

Mobility Activity 2: Moving Around

Descriptors	Points
a. Can stand and then move more than 200 metres, either aided or unaided.	0
b. Can stand and then move more than 50 metres but no more than 200 metres, either aided or unaided.	4
c. Can stand and then move unaided more than 20 metres but no more than 50 metres.	8
d. Can stand and then move using an aid or appliance more than 20 metres but no more than 50 metres.	10
e. Can stand and then move more than 1 metre but no more than 20 metres, either aided or unaided.	12
f. Cannot, either aided or unaided, – (i) Stand, or (ii) Move more than 1 metre.	12

Legislative Definitions

“Stand” means stand upright with at least one biological foot on the ground;

“Aided” means with—

- (a) The use of an aid or appliance; or
- (b) Supervision, prompting or assistance;

“Unaided” means without—

- (a) The use of an aid or appliance; or
- (b) Supervision, prompting or assistance.

Select Case Law

- [AP v SSWP \[2016\] UKUT 0501 \(AAC\)](#) – Considers conflicting decisions in [JP](#) and [KL](#) and agrees entirely with JP. Distance is the relevant factor with the added refinement provided between descriptors (c) and (d) [para 43].

The question is can the claimant walk more than 20m but less than 50m distance without an aid (c) or do they require an aid to walk more than 20m but

less than 50m (d). If they can walk more than 50m they do not satisfy these descriptors.

- [KL v SSWP \[2015\] UKUT 612](#) – Also considers that Reg 4(2) of the PIP Regs outlines that the ability to complete each activity should be considered in light of any aid or appliance the claimant will normally or could reasonably use. As the refinement between descriptor (c) and (d) relates to the ability to use aids, this case outlines that the general words of regulation 4(2) must yield to the specific words of mobility descriptor 2(c). Otherwise, descriptor 2(c) would be pointless.
- [CPIP/2377/2015](#) – Ability to move around to an acceptable standard is more than merely the distance covered:

6. ...Matters such as pain, and its severity, and the frequency and nature, including extent, of any rests required by the claimant, are relevant to the question of whether a claimant can complete a mobility activity descriptor “to an acceptable standard”.

See also [PS v SSWP \[2016\] UKUT 0326 \(AAC\)](#)

- [DT v SSWP \[2016\] UKUT 240](#) – Walking outdoors considers normal pavements and roads. Not restricted to completely flat. Will consider ability to step up and down of kerbs but does not consider ability to climb steps or slopes.
- [LG v SSWP \[2020\] UKUT 343 \(AAC\)](#) - *Evidence of ability to walk in airport should be considered in the context of Reg 4. Guidance on evidence from airport walking in DLA decision [JT v SSWP \(DLA\) \[2013\] UKUT 221 \(AAC\)](#) is applicable to PIP:*

9. The tribunal either did not apply that guidance, or did not make it clear, in its reasoning, that it had done. ...It did not explain why the walking on those relatively isolated occasions might be demonstrative of the claimant’s overall walking ability. It might have been, for example, that he claimant was making additional effort or was prepared to walk through pain, on those occasions, in circumstances where she would not normally have done so.

JT v SSWP was adopted in [GY-v-DfC \(DLA\) \[2017\] NICom 40](#)