# EAASI – a Gender and Diversity Sensitive Usability Evaluation Tool

# The TInnGO ‘EAASI’ Product Evaluation Template

## Introduction

This template is in three parts:

Part A ensures that the product is described with both text and images, and any links to source documents or websites.

Part B is a series of prompts for the evaluator to fill in, one for each ‘Indicator’ with an overall rating at the end of each section.

Part C is a Summary Evaluation

We have tried to provide all instructions on the form, with a worked example and a blank template. It is a Word document – so we advise creating a copy, and then clearing or overtyping the right hand column in the worked example.

## Evaluator(s)

The tool can be used by independent evaluators, whose findings can then be brought together in a summary report, or it could be completed during a workshop with co-evaluators using one form between them.

If using several independent evaluators, give them each a copy, and they can add their name below. In some circumstances you could anonymise the names when the report is given back to the designers – such as Evaluator A, B C or as preferred.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator Name | *Dr Janet Saunders* |
| Affiliation | *CU* |

# Part A: Product Description

This section ensures that the product is defined, i.e., the ‘problem definition’ which should include details about the ‘scenario of use’ AND any key target users, (such may be available in a design brief), bearing in mind this is intended to be ‘inclusive design’. This serves two purposes:

1. As part of a design process, with designers completing the evaluation tool as a means of prompting thoughts about the TInnGO gender and diversity-smart mobility indicators

Or

1. For completion by an evaluator who has been asked to appraise a design or actual product in the marketplace – and using secondary sources such as marketing material or press articles to discover as much as they can about the design or product.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Product Description** | Type your answers below – a worked example is provided |
| **Name of product or brief summary if it doesn’t have a Name** | NurturepodTM |
| **Source organisation or design source** | *Coventry University,* [*https://oip.transportgenderobservatory.eu/ideas-lab-contribution-78*](https://oip.transportgenderobservatory.eu/ideas-lab-contribution-78)*,*  **http://transportgenderobservatory.eu/worlds-breastfeeding-week-the-uk-hub-the-nurturepod-tm/** |
| **Product Goal / problem definition/ purpose / USP**  *Describe briefly what the product is for, who it is for, what problem it solves. (This can be developed further in the following questions)* | *To provide a safe, comfortable and welcoming space for women (and others) to feed or nurture babies, while in transit, designed for foyers/airports etc to replace the ‘room off a toilet’. Need to make them feel special. The NurturepodTM is an infant feeding space for displacement locations such as airport lounges. Designed to comfort the travelling family, the pod design gives a degree of control, dignity and privacy, safety, warmth and kindness.* |
| **What part of this product are you evaluating?** *Be specific about what is being evaluated, e.g. if this is a vehicle – is it only the interior, or does this include the exterior also. Is there a service design component?* | *The NurturepodTM idea as explained in the design source above. The NurturepodTM system is designed to be configured for solo installation or as a growing forest, offering tranquillity and removal from distractions. In this space, the focus is on the child, the moment, and the calm. No service design component has been proposed.* |
| **Is a design brief available?** *If Yes, please attach it or provide a link* | [*http://transportgenderobservatory.eu/worlds-breastfeeding-week-the-uk-hub-the-nurturepod-tm/*](http://transportgenderobservatory.eu/worlds-breastfeeding-week-the-uk-hub-the-nurturepod-tm/)  *NurturepodTM Registration number:       6083544*  *NurturepodTM Trademark numbers:  UK00003467012 / UK00003467018* |
| **Do we know anything about the design process?** *Was there any co-creation or user involvement? Were diverse groups included?* | *The idea originated in the autoethnographic work conducted as part of the AHRC [Wemobile](http://mymobilitymatters.org/) project, led by Professor Andree Woodcock at the Research Centre for Arts, Memory and Communities. The concept design was created by Paul Magee, Senior Designer at the Centre for Intelligent Healthcare.*  *The nuturepod is now on the OIP where feedback can be left.*  *User testing was planned but we did not get the grant to build a model*  *No user consultation was conducted* |
| **User groups, primary and secondary, plus others - may include the service provider or other people who may be affected or share space with the product** | *Primary users – breastfeeding mothers, those feeding babies. The baby*  *Secondary users – accompanying adults and children*  *Tertiary users – cleaning and maintenance staff* |
| **Task Context**  *Describe any specific task requirements, think about e.g. the street environment, time of day, lighting, weather, user luggage needs, journey distances…* | *Foyer, airport waiting lounge, train and bus stations where there are large open areas where women may have to wait with children but would like a safe and intimate space where they can breastfeed away from the male gaze.*  *Could be extended into office environments* |
| **User needs**  *Describe any specific user requirements* | *Comfort, safety, privacy, feel special. Ability to do all that is required to look after the baby (e.g., feed it, clean it), Also provide some visibility to the outside world and connection with accompanying partners and children*  *Breaking the clinical aesthetic is a major aim of the design.* |
| **Images of the product**  *Paste one or more images of the product into the column on the right, up to 3 is suggested* | *Image 1 – main image* |
|  | *Image 2 – additional image* |
|  | *Image 3 – additional image – more images are available from*  *http://transportgenderobservatory.eu/worlds-breastfeeding-week-the-uk-hub-the-nurturepod-tm/* |

# Part B: EAASI Indicators

The following sections consider the product in terms of each of the TInnGO ‘Gender and Diversity Smart Indicators’, which are briefly explained at the start of each section. Working through each indicator has 4 steps – goal setting; evaluating; evaluating for user groups; overall evaluation.

## **Indicator 1: Effective: Does it deliver what it promises? Does it produce the intended result from the perspective of both user and provider?**

‘Effectiveness’ means how far does the product produce the intended result for both user and provider. It requires thinking about the ‘user task’, as defined in the initial assessment of goals for the product, and the provider goals, and assessing whether the desired end result would be achieved.

For TInnGO, ‘Effectiveness’ ALSO means thinking about the user task from the point of view of a range of users, and women in particular. In relation to gender dimensions, it’s important to remember that ‘single trips’ are more often made by men, while women tend to make more multiple trips and ‘chained trips’ for different purposes – e.g. dropping children off at care, school, picking up groceries on way to/ from work. Other kinds of trip chaining could apply to either gender – visiting a gym or swimming pool after work for example, but we have learned that women typically do more chained trips. Travel purposes vary immensely across group intersections: to work, care, medical appointments, shopping, leisure.

### Step 1: Goals - The product has been designed to be effective in the following ways:

*Please complete the product goals per user groups.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Group**  *(add target users AND other citizens who use the same city space)* | **How would it be effective for end users?** |
| Infant-nurturing parents and carers, with their infants: includes breastfeeding, bottle feeding, chest-feeding (for post-op transmen) and the diverse existing forms of childcare. | The NurturepodTMaims to provide a safe nurturing inclusive space for all, recognising the diversity existing in the act of infant nurturing for carers, wet nurses, as well as pre- and post-op transmen parents – all and any familial and non-familial configuration involved in caring. It will feel comfortable, safe, and calm, for mum or carer and baby, yet still have a physical connection to family waiting outside. It must not feel clinical. Will improve the quality of the journey and well-being |
|  |  |
| Other family members | Other people in the travelling family may want to be included in the space or close by |
| Other travellers | It must be clear that this is a space for infant nurturing, so not attracting prying eyes or other uses |
| Cleaning and maintenance staff | Ease of cleaning |
| **Providers**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How would it be effective for providers?** |
| Airport authority | Would add to the appeal of using the airport |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet the ‘Effectiveness’ goals described above?

***Please complete using what information you have available from your design sources***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Goal** | **Does it meet the goal?** |
| Provide a safe nurturing inclusive space.It will feel comfortable, safe, and calm, for mum or carer and baby, yet still have a physical connection to family waiting outside. It must not feel clinical. Will improve the quality of the journey and well-being | *Yes it appears to. Ambient audio and optional fragrance are mentioned in the design detail. There is a focus on providing a gentle calm space. A natural wood visual on the interior wall moves subtly away from the clinical. Controlled interior illumination and natural illumination. Large obscured window provides a connection to other family members waiting outside. Sculpted seating* |
| *Options for other family members* | *The pod appears large enough for other small children. Other family adults may wait outside and be visible through the obscured window.* |
| *Other travellers* | *Some branding has been suggested which would clarify what the pod was designed for. We do not have any other information about this* |
| *Easy to maintain* | *Surfaces all appear to be easily wipeable – we don’t have any more information.* |
| **‘Gender and Diversity Smart’ Effectiveness** |  |
| **Is it effective for commuters?** | *Not applicable* |
| **Is it effective for leisure visitors?** | *Yes, for nurturing parents at airports or similar spaces* |
| **Is it effective for single trips?** | *Yes – although not relevant in this context* |
| **Is it effective for chained or multiple trips?** | *Can be used as many times as needed – may need to consider ‘how many’ pods to be provided and their locations* |
| **Is it effective for care related trips travelling with children or a dependent adult? E.g. to nursery, day-care, hospitals, schools?** | *Yes – it is specifically designed for a specific need here.* |
| **Is it effective for trips with luggage or shopping?** | *It should accommodate a buggy and any hand luggage – appears to be large enough* |
| **Does it impinge on others enjoyment or perceptions of safety in the city?** | *No* |

### Step 3: Effectiveness for Social groups and Providers – consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Score percentage** | **‘Effectiveness’ considerations** |
| Work commuters | NA | *Not applicable* |
| Leisure / off peak travellers | 100 | *Very effective for nursing parents and their baby, families* |
| Women in general | NA | *Designed for a specific need* |
| Women or others making multiple / chained trips | 100 | *Can be used as many times as needed* |
| Adults travelling with dependent children or carers | 100 | *Yes for the specific case of nursing parents – not for other types of dependents* |
| Low income groups, people on welfare | 100 | *No charge once in the airport space* |
| Young people and students | NA | *Not applicable* |
| School-children travelling independently | NA | *Not applicable* |
| Older people | NA | *Not applicable* |
| People with disabilities, physical or cognitive | 50 | *The needs of a disabled mum are not considered* |
| People travelling from or to remote locations | NA | *Not applicable* |
| Minority ethnic groups | 50 | *Could be cultural disincentives, but likely to be helpful where privacy of feeding is required* |
| People feeling vulnerable in public spaces | 100 | *It works well for this need, applied to infant nursing* |
| Transport Providers | 70 | *Will enhance attractiveness of airport to parents/carers/families* |
| **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** | **84%** | ***Very effective for this niche group, purposefully excludes others*** |

### Step 4: Effectiveness: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Effective for who? Is it effective for the citizens it is aimed at?** | *A very effective solution for the niche group: families or parents travelling alone with small children. It is not aimed at any other groups.* |
| **Not Effective for who?** | *Not effective for anyone travelling with a dependent older child or adult – they would need a different solution for a safe space. We are not sure how much luggage could be accommodated into the pod.* |
| **Percentage Score** | **84%** |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated |

Key:

**Indicator 2. Attractive – appealing in terms of implementation, use and benefit from both provider and user perspective**

‘Attractive’ Mobility is set within the context of providing safe and accessible solutions for a broad and diverse range of people. It includes how far ‘the solution’ can be customised and made comfortable, and factors such as clean, safe and convenient. There should be scope here to consider attractiveness according to age, gender and other factors such as social grouping, ethnicity, personality. Also consider the impact on, and of, surrounding areas such as bus stops, hubs, rail stations. How is the artefact adaptable to users’ needs and wishes? Note: With adaptability, there is some overlap with the criteria of ‘Inclusive’ (discussed later) where adaptability and accessibility can be commented on in more detail.

### Step 1: Goals: The product has been designed to be attractive in the following ways:

**Please complete below how the product has been designed to be attractive for users and providers.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Target user group**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How will it be attractive to end users?** |
| Infant-nurturing parents and carers, with their infants: includes breastfeeding, bottle feeding, chest-feeding (for post-op transmen) and the diverse existing forms of childcare. | *The answers here are similar to those for ‘Effective’, as attractive is very much part of the rationale for this design.*  It will feel comfortable, safe, and calm, for mum or carer and baby, yet still have a physical connection to family waiting outside, so it is not stigmatising to carer and baby. It must not feel clinical but must be clean. Will improve the quality of the journey and well-being. |
| Other family members | *As above, perhaps there should be room for toddlers inside (?), and waiting space outside for partners to wait* |
| Other travellers | *We don’t have much information – it may add to travellers’ enjoyment if nurturing mums are able to satisfy hungry crying babies more easily and stay calm!*  *It must be an aesthetically pleasing part of the airport and not be ‘in the way’ of busy transit.* |
| Cleaning and maintenance staff | Must have wipeable surfaces |
| **Providers**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How will it be attractive to providers?** |
| Airport authority | *No information has been provided as to cost or size of the pod so this is hard to assess. We have assumed the service is free to the end user, to enhance their visit and impression of the airport facilities.* |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet ‘Attractiveness’ goals?

***Please complete using what information you have available from your design sources***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attractiveness Goal** | **Does it meet the goal?** |
| For mum/ carer and baby, it will feel comfortable, safe, and calm, yet still have a physical connection to family waiting outside, so it is not stigmatising to carer and baby. It must not feel clinical but must be clean. Will improve the quality of the journey and well-being. | *It appears to, from the design drawings and descriptions. It has a clean aesthetic but does not stigmatise because it is designed to be attractive, not clinical.* |
| Other family members – as above | *It appears to, from the design drawings and descriptions. We don’t know how much room there is inside the pod for other small children.* |
| Other travellers – should not impinge on their journey | *We do not have information about where pods will be situated, which could cause problems for transiting people, if it is perceived as an obstacle, the pod appears to be designed with ‘pleasing aesthetics’ in mind* |
| Airport authority’s goals | *We have no information on this.* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Gender and Diversity Smart ‘Attractiveness’ questions** |  | | **Safety:**  Does it feel safe to a range of groups? E.g. waiting at stops, stations and deserted areas  Is it safe to actually use? What are the safety issues?  Are there safety issues for other transport users or pedestrians? | *It is only designed for the needs of a particular user group – nursing parent and baby, family members. Feeling safe is a central part of the design.*  *More detail needed on sight lines especially if going to sit in there. Can I see who is around me? What the other children are doing?*  *What is the lighting like?*  *Will I be claustrophobic?*  *Is there a step to access this? (it appears no step) – can a buggy and wheelchair easily get in?* | | **Clean and Hygienic:**  Can it be kept clean or cleaned for next user? | *Wipeable surfaces – we don’t have enough information about how it would be kept clean.*  *Material details need to be provided. Does it have running water, a bin and baby wipes inside*  *If outside is it open to the elements? Will wind and rain blow in?*  *Is it open to access for everybody? What is to stop homeless people, drug addicts using it?* | | **Convenient:**  Can it be accessed in a convenient location? | *We do not have information about exact locations within the airport, but the description suggests it would be not far from main waiting areas. May depend on size and cost – no information about that.* | | **Adaptability:**  Is it adaptable to users of different sizes in weight and height?  Can it be used in different ways e.g. Sit / stand?  Is there any luggage storage?  Is this information provided in the design? | *It needs to be large enough to accommodate nursing parent, a buggy and one or more small children. The drawings suggest it will be but no sizes are shown. It does not look large enough to accommodate a mum in a wheelchair. We do not know how much luggage could be also accommodated.*  *Design needs an interior package to be presented.*  *Presumably the height will be 6’*  *Worried about the convenience of dragging luggage and the buggy in and out and manoeuvrability inside* | | **Comfort:**  Does it offer comfort? Is the design comfortable to hold / sit on or sit in? Are controls within reach for everyone?  Consider shelter from elements, seating, waiting area, toilets? | *It is a shelter, but I assume it is an open ended tube, so depends on the location. Not clear if it is closed or open-ended – there are 2 options shown in drawings.*  *Not enough details of the interior shown to say how snug and nurturing the inside would look.* | | **Interest, Novelty and Usefulness:**  Does it offer something interesting? Timetable information; entertainment; fun; local information; city event updates | *Yes it looks novel and interesting.*  *As this is a quiet space I don’t expect to be bombarded with information, but some alerts would be appropriate* | |  |  |  Step 3: Attractiveness to Social groups and Providers – consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Group** | **Score %** | **‘Attractiveness’ considerations** | | Work commuters | *NA* | *Not applicable* | | Leisure / off peak travellers | 100 | *Looks to be attractive to most nursing parents and their baby, families* | | Women in general | NA | *Designed for a specific need* | | Women or others making multiple / chained trips | 100 | *Can be used as many times as needed* | | Adults travelling with dependent children or carers | 100 | *Yes for the specific case of nursing parents – not for other types of dependents* | | Low income groups, people on welfare | 100 | *No charge once in the airport space* | | Young people and students | NA | *Not applicable* | | School-children travelling independently | NA | *Not applicable* | | Older people | NA | *Not applicable* | | People with disabilities, physical or cognitive | 50 | *It is not evident that needs of a disabled mum or someone in a wheelchair are considered* | | People travelling from or to remote locations | NA | *Not applicable – this is an airport!* | | Minority ethnic groups | 50 | *Likely to be attractive where privacy of feeding is preferred* | | People feeling vulnerable in public spaces | 100 | *It works well for this need, applied to breastfeeding and infant nursing* | | Transport Providers | 70 | *Will enhance attractiveness of airport to parents/carers/families* | | **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** | ***84%*** | ***Likely to be attractive to most people in this niche group – but more information is also needed.*** | |

### Step 4: Attractiveness: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Attractive to who?** | ***Likely to be attractive to most people in this niche group – but more information is also needed.***  *It has a clean aesthetic, not sure whether it would be of interest to an airport authority or similar transport provider. Or attractive to them as not sufficient details have been provided, e.g., in terms of installation, cost and size* |
| **Not Attractive to who?** | *Does not look as if wheelchair users could be accommodated* |
| **Percentage Score** | **84%** |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key:

## **Indicator 3: Affordable – cost-effective in terms of acquisition/implementation and maintenance from both provider and user perspectives**

Does this transport solution contribute to ending transport ‘accessibility poverty’? This assesses whether people can reach their basic daily activities within a reasonable time, ease and cost – and relates to key activities that support life chances such as employment, education, health visits. (Lucas, 2016)

For the TInnGO project, this incudes affordability from the point of view of public transport – so the public investment of the provider must support a solution that will be used by a wide base of users. It can also be assessed from the point of view of Affordability for individuals. This can be very subjective – e.g. a taxi could be an everyday item for people with plenty of disposable income, but a luxury for those on lower incomes. If a transport solution is likely to be adopted, it needs to be ‘affordable’ for the majority of everyday citizens, *regardless of income* – otherwise it is not an equitable choice. It should be kept in mind that the gender pay gap means women have fewer economic resources than men.

Affordability for the transport provider, involves a discussion about investment and long-term goals, and it is important that designers consider this perspective. A distinction could be made between cost to the user of hiring/sharing or owning their own means of transport e.g. cycles. Public authorities can provide shared means of transport or facilities for parking of privately owned items. If hire vehicles are in a central hub, affordability of getting to the hub from an out-of-city location could also be considered.

### Step 1: The product has been designed to be affordable in the following ways:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Group**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How is it affordable to end users?** |
| Infant-nurturing parents and carers, with their infants: includes breastfeeding, bottle feeding, chest-feeding (for post-op transmen) and the diverse existing forms of childcare. | *It would be free to use* |
| Other family members | *It would be free to use* |
| Other travellers | *Would not be using it* |
| **Provider** | **How is it affordable to providers?** |
| Airport authority | *The alternative is to do nothing and let women continue to feed in public on overcrowded benches, or go to the toilets for seclusion – there will be a cost to the provider, but it will enhance the airport experience hopefully for everyone* |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet ‘Affordability’ goals?

**Please add evaluations based on the goals outlined above and complete the additional questions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Affordability Goals as defined above** | ***Answers – please complete using what information you have available from your design sources*** |
| Infant-nurturing parents | *Free* |
| Providers – airport authority | *We do not know the proposed cost, cleaning and maintenance must also be factored in* |
| **Gender and Diversity Smart ‘Affordability’ Questions** |  |
| Is an affordable alternative provided? – e.g. a walking route | *In this case the alternative is to do nothing.* |
| Is it affordable for the transport provider? Is there a break-even level? | *We do not have information about this – it is about service quality* |
| In the case of ‘shared transport’ - Will users’ own vehicles’ be permitted (e.g., personal bikes, e-scooters)? | *Not applicable* |
| Does this solution allow access to basic daily activities within reasonable time and cost? Consider e.g. bus routes, employment sites, education access, health visits. | *Not applicable* |

### Step 3: Affordability for Social groups and Providers – consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Score percentage** | **‘Affordability’ considerations** |
| Work commuters | *NA* | *Not applicable* |
| Leisure / off peak travellers | 100 | *Free* |
| Women in general | NA | *Designed for a specific need* |
| Women or others making multiple / chained trips | 100 | *Free* |
| Adults travelling with dependent children or carers | 100 | *Free* |
| Low income groups, people on welfare | 100 | *Free* |
| Young people and students | NA | *Not applicable* |
| School-children travelling independently | NA | *Not applicable* |
| Older people | NA | *Not applicable* |
| People with disabilities, physical or cognitive | 100 | *Free* |
| People travelling from or to remote locations | 50 | *If in a train station this might make cheap travel more easy for nursing parents* |
| Minority ethnic groups | 100 | *Free* |
| People feeling vulnerable in public spaces | 100 | *Free* |
| Transport Providers | NA | *We do not have enough information – there will be a cost!* |
| **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** | ***94%*** | ***Affordable for users, but we do not have information about cost to providers.*** |

### Step 4: Affordability: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Affordable for who? Is it affordable for most citizens?** | *Yes it is free to users* |
| **Not Affordable to who?** | No one – it is free – We do not have information about cost of providing it however. |
| **Percentage Score** | **94%** |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

## **Indicator 4: Sustainable: Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.**

One key goal of sustainable travel is to reduce CO2 emissions, and enhance travel in an environmentally friendly and ‘green’ way, whether this is a mode of travel, or an infrastructure product. For example, utilising new ‘Smart’ technology may provide an advantage to the users in terms of ease of use or access to better information, improving traffic flow and reducing congestion. Sustainability should be offered to a wide group of users, offering green transport opportunities both now and for the future. Sustainability may also take into account the use of materials, energy and the life and maintenance of the product, from both user and provider perspective, (UN Goal 12).

### Step 1: The product has been designed to be sustainable in the following ways:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **User Group**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How is it sustainable to end users?** |
| Infant-nurturing parents and carers, with their infants: includes breastfeeding, bottle feeding, chest-feeding (for post-op transmen) and the diverse existing forms of childcare. | *The NurturepodTM has been designed using sustainably sourced material*  *All elements have been designed to be easily cleanable, durable and vandal proof*  *The nurturepod has been designed to encourage the use of public transport (sustainable forms of transport) by mothers /families with young children, by providing them with a safe , comfortable and relaxing space to feed their babies in waiting areas. This might encourage the use of sustainable forms of transport, as it improves the quality of end to end journeys – as opposed to the car. Although the airport example is not so sustainable, the pod could equally be available in a railway station concourse or bus/tram hub*  *The nurturepodTM encourages breastfeeding – which in itself is a sustainable form of food.* |
| Other family members | *Supports the family that contains a breast-fed infant* |
| Other travellers | *Not applicable* |
| **Providers**  *(complete as appropriate)* | **How is it sustainable for providers?** |
| Airport Authority or similar transport hub | *Sustainably sourced material, longevity of life of product and recycle options should be considered – not enough information* |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Step 2: How well does it meet the ‘Sustainable’ goals?

Please add evaluations based on the goals outlined above and complete the additional questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sustainable Goals as defined above** | **Answers *– please complete using what information you have available from your design sources*** |
| *Reduces need for commuters to drive within city,*  *reduce numbers needing bus transport* | *If provided in a railway station, or similar public transport hub, this may encourage more families with small children to use public transport instead of their car.* |
| *provider goals* | *Sustainably sourced material and longevity* |
|  | *All elements have been designed to be easily cleanable, durable and vandal proof* |
|  |  |
| encourages breast feeding | *Encourages provision of a sustainable and healthy source of food* |
| Easy to maintain | *Easy to wipe clean* |
| Long life of product | *Not enough information* |
| **Gender and Diversity Smart Questions related to Sustainability** |  |
| Is it sustainable for single trips? | *Yes* |
| Is it sustainable for chained or multiple trips? | *Yes* |
| Are some groups more attracted to sustainable solutions than others? Does the solution cater for these differences? | *If younger people (and women) are more attracted to sustainable solutions, then this certainly appeals to them, it has a modern design which echoes natural forms and imagery.* |
| Will the transport solution continue to be sustainable when users’ needs change? | *This is not relevant here – it is publicly available so any user who needs it may access it.* |
| Does it provide speedy trips with no emissions? | *Not applicable – enhances the quality of the trip* |
| Will it encourage users to leave their cars behind? | *Potentially* |
| Wil it replace bus travel? | *It is not a form of travel.* |

### Step 3: Sustainability for Social groups and Providers

**Is this a ‘sustainable choice’ for these groups? Consider needs and intersections where relevant – some could be left blank**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** |  | **Score percentage** | **‘Sustainability’ considerations** |
| Work commuters |  | *NA* | *Not applicable* |
| Leisure / off peak travellers |  | 100 | *It appeals at the level of encouraging breastfeeding* |
| Women in general |  | 100 | *Designed for a specific need of breastfeeding mothers* |
| Women or others making multiple / chained trips |  | NA | *NA* |
| Adults travelling with dependent children or carers |  | 50 | *Designed for the niche of infant feeding, a sustainable form of infant food – reduces the need for bottles etc.* |
| Low income groups, people on welfare |  | 100 | *Encourages a free form of infant food* |
| Young people and students |  | NA | *Not applicable* |
| School-children travelling independently |  | NA | *Not applicable* |
| Older people |  | NA | *Not applicable* |
| People with disabilities, physical or cognitive |  | NA | *Not applicable* |
| People travelling from or to remote locations |  | 50 | *If in a train station this might make sustainable travel more easy for nursing parents* |
| Minority ethnic groups |  | 50 | *May encourage breastfeeding mums to travel more sustainably (e.g. train replaces car)* |
| People feeling vulnerable in public spaces |  | 50 | *It shows the transport provider ‘cares’ about quality which may appeal to vulnerable people, and particularly women* |
| Transport Providers |  | NA | *Sustainable materials – but we don’t have much information* |
| **Conclusions (Total % / n of applicable groups)** |  | 71% |  |

### Step 4: Sustainability: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Sustainable for who? Is it sustainable for most citizens?** | *The pod is a sustainable solution designed to encourage breastfeeding ,a sustainable form of infant feeding, in public transport spaces including airport, railway or other transport concourses.*  *It may encourage more families with small children to use public transport hubs instead of their car.* |
| **Not Sustainable for who? How is it not sustainable?** | The design is branded as sustainable, with sympathetic imagery, wood etc. We do not have enough information about its longevity or recycling options at the end of the unit life. |
| **Percentage Score** | **71%** |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

## **Indicator 5: Inclusive: Which stakeholders/users are served by the product? What aspects promote the inclusive approach? What barriers will this help to overcome?**

Inclusion is seen as a universal human right. The aim of inclusion is to embrace all people irrespective of race, gender, disability, medical or other need. It is about giving equal access and opportunities and getting rid of discrimination and intolerance (removal of barriers). It affects all aspects of public life.

**Inclusive design:** Inclusive design is about making places that everyone can use. The way places are designed affects our ability to move, see, hear and communicate effectively.

Inclusive design aims to remove the barriers that create undue effort and separation. It enables everyone to participate equally, confidently and independently in everyday activities and to access a product or service equally – however they encounter it.

Inclusive design is aimed at considering and combatting discrimination against certain groups of people and the intersections between them. It should particularly consider groups who may be vulnerable because of perceived differences, such as ethnicity or different gender or ability.

We do not ask for goals to be defined here, these will be evident from the earlier sections. We simply offer questions to assess inclusive design for products. This section also includes explicit questions to assess how the product caters for the widest range of ability, by making the abilities more explicit. This is not an exhaustive list but covers the types of ability normally considered in an ‘accessibility checklist’. Considering this list may prompt designers to think about inclusivity issues they might otherwise have overlooked.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TInnGO Questions related to Inclusivity** | **Percentage** | **Answers** |
|  |  |  |
| Does it offer effective, affordable, attractive and sustainable transport for all social groups? | *50%* | *It offers a higher quality experience to travelling families with breastfed infants or parent and baby needing a ‘special’ time. It is not intended for anyone else to use.* |
| Does the solution provide security for vulnerable groups? | *50%* | *Seeing breastfeeding mothers / parents with small babies as a vulnerable group, yes it does.* |
| Does the solution apply to various social groups with regard to economy, disability, age? | *40%* | *Does not discriminate on economic group, but is designed for a niche user* |
| What anti-discrimination efforts might be applied to this product/solution? Please make recommendations. | *NA* | *Recommendations needed here: the product would need to be thoroughly tested to ensure it appealed to mothers/ parents from a range of ethnic groups and cultures.* |
| **Physical and cognitive Accessibility questions:** |  |  |
| Will anyone be **excluded** because of issues with: |  |  |
| Vision impairment | *0%* | *Possibly would not be able to use it without assistance, difficult to locate it and navigate the space* |
| Hearing impairment | *100%* | *No obvious issues in the design although would not benefit from ambient sounds* |
| Cognitive impairment | *0%* | *Could present problems for a user with cognitive impairment* |
| Strength, dexterity or reach | *100%* | *No* |
| Mobility: Walking, stair climbing, standing or balance | *50%* | *Navigating the pod space could be difficult* |
| Are provisions made for users with mobility aids.e.g., Wheelchair users, crutches and walking sticks? | *0%* | *It does not appear to have been considered* |
| **Overall Inclusivity Percentage = Total / n (mean)** | ***43%*** |  |

### Step 4: Inclusivity: Overall Evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Please summarise based on the comments and evaluations above** |
| **Who is included in this solution?** | *It offers a higher quality experience to travelling families with breastfed infants or parent and baby needing a ‘special’ time. It is not intended for anyone else to use.* |
| **Who is NOT included in this solution?** | *There may not have been enough consideration given to the needs of mothers and parents with cognitive, vision or mobility difficulties.* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Percentage Score** | **43%** |
| Copy a smiley to give your overall impression | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

Part C: Overall Assessment

This is intended to summarize how the product fits with its own defined goals and how far it meets ‘Gender and diversity smart’ criteria. The Evaluator should complete a rating based on the ratings per each indicator already completed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Does the design meet its own goals?** | **Percent** | **Smiley** | **Notes** |
| *The pod meets the declared goals of providing a safe, comfortable and welcoming space for women (and others) to feed or nurture babies, while in transit, designed for foyers/airports etc to replace the ‘room off a toilet’. Need to make them feel special.* | *85%* | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | *The pod meets the goals very well – but possibly not enough consideration has been given to the needs of mothers with disabilities.* |
| *The NurturepodTM is an infant feeding space for displacement locations such as airport lounges. Designed to comfort the travelling family, the pod design gives a degree of control, dignity and privacy, safety, warmth and kindness.* | *75%* | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | *For sustainability it was felt that additional (and more sustainable) locations would be train stations or public transport hubs. Providers would need to balance the cost against a need for quality of service.* |
| **Does the design meet the Gender & Diversity Smart goals - EAASI?** |  |  |  |
| 1 - Effective  Is the product effective? | 84% | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | *A very effective solution for the niche group: families or parents travelling alone with small children. It is not aimed at any other groups. Not effective for anyone travelling with a dependent older child or adult – they would need a different solution for a safe space. We are not sure how much luggage could be accommodated into the pod.* |
| 2 - Attractive  Is the product attractive to a wide range of users? | 84% | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | ***Likely to be attractive to most people in this niche group – but more information is also needed.***  *It has a clean aesthetic, not sure whether it would be of interest to an airport authority or similar transport provider. Or attractive to them as not sufficient details have been provided, e.g., in terms of installation, cost and size* |
| 3 - Affordable  Is the product affordable to a wide range of users? | 94% | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | *Free to users – Providers will have to balance cost against quality of the service they provide* |
| 4 - Sustainable  Is the product sustainable / does it encourage sustainable behaviour? | 71% | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | *The pod is a sustainable solution designed to encourage breastfeeding ,a sustainable form of infant feeding, in public transport spaces including airport, railway or other transport concourses.*  *It may encourage more families with small children to use public transport hubs instead of their car.* |
| 5 - Inclusive  Is the product inclusive from the point of view of gender and diversity? From the point of view of Accessibility? | 43% | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | *It offers a higher quality experience to travelling families with breastfed infants or parent and baby needing a ‘special’ time. It is not intended for anyone else to use.*  *There may not have been enough consideration given to the needs of mothers and parents with cognitive, vision or mobility difficulties.* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent (70 to100%) | Good (60-69%) | Satisfactory (50-59%) | Poor (40-49%) | Fails this indicator (0-39%) |
| A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | Shape, circle  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated | A yellow smiley face  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |

Key

**What next?**

### 

#### We hope this has given you some insight into how the product scores on the TInnGO ‘Gender and diversity smart’ indicators.

#### Perhaps the product met the design brief or your organisation requirements well but scored lower on the indicators? Having this knowledge can indicate where the gaps are and show aspects that could be improved or redesigned to be more inclusive and more gender and diversity smart.

#### **Designers:** you might want to revisit your design brief and discuss with your clients – is the brief wide enough? Does anything need to change?

#### **Evaluating a range of products?** You can use this knowledge to make choices or better predict take-up of a solution – does anything need to change to make it more EAASI?

#### The TInnGO team would like to hear your feedback about our tool.

#### Contact: Andree.woodcock@coventry.ac.uk