

ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Program
INCLUDE and PEPDEL
Disability Programs

FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

Emily S Andrews, Ph.D.
July 21, 2011

Acknowledgements

This report could not have been accomplished without the gracious support of ILO staff. In particular, I appreciate the assistance and understanding provided by Girma Agune, Evaluation Manager, and Barbara Murray, responsible for backstopping. In addition, I am grateful for the discussions I had in Geneva with Christine Evans-Klock, José Manuel Salazar, Carla Henry, Joni Simpson, Pawel Gmyrek, Debra Perry, and Jeannette Sanchez. Each and every one helped me understand a very complicated project focused on policy and attitudinal changes that may take years to accomplish fully. I would also like to thank Anne Sullivan and Kimberly Muller for helping me with scheduling and arrangements.

I appreciate the quick responses of the ILO field offices to my many surveys of program performance, including Emanuela Pozzan, Bill Salter, Pia Korpinen, Jurgen Schwettmann, Fantahun Melles, George Mubita and Liu Chunxiu.

My trip to Hanoi provided me valuable insights into the ILO-Irish Partnership on the ground. There I would like to thank in particular, Rie Vejs Kjeldgaard, Shafinaz Hassendeen, Cam Ly Pham Thi, Jonna Naumanen, Seidy, Yoon Youngmo and the many constituents who were kind enough to meet with me. I could not have managed without the services of my fine interpreter, Ha Ngoc Anh, my driver, Mr. Bihn and the arrangements made for me by Nguyen Thi Hien. In addition, my conversations with Daniel Mont of the World Bank further deepened my knowledge of disability statistics throughout the world. Lastly, Mags Gaynor, of the Embassy of Ireland, helped me understand some of the partnership issues related to the ILO and Irish Aid in Vietnam.

While I could not have produced this evaluation without the assistance provided by the many people above, all remaining errors, misconceptions, and omissions in the report are my own.

Emily S Andrews, Ph.D.
Monitoring and Evaluation Consulting
+1 202 203 0084 (cell)
+1 720 257 5493 (Colorado)
+1 202 944 9624 (Washington, DC)
emilysandrews@hotmail.com

Table of Content

Executive Summary	6
A. Findings	7
1. Relevance	7
2. Efficiency	7
3. Design Validity	8
4. Effectiveness	8
5. Impact:	8
B. Recommendations	9
1. General Program Design	9
2. Specific Program Activity Focus	10
Acronyms	12
Section I: Project Overview and Evaluation Description	13
A. Precursor Programs	13
B. The INCLUDE Program:	14
C. The PEPDEL Program:	14
D. Evaluation Objectives:	15
E. Report Structure	16
F. Evaluation Methodology	16
Section II: Relevance of INCLUDE and PEPDEL	18
A. Irish Aid:	18
C. ILO Priorities:	19
D. ILO Program and Budget Strategic Framework Objectives	20
E. Gender Analysis:	21
F. Complementary Activities:	21
Section III: Efficiency of INCLUDE and PEPDEL	22
A. Comparative Expenditures:	22
B. Detailed Budget Analysis:	22
C. Other Considerations:	25
Section IV: Design Validity of INCLUDE and PEPDEL	26
A. The INCLUDE Project:	26
B. The PEPDEL Project:	28
C. Risk Analysis	29

D. Utility of the Logframe Matrix:	30
Section V: Effectiveness of INCLUDE and PEPDEL.....	31
A. Risk Analysis	31
B. The INCLUDE Project	32
1. INCLUDE Outputs:	32
2. INCLUDE Effectiveness Indicators	34
C. The PEPDEL Project	37
1. PEPDEL Outputs	37
2. PEPDEL Project Effectiveness Indicators.....	40
Section VI. Impact of INCLUDE and PEPDEL	44
A. The INCLUDE Project	44
1. INCLUDE Objective Indicators	44
2. INCLUDE: ILO Immediate Outcomes for 2008-2009	46
B. The PEPDEL Program	47
1. PEPDEL Objective Indicators:.....	47
2. PEPDEL: ILO Immediate Outcomes for 2008-2009	48
Section VII: Sustainability of INCLUDE and PEPDEL.....	50
A. The INCLUDE Program	50
B. The PEPDEL Program	51
Section VIII. Summary and Recommendations	53
A. Summary	53
1. Relevance	53
2. Efficiency	53
3. Design Validity	53
4. Effectiveness	54
5. Impact:	55
B. Recommendations	56
3. General Program Design.....	56
4. Specific Program Activity Focus.....	58
Annexes	60
Annex 1: INCLUDE Logframe Survey	61
Annex 2: INCLUDE Effectiveness Survey.....	62
Annex 3: PEPDEL Logframe Survey	64

Annex 4: PEPDEL Effectiveness Survey 66

Annex 5: Risk Analysis Outcomes Survey 68

Annex 6: Vietnam Trip Report..... 69

Executive Summary

This report provides an independent evaluation of disability programs funded through Phase III of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme. Phase III activities represent a continuation and expansion of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership's focus on disability. Two disability programs were funded: the INCLUDE program (Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service) and the PEPDEL program (Promoting the Employability and Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation).

The objective of the INCLUDE program is to promote greater inclusion of women and men with disabilities in mainstream small enterprise development, micro-finance, vocational training, employment promotion, poverty reduction and rural development programs. The objectives of PEPDEL are threefold: (i) enhanced government capacity to collaborate with social partners in planning the implementation of legislation, policies and programs addressing employability and employment of persons with disabilities (with particular attention to women and persons living with HIV/AIDs, (ii) strengthened implementation and enforcement of employment-related laws and policies, and (iii) attention to disability perspective in laws and policies through greater involvement of universities in sensitizing existing and future generations of lawyers.

The programs were implemented in each of five countries in two geographic regions. INCLUDE was active in four countries with outreach to a further four (in Asia, Viet Nam with outreach to Laos and Cambodia; and in Africa, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zambia, with outreach to Kenya and Uganda). PEPDEL was active in three countries in Asia (China, Thailand and Viet Nam) and four countries in Africa (Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia).

The evaluation is intended to provide a qualitative assessment of program performance based on well-recognized elements for evaluating project design and implementation. These include:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which the program is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor;
- **Efficiency:** The extent to which the program uses the least costly resources to achieve its results;
- **Design Validity:** The extent to which the intervention logic is coherent and realistic;
- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the program attains its outcomes;
- **Impact:** The extent to which the activity objectives and development indicators are met;
- **Sustainability:** The extent to which the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

It is based on a desk review of documents, with the exception of a field trip to Vietnam where a series of interviews was conducted with key participants in the program. The backbone of the evaluation uses responses to a set of questionnaires sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators, which are:

- a. Survey instruments sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators requesting information on output and objective indicators from the Logframe analysis in the Project Documents;
- b. Survey instruments sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators on key questions related to the five project effectiveness areas discussed above;
- c. A Survey instrument sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators on the degree to which risks indicated in the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Agreement obtained, and if so, what mitigation measures were taken.

A. Findings

The evaluation findings related to the five recognized elements of a qualitative evaluation: relevance, efficiency, design validity, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Relevance and efficiency rate highly. In terms of effectiveness, the projects effected outputs in most countries as anticipated, although the logical framework could have been improved. Because of the difficult nature of changing the disability paradigm, in many countries greater efforts are needed to fully achieve anticipated impacts and ensure sustainability.

1. Relevance

INCLUDE and PEPDEL's focus is highly relevant with regard to Irish Aid funding, as the funding addresses key issues related to persons with disability, who experience greater poverty, exclusion, and fewer economic opportunities. Both INCLUDE and PEPDEL support and promote the guiding principles of the UN Convention, as clearly indicated in the Program Objectives. Further, the activities are clearly relevant to ILO Convention 159. ILO's objectives implemented through Decent Work Country Programs have four strategic objectives: creating jobs, guaranteeing rights at work, extending social protection and promoting social dialogue that are all related to an inclusive disability strategy. INCLUDE and PEPDEL were designed to be attuned to the ILOs Program and Budget Strategic Framework Objectives for 2008-2009.

2. Efficiency

The ILO is attempting to do a great deal with very limited resources. Funds were spent expeditiously with little apparent shortfall for the third year. Nonetheless, many countries indicated that they could not achieve their objectives due to lack of funding. Consequently, it would appear that a more generous budget would be more efficient in meeting program objectives.

3. Design Validity

Individual indicators generally are, in and of themselves important to the development of an inclusive nation-wide disability policy, although the logical framework itself could be improved. Further, there are issues of attribution. It would be useful to have some interim outcome indicators in-between the outputs and the objectives. The Logframe Matrices for INCLUDE and PEPDEL were well documented by the ILO in progress reports to Irish Aid and Geneva.

4. Effectiveness

The ILO-Irish Aid Program document spelled out four country risks that could reduce the effectiveness of the project. Except for political risk, many countries indicated that one or more risks occurred. These were generally lack of effectiveness of constituent participation and often related to lack of resources, be it in the form of a Country Disability Coordinator or financial means.

In general, all of the *INCLUDE* output indicators were met. The ILO provided the training, support, materials and guidance as intended. The Disability Equality Training approach developed in the project was refined and DET facilitations were trained in participating countries. Disability inclusion support agencies were established and operational, with the exception of Tanzania, which fell seriously behind with the death of a director. In terms of INCLUDE Knowledge Development, all countries indicated that the program assisted greatly in the spread of information, although only some countries provided examples improved understanding or advances in rights. INCLUDE Capacity Building was reported to be strong but the reporting of specific accomplishments stemming from capacity building was more limited.

PEPDEL output indicators were more complicated to assess. Implementation and action plans were developed generally, with the exceptions of Tanzania and Uganda. PEPDEL provided support to university legal faculties, developing disability curricula and sponsored the establishment of the Centre for Disability Law and Policy at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. Progress with regard to other indicators was varied. Ethiopia demonstrated strong achievements in vocational education, while Tanzania and Uganda had none. Some, but by no means all, employer and workers organizations have undertaken new initiatives. Most PEPDEL developed disability courses in university settings, particularly through law faculties. Constituents in all countries received some training on the drafting and implementation of legislation, but whether this has been or will be used to influence the legislative process still appears to be an open question.

In terms of PEPDEL Knowledge Development, all countries indicated that the program assisted greatly in the spread of information, although only some countries provided examples improved understanding or advances in rights. In terms of Capacity Building, a number of countries, including China, Zambia and Uganda, indicate that PEPDEL has led to positive actions to influence legislation and policy.

5. Impact:

Many INCLUDE countries reported progress with regard to the objectives in the ILO Logframe analysis, but the progress is not uniform. Further attribution is difficult as there are many other influences on these

achievements, e.g. from donors, government, social partners and/or civil society. The strengthening of disability inclusion agencies was clearly a result of ILO activities (but likely should have been listed as an output or outcome). Some INCLUDE countries indicated that there were existing government inclusion policies within the country, but none on policy implementation.

In general, PEPDEL has been extremely active in all countries on disability policy and legislation, with a more inclusive focus than only that of young women and men with disabilities, including support to review existing laws, draft new laws, and hold consultative meetings with social partners and civil society. In addition, support was provided to civil society for advocacy in favor of ratification of the UN CRPD. The problem is that it is very difficult to move from training constituents, to encouraging them to take specific actions, to actually changing the environment in which persons with disabilities live. Some countries have placed a strong emphasis on modifying national training policies. For example, Zambia has made progress in promoting inclusive vocational education and training. In other countries, however, discussions have been held on the issue of training policies, but no changes have been implemented. While a variety of training and media initiatives have been undertaken with regard to HIV/AIDS programs, these are not specifically for an HIV/AIDS education. Inclusion in public and private employment services is another area where more work is needed. The improvement of statistical data on persons with disabilities should also be a priority.

B. Recommendations

Overall, the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme has been extremely satisfactory in its steps to develop and encourage inclusion in the mainstream of society for persons with disabilities. The program has done a great deal with scarce resources in an area where negative attitudes towards an inclusive society are prevalent around the world. Nonetheless, I have made some suggestions in terms of general program design and specific activities that I believe would strengthen a continuation of INCLUDE and PEPDEL to strengthen impact and ensure sustainability.

1. General Program Design

a. Choice of Countries

The selection of countries is extremely important as some countries have made greater progress than others. There needs to be an assessment of which countries should be funded in any future phase of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme related to disability. This assessment would require discussions on-the-ground and cannot be made with only a document audit.

b. Funding

Another area for additional assessment is the amount of funding provided per country. The one factor consistently raised in the Risk Analysis was that risks related to constituent participation and action could be mitigated by additional resources. Additional funding might be best used for Country Disability Coordinators, in the first instance, and for a more realistic assessment of the costs of international experts.

c. Project Management

The use of Implementation Plans detailing program activities and submission of progress reports are extremely important tools used by the ILO program management to conduct a continuing evaluation of whether and how countries are meeting output indicators and objectives. A simple utilization of MS Project might be one way to go to better appreciate whether or not activities were meeting their targets on time.

d. Monitoring and Evaluation

The basic monitoring and evaluation framework for the ILO-Irish Aid Programme is excellent in so far as it uses a Logframe analysis that takes each program from activities to outputs to objective indicators to objectives. However, the outputs and objective indicators for both INCLUDE and PEPDEL need to be revisited. In particular, all output indicators ought to be ones that are directly attributable to the program and not any that need to have a next step taken by program participants that is out of control of the project.

e. Program Expansion

Many INCLUDE and PEPDEL activities have been focused at the national level with less regional or local participation, despite wishes for expansion. A potential Phase IV program might provide greater regional focus for program expansion, particularly to countries that have already had positive results in terms of objective indicators.

2. Specific Program Activity Focus

a. Media Campaigns

The most obvious route to awakening civil society is through the media. In general, while media training has been provided, actual media campaigns resulting from training and the provision of good media tools have been limited. I would suggest using some funding to arrange for technical assistance for a media campaign engaging country media specialists, and perhaps partnering with a specific organization or organizations, as has been done in China, focusing on the most effective media -- be they print, radio, television or other means, to reach civil society.

b. Regulation and Implementation

PEPDEL has improved the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement effective legislation and policies, including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion. But the legislative process is only the first step in changing behavior. It may be the right time to add training and capacity building for the next step in the process – regulation and implementation of disability laws, labor codes, and other legislation related to accessibility and accommodation.

c. Disability Statistics

Very little has been done in the area of disability statistics at the national level with statistical agencies. Further, different measures and concepts of disability are actually appropriate for specific policies and programs. Another benefit of including disability questions in labor force surveys would be to measure the labor force participation of persons with disabilities and compare that figure to the population overall – a way to measure the ultimate objective of improved disability policies.

a. Additional Guidance and Guidelines

There is virtually nothing but praise for the guides and tools that the ILO has prepared and used in training and for capacity building within country. But there may be some areas where additional guidance and tools may be appropriate. Aside from guidance on measurement issues (see above), another potential area would be to document guidance on accommodation for specific conditions.

Acronyms

ACFTU	All China Federation of Trade Unions
CDLP	Center for Disability Law and Policy
CEC	China Enterprise Confederation
CETU	Confederation of Ethiopian Trade Unions
DET	Disability Equality Training
DEWD	Developing Entrepreneurship among Women with Disabilities
DPO	Disabled Persons Organization
DWCP	Decent Work Country Program
ECDD	Ethiopian Center for Disability and Development
ECOT	Employers' Confederation of Thailand
EMP/SEED	Boosting Employment through Small Enterprise Development
ENDAN	Ethiopian National Disability Action Network
EPD/IL	Employment of People with Disabilities-the Impact of Legislation
EWDNA	Ethiopian Women with Disabilities National Association
FENAPD	Federation of Ethiopian National Association of People with Disabilities
GENDER	ILO Bureau for Gender Equality
GLADNET	Global Applied Disability Research and Information Network
GO	Government organization
HIV/AIDS	Human immunodeficiency virus/ Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
IDDP	International Day of Persons with Disabilities
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INCLUDE	Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service
Lao PDR	Lao Peoples Democratic Republic
MOLISA	Ministry of Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs
MoLSA	Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs
MSRTVT	Ministry of Science, Technology and Vocational Training
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NUWODU	National Union of Women with Disabilities in Uganda
NVRC	National Vocational Rehabilitation Center
PEPDEL	Promoting the Employability and Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation
SME	Small and medium enterprises
SNE	Special Needs Education
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education Training
UN	United Nations
UN CRPD	UN convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
VGCL	Vietnam General Confederation of Labor
WEDGE	Women's Entrepreneurship and Gender Equality
WISE	Organization for Women in Self Employment
ZACDID	Zanzibar Center for Disability and Inclusive Development
ZAFOD	Zambia Federation of Disability Organisations
ZNADWO	Zambia National Association for Disabled Women

Section I: Project Overview and Evaluation Description

This report provides an independent evaluation of disability programs funded through Phase III of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme. Phase III activities represent a continuation and expansion of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership. Two disability projects were funded: the INCLUDE program (Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service) and the PEPDEL program (Promoting the Employability and Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation). The INCLUDE program is a logical extension of earlier activities related to women's entrepreneurship. The PEPDEL program is the continued expansion of activities to improve the legislative environment. Each project also has a global component involving the publication and development of tools and guidelines, as well as media material, to further program objectives. Paired, these programs represent a top-down policy approach combined with a bottom-up client focus. Both are needed to ensure that persons with disabilities have the opportunities to live and work in mainstream society in an inclusive environment.

The programs were implemented in each of five countries in two geographic regions. INCLUDE was active in four countries with outreach to a further four (in Asia, Viet Nam with outreach to Laos and Cambodia; and in Africa, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zambia, with outreach to Kenya and Uganda). PEPDEL was active in three countries in Asia (China, Thailand and Viet Nam) and four countries in Africa (Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia).

The budget for each program is quite small: the INCLUDE program received nearly US\$2.4 million over the three years, and the PEPDEL program received close to US\$ 2.2 million. The objectives of each program are consequently very ambitious. A short description of each of the programs and the country assistance provided is outlined below.

A. Precursor Programs

Phase 1 of the partnership (2002 – 2004) funded DEWD (Developing Entrepreneurship among Women with Disabilities) that focused on testing a strategy to support women with disabilities and women with disabled dependents by improving their standard of living through entrepreneurship development in Ethiopia. Limited collaboration also took place with the WEDGE (Women's Entrepreneurship and Gender Equality) Component of the Partnership Programme. In addition, EPD/IL (Employment of People with Disabilities-the Impact of Legislation), the precursor program to PEPDEL, was designed to strengthen the capacity of national governments to develop and implement effective legislation and policy concerning the training and employment of people with disabilities. At the outset, extensive reviews of legislation, policy and implementation mechanisms concerning the training and employment of persons with disabilities were completed through desk research and country studies.

In Phase 2 (2004 – 2007) collaboration between DEWD and WEDGE became closer and more systematic, extending the program to four more countries where WEDGE was active (Kenya, Uganda, Cambodia, and Laos) by establishing partnerships with DPOs (Disabled Persons' Organizations) to refer women with disabilities to WEDGE activities and provide support to ensure that their participation was

effective. In Phase 2, PEPDEL supported increased interest among governments to review their disability legislation with the development and adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD).

B. The INCLUDE Program:

The objective of the INCLUDE program is to promote greater inclusion of women and men with disabilities in mainstream small enterprise development, micro-finance, vocational training, employment promotion, poverty reduction and rural development programs. This objective was to be met by developing the capacity of country agencies to promote the full participation of persons with disabilities in mainstream social and economic institutions. INCLUDE focused on enterprise development, vocational training and employment-related programs generally. The project was expected to continue to coordinate with WEDGE. In many ways this is a direct expansion of Phase I and Phase II efforts. Further, the project was to give attention to promoting the inclusion of disabled women and men living with HIV/AIDS.

Activities included the dissemination and documentation of good practices for disability inclusion and the preparation of guides and tools on disability inclusion. It was expected that existing ILO tools and guides in Enterprise Development, Skills Development, and Employment Promotion would be used to promote inclusive disability and that Disability Equality Training (DET) would be provided in collaboration with the ILO International Training Centre, Turin, Italy. Further, a key outcome of the project in selected countries was support for the establishment and operation of a Disability Inclusion Support Service (but not the actual operation itself). In addition, the Disability Equality Training approach developed in the project was to be refined and DET facilitations to be trained in participating countries. The program was intended to augment its impact through collaboration with the ILO Small Enterprise Development Department, Social Finance Unit, GENDER Bureau and ILO/AIDS.

It was anticipated that service contracts could be implemented in four countries – Ethiopia, Vietnam, Zambia and in Tanzania, Zanzibar. In addition, funds were earmarked to support the participation of women with disabilities in WEDGE events in Cambodia, Kenya, Laos, and Uganda, where WEDGE was active. In these countries, INCLUDE only focused on promoting an inclusive approach to women's entrepreneurship development.

A logical framework (Logframe) was developed in the Project Document specifying objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities. For this evaluation, specific information was requested for each country on the success of achieving project outputs and objectives.

C. The PEPDEL Program:

The objectives of PEPDEL are threefold: (i) enhanced government capacity to collaborate with social partners in planning the implementation of legislation, policies and programs addressing employability and employment of persons with disabilities (with particular attention to women and persons living with HIV/AIDS), (ii) strengthened implementation and enforcement of employment-related laws and policies, and (iii) attention to disability perspective in laws and policies through greater involvement of universities

in sensitizing existing and future generations of lawyers. These objectives were to be met by combining technical support with the development of legislation and its implementation.

Support was to be provided through capacity building, such as an inclusive approach to vocational training for disabled persons. Emphasis was to be placed on improving the prospects for the recruitment of disabled persons. A pilot program of the supported employment was to be implemented in Uganda with progress reports provided to employers' organizations in other countries with a view towards future replication. The project was also intended to increase productivity through training programs for cooperatives and enterprises of disabled persons. Direct legal advice was to be facilitated, as necessary, for the review and/or development of legislation, and disability audits of legislation relating to employment and training. Linkages with law faculties of national universities, initiated in Phase 2 of the project, were to be further developed and strengthened. In addition, PEDPEL was to contribute to the development of reliable data on labor force statistics related to persons with disabilities. Training was to be offered to national statistics agencies in collaboration with the ILO Bureau for Statistics.

In Africa, PEPDEL programs were implemented in Ethiopia, Zambia, Tanzania and Uganda. In Asia, PEPDEL was active in China, Thailand and Vietnam. A logical framework was developed in the Project Document specifying objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities. For this evaluation, specific information was requested for each country on the success of achieving project outputs and objectives.

D. Evaluation Objectives:

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold. First, it is intended to provide a qualitative evaluation of program performance based on an assessment of well-recognized elements for assessing project design and implementation. These include:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which the program is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor;
- **Efficiency:** The extent to which the program uses the least costly resources to achieve its results;
- **Design Validity:** The extent to which the intervention logic is coherent and realistic;
- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the program attains its outcomes;
- **Impact:** The extent to which the activity objectives and development indicators are met;
- **Sustainability:** The extent to which the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

Within this framework, the evaluation is also intended to consider project effectiveness in five areas: (i) knowledge development initiatives; (ii) advocacy and technical advisory services; (iii) capacity building; (iv) crosscutting issues; and (v) gender framework. These areas focus on the methods which the ILO-Irish Aid program uses to meet its objectives and the key constituencies that are the focus of the program interventions.

Second, and perhaps more important, the evaluation seeks not so much to retrospectively assess program effectiveness in a critical manner, but, rather, to focus on steps forward to achieve the goals of creating an

inclusive, mainstreaming approach to persons with disabilities in the countries supported by the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme.

E. Report Structure

The remaining sections of the report are structured as follows. Section II addresses the relevance of the program including the extent to which activities have been relevant to ILO priorities, Irish Aid priorities and national priorities, including the overarching goal of poverty reduction. Section III addresses project efficiency including the amount and distribution of resource allocation. Section IV discusses design validity terms of the logical framework and its use in project reporting.

Section V is the core of the evaluation indicating the extent to which the project activities achieve their outcomes as measured by Logframe outcome indicators. In addition, this section provides an assessment of the extent to which project outcomes may have been affected by risks outlined in the Proposal Overview and the extent to which mitigation measures taken were effective. Section VI is related to Section V and is equally essential to the core evaluation as it provides an assessment of Logframe objective indicators, as well as the ILO strategic indicators. Both sections discuss the program overall, by region, and highlight specific findings by country.

Section VII discusses project sustainability, to the extent that project outcomes have been met, with particular focus on whether the project has followed the elements of the sustainability strategy implemented for PEPDEL. This analysis also assesses the potential to upscale, mainstream and/or replicate the projects in other countries and to place this analysis within the broader perspective of ILOs Decent Work Agenda, Standards and Decent Work Programs. Section VIII summaries the findings and presents some preliminary recommendations on ways to go forward in assisting countries achieve inclusion for persons with disabilities.

One of the challenges in evaluating the ILO-Irish Aid partnership is that it is a qualitative rather than a quantitative evaluation. The ultimate objective of inclusion of persons with disabilities in society leading to improved employability, employment and earnings is one that can only be achieved incrementally over a long period of time, as inclusion requires not only legal change but attitudinal changes that may be extremely difficult to achieve and will differ considerable by country. Further, INCLUDE and PEPDEL activities are not tried and true in the sense that the development community knows how to design good road in every geographical setting and climate. Very few projects have focused on persons with disabilities, and to that extent, every project undertaken is a pilot. Not every type of activity, dialogue, or assistance can be expected to have been desired by or been effective in each of the countries covered by INCLUDE and PEPDEL.

F. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation is based on a desk review of documents, with the exception of a field trip to Vietnam where a series of interviews were conducted with key participants in the program. These interviews were undertaken without the presence of ILO staff in Hanoi or with the ILO Disability Coordinator. The following documents were reviewed for the evaluation:

- a. INCLUDE and PEPDEL Project Documents/Summary Project Outlines;
- b. INCLUDE and PEPDEL Progress Reports;
- c. Past Evaluations of ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programmes;
- d. Other ILO documents on disability issues;
- e. ILO Submissions of Statements of Income and Expenditures for the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme;

The backbone of the evaluation is based on a set of questionnaires sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators. These are:

- d. Survey instruments sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators requesting information on output and objective indicators from the Logframe analysis in the Project Documents;
- e. Survey instruments sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators on key questions related to the five project effectiveness areas discussed above;
- f. A Survey instrument sent to ILO field staff and Country Disability Coordinators on the degree to which risks indicated in the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Agreement obtained, and if so, what mitigation measures were taken;.

Section II: Relevance of INCLUDE and PEPDEL

Relevance: The extent to which the program is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor

There are several priorities which must be considered in assessing the relevance of INCLUDE and PEPDEL, including priorities of the Irish Aid, the UN, and the ILO. These are not necessarily identical but are certainly in concert with one another. Overall, the INCLUDE and PEPDEL programs are highly relevant to the priorities and policies of the donors. Further, INCLUDE and PEPDEL programs are highly relevant to the countries included, as indicated by the signature and ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the priority of disability in ILO Decent Work Country Programs by the majority of countries included. In addition, these are also the specific priorities of countries: for example, Ethiopia's five- year development plan (*Growth and Transformation Plan*), disability is a cross-cutting development issue and hence the two projects are specific to the government's priorities.

A. Irish Aid:

Irish Aid's overarching objective is "poverty reduction to reduce vulnerability and increase opportunity" in keeping with its White Paper on (2006) to provide support to meet the basic needs of the most vulnerable complemented by assistance to expand the economic opportunities of the poor and excluded. Current data indicate that INCLUDE and PEPDEL's focus is highly relevant with regard to Irish Aid funding, as the funding addresses key issues related to persons with disabilities who experience greater poverty and exclusion, and have fewer economic opportunities.

A recent study by Mont and Loeb¹ indicates that, "Disability and poverty are intricately linked. Roughly 10-12 percent of the world's population has a disability and they are among the poorest of the poor." Recent research has also suggested that the costs of disability raise poverty rates even higher.²

Unfortunately, disability data for developing countries are scarce and definitions of disability may differ substantially. Definitions related to the ability to work and participate in society may lead to significant differences in rates compared to medical definitions or conditions related to eligibility for social programs. Further, survey data using an accepted definition of functional disability are not available for many developing countries, thus restricting measurement to only those countries with adequate data.

¹ Daniel Mont and Mitchell Loeb (2008). "Beyond DLAYS: Developing Indicators to Assess the Impact of Public Health Interventions on the Lives of People with Disabilities. SP Discussion Paper #0815, World Bank.

² Jeanine Braithwait and Daniel Mont. 2009. "Disability and poverty: A Survey of World Bank Poverty Assessments and Implications," ALTER, European Journal of Disability Research 3:129-232. On line www.sciencedirect.com.

Despite these data deficiencies, it is well known that persons with disabilities are often not included in the mainstream economy and are less likely to be employed and earn less than persons without disabilities when they are employed. Further, it has been shown through practice that persons with disabilities can be employed in mainstream jobs when employers are willing to provide relatively inexpensive accommodation.

B. United Nations Objectives:

With regard to the UN, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability (CRPD) was adopted on December 13, 2006 and came into force in May 2008. As of July 2011, it was ratified by 103 countries and had 149 signatories. Its guiding principles are respect for individual autonomy, non-discrimination, inclusion, respect for differences, equality of opportunity, accessibility, equality for men and women, and respect for the children with disabilities. The Convention adopts a social model of disability and includes reasonable accommodation and accessibility in its framework. It provides for rights to health, education, rehabilitation, work and employment, and voting. Both INCLUDE and PEPDEL support and promote the guiding principles of the UN Convention as clearly indicated through the Program Objectives. Further, all the countries included in the Partnership Programme have signed the UN Convention. Only Cambodia and Vietnam have not yet ratified it.³

C. ILO Priorities:

Similarly, ILO Convention C159, Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) calls for appropriate vocational rehabilitation to be made available to all persons with disabilities, as well as the promotion of employment opportunities for in the open labor market. It stresses the principal of equal opportunity and equal treatment for men and women workers. Further, accommodation for persons with disabilities is not to be regarded as discrimination against other workers.

INCLUDE supports vocational training and employment of persons with disabilities, and PEPDEL supports legislation in these and related areas. Hence, the activities in that program are clearly relevant to ILO Convention 159. Two African countries in the Partnership Program, Kenya and Tanzania, and three Asian countries, Cambodia, the Lao PDR, and Vietnam, have not yet signed Convention 159. Hence, the overlapping objectives of INCLUDE and PEPDEL with Convention 159 are less relevant to half of the countries included in the program.

ILO's objectives are outlined in The Decent Work Agenda that is implemented through Decent Work Country Programs (DWCP) through the implementation of four strategic objectives: creating jobs, guaranteeing rights at work, extending social protection and promoting social dialogue. All five African countries had DWCPs during Phase III of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme, and all five included disability in the text of the DWCP indicating that it was a priority area. The same was true for Cambodia, China and Vietnam. The Lao PDR and Thailand did not have a DWCP. However, both countries had signed and ratified the UN convention.

³ The UN DESA website www.un.org/Disabilities, maintains the updated list of ratifications.

D. ILO Program and Budget Strategic Framework Objectives

A third consideration from the standpoint of the ILO is how INCLUDE and PEPDEL fit in with the ILO's strategic framework objectives. The INCLUDE and PEPDEL Project Documents indicate that the program will contribute to the achievement of ILO immediate and joint immediate outcomes for 2008 – 9.

INCLUDE	PEPDEL
<u>Immediate outcome 2a.1</u> 'Increase constituent capacity to develop policies and policy recommendations focused on job-rich growth, productive employment and <u>poverty reduction</u> ';	<u>Immediate outcome 2a.1</u> 'Increase constituent capacity to develop policies and policy recommendations focused on job-rich growth, productive employment and <u>poverty reduction</u> ';
<u>Immediate outcome 2a.3</u> 'Increase member State capacity or programmes focused on youth employment.'	<u>Immediate outcome 2a.3</u> 'Increase member State capacity or programmes focused on youth employment.'
<u>Immediate outcome 2b.1</u> 'Increase member State and constituent capacity to develop or implement training policies'	<u>Immediate outcome 2b.1</u> 'Increase member, State and constituent capacity to develop or implement training policies'.
<u>Immediate outcome 2b.2</u> 'Improve State capacity to develop or implement employment services'.	<u>Immediate outcome 2b.2</u> 'Improve State capacity to develop or implement employment services'.
<u>Immediate outcome 4a</u> 'Increase the value of employers' organizations to existing and potential membership'.	<u>Immediate outcome 4a.1</u> 'Increase the value of employers' organizations to existing and potential membership'.
<u>Immediate outcome 4b</u> 'Increase the value of workers' organizations to existing and potential membership.'	<u>Immediate outcome 4a.2</u> 'Increase the value of workers' organizations to existing and potential membership'.
<u>Joint immediate outcome 02100</u> 'Increase capacity of constituents to develop integrated policies and programmes to advance gender equality in the world of work.'	<u>Immediate outcome 4b.1</u> 'Increase the capacities of employers' and workers' organizations to participate effectively in the development of social and labour policy.'
<u>Joint immediate outcome 021125</u> 'Increase the participation of constituents in the formulation of financial policies.'	<u>Immediate outcome 4c.1</u> 'Increase member State capacity to develop policies and labour legislation through tripartite dialogue between constituents'.
	<u>Immediate outcome 4c.2</u> 'Increase the capacity of the tripartite constituents to implement labour policies and programmes, including through coordination at regional and subregional levels.'
	<u>Joint immediate outcome 021000</u> 'Increase capacity of member States and development partners to promote coherent economic and social policies in support of decent work at national, regional and global levels.'

The Mid-Term Self Evaluation Report specifically looked at the degree to which the Irish Partnership Program were meeting these objectives and describes the success of INCLUDE and PEPDEL in meeting these objectives one at a time⁴. From the standpoint of program relevance, INCLUDE and PEPDEL cover the strategic objectives indicated in the Project Documents. From the standpoint program Impact, however, the ILO strategic objectives not as useful as the Logframe indicators as a means to track whether or not program goals have been met.

⁴ ILO/Irish Aid Partnership, Mid-term Self Evaluation Report, Third Phase 2008-2011. 2010. Luis L. Zegers-Febres, Evaluation Manager. Unpublished pdf.

E. Gender Analysis:

The ILO has promoted gender equality for decades through its Constitution and Conventions for equal pay, against discrimination, and recognizing family responsibilities of workers and rights for maternity protection in the workplace. The ILO approach to gender mainstreaming considers different needs of men and women and may be addressed using gender-specific measures designed to overcome discrimination and inequality.

The INCLUDE project builds on prior experience in the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme through the DEWD and WEDGE projects, which promoted the participation of women with disabilities in mainstream entrepreneurship activities. As such, the gender focus in Phase III remains strong. Women with disabilities are often doubly disadvantaged, facing barriers arising from gender as well as disability, and are far less likely to have jobs than disabled men⁵. The ILO Gender Bureau is one of the collaborating offices for the project. There is an emphasis on women in INCLUDE in the collaboration with WEDGE. The Project Document also indicates that INCLUDE will focus on promoting the inclusion of both women and men with disabilities, indicating that a gender balance would be maintained although the focus of many project elements remained on women.

PEPDEL included gender in the activities highlighted in the project implementation plan. One of the key output indicators was the inclusion of specific consideration of gender equality and HIV/AIDS issues. Further, the project is to collaborate with other ILO departments, including the Gender Bureau during implementation. Nonetheless, PEPDEL did not require a specific 'gender analysis' and the extent to which gender issues were addressed meaningfully will only be reflected in the evaluation of project effectiveness and impact.

F. Complementary Activities:

Project relevance can be augmented if projects contain activities that are complementary to other objectives. This is the case for both INCLUDE and PEPDEL as reflected in Project Documents. In particular, DWCP programs are enhanced overall in those countries where disability is cited as an objective. In addition, INCLUDE is also linked to HIV/AIDs programs. INCLUDE Implementation Plans are specifically to be designed with considerations of both gender equality and HIV/Aids issues. The INCLUDE proposal relates to commitments made in the Declaration on Employment and Poverty in Africa, adopted at the African Union Third Extraordinary Session on Employment and Poverty Alleviation, Ouagadougou, September 2004, and in the Biwako Millennium Framework of the 2nd Asian and Pacific Decade of Person with Disabilities. PEPDEL also contributes the ILO Global Employment Agenda, by focusing on legislative, policy and program issues which prevent or discourage the participation of disabled workers in the active workforce.

⁵ O'Reilly, A. (2007): *The right to decent work of persons with disabilities* (ILO, Geneva).

Section III: Efficiency of INCLUDE and PEPDEL

Efficiency: The extent to which the program uses the least costly resources to achieve its results

The unique characteristic of ILO assistance compared to other donors such as the World Bank is that the ILO seeks to provide countries with the tools to implement changes and manage programs themselves rather than providing full technical assistance for either service delivery and/or policy development. This model means that the objectives of the project may be both narrower and wider than that of donors who will fund the development of training centers, for example, or make policy loans with specific conditionality. Direct loans may not be more successful than the ILOs efforts, however, and ILO funding, such as INCLUDE and PEPDEL, may have greater impact due to the development of country-based capacity, for instance, by assisting DPOs under INCLUDE, and legal frameworks based on a consultative model, such as the work accomplished under PEPDEL. The ILO model also allows for greater flexibility as it does not represent a pre-determined investment or policy initiative, so that the funding can support country-specific initiatives depending on conditions on the ground. This type of ‘pilot-testing’ is extremely important in areas such as disability where little direct funding has been implemented.

A. Comparative Expenditures:

Statistics on World Bank funding of projects that include some disability component or disability focus indicate the considerable difference in funding levels between the World Bank and the ILO. A search of World Bank Projects with a focus on ‘empowerment, security and social inclusion’ and a relationship to disability identified twenty-three active projects, with an average loan amount of US\$43 million. None of the countries are the same as those included in INCLUDE and PEPDEL. While there are other World Bank loans with some focus on disability, it is difficult to identify the degree of involvement in any of them, as mainstreaming disability into World Bank operations is a main goal for the Disability and Development Team at the World Bank. By contrast, the total funding for INCLUDE and PEPDEL is US\$4.6 million spread over 10 countries, or an average of \$460,000 per country, although the projects are not operational to exactly the same extent in each country. In other words, the ILO hopes to achieve substantial leveraging for a small amount of resources. The question is how much leveraging can be done?

B. Detailed Budget Analysis:

While project data do not provide for a true cost-benefit analysis, a budget analysis by type of expenditure may provide a basis on which the allocation of expenditures can be related to the achievement of results in subsequent sections of this evaluation. Some expenditure analysis can be made on the basis of original PEPDEL and INCLUDE budgets and actual PEPDEL and INCLUDE expenditures for 2009 and 2010, the first full years of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Program. Actual expenditures on each of these programs amounted to around two-thirds of the total budget, indicating the programs were disbursing as projected. INCLUDE expenditures at 70 percent of the total budget were slightly higher as a percentage of total budget, but not significantly different from the two-thirds mark.

The original PEPDEL budget allocated 27 percent of the budget to international experts and consultants and 20 percent of the budget to seminars. In terms of actual expenditures, however, international consultants and experts for PEPDEL accounted for 34 percent of total expenditures for 2009 and 2010 combined.⁶ By contrast, seminar costs for 2009 and 2010 combined were somewhat less than budgeted as a percentage of expenditures.

Table 1: PEPDEL Budget and Expenditures (2009/2010)

Expenditure Category	Budget - US\$	Actual 2009-2010 - US\$	Budget (%)	Actual (%)
Experts	\$ 600,000	\$ 524,193	27%	34%
Administrative Support	\$ 50,000	\$ 34,684	2%	2%
Travel Costs	\$ 60,000	\$ 42,159	3%	3%
Mission Costs	\$ 50,000	\$ 17,543	2%	1%
Evaluation Mission	\$ 40,000	\$ -	2%	0%
National Consultants	\$ 100,000	\$ 174,028	5%	11%
Sub-contracts	\$ 200,000	\$ 150,443	9%	10%
Seminars	\$ 500,000	\$ 312,141	23%	20%
In-service training	\$ 175,000	\$ 26,804	8%	2%
Equipment	\$ 30,000	\$ 12,354	1%	1%
Operation and Maintenance of equipment	\$ 15,000	\$ 5,643	1%	0%
Miscellaneous	\$ 50,200	\$ 48,820	2%	3%
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>\$ 1,870,200</i>	<i>\$ 1,348,812</i>	<i>84%</i>	<i>88%</i>
Program Support Costs	\$ 243,126	\$ 85,530	11%	6%
	\$ 105,666	\$ -	5%	0%
TOTAL	\$ 2,218,992	\$ 1,524,322	100%	100%

The original INCLUDE budgets allocated 25 percent of the budget to international experts and consultants (combined) and over 25 percent of the budget to seminars. In terms of actual expenditures, however, international consultants and experts for INCLUDE accounted for over 33 percent of total expenditures for 2009 and 2010.⁷ By contrast, seminar costs for 2009 and 2010 combined were approximately the same as budgeted as a percentage of expenditures.

⁶ This difference was not attributable to the 5% provision for cost increases in the original budgets.

⁷ This difference was not attributable to the 5% provision for cost increases in the original budgets.

Table 2: INCLUDE Budget and Expenditures (2009/2010)

Expenditure Category	Budget - US\$	Actual 2009-2010 - US\$	Budget (%)	Actual (%)
Experts	\$ 600,000	\$ 552,958	25%	33%
Administrative Support	100,000	\$ 71,562	4%	4%
Travel Costs	60,000	\$ 47,999	3%	3%
Mission Costs	55,000	\$ 29,757	2%	2%
Evaluation Mission	40,000	\$ 0	2%	0%
National Consultants	100,000	\$ 127,095	4%	8%
Sub-contracts	200,000	\$ 137,357	8%	8%
Seminars	600,000	\$ 393,219	25%	24%
In-service training	100,000	\$ 31,130	4%	2%
Equipment	75,000	\$ 9,662	3%	1%
Operation and Maintenance of equipment	16,000	\$ 18,347	1%	1%
Miscellaneous	48,800	\$ 56,647	2%	3%
<i>Sub total</i>	<i>1,994,800</i>	<i>\$ 1,475,733</i>	<i>84%</i>	<i>88%</i>
Program Support Costs	259,324	\$ 191,846	11%	12%
Provision for Cost Increase	112,706	\$ 0	5%	0%
TOTAL	2,366,830	\$ 1,667,579	100%	100%

The question is whether the reallocation of the budget improved performance of each of the projects relative to the Logframe indicators. This may not be possible to determine, however, as the counterfactual is not apparent.

I had access to budgets for five PEPDEL countries for the evaluation – China, Thailand, Vietnam, Ethiopia and Zambia. All of these countries, except for Thailand, employed a national disability coordinator. While there were differences in the distribution of budgeted expenditures across countries, the most striking change from the ILO basic PEPDEL budget was somewhat lower proposed expenditures on international consultants in China, Ethiopia and Zambia, and higher international consultant expenditures in Thailand, more in line with the initial ILO budget. Much the same pattern can be found in the available budgets for INCLUDE – those of Vietnam, Ethiopia and Zambia. There is considerable variation in the percent of the budget allocated to the national disability coordinators, as well, with the allocation for the PEPDEL coordinator in China taking up 27 percent of the budget and the allocation for the coordinator in Zambia accounting for 19 percent of the combined PEPDEL and INCLUDE budgets.⁸

⁸ The salary scales for locally employed national coordinators are determined through standard salary systems by the UN at country level and are simply implemented by ILO projects.

In this case, the key issue might be to determine whether the re-allocation from international consultant expenditures to a national disability coordinator improves performance as measured by the log frame indicators. Here the issue may be difficult to determine as the countries without a disability coordinator are those which solely link disability outcomes to WEDGE.

C. Other Considerations:

The budgeting process does not provide data by gender and insofar as the activities for PEPDEL are gender inclusion, there would be no reasonable way to disaggregate benefits. In terms of INCLUDE, many of the benefits, and hence the expenditures, are more focused on women with disabilities. But, as the ILO program provides institutional development, the final beneficiaries are an outcome of the activities of that development and cannot be measured first hand. No monitoring data of this type are available sufficient to determine the cost or benefit allocation by gender of this project.

There have been considerable synergies between INCLUDE and PEPDEL and other ILO programs including WEDGE and EMP/SEED. In China, PEPDEL has cooperated with the ILO project “Equality at Work in China – support to promote and apply ILO Convention No. 111. ILO contributions include the technical support from the ILO Senior Disability Specialist, the Decent Work Country teams and relevant ILO offices. In addition, PEPDEL is building on tools and strategies developed to date, and has collaborated with other ILO partners – in particular within the Skills and Employability Department, with ILO’s Social Dialogue Programme, with the Standards Department, with ILO/AIDS and with the GENDER Bureau, as well as with the International Training Centre, Turin, Italy to extend and deepen its impact on constituent capacity. Media tools were funded by INCLUDE/PEPDEL, rather than by the ILO directly, outside the ILO-IA Partnership Programme.⁹

To this extent, the budgeted expenditures for the ILO-Irish Aid Compact are underestimates of the total expenditures actually attributable to project effectiveness. As a consequence, Irish Aid has gotten a lot for its US\$4.6 million funding. But, if it were possible to develop a quantitative cost benefit analysis, these other expenditures would have to be included as they are fundamental to project outcomes.

⁹ Examples are the Media Guidelines for the Portrayal of Disability” which has been translated into local languages, and the *Decent work for Persons with Disabilities - Count Us In* flash video now also available local languages (see www.ilo.org/inclusion).

Section IV: Design Validity of INCLUDE and PEPDEL

Design Validity: The extent to which the intervention logic is coherent and realistic

Logframe analysis is a tool to help determine what the aim of the program is and what the pathways will be to reach that objective. It is a way to consider whether the project in itself will be useful to reaching a goal. Both Program Documents for INCLUDE and PEPDEL provided a Logframe analysis that has been used to document program progress. These include an overarching objective, objective indicators, outputs and activity indicators. None of the indicators are quantitative given the program design, which is to facilitate the development of effective institutions and an improved legal environment to enable persons with disabilities to enter the mainstream of society, reducing poverty and increasing employability and earnings.

The question raised by the Logframe matrices is how well the activities track the outcomes and the objective indicators represent the objectives. The discussion below looks at each program separately and evaluate the project logic starting from activities to outcomes to objective indicators to objective.

The structure of the Logical framework raises issues related to both the coherence of the logical analysis and the realism of achieving the goals, as attitudinal change relying on laws and dialogue is very difficult. Nonetheless, the individual indicators selected, are, in general, in and of themselves crucial to the development of an inclusive nation-wide disability policy, although the logical framework could be clearer and more transparent.

The objectives for both INCLUDE and PEPDEL are broad-based and not likely to be easily achieved. The objective indicators, rather than measuring the objectives themselves, appear to be more properly designated ‘outcome indicators’, as they are intermediate steps in the desired direction to meet the ultimate objectives. Of course, the objectives themselves are intermediate steps to reaching Irish Aids primary goal of poverty reduction (among persons with disabilities).

A. The INCLUDE Project:

Outputs: INCLUDE has a series of nine outputs which are supported by a list of output indicators and activities leading to those outputs. The outputs for INCLUDE are as follows:

1. Implementation Plan Prepared¹⁰
2. Good Practice in Disability Inclusion Documented
3. Practical Guides and Tools for disability inclusion prepared
4. Existing ILO tools and guides in enterprise development, skills development and employment promotion reflect disability perspective
5. Disability Equality training courses conducted
6. Disability inclusion support service established and operational in selected countries
7. Capacity of Implementing Agencies strengthened

¹⁰ The development of the implementation plan is only appropriate in countries where there is a national disability coordinator.

8. Disability inclusion support strategy and service documented and publicized.

For many of these outputs ILO takes the lead, as it is ILO's technical assistance to the country that is used to build country capacity and lead to a sustainable objective. The guides and tools prepared will be useful *only if* the inclusion support services and implementing agencies (outputs 6 and 7) are prepared to use them and disseminate them throughout the country. That is, these basic outputs require a next step before they will lead to greater inclusiveness in society. Among these outputs, output 6 (establishment of inclusion support service) and output 7 (capacity of implementing agencies strengthened) are outputs that lead to a way forward. Output 8 appears to be clearly connected to outputs 6 and 7 if change it to take place. This is not to say that outputs 1-5 are not necessary predecessors to ensure that outputs 6 and 7. Nonetheless, they are predecessors. In that regard, monitoring of results on the ground is needed to determine whether representatives of benefiting organizations have taken any additional steps forward to reach the objective of INCLUDE.

Objective: The objective of INCLUDE is to foster greater inclusion of women and men with disabilities in mainstream small enterprise development, micro-finance, vocational training, employment promotion, poverty reduction and rural development programs. The indicators of whether or not that objective will be reached are:

- a. Disability inclusion support agencies in operation and strengthened
- b. Implementation of existing inclusion policies related to persons with disabilities
- c. Constituents develop new or modify existing training policies and program measures
- d. Public employment services or regulators environment of private employment services make them more accessible to persons with disabilities
- e. Financial institutions adopt measures to increase access to financing among persons with disabilities
- f. Policy measures are introduced to promote gender equality for persons with disabilities
- g. Policy and program measures are introduced to assist disabled persons living with HIV/AIDS

The problem with the Logframe is that the links between the outputs and the objective indicators are not strongly enough connected, although in a general sense, training and material produced in terms of best practice should incentivize these objective indicators. It would be useful to have some outcome indicators in-between. Further, there are issues of attribution. While attribution is always an issue in development projects, it is even less clear for the model used by ILO as the objectives are not quantifiable and the paths to meeting the objectives are not straightforward. Consequently, it often cannot be clear whether the achievement of outputs reflects INCLUDE interventions or concurrent/exogenous efforts of other donors, or champions in government and/or civil society.

The strength of the Logframe analysis is that it does indicate very specific steps that a country ought to take to create an inclusive approach to disability. Indicators (a) and (b) focus on inclusion directly. Indicator (c) is tied to the vocational training objective. Indicator (d) is specifically focused on employment promotion. Indicator (e) is likely to improve small-enterprise development, micro-finance

and rural development. Indicator (f) specifically looks to the greater inclusion of women and (g) focuses on a particular disability situation of considerable interest around the world due to discrimination.

B. The PEPDEL Project:

Outputs: PEPDEL has a series of seven outputs based on project activities:

1. Implementation plan developed and agreed in seven countries
2. National action plan developed to improve implementation of laws and policies on the employability and employment of persons with disabilities adopted and implemented
3. National vocational training agencies strengthen employability of persons with disabilities who participation in mainstream courses and the labor market relevance of courses is improved in centers for persons with disabilities
4. Employers organizations support pilot testing and promotion of innovative forms of employment of disabled persons
5. Workers organizations develop action plans to promote equality of opportunity and job retention for workers and job seekers with disabilities
6. Disability advocates organizations improve capacity to advocate for disability issue in training an employment
7. National training institutions have enhanced capacity to provide training in disability equality legislation to national stakeholders

Some outputs seem to be directly connected to PEPDEL activities, that is outputs 1, 2 and 6 where plans are developed and capacity is improved. But, outputs 3-5 require constituents to take actions they would not take without the PEPDEL project providing training and capacity building to understand that a new paradigm towards disability is necessary. I would call these outcomes rather than outputs. Similarly, enhancement of capacity of law faculties requires both sensitizing the faculties and government to international standards and then having them take the step to provide establish a curriculum to teach students these ideas.

A number of the indicators stipulate that at least four countries ought to achieve the output indicator. (This is true for outputs 3, 6 and 7) This means that the outputs are met if four out of seven PEPDEL countries achieve these indicators. Depending on the Implementation Plans developed, it would seem that there would be a need for each country to focus on one or more of these indicators, as fulfilling all of them would appear to be a stretch in a three-year period, prior PEPDEL projects notwithstanding.

Objectives: Unlike INCLUDE, PEPDEL has not one, but three specific objectives.

1. Enhanced government capacity to collaborate with social partners in planning the implementation of legislation, policies and programs addressing employability and employment of persons with disabilities (with particular attention to women and persons living with HIV/AIDs)
2. Strengthened implementation and enforcement of employment-related laws and policies.
3. Attention to disability perspective in laws and policies through greater involvement of universities in sensitizing existing and future generations of lawyers.

More simply, these are better legislation and policy, better implementation, and better legal training in the area of disability. The indicators of whether or not these objectives are met reached are:

- a. Laws about employment and employability of persons with disabilities reviewed, reformed and strengthened through new implementation and enforcement measures
- b. Policies, national action plans or programs developed to promote productive employment for young women and men with disabilities
- c. New or modify existing training policies developed to be more accessible to persons with disabilities facing discrimination
- d. Training programs for persons with disabilities include HIV/AIDS education and training component
- e. Public employment services or regulatory environment of private employment services improved to make them more accessible to persons facing labor market discrimination
- f. Statistical data on labor market situation of persons with disabilities improved through revisions to census, labor force survey, household survey or other surveys

Each of these indicators require that four countries succeed, except for objective indicator (b) which requires that all seven PEPDEL countries develop policies, programs, or national action plans for young persons with disabilities.

The relationship between the output indicators and the objectives are murky. There is no output that leads to better statistical data, and the need for statistical data is not clearly connected to the objective. This does not mean that better statistical data is not important, but rather that the program logic is not clear. It is also not clear why objective (b) focuses on young men and women while output 2 is more general, asking for a national action plan only. Outputs 3 and 7 specifically address training issues, while objective (d) only focuses on HIV/AIDS education. Overall, while the specific outputs and objectives are generally useful and commendable, the program logic has not been clearly delineated. In fact, some outputs could be objective indicators, and *visa versa*.

C. Risk Analysis

The project risk analysis is only found in the Proposal Overview¹¹ and includes four main risks to program completion:

1. Key interlocutors and partners fail to engage throughout the partnership program
2. ILO tripartite constituents do not have the necessary capacity to assume responsibility for and sustain activities under the Partnership Program
3. Other civil society partners do not have the necessary capacity to assume responsibility for and sustain activities initiated under the Partnership
4. Significant political change or destabilized national institutions occurred in the country

Risks 1, 2 and 4 have a high impact on project completion but a low risk of occurring. Risk 2 has a medium risk of occurring and represents a medium risk to the project. Risk mitigation measures are not

¹¹ Proposal Overview, ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme Third Phase 2008-2011 (not dated),

clearly spelled out, however. Section V will discuss what measures were taken for those countries finding that any of these risks hampered project implementation.

There was no risk analysis linking the likelihood of attaining outputs with the likelihood of reaching the project's objectives. Had such a risk analysis been undertaken, the project logic might have been more cohesive.

D. Utility of the Logframe Matrix:

The Logframe Matrices for INCLUDE and PEPDEL were well utilized by the ILO in the submission of reports to Irish Aid and in the submission of progress reports to Geneva. But the reporting tended to focus on achievements towards a particular goal rather than discussing whether the program was on target, if not, why not, and what additional steps might be needed to achieve it.

Section V: Effectiveness of INCLUDE and PEPDEL

Effectiveness: The extent to which the program attains its outcomes

The effectiveness of INCLUDE and PEPDEL can be measured in several ways. One way is to evaluate the extent to which output indicators in the Logframe Matrix were achieved. A second is to evaluate the project according to a series of criteria to help determine project effectiveness in five ILO focus areas: (i) Knowledge development initiatives; (ii) Advocacy and technical advisory services; (iii) Capacity building; (iv) Crosscutting issues; and (v) Gender framework. The evaluation of effectiveness first takes into consideration the risks faced by different countries, as risks, their mitigation or lack thereof may reduce the effectiveness of the ILO-Irish Aid Program. The section then assesses the achievement of output and effectiveness by country providing specific examples of success and failure in meeting targets suggested for INCLUDE and PEPDEL.

A. Risk Analysis

The ILO-Irish Aid Program document identified four country risks that could reduce project effectiveness. Except for political risk, many countries indicated that one or more risks occurred. These were generally lack of effectiveness of constituent participation. With the exceptions of Tanzania and Uganda, most felt the impact of risks on the project was low. The risks faced by Tanzania and Uganda were assessed to be high, however, due to a lack of project in-country project coordinators. This risk could not be mitigated due to lack of resources and had a negative impact on the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme. Only Ethiopia found that none of these risks had occurred.

Significant political change occurred or national institutions were destabilized. Only one country, Thailand, reported that political change interrupted the program. Due to the political situation and social unrest in the country, PEPDEL activities had been delayed in 2009. But, only one training program was cancelled and once the situation returned to normal, activities were delivered as planned. Thus the countries selected for the ILO-Irish Aid program generally had political stability enabling the program to run smoothly. While it is never completely possible to predict political change, the selection of countries with stable governments enhances the chances of program success. Apparently, this criterion was met.

ILO tripartite constituents did not have the necessary capacity to assume responsibility for and sustain activities initiated under the Partnership Programme. Seven out of nine countries indicated that this risk constituted an issue for program success. The most severe example was in Tanzania. The low capacity of the implementing entity following the death of its original director blocked successful implementation. In China, while the China Enterprises Confederation (CEC) was active in the project, it had did not have sufficient capacity to assume responsibility and sustain activities under the Partnership Programme. The All China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU) and Ministry of Human Resource and Social Security also started to actively engage in the project. To mitigate the delay, PEPDEL offered the CEC more training and capacity building.

In Thailand, while ILO tripartite constituents strengthened their capacity to assume responsibility for activities, due to resource constraints, only the Ministry of Labor allocated resources to sustain the

activities initiated under PEPDEL. As mitigation, PEPDEL supported the four Thai workers' unions to endorse an official commitment to equal employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. It also supported the revitalization of the Employers' Confederation policy on disability. Several countries indicated that obtaining full support was difficult to accomplish and would require additional financial resources. This was the case for Cambodia, the Lao PDR and Uganda. In Zambia further ILO training was determined to be the key to improving constituent capacity.

Key interlocutors and partners failed to engage throughout the Partnership Program. Five out of nine countries indicated this risk constituted an issue for program success. The risks were judged to be high in Tanzania and Uganda. In Tanzania and Uganda, the problem was in the capacity of the implementing agency, discussed above. In both countries, these issues could have been mitigated, in part, by a country disability coordinator. In Thailand, it was averred that the national context is in general challenging and that it is often difficult getting constituents to take up issues. In Zambia, discussions were held at the highest level of government in key ministries to foster better government engagement. Lack of funds was also stated as a constraint to persuading key partners to engage. In Kenya, lack of resources was the constraint.

Other civil society partners did not have the necessary capacity to assume responsibility for, and sustain, activities initiated under the Partnership Program. Five out of nine countries indicated this risk constituted a risk for program success. In Tanzania, the weakness of the implementing entity again led to a high risk assessment. In general, mitigation appeared require greater capacity-building that was constrained by a lack of financial resources.

B. The INCLUDE Project

General comments and examples of successful or unsuccessful outputs and effectiveness indicators in INCLUDE countries are provided below. INCLUDE countries generally achieved the intended outputs in a straightforward manner. Country responses with respect to effectiveness, indicators, however, were more varied with questions related to changes undertaken in response to training and advocacy efforts more mixed.

1. INCLUDE Outputs:

Two types of programs are evaluated: INCLUDE programs without country disability coordinators focused on integrating persons with disabilities within the WEDGE program and full INCLUDE programs with a country disability coordinator. Ethiopia, Zambia, Vietnam and Tanzania have full INCLUDE programs, whereas Cambodia, Laos, Uganda and Kenya assist persons with disabilities through WEDGE. In many areas, no progress was made in Kenya, while other WEDGE countries had positive results.

Implementation Plan Prepared (applicable to countries with national coordinator). All of the INCLUDE countries with national coordinators developed project implementation plans that provided guidance for the implementation of the INCLUDE program.

Good Practice in Disability Inclusion documented /received. Most of the INCLUDE countries with national coordinators documented good practice in disability inclusion. This is a task that was mainly undertaken at ILO headquarters, drawing to some extent on what is happening in the participating countries, rather than by the national coordinators.

Practical Guides and Tools for disability inclusion prepared/received: Guides for Good Practices were provided through the global element of the project and disseminated in workshops. These guides include Count Us In, DET Guide, UN CRPD, ILO Convention 159 Recommendation 168, and Legislation Guide for Employment of Persons with Disabilities, Media Guidelines for the Portrayal of Disability and the Guide to Microfinance.

Disability Equality training courses conducted/received: Disability training courses were conducted in all the Asian INCLUDE and WEDGE countries. For example, in Cambodia, training was provided to Disability Action Council and then to WEDGE partners; in the Lao PDR, training was provided to WEDGE partners, representatives of Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, employers' and workers' organizations and disabled people's organizations. The situation was similar for the African Countries. In Ethiopia, these included the ECDD, the Ethiopian Women with Disabilities National Association (EWDNA), WISE, CETU and Tigray Disabled Veterans. In Zambia, at least eight workshops were completed and included all constituent groups. Workshops were also held form some member of the Zambian parliament as well as staff of UN agencies. In addition, several DET workshops were conducted in Tanzania and Uganda.

Disability inclusion support service established and operational in selected countries (NGOs).

Disability inclusion support services were established and operational in Vietnam, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zambia. In Tanzania, the death of the original Director, created a vacuum that was difficult to fill and led to a long period with lack of capacity in this area. This is the reason why many objectives were not realized. (Cambodia was the only WEDGE country that provided documentation that their inclusion support strategies were documented and publicized. There limited documentation is available, by contrast to Ethiopia, for example.)

Capacity of Implementing Agencies strengthened: The capacity of specific implementing agencies was strengthened in each of the participant countries. In Asia, this included the Cambodian Disability Action Council, in the Lao PDR Disabled Women's Development Center, the Vietnam Include Agency. In Africa, Ethiopia reports strengthened capacity in the implementing agencies that received training. In Zambia, this was accomplished through support to the Disability Initiatives Foundation. The question for the future, however, is how and whether increased capacity will be used and whether reinforcement is needed to achieve the desired results for these organizations.

Disability inclusion support strategy and service documented and publicized. The ILO Website indicates that many ILO documents on persons with disabilities have been translated into local languages. During my field trip to Vietnam, many of the persons I interviewed thought the ILO documents in Vietnamese were extremely helpful and well written. Consequently, it appears that the next important step would be to extend this work to outreach that is undertaken by the recipient countries directly and

represents their own country-specific strategies. Cambodia was the only one WEDGE country that provided evidence that their inclusion support strategies were documented and publicized.

2. INCLUDE Effectiveness Indicators

a. Knowledge development initiatives:

How has project research and knowledge development improved understanding of access to equal training and employment opportunities? All of the INCLUDE countries indicated strong support of the way in which project research and knowledge development led to improved understanding. This is where the global component of the INCLUDE project has been very active.

How has the project contributed to advances in the rights of persons with disabilities? What has taken place to create, share and disseminate knowledge? All INCLUDE countries indicated that the project contributed to advances in the rights of persons with disabilities. Most countries discussed the different types of training that took place under the project. For example, Vietnam focused on the increased in understanding developed through training on disability equality (DET).

b. Advocacy and Technical Advisory Services:

How have advocacy and technical advisory services educated ILO constituents about legislative and policy issues related to disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion? All countries provide support for the positive impact of the program's advocacy services. As an example, in Vietnam, With ILO's technical advice, the Ministry of Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA) was provided in-depth information and reference material about the key concepts that national legislation and policies should include. The ILO also provide assistance to help them consult with the major social partners in drafting the disability law, ensuring that their voices were heard and creating the basis for successful implementation. Like most DET training, that conducted in Tanzania included sessions on the UN CRPD and reference to national legislation.

How has the project led to a dialogue between ILO constituents and provided a platform for disabled peoples' organizations to inform ILO constituents? Disabled peoples organizations have been involved in all countries for training and within the policy dialogue. One strong example of this relationship comes from Ethiopia where the involvement of ILO constituents in the planning of INCLUDE activities and monitoring of its performance in Project Advisory Committee sessions greatly contributed to a dialogue between ILO constituents and provided a platform for disabled people organizations to inform ILO constituents. Besides a national disability platform called the Ethiopian National Disability Action Network (ENDAN) that represents more than 40 instructions on disability rights (DPOs, NGOs, GOs, and Associations) closely works with the Project to facilitate dialogue between ILO constituents. ENDAN was established with support from the ILO-Irish and project and MoLSA. This appears not to have occurred at all in Tanzania, however. (It was not relevant for the WEDGE countries.)

How have employers' organizations been encouraged to promote the notion of disability-inclusive workplaces? How many have changed practices? While employers' organizations have

been encouraged to promote a disability-inclusive workplace, this has not yet led to substantial changes in their practices. This appears to be an area where further efforts may be needed to go from training to implementation. Nonetheless, employer cooperation appears to have been quite successful in Cambodia where through synergies with the Better Factory Cambodia program, INCLUDE promoted the notion of inclusive workplaces and abilities of persons with disabilities. Members of the employers' organizations in Cambodia have raised interest in employing people with disabilities. There were insufficient resources to engage employers in Tanzania to any great extent, much less to change their practices. While there was some activity with employers in some of the WEDGE countries, it did not lead to changes in practices.

How have workers' organizations been encouraged and supported to work to persons with disabilities? How many have changed practices? While one might intuit that workers organizations would be more likely to change practices than employers' organizations, the evidence does not indicate that this is the case. In Vietnam, The VGCL, the only workers' organization in the country, received staff training to raise awareness on disability equality and improve the role of the trade union in promoting employment for persons with disabilities. As a result, they included disability as part of the agenda for the annual dialogue between VGCL and MOLISA and also intend to start collecting statistics on persons with disabilities who are trained and employed at the vocational training and employment centers run by the VGCL nationwide. Nonetheless, in discussions with the VGCL, it appeared that there was skepticism about the feasibility of an inclusive approach at this time.

Ethiopia worked with the Confederation of the Ethiopian Trade Unions (CETU), and trade union leaders in Addis Ababa and Southern region attended disability awareness training, exposing them to the UN CRPD, the new disability rights employment law: Proc. 568/2008). As a result trade union leaders are working towards including disability rights in the collective agreements they sign with employers. Tanzania was again hampered by a lack of financial resources and did not end up engaging with workers' organizations at all.

In addition, more globally, two tripartite regional conferences were held introducing policy innovations to participating countries. Seven countries were represented in the first regional conference held in Lusaka, Zambia in March 2010, which focused on training and employment opportunities for persons with intellectual disabilities. Six countries participated in the second, held in Bangkok in March 2011, which was concerned with policy innovations for inclusive vocational education and training.

How have civil society been engaged in understanding disability as an issue of discrimination and rights? How many have taken actions? Efforts to engage civil society have been undertaken through DPOs and the media. For example, in Ethiopia civil society has been engaged through media intervention by FENAPD (the umbrella DPO that secures the ILO financial and technical support on disability rights). FENAPD and other Disability NGOs run radio programs on disability rights and also approach the general public through awareness raising seminars, annual events to celebrate the International Day of Persons with Disabilities (IDDP). In Zambia, civil society has been engaged through meetings, such as project advisory committee meetings. Many DPOs have lobbied the

Zambian government to ratify the UN CRPD. The involvement of the disability movement in the constitutional deliberations in Zambia also focused on the human rights approach to disability. The participation of women entrepreneurs with disabilities in the Month of the Women Entrepreneur celebrations organized by WEDGE in Africa (with INCLUDE support) has been a further way in which civil society has been engaged and stereotypes tackled. Many countries, however, do not report that specific actions have been taken.

How has the media been encouraged to tackle stereotypes of persons with disabilities and promote understanding of their working capacity? How many media portraits/reflections have done so? All INCLUDE countries, except Tanzania, had media training programs to encourage greater media coverage of issues involved with persons with disabilities. There were no media activities anticipated for the WEDGE outreach countries.

c. Capacity Building:

How has the project improved the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement effective legislation and policies, including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion? What changes can be observed? INCLUDE countries generally provided training to enhance the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement policies and legislation. In addition, the project fostered the development of a network of DET facilitators through training workshops in the two regions and training was also provided through the International Training Centre, in Turin, Italy. In some countries direct evidence is provided on the impact of ILO-sponsored training. For example, in Ethiopia, The ILO helped MoLSA to develop a new employment rights law for persons with disabilities, design a National Action Plan for disability inclusion and convince the Ethiopian parliament to ratify the UN CRPD. The ILO raised the capacity of DPOs, workers unions and employers through DET sessions to union leaders, as well as awareness arising and job fairs for employers to engage their support for policies of inclusion and disability rights. Ethiopia has ratified the UN CRPD and is ready to implement it. New employment legislation is to be implemented based on social model of disability and disability is incorporated in the country's national plan. The CETU (the Workers Unions) is calling for the inclusion of disability rights in collective agreements with employers. This happened after union leaders were exposed to the disability rights laws and DET training organized by the ILO. Of course, attribution is difficult to prove, but it would appear that through the INCLUDE project, at least some constituents became active influences in the legislative process. (No legislative work was expected in the WEDGE outreach countries.)

How has the project improved the ability of disabled peoples' organizations to promote decent work, non-discrimination and dialogue with labor market institutions? It is clear that the project build the capacity of the DPOs in all countries. In Vietnam, the Hanoi DPO is able to provide mainstream services including courses on disability equality, non discrimination, to provide such services for staff of universities, employment centers, micro-finance institutions. Nonetheless, the lack of evidence provided on specific accomplishments makes me believe that more support in this area will continue to be needed.

d. Crosscutting Issues:

To what extent has the project been complimentary to other initiatives, including, as applicable, other Irish Aid programs? To what extent have awareness-raising initiatives, including that aimed at the media, been relevant to broader policy and development issues? In all countries there has been successful collaboration between WEDGE and INCLUDE. In Vietnam, that collaboration appears to have been more extensive with are three (out of four) components/projects of the Irish Aid-ILO Partnership very complimentary to each other.

e. Gender Framework:

How well has the project aligned with national gender-related goals and ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality? Is the project adapted to the needs and capacities of female and male beneficiaries? How have resources been distributed between male and female beneficiaries? Has the project outcome affected women and men differently? As INCLUDE and WEDGE are so closely connected, INCLUDE has a strong built-in gender component. In Zambia, the project aims to cater for the different needs of male and female beneficiaries with disabilities. For example, the workshops and all other programs, the selection of participants is gender sensitive and efforts are made to have at least 50- 50 representation. The project outcomes have affected women and men differently, as women often have been left out of many programs run by disabled people's organizations. The project has engaged with the umbrella DPO, ZAFOD to help in resuscitating the women's umbrella NGO Zambia National Association for Disabled Women (ZNADWO) which has not been functioning effectively. In Uganda, the project contributed to the SME policy draft on disability inclusion, done though collaboration with WEDGE.

C. The PEPDEL Project

General comments and examples of successful or unsuccessful outputs and effectiveness indicators in PEPDEL countries are provided below. Most outputs related to direct PEPDEL assistance were met in all countries except Tanzania and Uganda. Those outputs that could be more accurately described as outcomes varied considerably country by country. The same is true of the effectiveness indicators, where results achieved varied considerably, while, in general, the basic outputs of the project were achieved. Different countries tended to report greater or lesser achievements in different areas. In particular, Zambia appears to have been successful in many output areas. PEPDEL's efforts to include courses on disability legislation and rights in law schools have proven to be immensely successful.

1. PEPDEL Outputs

Three Asian countries and four African countries participated in PEPDEL. While the Logframe matrixes are not optimally designed to distinguish between outputs and objectives, the indicators are valuable to assess the success of the project.

Implementation plan developed. Except for Tanzania, each of the PEPDEL countries developed project implementation plans that provided guidance for the implementation of the PEPDEL program.

National project action plan developed to improve implementation of laws and policies on the employability and employment of persons with disabilities adopted and implemented. Except for Tanzania and Uganda, all PEPDEL countries have developed national action plans.

National vocational training agencies strengthen employability of persons with disabilities who participation in mainstream courses and the labor market relevance of courses is improved in centers for persons with disabilities. Activities in this area vary strongly by country. Zambia takes the lead in this area as it already adopted an inclusive vocational training policy. PEPDEL has been providing extensive support to the development of an Action Plan for its implementation. A pilot project involving five mainstream TVET centers has been developed by a working group in the Ministry of Science, Technology and Vocational Training (MSTVT) with PEPDEL support. This followed an extensive review funded by PEPDEL with the participation of an international consultant and government officials. Thus, when it comes to steps taken for implementation of inclusive vocational training, Zambia is ahead of the other countries.

In Ethiopia the Ministry of Education is designing a Special Needs Education (SNE) TVET framework document which provides better access to technical and vocational education for person with disabilities. In Thailand, PEPDEL supported the Ministry of Labor in promoting inclusive vocational training, assisting in identifying good practices and new, interesting approaches. This commitment is reflected in the 2011 Action Plan of the Ministry of Labor in line with ILO C. 159 and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Other countries, like China, are still in the process of assessment and dialogue among the social partners with regard to this issue. And some, like Vietnam, have not started. No progress has been made yet in Tanzania or Uganda.

Employers' organizations undertake initiatives, such as support of pilot testing and promotion of innovative forms of employment of disabled persons. Workers organizations develop action plans to promote equality of opportunity and job retention for workers and job seekers with disabilities. Work with employers' organizations is more advanced in some countries than others. Some countries provided training to employers and trade unions to sensitize them towards disability awareness and good practice. In Zambia, employers organization are conducting a study on the perceptions, experiences and challenges of employers who employ persons with disabilities and to determine why some employers do not employ persons with disabilities. The study will be important in determining next steps employers should take to make their workplaces more open. In China, the All China Federation of Trade Unions has taken first steps to becoming active on disability rights issues. The Federation of Uganda Employers started to launch a pilot project on supported employment based on an analysis undertaken with PEPDEL, and would have liked to be involved in the pilot implementation, but funding constraints prevented the ILO from proceeding. The pilot project ultimately was implemented by Handicap International.

In Ethiopia, workers' organizations have taken steps to promote equality of opportunities, raising disability awareness among their communities and taking practical steps towards including disability equality provisions in the collective agreements. Four Thai Labor Unions have actively engaged in a disability champions' program launched by PEPDEL. Through intensive training and awareness raising program, the unions have acquired capacities to work on disability issues and rights and to promote decent work for persons with disabilities. In Thailand, Thai Trade Unions issued a statement committing

them to equal employment opportunity for persons with disabilities and working closely with the disabled people's organizations.

Disability advocates organizations improve capacity to advocate for disability issues in training an employment. In several countries, disability advocate organizations took direct steps to use the training they received to improve their capacity to advocate for disability issues. In China, a media social enterprise composed by young journalists with disabilities produced radio programs and a public service announcement in English and Chinese, which was aired throughout the country. In Thailand, through a series of activities supported by PEPDEL, the DPOs advocated for the use of a more disability-friendly terminology and for the abandonment of the use of negative stereotypes and attitudes towards persons with disabilities in the media. Two Thai media companies agreed to work on improving facilities in their workplace, promoting employment opportunities and increasing and support TV programs related to disability. They also agreed on including disability into their corporate policies. In Vietnam, the INCLUDE Agency established and piloted activities to improve their service providing capacity in disability equality, inclusive employment and vocational training, advocating for the rights of people with disabilities. The Federation of Ethiopian National Associations of Persons with Disabilities (FENAPD), the umbrella DPO in the country, greatly contributed to the ratification of the UN CRPD and the improvement of policies and laws for improved employability and employment of persons with disabilities. Elsewhere, though training has occurred, additional actions have not yet been taken.

National training institutions, including universities, improve capacity to provide training in disability equality legislation to national stakeholders. This is an objective indicator that may be primarily attributed to work by the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership. PEPDEL's efforts to include courses on disability legislation and rights in law schools have proven to be immensely successful. Curricula have been developed or improved in China, Thailand, Vietnam and Ethiopia. In Zambia, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed with the University of Zambia in January 2010. The next stage would be to monitor the number of law students taking these classes and how many of those would use their expertise after receiving their law degrees. While attempts were made to forward this process in Tanzania and Uganda, success was not achieved due to a lack of a Country Disability Coordinator and/or lack of funding.

PEPDEL also sponsored the establishment of a Centre for Disability Law and Policy at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa with a view to it becoming a regional resource centre, offering post-graduate courses and stand-alone workshops. The first workshop was held over a two-week period in November 2010, The CDLP developed a Masters Degree course in disability legislation that has been approved and several post-graduate students have already registered. A PhD course is being planned.

Constituents have enhanced capacity to draft and implement disability legislation in line with international standards. Constituents in all countries have received some training that could enhance their capacity to draft and implement legislation in line with international standards. In Zambia, an advocacy strategy has been developed by the DPOs. The strategy also proposes the establishment of an independent monitoring unit to oversee the domestication process of the CRPD. The project has disseminated the audit of legislation report of 2008 to ILO constituents and they have adopted it as a basis

for making proposals to law reform in line with the UN CRPD. The test will be whether other constituents can or will use that enhanced capacity in the policy dialogue.

2. PEPDEL Project Effectiveness Indicators

a. Knowledge development initiatives:

How has project research and knowledge development improved understanding of access to equal training and employment opportunities? Project knowledge development is universally acknowledged to have improved understanding. Different countries cited different areas where knowledge development made a difference. In China, it was through research requested by the China Disabled Persons Federation as well as Law School courses on labor law and social security with an emphasis on disability. In Thailand work done by the Faculty of Law was also cited. Other countries mentioned using ILO products in a variety of situations. The Opportunity for All project in Viet Nam is a further example of how disability-inclusive workplaces are being encouraged.

How has the project contributed to advances in the rights of persons with disabilities? What has taken place to create, share and disseminate knowledge? Most countries agree that training and other capacity building activities have forwarded knowledge-creation, sharing and dissemination of information on the rights of persons with disabilities. Different countries focused on specific areas, be it DPO involvement, legislation and/or trade unions, presumably depending on the particular country emphasis.

b. Advocacy and Technical Advisory Services:

How have advocacy and technical advisory services educated ILO constituents about legislative and policy issues related to disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion? All countries are in agreement that ILO services have provided education on disability issues that has provided useful education on legislative and policy issues. In Zambia, due to education through DET, the members of Zambian parliament, trade union leaders and government personnel were oriented to the rights based approach and the UN CRPD. Through participation on various technical committees at national level, the project has continued to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities. PEPDEL also participates actively in the planning for the UN CRPD in the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services.

How has the project led to a dialogue between ILO constituents and provided a platform for disabled people organizations to inform ILO constituents? PEPDEL countries indicate that they have a variety of ways to meet and have an ongoing dialogue with constituents. For instance, in Uganda, ILO constituents have participated in a workshop with representatives from several DPOs. The DPOs decided to work together to advance recommendations from the disability audit and embrace a common view and strategy to influence constituents in promoting the rights of persons with disabilities through improvements in the legal and policy framework. In China, regular meetings among constituents and stakeholders have provided a platform to share knowledge and experience and allow DPOs to have access to government institutions involved with disability policy. Moreover, PEPDEL established a webpage on the ILO knowledge sharing platform where ILO constituents can

find information and translated materials in Chinese. By contrast, in Tanzania, no dialogue took place due to the weakness with the key DPO.

How have employers' organizations been encouraged to promote the notion of disability-inclusive workplaces? How many have changed practices? Through training provided to employers' organizations, some employers have changed practices, but the numbers are small and more follow-up is needed. China furnishes an example in this regard, as employers participating in training drafted action plans for a disability strategy and CEC Shenzhen integrated a disability strategy in their workplan. Follow-up to this activity showed that a number of participants started to employ people with disabilities and to think about accessibility in their workplace. The Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT) provided advisory services to its members, including an information tool kit on the Ministerial Regulation issued by the Ministry of Labor in 2011, as well as tax and other benefits granted employers who employ people with disabilities. Through PEPDEL support, employers' organizations in Zambia are conducting a study on the perceptions, experiences and challenges of employers who employ persons with disabilities. It will also investigate the reasons that some employers do not employ persons with disabilities at all. In Vietnam, follow-up to a workshop of seven employers determined that two had subsequently started recruiting persons with disability. Employer outreach activities were not possible in Tanzania due to the lack of a country disability coordinator.

How have workers' organizations been encouraged and supported to work to persons with disabilities? How many have changed practices? In Thailand all four trade unions have been actively involved in issues related to disability. They have appointed focal points and agreed on a common statement promoting the right to decent work for persons with disabilities. They have also conducted awareness-raising activities among their members. While almost all countries have engaged in dialogue and provided training to workers' organizations, only Thailand mentions specific practices that have changed as a result. No outreach activities of this type took place in Tanzania or Uganda due to resource constraints.

How have civil society been engaged in understanding disability as an issue of discrimination and rights? How many have taken actions? A number of countries either discuss media initiatives or work with DPOs. Of course, INCLUDE is focused more strongly on DPOs. PEPDEL activities in this area have been relatively minimal to date.

How has the media been encouraged to tackle stereotypes of persons with disabilities and promote understanding of their working capacity? How many media portraits/reflections have done so? In Thailand, the translation and dissemination of the ILO "Media Guidelines for the Portrayal of Disability" were an important tool for media advocacy, as they provided practical advice on how to promote positive, inclusive images of women and men with disabilities and stimulate a climate of non-discrimination and equal opportunity for persons with disabilities at all levels of the economy and society. Media activities led to the integration of disability in media organization policies, while increasing provision for reasonable accommodation and employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. In China, PEPDEL supported the China Communications University to undertake a benchmarking review of disability-related reports in the print media, and organized a

workshop with media representatives to discuss stereotypes and present the media guidelines. The Maha Thai Foundation of Persons with Disabilities on promoting non-discrimination on the grounds of disability and HIV and the workplace through the development of some video clips which are to be screened in Thai TV. In other countries, training seminars have been held, but media programming on disability issues has not clearly been achieved as a result of PEPDEL intervention. Media Guidelines are available in wide variety of local languages, including Amharic, Chinese, and Vietnamese. No activities of this type were undertaken in Tanzania or Uganda.

c. Capacity Building:

How has the project improved the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement effective legislation and policies, including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion? What changes can be observed? In China, PEPDEL is credited with assistance in major pieces of disability legislation and implementation. In Zambia, the project has disseminated the audit of legislation done through PEPDEL support to ILO constituents, and it has been adopted it as a basis for legislative reform in line with the UN CRPD. The project supported staff from the government Human Rights Commission to attend a course at the University of Western Cape on aligning national legislation and policy to the UN CRPD. (The course was prepared by the PEPDEL-sponsored Center for Disability Law and Policy, and attended by participants from PEPDEL countries.) As a result, the government proposes to move quickly to implement the UN CRPD; a technical committee has been established and a budget proposal has been submitted to the Ministry of Finance. In Uganda, a disability audit undertaken with PEPDEL support that outlined recommendations on the enhancement and strengthening of legal provisions for the education, training and employment of persons with disabilities were made to the Ugandan Government. The audit report has been widely distributed to constituents, as well as presented at the workshop in Kampala in 2009.

How has the project improved the ability of disabled peoples' organizations to promote decent work, non-discrimination and dialogue with labor market institutions? In Thailand, as a result of the knowledge transferred by PEPDEL to the disabled people's organizations a number of multinationals have requested advisory services from disabled people's organizations on how to promote employment opportunities for persons with disabilities. More generally, countries report that PEPDEL has provided support to DPOs, but no strong results are identified. This indicator, of course, is closely connected to capacity building through INCLUDE and joint results would likely be reported for all African countries participating in PEDDEL. No activities were scheduled in Tanzania due to a lack of staff and financial resources.

d. Crosscutting Issues:

To what extent has the project been complimentary to other initiatives, including, as applicable, other Irish Aid programs? To what extent have awareness-raising initiatives, including that aimed at the media, been relevant to broader policy and development issues? In China, PEPDEL has been complementary to a number of ILO projects, including the HIV program, the non-discrimination C.111 program, and the livelihood program. PEPDEL has also cooperated with WEDGE, as funded by Irish Aid in South China. In Ethiopia, the project worked closely with the ILO-Social Finance Unit, raising disability awareness in CETU and among trade union leaders. It actively participated in the UN Disability Working Group and initiated joint activities, such as

research on mainstreaming HIV/AIDS service to persons with disabilities. PEPDEL also worked with ILO-Irish Aid on the development of a gender mainstreaming guide, with a disability dimension, for the Ministry of Trade and Industry.

In Uganda, on a cost sharing basis with ILO's IPEC program (International program on the elimination of Child Labor), PEPDEL undertook a study to establish the relationship between disability and child labor among children and families in the districts of Rakai, Mbale and Wakiso. Collaboration with ILO/AIDS in the 'Opportunity for All' project in Vietnam has also taken place. In Thailand, PEPDEL engaged disabled people's organizations and association of persons living with HIV in a dialogue which resulted in cross fertilization of knowledge of the two movements. An annotated bibliography was developed to help the organizations understanding common theories and issues. In other countries, there has been a close working relationship with WEDGE.

e. Gender Framework:

How well has the project aligned with national gender-related goals and ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality? Is the project adapted to the needs and capacities of female and male beneficiaries? How have resources been distributed between male and female beneficiaries? Has the project outcome affected women and men differently? In Thailand, the gender dimension of disability has been always stressed in all training programs, especially in the disability equality training which stimulates thinking about how differently disability affects women and men. Despite the limited research available on issues related to women with disabilities in the region, PEPDEL managed to ensure that sex disaggregated data was included in all research and questionnaires conducted. In Zambia, by design, the project aims to cater for the different needs of male and female beneficiaries with disabilities. During the workshops and all other programs selection of participants is usually gender sensitive and efforts are made to have at least 50- 50 representation. In Uganda, through collaboration with WEDGE, the National Union of Women with Disabilities in Uganda (NUWODU) developed a position paper, 'Mainstreaming Gender and Disability in Policy Recommendations, in late 2009, which contributed to the advocacy efforts of the Council for Economic Empowerment for Women of Africa – Uganda chapter, ensuring that the concerns of women in business were recognised by government. This position paper has been submitted to the policy review for their consideration. By contrast, Tanzania reported no coordination with gender goals.

Section VI. Impact of INCLUDE and PEPDEL

Impact: The extent to which the activity objectives and development indicators are met

For several reasons, the impact of INCLUDE and PEPDEL on objectives and development indicators is difficult to assess. First, the objectives of the INCLUDE program imply that the outputs of the program lead ILO constituents to change the way they act as a result of training and capacity building. It is hard to determine attribution from output to objective, however, particularly when the objectives are qualitative rather than quantitative. Second, societal change from a ‘charity’ approach to an inclusive approach requires that little by little all social partners and civil society alter frequently well-entrenched attitudes. This takes time. Finally, it will take even more time to reach Irish Aid’s ultimate goal of poverty reduction because this requires actual increases in the employment and earnings of persons with disabilities that must be based on concomitant improvements in education and training.

A. The INCLUDE Project

The impact of INCLUDE can be measured against objective indicators and ILO immediate outcomes for 2008-2009. This section presents country-specific successes and failures with regard to these goals. The difficulty faced, generally, is that it is difficult to attribute successes to ILO projects alone. Nonetheless, Ethiopia appears to have been particularly successful in terms of objectives. Kenya’s INCLUDE program appears to have been the least successful, although WEDGE was operating more fully.

1. INCLUDE Objective Indicators

Many INCLUDE countries reported progress with regard to the objectives in the ILO Logframe analysis. The attribution of success in terms of objectives is not transparent, however, as there may be many other influences on these achievements, e.g. from donors, government, social partners and/or civil society.

Disability inclusion support agencies (NGOS) in operation and strengthened. This objective is the clearly attributable to the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership but should actually be listed among the outputs (or outcome indicators). Agencies were operational in all the INCLUDE countries. Vietnam’s INCLUDE Agency was established and in operation since April 2010. The Ethiopian Center for Disability and Development (ECDD) is also operational and active. Zambia strengthened the Disability Inclusion Organization. Tanzania had the greatest problem in this regard due to the death of the director and subsequent management problems. WEDGE-only countries, however, were not charged with establishing an agency.

Implementation of existing inclusion policies related to persons with disabilities. Some INCLUDE countries indicated that there were government inclusion policies within the country, but none reported on the implementation of these policies in general, or on the role of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership on such implementation. This would appear to be an area for future focus. In Zambia, the project continued to provide support to the Ministry of Science, Technology and Vocational Training (MSTVT) to develop an Action Plan for the MSTVT disability policy, as well as engaging with Ministry of Education,

Government departments and disability community discuss ways of realizing training and employment opportunities for persons with disabilities as outlined in educational and training policies.

Constituents develop new or modify existing training policies and program measures. There is considerable variation across countries in how this objective was met. In Ethiopia, both the government and the Confederation of Trade Unions were making significant changes in their training policies. In Vietnam, the Confederation of Trade Unions added a disability component to its training. In other countries, such as Cambodia, changes in training policies and programs took place in the NGO sector. Some INCLUDE programs were just building up to that stage. This is an area for stronger actions in countries where greater progress could be made. In Zambia, courses at the National Vocational Rehabilitation Centre (NVRC) are being reviewed to meet the learning needs of persons with disabilities. New methods for testing and examination marking standards are also being revised to meet the needs of persons with disabilities. Other countries did not report significant changes.

Public employment services or regulators environment of private employment services make them more accessible to persons with disabilities. There is considerable variation in terms of access to employment services as well. The private employment agency *Info Mind Solutions*, which was supported by the INCLUDE agency in Ethiopia to cater to job-seekers with disabilities, now employs a dedicated candidate relations officer to provide targeted support to these job-seekers, if required, among other measures. Yet overall, this is an area where some progress is being made, but it is difficult to determine how much. Continued focus in this area would be desirable to obtain better data on the accessibility of the public and private employment agencies and outreach done to list employment opportunities where they would be accessible to persons with disabilities and disabled persons agencies.

Financial institutions (primarily micro-finance) adopt measures to increase access to financing among persons with disabilities. Ethiopia reports definite progress in this area but other countries, such as Vietnam, are at best just starting activities to increase access to micro-finance and other types of financial institutions potentially providing micro- or small business loans to persons with disabilities. The Tanzania Women Bank has been sensitized on disability issues through WEDGE, and has, as a first step, built a ramp to enable access for physical impaired persons to the bank premises. An assessment of access to credit for persons with disabilities on Zanzibar was in the pipeline for activities to be coordinated by ZACDID but due to the capacity building required to strengthen ZACDID this activity could not proceed

Policy measures are introduced to promote gender equality for persons with disabilities. While ILO training focuses on gender issues, there continues to be a lacuna in terms of policy measures for gender equity. While the proclamation on right to employment in Ethiopia has a provision providing for priority for women with disabilities, the word gender is not mentioned in the new Vietnam Law on Persons with Disabilities. This is an area that demands further sensitization.

Policy and program measures are introduced to assist disabled persons living with HIV/AIDS. Again, Ethiopia appears to be ahead of other countries, as there has been sufficient NGO interest to encourage the government to make HIV/AIDS its priority. In Vietnam, there has been coordination with the ILO HIV/AIDS program, where employers appear to be far more cognizant of the needs of employees with HIV/AIDS than with employees with disabilities. For the first time in the region, representatives of

disabled people's organizations in Thailand took part in the Universal Access Regional Meeting that took place in March 2011 to review the HIV program in the region in terms of access to prevention and treatment. The meeting provided an opportunity to understand how to integrate issues for persons with disabilities into the response to HIV in the region. In Zambia, with the National HIV/AIDS and TB Council, the statutory body that coordinates HIV/AIDS interventions, specific programs were developed targeting persons with disabilities living with HIV/AIDS. And coordination in this area may be understated, as INCLUDE is not necessarily taking the lead on HIV/AIDS issues.

2. INCLUDE: ILO Immediate Outcomes for 2008-2009

The success in achieving ILO 2008-2009 Immediate Outcomes can be derived from the Program output indicators (Section V) and the objective indicators in this section above. Short summaries are provided below.

Immediate outcome 2a.1 'Increase constituent capacity to develop policies and policy recommendations focused on job-rich growth, productive employment and poverty reduction'.

Where there has been success of INCLUDE in training constituents to engage in a policy dialogue and improve training these goals have been met – for instance, in Thailand and Zambia. There is still a need to continue to focus on both policy dialogue and on improving access of persons with disabilities to employment opportunities. This takes time as it requires a fundamental change in mentality on the part of government, the social partners and civil society. Many societies still view disability in medical terms and assistance as charity and separation. To go from there to viewing disability as functional impairment that can be mitigated by accommodation and inclusion and mainstreaming as the way forward requires societal change that cannot be accomplished overnight.

Immediate outcome 2a.3 'Increase member State capacity or programmes focused on youth employment.' INCLUDE's focus on employment and vocational training will assist young people with disabilities. China, Thailand, Ethiopia and Zambia are taking steps in this direction. Training and education will be the means for youth with disabilities to enter the mainstream labor market. More work for many years is required to fully meet this objective.

Immediate outcome 2b.2 'Improve State capacity to develop or implement employment services'

More work with all employment agencies is needed, not only with state services. Thailand may be the most successful in this area. INCLUDE in other countries has worked with non-state employment services, which should be as important, or more important, than state services in a functioning market economy.

Immediate outcome 4a 'Increase the value of employers' organizations to existing and potential membership'. Employers organizations have received training in INCLUDE and PEPDEL countries, which would increase employment of persons with disabilities as employers understand better that employees with disabilities can add to the productive output of their companies. To date, more work is needed to ensure that training will lead to changes in attitudes among employers, although there has been some success in this area in Ethiopia, Vietnam and Cambodia.

Immediate outcome 4b ‘Increase the value of workers’ organizations to existing and potential membership.’ Like employers organizations, training provided to trade unions will increase the value of those unions to current and future workers with disabilities, as well as workers who are not currently disabled. It will require further assistance to ensure that this training is put into practice in union activities and bargaining relationships with employers.

Joint immediate outcome 02100 ‘Increase capacity of constituents to develop integrated policies and programmes to advance gender equality in the world of work’ INCLUDE has provided joint training in coordination with the WEDGE project that has helped sensitize entrepreneurs with disabilities of the possibilities for them to start small businesses. And gender issues have been raised in a variety of training situations. Nonetheless, viewing current legislation, more emphasis is still needed to ensure that gender issues are raised specifically in terms of policy and laws related to persons with disabilities.

Joint immediate outcome 021125 ‘Increase the participation of constituents in the formulation of financial policies.’ WEDGE and INCLUDE training included information on the access of various types of micro-credit and small loans to persons with disabilities. Ethiopia reports the greatest progress in this area.

B. The PEPDEL Program

The impact of PEPDEL can be measured against objective indicators and ILO immediate outcomes for 2008-2009. This section presents country-specific successes and failures with regard to these goals. The difficulty faced, generally, is that it is difficult to attribute successes to ILO projects alone. Thailand and Ethiopia were particularly strong in reaching results to improve training policies with respect to persons with disabilities. Progress on improvements in statistical data has been limited and spotty at best.

1. PEPDEL Objective Indicators:

Policies, national action plans or government programs developed to promote productive employment for young women and men with disabilities. In general, PEPDEL has been extremely active in all countries on disability policy and legislation, although the focus is more inclusive than only young women and men with disabilities. This assistance has ranged from input in developing legislation to assistance in creating national action plans to advocacy for the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The amount and variety of issues supported through PEPDEL are too numerous to document individually. While it is obvious it would be impossible to measure specific attribution to the efforts of the ILO-Irish-Aid Partnership due to the participation of other donors, government ministries, social partners, DPOs etc., it is clear that PEPDEL has had strong participatory input in this area.

New or modified national training policies developed to be more accessible to persons with disabilities facing discrimination. Some countries have placed a strong emphasis on modifying national training policies. In China, PEPDEL supported a survey on the situation of access to vocational training and employment opportunities for persons with disabilities in the rural areas. As a result a Circular entered into force that implies that more training facilities are to be made available in the rural

areas and persons with disabilities should be facilitated to access these opportunities. In Thailand, PEPDEL encouraged the Ministry of Labor to open more training opportunities for persons with disabilities in the mainstream training system and to provide more training and coaching opportunities for persons with intellectual disabilities. This commitment is reflected in the 2011 Action Plan of the Ministry of Labor. In Ethiopia, PEPDEL contributed to a disability inclusive TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training) framework designed by the Ministry of Education. In Zambia, plans are underway to review the training curriculum including revision of the examinations and testing guidelines for the National Vocational Rehabilitation Centre. Discussions have been held on training policies in other countries, but no changes have been implemented yet.

Training programs for persons with disabilities that have been developed include an HIV/AIDS education and training component. While a variety of training and media initiatives have been undertaken with regard to HIV/AIDS programs, these are not specifically for an HIV/AIDS education.

Public employment services or regulatory environment of private employment services improved to make them more accessible to persons facing labor market discrimination. This is another area where more work is needed. While INCLUDE did work with public or private employment services to ensure greater accessibility to job opportunities for persons with disabilities, with the exception of Thailand where PEPDEL supported the Ministry of Labor in improving the inclusion of job-seekers with disabilities in employment service centers, as reflected in the 2011 Action Plan of the Ministry of Labor. PEPDEL provided the Department of Employment of the Ministry of Labor with technical training materials in Thai language that were integrated in training programs conducted by the department of employment to all employment service centers in all provinces.

Statistical data on labor market situation of persons with disabilities improved through revisions to census, labor force survey, household survey or other surveys. This is an area where much greater coordination is necessary. Some progress is being made on statistical data ranging from the inclusion of questions on disability in the Ethiopian Census to special surveys outside government in China. Employer surveys were undertaken in Thailand and discussions were held elsewhere. No activity has taken place, however, in Tanzania or Uganda.

2. PEPDEL: ILO Immediate Outcomes for 2008-2009

Immediate outcome 2a.1 ‘Increase constituent capacity to develop policies and policy recommendations focused on job-rich growth, productive employment and poverty reduction.’ PEPDEL has had a strong impact on constituents through disability training that has been used to further involvement in the policy process. Constituent involvement has included input into a wide variety of public policy debates, including education programs, vocational training programs, disability laws, labor laws, and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Immediate outcome 2a.3 ‘Increase member State capacity or programmes focused on youth employment.’ PEPDEL has focused less on youth employment than on employment for all persons with disabilities. Efforts in the area of vocational training, such as programs in China, Ethiopia, and Zambia are more likely to impact on youth.

Immediate outcome 2b.1 ‘Increase member, State and constituent capacity to develop or implement training policies’ The activities and outcomes are the same as those above, where vocational training initiatives have been spearheaded by PEPDEL involvement in some countries, but not all.

Immediate outcome 2b.2 ‘Improve State capacity to develop or implement employment services’ Greater emphasis might be placed in this area. Similarly to efforts made through the INCLUDE program, it is important to improve employment services to provide better access to persons with disabilities in both the state and private sectors.

Immediate outcome 4a.1 ‘Increase the value of employers’ organizations to existing and potential membership.’ Training for employers has been provided in PEPDEL countries, but it remains to be seen whether this will have an effect on the attitudes and actions of employers. Progress is being made particularly in China, Thailand and Zambia.

Immediate outcome 4a.2 ‘Increase the value of workers’ organizations to existing and potential membership.’ While all countries have engaged in dialogue and provided training to workers’ organizations, it is mainly only Thailand that mentions specific practices that have changed as a result.

Immediate outcome 4b.1 ‘Increase the capacities of employers’ and workers’ organizations to participate effectively in the development of social and labour policy.’ PEPDEL countries indicate that they have a variety of ways to meet and have an ongoing dialogue with constituents.

Immediate outcome 4c.1 ‘Increase member State capacity to develop policies and labour legislation through tripartite dialogue between constituents’ Many disability training workshops and seminars have included tri-partite representation. Further, many countries have included tri-partite participation in terms of the policy dialogues on disability issues. While this is a broader issue for governments that goes beyond input on disability policy, the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Program provided strong support in this area.

Immediate outcome 4c.2 ‘Increase the capacity of the tripartite constituents to implement labour policies and programmes, including through coordination at regional and subregional levels.’ While PEPDEL countries indicate that they have a variety of ways to meet and have an ongoing dialogue with constituents, it is not clear that regional and sub-regional coordination has been a specific focus. It is important to note, however, that an inclusive disability approach is a new concept that requires buy-in first at the national level. This remains an area for further assistance.

Joint immediate outcome 021000 ‘Increase capacity of member States and development partners to promote coherent economic and social policies in support of decent work at national, regional and global levels’ The PEPDEL program works in concert in support of decent work. By definition, PEPDEL by supporting mainstreaming and inclusion in disability and providing training for ILO constituents supports decent work. As indicated earlier, all the PEPDEL countries, except Thailand, have signed Decent Work Country Programs.

Section VII: Sustainability of INCLUDE and PEPDEL

Sustainability: The extent to which the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn

Sustainability of an inclusive disability framework relies on a combination of changes in terms of law, regulation, and implementation. But most of all, mainstreaming disability can only be successful when the attitudes of the general population and that of persons with disabilities realizes that inclusive disability can work and that the focus of society should be on maximizing the opportunity to use abilities rather than on the negative of disability. As this is most often a complete change in paradigm, it is no surprise that sustainability will not come easily. This section focus on the degree to which countries in INCLUDE and PEPDEL can meet this long run objective.

A. The INCLUDE Program

It is likely that in many countries INCLUDE program benefits will be reduced without continued support, despite the provision of guidance and tools that for constituents. Many of the outputs of the INCLUDE Program are necessary, but not sufficient, for sustainability.

In particular, documentation of good practice and the availability of practical guides and tools in the hands of trained constituents are outputs that can continue to be used after funding has been withdrawn. Specifically, in Ethiopia, various guides and tools were prepared globally for disability inclusion, translated into Amharic and disseminated to partners and disability advocates for use. These guides are Count Us In, DET Guide, UN CRPD, ILO Convention 159 Recommendation 168, and Legislation Guide for Employment of Persons with Disabilities, Media Guidelines for the Portrayal of Disability. In Zambia, practical guides and tools were disseminated including the “Count us in guidelines”, media guidelines on disability; Publication on the ILO convention 159 and the UN CRPD; and guidelines on the employability and legislation. Objective indicators for Ethiopia and Zambia indicate that constituents have not only attended training but that they have also started using that training to effect change in many areas, but not all. Both Ethiopia and Zambia have been included in earlier ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programs. But results on the ground have been less in Vietnam, which just started the INCLUDE program, and the impact of WEDGE, with its more limited focus, has been less widespread.

A second way to increase the likelihood of sustainability for INCLUDE has been the establishment of disability inclusion support services and the strengthening of implementing entities. In that way, there is be organization outside of government and the social partners that could continue the advocacy role and training provided through INCLUDE. ‘INCLUDE agencies’ were established in Vietnam, Ethiopia and Zambia. Both Zambia and Vietnam reported the need for greater resources to offset the risk that “other civil society partners would so have the necessary capacity to assume responsibility for, and sustain, activities initiated under the Partnership Program.”

Without the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership, INCLUDE Agencies might not yet be sustainable. Further, as small organizations, their potential outreach may be limited to a handful of advocates, although it may grow, as the example in Ethiopia proves, where its outreach has become quite broad. While business

groups and trade unions received training about inclusive disability policies, in many countries with respect to the implementation of existing disability policies, the development or modification of new training policies, the access to employment services, and the access to financial institutions, few have changed their policies and they may need additional capacity building before inclusive disability policies are firmly embedded in most of the business community.

B. The PEPDEL Program

The PEPDEL Sustainability Strategy provided four main pillars to create sustainability:

- Laws, policies and implementation for a rights-based approach to disability
- Capacity building
- Media Strategy
- Links to other development framework (including ILO DWCP)

The approach was to include global, country-specific, and regional elements. At the global level this provided accessible websites through the ILO and GLADNET (Global Applied Disability Research and Information Network); a knowledge base, legislative guidelines, statistical guidelines, and curriculum. Regionally, a Center on Disability Law and Policy was established on a pilot basis at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. All PEPDEL countries were provided with ILO guidelines and tools, usually in local languages as well as English. Further, PEPDEL ensured access to a knowledge base on modern disability laws in conjunction with local universities. Beyond that, support for the review of legislation and policies related to disability was provided to each country. Capacity building included a regular two-week course on disability legislation and policy at ILO's International Training Center in Italy and an on-line distance-learning course. In addition, the institution of course on disability legislation and policy in many law faculties in PEPDEL countries were intended to ensure sustainability.

Media programs were introduced starting from a communications framework for an advocacy and media strategy to support the “Decent Work for People with Disabilities – Count Us In” campaign. Core tools for advocacy and public information were developed in collaboration with ILOs Department of Communication. In addition, PEPDEL support would include one-day workshops on disability issues, a “guide for the Media” prepared in the local language, and an advocacy kit for the media. The process has started out in several countries, and considerable progress has been made in Thailand. Numerous radio programs on disabilities issues have been held in Ethiopia with project support.

These approaches all seem valid a priori. The question is how to measure whether or not PEPDEL activities are, in fact, sustainable after Phase III of the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership. One way to measure this is to identify how PEPDEL outputs led to concrete actions for PEPDEL objectives. Many PEPDEL outputs and objectives reflect activities that ought to be a result of PEPDEL initiatives. These include:

- Improved labor market relevance of vocational training in mainstream courses
- Initiatives undertaken by employers' organizations; action plans developed by workers organizations;
- Training policies changed to be more accessible;

- Training programs for HIV/AIDS education developed;
- Employment services made more accessible

In other cases, one would like to know whether or not the capacity-building activities -- for example, capacity to draft legislation, provide advocacy, or offer training -- actually resulted in actions that make a difference. While some countries have cited direct results related to outputs or outcomes, in other cases, it is clear that the process has just started. Without directly observable results, it is difficult to decide whether the program is yet sustainable. Further, as a small program, PEPDEL cannot touch more than a limited number of participants. Training classes are not large. We do not know how widely media materials have been disseminated, but based on survey findings, media efforts have not been yet substantial in most countries. While basic information has been made accessible, it is not clear how much it has been used. Even with directly observable results, it is difficult to assume that a sustainable policy of inclusion for persons with disabilities will be established within the country when such a result requires a fundamental change in society. Thus, it is not a question of whether the actions taken in the PEPDEL program are the right ones for sustainability, but whether it will take a longer time for such a new approach to become embedded in the mentality of at least government officials, business leaders, trade union leadership, and, at the least, the majority of DPOs.

Section VIII. Summary and Recommendations

Challenge: The challenge is how to ramp up the program, changing attitudes and opportunities for persons with disabilities

A. Summary

As a prelude to recommendations for future assistance, the main findings of earlier sections are summarized below.

1. Relevance

INCLUDE and PEPDEL's focus is highly relevant with regard to Irish Aid funding as these programs addresses key issues related to persons with disability who experience greater poverty, exclusion, and fewer economic opportunities. Both INCLUDE and PEPDEL support and promote the guiding principles of the UN Convention, as clearly indicated in the Program Objectives. The INCLUDE program supports vocational training and employment of persons with disabilities and PEPDEL supports legislation in these and related areas. Hence, the activities in that program are relevant to ILO Convention 159. ILO's objectives implemented through Decent Work Country Programs support four strategic objectives: creating jobs, guaranteeing rights at work, extending social protection and promoting social dialogue that are all related to an inclusive disability strategy. INCLUDE and PEPDEL were designed to be attuned to the ILOs Program and Budget Strategic Framework Objectives for 2008-2009. The program could hardly be more relevant.

2. Efficiency

A search of World Bank Projects with a focus on 'empowerment, security and social inclusion' and a relationship to disability identified twenty-three active projects, with an average loan amount of US\$43 million. By contrast, the total funding for INCLUDE and PEPDEL is US\$4.6 million spread over 10 countries, or an average of \$460,000 per country. In other words, the ILO is attempting to do a great deal with very limited resources. Approximately one-quarter of budgeted expenditures were targeted to international experts and about one-quarter for seminars. Actual expenditures for international experts were somewhat greater than budgeted, as were those for Country Disability Coordinators, who were not included in the original budget document. Funds were spent expeditiously with little apparent shortfall for the third year. Nonetheless, many countries indicated that they could not achieve their objectives due to lack of funding. Consequently, it would appear that a more generous budget would be more efficient in meeting program objectives.

3. Design Validity

Individual indicators generally are, in and of themselves important to the development of an inclusive nation-wide disability policy, although the logical framework itself could be improved. The problem with the Logframe is that the links between the outputs and the objective indicators are not necessarily well connected, although in a general sense, training and materials produced about good practice ought to lead

to the objective indicators. Further, there are issues of attribution. It would be useful to have some interim outcome indicators in-between the outputs and the objectives. The Logframe Matrices for INCLUDE and PEPDEL were well documented by the ILO in progress reports to Irish Aid and Geneva. But the reporting tended to focus on achievements towards a particular goal rather than discussing whether the program was on target, if not, why not, and what additional steps might be needed to achieve the target.

4. Effectiveness

The ILO-Irish Aid Program document spelled out four country risks that could reduce the effectiveness of the project. Except for political risk, many countries indicated that one or more risks occurred. These were generally lack of effectiveness of constituent participation and often related to lack of resources, be it in the form of a Country Disability Coordinator or financial means.

In general, all of the *INCLUDE output* indicators were met. The ILO provided the training, support, materials and guidance as intended. Disability inclusion support agencies were established and operational, with the exception of Tanzania, which fell seriously behind with the death of a director.

INCLUDE Effectiveness Indicators. In terms of INCLUDE Knowledge Development, all countries indicated that the program assisted greatly in the spread of information, although only some countries provided examples improved understanding or advances in rights. There was likewise general satisfaction with program Advocacy and Advisory services. Constituents have been educated and dialogue fostered. By contrast, there were virtually no changes reported in the practices of civil society. While there were media training reported, there were few reports of media outreach as a result. Tanzania was least likely to report activities in any of these areas, reportedly due to lack of staffing and/or financial resource.

INCLUDE Capacity Building was reported to be strong but the reporting of specific accomplishments stemming from capacity building was more limited. This could be due to the challenge of actually having constituents act on their new knowledge or due to issues of attribution, where specific outputs may not be able to be attributed to limited engagement. Nonetheless, at least in some countries, capacity building led to changes in the practices of employer or workers organizations. In all countries there has been successful collaboration between WEDGE and INCLUDE. As INCLUDE and WEDGE are so closely connected, INCLUDE has a strong built-in gender component.

PEPDEL output indicators were more complicated to assess. Implementation and action plans were developed generally, with the exceptions of Tanzania and Uganda. Progress with regard to other indicators was varied. Ethiopia demonstrated strong achievements in vocational education, while Tanzania and Uganda had none. Some, but by no means all, employer and workers organizations have undertaken new initiatives. Zambia employers are at the forefront, as are unions in Ethiopia and Thailand. In certain instances, there were some strong steps taken by disability advocates, such as a media campaign by young journalists with disabilities in China. Elsewhere, although training seminars were conducted, constituents have not taken further actions to change their practices. Most PEPDEL developed disability courses in university settings, particularly through law faculties, with the exception of Tanzania and Uganda, where such efforts did not come to fruition. Constituents in all countries

received some training on the drafting and implementation of legislation, but whether this has been or will be used to influence the legislative process still appears to be an open question.

PEPDEL Effectiveness Indicators: In terms of PEPDEL Knowledge Development, all countries indicated that the program assisted greatly in the spread of information, although only some countries provided examples improved understanding or advances in rights. There was likewise general satisfaction with program Advocacy and Advisory services. Quite a few countries provided examples of the way in which these activities changed the behavior of employers, worker organizations, DPOs or others. PEPDEL activities focused on civil society appear to have been weaker, although INCLUDE, its counterpart program, provides greater support to DPOs. Nonetheless, PEPDEL also provided support to civil society (Disabled Persons Organizations and disability-related NGOs) raising awareness and fostering advocacy, with a particular focus on the UN CRPD. The most obvious route to awakening civil society is through the media. While training has been provided, actual media campaigns were limited. In most instances, Tanzania and Uganda have had not success in these areas.

In terms of Capacity Building, a number of countries, including China, Zambia and Uganda, indicate that PEPDEL has led to positive actions to influence legislation and policy. Countries report that PEPDEL provided support to DPOs, but no strong actions taken were identified. PEPDEL is generally considered to have synergies with other ILO and Irish Aid programs and countries indicate that they take the gender dimension of the program into account.

5. Impact:

Many INCLUDE countries reported progress with regard to the objectives in the ILO Logframe analysis, but the progress is not uniform. Further attribution is difficult as there are many other influences on these achievements, e.g. from donors, government, social partners and/or civil society. The strengthening of disability inclusion agencies was clearly a result of ILO activities, however (but likely should have been listed as an output or outcome). Some INCLUDE countries indicated that there were existing government inclusion policies within the country, but none on policy implementation. There was considerable variation across countries in how constituents developed or modified existing training policies and similar variation with regard to access to employment services. Ethiopia reports definite progress with regard to micro-finance, but other countries are at best just starting activities. Again, Ethiopia appears to be ahead of other countries as has been sufficient NGO interest to lead government to make HIV/AIDS a priority. While ILO training focuses on gender issues, there continues to be a lacuna in terms of policy measures for gender equity.

In general, PEPDEL has been extremely active in all countries on disability policy and legislation, with a more inclusive focus than only that of young women and men with disabilities. The problem is that it is very difficult to move from training constituents, to encouraging them to take specific actions, to actually changing the environment in which persons with disabilities live. Some countries have placed a strong emphasis on modifying national training policies. For example, Zambia has made progress in promoting inclusive vocational education and training. In other countries, however, discussions have been held on the issue of training policies but no changes have been implemented. While a variety of training and media initiatives have been undertaken with regard to HIV/AIDs programs, these are not specifically

for an HIV/AIDS education. Inclusion in public and private employment services is another area where more work is needed. The improvement of statistical data on persons with disabilities is an area where considerable improvement is needed.

B. Recommendations

This section provides a series of recommendations for future programs that would lead to greater sustainability of results in the spheres in which INCLUDE and PEPDEL have been working. Overall, the ILO-Irish Aid Partnership Programme has been extremely satisfactory in its steps to develop and encourage inclusion in the mainstream of society for persons with disabilities. The program has done a great deal with scarce resources in an area where negative attitudes towards an inclusive society are strong around the world. In other words, INCLUDE and PEPDEL are dealing with attitudinal change – an objective that is much more difficult than, for instance, building a road or creating a cash benefit program. In order to see sustainable change, to ramp up the program, and create greater multiplier and spillover effects, I have recommendations in the following areas.

3. General Program Design

a. Choice of Countries

The selection of countries is extremely important as some countries have achieved greater progress than others. There needs to be an assessment of which countries should be funded in any new phase of an ILO-Irish Aide Partnership Programme related to disability. In particular, there has been less success in Tanzania, Uganda and Kenya. The reasons for lack of progress should be examined more carefully and a decision taken to (i) add Disability Program Coordinators; (ii) increase funding or (iii) decide that these countries are not yet ready to continue work in this area. Another possibility is that some WEDGE countries, such as Cambodia or the Lao PDR might be ready to ‘graduate’ into a full INCLUDE program. Consideration might also be given to assessing when high performing countries such as Ethiopia and Zambia might be ready to graduate out of the program. This assessment would require discussions on-the-ground and cannot be made with only a document audit.

b. Funding

Another area for additional assessment is the amount of funding provided per country in any Phase IV program. The one factor consistently raised in the Risk Analysis was that risks related to constituent participation and action could be mitigated by additional resources. This issue is closely related to country selection. More funding in fewer countries might be the appropriate action to take. Additional funding might be best used for Country Disability Coordinators, in the first place, and for a more realistic assessment of the costs of international experts. It also might be useful to consider a greater differential between INCLUDE and PEPDEL funding, with PEPDEL increased relatively more, as the objective indicators suggest a far broader mandate.

c. Project Management

The use of Implementation Plans detailing program activities and submission of progress reports are extremely important tools used by the ILO program management to conduct a continuing evaluation of whether and how countries are meeting output indicators and objectives. While there needs to be flexibility in program design and management, it would still seem that a new project-management tool might be added to be able to determine better whether projects are on track with respect to the proposed timeline. This would better incorporate the risk assessment within the structure of the project and have risk mitigating actions within the project management framework. A simple utilization of MS Project might be one way to go to better appreciate whether or not activities were meeting their targets on time.

d. Monitoring and Evaluation

The basic monitoring and evaluation framework for the ILO-Irish Aid Programme is excellent in so far as it uses a Logframe analysis that takes each program from activities to outputs to objective indicators to objectives. Similarly, the ILO requirements for a mid-term and final evaluation are sufficient to assist in mid-term modifications and final recommendations for next steps. However, the output and objective indicators for both INCLUDE and PEPDEL need to be revisited for a potential Phase IV program. In particular, all output indicators ought to be ones that are directly attributable to the program and not any that need to have a next step taken by program participants that is out of control of the project. For that reason, I consider that a number of the PEPDEL output indicators are really outcome indicators. I would suggest a revised Logframe analysis with output, outcome and objective indicators. Further, while it is unfortunately not well done in any development programs, an analysis of risks that constrain the move from output to outcome and from outcome to objective would be valuable, as it is extremely difficult to change country paradigms, and this is exactly what the program is trying to accomplish.

There is also a need to find better ways to document changes that result from training, workshops and other methods of capacity building. Monitoring progress from output to outcome might be accomplished by following up of training seminar and workshop participants, as has been done in some countries, to determine whether and how constituents are actually using their knowledge and enhanced capacity for action to determine the potential for multiplier effects across society. Similarly, monitoring of additional program outcomes might be helpful for some outputs, such as the development of curricula on disability at law faculties. In that case, one might survey graduates to determine how they intended to use their education.

e. Program Expansion

Many INCLUDE and PEPDEL activities have been focused at the national level with less regional or local participation, despite wishes for expansion. A new ILO-Irish Aid program might provide greater regional focus for program expansion, particularly to countries that have already had positive results in terms of objective indicators. Another way to gain regional

coverage would be through comprehensive media campaigns (discussed below) which would reach civil society in general and improve the focus of INCLUDE and PEPDEL beyond the direct ILO constituent community. Similarly, INCLUDE activities might stretch more broadly to DPOs across the country beyond already identified inclusion support agencies.

4. Specific Program Activity Focus

a. Media Campaigns

The most obvious route to awakening civil society is through the media. In general, while media training has been provided, actual media campaigns resulting from training and the provision of good media tools have been limited. I would suggest using some funding to arrange for technical assistance for a media campaign engaging country media specialists and, perhaps, partnering with a specific organization or organizations, as has been done in China, focusing on the most effective media -- be they print, radio, television or other means, to reach civil society. Most countries reported relatively little impact on civil society to date beyond DPOs. Media is the most effective way to do this. My understanding from the World Bank is that a number of Latin American countries have launched such campaigns in the area of disability, in particular, Brazil. Incorporation of a media message within a popular television program may be particularly effective, such as one done in Kazakhstan to popularize their pension reform. Another possible strategy would be to have business 'champions' who employ effective mainstreaming in the workplace, perhaps larger firms or even multi-nationals, to tell their stories to the media.

b. Regulation and Implementation

PEPDEL has improved the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement effective legislation and policies, including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion. But the legislative process is only the first step in changing behavior. It may be the right time to add training and capacity building for the next step in the process – regulation and implementation of disability laws, labor codes, and other legislation related to accessibility and accommodation. There could also be workshops for the social partners – employers, trade unions, and government to engage in a process of comment and recommendation for decrees, circulars and inspection policies used to implement relevant laws and policies.

c. Disability Statistics

Very little has been done in the area of disability statistics at the national level with statistical agencies. A clear example of the challenges in this area is the example of Vietnam. Most constituents continue to cite the figure of a 6 percent disability rate when the statistical agency and the World Bank use a figure closer to 15 percent. The difference rests in the definition. Medical definitions of disability tend to be lower than definitions related to functional capacity, and the latter is generally what is important in terms of disability legislation including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination, and inclusion.

Further, different measures and concepts of disability are actually appropriate for specific policies and programs. For example, a country might want to distinguish between those persons with disability with little or no working ability and provide insurance based or income based cash benefits to individuals who would qualify for those benefits. While there is not necessarily one definition of functional capacity, and there have been discussions on proper measurement, including the Washington Coalition, there has been sufficient progress made in this area for a country to select one standard definition of disability, as the Vietnam statistical agency has done and as the World Bank is doing in its Living Standards Measurement surveys, to provide training to constituents in PEPDEL countries and encourage them, and their statistical agencies to implement policies for the proper measures of disability for the proper purposes. Another benefit of including disability questions in labor force surveys would be to measure the labor force participation of persons with disabilities and compare that figure to the population overall.

d. Additional Guidance and Guidelines

There is virtually nothing but praise for the guides and tools that the ILO has prepared and used in training and for capacity building within country. But there may be some areas where additional guidance and tools may be appropriate. Aside from guidance on measurement issues (see above), another potential area would be to document guidance on accommodation for specific conditions. Based on experience in Vietnam, it seems likely that constituents in many countries may hear the message about accommodation and mainstreaming, appreciate the message, but not believe in their hearts that accommodation can be practical and inexpensive. Guidance on specific measures have been taken by employers around the world could be an effective way of showing that persons with disabilities need not spend their lives working in sheltered workshops or limit the use of their abilities at all.

Annexes

Annex 1: INCLUDE Logframe Survey Instrument

Annex 2: INCLUDE Effectiveness Survey Instrument

Annex 3; PEPDEL Logframe Survey Instrument

Annex 4: PEPDEL Effectiveness Survey Instrument

Annex 5: Risk Analysis Outcome Survey Instrument

Annex 6: Vietnam Trip Report

Annex 1: INCLUDE Logframe Survey

Indicator	Progress
Objective Indicators:	
9. Disability inclusion support agencies(NGOS) in operation and strengthened	
10. Implementation of existing inclusion policies related to persons with disabilities	
11. Constituents develop new or modify existing training policies and program measures	
12. Public employment services or regulators environment of private employment services make them more accessible to persons with disabilities	
13. Financial institutions (primarily micro-finance) adopt measures to increase access to financing among persons with disabilities	
14. Policy measures are introduced to promote gender equity for persons with disabilities	
15. Policy and program measures are introduced to assist disabled persons living with HIV/AIDs	
Output Indicators:	
1. Implementation Plan Prepared (applicable to countries with national coordinator)	
2. Good Practice in Disability Inclusion documented /received (based on ILO Geneva lead)	
3. Practical Guides and Tools for disability inclusion prepared/received(based on ILO Geneva lead)	
4. Disability Equality training courses conducted/received	
5. Disability inclusion support service established and operational in selected countries (NGOs)	
6. Capacity of Implementing Agencies strengthened	
7. Disability inclusion support strategy and service documented and publicized.	

Annex 2: INCLUDE Effectiveness Survey

Question	Response
Knowledge development initiatives: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How has project research and knowledge development improved understanding of access to equal training and employment opportunities? 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. How has the project contributed to advances in the rights of persons with disabilities? What has taken place to create, share and disseminate knowledge? 	
Advocacy and Technical Advisory Services: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How have advocacy and technical advisory services educated ILO constituents about legislative and policy issues related to disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion? 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. How has the project led to a dialogue between ILO constituents and provided a platform for disabled people organizations to inform ILO constituents? 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. How have employers' organizations been encouraged to promote the notion of disability-inclusive workplaces? How many have changed practices? 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. How have workers' organizations been encouraged and supported to work to persons with disabilities? How many have changed practices? 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. How have civil society been engaged in understanding disability as an issue of discrimination and rights? How many have taken actions? 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. How has the media been encouraged to tackle stereotypes of persons with disabilities and promote understanding of their working capacity? How many media portraits/reflections have 	

Annex 2: INCLUDE Effectiveness Survey

Question	Response
done so?	
Capacity Building: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How has the project improved the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement effective legislation and policies, including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion? What changes can be observed? 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. How has the project improved the ability of disabled peoples' organizations to promote decent work, non-discrimination and dialogue with labor market institutions 	
Crosscutting Issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent has the project been complimentary to other initiatives, including, as applicable, other Irish Aid programs? To what extent have awareness-raising initiatives, including that aimed at the media, been relevant to broader policy and development issues? 	
Gender Framework: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How well has the project aligned with national gender-related goals and ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality? Is the project adapted to the needs and capacities of female and male beneficiaries? How have resources been distributed between male and female beneficiaries? Has the project outcome affected women and men differently? 	

Annex 3: PEPDEL Logframe Survey

Indicator	Progress
Objective Indicators:	
8. Policies, national action plans or government programs developed to promote productive employment for young women and men with disabilities	
9. New or modified national training policies developed to be more accessible to persons with disabilities facing discrimination	
10. Training programs for persons with disabilities that have been developed include an HIV/AIDS education and training component	
11. Public employment services or regulatory environment of private employment services improved to make them more accessible to persons facing labor market discrimination	
12. Statistical data on labor market situation of persons with disabilities improved through revisions to census, labor force survey, household survey or other surveys	
Output Indicators:	
1. Implementation plan developed	
2. National action plan developed to improve implementation of laws and policies on the employability and employment of persons with disabilities adopted and implemented	
3. National vocational training agencies strengthen employability of persons with disabilities who participation in mainstream courses and the labor market relevance of courses is improved in centers for persons with disabilities	

Annex 3: PEPDEL Logframe Survey

Indicator	Progress
4. Employers' organizations undertake initiatives, such as support of pilot testing and promotion of innovative forms of employment of disabled persons. Workers organizations develop action plans to promote equality of opportunity and job retention for workers and job seekers with disabilities	
5. Disability advocates organizations improve capacity to advocate for disability issue in training an employment	
6. National training institutions, including universities, improve capacity to provide training in disability equality legislation to national stakeholders	
7. Constituents have enhance capacity to draft implement disability legislation in line with international standards	

Annex 4: PEPDEL Effectiveness Survey

Question	Response
Knowledge development initiatives:	
3. How has project research and knowledge development improved understanding of access to equal training and employment opportunities?	
4. How has the project contributed to advances in the rights of persons with disabilities? What has taken place to create, share and disseminate knowledge?	
Advocacy and Technical Advisory Services:	
7. How have advocacy and technical advisory services educated ILO constituents about legislative and policy issues related to disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion?	
8. How has the project led to a dialogue between ILO constituents and provided a platform for disabled people organizations to inform ILO constituents?	
9. How have employers' organizations been encouraged to promote the notion of disability-inclusive workplaces? How many have changed practices?	
10. How have workers' organizations been encouraged and supported to work to persons with disabilities? How many have changed practices?	
11. How have civil society been engaged in understanding disability as an issue of discrimination and rights? How many have taken actions?	
12. How has the media been encouraged to tackle stereotypes of persons with disabilities and promote understanding of their working capacity? How many media portraits/reflections have	

Annex 4: PEPDEL Effectiveness Survey

Question	Response
done so?	
Capacity Building: 3. How has the project improved the ability of ILO constituents to develop and implement effective legislation and policies, including concepts of disability rights, non-discrimination and inclusion? What changes can be observed?	
4. How has the project improved the ability of disabled peoples' organizations to promote decent work, non-discrimination and dialogue with labor market institutions	
Crosscutting Issues: 2. To what extent has the project been complimentary to other initiatives, including, as applicable, other Irish Aid programs? To what extent have awareness-raising initiatives, including that aimed at the media, been relevant to broader policy and development issues?	
Gender Framework: 2. How well has the project aligned with national gender-related goals and ILO's mainstreamed strategy on gender equality? Is the project adapted to the needs and capacities of female and male beneficiaries? How have resources been distributed between male and female beneficiaries? Has the project outcome affected women and men differently?	

Annex 5: Risk Analysis Outcomes Survey

Type of Risk	Risk Occurred (Yes/No)	If yes, impact (H, M, L)	Mitigation Measures Taken
Key interlocutors and partners failed to engage throughout the Partnership Program			
ILO tripartite constituents did not have the necessary capacity to assume responsibility for, and sustain, activities initiated under the Partnership Program			
Other civil society partners did not have the necessary capacity to assume responsibility for, and sustain, activities initiated under the Partnership Program			
Significant political change occurred or national institutions were destabilized			

Respondent name and affiliation: _____

Annex 6: Vietnam Trip Report

From June 20 to June 24, I visited Hanoi for a site visit as part of my evaluation of the INCLUDE and PEPDEL projects of the ILO-Irish Aide Partnership Programme. Vietnam is a country with very high growth rates leading to strong poverty reduction. There is a continued interest in disability issues, in part, as a result of the last war which produced many military disabled, disability due to land mines, and disability due to contact with Agent Orange. INCLUDE and PEPDEL in Vietnam are new projects and have come a long way in a short time. But many tasks are still left to accomplish.

During my visit I interviewed representatives from the following organizations:

- Disability Research and Development Organization, Ho Chi Minh
- INCLUDE Agency
- Youth Employment Center
- Vietnam General Confederation of Labor
- Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- Irish Aid Office, Embassy of Ireland
- Ministry of Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs, Legislation and Social Protection Bureaus
- World Bank
- People's Representative Newspaper
- Spanish Red Cross

as well as ILO program staff from INCLUDE and PEPDEL, as well as other ILO programs such as WEDGE.

Every constituent organization was extremely supportive of the ILO programs, tools and guides. It appeared as if the ILO was the primary donor with a program fully supporting a program of inclusion and mainstreaming of persons with disabilities in Vietnam. PEPDEL was one of the primary donors providing assistance for the development of the new Law on Persons with Disabilities. The development of a course on disability at the Hanoi Law University was a key achievement. Similarly, the enthusiasm and effectiveness of the INCLUDE Agency is providing training to organizations such as the Spanish Red Cross was the result of hard-won efforts on the part of the DP Hanoi and the ILO. There has been considerable interaction with INCLUDE and WEDGE and with the ILO HIV/AIDS program.

While all constituents indicated their support of an inclusive policy for persons with disabilities in Vietnam, it appeared that there was a long way to go before that would happen. The Youth Employment Center still had to wait for a new building before its premises would be accessible. Nonetheless, the Center was firmly behind increasing job opportunities for persons with disabilities. Representatives of labor and business were also knowledgeable about inclusive policies for persons with disabilities and appreciated the workshops and training they attended. Nonetheless, there appeared to be an undercurrent of doubt as to the feasibility of such a new policy, wondering if employers could hire persons with disabilities, whether persons with disabilities were ready for mainstreaming, and whether other workers would have non-discriminatory attitudes. From a small sample of employers, it appears that businesses

are more likely to have an HIV/AIDS policy than a disability policy for their workers. Clearly there is a long way to go. One indication of the challenge with mainstreaming, is that the only company I visited was, in fact, a sheltered workshop – apparently a well-managed one started by private entrepreneurs, but nonetheless not a company with a smaller percentage of mainstreamed workers.

In terms of legislation, the new Law on Persons with Disabilities has a great deal to recommend it in terms of inclusion, mainstreaming and completeness. Nonetheless, Article 34 still provides excessive benefits to enterprises where persons with disabilities comprise over 30 percent of their workforce. The advantages include exemption from income tax, loans at preferential interest rates, etc. etc. These are the types of benefit that have promoted sheltered workshops that are established purely for the purpose of maximizing profits through tax exemptions. The point is that there still needs to be further education within government and with constituents to remove provisions like these that are contrary to mainstreaming. More work is also needed on disability topics now that the Labor Code is being redrafted as the current Labor Code still contains employment quotas. We discovered through interviews that most companies ignored these quotas and would rather pay the penalties. But, in most provinces there was not place to pay. These quotas are clearly non-functional from both a disability policy viewpoint and from the standpoint of implementation.

Data collection and dissemination is another challenge for Vietnam. Most interviewees first cited a 6 percent figure of the number of disabled in the country. This is the figure that is officially used by MOLISA and the one topic on which I felt that they were not fully understanding or supporting inclusion and mainstreaming. When pressed, most interviewees acknowledged that they did know about the statistical offices higher figure that was closer to 15 percent. This suggests that more training is needed to explain to constituents and government officials in Vietnam that disability may have different definitions depending on the purpose of the statistic, with higher figures more applicable for issues related to employment and training and lower figures more applicable to medical conditions or to program eligibility.

Discussions with the Irish Embassy were surprising as the representative knew little about INCLUDE or PEPDEL. A future challenge with funding would appear to be the ONE UN program which is encouraging donors to focus on core funding. In addition, Irish Aid wanted to emphasize that the ILO should focus on its core constituencies – government, labor, and employers – the tri-partite relationship, as there was no other UN organization with that specific mandate. There seems to be a need to enter into discussions with the UN and Irish Aid about the function of pilot project, which do not constitute programs, but rather experiments for future policy design in terms of what works and what does not. Further, it appears that there has been little coordination among donors on funding of disability issues in Vietnam.