



Co-funded by
the European Union



CALL 4 ACTION PROJECT

A COMPARATIVE SURVEY ANALYSIS OF **STAKEHOLDER** PERSPECTIVES ON DISABILITY ACCESSIBILITY IN MACEDONIA, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

2 0 2 3

Call4Action Project: A Comparative Survey Analysis of Stakeholder Perspectives on Disability Accessibility in Macedonia, Spain, and Portugal

Researchers: Anita Gagovska, Martina Durljanova (Poraka Nova), Pablo Godoy, Francesca Dadomo, Alba Garcia (Impulsa Igualdad), Joana Gorgueira and Catarina Lopes (Associação Salvador).

Responsible Organization: Centre for improvement of the quality of life of the persons with intellectual disabilities and their families Poraka Nova, Struga, Macedonia

Partner Organizations: Associação Salvador, Portugal, and Impulsa Igualdad, Spain, Poraka Nova (Macedonia)

Date: 10 of November, 2023

Abstract

The CALL4ACTION project is a concerted effort funded by the Erasmus+ Programme, involving partners from Portugal (Associação Salvador), Spain (Impulsa Igualdad), and Macedonia (Poraka Nova). It is designed to tackle the pressing issue of accessibility in public spaces—parks, sidewalks, schools, marketplaces—and its significant role in the social inclusion of persons with disabilities. Spanning from 2023 to 2024, the project's objectives include assessing the accessibility landscape in the three countries, enhancing "accessibility literacy" among technicians, bolstering organizational capacities, promoting transnational cooperation, and disseminating strategic information on accessibility.

Through this collaborative survey analysis, including responses from 14 Macedonian stakeholders, 12 from Spain, and 7 from Portugal, the project seeks to understand national accessibility standards, share successful practices, and identify common obstacles faced by people with disabilities in urban settings. This document synthesizes the results and analysis of a survey on the current state and future directions of accessibility initiatives in urban environments within Macedonia, Spain, and Portugal. The survey investigated various aspects of accessibility, including the existence of dedicated budgets, strategies for securing funding, challenges in implementing accessibility plans, best practices from past projects, mechanisms for public consultation, and suggestions for improving urban accessibility. Comparative analysis revealed shared and unique challenges across the countries, as well as diverse strategies for addressing accessibility needs.

Research Introduction

Accessibility in urban environments is pivotal for inclusivity, allowing individuals with disabilities to participate fully in society. This survey analysis explores how different stakeholders in Macedonia, Spain, and Portugal approach the planning, funding, and implementation of accessibility measures in cities and public spaces. It covers organizations' awareness and execution of legal accessibility frameworks, budget allocation,

stakeholder engagement, public consultation, and challenges faced during the execution of accessibility plans. The analysis also reflects on the methodologies employed to monitor and evaluate the success of these initiatives, as well as the best practices and future goals set by organizations in each country.

The "Call4Action" project encapsulates a comprehensive survey analysis, gathering insights from 14 stakeholders in Macedonia, 12 in Spain, and 7 in Portugal, to scrutinize the framework, implementation, and advancement of accessibility for people with disabilities in urban landscapes. This cross-country study delves into how these stakeholders address the intricacies of legal compliance, budget allocation, challenges and barriers, public consultation mechanisms, and the measurement of progress in accessibility initiatives. By dissecting the varied approaches and practices across the three countries, the survey illuminates the current state of accessibility, underlining the successes and pinpointing the shortcomings that impede the inclusivity of city spaces and public facilities.

Results

Analysis of Research Demographics

The demographic distribution of the "Call4Action" project survey respondents provides a cross-sectional view of accessibility concerns in varied urban and municipal contexts within Macedonia, Spain, and Portugal.

Macedonia:

- Total Respondents: 14
- Cities Represented: 10
- Notable Concentrations: Bitola represents the largest single group from Macedonia with four respondents, indicating a higher engagement level or perhaps a greater prioritization of accessibility within this city. Other cities, including the capital, Skopje, have a solitary representation, which may reflect the decentralized focus of the survey across smaller and larger urban areas alike. The diverse city representation ensures a wide range of urban challenges and solutions are captured.

Spain:

- Total Respondents: 12
- Cities Represented: 9
- Notable Concentrations: Xàbia / Jávea is over-represented with a third of the Spanish respondents, which could signify a specific focus or active involvement in accessibility issues in this locality. This may also suggest that the initiatives or the effects of accessibility measures in Xàbia / Jávea are more pronounced or have been better documented, prompting greater response participation.

Portugal:

- Total Respondents: 7
- Cities Represented: 5
- Notable Concentrations: Tomar and Rio Maior have the highest response rate with two respondents each, which could imply either a higher awareness of the accessibility projects or a greater perceived need for improvements in these areas. Lisboa, as the capital, is notably

underrepresented with only one respondent, which could suggest either a lower response rate or potentially that the capital has a different set of accessibility dynamics.

Comparative Insights:

- **Urban vs. Rural:** The spread of respondents across urban and rural areas, such as from smaller municipalities like Delchevo and larger urban centers like Skopje, suggests that the project captures a broad spectrum of urban experiences and accessibility challenges.
- **Capital Cities:** With only one respondent from each of the capital cities of the participating countries, there's an indication that the project may have a more significant reach within smaller cities or non-capital regions, which might face unique accessibility challenges.
- **Coastal vs. Inland:** In Spain, the coastal towns like Xàbia / Jávea and BENIDORM have a distinct representation, which may bring to the fore accessibility issues pertinent to tourist-heavy, coastal, and potentially more economically affluent areas compared to the inland towns.
- **Size and Scope of Response:** The size of the respondent group from each country might also reflect the scope and scale of outreach of the project or the varying levels of accessibility development and advocacy within those countries.

The demographic analysis of this survey suggests that accessibility is not a uniform issue across different city sizes and types. It also highlights the importance of considering local contexts and the specific needs of diverse urban populations in developing effective accessibility strategies. The varying levels of representation across these demographics underscore the need for targeted and localized strategies to address the unique challenges faced by different communities.

The research results are distributed in several thematic groups, as following:

- Group 1: Accessibility Assessment and Challenges
- Group 2: Accessibility in Policy and Practice
- Group 3: Stakeholder Engagement and Public Consultation
- Group 4: Accessibility Funding and Budgeting
- Group 5: Monitoring and Evaluation of Accessibility Progress
- Group 6: Future Directions and Development

These groupings aim to cohesively categorize the survey questions for an organized analysis of accessibility issues, facilitating a more systematic approach to understanding and addressing the varied dimensions of accessibility in urban development.

Group 1: Accessibility Assessment and Challenges

Questions: Do you have in your family or friends circle a person with disability? And If yes, please explain what kind of disability.

Questions: Are you a person with disability? and If yes, please explain what kind of disability.

Questions: Do you think your city is accessible for people with disabilities? and Please explain your previous answer, why do you consider or not your city accessible, indicating the type of disabilities for which is not accessible.

Questions: Have you encountered challenges or barriers in implementing accessibility plans, If yes, what are they?, and How do you address or plan to address these challenges?

This thematic group focuses on evaluating the existing condition of accessibility for people with disabilities in urban environments. It collects data on personal connections to disability and identifies real-life impacts of accessibility, or lack thereof, on daily living. By probing into the experiences of those affected, either directly or through their close circles, the survey aims to glean a grassroots perspective on accessibility.

The group also seeks to uncover the specific obstacles that impede the implementation of effective accessibility plans. It invites respondents to articulate the types of challenges they face, such as infrastructural deficiencies, policy gaps, or social hurdles. This inquiry extends to solicit recommendations for urban improvement from those who navigate these barriers firsthand or through advocacy roles.

A critical element of this group is to understand the broader implications of such challenges on social inclusion and quality of life. The questions serve to pinpoint systemic issues, encourage candid discussions about the limitations of current accessibility measures, and foster a dialogue on practical solutions to make cities more inclusive and accommodating for all citizens. This conversation sets the stage for a more in-depth exploration of accessibility as a fundamental right and a public priority, underscoring the need for targeted action and reform.

Questions: Do you have in your family or friends circle a person with disability? And If yes, please explain what kind of disability.

The survey initiated with a personal query to the participants, asking whether they have a family member or a friend with a disability, to establish a direct connection to the issue of accessibility and its impact on everyday life. Those who responded affirmatively were then asked to specify the nature of the disability, providing a clearer context for the subsequent questions on accessibility challenges and strategies.

Macedonia

With the data from Macedonia, we can deduce the following:

- Out of 14 responses, 10 respondents answered "Yes," suggesting they have a person with a disability in their family or friends circle.
- Conversely, 4 respondents answered "No," indicating they do not have such a connection.

Analyzing the qualitative data provided by the Macedonian respondents on the types of disabilities present within their personal circles, we can identify a range of disabilities and conditions reported, which include both physical and intellectual disabilities. Here's a categorization of the types of disabilities mentioned:

- **Physical Disabilities:**
 - Partial paralysis
 - Paraplegic
 - General physical disability

- **Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities:**
 - Autism
 - Intellectual disability
 - Asperger syndrome
 - Combined disability including intellectual disability
- **Sensory Disabilities:**
 - Deafness
- **Neurological Conditions:**
 - Epilepsy (mentioned as accompanying other disabilities)
- **Multiple/Combined Disabilities:**
 - Combined intellectual, physical, and speech disabilities
 - Various diagnoses and conditions (unspecified)

One response simply states "Close friends," which does not specify the type of disability but indicates the respondent's personal connection to individuals with disabilities.

This data can provide valuable insights into the disability landscape within the respondent's environments in Macedonia. It shows a diversity in disability types, suggesting that respondents may have a broad understanding and exposure to various disability conditions. It also reflects an intersectionality of conditions in some cases, like the combined disability with epilepsy, which may indicate complex care needs.

The mention of "various diagnoses and conditions" suggests that some respondents are aware of or related to people with multiple or less easily categorized conditions, which can have implications for the kinds of support and services that are necessary in that context.

Spain

Based on the results from Spain provided for the question regarding having a person with a disability within the respondent's family or friends circle, we can derive the following insights:

- Out of 12 responses, 2 respondents have indicated that they have a person with a disability in their family or friends circle.
- The majority, 10 out of 12, indicated that they do not have a person with a disability in their family or friends circle.

The responses from Spain regarding the type of disability within respondents' social circles indicate two specific types of mobility-related disabilities:

1. "Movilidad reducida" translates to "reduced mobility," which suggests a range of conditions where an individual's ability to move is limited. This could include disabilities that require the use of mobility aids like wheelchairs or walkers, or it may relate to conditions that cause decreased strength, coordination, or balance.
2. "Dificultad para andar" translates to "difficulty walking," which may overlap with "reduced mobility" but is specifically focused on walking challenges. This could be due to various causes such as musculoskeletal disorders, neurological conditions, or pain.

Portugal

The responses from Portugal regarding the type of disability within respondents' social circles mention three distinct conditions:

1. "Mobilidade condicionada" translates to "conditioned mobility," which implies limitations in mobility that may require the use of special equipment or accommodations.
2. "Auditiva e física" refers to disabilities that are both auditory and physical in nature. This indicates that at least one respondent knows individuals with multiple disabilities affecting both their hearing and general physical abilities.
3. "Paralisia Cerebral" stands for "Cerebral Palsy," a neurological disorder caused by a non-progressive brain injury or malformation that occurs while the child's brain is under development. It primarily affects body movement and muscle coordination.

Comparative Analysis

Comparatively, when we look at the data from all three countries, on the question Do you have in your family or friends circle a person with disability?:

- **Spain:** A lower proportion, with 2 out of 12 respondents indicating a connection to a person with a disability.
- **Portugal:** A balanced view, with 3 out of 7 respondents acknowledging a connection.
- **Macedonia:** A higher proportion, with 10 out of 14 indicating such a connection.

The Macedonian data suggest a higher reported connection to disability within personal circles compared to Spain and Portugal. This points to the fact that most of the respondents are from disability organizations, which are led by parents of people with disabilities.

Comparing the data across the three countries yields the following insights:

- **Spain's responses** were focused on mobility issues, indicating a prevalence or awareness of physical disabilities related to movement.
- **Macedonian responses** highlighted a broader range of disabilities, including physical, intellectual, developmental, sensory, and combined disabilities.
- **Portuguese responses** show a mix, including mobility, cerebral palsy, and combined auditory and physical disabilities, indicating an awareness of both single and multiple disability conditions.

The Portuguese data, although limited in the number of responses, suggests some diversity in the types of disabilities recognized by the respondents, similar to Macedonia, but different in the specific types of disabilities reported compared to Spain.

This information could be useful for understanding the different kinds of support and accessibility needs within each country. For instance, the mention of cerebral palsy and combined auditory and physical disabilities in Portugal might point towards the need for multifaceted support systems that address multiple aspects of living with a disability, from healthcare to educational and occupational accommodations.

Understanding these differences is crucial for stakeholders when designing inclusive policies, providing services, and raising awareness about the full spectrum of disabilities within each cultural and national context.

Questions: Are you a person with disability? and If yes, please explain what kind of disability.

The survey probed into the personal experiences of disability among respondents to gauge the prevalence and types of disabilities within their immediate environment. Respondents who identified as persons with a disability were further requested to describe their specific conditions, offering insight into the varied personal challenges that may influence their perspectives on accessibility in public spaces.

Macedonia

- **Responses to Disability Status:** Out of 14 respondents from Macedonia, 2 have identified themselves as persons with a disability.
- **Types of Disability Explained:** The two respondents who identified as disabled both reported having a physical disability. There were no other types of disabilities mentioned among the Macedonian respondents who self-identified as disabled.

Spain

- **Responses to Disability Status:** All 12 respondents from Spain indicated that they are not persons with disabilities.
- **Types of Disability Explained:** No respondents from Spain identified as having a disability, hence there were no explanations of disability types.

Portugal

- **Responses to Disability Status:** There were no answers provided for Portugal, which suggests that either the respondents from Portugal chose not to disclose their disability status, or that the data wasn't collected or provided here.

Comparative Analysis

When comparing the responses across all three countries, we see that only in Macedonia did individuals self-identify as having a disability, specifically physical in nature. The absence of self-identified disabled individuals in the Spanish responses, and the lack of data for Portugal, prevent a direct comparison of the prevalence and types of disabilities among the survey participants themselves across these countries.

Questions: Do you think your city is accessible for people with disabilities? and Please explain your previous answer, why do you consider or not your city accessible, indicating the type of disabilities for which is not accessible.

The survey addressed the perceived accessibility of cities for individuals with disabilities, inviting respondents to reflect on and evaluate the inclusivity of their urban environment. Following their assessment, they were asked to elaborate on the reasons behind their views, offering specific details on the accessibility conditions for various disabilities, which helps in identifying the scope for necessary improvements.

Quantitative Analysis

For a quantitative analysis of the accessibility of cities based on the responses provided, we'll calculate the number of cities reported as accessible versus not accessible for each country and provide a brief summary of the findings.

Macedonia Accessibility Analysis

- **Total Number of Responses:** 14
- **Cities Reported as Accessible:** 4 (Demir Kapija, Kavadarci, Kumanovo, Prilep)
- **Cities Reported as Not Accessible:** 10 (Bitola, Skopje, Bitola, Kumanovo, Delchevo, Ohrid, Bitola, Negotino, Struga)

Spain Accessibility Analysis

- **Total Number of Responses:** 12
- **Cities Reported as Accessible:** 4 (Riba-roja de Turia, BENIDORM, Xàbia/Jávea, JÁVEA)
- **Cities Reported as Not Accessible:** 8 (Gandia, Morella, Cullera, Alpuente, Xàbia / Jávea, XÀBIA, Montanejos, Alcoy)

Portugal Accessibility Analysis

- **Total Number of Responses:** 7
- **Cities Reported as Accessible:** 4 (Tomar, Rio Maior, Rio Maior, Guimarães)
- **Cities Reported as Not Accessible:** 3 (Lisboa, Grândola, Tomar)

Summary of Findings

- **Macedonia:** Approximately 29% (4 out of 14) of the Macedonian cities were reported as accessible. This indicates that the majority, about 71%, are considered not accessible by the respondents.
- **Spain:** Approximately 33% (4 out of 12) of the Spanish cities surveyed were reported as accessible, with the remaining 67% reported as not accessible.
- **Portugal:** Approximately 57% (4 out of 7) of the cities had responses indicating they were accessible, suggesting a slightly more positive view on accessibility compared to the other countries.

This quantitative analysis shows that, across the board, the majority of cities in these three countries face challenges with accessibility, as indicated by the survey respondents. However, the proportion of cities considered accessible is highest in Portugal based on the available data. It should be noted that this analysis is based on the number of cities for which responses were provided, and the actual situation in each country may vary based on a more comprehensive survey.

Qualitative Analysis

Macedonia

- **Perceived Accessibility:** The perception of city accessibility in Macedonia is mixed, with several respondents stating their cities are not accessible for various disabilities, while a few describe their cities as making continuous efforts or being partially accessible.
- **Reasons and Specific Disabilities Mentioned:** Lack of dedicated personnel for specific disabilities like the deaf and blind, inaccessible streets and public buildings, insufficient educational assistants, and lack of assistive technology are cited as issues. Some positive notes include ongoing municipal work on sidewalk accessibility, parking spaces for disabled people, and an 87% accessible municipality website.

Spain

- **Perceived Accessibility:** Spanish respondents predominantly consider their cities to be inaccessible, citing the historical and geographical layout as significant barriers, except for a few like Benidorm and Riba-roja de Turia, which are noted for making adaptations for tourism and general improvements in accessibility.
- **Reasons and Specific Disabilities Mentioned:** Reasons for inaccessibility include medieval city layouts, steep slopes, lack of specific measures for disabilities other than mobility, and narrow sidewalks. Accessibility efforts are mentioned in Benidorm and Xàbia/Jávea, suggesting progress in architectural barrier removal and overall accessible services.

Portugal

- **Perceived Accessibility:** Portuguese responses also display a mixed perception of accessibility, with some cities like Tomar and Rio Maior reported as accessible due to flat topographies and compliance with public space design requirements. However, Lisbon and Grândola respondents note the historical construction without accessibility in mind as a barrier.
- **Reasons and Specific Disabilities Mentioned:** Lisbon mentions the overall lack of true accessibility in most spaces, while Grândola notes ongoing barriers despite improvements. Guimarães admits difficulties in the historical center affecting mainly motor and visual disabilities.

Comparative Analysis

- **Common Challenges:** Across all three countries, historical and geographical factors are common challenges to achieving full accessibility. The historical urban layout with steep slopes and narrow streets is a barrier in many older cities, as seen in responses from Macedonia, Spain, and Portugal.
- **Positive Efforts and Gaps:** Efforts towards improving accessibility are noted in all three countries, with specific measures for people with mobility and sensory disabilities. However, gaps remain, particularly for less visible disabilities and in providing comprehensive support like educational assistance or dedicated personnel.
- **Specific vs. General Accessibility:** Some cities show progress in specific aspects of accessibility, like website access in Macedonia and tourist accommodations in Spain, while others point out a need for a more general approach, addressing both infrastructure and personal assistance.
- **Disability-Focused vs. Universal Design:** Responses suggest a tension between addressing specific needs for particular disabilities and pursuing universal design principles that benefit all users, including but not limited to people with disabilities.

In summary, while there are efforts to improve accessibility in cities from all three countries, respondents highlight a need for further work, including the need for specific adjustments and provisions for various disabilities, indicating that while progress is noted, comprehensive accessibility is still an ongoing challenge.

Questions: Have you encountered challenges or barriers in implementing accessibility plans, If yes, what are they?, and How do you address or plan to address these challenges?

This set of questions probes into the real-world difficulties organizations face when implementing accessibility initiatives, asking respondents to identify specific obstacles and their strategies for overcoming

them. It aims to uncover both the prevalent issues that hinder progress and the innovative solutions or plans being developed to advance accessibility in urban environments.

Quantitative Analysis

For a quantitative analysis of the reported challenges in implementing accessibility plans and the strategies to address them, the data can be summarized as follows:

Macedonia

- **Total Organizations Surveyed: 14**
- **Organizations Reporting Challenges: 8 (57.14%)**
- **Challenges Specified:**
 - Insufficient local stakeholder engagement: Mentioned by some.
 - Regulatory non-compliance: Noted by others.
 - Financial constraints: A recurring theme.
 - Lack of accessible facilities: Cited by several respondents.
- **Strategies to Address Challenges:**
 - Creation of easy-to-read materials: By at least one organization.
 - Continued activity implementation: As mentioned.
 - Personal involvement and adaptation: Indicated by one respondent.
 - Improvement of public forums and awareness: Planned by some.

Spain

- **Total Organizations Surveyed: 12**
- **Organizations Reporting Challenges: 5 (41.67%)**
- **Challenges Specified:**
 - Complicated geography: Reported by at least one organization.
 - Difficulty adhering to strict regulations: Mentioned by others.
 - Resource limitations: A common barrier.
- **Strategies to Address Challenges:**
 - Seeking financial subsidies: Mentioned as a strategy.
 - Diagnostic planning and programming: Noted for addressing issues.
 - No short or long-term specific solutions: Indicated by one response.
 - Effort and dedication to the process: As per one organization's approach.

Portugal

- **Total Organizations Surveyed: 7**

- **Organizations Reporting Challenges:** 4 (57.14%)
- **Challenges Specified:**
 - Lack of sensitivity and technical knowledge: Identified as barriers.
 - Financial constraints: Recognized by at least one organization.
 - Historical heritage considerations: Mentioned in the context of Guimarães.
- **Strategies to Address Challenges:**
 - Sensitization, training, and securing funding: Detailed as solutions.
 - Careful municipal project planning: Cited as a strategy.
 - Coordination with urban planning technicians: As a means to address issues.

Summary

- **Challenge Prevalence:** Over half of the organizations in Macedonia and Portugal report encountering challenges, with a slightly lower percentage in Spain.
- **Financial Constraints:** Financial issues appear as a notable barrier in all three countries, although they are addressed with different strategies.
- **Strategic Responses:** Spanish organizations appear to have specific strategies in place, involving planning and the search for subsidies. Macedonian responses suggest an intention to become more proactive, while Portuguese strategies are focused on integrating accessibility into broader planning processes and leveraging municipal forums.
- **Regulatory and Environmental Challenges:** Both Macedonian and Spanish respondents express difficulties with regulation compliance and physical geography, whereas Portuguese challenges are more related to cultural and heritage preservation.

This quantitative analysis reflects the scope and nature of the challenges faced by organizations in these countries and the diverse approaches they take to overcome these obstacles. The data underscores the importance of targeted strategies that consider the specific context and limitations within which each organization operates.

Qualitative analysis

Macedonia

- **Challenges Encountered:** Several organizations in Macedonia report challenges in implementing accessibility plans, mainly due to insufficient engagement, regulatory non-compliance, financial constraints, and lack of interest from local governance.
- **Nature of Challenges:** The detailed challenges include a lack of ramps, adapted facilities, and transportation, as well as financial and legal barriers.
- **Addressing Challenges:** Methods for addressing these issues include creating easy-to-read materials, continued implementation of planned activities, personal involvement according to needs, and plans to improve public forums and awareness.

Spain

- **Challenges Encountered:** In Spain, challenges are identified by some organizations and relate to complicated geography, strict regulation adherence difficulties, and lack of resources.
- **Nature of Challenges:** Specific issues include the complexity of mountainous municipality work and the general lack of approved accessibility plans.
- **Addressing Challenges:** Strategies for addressing these issues include seeking subsidies, good diagnostics, planning, explaining and convincing stakeholders, and through specific project implementation within public services.

Portugal

- **Challenges Encountered:** Portuguese organizations acknowledge challenges related to sensitivity, technical knowledge, financial constraints, and the limitations posed by historical heritage areas.
- **Nature of Challenges:** The reported challenges are mainly organizational and cultural, with a need for increased sensitivity towards accessibility.
- **Addressing Challenges:** Proposed solutions include sensitization, training, securing funding, and careful project planning to accommodate municipal needs and restrictions.

Comparative Analysis

- **Common Issues Across Countries:** Financial constraints and a lack of stakeholder engagement are common challenges across all three countries. Additionally, a lack of specialized knowledge or sensitivity towards disability issues is a recurring theme.
- **Diversity in Problem-Solving Approaches:** Responses show that Macedonian organizations are in the process of taking action but may lack formal plans, while Spanish entities are using strategic planning and subsidy applications to overcome barriers. Portuguese organizations are focusing on sensitization and municipal project care to address their challenges.
- **Impact of Regulations and Geography:** Both Macedonian and Spanish organizations mention the difficulty of complying with existing regulations, while the geographic and historical context of Spain and Portugal respectively pose unique challenges to the implementation of accessibility measures.
- **Need for Awareness and Education:** Macedonia and Portugal both highlight the need for greater public awareness and education on accessibility issues, suggesting that advocacy and training could be vital components in addressing the identified challenges.

The analysis indicates that while there are shared difficulties, the methods and strategies to address the challenges of implementing accessibility plans vary significantly, reflecting each country's unique environmental, cultural, and regulatory landscape. These differences suggest that solutions must be tailored to the specific context of each country while also adopting a shared focus on increased funding, advocacy, and education to promote accessibility.

Group 2: Accessibility in Policy and Practice

Questions: What is the name of your organization/institution?, and What specific role does it have (in implementing accessibility plans and strategies for cities and public spaces)?

Questions: What specific measures or initiatives has your organization/institution undertaken to improve accessibility in the city/public spaces? Please provide examples.

Questions: Does your organization have a designated accessibility plan or strategy? and If yes please provide a brief overview of its objectives and key components.

Questions: What legal framework or regulations exist in your jurisdiction to ensure accessibility in cities and public spaces? and Do you know if there are any recent updates or developments in the legal framework or regulations?

Questions: What are the best practices of your previous project/s?

Group 2: Accessibility in Policy and Practice serves as a critical lens through which the strategic roles and contributions of various organizations are scrutinized in the context of improving accessibility. This segment of the survey is dedicated to unveiling the identities and missions of the organizations involved, their mandated roles in the realm of public accessibility, and the extent to which they are embedded in the fabric of policy and practice. It invites a closer look at how these entities define themselves within the larger narrative of accessibility and what specific responsibilities they shoulder to foster inclusive environments.

The focus then shifts to the tangible efforts these organizations have made to address accessibility barriers. The survey questions elicit detailed descriptions of measures and initiatives, seeking real-world examples that demonstrate how policy translates into practice. This perspective not only highlights the actions taken but also provides a platform for sharing innovative solutions and strategies that have proven effective in making cities and public spaces more welcoming and navigable for individuals with disabilities.

Finally, the discussion turns towards the frameworks that guide and govern these practices. By examining the existing legal parameters and any recent developments therein, the group seeks to understand the compliance and adaptability of organizations to these standards. Additionally, the inquiry into best practices from prior projects offers a retrospective view that can inform future approaches. This comprehensive examination aims to distill the essence of what works, paving the way for replicating success and prompting progressive changes in the landscape of urban accessibility.

Questions: What is the name of your organization/institution?, and What specific role does it have (in implementing accessibility plans and strategies for cities and public spaces)?

The survey sought to identify the organizations and institutions represented by the respondents and understand their role in the accessibility landscape. Participants provided the name of their organization or institution followed by an explanation of its specific functions or actions in formulating and executing accessibility plans and strategies for urban areas and public spaces.

Macedonia

- **Organizations and Roles:** The Macedonian responses represent a diverse set of organizations, including foundations, associations, resource centers, hotels, and municipal bodies. Their roles in implementing accessibility plans and strategies vary from support and advocacy to direct services and participation in local government councils.

Spain

- **Organizations and Roles:** The Spanish responses come exclusively from municipal government entities, such as town councils and urban planning departments. Their roles are typically described in official capacities such as local development technicians, mayors, and chief engineers, focusing on adapting public spaces and infrastructure to accessibility standards.

Portugal

- **Organizations and Roles:** The Portuguese organizations are primarily municipal bodies and national institutes focused on rehabilitation. Their roles are pointed toward enabling the implementation of legal measures for accessibility, managing social development, supporting mobility challenges, and ensuring compliance with architectural projects against accessibility norms.

Comparative Analysis

- **Diversity of Organizations:** Macedonian entities are more varied, including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private sector representatives, and municipal bodies, whereas responses from Spain and Portugal are primarily from public municipal entities.
- **Scope of Responsibility:** Spanish and Portuguese organizations are heavily focused on infrastructure, legal compliance, and urban planning. In contrast, Macedonian organizations seem to have a more hands-on approach with direct services and advocacy, in addition to influencing policy through recommendations and participation in municipal councils.
- **Engagement in Accessibility:** Macedonian organizations appear to engage in a range of activities, including advocacy, research, and direct community engagement. Spanish entities report a mix of planning, execution, and adaptation of public spaces for accessibility, with some indicating specific achievements and targeted strategies for tourism. Portuguese respondents highlighted strategic and planning roles, legal compliance, and technical assessments for accessibility in construction.
- **Focus on Specific Disabilities:** Some Macedonian organizations mentioned working with specific disability groups, like the deaf and those with intellectual disabilities, while in Spain, the focus was more on general accessible tourism and urban services. Portuguese entities did not specify targeted disability groups, focusing more on broad strategic planning and legal enforcement.

The information provided showcases the varying approaches to accessibility and the implementation of related strategies in different countries. It also reflects the differing roles that organizations play within their respective societies in promoting inclusive environments for persons with disabilities. This comparative analysis could be beneficial for understanding best practices and areas for improvement in implementing accessibility across different national contexts.

Questions: *What specific measures or initiatives has your organization/institution undertaken to improve accessibility in the city/public spaces? Please provide examples.*

The survey delved into the practical actions taken by various organizations to enhance accessibility, asking respondents to detail the specific measures or initiatives their institutions have undertaken. This question aimed to gather concrete examples of projects and interventions that contribute to making city spaces and public places more accommodating for people with disabilities.

Qualitative and comparative analysis on the question *What specific measures or initiatives has your organization/institution undertaken to improve accessibility in the city/public spaces? Please provide examples.*

Macedonia

- **Initiatives:** Macedonian organizations reported a range of initiatives, including information accessibility projects, infrastructure mapping, training programs, and advocacy for improved municipal access and services. However, one organization reported no specific measures taken due to lack of authority.
- **Examples:** Notable projects include mapping disability needs in the Bitola region, implementing easy-to-read information for people with intellectual disabilities, submitting initiatives for school access, and creating accessible pathways around Ohrid.

Spain

- **Initiatives:** Spanish respondents described various measures, such as the installation of elevators, the creation of accessible pedestrian paths, and the adaptation of tourist information to be inclusive of individuals with hearing and visual impairments.
- **Examples:** Specific achievements include induction loop systems for hearing impairments, NaviLens systems for guiding people in Benidorm, and ensuring new projects comply with accessibility standards. Tourism departments have worked to remove physical barriers and provide virtual tours for accessible online experiences.

Portugal

- **Initiatives:** Portuguese entities have undertaken measures like public and private sector sensitization, technical training, funding for barrier elimination, infrastructure adaptation, and strategic planning.
- **Examples:** Projects in Portugal include extensive requalification of public avenues, adaptation of public service buildings and gyms, requalification of school buildings, and the implementation of accessible pavements and pedestrian crossings.

Comparative Analysis

- **Range of Measures:** All three countries show a commitment to improving accessibility through a variety of initiatives, though the specific focus varies by country. Macedonian responses emphasize direct service provision and advocacy, Spanish responses focus on infrastructure and information access, and Portuguese responses indicate a mix of strategic planning and infrastructure improvement.
- **Infrastructure vs. Information Access:** There is a noticeable trend towards infrastructure adaptation across all responses, but Spain stands out for its emphasis on information accessibility for tourists with disabilities. Macedonia also shows a combination of infrastructure and service-oriented approaches.
- **Collaborative Efforts:** Several Macedonian and Spanish organizations reported collaboration with municipalities, reflecting a trend towards public-private partnerships in accessibility efforts. Portugal's measures appear to be more municipally or government-driven.
- **Awareness and Training:** Portugal particularly mentioned sensitization and training, which is essential for long-term inclusivity, while Macedonia and Spain also reported training but with a more infrastructure-focused narrative.

- **Authority and Execution:** A notable difference is seen in the mention by a Macedonian organization of having no authority to implement changes, contrasting with the other countries where organizations either assumed or were assigned clear roles in accessibility improvements.

The comparative analysis reveals that while there is a shared goal of enhancing accessibility, the approaches and execution methods reflect the unique administrative structures, resource availability, and prioritization of needs in each country. The diversity in the types of initiatives and their scope suggests varying stages of policy implementation and public awareness regarding disability access.

Questions: Does your organization have a designated accessibility plan or strategy? and If yes please provide a brief overview of its objectives and key components.

The responses to the questions regarding designated accessibility plans and strategies provide a window into how organizations conceptualize and formalize their commitment to inclusivity. For those with established plans, the overview of objectives and key components offers a snapshot of their strategic approach to dismantling barriers and creating universally accessible environments.

For a quantitative analysis, we'll look at the number of organizations with a designated accessibility plan or strategy and summarize the objectives and components for those that reported having such a plan.

Quantitative Analysis

Macedonia

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 14
- **Organizations with Accessibility Plan/Strategy:** 5
- **Percentage with Plan/Strategy:** Approximately 35.71%

Spain

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 12
- **Organizations with Accessibility Plan/Strategy:** 4
- **Percentage with Plan/Strategy:** Approximately 33.33%

Portugal

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 7
- **Organizations with Accessibility Plan/Strategy:** 2
- **Percentage with Plan/Strategy:** Approximately 28.57%

Objectives and Key Components Summary for Those with a Plan

Macedonia

- **Research:** Undertaken by organizations to understand the needs and barriers.
- **Advocacy and Lobbying:** Conducted to influence local government policy and practice.
- **Cooperation:** Engaging various stakeholders to collaborate on accessibility issues.

- **Resource Centers:** Creating accessible centers for rights exercise and service provision.

Spain

- **Accessibility in Public Infrastructure:** Focus on making public buildings and communication more accessible.
- **Accessible Tourism:** Benidorm's detailed plan to lead in accessible tourism.
- **Compliance with Standards:** Ensuring new projects meet accessibility regulations.

Portugal

- **Integrated Accessibility:** Part of a broader plan to improve overall living conditions for disabled people.
- **Strategic Local Planning:** Avoiding sporadic measures and ensuring coherent local policies.
- **Population Identification:** Targeting specific needs of the elderly/disabled for better integration.
- **Architectural Barriers:** Addressing physical impediments to accessibility.

Comparative Summary

When comparing the presence of accessibility plans across the surveyed organizations:

- Macedonia and Spain have a similar proportion of organizations with designated accessibility plans, with Macedonia having a slightly higher percentage.
- Portugal has a lower percentage of organizations reporting such plans compared to Macedonia and Spain.
- The focus and specificity of the plans vary, with some countries focusing more on strategic planning and others on operational execution.

This quantitative analysis provides a high-level overview of how organizations across the three countries prioritize and formalize their efforts to improve accessibility. It reflects the attention given to the issue within their operational and strategic frameworks and the degree to which these considerations are embedded in their organizational policies.

Qualitative analysis

Macedonia

- **Accessibility Plans or Strategies:** Among the Macedonian organizations, 5 out of 14 reported having a designated accessibility plan or strategy.
- **Overview of Plans:** The objectives and key components provided by those with a plan include research, advocacy, lobbying, cooperation with stakeholders, creating an inclusive local environment, and establishing resource centers for exercising rights in various domains.

Spain

- **Accessibility Plans or Strategies:** In Spain, 4 out of 12 organizations reported having a designated accessibility plan or strategy.

- **Overview of Plans:** The plans mentioned involve developing accessibility in communication and public buildings, with one detailed plan from Benidorm focusing on becoming a leader in accessible tourism by aligning with broader strategic tourism goals.

Portugal

- **Accessibility Plans or Strategies:** In Portugal, 2 out of 7 organizations responded affirmatively about having an accessibility plan or strategy.
- **Overview of Plans:** The plans mentioned aim to improve the living conditions of people with disabilities through strategic local thinking, policy integration, identifying and improving architectural barriers, and involving local entities in solution-finding.

Comparative Analysis

- **Prevalence of Plans:** Accessibility plans are more common among the Macedonian respondents than in Portugal, with Spanish organizations having a similar prevalence to Macedonia.
- **Focus Areas:** There is a diverse focus across the responses. Macedonian plans seem to be more directed toward creating inclusive environments and providing direct services. Spanish plans are centered on public infrastructure and tourism, and Portuguese plans integrate accessibility into broader life improvement strategies.
- **Plan Specificity:** Spanish responses provided more specific information about their accessibility plans, especially the detailed strategy from Benidorm. In contrast, Macedonian and Portuguese plans appear to be more general and integrated with other organizational activities.
- **Strategic vs. Operational Plans:** Spanish and Portuguese organizations provided examples of strategic objectives, while Macedonian responses mixed strategic elements with operational activities, like providing resources directly to affected individuals and families.
- **Integration with Broader Goals:** Portuguese plans are noted for their strategic integration with municipal policies and broader quality of life improvements. Spanish plans align with tourism strategies, indicating a synergy between accessibility and economic development goals.

Overall, the analysis indicates that while a number of organizations have accessibility plans or strategies in place, there is significant variability in their comprehensiveness, focus, and integration with broader policy initiatives. The specific measures being taken reflect different priorities and approaches to addressing accessibility in each country.

Questions: What legal framework or regulations exist in your jurisdiction to ensure accessibility in cities and public spaces? and Do you know if there are any recent updates or developments in the legal framework or regulations?

The inquiries about legal frameworks and regulations are aimed at mapping the legislative landscape that underpins accessibility efforts in cities and public spaces. They also seek to identify whether there have been recent updates or developments, indicating a dynamic legal environment responsive to the evolving needs for accessibility.

Quantitative Analysis

For the quantitative analysis of the awareness of legal updates and knowledge of existing legal frameworks for accessibility, the following counts are based on the responses provided:

Macedonia

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 14
- **Aware of Legal Updates:** 3 (21.43%)
- **Not Aware of Legal Updates:** 11 (78.57%)
- **Reported Existing Legal Framework Knowledge:** 6 (42.86%)
- **Reported No Knowledge or Jurisdiction:** 8 (57.14%)

Spain

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 12
- **Aware of Legal Updates:** 4 (33.33%)
- **Not Aware of Legal Updates:** 8 (66.67%)
- **Reported Existing Legal Framework Knowledge:** 8 (66.67%)
- **Reported No Knowledge or Did Not Answer:** 4 (33.33%)

Portugal

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 7
- **Aware of Legal Updates:** 3 (42.86%)
- **Not Aware of Legal Updates:** 4 (57.14%)
- **Reported Existing Legal Framework Knowledge:** 4 (57.14%)
- **Reported No Knowledge or Did Not Answer:** 3 (42.86%)

Summary

- **Awareness of Legal Framework:** In Macedonia, less than half of the organizations surveyed have knowledge of the legal framework ensuring accessibility. In Spain, two-thirds of the organizations are aware of the legal framework, and in Portugal, just over half reported knowledge of the existing legal requirements.
- **Legal Updates:** The proportion of organizations aware of recent legal updates is lowest in Macedonia, with only 21.43% aware of any changes, compared to a third in Spain and nearly half in Portugal.
- **Knowledge Gaps:** There is a significant knowledge gap in all countries, with a number of organizations either unaware of the legal frameworks or not providing specific information about them.

This quantitative analysis highlights the variance in awareness and knowledge of legal frameworks related to accessibility across these countries, reflecting potential differences in how information is disseminated and the level of engagement among these organizations with regards to legal compliance and advocacy.

Qualitative analysis

Macedonia

- **Awareness of Legal Updates:** Three organizations are aware of recent updates or developments in the legal framework or regulations, with the majority unaware or not providing information.
- **Existing Legal Framework:** Responses vary from no knowledge to specific mentions of laws relating to construction, road safety, spatial planning, social protection, and accessible housing. The ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2011 is noted as a guiding framework.

Spain

- **Awareness of Legal Updates:** Four organizations are aware of recent updates or developments in legal frameworks or regulations.
- **Existing Legal Framework:** Various state and regional regulations are cited, including specific decrees and ordinances concerning mobility, accessibility in public buildings and spaces, beach use management, and home assistance services. References to the Technical Building Code and other regulations indicate a structured approach to accessibility.

Portugal

- **Awareness of Legal Updates:** Three organizations are aware of updates in the accessibility legal framework, while others are not or have not provided information.
- **Existing Legal Framework:** The legislation mentioned includes Decree-Law 163/2006, which is common to all entities and covers accessibility standards. There is also a mention of a Municipal Regulation to Support People with Disabilities published in 2022.

Comparative Analysis

- **Legal Framework Awareness:** There is a general awareness gap in all three countries, with several organizations not knowing if there have been recent legal updates or not being familiar with existing laws.
- **Legislation Specificity:** Macedonia's responses were less specific overall, with some organizations citing lack of jurisdiction or complete information. In contrast, Spain and Portugal provided more detailed references to specific laws and ordinances, indicating a more robust familiarity with the legal framework.
- **Recent Developments:** The few organizations that are aware of recent legal developments point to an ongoing process of legal evolution in accessibility in public spaces, with Spain and Portugal mentioning specific recent regulations that have been put into place.
- **Comprehensive Accessibility Approach:** Spain seems to have a well-articulated set of legal measures at both the state and regional levels, while Portugal and Macedonia have overarching national laws supplemented by local action plans and strategies.

The comparative analysis suggests that while there is an established legal basis for accessibility in all three countries, the depth of knowledge and the specificity of the responses suggest varying degrees of engagement with these frameworks. This may reflect differences in the roles organizations play within their

jurisdictions, the complexity of the legal landscape, or the recency of regulatory changes in the field of accessibility.

Questions: What are the best practices of your previous project/s?

The questions focused on best practices from previous projects serve to highlight successful strategies and interventions that organizations have identified as particularly effective in advancing accessibility. These insights can offer valuable lessons and potentially replicable models for future accessibility endeavors.

Macedonia

- **Best Practices:** Macedonian organizations listed specific actions such as creating job opportunities for people with disabilities, producing easy-to-read materials for voter engagement, and making polling stations more accessible with the purchase of assembly ramps.
- **Project Execution:** One organization cited a general improvement in institutional accessibility, with the construction of accessible entrances and ramps. Another highlighted their agricultural project, which involves users with disabilities in growing and selling produce.

Spain

- **Best Practices:** Spanish respondents highlighted practical infrastructure improvements such as accessible beach points, lowered sidewalks for ease of movement, and the implementation of audible signals at traffic lights for the visually impaired.
- **Consultation and Compliance:** Some best practices included seeking qualified advice from sector associations and ensuring all projects comply with current accessibility standards.

Portugal

- **Best Practices:** Portuguese organizations reported on training and sensitization activities for public administration officials, support for barrier elimination, and securing financing lines. One project highlighted was "Mais Acessibilidades para todos" (More Accessibility for All) by Associação Salvador.
- **Incorporation into Projects:** Accessibility has been a mandatory and integral part of all projects since 2016, with pedestrian accessibility at crossings being a particular focus.

Comparative Analysis

- **Focus on Practical Solutions:** All three countries have implemented practical solutions tailored to specific needs, such as workplace inclusion in Macedonia, urban infrastructure in Spain, and policy and funding in Portugal.
- **Engagement and Training:** Portugal emphasizes the importance of engaging and training stakeholders, while Macedonia focuses on direct employment and participatory projects for people with disabilities.
- **Infrastructure Improvements:** Spain and Macedonia have both focused on physical infrastructure improvements to enhance accessibility, such as accessible beaches, sidewalks, and traffic systems.
- **Compliance and Standards:** Spanish organizations have ensured compliance with accessibility standards as a regular part of project implementation, similar to the approach in Portugal, which mandates accessibility integration into all projects since 2016.

- **Project Diversity:** The types of projects vary, with Macedonia including innovative projects like agriculture for engagement, while Spain focuses on immediate physical accessibility improvements, and Portugal combines policy with practical interventions.

The comparative analysis indicates that while the countries have different approaches and focus areas, they share common objectives in enhancing accessibility. The practices reflect a combination of regulatory compliance, community engagement, infrastructure development, and training, with each country adopting practices best suited to its context and needs.

Group 3: Stakeholder Engagement and Public Consultation

Questions: How does your organization/institution ensure effective governance and coordination among various stakeholders involved in implementing accessibility plans?

Questions: Are there mechanisms for collaboration with disability organizations or advocacy groups? and Please explain your previous answer.

Questions: How do you gather feedback and input from individuals with disabilities or disability organizations during the planning and implementation of accessibility measures?

Questions: Are there mechanisms for public consultation? and Please explain your previous answer.

Questions: Are there resources and technical qualifications that your organization possesses to support the implementation of accessibility plans?, Are there dedicated personnel or departments responsible for accessibility-related tasks? and Does this personnel have any training or education in the field of accessibility?

Group 3: Stakeholder Engagement and Public Consultation emphasizes the importance of collaborative efforts and open dialogue in the pursuit of accessibility. This group of questions aims to uncover how organizations orchestrate the interplay between diverse stakeholders, including individuals with disabilities, advocacy groups, and other entities integral to the development and implementation of accessibility plans. The focus is on the mechanisms of cooperation that bring together varied perspectives and expertise to create a cohesive strategy for accessible environments.

The inquiry extends to the participatory processes that these organizations employ to involve those directly affected by accessibility issues. It assesses the methods for gathering valuable feedback from individuals with disabilities and how their contributions shape the planning and execution phases of accessibility projects. The transparency and inclusiveness of public consultations are also examined, offering insight into how organizations engage with the wider community to validate and enrich their accessibility initiatives.

Moreover, the survey probes into the internal capabilities of these organizations, such as the availability of resources, the presence of specialized personnel, and the level of expertise in accessibility matters. Understanding whether the staff responsible for carrying out these tasks are well-equipped with the necessary training and education is crucial for evaluating the potential effectiveness of the accessibility measures being proposed or implemented. Through this multifaceted approach, Group 3 seeks to highlight the synergies and challenges in stakeholder engagement and the practical aspects of turning accessibility plans into reality.

Questions: How does your organization/institution ensure effective governance and coordination among various stakeholders involved in implementing accessibility plans?

The questions regarding governance and coordination probe into the methods organizations use to synergize efforts among various stakeholders essential to the implementation of accessibility plans, ensuring that governance structures support effective collaboration and inclusive decision-making.

Macedonia

- **Governance and Coordination:** Macedonian organizations cite various degrees of involvement in ensuring effective governance and coordination, from merely reporting issues to local authorities to being part of municipal social councils and actively participating in debates, research, and policy-making processes.
- **Reported Strategies:** Involvement ranges from informal communication based on personal experiences to formal meetings, participation in social protection law discussions, and annual planning for resource allocation and service provision.

Spain

- **Governance and Coordination:** Spanish organizations report a mix of interdepartmental meetings, responding to EU demands, and direct communication with disability collectives to ensure governance and coordination. A notable mention is the partnership between PREDIF and the municipality of Benidorm in developing an accessibility plan.
- **Reported Strategies:** Strategies include complying with legal regulations when resources permit, easier coordination in smaller municipalities, and strategic planning with a focus on tourism accessibility.

Portugal

- **Governance and Coordination:** Portuguese organizations emphasize the importance of coordination among public, private, and non-governmental organizations. They also mention the role of specialized project management teams and the application of current legislation by territorial management divisions.
- **Reported Strategies:** Working groups, planning and management units, and inter-service articulation are mentioned as part of the coordination process.

Comparative Analysis

- **Engagement with Stakeholders:** There is a general trend across all three countries towards engaging with a range of stakeholders. However, the degree and formality of engagement vary, with Macedonia often relying on less formal mechanisms, Spain utilizing structured partnerships and legal compliance, and Portugal emphasizing inter-agency coordination and legislative application.
- **Resource Allocation:** Responses from Spain indicate a reliance on budget availability and human resources to comply with accessibility laws, which may not always be sufficient. In contrast, Macedonia and Portugal seem to integrate accessibility more into their annual plans and ongoing services.

- **Strategic Approach:** Both Spain and Portugal show a strategic approach to accessibility, with Portugal's focus on urban planning and Spain's focus on tourism accessibility. Macedonia's strategy appears to be more reactive and based on advocacy and direct communication of needs.
- **Legal Compliance:** Spanish organizations mention legal regulations more frequently as a backbone of their strategy, while Portugal emphasizes the application of legislation in project management. Macedonian responses suggest that legal frameworks guide their actions but also highlight gaps in implementation.

Overall, the comparative analysis reveals that effective governance and coordination for implementing accessibility plans are approached differently in Macedonia, Spain, and Portugal. Spain's focus on tourism and Portugal's methodical application of legislation contrast with Macedonia's more grassroots-level advocacy and direct stakeholder engagement. The responses underscore the need for a multifaceted approach to governance that includes legal compliance, stakeholder engagement, resource allocation, and strategic planning to address accessibility effectively.

Questions: Are there mechanisms for collaboration with disability organizations or advocacy groups? and Please explain your previous answer.

The questions on collaboration mechanisms assess the extent to which organizations engage with disability groups and advocacy partners, while the follow-up explanations provide context on how these collaborations are structured and operationalized to enhance accessibility efforts.

Quantitative analysis

For the quantitative analysis of the mechanisms for collaboration with disability organizations or advocacy groups and the explanations for their existence or absence, here's the data based on the responses provided:

Macedonia

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 14
- **Organizations with Collaboration Mechanisms:** 7 (50%)
- **Organizations without Collaboration Mechanisms:** 7 (50%)
- **Organizations Providing Explanations for Collaboration:** 7 (50%)
- **Organizations Not Providing or Unsure of Explanation:** 7 (50%)

Spain

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 12
- **Organizations with Collaboration Mechanisms:** 7 (58.33%)
- **Organizations without Collaboration Mechanisms:** 5 (41.67%)
- **Organizations Providing Explanations for Collaboration:** 7 (58.33%)
- **Organizations Not Providing or Unsure of Explanation:** 5 (41.67%)

Portugal

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 7

- **Organizations with Collaboration Mechanisms:** 7 (100%)
- **Organizations Providing Explanations for Collaboration:** 7 (100%)
- **Organizations Not Providing or Unsure of Explanation:** 0 (0%)

Summary

- **Macedonia:** Collaboration mechanisms are present in half of the surveyed organizations, with an equal split in the level of detail provided regarding their collaboration efforts.
- **Spain:** Just over half of the organizations have mechanisms for collaboration, with a similar proportion providing explanations for how these collaborations are conducted or acknowledging a lack of such mechanisms.
- **Portugal:** All responding organizations from Portugal confirmed the existence of collaboration mechanisms and provided explanations for their implementation, indicating a strong and consistent approach to stakeholder collaboration in the accessibility domain.

The quantitative analysis shows a clear distinction between the countries in terms of formalized collaboration processes. Portugal demonstrates the highest level of structured collaboration, Spain has a moderate level, and Macedonia shows a notable gap with half of the organizations lacking defined mechanisms for collaboration. These figures suggest potential areas for improvement in governance and stakeholder engagement, especially in Macedonia.

Qualitative analysis

Macedonia

- **Mechanisms for Collaboration:** Mixed responses regarding collaboration mechanisms; some organizations mention having none, while others participate through memorandums of understanding or working groups.
- **Explanation of Collaboration:** The collaborations that do exist tend to be informal, with a focus on consultations, participation in strategy preparation, and non-binding memorandums. Some organizations express a lack of freedom or authority for independent action.

Spain

- **Mechanisms for Collaboration:** A majority of organizations have some form of collaboration mechanism with disability organizations and advocacy groups.
- **Explanation of Collaboration:** Collaborations are carried out through various participatory dynamics like focus groups, direct attention to requests from disabled citizens, partnerships with major disability organizations like ONCE, and involvement in tourism-related accessibility audits and certifications.

Portugal

- **Mechanisms for Collaboration:** All responding organizations from Portugal report having collaboration mechanisms.

- **Explanation of Collaboration:** The collaborations are often formalized through protocols or integration into municipal forums for disability, ensuring that disability organizations are involved in relevant initiatives and actions.

Comparative Analysis

- **Prevalence of Collaboration:** Portugal shows the highest reported prevalence of formal collaboration mechanisms, followed by Spain, with Macedonia having a more ad hoc approach to collaboration.
- **Formal vs. Informal Collaboration:** There is a contrast between the countries, with Portuguese organizations describing formalized collaboration structures, Spanish organizations using a mix of formal and informal mechanisms, and Macedonian organizations often lacking formalized channels for cooperation.
- **Scope and Depth of Collaboration:** The collaborations in Macedonia seem to be more consultative, while in Spain, they appear to be more participatory, with a focus on specific disability sectors and accessibility efforts. Portugal's organizations describe systemic involvement in actions within the scope of accessibility and disability support.
- **Role of Disability Organizations:** In all three countries, disability organizations play a role in shaping accessibility initiatives, but the level of their involvement varies. Portuguese organizations ensure involvement in every initiative, Spanish entities address demands and participate in certification processes, while Macedonian organizations' involvement is more related to advocacy and communicating challenges rather than direct policy influence.

The comparative analysis indicates different approaches to stakeholder engagement across the three countries. It highlights the importance of having structured mechanisms for collaboration to effectively gather input from and address the needs of people with disabilities in the development and implementation of accessibility plans.

Questions: Are there resources and technical qualifications that your organization possesses to support the implementation of accessibility plans?, Are there dedicated personnel or departments responsible for accessibility-related tasks? and Does this personnel have any training or education in the field of accessibility?

The questions explore the availability of resources and expertise within organizations to support the execution of accessibility plans, including the presence of specialized personnel or departments, and whether these individuals are equipped with the necessary training and education to address accessibility effectively.

Quantitative Analysis

For the quantitative analysis of the presence of resources, dedicated personnel, and training in accessibility, we'll compile the responses from each country and present them statistically:

Macedonia

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 14
- **Organizations with Resources/Qualifications:** 6 (42.86%)
- **Organizations without Resources/Qualifications:** 8 (57.14%)
- **Organizations with Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** 7 (50%)

- **Organizations without Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** 7 (50%)
- **Personnel with Training in Accessibility:** 6 (42.86%)
- **Personnel without Training in Accessibility:** 8 (57.14%)

Spain

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 12
- **Organizations with Resources/Qualifications:** 6 (50%)
- **Organizations without Resources/Qualifications:** 6 (50%)
- **Organizations with Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** 4 (33.33%)
- **Organizations without Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** 8 (66.67%)
- **Personnel with Training in Accessibility:** 5 (41.67%)
- **Personnel without Training in Accessibility:** 7 (58.33%)

Portugal

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 7
- **Organizations with Resources/Qualifications:** 5 (71.43%)
- **Organizations without Resources/Qualifications:** 2 (28.57%)
- **Organizations with Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** 3 (42.86%)
- **Organizations without Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** 4 (57.14%)
- **Training in Accessibility:** Data not fully provided for all organizations.

Summary

- **Availability of Resources:** Portugal reports the highest availability of resources and qualifications to support the implementation of accessibility plans, followed by a 50% rate in Spain and a lower rate in Macedonia.
- **Dedicated Personnel:** Half of the Macedonian organizations surveyed have dedicated personnel or departments for accessibility, while a third of Spanish organizations have such personnel, and less than half of the Portuguese organizations reported on this aspect.
- **Personnel Training:** Among the organizations with dedicated personnel, Macedonia and Spain show that only a subset of this personnel has received training in accessibility, indicating a need for more comprehensive training programs. Portugal's data on training was incomplete, so it's difficult to draw a direct comparison.

This quantitative analysis shows that while some organizations are taking steps toward better accessibility practices, there are gaps in resources, dedicated personnel, and especially in training that need to be addressed to improve overall accessibility implementation.

Qualitative analysis

Macedonia

- **Resources and Technical Qualifications:** A mixed response with some organizations having the necessary resources and qualifications to support accessibility plans, while others do not.
- **Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** Similar to the resources question, there is a split, with some organizations having dedicated personnel or departments, and others not having them.
- **Training in Accessibility:** For those organizations with dedicated personnel, training and education in accessibility are also mixed. While some personnel are trained, others are not, indicating potential gaps in expertise.

Spain

- **Resources and Technical Qualifications:** Spanish organizations vary in their resources and technical capabilities to support accessibility, with nearly half indicating they have such resources.
- **Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** A small number of organizations have dedicated personnel or departments responsible for accessibility tasks.
- **Training in Accessibility:** Among those with dedicated personnel, most report having received some form of training or education in accessibility, suggesting a level of preparedness to handle these tasks.

Portugal

- **Resources and Technical Qualifications:** The majority of Portuguese organizations claim to possess the necessary resources and technical qualifications for accessibility implementation.
- **Dedicated Personnel/Departments:** The responses were split, with some having dedicated staff or departments and others not.
- **Training in Accessibility:** The analysis was limited due to incomplete data, but where provided, it indicates that not all dedicated personnel may have received training in accessibility.

Comparative Analysis

- **Resource Availability:** Portugal seems to have a higher reported rate of organizations with the necessary resources and qualifications to implement accessibility plans compared to Macedonia and Spain.
- **Presence of Dedicated Teams:** Dedicated personnel or departments for accessibility are more common in Macedonia and Spain for those organizations that reported having such teams, with Portugal also showing the presence of dedicated teams.
- **Training and Expertise:** Training for personnel in the field of accessibility appears to be more consistently reported in Spain, with some Macedonian and Portuguese organizations indicating gaps in this area.

The comparative analysis reveals varying levels of commitment and capability among the organizations surveyed in these three countries. While some organizations are well-equipped with both the technical resources and trained personnel to implement accessibility plans, others lack in one or more areas. This suggests an opportunity for improvement, especially in providing training for existing personnel to ensure a knowledgeable approach to accessibility implementation. The disparities may also reflect different stages of organizational development with respect to accessibility and varying national or local emphases on disability support infrastructure.

Questions: How do you gather feedback and input from individuals with disabilities or disability organizations during the planning and implementation of accessibility measures?

The questions delve into the methodologies organizations employ to solicit and incorporate feedback from individuals with disabilities and disability organizations, ensuring that the planning and implementation of accessibility measures are informed by those who are directly impacted.

Macedonia

- **Feedback and Input Collection Methods:** Macedonian responses show a reliance on various methods like online surveys, workshops, contact forms, and direct contacts, including working groups and meetings.
- **Commonality in Approach:** There's a consistent mention of workshops as a mode of gathering feedback across multiple organizations.

Spain

- **Feedback and Input Collection Methods:** Spanish organizations use information collection, analysis, diagnostic reviews, written submissions from affected individuals, and formal requests from associations.
- **Systematic Approach:** Some organizations describe a systematic approach to collecting feedback, including multi-step processes involving information gathering, problem analysis, and action planning.

Portugal

- **Feedback and Input Collection Methods:** Portuguese organizations mention working directly with non-governmental organizations for disabled persons (ONGPDs), holding meetings, and using legislation updates as a feedback mechanism.
- **Project Discussion:** Feedback is also gathered through public discussion on space projects, direct contact with individuals with disabilities, and participation in social investment projects.

Comparative Analysis

- **Diversity of Methods:** All three countries show a range of methods for collecting feedback from individuals with disabilities, with online tools and direct engagement being common across the board.
- **Formality and Structure:** Spain's organizations indicate a more structured diagnostic process, while Macedonia's and Portugal's methods seem more varied and less formalized, with a mix of ad-hoc and systematic approaches.
- **Use of Workshops:** Macedonian organizations heavily favor workshops, which can be effective for in-depth discussions but may not always capture the full spectrum of accessibility needs or preferences.
- **Legislation as Feedback:** Portugal uniquely mentions using ongoing legislative updates as a way to reflect the needs and input of people with disabilities, which suggests a regulatory-driven approach to feedback integration.
- **Utilization of Existing Forums:** Portugal also specifically references the use of established forums and social projects for gathering input, demonstrating an integrated community and legislative approach.

The comparative analysis highlights that while there is a shared commitment to engaging with disability communities, the methods and structures for this engagement reflect diverse practices and potentially different levels of resource availability. The responses suggest that incorporating feedback from disability communities is an area with room for improvement in terms of ensuring diverse and representative input into accessibility planning.

Questions: Are there mechanisms for public consultation? and Please explain your previous answer.

The questions seek to uncover whether organizations have established processes for public consultation, providing an understanding of how these mechanisms facilitate community input and dialogue, particularly from individuals with disabilities, in shaping accessibility measures.

Quantitative Analysis

For the quantitative analysis of the existence of public consultation mechanisms and the provision of explanations for these mechanisms, we can summarize the data as follows:

Macedonia

- **Total Organizations Surveyed: 14**
- **Organizations with Public Consultation Mechanisms: 2 (14.29%)**
- **Organizations without Public Consultation Mechanisms: 12 (85.71%)**
- **Organizations Providing Explanations for Mechanisms: 2 (14.29%)**
- **Organizations Not Providing Explanations: 12 (85.71%)**

Spain

- **Total Organizations Surveyed: 12**
- **Organizations with Public Consultation Mechanisms: 6 (50%)**
- **Organizations without Public Consultation Mechanisms: 6 (50%)**
- **Organizations Providing Explanations for Mechanisms: 6 (50%)**
- **Organizations Not Providing Explanations: 6 (50%)**

Portugal

- **Total Organizations Surveyed: 7**
- **Organizations with Public Consultation Mechanisms: 4 (57.14%)**
- **Organizations without Public Consultation Mechanisms: 3 (42.86%)**
- **Organizations Providing Explanations for Mechanisms: 4 (57.14%)**
- **Organizations Not Providing Explanations: 3 (42.86%)**

Summary

- **Macedonia:** A small minority of organizations have public consultation mechanisms, and few provide explanations for their operation, indicating a potential area for development in public engagement practices.
- **Spain:** Half of the organizations surveyed acknowledge the existence of public consultation mechanisms, and there is an equal split in providing explanations, suggesting a moderate level of engagement and transparency.
- **Portugal:** A slightly higher percentage of organizations compared to Spain have mechanisms for public consultation, with explanations provided for their approaches, indicating a proactive stance in public engagement.

The quantitative data reveal differences in how public consultation mechanisms are recognized and utilized among the countries. These statistics could reflect the varying stages of maturity in the public engagement processes of each country, with room for growth in establishing and clarifying such mechanisms, particularly in Macedonia.

Qualitative analysis

Macedonia

- **Mechanisms for Public Consultation:** Only two of the Macedonian organizations reported having mechanisms for public consultation.
- **Explanation of Public Consultation:** The explanations provided suggest that where mechanisms exist, they take the form of consultations with municipal representatives and public debates. However, many respondents either did not know of any mechanisms or confirmed their absence.

Spain

- **Mechanisms for Public Consultation:** Half of the Spanish organizations reported having mechanisms for public consultation.
- **Explanation of Public Consultation:** Those with mechanisms described using citizen participation channels, suggestion systems, and public exposure of projects for consultation. However, some responses indicated a lack of formal consultation processes, relying instead on conventional citizen service offices or informal meetings with politicians.

Portugal

- **Mechanisms for Public Consultation:** Four of the Portuguese organizations indicated the existence of public consultation mechanisms.
- **Explanation of Public Consultation:** The explanations provided indicate that public consultations are typically associated with the legislative process and specific public oversight or monitoring functions are not always clearly defined. One response pointed out that public consultations occur during inspections in response to complaints or issues identified by legal and public procurement services.

Comparative Analysis

- **Prevalence of Formal Mechanisms:** There appears to be a variance in the prevalence and formality of public consultation mechanisms, with Spain reporting a more established system of public consultation than Macedonia, where such mechanisms are less common and less formal.

- **Methodology:** Spanish organizations rely on diverse methods, including civic platforms and direct suggestions, while Macedonian methods are less structured. Portuguese organizations seem to rely on established legal processes for public consultation, integrating disability considerations into broader municipal forums and legal processes.
- **Informality vs. Structure:** Macedonia and Portugal have similar levels of informality in their public consultation processes, with Macedonia leaning more towards ad hoc methods like social networks and Portugal towards more structured legal requirements.
- **Engagement in Legislative Processes:** Portugal's engagement with the public is notably through legally required processes, whereas Macedonia's engagement appears to be more at the community level with direct contacts and meetings, and Spain employs a mix of legislative and community engagement strategies.

The comparative analysis suggests that while all three countries recognize the value of public consultation in accessibility planning, the approaches to integrating public input vary widely. Spain seems to have a more mixed but systematic approach, Portugal relies on formal legislative frameworks, and Macedonia appears to have less formalized and possibly less consistent mechanisms for public engagement.

Group 4: Accessibility Funding and Budgeting

Questions: Is there a budget allocated specifically for accessibility initiatives?, and How does your organization/institution secure funding for these projects?

Group 4: Accessibility Funding and Budgeting critically examines the fiscal strategies and budgetary commitments of organizations towards accessibility initiatives. This theme encompasses the allocation of budgets specific to accessibility projects and the mechanisms for securing necessary funding, whether through government grants, private sector contributions, or alternative financial sources. It aims to shed light on how these entities prioritize financial resources for the development of inclusive environments and the sustainability of their efforts. The focus is on both the availability of funds and the efficacy of the approaches employed to ensure that accessibility remains a well-supported aspect of organizational and urban planning.

Questions: Is there a budget allocated specifically for accessibility initiatives?, and How does your organization/institution secure funding for these projects?

The questions inquire about the financial commitment to accessibility, probing both the allocation of specific budgets for such initiatives and the strategies organizations employ to secure funding, which is critical for the sustainability and expansion of accessibility projects.

Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative analysis for budget allocation and funding security for accessibility projects is summarized as follows:

Macedonia

- **Total Organizations Surveyed: 14**

- **Organizations with Specific Budget for Accessibility:** 5 (35.71%)
- **Organizations without Specific Budget:** 9 (64.29%)
- **Funding Sources Identified:**
 - Foreign donors: Several mentions.
 - Municipal funds: At least one mention.
 - International donors: Some mentions.
 - Own budget or donations: Few mentions.

Spain

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 12
- **Organizations with Specific Budget for Accessibility:** 4 (33.33%)
- **Organizations without Specific Budget:** 8 (66.67%)
- **Funding Sources Identified:**
 - Subsidies and grants: Multiple mentions.
 - Municipal budget: At least one mention related to urban services maintenance.
 - Own budget: Mentioned in the context of specific projects or departments.

Portugal

- **Total Organizations Surveyed:** 7
- **Organizations with Specific Budget for Accessibility:** 3 (42.86%)
- **Organizations without Specific Budget:** 4 (57.14%)
- **Funding Sources Identified:**
 - State Budget and community funding: At least one mention.
 - Own budget: Some mentions, including integration with larger projects.
 - Internal budget allocations: At least one mention within the municipality.

Summary

- **Budget Allocation for Accessibility:** Approximately one-third of organizations in Spain and slightly over one-third in Macedonia have specified budgets for accessibility initiatives, while nearly half in Portugal have such budgets.
- **Reliance on External Funding:** There is a notable reliance on external funding across all countries, with foreign donors and grants being crucial, especially in Macedonia and Spain.
- **Use of Municipal or Own Funds:** Funding from municipal or own budgets is more frequently mentioned by Spanish and Portuguese organizations than Macedonian ones, suggesting different funding models or availability of resources.

- **Strategic Funding Approaches:** Portugal shows evidence of strategic budgeting, where accessibility is integrated into wider project funds, indicating a possibly more holistic or inclusive approach to infrastructure funding.

This quantitative analysis demonstrates that dedicated funding for accessibility initiatives is not universally present across the surveyed organizations. It also indicates that those with specific accessibility budgets may have a more strategic approach to project implementation, leveraging a combination of internal and external funding sources to meet their objectives.

Qualitative analysis

Macedonia

- **Budget Allocation:** A few organizations in Macedonia confirm having a specific budget for accessibility initiatives, while the majority do not.
- **Securing Funding:** Funding is mostly secured through foreign donors, with some assistance from municipal minimum funds designated for NGOs. Some rely on international donors, others on donations, and one mentions continuous work within their own capacity for improvements.

Spain

- **Budget Allocation:** A minority of Spanish organizations have a specific budget for accessibility; most do not.
- **Securing Funding:** Those with funding use a combination of their own budget (often limited), municipal maintenance funds, and subsidies. The reliance on grants is significant, with some efforts constrained by municipal budget limitations.

Portugal

- **Budget Allocation:** Some Portuguese organizations have a specific budget for accessibility, others do not.
- **Securing Funding:** Funding sources include the State Budget, community financing, and own budget provisions. Some integrate financing into larger projects with significant interventions, while others rely on internal budget allocations or project-specific funding applications.

Comparative Analysis

- **Budgeting for Accessibility:** Across all three countries, there is a notable variation in the allocation of specific budgets for accessibility. Portugal and Spain have organizations that allocate specific budgets, albeit sometimes limited, whereas in Macedonia, dedicated funding is less common.
- **Funding Strategies:** There is a common reliance on external funding sources, with foreign donors and grants mentioned by organizations in Macedonia and Spain. Portuguese organizations also mention state and community funding, reflecting a more diverse funding strategy.
- **Challenges in Funding:** The data reflect a common challenge across all countries in securing sufficient funds for accessibility projects. Limited municipal budgets require organizations to seek external funding or prioritize accessibility within larger budget frameworks.
- **Financial Autonomy:** Some organizations in Macedonia and Portugal mention using their own funds, indicating a degree of financial autonomy in project implementation. In contrast, Spanish entities appear more dependent on external funding mechanisms.

- **Integration with Wider Projects:** In Portugal, funding for accessibility is sometimes integrated into broader project budgets, which may reflect a more holistic approach to budgeting for public works and infrastructure improvements.

The comparative analysis suggests that while funding accessibility initiatives is a recognized need across Macedonia, Spain, and Portugal, the methods of securing and allocating funds vary, with implications for the scope and sustainability of these initiatives. External funding sources play a crucial role, but there is also a clear indication that internal budgeting strategies, where feasible, can provide a stable foundation for ongoing accessibility efforts.

Group 5: Monitoring and Evaluation of Accessibility Progress

Questions: Are there any ongoing monitoring or evaluation mechanisms in place to assess the effectiveness of accessibility plans and strategies?, and How do you measure progress or success in improving accessibility?

Group 5: Monitoring and Evaluation of Accessibility Progress delves into the oversight and appraisal of accessibility initiatives to gauge their success and impact. This segment focuses on the presence of established monitoring systems or evaluative procedures that organizations use to continuously assess the efficacy of their accessibility plans and strategies. It further investigates the metrics or benchmarks used to measure progress and determine whether improvements in accessibility are meeting the intended goals. The essence of this group is to understand the accountability frameworks in place that ensure that the steps taken towards accessibility are not only executed but also lead to tangible, positive outcomes for individuals with disabilities.

Questions: Are there any ongoing monitoring or evaluation mechanisms in place to assess the effectiveness of accessibility plans and strategies?, and How do you measure progress or success in improving accessibility?

These questions aim to discern the presence of ongoing monitoring or evaluation mechanisms organizations use to assess the effectiveness of their accessibility plans and strategies, and to understand the metrics by which they measure progress or success in enhancing accessibility.

Macedonia

- **Monitoring or Evaluation Mechanisms:** The majority of Macedonian organizations reported not having ongoing monitoring or evaluation mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of accessibility plans and strategies.
- **Measuring Progress:** For those that do measure progress, metrics include the realization of set goals within action plans, direct user feedback, and observations of institutions. Satisfaction levels among persons with disabilities serve as a progress indicator for one respondent.

Spain

- **Monitoring or Evaluation Mechanisms:** Only two Spanish organizations indicated having mechanisms for monitoring or evaluating accessibility plans.

- **Measuring Progress:** Spanish organizations that measure progress do so based on the execution of construction projects, user feedback, and usage checks. Success is sometimes assumed through the absence of complaints or the effort to secure and use targeted funding.

Portugal

- **Monitoring or Evaluation Mechanisms:** Portuguese organizations have a mixed response, with some confirming the existence of monitoring mechanisms and others indicating no knowledge of such.
- **Measuring Progress:** Methods of measuring progress include technical site visits, surveys, and the application of procedures outlined in the legal framework for urban planning. The Municipal Forum for People with Disabilities is also a tool for evaluation.

Comparative Analysis

- **Prevalence of Formal Monitoring:** Formal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are not widely reported in Macedonia and Spain, with Portugal showing a slightly better establishment of such mechanisms.
- **Approaches to Measurement:** The approach to measuring success varies, with Macedonia using qualitative feedback and goal completion metrics, while Spain and Portugal mention more structured approaches such as legal compliance and feedback from specific forums.
- **Reliance on User Feedback:** There is a common reliance on direct feedback from disabled individuals across all three countries, indicating the importance of participatory evaluation processes in the field of accessibility.
- **Use of Established Legal and Planning Processes:** Portugal distinctively uses its existing legal and urban planning regulations as a framework for monitoring, which is not explicitly mentioned by Macedonia or Spain.
- **Challenges in Measurement:** A lack of dedicated monitoring tools and clear measurement criteria is evident, particularly in Macedonia, where organizations are less aware of or lack plans for accessibility evaluation.

The comparative analysis reveals a need for improved monitoring and evaluation practices in Macedonia and Spain, with the potential for sharing best practices from Portugal, where legal frameworks provide a structure for ongoing evaluation. The differences in responses also reflect varying levels of commitment to and capacity for assessing accessibility initiatives, which could influence the effectiveness of measures implemented.

Group 6: Future Directions and Development

Questions: What are your future goals and targets for enhancing accessibility in cities and public spaces?

Questions: What are the improvements or recommendations you would suggest to make your city more accessible for people with disabilities?

Group 6: Future Directions and Development explores the aspirations and planned trajectories that organizations have charted out to advance accessibility in urban and public domains. This theme addresses the forward-looking objectives that aim to further dismantle barriers and enhance inclusivity in cities and

public spaces. It also seeks to gather a compendium of proposed enhancements and well-considered recommendations from these organizations, offering insight into the proactive measures and innovative ideas envisioned to foster a more accessible future. The core of this group is to capture the evolving landscape of accessibility ambitions, painting a picture of a progressive society that continually strives to improve the lived experiences of people with disabilities.

Questions: What are your future goals and targets for enhancing accessibility in cities and public spaces?

The questions solicit forward-looking statements from organizations about their goals and targets for enhancing accessibility in cities and public spaces, offering a glimpse into the aspirations and planned efforts to create more inclusive environments.

Macedonia

- **Future Goals for Accessibility:**
 - Some organizations have no future goals or did not specify them.
 - Others focus on advocating through petitions and promoting awareness to influence institutions.
 - Goals mentioned include improving communication and training among professionals, raising public awareness, and enhancing budget allocation for accessibility projects.
 - A few aim to create new services and facilities for people with disabilities.

Spain

- **Future Goals for Accessibility:**
 - The goals range from developing comprehensive accessibility plans involving all sectors to making streets and public spaces more accessible.
 - A continuous improvement approach is noted, with some areas having no specific future improvement plans but intending to progress as resources allow.
 - Utilizing opportunities provided by grants to promote accessibility is also a target.

Portugal

- **Future Goals for Accessibility:**
 - Portuguese organizations aim to strengthen awareness, training, funding, and enforcement of accessibility regulations.
 - The commitment to making all spaces accessible and ensuring all public space interventions include accessibility is evident.
 - There is a desire for specific budgeting for accessibility issues and continued development of municipal accessibility plans.

Comparative Analysis

- **Common Goals Across Countries:** All countries share a focus on increasing public awareness and the implementation of accessibility in future city planning. However, the specificity of the goals and the means to achieve them vary.
- **Advocacy and Awareness:** Macedonian organizations emphasize the need for advocacy and pressure on institutions as a means to forward their accessibility agendas.
- **Planning and Resources:** Spanish goals appear to be tied closely to the development and execution of plans contingent on funding and resources, reflecting a pragmatic approach to incremental improvements.
- **Regulatory Enforcement:** Portugal's responses highlight a methodical approach, with an emphasis on strict adherence to and enforcement of accessibility regulations in architectural projects.
- **Training and Sensitization:** Both Macedonia and Portugal mention the need for education and specialized training for professionals involved in implementing accessibility, indicating a recognition of the importance of technical expertise in this area.
- **Budgeting for Accessibility:** Portugal specifically mentions budget allocations for resolving accessibility issues, which is not a common point in the responses from Macedonia or Spain.

The comparative analysis reveals that while there is a consensus on the importance of enhancing accessibility, the readiness and approach to achieve this vary, with Portugal showing a more structured and regulation-driven methodology, Spain indicating a resource-dependent strategy, and Macedonia focusing on advocacy and awareness as primary tools. The analysis suggests that despite differing approaches, there is a universal need for enhanced training, better resource allocation, effective advocacy, and public engagement to improve accessibility.

Questions: *What are the improvements or recommendations you would suggest to make your city more accessible for people with disabilities?*

These questions invite organizations to propose tangible improvements or recommendations that could make cities more accessible, reflecting on practical steps and innovative ideas to address current shortcomings and enhance inclusivity for people with disabilities.

Macedonia

Macedonian respondents suggest a range of improvements for accessibility, with a common theme around greater involvement of disabled individuals in urban planning and the need for larger budget allocations. Recommendations include:

- Creating urban solutions by involving those affected.
- Ensuring law compliance and information accessibility.
- Improving cooperative efforts and harmonizing requirements for the benefit of larger populations rather than individuals.
- Allocating more financial resources and organizing educational events to raise awareness.

Spain

Spanish suggestions for improvements emphasize awareness, minimum budget specification, and the continuous improvement of public space accessibility. Key recommendations include:

- Sensitizing and educating about daily interaction needs with public spaces.
- Ensuring accessible entries for shops and museums.
- Establishing a consistent budget for accessibility not solely reliant on subsidies.
- Engaging in detailed accessibility planning and discussion with involved collectives to extract actionable plans.

Portugal

Portuguese respondents focus on reinforcing current initiatives and creating an inclusive public environment free from physical and architectural barriers. They advocate for:

- Enhancing existing initiatives mentioned previously.
- Planning broader city areas with specific accessible routes.
- Installing audible signals and tactile pavements at pedestrian crossings.
- Ensuring public building access via ramps and maintaining street pavements for ease of wheelchair and visually impaired movement.
- Continuing to develop municipal accessibility plans in coordination with urban planning services.

Comparative Analysis

- **Involvement and Awareness:** There is a shared emphasis across all three countries on the importance of involving people with disabilities in the planning process and raising public awareness about the importance of accessibility.
- **Legal Compliance and Budgeting:** Macedonian and Spanish responses both note the necessity of respecting existing laws to ensure accessibility, while Spanish and Portuguese respondents highlight the need for reliable budget allocations for consistent improvements.
- **Educational Initiatives:** Macedonian responses mention the need for education and training as part of improving accessibility, a sentiment echoed in Portugal's emphasis on reinforcing initiatives through training.
- **Infrastructure and Urban Planning:** Recommendations from Spain and Portugal display a focus on urban planning improvements, such as removing physical barriers, improving street conditions, and designing inclusive public spaces.
- **Financial Resources:** There's a clear recognition in Macedonia of the need for financial investment in accessibility, which is also evident in Spain's suggestion for establishing dedicated municipal budget provisions.
- **Strategic Development:** Portuguese respondents underscore the continuation and development of strategic municipal plans, suggesting a more structured approach to long-term accessibility planning compared to the project-based focus seen in Macedonia.

The comparative analysis reveals that while the recommended practices are diverse, they converge on several key themes, including the need for active participation of disabled individuals in planning, enhanced public

awareness, sufficient budgeting, and strategic urban development. The responses indicate that a multi-faceted approach that combines law compliance, community engagement, financial planning, and infrastructure improvement is essential for creating more accessible environments.

Key Aspects of Research

1. Budget Allocation for Accessibility:

- A minority of organizations across all three countries have dedicated budgets for accessibility, suggesting a need for stronger financial commitment.
- The dependency on external funding, like foreign donors and grants, is common, with internal budgeting serving as a supplementary source.

2. Stakeholder Engagement:

- Involvement of disabled individuals in the planning and implementation of accessibility measures is not widespread, indicating potential for enhanced participatory practices.
- Public consultation mechanisms are limited, particularly in Macedonia, emphasizing the need for formal structures to gather community input.

3. Implementation Challenges:

- Financial constraints, insufficient stakeholder engagement, and regulatory compliance issues are recurrent challenges for implementing accessibility plans.
- Physical infrastructure improvements, such as ramps and adapted facilities, are often cited as areas needing attention.

4. Monitoring and Evaluation:

- There is a general lack of ongoing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of accessibility initiatives, especially in Macedonia and Spain.
- Some organizations measure success through user satisfaction and the achievement of specific project goals.

5. Best Practices:

- Job opportunities for people with disabilities and voter engagement initiatives were successful projects in Macedonia.
- Infrastructure modifications like accessible beach points and lowered sidewalks were noted in Spain.
- Comprehensive legal compliance and strategic urban planning are emphasized in Portugal.

6. Future Goals and Targets:

- Enhanced public awareness and education on accessibility are common future goals.

- The strategic development of urban spaces to eliminate physical barriers is a priority for future planning.

Guidelines/Observations for Future Improvements

1. Increase Budget Allocations:

- Advocate for more government funding and create a reliable, earmarked budget for accessibility within municipal finance planning.

2. Foster Collaborative Engagement:

- Develop structured forums for regular engagement with disability organizations and advocacy groups.
- Include disabled individuals in policy-making to ensure their needs are met and voices are heard.

3. Improve Public Consultation Processes:

- Establish formal public consultation processes to collect input on accessibility needs and priorities.
- Use digital platforms to facilitate broader participation in public consultations.

4. Address Implementation Barriers:

- Educate local stakeholders about accessibility laws to improve compliance.
- Pursue comprehensive urban planning initiatives that integrate accessibility from inception.

5. Regular Monitoring and Reporting:

- Introduce regular reporting and evaluation protocols to track progress and identify areas for improvement in accessibility.
- Publicize accessibility audits and progress reports to maintain transparency and accountability.

6. Share and Adapt Best Practices:

- Create channels for sharing best practices among cities and countries to learn from each other's successes and challenges.
- Adapt successful initiatives from one context to another, considering local nuances and specific needs.

7. Focus on Comprehensive Training:

- Conduct targeted training programs for relevant stakeholders to ensure they have the necessary skills to implement and advocate for accessibility measures.
- Include accessibility modules in educational curricula for urban planners, architects, and public administrators.

8. Legal and Regulatory Frameworks:

- Strengthen legal frameworks to support and enforce the execution of accessibility plans.
- Ensure that new legislation accommodates the evolving standards and technologies in accessibility.

These guidelines and observations provide a roadmap for stakeholders to enhance accessibility. They suggest that a shift towards more integrated, well-funded, and participatory approaches is crucial for building inclusive urban environments.

Conclusion

The findings from the "Call4Action" project survey reveal that despite the difference in the number of responses, with Macedonia providing 14, Spain 12, and Portugal 7, several common challenges persist in executing accessibility plans across these countries. These challenges include but are not limited to financial limitations, inadequate stakeholder engagement, and the need for robust public consultation processes. The survey highlights a pronounced variance in approach toward budgeting for and financing of accessibility projects, with a particular emphasis on the reliance on external funding in Macedonia and Spain, compared to a mixed funding approach in Portugal. In conclusion, the collective data from the survey accentuates the necessity for all three nations to adopt more targeted, inclusive, and sustainable strategies to fortify the integration of people with disabilities into the urban tapestry. The implementation of such strategies requires steadfast commitment to increased funding, comprehensive training, effective advocacy, and the cultivation of community-driven, participatory development plans to ensure the accessibility and usability of city environments for all citizens.

The analysis confirms that accessibility is a multifaceted issue requiring a concerted effort from various stakeholders, including government bodies, NGOs, and the disabled community. Despite the presence of legal frameworks and dedicated organizations, there are significant challenges, such as insufficient funding, lack of stakeholder engagement, and limited public consultation mechanisms. Best practices identified across the survey responses include targeted infrastructure improvements, involvement of disabled individuals in planning, and the strategic use of funding and legislation to guide initiatives. Moving forward, it is essential for organizations to develop comprehensive, participatory, and resource-efficient strategies to address the wide range of accessibility needs. Collaboration between sectors and countries, sharing of best practices, and a commitment to continuous learning and adaptation will be critical in overcoming existing barriers and achieving the goal of universally accessible urban spaces. The findings suggest an emerging consensus on the need for proactive, inclusive, and well-funded accessibility planning, yet also highlight the diversity of approaches and the need for context-specific solutions.