local Public Authority - Head of the department (female) - myCicero – marketing - Sales Manager (female) - Gest Group – marketing - Marketing Manager (female) - Ikonic - Sales consultants - Administrative and legal manager (female) - Conerobus - Local Transport Operator - Project Assistant (female) - CISL (Italian Confederation of Labor Unions) - Vulnerable user group - General union representative (female) - Fercam – Logistics - Expert Back Office (female) - EPN – Logistics - Logistic Manager (female) - Conerobus - Local Transport Operator - Technical expert (male) - myCicero- service provider - Project Specialist (male) - myCicero- service provider – advisor (male)	The participating institutions/entities attending the SB activities are quite diverse and overall represent the different categories involved in mobility in the pilot of Ancona, specifically: i) Ancona municipality and public administration mainly involved in mobility are represented in the three workshops; ii) The groups at risk of exclusion targeted (it was not a specific category targeted, since public and private transport users are very diverse) were represented by National Deaf Organisation and the Italian Confederation of Labour Unions, which specifically represented vulnerable user groups. iii)

| | | | | - ENS (National Deaf Organization) - Vulnerable user group - President of the province (male)
- PluService - UI/UX - Service Provider - Project Manager (male)
- Comune Ancona - Local Public Authority - Area Mobility Manager (male)
- APT – Tourism - Customer Service Expert (male)
- Conerobus - Local Transport Operator - Technical expert (male) | Private mobility organisations and mobility service providers were well represented among the attendants. More representatives of public social services might have integrated a vision more focused on inclusiveness. Local partners of Ancona also recognised a lack of disabled users, as only a few were present at the workshops, and explained that it was difficult to involve them because of the modality of the workshop as it was online. |

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the process contributed to the strengthening of cooperation among stakeholders? 🙂	KPI 3.1) number of **agreements** among stakeholders. KPI 3.2) number of **extra activities conducted** with vulnerable-to inclusion groups and other stakeholders.	Collaboration among key stakeholders is consolidating around key issues.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 3.1) No agreements have been made among stakeholders yet. KPI 3.2) No extra-activities among the stakeholders / key actors have been conducted.	It was not specifically requested to make agreements or conduct extra activities with key stakeholders. Nonetheless, for evaluation purposes, these aspects can be considered important for the future sustainability of local initiatives once the project is completed. The pilot of Ancona did not lead any of the mentioned activities yet. However, it can be stated that the workshops help participants to connect with key stakeholders. It is worth highlighting that 70% of participants agree that they could strengthen or make new professional connections thanks to the SB activities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Gender representativity	KPI 4.1) **Number of women representatives** of product/ service **providers and public entities**. KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of **groups at risk of exclusion**. KPI 4.3) **gender leadership.**	Women are well represented among the different stakeholders involved.	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	Overall, women represented 52% of the workshops' attendants, which means they were well represented in the activities. KPI 4.1) In total 6 women representatives of public entities and service providers, it can be stated that they are well represented among these categories. KPI 4.2) Only 1 (over 2 representatives of vulnerable to exclusion groups) woman represented a group at risk of exclusion, specifically a member of the Italian Confederation of Labor Unions (CISL), representing vulnerable user group. KPI 4.3) Gender leadership: looking at the role of the female attendants, it can be stated that 6 out of 9 have a leadership role in the department they're working. The working positions include head of department of public and private entities, as well as lead managers etc. Other positions include female programme and lead managers, a social designer etc. It can be infer that overall they can make key decisions that somehow impact how the entity/company where they operates.	Overall, it can be stated for the pilot of Ancona that women were well represented in the SB activities in all categories analysed and that private entities had great representation. Furthermore, gender leadership can be assessed positively.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are scenarios developed well designed and understandable?	KPI 5) **Clarity/ transparency** of scenarios developed	Scenarios are clear and understandable	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 5) According to the evaluation surveys, the three scenarios developed (Green and Smart; Oriented to e-car; and 'Partnership between public and private entities') are perceived by participants as "well designed and understandable" (≈90% agree or strongly agree with the statement: the scenario created are well designed and understandable). The interview with Ancona's partners confirms this overall perception of participants.	Overall, the scenario developed can be considered well designed and understandable; nonetheless, the focus of scenarios should have been more specifically on the digital aspects of the mobility system.
Are scenarios developed consistent?	KPI 6) **Consistency** scenarios developed	No logical contradictions in the designed scenarios	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 6) Considering the assessment of the indicators focusing on the clarity/understandability and plausibility to the co-created scenarios, it can be reasonably deduced that the 3 scenarios developed were consistent (namely, with no evident logical contradictions). Ancona's partners pointed out that the work developed with participants tried to avoid any inconsistency or contradiction. Specifically, the key drivers were assessed by experts from each relevant area, ensuring a clear comprehension, consistency and plausibility.	No specific question on the consistency of the scenarios was included in the evaluation survey. The interviews did not highlight inconsistency problems but the need to focus more specifically on digital aspects of mobility.

| Are scenarios developed plausible and realistic? | KPI 7) **Plausibility** of scenarios developed | Scenarios are possible, convincing and reasonable | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. | KPI 7) All survey respondents (100%) answered that the three scenarios developed were plausible and realistic. The interview with the pilot region supports this result by saying that the first scenario (Green and smart) may be slightly more positive/optimistic than it is realistic. However, the other two scenarios (Oriented to e-car and Partnership between public and private entities) are more realistic than positive. Ancona pilot strives to achieve the first scenario (Green and smart). | No further comments. |

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios relevant to target groups for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 8) **Relevance of strategies** and **policy recommendations** developed.	Strategies and policy recommendations proposed are focused on groups at risk of exclusion.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 8) The feedback received on the specific question of the evaluation survey focusing on the relevance of the strategies and policies recommendation proposed by the group of participants is clear and positive. In fact, all respondents of the survey (100%) answered that strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios were relevant to target groups for a digitally inclusive mobility system.	No further comments.

				KPI 9) Diverse parts of the evaluation survey, relating to the learning results and the quality of the results, help assessing this specific indicator specifically: - 100% of the survey respondents state that they felt (agree or strongly agree on the fact) that the right topics were discussed during the SB activities. - 90% of the respondents perceive that the SB process helped to converge diverse participants perspectives. The other 10% neither agrees nor disagrees on this statement. - 100% of the respondents perceive that differences among participants were addressed in a constructive manner. No negative comments were made about this process. The open questions of the survey support this as well, mentioning only positive aspects such as the "Possibility of open dialogue" and the "Interactivity and sharing". This overall perception of relevance of the SB process is confirmed by Ancona pilot region partners.	
To what extent has the process led to the development of relevant tools, policy recommendations or strategies for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 9) **Relevance** of the SB **process** for the development of substantial results.	SB process facilitate the development of relevant results.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.		The process itself has been developed correctly, the main concern is about the content/topics discussed. Even though all respondents felt that the right topics were discussed, it is considered that the focus of the activities was not specifically on the digital aspects of the mobility system.

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the results been shared transparently and clearly? Has the SB process facilitated collaboration and co-creation activities?	KPI 10.1) Number of **reports/ documents** with the results/ conclusions released. KPI 10.2) Number of **return sessions/follow-up meetings** organised	SB process provides insightful results/conclusions that are available/ shared with the stakeholders SB process facilitates the creation of alliances/ agreements for further collaboration	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 10.1) The workshop's outcome has been shared with all participants through self-explaining videos. "The three different scenarios developed are represented in videos uploaded on YouTube: a. Green and Smart https://youtu.be/nshkAWSIcbQ b. Oriented to e-car https://youtu.be/-9225F0q53w c. The partnership between public and private entities https://youtu.be/XcINBDzHZxY They are contained in the document 'Guide for recommendations', which is a direct outcome of the DIGNITY project by the Ancona pilot region. KPI 10.2) There has been no follow-up session yet.	It was not specifically requested to make extra activities with stakeholders, follow-up/return sessions, or specific dissemination of the results. Nonetheless, for evaluation purposes, these aspects can be considered important to maximise the impact of the activity among key stakeholders. Three videos have been created describing in detail the scenarios. The importance of the dissemination of the results in order to generate impact or simply for the need to keep informed the stakeholders is pointed out with suggestions of improvement: "I'm not an expert so I don't know what to say. it would only be interesting to know if and when these actions will be implemented"; and "Have more concrete answers from the municipality on the dates of when these new actions will really be possible"

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: FOSTER SOCIAL LEARNING AND EMPOWERMENT

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the activities helped participants get a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and its future challenges?	KPI 11) Perception of **personal understanding of mobility ecosystem** and its present and future challenges.	SB provided a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and future challenges.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 11) 90% of the survey respondents stated that their understanding of mobility and future challenges has greatly improved after participating in the workshops. Considering the professional background of most participants, most of them mobility experts, this can be considered a relevant result.	A survey respondent mentioned the need for a greater in-depth study of the issues to gain more knowledge on the subjects presented as an answer to the open question. But, aside from this, the survey and the interview results were positive on this topic.
Have the activities provided participants new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility?	KPI 12) Perception/appreciation of **new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility**.	SB provided new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 12) Pilot partners pointed out that workshops tried to provide new information on digital inclusion in mobility from the digital and inclusive departments of the municipality. This worked, as 90% of the survey respondents stated that the SB process provided them with new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility. The other 10% neither agree nor disagree with this statement. This perception contrasts with the content of the activities, which was not specifically focused on digital inclusion in mobility.	As commented earlier on previous indicators, the main focus of workshops' activities could have been more specific on the mobility system's digital aspects.

Have the activities helped participants to learn or have a better understanding of the perspective of the other stakeholders involved?	KPI 13) Degree of awareness/ understanding of the **perspectives of the other stakeholders**.	SB fostered learning and understanding of other stakeholders' perspectives.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 13) The exchange of information on future plans from each stakeholder was helpful and useful for getting a better idea of the perspectives. Even with the hurdle of doing the workshops fully online, all (100%) of the survey respondents stated that they had gotten a better understanding of the perspective of the other stakeholders.	No further comments.
To what extent do participants feel empowered by the process of managing future planning challenges and tasks?	KPI 14) Perception/ appreciation of **empowerment/ capacity** to manage future planning challenges/tasks.	SB process facilitates the development of skills and capacities for future planning management.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 14) The empowerment or the acquisition of specific capabilities by participants was out of the scope of the SB methodology. The partners of the pilot of Ancona highlight that, even if it is hard to say the SB activities empowered that participant, they sure have acquired valuable knowledge about the digitalisation in transport and problems that may cause, as well as about the future of mobility in Ancona. Besides, the activities and discussions with other stakeholders gave participants a better understanding of the perspectives of other stakeholders in the mobility field.	No further comments.

FINAL REMARKS – ANCONA:

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Capacity to **involve key stakeholders in the SB process**

- Overall, SB activities carried out in Ancona involved relevant and diverse stakeholders, representing the diversity of actors with the capacity to influence the digitalisation trend in mobility and promote inclusion.
- The private sector seemed to be overrepresented concerning public administration and social services / social policy representatives. More representatives of public social services might have integrated a vision more focused on digital inclusiveness.
- Women were well represented in the SB activities in all categories analyzed, having private entities the greatest representation. Gender leadership – namely female attendants holding working positions whose decisions have an impact in the entity/company where they operate – overall is assessed positively since most of them have leading roles in respective entities.

Capacity to **ensure the overall quality of scenario results**

- The overall quality of the scenarios developed had a good assessment in terms of clarity, consistency and plausibility. Nonetheless, the activities of the workshops and the respective scenarios developed should have been more focused on digital inclusion in mobility. Overall, the co-created scenarios can be considered relevant for the municipality of Ancona, which is in the process of integrating some of the strategies resulting from the SB activities in the policy debate.
- The strategies and recommendations developed through the results of scenarios can be considered significant in general terms, but they should have been more focused on a digitally inclusive mobility system. The groups targeted were diverse: visually impaired people, people with reduced mobility, the elderly, people with low income, migrants, etc. Specific actions are already being taken to improve the digital inclusion of these groups.

Capacity to **foster social learning and empowerment**

- Considering the fact that the empowerment of participants was not an objective of the SB process, it is worth highlighting that SB activities contributed to promoting social-learning on new aspects related to inclusiveness and awareness-raising on the need of inclusion in mobility.
- The SB process has favoured awareness raising on the topic of digitalization and the digital gap in mobility, as well as a better understanding of the perspective of other stakeholders involved, specifically vulnerable-to-inclusion groups.
- Feedback to key stakeholders involved in the process was given through videos describing the different scenarios developed in detail.

3.2. Barcelona Metropolitan Area

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods	Evidence	Commentaries
Have key stakeholders participated in the workshops?	KPI 1.1) **Number** of **key stakeholders** attending the activities. KPI 1.2) **Relevance** of stakeholders attending the activities.	Main key stakeholders (including public administration, transport operators, web/app developers, data management companies, representatives of groups at risk of exclusion, etc.) have attended the workshops.	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 1.1) In total, 21 stakeholders participated in the three workshops. Overall, the same people participated to the different workshops, with slight differences among workshops. KPI 1.2) It can be stated that overall the key stakeholders involved in SB activities represent relevant categories for the discussion on improving the digital mobility gap. According to the evaluation survey, the majority of respondents (94%) perceived that all relevant stakeholders were present at the workshops. As a matter of fact, important managing positions represented the main public administration departments and public companies /entities related to mobility and digitalisation in Barcelona	The number of participants in each workshop was correct to maximise the participation in the activities of the attendants. 17 people completed the evaluation form because there were fewer participants at the last workshop. Regarding the relevance of the stakeholders, it is worth highlighting the presence of members of high/senior positions in Catalan public administration and key transport public companies in Cataluña. Furthermore, diverse regional key associations and organisations represented the categories at risk of exclusion. Some commentaries of improvement remarked the

				metropolitan area (stakeholders are detailed in the next indicators). Also, the stakeholders of the categories at risk of exclusion in transport cognitive impaired, sensorial impaired, elderly, and people with low income) were relevant and well represented.	need to integrate the political side: " it could have been positive to incorporate the political part of the administration, which in the end is the decision".

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are stakeholders involved diverse and representatives of different groups at risk of targeted exclusion?	KPI 2) Stakeholders **diversity** and **representativeness**	Representatives of all target groups attended the workshops	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 2) Participant list (comprising total attendants of the 3 workshops): - Government of Catalonia; Head of road public transport service (Female) - Municipality of Barcelona; ICT Agent (Female) - Barcelona Metropolitan Area – AMB; Responsible for the department of the public transport fares (Female) - Transport Metropolitan Authority – ATM; Director of the area of systems and innovation (Female) - Transport Metropolitan Authority – ATM; Head of transport management (Male) - RENFE (Public company - Ministry of Public Works and Transport); Technician for technology and systems (Female) - Metropolitan Transports of Barcelona – TMB; Responsible for strategy and digital channels (Male) - Metropolitan Transports of Barcelona – TMB; Technician - transformation of digital channels (Male) - Metropolitan Transports of Barcelona – TMB; Consultant on the digital gap (Male)	The participating institutions/entities are quite diverse and very representative of the different categories involved in mobility in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area, specifically: i) The government of the autonomous region of Catalonia, as well as regional and municipal public administration involved in mobility and policy development, were well represented in the three workshops; ii) Different groups at risk of exclusion targeted (cognitive impaired, sensorial impaired, elderly, people with low income) were well represented in all workshops.

| | | | | - Municipal Services of Barcelona - B:SM; Director of strategic and transversal projects (Male)
- Factual consulting; Managing partner (Male)
- Public Transport Promotion – PTP; Representative (Female)
- Barcelona City Council - Advisory Council for Elderly People; Member of the advisory board for elderly people (Male)
- Caritas; Representative / Technician (Poverty)(Female)
- DINCAT (cognitive impairment association); Representative (Male)
- DINCAT (cognitive impairment association); Representative (Male)
- ACIC - Catalan association for the integration of blind people; Representative / Technician (Female)
- Polytechnic University of Catalonia; University professor - mobility expert (Male)
- Barcelona Regional; Head of mobility studies - mobility expert (Female)
- Barcelona Regional; Mobility Technician (Male)
- Barcelona Regional; Mobility Technician (Female) | iii) Public and private mobility organisation (through important public companies such as RENFE, the Transport Metropolitan Authority, Metropolitan Transport of Barcelona, etc.) were also well represented among the attendants.

Among the positive aspects highlighted: 'Great participation and a good representation of the mobility ecosystem and groups with the potential to be excluded by the digital gap'. |

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the process contributed to the strengthening of cooperation among stakeholders?	KPI 3.1) number of **agreements** among stakeholders. KPI 3.2) number of **extra activities conducted** with vulnerable-to inclusion groups and other stakeholders.	Collaboration among key stakeholders is consolidating around key issues.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 3.1) No agreements have been subscribed among stakeholders. KPI 3.2) No extra activities among the stakeholders/ key actors have been conducted. Overall, it can be stated that the collaboration among key stakeholders is consolidating thanks to SB activities. ≈75% of the survey respondents stated that they strengthened or made new connections for their professional network.	It was not specifically requested to make agreements or conduct extra activities with key stakeholders. Nonetheless, for the evaluation purposes these aspects can be considered important for the future sustainability of local initiatives, once the project is completed. The pilot of Barcelona did not promote any of the mentioned activities yet (further activities are planned at a later stage), even though continuity was explicitly requested by participants, as shown by quotes below: - 'More types of workshops like these should be done'. - 'Good work has been done and we all agree that it should be given continuity!'

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Gender representativity	KPI 4.1) **Number of women representatives** of product/ service **providers and public entities**. KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of **groups at risk of exclusion**. KPI 4.3) **gender leadership.**	Women are well represented among the different stakeholders involved.	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	Overall, women represented 48% of the workshops' attendants. KPI 4.1) Female representatives of product/ service providers and public entities were overall well represented in workshops: in total 7 women representatives of these categories. KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of groups at risk of exclusion: 3 women, respectively representatives of public transport promotion, people with low income and for the integration of blind people. KPI 4.3) Gender leadership: the working positions indicated include high/senior positions for most female attendants, implying the possibility to make key decisions that impact how the entity/company operates. The others are overall expert in the mobility field.	Overall, women were well represented in the SB activities of the pilot based in Barcelona, and public entities had a great representation. It is remarked the fact that a relevant number of women have a leading position in respecting affiliated public entities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are scenarios developed well designed and understandable?	KPI 5) **Clarity/ transparency** of scenarios developed	Scenarios are clear and understandable	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 5) According to the evaluation surveys, the three scenarios developed (respectively named: CONTINUITY, A LOST OPPORTUNITY, A SEA OF CONTRADICTIONS) are perceived by participants as "well designed and understandable" (≈ 76% agree or strongly agree with the statement: the scenario created are well designed and understandable). The members of the Barcelona pilot pointed out the efforts for a clear design of the scenarios.	No further comments.
Are scenarios developed consistent?	KPI 6) **Consistency** scenarios developed	No logical contradictions in the designed scenarios	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 6) Considering the answers provided in the evaluation survey regarding clarity/understandability and plausibility of the co-created scenarios, it can be inferred that the 3 scenarios developed were consistent. Besides, no contradictions were specifically pointed out by the interviewed pilot partners.	No specific question on the consistency of the scenarios was included in the evaluation survey. Therefore, the interview with IZT has specifically integrated the information on consistency.

| Are scenarios developed plausible and realistic? | KPI 7) **Plausibility** of scenarios developed | Scenarios are possible, convincing and reasonable | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. | KPI 7) According to the evaluation survey, the scenarios created are possible and reasonable. The survey answers support this statement, as 71% of the respondents answered that the 3 scenarios developed were plausible and realistic.

The interview at Barcelona partners confirms the respondents' perception, pointing out that special efforts were made to ensure the plausibility of the different scenarios. | No further comments. |

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios relevant for target groups for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 8) **Relevance of strategies and policy recommendations** developed.	Strategies and policy recommendations proposed are focused on groups at risk of exclusion.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 8) The respondents gave positive feedback on the evaluation survey focusing on the relevance of the strategies and policy recommendations. ≈ 88% of the survey participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios were relevant for target groups for future digitally inclusive mobility systems. Barcelona pilot also reported that strategies and policy recommendations developed from the SB process were relevant for digital inclusion in mobility.	The evaluation survey reported positive comments of participants on the relevance of the knowledge produced during SB activities: "The knowledge produced is politically useful. It would be a shame not to take enough advantage of it at the European level". Other participants remarked the lack policy makers to workshops' activities: "I think it could have been positive to incorporate the political part of the administration, which in the end is the decision".

To what extent has the process led to the development of relevant tools, policy recommendations or strategies for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 9) **Relevance** of the SB **process** to develop substantial results.	SB process facilitates the development of relevant results.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 9) Different questions of the evaluation survey are useful to frame this specific indicator respectively related to the learning results and the quality of the results, specifically: - ≈ 94% of the survey respondents stating that they felt (agree or strongly agree with the fact) that the right topics were discussed during the SB activities. - ≈ 82% of the respondents perceive that the SB process helped to converge diverse participants' perspectives. - ≈ 94% of the respondents perceived that differences among participants were addressed appropriately. Comments and suggestions from the surveys confirm these perceptions	Participants acknowledged the relevance of the SB process and the interaction with diverse agents, expressing willingness to maintain collaboration and to continue participation in order to address future challenges: - "The interaction and the process have been the most enriching. The participants have been open to continue participating and to maintain the community." - "The knowledge produced is politically useful. It would be a shame not to take enough advantage of it at the European level"

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the results been shared transparently and clearly? Has the SB process facilitated collaboration and co-creation activities?	KPI 10.1) Number of **reports/ documents** with the results/ conclusions released. KPI 10.2) Number of **return sessions/follow-up meetings** organised	SB process provides insightful results/conclusions that are available/ shared with the stakeholders SB process facilitates the creation of alliances/ agreements for further collaboration	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 10.1) A document including general conclusions of the experience, integrating the policy recommendations from the SB activity, has been released as feedback for participants. KPI 10.2) Yet, no follow-up meetings or specific dissemination of the results occurred. Pilot partners highlight their interest in promoting at a later stage follow-up activity with key stakeholders.	It was not specifically requested to make extra activities with stakeholders, follow-up/return sessions, or specific dissemination of the results. Nonetheless, for evaluation purposes, these aspects can be considered important to maximise the impact of the activity among key stakeholders. The pilot has released a document with the overall conclusions and recommendations for the attending stakeholders. No specific dissemination or follow-up activities have been promoted yet. Commentaries of improvement highlight the importance of feedback for participants, as well as dissemination: - "I would like to be able to see a report or the conclusions drawn from the workshop. I hope you get it for the participants." - "A return session (after a few months or weeks) to know the impact of the workshops carried out" - "More types of workshops like these should be done." - "...we all agree that it should be given continuity!" - To be improved: "Communication and dissemination of the workshop and the results"

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: FOSTER SOCIAL LEARNING AND EMPOWERMENT

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the activities helped participants get a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and its future challenges?	KPI 11) Perception of **personal understanding of mobility ecosystem** and its present and future challenges.	SB provided a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and future challenges.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 11) According to the evaluation survey ≈ , 76% of the respondents stated that their understanding of future mobility challenges has greatly improved. This percentage is quite high because many attendants are experts in the field with a great understanding of mobility and its future challenges. The interview highlighted that the diversity of stakeholders and perspectives was especially relevant in understanding future challenges.	No further comments.

Have the activities provided participants with new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility?	KPI 12) Perception/ appreciation of **new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility**.	SB provided new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 12) According to the evaluation survey ≈ 76% of the survey respondents stated that the SB process provides them with new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility.

The interview confirmed this perception; the partners of the Barcelona pilot pointed out that most participants were aware of possible problems related to digital inclusion in mobility, mainly related to physical impairment. Nonetheless, they realised the relevance and full extent of the problem during SB activities. The SB activities have raised awareness of the importance of this issue. | No further comments. |
| Have the activities helped participants to learn or have a better understanding of the perspective of the other stakeholders involved? | KPI 13) Degree of awareness/ understanding of the **perspectives of the other stakeholders**. | SB fostered learning and understanding of other stakeholders' perspectives. | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. | KPI 13) According to the evaluation survey ≈ , 82% of the respondents stated that they better understand the other stakeholders' perspectives.

Barcelona partners support this perception through the semi-structured interview, which highlighted the appreciation of the participants of the integration in the workshops of different stakeholders' profiles as well as different views/perspectives on the digitalisation in mobility. | Different commentaries reported in the evaluation survey as positive aspects highlight the appreciation of stakeholders' diversity and their contribution.

- Confluence of different profiles of interest
- The quality of the contributions and the diversity of origins of the |

					participants - Active process and the involvement of all sectors - … the very positive intention of trying to reflect different points of view in the development of the workshop.
To what extent do participants feel empowered by the process of managing future planning challenges and tasks?	KPI 14) Perception/ appreciation of **empowerment/ capacity** to manage future planning challenges/tasks.	SB process facilitates the development of skills and capacities for future planning management.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 14) The empowerment or the acquisition of specific capabilities by participants was out of the scope of the SB methodology. According to the evaluation survey and the inputs of the partners of the Barcelona pilot, reported in the interview, participants have acquired along the process: i) specific knowledge related to some aspects of the digital gap in mobility and groups at risk of exclusion ii) a better understanding of the perspectives to other stakeholders involved iii) knowledge of future challenges related to mobility sector	No further comments.

FINAL REMARKS – BARCELONA METROPOLITAN AREA:

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Capacity to **involve key stakeholders in the SB process**

- The workshop activities involved very relevant and diverse stakeholders, representing government of the autonomous region of Catalonia, as well as the main regional and municipal public administration involved in mobility and digitalisation. Also, different vulnerable-to-exclusion groups were well represented.
- Overall, high/leading positions attended the activities, especially of the public administration and key public-private companies of the mobility sector. This participation was reflected in the quality of the scenarios and recommendations.
- Women were well represented in the scenario-building activities in the different categories attending, having public entities the greatest representation. Female attending hold key working positions whose decisions have an impact, not only in the entity/company where they operate but also in the general mobility sector. Therefore, gender leadership has a very good assessment.

Capacity to **ensure the overall quality of scenario results**

- Despite the initial uncertainty of the partners of Barcelona, specifically about the political significance of the SB process, eventually the three scenarios co-created had a very good assessment in terms of clarity, consistency and plausibility. It is worth pointing out that a particular effort has been made to take a set of future complex challenges into consideration that involve local and global actors (climate crisis, economic crisis, increasing social inequalities etc.) in the future of digitalisation in mobility, and how this can be reflected into a better promotion of inclusiveness.
- The strategies and policy recommendations proposed through the process are considered relevant for promoting more digitally inclusive mobility systems and for specific policy developments that aim to integrate all users potentially affected by the digital gap in mobility. Regretfully, no efforts have been made to disseminate results and recommendations.

Capacity to **foster social learning and empowerment**

- The participants of the SB activities were for the majority experts from the mobility sector, having prior knowledge of the problem of digital gap in mobility. However, the activities contributed to raising awareness of specific issues experienced by vulnerable-to-exclusion groups targeted and to create specific knowledge on the current extent and complexity of the problem, as well as the importance of properly addressing its future challenges.
- The evaluation survey responses highlighted both the political relevance of the results and the expectation of the participant's continuity of this process (maintaining the community created through the workshops, promoting advocacy at higher levels, promoting activities involving the political part etc.). Regretfully, no further actions have been promoted by local partners despite a clear interest expressed by the stakeholders.

3.3. Flanders
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods	Evidence	Commentaries
Have key stakeholders participated in the workshops?	KPI 1.1) **Number** of **key stakeholders** attending the activities. KPI 1.2) **Relevance** of stakeholders attending the activities.	Main key stakeholders (including public administration, transport operators, web/app developers, data management companies, representatives of groups at risk of exclusion, etc.) have attended the workshops.	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 1.1) In total, 19 stakeholders participated in the three workshops. Specifically, workshop 1 counted 15 participants. Workshop 2 had 14 participants and workshop 3 counted 7 participants, according to the participants list. Only three people attended all the workshops, the majority attended just the first two. KPI 1.2) Overall, the majority of key stakeholders involved represent important categories relating to mobility, in its current trend towards digitalisation, with the social issue of digital divide in the SB activities. According to the evaluation survey, the majority of respondents (≈64%) perceived that all relevant stakeholders were present at the workshops.	The number of participants in each workshop was correct to maximise the participation in the activities of the attendants. Only 11 people completed the evaluation form because there were fewer participants at the last workshop. Regarding the relevance of the stakeholders, it is worth highlighting the presence of members of Flanders' government, mobility and policy departments. Furthermore, diverse Flemish associations and organisations represented the categories at risk of exclusion. Nonetheless, no specific organisation or representative of elderly people participated. It is worth highlighting some commentaries of improvement that pointed out the need to maximise the participation of groups at risk targeted: i) "Accessible

					communication - broader target group representation (more on the basis of digital skills)" and ii) "Digital cooperation offers opportunities, but can also exclude groups. Important for a process around digital inclusion. It might be interesting to ask some of the questions to digitally less fit people as well". They point out the need to integrate members of vulnerable-to-excusion groups in the activities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are stakeholders involved diverse and representatives of different groups at risk of exclusion? 🙂	KPI 2) Stakeholder's **diversity** and **representativeness**	Representatives of all target groups attended the workshops	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 2) Participant list (comprising total attendants of the 3 workshops): -Gezinsbond (Family organisation) – policy advisor (male) -Gezinsbond (Family organisation) – attachee (female) -Extern (Mobility organisation) – product owner (female) -ESINCOR (Mobility organisation) – project manager (male) -VFG (Association disabled people) – (female) Mobiel21 – (female) -De Lijn (Public transport company Flanders) – coordinator accessibility (male) -MOW (Policy department) – policy development (female) -Intern TomorrowLab (Advice on accessibility) – advisor (female) -Intern TomorrowLab (Advice on accessibility) – advisor (male) -Extern (Mobility organization) – data and process engineer (male) -MOW (mobility organization) – project manager (female) -VVSG (Flemish association cities and villages) – staff member (male)	The participating institutions/entities are quite diverse and overall represent the different categories involved in mobility in the Flanders region, specifically: i) Flanders government and public administration involved in mobility and policy development are well represented in the three workshops; ii) The groups at risk of exclusion targeted (elderly people) represented by specific organisations that attended the activities – addressed to people with mental issues, disabled people etc. No specific association of 'elderly people' is mentioned, nonetheless more generic social organisation operating in the Flemish

| | | | | -VVSG (Flemish association cities and villages) – coordinator (male)
-VVSG (Flemish association cities and villages) – coordinator (male)
-Onze Nieuwe Toekomst (Organisation for people with mental issues) – director (male)
-MOW (Flanders governement) – project leader (female)
-De Werkvennootschap (Social work Flanders) – mobility manager (male)
-MOW (transport regional management – manager (male)
-Zonhoven (Management transport region) – chairman (male) | territory, such as 'families' association' and an 'association of cities and villages could have well represented this specific category at risk of exclusion. iii) Public and private mobility organisations are also represented among the attendants. |
| | | | | | |

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the process contributed to the strengthening of cooperation among stakeholders?	KPI 3.1) number of **agreements** among stakeholders. KPI 3.2) number of **extra activities conducted** with vulnerable-to exclusion groups and other stakeholders.	Collaboration among key stakeholders is consolidating around key issues.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 3.1) No agreements have been subscribed among stakeholders. KPI 3.2)No extra activities have been conducted among the stakeholders / key actors	It was not specifically requested to make agreements or conduct extra activities with key stakeholders. Nonetheless, for evaluation purposes, these aspects can be considered important for the future sustainability of local initiatives once the project is completed. The pilot of Flanders did not promote any of the mentioned activities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Gender representativity 🙂	KPI 4.1) **Number of women representatives** of product/ service **providers and public entities**. KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of **groups at risk of exclusion**. KPI 4.3) **gender leadership**.	Women are well represented among the different stakeholders involved.	List of participants in the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	Overall women represented 40% of the workshops' attendants. KPI 4.1) Women representatives of product/ service providers and public entities: in total 6 women representatives of these categories. Public entities and service providers are well represented among female participants. KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of groups at risk of exclusion: only 1 woman, an expert in social work in the Flanders region. KPI 4.3) Gender leadership: the working positions indicated include product/service owners, project leaders, policy developers etc. From the data collected, it is unclear if the women participating have working positions implying the possibility to make key decisions that impact how the entity/company operates. Nonetheless, it can be stated that women participants are experts in the mobility field.	In general, women were well represented in the SB activities, and public entities had great representation. On the other side, it is worth pointing out that the targeted groups at risk of exclusion have mainly a male representation.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are scenarios developed well designed and understandable?	KPI 5) **Clarity/ transparency** of scenarios developed	Scenarios are clear and understandable	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 5) It is important to point out that the SB method was adapted in order that previous foresight results could be used. According to the evaluation surveys, the four scenarios developed (DIGI-COSMOS, FLEXI-MAXI, CONSCIOUS-LOCAL, OPTI CONNECT) are perceived by participants as "well designed and understandable" (≈ 80% agree or strongly agree with the statement: the scenario created are well designed and understandable). Furthermore, the interview with Flanders pilot members confirmed this perception.	It is worth highlighting that the SB process was conducted differently than the other three pilot regions since Flanders already conducted foresight activities in 2019. As part of a future visioning process for department MOW, 4 contextual future scenarios were created in 2019 that outlines a possible context of mobility in Flanders. Therefore, the scenarios already existed. The SB technique also differed from the methodology used in DIGNITY. The two most important key factors (social value and mobility needs) with their extreme values were used to develop the future space. According to the survey, the interview, and the IZT report, the 4 scenarios are very understandable and related to 2 clear axes: mobility need and social value.

Are scenarios developed consistent?	KPI 6) **Consistency** scenarios developed	No logical contradictions in the designed scenarios	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 6) Considering the answers provided in the evaluation survey regarding clarity/understandability and plausibility to the co-created scenarios, it can be inferred that the 4 scenarios developed were consistent. Besides, no contradictions were specifically pointed out by the pilot partners interviewed.	No specific question on the consistency of the scenarios was included in the evaluation survey. Therefore, the interview with IZT has specifically integrated the information on consistency.
Are scenarios developed plausible and realistic?	KPI 7) **Plausibility** of scenarios developed	Scenarios are possible, convincing and reasonable	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 7) According to the evaluation survey, the scenarios created are possible and reasonable. The survey answers support this statement, as 80% of the respondents answered that the 4 scenarios developed were plausible and realistic. The description of the pilot partner, Flanders, during the interview endorses the respondents' perception of the survey, pointing out that not only the future assumption on digitalisation are possible, but also the described effect on mobility in Flanders.	No further comments.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios relevant to target groups for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 8) **Relevance of strategies and policy recommendations** developed.	Strategies and policy recommendations proposed are focused on groups at risk of exclusion.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 8) The pilot region received very positive feedback on the specific question of the evaluation survey focusing on the relevance of the strategies and policies recommendation proposed: ≈ 90% of the survey participants agreed or strongly agreed on the statement that strategies and policy recommendations propsed through scenarios were relevant for target groups for future digitally inclusive mobility system. The interview with Flanders project partners highlighted that 10 recommendations were formulated: 3 on micro, 3 on meso and 4 on the macro level and that they were all linked to a DIGNITY framework dimension and completely relevant for the groups at risk targeted.	Two commentaries were reported in the evaluation survey, related to the aspects to be improved: i) "Policy recommendations were only a short part compared to the rest of the steps. Involving even more target groups" and ii) "Step to policy recommendation during a workshop is not evident. Requires more time and reflection. Result is therefore rather a first impulse/direction". These comments do not lessen the validity of the overall perception of the relevance of strategies and policy recommendations resulting from SB activities; however, they point out that more reflection is needed to tailor recommendations on specific territorial aspects.

To what extent has the process led to the development of relevant tools, policy recommendations or strategies for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 9) **Relevance** of the SB **process** for the development of substantial results.	SB process facilitate the development of relevant results.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 9) Different questions of the evaluation survey are useful to frame this specific indicator respectively related to the learning results and the quality of the results, specifically: - 80% of the survey respondents stating that they felt (agree or strongly agree with the fact) that the right topics were discussed during the SB activities. - ≈73% of the respondents perceive that the SB process helped to converge diverse participants' perspectives. - 100% of the respondents perceive that difference among participants was addressed constructively. The overall perception of the relevance of the SB process for the results achieved was confirmed by pilot partners. They remarked in the interview that the overall process was especially relevant for the development of the scenarios through 'vulnerable-to-exclusion glasses'. The answers to the open question of the evaluation survey provide	The relevance of the topics discussed, the ability to make converging diverse perspectives throughout the process and to address the difference among participants can be taken as Evidence of the relevance of the SB process. Also, it is worth highlighting the fact that the activities counted with the coordination of Tomorrowlab, a company expert in foresight activities and digital transformation. This helped to maximise the results' participation and relevance with on-line activities. Respondents highlighted: i) the broad involvement of stakeholders, ii) the thorough, methodical approach, iii) the respectful, high quality and creative guidance to the thinking exercises. On the other side, as pointed out earlier for the first indicator, participants highlight a broader target group representation as a

				interesting information, in part confirming a positive vision and overall relevance of the SB process. However, some aspects of the process need to be improved according to the participants.	point of improvement. Besides, it was remarked that due to the online modality it was not easy have good discussions.

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the results been shared transparently and clearly? Has the SB process facilitated collaboration and co-creation activities?	KPI 10.1) Number of **reports/ documents** with the results/ conclusions released. KPI 10.2) Number of **return sessions/follow-up meetings** organised	SB process provides insightful results/conclusions that are available/ shared with the stakeholders SB process facilitates creating of alliances/ agreements for further collaboration	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 10.1) There has been no specific publications unless extended reporting by Tomorrowlab (the company expert in foresight activities that supervised the workshops). KPI 10.2) No follow-up meetings took place or specific dissemination of the results.	It was not specifically requested to make extra activities with stakeholders, follow-up/return sessions, or specific dissemination of the results. Nonetheless, for evaluation purposes, these aspects can be considered important to maximise the impact of the activity among key stakeholders. The pilot of Flanders did not promote any of the mentioned activities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: FOSTER SOCIAL LEARNING AND EMPOWERMENT

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the activities helped participants get a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and its future challenges?	KPI 11) Perception of **personal understanding of mobility ecosystem** and its present and future challenges.	SB provided a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and future challenges.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 11) According to the evaluation survey ≈ , 65% of the respondents stated that their understanding of future mobility challenges has greatly improved. This percentage is quite high, considering many attendants already understand mobility and its challenges. According to the interview, the approach gave the pilot region a wide range of different and relevant elements. Interviews pointed out that the overall experience was relevant in understanding present problems and future challenges.	No further comments.

Have the activities provided participants with new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility?	KPI 12) Perception/ appreciation of **new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility**.	SB provided new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 12) According to the evaluation survey ≈ 55% of the survey respondents supported this and stated that the SB process provides them with new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility. The interview confirmed this perception. The Flanders's partners highlighted that participants were encouraged to think beyond their daily interests or profession.	No further comments.
Have the activities helped participants to learn or have a better understanding of the perspective of the other stakeholders involved?	KPI 13) Degree of awareness/ understanding of the **perspectives of the other stakeholders**.	SB fostered learning and understanding of other stakeholders' perspectives.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 13) According to the evaluation survey ≈ , 80% of the respondents stated that they better understand the other stakeholders' perspectives. This perception is supported by the input of the representatives of Flanders during the semi-structured interview, which highlighted a better understanding of other views/perspectives on the problems experienced by other stakeholders. Participants were encouraged to discuss all the topics even if they were not the 'owner' or specialist and were challenged to approach the different topics from different angles beyond their comfort zone.	No further comments.

				KPI 14) The empowerment or the acquisition of specific capabilities by participants was out of the scope of the SB methodology. According to the evaluation survey and the inputs of Flanders' partners, reported in the interview, participants have acquired along the process:	
To what extent do participants feel empowered by the process of managing future planning challenges and tasks?	KPI 14) Perception/ appreciation of **empowerment/ capacity** to manage future planning challenges/tasks.	SB process facilitates the development of skills and capacities for future planning management.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	i) general knowledge of the mobility ecosystem, ii) specific knowledge related to some aspects of the digital gap in mobility and groups at risk of exclusion, as well as iii) new perspectives and a better understanding of the perspectives of other stakeholders.	No further comments.

FINAL REMARKS – FLANDERS:

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Capacity to **involve key stakeholders in the SB process**

- Overall, during the workshops in Flanders, a diverse and relevant group of attendants were present, with participants varying from governmental policy/ mobility positions to private mobility companies. Furthermore, some representatives of the vulnerable-to-exclusion groups also attended the workshops.
- The representatives of the groups at risk of exclusion mainly consisted of men, and there seemed to be no direct representative present for elderly people, which was one of the target groups of Flanders. The participants suggested that a more consistent representation of vulnerable-to-exclusion groups should have been ensured.
- It is worth highlighting that women were overall well represented in the governmental, public and private sectors during the SB activities. Female participants in worshops' activities were for the majority experts of the mobility field.

Capacity to **ensure overall quality of scenario results**

- In spite of the challenges experienced by the partners of Flanders – namely i) the change of dedicated personnel in the team and ii) the need to adapt the methodology in order to integrate the results of a preceding major SB process experienced – the overall assessment of the quality of the developed scenarios is positive. Compared to the other three pilots, the Flanders SB process started from a previous foresight activity, made back in 2019 by the region for the development of mobility services in 2040. The four scenarios developed related to two clear axes: mobility needs and social values; they can be considered overall of high quality and, according to the assessment, plausible and consistent.
- The workshop activities were supported by a company that functioned as a facilitator, which helped maximise the stakeholders' participation and the relevance of the results with online activities.
- The policy recommendations and strategies developed during the workshops were perceived as relevant by participants, even though certain aspects of this process,

such as the duration of this specific part during the workshop, were perceived as quite short.

Capacity to **foster social learning and empowerment**

- Even though many attendants already had a high level of knowledge and sensitivity on future mobility challenges, being for the majority of workers/experts in the mobility field, a high percentage mentioned an important improvement in their understanding.
- The pilot region pointed out that it was not easy to ensure in-depth discussions with participants due to the online modality. However, still, it can be remarked that participants acquired specific knowledge related to digital gap in mobility and gained new perspectives and a better understanding of the positions of the other stakeholders during the workshops.

3.4. Tilburg
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods	Evidence	Commentaries
Have key stakeholders participated in the workshops? 🙂	KPI 1.1) **Number** of **key stakeholders** attending the activities. KPI 1.2) **Relevance** of stakeholders attending the activities.	Main key stakeholders (including public administration, transport operators, web/app developers, data management companies, representatives of groups at risk of exclusion, etc.) have attended the workshops.	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 1.1) 16 participants spread over the three workshops participated. 10 stakeholders were present at the first workshop, 6 stakeholders were present at the second workshop and 8 stakeholders participated in the third workshop. KPI 1.2) The stakeholders participating in the workshops were very relevant for the SB process. They represented important aspects related to the digital gap in mobility, such as policymakers with specific expertise in public transport and elderly people, as well as important operators and companies of the private sector. There was a good balance among the diverse categories attended (public administration, private sector and vulnerable-to-	The number of participants in each workshop was correct to maximise the participation in the activities of the attendants. All of the stakeholders invited for the workshops showed interest in the subject and appeared relevant for the targeted local experience and group at risk. Only 6 stakeholders completed the evaluation survey, which is something to keep in mind when looking at the survey results.

				exclusion groups targeted. Specifically, the people attending work in the following sectors: - Public administration (7 in total, 4 female) - Transport operators (5 in total, 3 female) - Academics (2 in total, 0 female) - Target group representatives (2 in total, 1 female)	

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are stakeholders involved diverse and representatives of different groups at risk of targeted exclusion? 🙂	KPI 2) Stakeholder's **diversity** and **representativeness**	Representatives of all target groups attended the workshops	List of participants in the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	KPI 2) The participants agreed that all relevant stakeholders were present at the workshop. The workshop consisted of: -Municipality of Tilburg - policymaker mobility Tilburg (female) -Municipality of Tilburg - policymaker elderly Tilburg (female) -Municipality of Tilburg - policymaker transportation (female) -Municipality of Tilburg - Project lead Tilburg (female) -KBO (elderly citizens association in Tilburg) - Secretary volunteer position (female) -ANWB automaatje - elderly ride sharing service; part of Contour de Twern, the welfare organisation - coördinator (female) -Bureau Zet - Social designer (female) -Bureau Zet - consultant (female) Province Noord-Brabant - project lead shared mobility (female) -Bureau Zet mobility - Program manager and consultant (female) -Regional transport organisation Midden-Brabant - senior manager (male) -Province of Noord-Brabant - manager shared mobility (male)	The participating institutions/entities are diverse and overall representative of the different categories involved in mobility in the Tilburg region, specifically: i) Tilburg municipality and public administration involved in policy development on public transport and elderly people are well represented in all the workshops; ii) The groups at risk of exclusion targeted (elderly people) are well represented by three organisations that attended the activities – addressed to people with mental issues, disabled people etc. iii) Public and private mobility organisation, consultancies etc. are also represented

| | | | | -Contour de Twern (welfare organization Tilburg) - Project leader elderly programme of the welfare organisation (male)
-Nextbike bike share - Business development manager (male)
-Reizigersoverleg Brabant public transport - Manager (male)
-Breda University of Applied Sciences - Researcher & Project Leader focusing on Inclusive and Digital Cities (male) | among the attendants. Despite a good representativeness of participants, the open questions of the evaluation survey highlighted the importance of keeping one of the main target groups involved through the entire process: " More concrete follow-up, when it comes to older people always involve them". Furthermore, KBO, the elderly association in Tilburg, noted that "the first workshop was difficult to follow as an elderly, it felt too abstract". Another survey respondent mentioned: "I missed the presence and input of the final end user." |

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: INVOLVE KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE SB PROCESS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the process contributed to the strengthening of cooperation among stakeholders?	KPI 3.1) number of **agreements** among stakeholders. KPI 3.2) number of **extra activities conducted** with vulnerable-to exclusion groups and other stakeholders.	Collaboration among key stakeholders is consolidating around key issues.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 3.1) No agreements have been made among stakeholders yet. KPI 3.2) No extra-activities have been conducted yet among the stakeholders / key actors.	It was not specifically requested to make agreements or conduct extra activities with key stakeholders. Nonetheless, for evaluation purposes, these aspects can be considered important for the future sustainability of local initiatives once the project is completed. The pilot of Tilburg did not promote any of the mentioned activities.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Gender representativity	KPI 4.1) **Number of women representatives** of product/ service **providers and public entities**. KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of **groups at risk of exclusion**. KPI 4.3) **gender leadership.**	Women are well represented among the different stakeholders involved.	List of participants to the SB workshops Evaluation Surveys	Overall, women represented 63% of the workshops' attendants, which means they were well represented in the activities. KPI 4.1) In total 9 women representatives of these categories. Public entities and service providers are well represented among female participants. KPI 4.2) Number of women representatives of groups at risk of exclusion: only one woman represented a group at risk of exclusion, specifically representing the elderly citizens association. KPI 4.3) Gender leadership: the working positions indicated include policymakers of Tilburg's municipality responsible for elderly people and Transport, both female, etc. Other positions include female programme and lead managers, a social designer etc. Apart from policy makers and a leading manager of the Municipality of Tilburg,	In general, women were well represented in the SB activities and balanced among the different categories involved.

				for the other positions, it is unclear if they imply the possibility of making key decisions impacting how the entity/company operates. Nonetheless, women participants are overall expert in the mobility/social field.	

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are scenarios developed well designed and understandable?	KPI 5) **Clarity/ transparency** of scenarios developed	Scenarios are clear and understandable	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 5) According to the evaluation surveys, the three scenarios developed focusing on the Tilburg pilot (2030: Dare to travel!, 2045: Moppie, 2070: Mobi) are perceived by participants as "well designed and understandable". In fact, all respondents (100%) agreed on such a statement. The participants were highly satisfied with the workshop. The interview with the representatives of the Tilburg pilot supported this result.	It is worth highlighting that the scenarios themselves are actually only different along the time axis.
Are scenarios developed consistent?	KPI 6) **Consistency** scenarios developed	No logical contradictions in the designed scenarios	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 6) Considering the answers provided in the evaluation survey regarding clarity/understandability and plausibility to the co-created scenarios, it can be inferred that the 3 scenarios developed were consistent. Pilot partners interviewed highlighted an overall	No specific question on the consistency of the scenarios was included in the evaluation survey. Therefore, the interview with IZT has specifically integrated the information on consistency. The fact that scenarios are different only along the time axis should not to be seen critically. According to IZT this aspect could

Are scenarios developed plausible and realistic?	KPI 7) **Plausibility** of scenarios developed	Scenarios are possible, convincing and reasonable	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	overlap between the three developed scenarios, which made them very consistent.	help build a strategy development in particular.
				KPI 7) According to the evaluation survey just ≈ 65% of the respondents think that the scenarios created are plausible. The description of pilot partners of Flanders during the interview confirms this perception, pointing out that the plausibility of the different scenarios varied since they respectively focus on the years 2030, 2045 and 2070. This might affect the overall perception of respondents.	A survey quote might help clarify the results: "The scenarios were not forward-looking enough. They thought too small and underestimated the pace of the transitions. As a result, they are of limited use in the longer term."

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: ENSURE OVERALL QUALITY OF SCENARIO RESULTS

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Are strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios relevant for target groups for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 8) **Relevance of strategies** and **policy recommendations** developed.	Strategies and policies recommendations proposed are focused on groups at risk of exclusion.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 8) The pilot region received very positive feedback on the specific question of the evaluation survey focusing on the 'relevance of the strategies and policies recommendation proposed'. ≈ 90% of the survey participants agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that strategies and policy recommendations proposed through scenarios were relevant for target groups for future digitally inclusive mobility systems. The interview with Tilburg project partners highlighted the relevance of the 12 policy recommendations and strategies formulated at the end of the third workshop: 6 strategies were more general, and 6 specifically focused on policy development.	No further comments.

To what extent has the process led to the development of relevant tools, policy recommendations or strategies for a digitally inclusive mobility system?	KPI 9) **Relevance** of the SB **process** for the development of substantial results.	SB process facilitates the development of relevant results.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 9) Different questions of the evaluation survey, respectively related to the learning results and the quality of the results, can be used to assess this specific indicator specifically: - 85% of the survey respondents stated that they felt (agree or strongly agree with the fact) that the right topics were discussed during the SB activities. - 85% of the respondents perceive that the SB process helped to converge diverse participants' perspectives. - 85% of the respondents perceive that differences among participants were addressed constructively. This overall perception of the relevance of the SB process is confirmed by Tilburg pilot region partners. They mentioned in the interview that the process of SB helped them to co-create solid and relevant scenarios and policy recommendations.	The relevance of the topics discussed, the ability to make converging diverse perspectives throughout the process and to address in a constructive manner the difference among participants can be taken as Evidence of the relevance of the SB process.

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the results been shared transparently and clearly? Has the SB process facilitated collaboration and co-creation activities?	KPI 10.1) Number of **reports/ documents** with the results/ conclusions released. KPI 10.2) Number of **return sessions/follow-up meetings** organised	SB process provides insightful results/conclusions that are available/ shared with the stakeholders SB process facilitates thecreation of alliances/ agreements for further collaboration	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 10.1) The outcome of the workshop has been shared with all participants in the form of a report, and the scenario illustrations. KPI 10.2) There has been no follow-up session yet.	It was not specifically requested to make extra activities with stakeholders, follow-up/return sessions, or specific dissemination of the results. Nonetheless, for evaluation purposes, these aspects can be considered important to maximise the impact of the activity among key stakeholders. A final report, including visual illustrations describing the different scenarios has been made available for participants. The illustrations are very attractive and describe in a very clear way the three scenarios. The importance of the dissemination of the results in order to generate impact or even activate other parties is pointed out with a suggestion of improvement: "Elaboration after workshop 3 towards policy advice. And I am still looking for how we can 'advise' / activate other parties with the input we have collected."

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE: FOSTER SOCIAL LEARNING AND EMPOWERMENT

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
Have the activities helped participants to get a better understanding of the whole mobility ecosystem and its future challenges?	KPI 11) Perception of **personal understanding of mobility ecosystem** and its present and future challenges.	SB provided a better understanding of the mobility ecosystem and future challenges.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 11) 50% of the survey respondents stated that their understanding of mobility and future challenges has greatly improved. As for the other 50%, they neither agree nor disagree with the survey's proposed statement.	Tilburg parners doubted the survey answers; they think most participants already had a good understanding of the mobility ecosystem and its future challenges.

Have the activities provided participants with new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility?	KPI 12) Perception/ appreciation of **new knowledge and perspectives** specifically **on digital inclusion in mobility**.	SB provided new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 12) The participants somewhat agreed. ≈ 65% of the survey respondents stated that the SB process provides them with new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility. The other 35% do not agree nor disagree with the statement. This answer can be related to KPI 11), likewise, it is possible that the respondents already had solid knowledge about digital inclusion in mobility, being professionals of this field.	No further comments.
Have the activities helped participants learn or better understand the perspective of the other stakeholders involved?	KPI 13) Degree of awareness/ understanding of the **perspectives of the other stakeholders**.	SB fostered learning and understanding of other stakeholders' perspectives.	Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots.	KPI 13) All of the survey respondents (100%) stated that they better understand the other stakeholders' perspectives. The quotes extracted from the survey support this (see quotes in 'commentaries' section). The interview with local partners confirms a general understanding of respective positions during SB activities.	Positive quotes from the survey confirms a good understanding of each other perspectives: - "Understanding each other's point of view and bringing together different views 'on the world'. Bridging the gap between mobility and social." - "Different perspectives are discussed. The method guides you step by step towards concrete policy proposals" "Bringing perspectives together, room for discussion/exchanging insights."

					The interaction among stakeholders was very good. An aspect that may have helped in delivering such a positive result is the way the workshops were given: except from the first workshop, the workshops were in-person and not online. A quote from the Tilburg pilot partners confirms this: "Due to Covid we had to conduct the first workshop digitally, but by using a template and Miro (online brainstorm tool) it didn't limit us in our workshop. However online having a group conversation proved to be more challenging than in the 2nd and 3rd workshop".

| To what extent do participants feel empowered by the process of managing future planning challenges and tasks? | KPI 14) Perception/ appreciation of **empowerment/ capacity** to manage future planning challenges/tasks. | SB process facilitates the development of skills and capacities for future planning management. | Evaluation Surveys. Interviews with IZT and project pilots. | KPI 14) The empowerment or the acquisition of specific capabilities by participants was out of the scope of the SB methodology.

According to their perception, Tilburg partners pointed out that most participants have acquired knowledge of the problems experienced by groups vulnerable to exclusion in relation to the digitalisation in mobility. Also, the interaction with other stakeholders gives participants a better understanding of the perspectives of other stakeholders in the mobility field. | No further comments. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

FINAL REMARKS – TILBURG PILOT:

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Capacity to **involve key stakeholders in the SB process**

- All the stakeholders participating showed great interest in the subject of digital inclusion in mobility and were relevant to the results, local experience and the integration of the vision of groups at risk targeted. The functions of participants varied from governmental and public administration to private companies as well as representatives of groups at risk of exclusion. Overall, they can be considered relevant and representative.
- In general, women were well represented in the SB activities and well balanced among the different categories involved, many of them having a leadership role within their functions. Only one woman represented groups at risk of exclusion targeted.
- It is worth highlighting that according to the suggestions for improvement, for elderly people was sometimes difficult to follow the workshop very well, for being online (the first workshop) and because sometimes they were perceived as too abstract.

Capacity to **ensure the overall quality of scenario results**

- Overall, the scenarios developed received a positive assessment and can be considered well designed and understandable. However, the different scenarios' plausibility perception might vary according to their focus on near/far future, respectively, on years 2030, 2045 and 2070. It is worth pointing out that the scenarios developed differ only along the time axis. This choice should not be seen critically since it can be helpful for the development of strategies.
- Tilburg created a useful and attractive final report, including visual illustrations describing the different scenarios developed in a clear way. This report has been made available for participants and represents engaging dissemination material.
- The strategies and policy recommendations resulting from the SB process, which received very positive feedback from the attendants of the workshops, can be considered relevant for the Tilburg pilot region and vulnerable-to-exclusion groups targeted.

Capacity to **foster social learning and empowerment**

- The interaction among stakeholders was very good. Unlike the other pilots of the project, Tilburg had the opportunity to conduct two out of three workshops in person. This aspect may have helped the pilot to deliver such positive results. Participants acquired relevant knowledge on inclusivity and the problems experienced by groups vulnerable to exclusion in relation to the digitalisation of mobility. The attendees of SB workshops acquired specific knowledge on digital trends in mobility and a better understanding of the other stakeholders' perspectives.

4. Evaluation of the Inclusive Design Wheel activities

Prior to the evaluation of pilots' IDW activities it is worth highlighting that the IDW is an iterative process and would ideally involve multiple iterations of the phases of the process Explore-Create-Evaluate. The work on IDW started in the summer of 2021, and the IDW Report (D3.3) reflects the activities conducted up to May 2022. During this period, all of the pilots did substantial work on the Manage, Explore and Create phases of the IDW. Four of the five pilots did some Evaluate activities as well, thus completing at least one iteration of the adapted IDW process. In this sense, none of the pilots has completed the multiple iteration process of the IDW; however, the teams are continuing to work on improving their output. This aspect has been taken into account in evaluating the work and the outputs of the pilots.

The second Tilburg project (the one focussing on cycling and migrant women) delivered their concepts to UCAM too late to obtain feedback on them within the timeframe of the DIGNITY IDW work (up to May 2022). Consequently, this pilot did not conduct the Evaluate phase within this time frame. They received some feedback on current bikes and bike sharing schemes from participants in the co-creation workshop but did not get any feedback on their new concepts, which were developed after the co-creation workshop. However, UCAM did provide them with some informal feedback on their new concepts after May 2022. This feedback will be used by the pilots in their ongoing IDW work.

4.1. Ancona

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
To what extent has the IDW process been useful for the development of relevant and inclusive digital mobility services?	KPI 1) **Overall Usefulness** of the IDW process by pilot partners for the development of inclusive digital mobility solutions	The IDW process was useful for helping the pilot teams to develop high quality, relevant and inclusive digital mobility services	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 (IDW PQ) Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: The overall usefulness of the process was rated 'Good' (q. 2a). The IDW process was considered to be particularly helpful in providing a clearer/broader picture of the potential impact of the pilot demonstration, initially focused mainly on how to improve the app. The process helped the pilot team better identify users' needs and generate concepts beyond the digital aspects.	The assessment is in line with the expected trends. Pilot partners indicated no specific improvement. They remarked in the interview that, within the overall IDW process, the continued feedback from UCAM partners was key to improving the inclusivity of the concepts and improvement of the technical and digital aspects of the application.
To what extent has the material provided been appropriate and helpful for the overall quality of the process and results?	KPI 2) **Usefulness** of the material provided by UCAM (**guidelines D.2.2** and the design **log).**	The material provided to project pilots is appropriate and helpful to ensure the overall quality of the process and the results.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: - <u>Guidance document</u>: the document's usefulness was rated 'very good' (q. 2c); the ease of finding information in the document was rated 'very good' (q. 2d). - <u>Design log</u>: the usefulness of the design log was rated 'very good' (q. 2e); the ease of navigating and understanding the structure	Overall, the assessment of KPI2 is in line with expected trends. The material provided ensures the overall quality of the process and the results. The improvements suggested were: - the guidance document is quite theoretical and could include case studies/examples to help pilots.

				of the log was rated 'very good' (q. 2f). This very good assessment of the IDW materials provided by UCAM was confirmed in the interview. The log (together with the constant feedback from UCAM!) was specifically described as key to following the IDW process correctly. In addition, the guidance document was described as useful to get acquainted with the complex methodology, particularly in the initial phase of the process.	- no improvement was indicated for the design log
Was the support and guidance provided by Dignity partners satisfactory? 	KPI 3) Level of satisfaction with the **support and guidance** provided by Dignity partners.	The support and guidance provided by Dignity partners to the different pilots was satisfactory.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: The level of satisfaction with the support and guidance provided by UCAM was rated 'Very good' (q. 2b). The support and constant feedback provided by UCAM was particularly important to identify a proposal focused on inclusivity to achieve the final results.	The partner company works mainly on developing technological services for the transport system. In fact, the team started by being very focused on improving the accessibility of the app. The support of UCAM was particularly useful to help them identify and work on social aspects relating to technology and inclusivity.

Are participants in the IDW process representatives of the end user group(s) targeted during the IDW process?	KPI 4) How well was the **target end user group represented during the IDW process?**	Overall, the IDW process ensured a good representation of group(s) targeted.	List of participants in the co-creation workshops Co-creation questionnaire Interviews with pilots	Overall, 21 people attended the workshop. They included disabled (4) and immigrant (3) users, 7 members of public administration (Ancona municipality and Marche region) and representatives of companies/entities related to transport services.	Due to the Covid restrictions in place in Italy during that time, the co-creation workshop had to be run online. Consequently, the pilot may have had little input from those who are more digitally excluded. Pilot partners pointed out that they had some difficulty recruiting vulnerable-to-exclusion users; however, the targeted groups are quite well represented, except for elderly people. UCAM remarked on a continued need to encourage the team to consider and include more digitally disengaged people in the different IDW activities. After completing the IDW process, pilot partners had an additional group activity with a group of 8 disengaged people, including elderly and people with disabilities. The objective was to collect their impressions on the current ATMA app and the prototype of the new app.

Was the co-creation experience useful/relevant for all actors involved in the workshop?	KPI 5) **Level of satisfaction with the overall co-creation workshop experience for all actors involved**.	All actors involved perceived the overall co-creation experience as useful, rich and productive.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interview with pilots	Pilot partners very well valued the workshop experience. The usefulness of the co-creation workshop (q. 2g) and ideas produced in the workshop (q. 2h) were rated 'very good'. Despite the limitations of running the co-creation workshop online, the activity was described as very inspiring for the team. It produced many useful ideas for the app and for more general interventions to develop with local transport operators. According to the responses in the co-creation questionnaire, the participants enjoyed the workshop and remarked that it generated useful ideas to improve transport. Overall, it met their expectations and the respondents indicated no difficulties in participating in the workshop or being listened to.	The assessment of KPI 5 is in line with expected trends. Pilot partners indicated no specific improvement.\n\nParticipants respondents to the co-creation questionnaire pointed out the importance of: including more analysis of transport problems experienced by different population groups; increasing the participation of user associations, and including more older people.\n\nIt is important to point out that running the workshop online might have excluded people with lower digital capabilities.
Are the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops useful	KPI 6) **Usefulness of the ideas and insights produced** in	The ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops of the	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2	The usefulness of the ideas and insights arising from the co-creation workshop were perceived as useful for the great majority of participants and for	The assessment of KPI 6 is in line with expected trends. The pilot team eventually went beyond just improving the app to developing useful ideas and

for addressing inclusiveness?	the co-creation workshops by the different pilots.	different pilots were useful.	Interviews with pilots	pilot partners, who rated it 'very good' (q. 2h). The interview highlighted that the workshop was very inspiring for the pilot team and was key for developing the improvements to the app and other interventions to be developed with transport operators.	concepts related to non-digital aspects. Most of these ideas will be developed by the municipality of Ancona and local transport operators in the future.
To what extent can the concepts/services produced during the IDW can be considered inclusive and appropriate for the needs of the region and target group?	KPI 7) How **inclusive and appropriate are the concepts and services** produced during the IDW process?	The concepts and services produced through the IDW process are inclusive and have the potential to reduce the digital gap.	Interviews with pilots IDW deliverables	The main goals of the pilot were: i) to improve the accessibility of the ATMA app and website trying to reach as many users as possible(principally blind users and users with motor disabilities, the targeted vulnerable-to-exclusion groups); and ii) to add non-digital solutions to include users who face digital exclusion. The concepts and services developed through the IDW process are appropriate and improve the inclusiveness of the initial proposal. Specifically, the prototype of the new version of the ATMA app includes various usability and accessibility improvements (improvements in visual clarity and accessibility, a 'quick travel solutions' page and tutorials on the use of the app).	Aside from improving the accessibility of the ATMA app and website, the IDW process and the co-creation workshop helped the pilot to look beyond the digital side and think about the needs of digitally excluded people, for example, the non-smartphone users and people without internet access. In this sense, the pilot also produced a set of recommendations to improve the inclusivity of the local transport system. The impact of these actions will depend on how exactly they will be implemented in practice. In any case, they have the potential to reduce exclusion for various groups of people, including migrants and visitors, people on

				These improvements should reduce the exclusion of people with vision impairments and those with lower levels of digital competences (the targeted vulnerable-to-exclusion groups of the pilot). Furthermore, the new app version would also provide travel information in a larger number of languages, making it more inclusive for migrants and visitors to Ancona. Also, various recommendations to improve the accessibility of the ATMA website were identified through an audit. Integrating these recommendations will make the website more accessible and thus inclusive of people with various disabilities. The non-digital recommendations for improving the transport system also have the potential for reducing exclusion, depending on how exactly they are implemented in practice.	a low income, people with lower digital competence and women.

FINAL REMARKS – ANCONA

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Usefulness/relevance of the ideas and insights produced in the 'Create phase.'

The improvement of the accessibility of the ATMA (local public transport company) app and website is relevant for the purpose of reaching as many users as possible in local and regional public transport and, specifically, the targeted vulnerable-to-exclusion groups, namely the elderly, blind users and users with motor disabilities. The pilot partners already planned to focus on improving the accessibility of the app before conducting the IDW process. They are a technology company, and the need to improve the app was clear from the beginning. The key contribution of the IDW process was in helping the pilot team look beyond the app itself. The process encouraged the pilot team to complement their initial idea by also considering the needs of the more digitally excluded people, for example, those with no or limited internet access and non-smartphone users. Improvements to the website and the app, the set of recommendations for local transport companies and the provision of real time information at public stops are the most relevant insights of the Create phase.

Inclusiveness and appropriateness of the concepts and services produced during the IDW process.

The IDW process provided important feedback on the prototype app, identifying various aspects to be improved. Other outputs of the process included an accessibility audit of the website, a set of recommendations proposed for the local transport system, and an improved user testing plan. Acting on these will result in improved usability and inclusivity of the transport services in the region.

Potential future impact of the actions/services proposed

The actions proposed should reduce the exclusion in the local mobility environment of Ancona, especially for people with vision impairments and those with lower levels of digital competence, including many elderly people. The new version of the app would also provide travel information in a larger number of languages, making it more inclusive for migrants and, in general, for visitors to Ancona. Furthermore, the accessibility audit conducted on the ATMA portal website identified various improvements that would

benefit many potentially excluded groups. Lastly, the set of recommendations for the transport system in Ancona could have a crucial impact on the most digitally excluded people. However, the real impact will eventually depend on how exactly these recommendations are implemented in practice.

4.2. Barcelona Metropolitan Area

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
To what extent has the IDW process been useful for the development of relevant and inclusive digital mobility services?	KPI 1) **Overall Usefulness** of the IDW process by pilot partners for the development of inclusive digital mobility solutions	The IDW process is useful for helping the pilot teams to develop high quality, relevant and inclusive digital mobility services	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 (IDW PQ) Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: the overall usefulness of the process was rated 'good' (q. 2a). The open questions in the questionnaires and the interview content confirm that the IDW process is key to better identifying users' needs and generating/ improving the concepts and services designed through the pilot.	Overall, the assessment is in line with the expected trends. The only improvement to the overall IDW process suggested by pilot partners was a refinement of the design log. Specifically, how new material should be added to the log in order to make it easier to visualise the evolution of the project.
To what extent has the material provided been appropriate and helpful for the overall quality of the process and results?	KPI 2) **Usefulness** of the material provided by UCAM (**guidelines D.2.2** and the design **log)**.	The material provided to pilot projects was appropriate and helpful to ensure overall quality of the process and the results.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: - <u>Guidance document</u>: the usefulness of the document was rated 'average' (q. 2c); the ease of finding information in the document was rated 'good' (q. 2d). - <u>Design log</u>: the usefulness of the design log was rated 'good' (q. 2e); the ease of navigating and understanding the structure of the log was rated 'good' (q. 2f). The open questions in the questionnaires and the interview	The overall assessment of KPI2 is in line with expected trends. The material provided ensures the overall quality of the process and the results. The improvements suggested were: - The guidelines format could be more interactive and better match the structure of the log.

				confirmed a good assessment of the IDW materials. Both the guidance document and the log were helpful to the pilot in completing the process successfully. The pilot partners especially well valued the log; they described it as very well organised, easy to navigate and very useful in following the IDW process.	- The log could be improved to better record the evolution of the project and the pilot's ideas. In addition, it could be designed as a collaborative document where many users can collaborate and where different inputs can be visualised.
Was the support and guidance provided by Dignity partners satisfactory? 🟢	KPI 3) Level of satisfaction with the **support and guidance** provided by Dignity partners.	The support and guidance provided by Dignity partners to the different pilots were satisfactory.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: the level of satisfaction with the support and guidance provided by UCAM was rated 'very good' (q. 2b). In particular, the pilot valued the suggestions from UCAM that led to the inclusion of questions and aspects that the pilot had not previously identified.	The level of satisfaction with the support and guidance provided is very good. In some ways, this support exceeded pilot expectations. It is worth highlighting that (as pointed out by the partner interviewed) the IDW process was also a learning process for the pilot.
Are participants in the IDW process representatives of the end user group(s) targeted during the IDW process? 🙂	KPI 4) How well was the **target end user group represented during the IDW process?**	Overall, the IDW process ensured a good representation of group(s) targeted.	List of participants in the co-creation workshops Co-creation questionnaire Interviews with pilots	13 people attended the workshop. The pilot had some difficulty in recruiting a wide range of users. Eventually, several students and rural inhabitants took part in the co-creation workshop and a young mother. However, they did manage to include 3 older people (over the age of 65) and 1 person with a disability.	Elderly and disabled people could have been more represented in the co-creation workshop. However, targeted end user groups were included, and their opinion was especially considered in the final version of the proposal.

				Apparently, it was difficult to recruit elderly people living in that rural area, especially those who are dependent on a third person, to attend the workshop in person.	
Was the co-creation experience useful/relevant for all actors involved in the workshop?	KPI 5) **Level of satisfaction with the overall co-creation workshop experience for all actors involved**.	All actors involved perceived the overall co-creation experience as useful, rich and productive.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	Both participants and pilot partners very well valued the workshop experience. Both indicated that the co-creation workshop generated very useful ideas and concepts. The participants had a rich and useful experience, they enjoyed it and felt that their opinion was considered. Their expectations of the workshop were met unanimously. Pilot partners highlighted the workshop's mutual learning experience, in terms of the content discussed, the results and the human side of the activity.	The overall level of satisfaction with the co creation workshop is very high both for the participants and project partners. The experience provided excellent insights, which helped to improve the local proposal. As a possible improvement, the partners suggested having some written guidelines or descriptions of best practices for conducting a co-creation workshop effectively. The pilot received some advice from UCAM; however, having examples/ good practices would be helpful.
Are the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops useful for addressing inclusiveness?	KPI 6) **Usefulness of the ideas and insights produced** in the co-creation workshops by	The ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops were useful.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	The ideas and insights from the co-creation workshop were perceived as useful by the majority of participants and the pilot partners. They were especially useful for: - better identifying the main challenges of the DRT service	The assessment of KPI 6 is completely in line with expected trends. Pilot partners had not considered many of the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshop earlier.

	the different pilots.			developed by the pilot and its potential improvements - testing and improving the current app used for the DRT service	
To what extent can the concepts/services produced during the IDW be considered inclusive and appropriate for the needs of the region and target group?	KPI 7) How **inclusive and appropriate are the concepts and services produced** during the IDW process?	The concepts and services produced through the IDW process are inclusive and have the potential to reduce the digital gap.	Interviews with pilots IDW deliverables	Overall, the IDW process produced interesting ideas for improving the initially proposed digital and non-digital concepts. As regards the general concepts developed during the IDW process, they are interesting and with potential for inclusivity for DRT: i) a double shuttle service composed of two connected lines, ii) virtual stops that can change position according to users' needs and iii) smart bus posts or screens at bus stops providing real-time information and a facility for communicating with the bus operator (for example to make a reservation). The proposed ideas/concepts aimed at reducing the walking demand in rural areas (double shuttle, virtual stops, smart bus post/screen) are relevant and implementable. However, as pointed out in the feedback of UCAM, these ideas are only briefly described, and their assessment is very limited. Their possible implementation should be agreed	It should be considered that there were difficulties with the original pilot project (which aimed to promote the use of carpooling in industrial parks on the outskirts of Barcelona). Later, the pilot identified a second use case focusing on DRT. They ran both projects in parallel until they realised that it would not be possible to run a co-creation workshop for the carpooling project due to COVID restrictions in the company involved in this project. As a result, IDW activities after this focused solely on the DRT project. NEMI appears to implement the main features and changes to the app this year, which were identified during the IDW process. Other improvements will follow in the medium term, according to the pilot.

				upon with the local transport company, and care should be taken to ensure this implementation remains inclusive. The assessment of the DRT app reveals that the proposed changes are generally good and represent an improvement in inclusiveness and appropriateness since the proposed modifications appear to address changes requested by users. However, it seems important that a larger-scale revision is done in order to improve the usability of the whole app.	Regarding the non-digital concepts, all of these are potentially implementable, but their implementation depends on the bus operator in the area. This operator is not linked to the project and does not consider these implementations to be a priority. There has been some work with the operator and the city council (meetings, presentation of improvements, press releases, etc.), but the pilot has no control over this aspect.

FINAL REMARKS – BARCELONA METROPOLITAN AREA

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Usefulness/relevance of the ideas and insights produced in the 'Create' phase

The pilot focused on the improvement of an existing DRT service in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area. In response to the inflexibility of the existing service (users must previously book a seat on this service using a smartphone app or by phoning a call centre to be able to get on the bus), several of the pilot's ideas and insights aim to create more flexibility in DRT transport options (e.g. having both local and express lines and being able to request more convenient stops on a demand-responsive line) and to promote good communication of the full range of transport information. In addition, the pilot proposed several ideas about how to improve the DRT service's app. Overall, the ideas are relevant and useful for the improvement of the inclusiveness of this transport service for a range of vulnerable-to-exclusion groups living in the outlying area examined in the study.

Inclusiveness and appropriateness of the concepts and services produced during the IDW process

The different concepts produced are appropriate for the local context and improve the inclusiveness of the DRT service. In particular, the double shuttle service composed of two connected (local and express) lines and the virtual stops, which can change according to users' needs, can reduce the walking demand in rural areas, a relevant problem for the elderly and people with disabilities. In addition, smart bus posts or screens at bus stops, providing real-time information or a facility for communicating with the bus operator, have a strong potential to reduce the exclusion of people with lower levels of digital capabilities and those who do not have access to a smartphone.

Potential future impact of the actions/services proposed

Regarding digital improvements, making the app more inclusive would help reduce the demand on the telephone service and, therefore, make the service more efficient. The pilot identified various improvements that could be made to the app to make it usable and inclusive. These could particularly help users with lower levels of digital experience, and those who are not familiar with the system. However, a telephone service for bookings should be maintained because many users do not have access to a

smartphone. In addition, the non-digital proposals to improve the DRT service have great potential to improve the service as a whole. However, they are just proposals for the moment, and further work is needed to determine how to implement them in practice.

4.3. Flanders

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
To what extent has the IDW process been useful for the development of relevant and inclusive digital mobility services?	KPI 1) **Overall Usefulness** of the IDW process by pilot partners for the development of inclusive digital mobility solutions	The IDW process was useful for helping the pilot teams to develop high quality, relevant and inclusive digital mobility services	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 (IDW PQ) Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: The overall usefulness of the process was rated 'good' (q. 2a). The IDW process was especially useful for the Flanders pilot in ensuring that all the essential aspects of the local demonstration were investigated. It was key to structuring the work of the pilot such that inclusivity was integrated into their proposed solutions. Although partners described the general approach of the IDW as very useful, the process was described as too detailed, and, as an improvement, they strongly suggested that it be simplified.	The assessment of KPI 1 is in line with the expected trends. The IDW process was of great help for the development of relevant and inclusive concepts. However, it is perceived as excessively detailed.
To what extent has the material provided been appropriate and helpful for the overall quality of the process and results?	KPI 2) **Usefulness** of the material provided by UCAM (**guidelines D.2.2** and the design **log)**.	The material provided to pilot projects was appropriate and helpful to ensure overall quality of the process and the results.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: - Guidance document: the document's usefulness was rated 'good' (q. 2c); the ease of finding information in the document was rated 'average' (q. 2d). - Design log: the usefulness of the design log was rated 'good' (q. 2e); the ease of navigating and understanding the structure of the log was rated 'good' (q. 2f). Overall, the interview confirmed a good assessment of the IDW materials	Overall, the assessment of KPI 2 is in line with the expected trends. The material provided ensures the overall quality of the process and the results. No specific improvements are suggested.

				provided by UCAM. The guidance document and the log are described as relevant for the process. The log helped the pilot focus on the most important aspects of the process.	
Was the support and guidance provided by Dignity partners satisfactory?	KPI 3) Level of satisfaction with the **support and guidance** provided by Dignity partners.	The support and guidance provided by Dignity partners to the different pilots was satisfactory.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: the level of satisfaction with the support and guidance of UCAM was rated 'good (q. 2b). Also, the usefulness of the feedback provided on the concepts produced is rated 'good' (q. 2i). The support and feedback provided by UCAM is considered especially useful throughout the IDW process.	The support of UCAM has been useful, particularly to help the pilot focus on the most relevant aspects of the concepts under development.
Are participants in the IDW process representatives of the end user group(s) targeted during the IDW process?	KPI 4) How well was the **target end user group represented during the IDW process.**	Overall, the IDW process ensured a good representation of group(s) targeted.	List of participants in the co-creation workshops Co-creation questionnaire Interviews with pilots	15 people participated in the Flanders workshops (12 men and 2 women). The pilot held three in-person co-creation workshops with end users. These were held in different cities to make it easier for the target group (older people) to attend. All participants were aged 55 or over (3 aged 55-64, 9 aged 65-74, 2 aged 75-84 and 1 aged 85+). 2 people rated their digital capabilities as High, 8 as Medium and 3 as Low. Participants included people with physical, visual and auditory disabilities.	The assessment of KPI 5 is considered to be in line with expected trends. Overall, a good representation was ensured. However, there was a gender imbalance in the group of participants.
Was the co-creation	KPI 5) **Level of satisfaction**	All actors involved	Co-creation questionnaire	The workshop experience was rated 'average' by the members of the pilot	The assessment of KPI 5 is in line with expected trends.

experience useful/relevant for all actors involved in the workshop? 🙂	**with the overall co-creation workshop experience for all actors involved**.	perceived the overall co-creation experience as useful, rich and productive.	IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	(q. 2g). Simultaneously, the great majority of participants said that they enjoyed the workshop and that it was useful for them. Despite the rating of the pilot partners, the co-creation was described in the interview as inspiring, particularly due to the insights it provided into the point of view of the vulnerable groups targeted. This was useful for improving some of the aspects discussed, specifically for the two concepts that were taken further: the app and the training of public transport personnel.	Pilot partners indicated no relevant improvement. Workshop participants who responded to the questionnaire remarked, as possible improvement, the importance of having a mix of participants with high and low digital capabilities and having separate workshops for end-users and representatives of an interest group.
Are the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops useful to address inclusiveness? 🙂	KPI 6) **Usefulness of the ideas and insights produced** in the co-creation workshops by the different pilots.	The ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops were useful.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	The usefulness of the ideas and insights resulting from the co-creation workshop was rated 'average' by project partners (q. 2h). The majority of participants who responded gave a good rating to the usefulness of the ideas for improving transport generated through the co-creation workshop. The pilot partners indicated that the workshops were inspiring for the pilot team and helped to improve the concepts (specifically the concepts of the app and the training of public transport personnel). They provided an opportunity to get to know the opinions	Overall, the assessment of KPI 6 is in line with expected trends. Even though it appears that some of the concepts emerged before the workshops, the workshops were generally useful for clarifying the improvements through the help of the vulnerable-to-exclusion participants.

				of the vulnerable groups targeted, which were composed mainly of elderly people.	
To what extent can the concepts/services produced during the IDW be considered inclusive and appropriate for the needs of the region and target group?	KPI 7) How **inclusive and appropriate are the concepts and services** produced during the IDW process?	The concepts and services produced through the IDW process are inclusive and have the potential to reduce the digital gap.	Interview with pilots IDW deliverables	The concepts produced were: i) a single point of contact for booking your trip and customer helpline in Flanders; ii) a user-friendly app, easy to navigate; iii) an easy web application; iv) training for personnel of public transport and v) tariff uniformity in Flanders. The team selected two of these concepts to focus on, namely the user-friendly app and the training for public transport personnel. Both concepts are very relevant in terms of inclusiveness and their potential to reduce the digital gap in the region. In addition, the other concepts also have great potential to improve inclusion in Flanders. For example, improving the website (concept iii) is key to improving inclusion for those who do not own a smartphone or cannot install apps on their smartphone. Also, applying tariff uniformity in the region (concept iv) would also help increase inclusivity by reducing confusion and providing a simpler interface for users when travelling through multiple areas.	Overall, the concepts and services produced through the IDW process have a great potential to reduce the digital gap in Flanders and improve public transport's inclusiveness. However, the development of Hoppincentrale for Flanders is the project's final goal. This is a central point of contact for end users for public transport questions and planning trips (via an app, website or call centre). The effective development of such centre and the implementation of the improvements proposed during the IDW process depends on different factors, some of which are related to regional policy.

FINAL REMARKS – FLANDERS

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Usefulness/relevance of the ideas and insights produced in the 'Create' phase

The central idea of the pilot was to develop a central point of contact for the Flanders region (Hoppincentrale), bringing together the multiple transport providers and areas in Flanders and providing a more cohesive and uniform interface for users. This idea is very relevant for promoting inclusiveness. It would enable end users of public transport to ask for information and plan their trips (via an app, website or call centre) with a single point of contact. This can reduce the potential exclusion of some vulnerable groups, particularly the elderly, people with lower levels of digital capabilities, people who do not own a smartphone and those who cannot install apps on their smartphone. The pilot had already focused on this central idea before the IDW process. The IDW process helped to produce various complementary concepts which would improve the inclusivity of the transport service in the region and identify potential areas for improving the inclusivity and usability of the Hoppincentrale itself.

Inclusiveness and appropriateness of the concepts and services produced during the IDW process

Various digital and non-digital concepts and services, related and complementary to the central point of contact, were produced during the IDW process. These comprised: the single point of contact, a user-friendly app which is easy to navigate, an easy web application, a specific training programme for public transport personnel and the tariff uniformity in the Flanders region. The pilot elaborated on two of these concepts, specifically the user-friendly app and the personnel training. The pilot received feedback from UCAM with key suggestions for improving these two concepts. Both concepts are appropriate and could reduce exclusion. The non-digital proposal, namely the training for personnel, is very important since the elderly and people with disabilities often need additional assistance or specialised information, and transport personnel should be able to assist them properly.

Potential future impact of the actions/services proposed

All the actions and services identified have potential future impact. This includes those concepts that pilot partners did not explore in more detail during the IDW process. For example, developing an easy-to-use website would improve inclusion for people who do not own a smartphone or cannot install apps on their smartphone. In addition, promoting tariff uniformity in Flanders can help increase inclusivity by reducing confusion and providing a simpler interface for users when travelling through multiple areas.
The concepts that are currently being taken further have great potential. As remarked, the improvement of the app can make it more inclusive and accessible, and the training for transport personnel could provide better support for users with disabilities, reducing barriers to their travel.

4.4. Tilburg (elderly people project)

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
To what extent has the IDW process been useful for the development of relevant and inclusive digital mobility services?	KPI 1) **Overall Usefulness** of the IDW process by pilot partners for the development of inclusive digital mobility solutions.	The IDW process was useful for helping the pilot teams to develop high quality, relevant and inclusive digital mobility services	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 (IDW PQ) Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: The overall usefulness of the process was rated 'good' (q. 2a). The IDW process was relevant for the pilot, specifically for helping to structure the activities and offering clear steps and tools. The co- creation workshop was described as the most useful activity because it provided a lot of relevant information and insights for the production of key concepts.	The assessment of KPI 1 is in line with the expected trends.
To what extent has the material provided been appropriate and helpful for the overall quality of process and results?	KPI 2) **Usefulness** of the material provided by UCAM (**guidelines D.2.2** and the design **log).**	The material provided to pilot projects was appropriate and helpful to ensure the overall quality of the process and the results.	IDW process questionnaires 2 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: - Guidance document: the document's usefulness was rated 'average' (q. 2c); the ease of finding information in the document was rated 'average' (q. 2d). - Design log: the usefulness of the design log was rated 'good' (q. 2e); the ease of navigating and understanding the structure of the log was rated 'average' (q. 2f). The guidance document was described as important for familiarising the pilot	Overall, the material provided is appropriate and helpful. The log was not the most useful tool for this pilot, since its process was very iterative. The pilot partners perceived the log (implemented as a Powerpoint file) as too chronological in how it presented and recorded

				with the process at the beginning of the project. However, the partners pointed out that the document should be more 'readable' and shorter. The log is acknowledged as useful for structuring the process and giving an overview of all possible activities. However, for the process and workflow of this pilot (where they moved back and forth between activities), a more flexible tool (such as Miro) was chosen to record their activities instead of the log.	the activities. They preferred to use a Miro collaborative whiteboard instead and then transfer the information to the design log for sharing with UCAM. This feedback about using the log in a very iterative process was very valuable for the team at UCAM to identify potential improvements to the log.
Was the support and guidance provided by Dignity partners satisfactory? 🙂	KPI 3) Level of satisfaction with the **support and guidance** provided by Dignity partners.	The support and guidance provided by Dignity partners to the different pilots was satisfactory.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: The level of satisfaction with the support and guidance provided by UCAM was rated 'very good (q. 2b).' The usefulness of the feedback provided on the concepts was rated 'good' (q. 2i). Pilot partners described all the support and guidance provided by the UCAM team as being especially relevant. It was particularly useful to get different perspectives and inform the proposal's development and improvement.	The support of UCAM was satisfactory for the pilot partners.
Are participants of the IDW process representatives of the end user group(s) targeted	KPI 4) How well was the **target end user group represented**	Overall, the IDW process ensured a good representation of	List of participants in the co-creation workshops	8 older people participated in the Tilburg co-creation workshop, representing a diverse selection of this age group, specifically: young elderly, older elderly, elderly with disabilities, elderly with	The assessment of KPI 4 is in line with expected trends. Overall, the target end user group was well represented. The pilot also

during the IDW process?	**during the IDW process?**	group(s) targeted.	Co-creation questionnaire Interviews with pilots	migration backgrounds, and elderly with different digital skills. All people attending were able to follow the workshop and no specific problems or difficulties were reported in the co-creation questionnaire.	collected additional information from the target user group through individual interviews with elderly people, which were held after concepts were developed from the ideas generated in the co-creation workshop.
Was the co-creation experience useful/relevant for all actors involved in the workshop?	KPI 5) **Level of satisfaction with the overall co-creation workshops experience for all actors involved**.	All actors involved perceive the overall co-creation experience as useful, rich and productive.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	The workshop experience was rated 'very good' by the members of the pilot (q. 2g), while the great majority of participants who responded considered (agreed or strongly agreed) that they enjoyed the workshop and that it was useful for them. The workshop experience was particularly useful for pilot partners for providing insights directly from the target group about their problems, digital limitations and overall mobility experience, well as their proposals for improvements.	The assessment of KPI 5 is in line with the expected trends. Pilot partners indicated no relevant improvements. They were very satisfied with the co-creation workshop organisation and results.
Are the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops useful to address inclusiveness?	KPI 6) **Usefulness of the ideas and insights produced** in the co-creation workshops by	Ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops were useful.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	The usefulness of the ideas and insights resulting from the co-creation workshop was rated 'good' by project partners (q. 2h). The majority of participants who responded agreed that the ideas generated through the co-creation workshop were useful for improving transport.	Overall, the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshop are useful for reducing the digital gap of the vulnerable-to-exclusion groups targeted.

				The workshops were particularly useful for the pilot team in better identifying ways to improve the concepts and the related services. In particular, they helped to develop ideas for a non-digital connection to the digital mobility environment (this seemed to be a clear need of the elderly). The workshop results were augmented with additional interviews with elderly people to get more insights and enable the pilot team to develop a proposal that better meets the needs of elderly people.	The pilot also conducted additional interviews with other stakeholders. These identified the importance of working together with other organisations, for example, social welfare organisations, to produce feasible, practical solutions.
the different pilots.					
To what extent can the concepts/services produced during the IDW be considered inclusive and appropriate for the needs of the region and target group?	KPI 7) How **inclusive and appropriate are the concepts and services produced** during the IDW process?	The concepts and services produced through the IDW process are inclusive and have the potential to reduce the digital gap.	Interviews with pilots IDW deliverables	Two main concepts were developed through the IDW process: i) Making the existing public transport app more accessible for older people by adding a phone number that they can call for information and assistance and ii) Creating a physical and digital overview of all the mobility options in Tilburg, adding a personal helpdesk function (this could be a phone number) and linking this to an existing platform in Tilburg. After conducting additional interviews with elderly people about these concepts, the team was able to	Overall, the concepts and services produced through the IDW process have good potential to reduce the digital gap in public transport for the specific vulnerable-to-exclusion group targeted by the pilot. Providing this information via telephone includes many people who are digitally excluded. The pilot planned to explore the possibility of

| | | | | develop a specific concept to take further for the local demonstration. This was a single telephone number for people to call with all their questions about travel options. The subsequent work of the pilot focused on elaborating different routes through which people might get the phone number for the service and then get to the point of calling the number for help. The pilot developed storyboards describing 5 possible routes (through a caregiver, finding a folder at a community centre, via the local newspaper, via Google, and via a campaign). The non-digital options have a great potential to improve inclusivity and reduce the gap in mobility for many elderly people and, more generally, for people with low digital capabilities. This concept can be considered appropriate to improve inclusiveness for the target group. | working with the social welfare organisation to incorporate travel information into their existing helpline by providing the organisation with a decision tree linked to different travel options. |

FINAL REMARKS – TILBURG (Elderly people project)

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Usefulness/relevance of the ideas and insights produced in the 'Create' phase

The co-creation workshop generated three main ideas: a platform steward to provide personal contact, information and help when something goes wrong during a journey; a general telephone number for all travel questions and an information campaign to help users to find the right travel information. These ideas were designed specifically for older people but can improve inclusivity in general for people with low digital capabilities and people with physical impairment. The ideas and insights produced in the Create phase are relevant because non-digital solutions can be very effective, particularly for the elderly. In addition, the work of the pilot went beyond the creation of a telephone helpline and explored the best ways to reach all those who are potentially interested in this service.

Inclusiveness and appropriateness of the concepts and services produced during the IDW process

The concepts that were developed further by the pilot were: making the existing public transport app more accessible for older people by adding a phone number that they can call for information and assistance, and promoting the creation of a physical and digital overview of all the mobility options in Tilburg (with a personal helpdesk function, which could be a phone number) and linking this to an existing platform in Tilburg. These came together in a single telephone number for people to call with all their questions about travel options.

Both concepts are very appropriate and can improve the inclusiveness of the transport service, specifically for older people (the vulnerable-to-exclusion group targeted by the pilot). Furthermore, the pilot identified different routes through which the users might become aware of the service and get to the point of calling the helpline (through a caregiver, a community centre, the local newspaper, Google and a campaign). Developing a range of options, including non-digital options, makes the service more inclusive and more likely to be used by a wider range of people.

Potential future impact of the actions/services proposed

The proposed services have a good potential future impact, since the activities highlighted a clear need among the elderly to access a non-digital form of information on travel options. Providing help to the users via the telephone can potentially include many people with low digital literacy or are digitally excluded. Therefore, the services proposed are particularly important for the group targeted by the pilot. Apparently, the pilot team is discussing with the local social welfare organisation about the possibility of implementing this service in practice, for example by incorporating travel information into their existing helpline. This is a promising avenue forward that needs to be worked out by partners.

4.5. Tilburg (migrant women and bicycles project)*

Aspects assessed	KPIs	Expected Trends	Data Collection Methods*	Evidence	Commentaries
To what extent has the IDW process been useful for the development of relevant and inclusive digital mobility services?	KPI 1) **Overall Usefulness** of the IDW process by pilot partners for the development of inclusive digital mobility solutions.	The IDW process is useful for helping the pilot teams to develop high quality, relevant and inclusive digital mobility services	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 (IDW PQ) Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: The overall usefulness of the process is rated 'average' (q. 2a). Overall, the IDW process gave general insights and helped to better frame the pilot's problem and actions. The pilot apparently used just some elements of the IDW but not the whole method. The co-creation workshop was described as the most useful activity of the process since it gave relevant insights.	A partner of the Tilburg municipality answered the IDW PQ. However, the interview with Nextbike (the company that was leading this pilot) offered a more positive perspective and described the overall process as useful. The co-creation workshop was undoubtfully the most valued activity.
To what extent has the material provided been appropriate and helpful for the overall quality of the process and results?	KPI 2) **Usefulness** of the material provided by UCAM (**guidelines D.2.2** and the design **log)**.	The material provided to pilot projects was appropriate and helpful to ensure overall quality of the process and the results.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: - <u>Guidance document</u>: the usefulness of the document was rated 'average' (q. 2c); the ease of finding information in the document was rated 'average' (q. 2d). - <u>Design log</u>: the usefulness of the design log was rated 'average' (q. 2e); the ease of navigating and understanding the structure of the log was rated 'average' (q. 2f).	Apparently, the materials provided were appropriate, but they were not the most useful tools for this pilot, especially the log. This should be considered by UCAM when developing an improved version of the log.

				The guidance document and the log were useful mainly as an introduction to the IDW methodology and to frame the main steps and activities of the pilot. The partners appeared to work mainly in Word documents and then transfer some key points into the log.	
Was the support and guidance provided by Dignity partners satisfactory? 🙂	KPI 3) Level of satisfaction with the **support and guidance** provided by Dignity partners.	The support and guidance provided by Dignity partners to the different pilots were satisfactory.	IDW process questionnaires 1 and 2 Interviews with pilots	IDW PQ: The level of satisfaction with the support and guidance provided by UCAM was rated 'good' (q. 2b). in addition, the usefulness of the feedback provided on the concepts produced was rated 'good' (q. 2i). The support and guidance provided by the UCAM team were particularly useful to help develop and improve the concepts produced during the process.	The support of UCAM has been satisfactory for pilot partners. Though, it is worth pointing out that the pilot did not do the Evaluate phase at all since they delivered the new concepts (developed after the co-creation workshop) to UCAM too late for feedback. UCAM provided some informal feedback after the end of the process.
Are participants of the IDW process representatives of the end user group(s) targeted during the IDW process?	KPI 4) How well was the **target end user group represented during the IDW process?**	Overall, the IDW process ensured a good representation of group(s) targeted.	List of participants to the co-creation workshops Co-creation questionnaire	20 participants (19 female and 1 male) attended the Nextbike co-creation workshop, representing migrant women with different social backgrounds and levels of digital skills. All people attending were able to follow the workshop and no	The assessment of KPI 4 is in line with expected trends. Overall, the target end user group was very well represented. The gender imbalance was due to the target user group for this project, which was migrant women.

(green smiley)			Interviews with pilots	specific problems or difficulties were reported in the co-creation questionnaire. This is due in part to the provision of interpreters who translated the workshop into Arabic and Tigrinya.	
Was the co-creation experience useful/relevant for all actors involved in the workshop? (green smiley)	KPI 5) **Level of satisfaction with the overall co-creation workshop experience for all actors involved**.	All actors involved perceived overall co-creation experience as useful, rich and productive.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	The pilot's members rated the workshop experience 'very good' (q. 2g). The interview confirmed that the co-creation workshop was particularly relevant for them and gave important insights. The great majority of participants who responded were satisfied with the organisation of the workshop and considered (agreed or strongly agreed) that they enjoyed the workshop and that it was useful for them.	The assessment of KPI 5 is in line with the expected trends. All attendees were very satisfied with the co-creation workshop and participants suggested no relevant improvements. Apparently, the duration of the workshop could have been longer. Many comments point out that the activity went too fast.
Are the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops useful to address inclusiveness? (green smiley)	KPI 6) **Usefulness of the ideas and insights produced** in the co-creation workshops by the different pilots.	Ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshops were useful.	Co-creation questionnaire IDW process questionnaire 2 Interviews with pilots	The usefulness of the ideas and insights resulting from the co-creation workshop was rated 'good' by project partners (q. 2h). The majority of participants who responded agreed that the ideas for improving transport generated in the co-creation workshop were useful for improving transport.	Overall, the ideas and insights produced in the co-creation workshop are useful for reducing the digital gap of the vulnerable-to-exclusion groups targeted. In addition, the pilot ran a follow-up workshop with stakeholders, which was valuable for moving forward with the ideas and considering how they could be implemented.

				The workshops helped the pilot team deepen their understanding of the problems and potential barriers migrant women face in using bicycles. They also helped them to identify the most appropriate services. Non-digital aspects (including cultural/social aspects) and more 'practical' sessions, such as cycling lessons, were covered and relevant for the pilot's success.	
To what extent can the concepts/services produced during the IDW be considered inclusive and appropriate for the needs of the region and target group? 🙂	KPI 7) How **inclusive and appropriate are the concepts and services produced** during the IDW process.	The concepts and services produced through the IDW process are inclusive and have the potential to reduce the digital gap.	Interviews with pilots IDW deliverables	The pilot examined bike sharing in the Tilburg region, with special attention to the needs of migrant women. The IDW process produced: i) a list of services that a bike share provider could offer – this was a modular scheme, adaptable according to the needs of public authorities; ii) a set of recommendations for an equitable future shared cycling system in Tilburg (including various aspects such as: issues to do with cycling competencies, social and financial issues, types of bikes and bike accessories);	Overall, the concepts produced by the pilot are appropriate and have a good potential to reduce the digital gap for the user group targeted (women migrants) and other vulnerable-to-exclusion groups interested in this means of transport. This is particularly relevant for the pilot region, where cycling is a popular means of transport. However, it seems that the concept is still embryonic at the moment and needs further development.

				and iii) some concepts and guidance for bike sharing schemes, focused on understanding the stakeholders and their needs. The modular bike sharing scheme is a concept that public authorities could use to consider how to increase inclusion and create or improve a scheme to better meet the needs of a particular area or target user group. The concept produced is general and needs to be developed further, for example by including additional modules and more detailed consideration on the design of individual modules in order to increase inclusion.	In any case, it seems important to point out that the pilot concepts considered both digital and non-digital aspects for improving inclusion. For example, providing cycling lessons to overcome cultural and social barriers to participating in bike sharing and providing a smartcard instead of a smartphone app are useful and inclusive proposals.

* This pilot did not do the Evaluate phase since partners delivered the new concepts, developed after the co-creation workshop, to UCAM too late for feedback. UCAM provided some informal feedback after the end of the process. The rating, in particular, the 'feedback provided on the concepts produced' (part of KPI 3) has been considered a bit differently than the ratings from the other pilots. In fact, the feedback provided by UCAM on the new concepts produced was informal.

FINAL REMARKS – TILBURG (migrant women and bicycle project)

As regards the specific objectives of the evaluation, the following points can be established:

Usefulness/relevance of the ideas and insights produced in the 'Create' phase

The pilot examined bike sharing in the Tilburg region, aiming to develop a concept for a socially and digitally inclusive bike-share scheme with special attention to migrant women. A traditional bike sharing service might not take into sufficient consideration the potential barriers and specific needs that vulnerable-to-exclusion groups may experience. In the case of the group targeted, women migrants, various potential aspects – such as low digital literacy, not owning a smartphone, social and financial issues (e.g. not having a credit card), the lack of availability of particular types of bike, maintenance issues, etc. – can contribute to increase the exclusion of this particular group.

Inclusiveness and appropriateness of the concepts and services produced during the IDW process

The concepts produced by the pilot are particularly related to a better understanding of the users and their needs (particularly focusing on women migrants), and the exploration of more inclusive/equitable shared cycling systems. The pilot produced a high level concept for a bike sharing scheme with a list of the different services that could be provided in a modular mobility solution package and a list of possible features to be included in a user app. In addition, essential recommendations for promoting a more equitable shared system in the Tilburg area were provided. The issues raised by the pilot are appropriate and highlight the need for making bike sharing schemes more accessible. Bikes could be an affordable means of transport for migrant people. However, many might be excluded due to cultural, social or financial barriers such as not having a Dutch-issued debit card, home address, or credit card. Others may lack cycling competency and/or the capabilities to interact with a digital shared cycling platform.

Potential future impact of the actions/services proposed

The project was very focused on bike sharing for migrants (especially women) so the findings and potential impacts of the project primarily apply to this particular application area. Overall, the concept of a modular bike sharing scheme and the set of

recommendations provided by the pilot could be useful for public authorities. For example, a review of existing bikeshare services in the Tilburg area could be done, identifying holes in the provision, especially for this target user group. Services could then be improved or commissioned to meet these needs, taking into account the issues and advice identified by the pilot. The proposed concept for a modular bike sharing scheme could act as a framework for providing new services. Nonetheless, as pointed out by UCAM, the concept produced needs further development, adding specific modules and more detailed consideration of how the individual modules can be designed to increase inclusion.

5. Conclusions

The evaluation process carried out specifically considered in parallel the following aspects: i) the correct application of the methodologies that characterize the Bridging phase (SB and IDW) of the DIGNITY approach, constituting the basis for the subsequent evaluation steps; ii) the relevance of the ideas/projections/concepts produced during the processes and aimed at improving the inclusion of the vulnerable group targeted and iii) the potential future impact of project outputs, namely scenarios, concepts and services proposed by the local demonstrations as a result of the application of the methodologies.

The evaluation process had to consider relevant aspects related to the application of the SB and IDW methodologies. First, the inherent complexity of these methodologies and the diversity of the partner entities that applied them in diverse contexts had to be considered. In this sense, some of these are local or regional public entities. Others are technology-driven companies for which the novelty of the methodologies and the social approximation used could pose a challenge. Second, COVID restrictions, in place during the first part of the project in all partner countries, added complexity and difficulties to the correct application of these methodologies. As an example, the impossibility of carrying out face-to-face activities due to Covid, has resulted in the difficulty of involving members of vulnerable-to-exclusion target groups, such as: people with physical impairment, with low digital skills and elderly people.
. For these reasons, any partial adaptation of the methodologies to the needs of the local projects or the omission of particular activities expected were analysed based on the specific needs/difficulties experienced by the pilots and can be considered as relevant information for improving the respective tools in view of promoting their further application and upscaling beyond the project.

We invite the reader to consult the specific analysis of the different local demonstrations, which details the ideas, concepts and strategies that pilots developed to improve and promote inclusion in the respective local mobility systems. Some key aspects that emerged from the analysis for a correct understanding and decreasing digital exclusion, and that could promote the potential applicability/upscaling of the set of tools and methodologies employed as described below:

1. The two methodologies present a good integration within the bridging phase. Specifically, the output from the SB activities led by IZT provided inputs particularly relevant for the Explore activities of the IDW. This complementarity and alignment

between the two methodologies has to be considered to promote further applicability of the approach beyond the project demonstrations. However, due to the complexity of both methodologies, it appears necessary to have professional guidance for a proper application.

2. The SB favoured the engagement of a wide diversity of stakeholders with leading positions in public and private entities of the mobility sector, as well as representatives of vulnerable groups and end-users. Integrating different knowledge areas and perspectives from diverse sectors of the mobility field is especially valuable since these spaces of discussion and reflection are not common. The learning process resulting from SB activities is one of its key values. Although it is difficult to assess, it is worth pointing out that most participants state the SB helped improve their knowledge and awareness of the digitalisation in mobility.

3. The SB methodology has proven to be particularly suitable for dealing with the complex problems and challenges faced in societies by the ongoing digitalization of mobility. In this sense, different dimensions, actors, scales, present and future uncertainties etc. have been included in the discussions and activities of the tool and produced interesting results. Overall, the majority of scenarios produced can be defined as plausible and consistent; however, in some cases, they seem too open, possibly losing the focus on the digitalization in mobility and dealing more with broad transport problems.

4. The IDW methodology has proven to be especially useful in guiding pilot partners in identifying and integrating inclusiveness to improve digital mobility products and services. Along with improvements related to the accessibility of digital concepts and services produced, such as an app or a website, the process helped pilots to think more in terms of usability and inclusivity (e.g., 'how easy is the information to find and understand, both for people with impairments and for a wider range of users?') and to focus more on the needs of digitally excluded people. Accordingly, various non-digital concepts/options have been produced (telephone helpline, training personnel in specialised assistance, courses addressed to end-users etc.).

5. Overall, all local demonstration projects analysed and developed useful and appropriate ideas and concepts to reduce the exclusion of various vulnerable-to-exclusion groups (people with physical disabilities, elderly people, people with low digital abilities, migrant women etc.) in a specific territorial context. Some of these ideas and concepts produced through the IDW process are currently in an embryonic stage and need further work to determine how they can be implemented in practice. Nonetheless, they could potentially improve the mobility services better to meet the needs of a wide range of users.

6. The outputs of the different projects include, among different concepts produced during the bridging process, various sets of recommendations, mainly addressed to transport public authorities and transport companies (e.g. how to develop or improve the inclusion in specific services, specific training for transport personnel, non-digital solutions/approaches, etc.). Although developed for a specific local/regional context, these recommendations can be the basis for drafting more general recommendations for communication and awareness-raising.

7. The outputs of the different pilots' demonstrations highlighted the relevance of non-digital solutions to reduce the exclusion of various groups, particularly those who do not own a smartphone or cannot install an app, people with low digital competencies and the elderly. Non-digital solutions – such as personal customer attention or a customer helpline, specific training courses etc. – should be maintained along with digital services to ensure that mobility services be inclusive and accessible for all citizens.

8. SB workshops and IDW co-creation workshops are among the best valued activities regarding relevance and usefulness of information/insights produced to design more inclusive products and services. The participation of vulnerable-to-exclusion group – mainly under-represented in the design teams – in all process of design and co-creation of mobility services should be actively promoted and institutionalised as a way to integrate diversity in public policy and to produce services that are accessible to and usable by as many people as possible without the need for special adaptations.

References

Bracke, A., Delespaul, S. and Apeldoorn, N. van (2021). D3.1 Framing the digital gap in mobility on a local level. DIGNITY project deliverable. Available at: https://www.dignity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/DIGNITY_D3.1.pdf.

Bradley, M. and Goodman-Deane, J. (2021). D2.2 Guidelines for inclusive design processes for digital products and services. DIGNITY project deliverable. Available at: https://www.dignity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/D2.2_InclusiveDesignWheel.pdf.

Dziekan, K., Riedel, V., Müller, S., Abraham, M., Kettner, S., Daubitz, S. Evaluation matters. A practitioners' guide to sound evaluation for urban mobility measures (2013). Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304538182_Evaluation_matters_A_practitioners%27_guide_to_sound_evaluation_for_urban_mobility_measures

Goodman-Deane, J. and Bradley, M. (2022). D3.3 Report on the meso level process (Inclusive Design Wheel). DIGNITY project deliverable. Available at: https://www.dignity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Dignity-Deliverable-3.3-final.pdf

Lazzarini, B. and Roca, E. (2021). D4.1 Evaluation Guidelines Report. DIGNITY project deliverable. Available at: https://www.dignity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/DIGNITY_D4.1.pdf

Kollosche, I. and Uhl, A. (2022). D3.4 Report on the macro level process (Scenario Building). DIGNITY project deliverable. Available at: https://www.dignity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Dignity_3.4.pdf.

ANNEXES

Annex 1. Scenario Building co-creation workshop questionnaire for participants

The main goal of this questionnaire is to collect information on personal assessment of the attendees of Scenario Building workshops, held in the framework of the European project DIGNITY 'Digital Transport in and for Society' (https://www.dignity-project.eu/).

It will take only 5-10 minutes of your time

1a. Reference Pilot
 ➢ Ancona
 ➢ Barcelona
 ➢ Flanders
 ➢ Tilburg

1b. What best describes your gender?
 ➢ Female
 ➢ Male
 ➢ Non-binary

1c. What best defines your category?
 ➢ Public administration
 ➢ Enterprise
 ➢ Expert/Academic
 ➢ Public transport User
 ➢ Public transport operator
 ➢ Other: ……………………………

1d. Could you please briefly describe your interest to attend the workshop?

2a. Personal satisfaction. Please rate your agreements to the following statements (Scale 1 to 5)

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree
- ➢ I was motivated to participate in these workshops
- ➢ These workshops met my expectations and personal objectives for attending
- ➢ I strengthen or made new connections for my professional network
- ➢ I believe that all relevant stakeholders were present at the workshops
- ➢ I am satisfied with the quality of the organisation and support provided
- ➢ I had sufficient opportunities to provide input to the discussion

2b. Learning results. Please rate your agreements to the following statements (Scale 1 to 5)
1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree
After the Scenario Building process:
- ➢ I feel that the most relevant topics were discussed during the activities
- ➢ I have a better understanding of the perspective of the other stakeholders
- ➢ My understanding of mobility future challenges has greatly improved
- ➢ The scenario building process provide me new knowledge and perspectives on digital inclusion in mobility.

2c. Quality of the results. Please rate your agreements to the following statements (Scale 1 to 5)
1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree
- ➢ The scenarios created are well designed and understandable
- ➢ The scenarios created are plausible and realistic
- ➢ Policies and strategies proposed through the process are relevant for a digitally inclusive mobility systems
- ➢ Differences among participants were addressed in a constructive manner
- ➢ The scenario building process helped to converge diverse participants perspectives

3. Can you please highlight 2 positive aspects of the workshop?
……………………
4. Can you please highlight 2 aspects that could be improved (feel free to refer to any aspects of the workshop: contents, methods, practical information provided, activities, etc.)
……………………
5. Further comments and suggestions (including activities you think would be useful, for the future).
……………………

Annex 2. Pilot semi-structured interview – guiding questions (for Scenario Building and Inclusive Design Wheel)

Effectiveness
- ✓ Overall, do you think that goals initially set for this tool have been accomplished?
- ✓ To what extent members of the groups targeted have been effectively involved in the different pilots?
- ✓ Is there any part of the tool implementation that generated barriers of difficulties? Any pilot experienced problems in particular?
- ✓ Do you think that the tool has been useful for the pilots to gain specific knowledge for their local demonstrations? Do you have any specific positive experience to be reported?

Efficiency and resources
- ✓ To what extent the tool has been implemented in each pilot as was initially planned?
- ✓ Has it been planned properly, in terms of time, human resources?
- ✓ Do you think resources employed are proportional to the benefits obtained with this activity?
- ✓ Could other tools be considered that could have the same outcomes with less resources (human resources, time consumption, etc.)?

Participation and collaboration
- ✓ Was the implementation of the tool conducted with the vulnerable groups and stakeholders initially planned?
- ✓ Does the tool, in the way it was implemented, favour trust, commitment?
- ✓ Has the Information and communication flows been fluid among partners?
- ✓ Which are the main barriers and problems encountered in involving participants/pilot partners?

Expectations & social learning / Capabilities acquired
- ✓ Do you think the implementation of the tool was beneficial for participants (both pilots partners and members of targeted groups) involved? Has it favoured their empowerment? How?
- ✓ Which are in your opinion the main capabilities that the members of targeted groups might have acquired? (If any)
- ✓ Are there any mechanisms / arrangements that could be provided to improve the implementation of the tool by the participants?

Relationship with other Dignity tasks
- ✓ In your opinion, has the tool established bridges with the other Dignity activities?
- ✓ What resources/benefits does the tool provide to the other tasks within the project?

Annex 3. Inclusive Design Wheel co-creation workshop questionnaire for participants

This form is intended to give you an opportunity to express your opinion of the co-creation workshop held as part of the Dignity project, and to make suggestions for improvements. It should take 5-10 minutes to complete.

1. Information about yourself

1a. Which pilot are you part of?
- ☐ Ancona
- ☐ Barcelona
- ☐ Flanders
- ☐ Tilburg: Older people and digital mobility
- ☐ Tilburg: Migrant women and bicycles

1b. What best describes your gender?
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Prefer to self-describe:

1c. What best describes your role?
- ☐ Transport user
- ☐ Public administration
- ☐ Transport provider
- ☐ Designer
- ☐ Other:

1d. Which of the following groups do you consider yourself to be a member of? (Please feel free to skip this question if you prefer)
- ☐ Older person (age 65 or over)
- ☐ Person with a disability
- ☐ Person on a low income
- ☐ Person with a low education level
- ☐ Migrant to the country (i.e. you were born in another country)
- ☐ Low technology user (i.e. does not use a computer or smartphone regularly)
- ☐ Rural inhabitant
- ☐ Other:

2. Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I enjoyed the workshop	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The workshop was useful to me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The workshop generated useful ideas for improving transport	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I could participate well and my opinion was listened to	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Differences among participants were addressed in a constructive manner	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Questions about the workshop

3a. Please briefly describe your reasons for attending the workshop.

3b. Did the workshop meet your expectations? If not, why not?

3c. Did you find any parts of the workshop confusing or difficult? If so, please explain.

3d. Do you have any suggestions for improving the workshop?

3e. Any other comments:

Thank you for your feedback

Annex 4. IDW - Explore phase questionnaire (addressed to pilot partners)

This form is intended to give you an opportunity to express your opinion of the work with the IDW and design log so far, and make suggestions for improvements.

IDW process so far
- In which ways was the process helpful? In which ways was it not helpful?
- What did you need support with in the IDW process so far?
- Was there any further help/support you would have liked from the UCAM team?
- Which of the Explore activities did you find the most useful? Which were the least useful?
- Any other comments:

IDW guidance document (Deliverable 2.2)
- In which ways was the IDW guidance document helpful? In which ways was it not helpful?
- At what points did you refer to this?
- What aspects did you find useful? What did you not find useful?
- Was there any information missing that you would like to have had?
- Was anything confusing or unhelpful? Please explain
- Suggestions for improvement
- Any other comments:

Design log
- In which ways was it helpful? In which ways was it not helpful?
- Which of the log activity entries were most useful? Not useful?
- Was there anything in particular you found confusing?
- Suggestions for improvement, e.g. different format; changes to the structure or to individual slides; suggestions for additions (slides, templates, activities)
- Any other comments:

	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good
How helpful was the IDW process so far?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How helpful was the support provided by the UCAM team?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

How helpful was the IDW guidance document (Deliverable 2.2)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How easy was it to find what you needed in the guidance document?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How helpful was the design log so far?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How easy was it to navigate and understand the structure of the log?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

General comments:

....
....
....
....

Annex 5. IDW - End questionnaire (addressed to pilot partners)

This form is intended to be completed by members of the core pilot teams. It is intended to give you an opportunity to express your opinion of the work with the Inclusive Design Wheel (IDW) and design log, and to make suggestions for improvements. Depending on how many comments you would like to make, this should take around 10-20 minutes to complete.

1. Information about yourself

1a. Which pilot are you part of?
- ☐ Ancona
- ☐ Barcelona
- ☐ Flanders
- ☐ Tilburg: Older people and digital mobility
- ☐ Tilburg: Migrant women and bicycles

1b. What best describes your gender?
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Prefer to self-describe:

1c. (optional) Please describe your role on the pilot team

2. Please rate the usefulness, helpfulness and ease of use of various aspects of your experience of the IDW process:

	Very Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good
How useful was the IDW process overall?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How helpful was the support provided by the UCAM team?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

How helpful was the IDW guidance document (Deliverable 2.2)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How easy was it to find what you needed in the guidance document?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How helpful was the design log?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How easy was it to navigate and understand the structure of the log?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How useful was the co-creation workshop(s) held by your pilot?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How useful were the ideas produced in the co-creation workshop(s)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
How useful was the feedback provided by UCAM on your concepts?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The remaining questions ask you to comment on different aspects of the IDW process. It is fine to leave some of the questions blank if you do not feel you have anything to say about that particular topic.

3. These questions refer to your experience of the IDW process overall

3a. In which ways was the process helpful? In which ways was it not helpful?

3b. What did you need support with? Was there any further help/support you would have liked from the UCAM team?

3c. Which of the IDW activities did you find the most useful? Which were the least useful?

3d. Do you have any suggestions for improving the process or any other comments on the process?

4. These questions refer to your use of the IDW guidance document (Deliverable 2.2)
You can find this at: https://www.dignity-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/D2.2_InclusiveDesignWheel.pdf

4a. In which ways was the IDW guidance document helpful?

4b. How could the document be improved?

4c. Any other comments

5. These questions refer to your experiences with the IDW design log (the PowerPoint file used for recording the IDW actions and outcomes)

5a. In which ways was the design log helpful?

5b. How could the design log be improved?

5c. Any other comments

6. These questions refer to the co-creation workshop(s) held by your pilot

6a. In which ways was the co-creation workshop(s) helpful?

6b. How could the co-creation workshop be improved?

6c. Any other comments

7. These questions refer to the feedback provided by UCAM on the concepts produced by your pilot.

7a. In which ways was the feedback helpful?

7b. How could the feedback be improved?

7c. Any other comments

8. Any other comments:

Thank you for your feedback