ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** **Internal Evaluation of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17**

- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** **N/A**

- **Type of Evaluation :** **Internal Final**

- **Country(ies) :** **Global**

- **Date of the evaluation:** **November-December 2017**

- **Name of consultant(s):** **Chris Morris**

- **ILO Administrative Office:** **GED Branch**

- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** **GED Branch**

- **Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:** **N/A**

- **Date project ends:** **December 2017**

- **Donor: country and budget US$**

- **Evaluation Manager:** **Esteban Tromel**

- **Key Words:** **Disability**

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

Contents

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the time taken by all evaluation participants to talk to me in-person or via Skype. I am grateful to all the interviewees for agreeing to participate in the evaluation, and appreciate the flexibility in ensuring availability especially given the time-zone constraints. The participation of ILO staff who gave freely of their time during the workshop sessions in Geneva also ensured productive discussions were held.

I'm also very appreciative of the support of Stefan Tromel and Jurgen Menze in preparing documents for review, making introductions for interviews, and organizing the meetings and workshops in Geneva.

Chris Morris

December 2017

Abbreviations

ACTEMP	Bureau for Employers Activities
ACTRAV	Bureau for Workers Activities
CPO	Country Programme Outcome
DCOMM	Department of Communication
DET	Disability Equality Training
DG	Director General
DfID	Department for International Development
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
EVAL	Evaluation Office
GB	Governing Body
GBDN	Global Business and Disability Network
GED	Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch
DPO	Disabled Persons Organizations
HI	Handicap International
HRD	Human Resources Department
ILO	International Labour Organization
INTSERV	Internal Services and Administration Department
ITC	International Training Centre
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
PARDEV	Partnerships and Field Support Department
P&B	Programme and Budget
PRODOC	Project Document (Proposal)
RELMEETINGS	Official, Meetings, Documentation and Relations Department
SDG	Social Development Goals
UNCRPD	United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNPRPD	United Nations Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Executive Summary

This document reports on the findings of a final internal evaluation of the International Labour Organization's (ILO) Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17. The Disability Strategy was published in 2015 and set out outcomes and activities for ILO during the four-year period. The disability unit within the Gender, Equality and Diversity (GED) Branch in Geneva was responsible for the overall management of the strategy, but the document pertains to the actions of ILO as a whole, and not just one branch. As such the strategy laid out goals for disability action across branches within Geneva and the field, work in partnership with other United Nations (UN) agencies and external stakeholders, and also addressed ILO's internal policies on disability and inclusion.

Methodology and Limitations

The evaluation is an internal thematic final evaluation. Under ILO's Policy Guidelines for Evaluation, internal evaluations 'follow a formalized evaluation process but is managed by project administration'. A thematic evaluation 'provides a means for ILO technical programmes to explore in depth the effectiveness and impact of major means of actions and interventions'.

The evaluation was conducted by an external consultant. An initial desk review of key documents and Skype calls with the disability unit supported the development of the review methodology and interview guides. Skype calls were arranged with key field staff and external stakeholders which supported the development of an initial briefing paper. The briefing paper laid out initial findings and proposed key questions for discussion during the week-long field mission to Geneva. During the mission, a series of bilateral meetings were held with staff from various departments, followed by workshop sessions with a selection of key individuals who have supported the work of the disability unit. The workshops sessions included a WebEx meeting with field based staff, and four face-to-face sessions focused on policy, programme, internal policy, and communications. The workshops involved a brief presentation of initial findings, followed by a group discussion which was guided by pre-agreed questions. A presentation and brief discussion of the findings was also held during the GED staff meeting on the last day of the mission.

Limitations of the evaluation include limited time available to conduct the evaluation, the restricted participation of field staff in the workshops in Geneva, and the lack of a reporting system on the strategy which limits ability to assess whether indicators have been achieved.

Key Findings

The disability unit and GED branch have made some strong steps to advancing disability issues within ILO during the strategy period. Within headquarters in Geneva there has been increased understanding of disability issues among various departments. The Global Business and Disability Network (GBDN) has been strengthened through the involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and Disabled Persons' Organizations (DPOs) working on disability and the setting up of national-level bodies. There has been an improvement in the inclusive environment of ILO's headquarters in Geneva through attention to physical accessibility and better awareness of reasonable accommodation. The disability unit has also engaged with a network of informal champions in different departments.

However, a lot of work remains to be done if ILO is to meet its obligations towards promoting decent work for all workers without discrimination. Disability awareness among staff still remains low, particularly in the field, and disability is not well mainstreamed into ILO's country programmes. In most cases, disability interventions are dependent upon key individuals being interested in disability rather than the issue being institutionalized into ILO's programmes. Support at a senior level at headquarters and the field needs to be given to disability work. In his recent statement to mark the International Day of Persons with Disabilities, the Director General (DG) of ILO said, 'Much has been achieved, but more needs to be done by all to make

the world of work a world in which people with disabilities are truly and equally included.'[1] This is relevant to ILO itself as well as its tripartite constituents and partners.

Key Successes
- Quality of resources developed by the disability unit.
- Responsiveness of disability unit to requests for support.
- Strengthening of the GBDN.
- Continued work on disability in specific countries.
- Inclusion of disability in manuals and checklists.
- Improvement of an inclusive and accessible environment in Geneva.

Key Challenges
- Low level of resources of disability unit: two full-time staff plus one who is mainly seconded to other work in Geneva and very limited number of disability experts in the field.
- Limited mainstreaming of disability, particularly at a field level.
- The disconnect between the fairly good mainstreaming of disability in DWCPs and the very limited inclusion of disability in CPOs.
- A tendency for disability to be overshadowed by gender within the gender equality and non-discrimination cross-cutting policy driver.
- Lack of knowledge of disability issues among ILO staff.
- Reduced funding opportunities for disability interventions.

Opportunities for next strategy
- Identification and engagement of key staff at a field level.
- High-level endorsement of the strategy and ILO's disability work.
- Inclusion of disability as a prohibited ground of discrimination in the recommendations emanating from the gap analysis of existing ILO standards on discrimination in employment and occupation, namely C.111.
- Partnership development with other ILO branches and inclusion of disability in major ILO initiatives such as Future of Work and Women at Work.
- Engagement of donors who have expressed a commitment to disability.
- Partnerships with civil society, particularly disabled persons organizations (DPOs), at the field level.

Relevance
Overall the evaluation judged the Disability Strategy to be aligned with ILO's 2010-15 Strategic Policy Framework. The Strategic Policy Framework emphasises the importance of non-discrimination, with each outcome detailing the work which will be done on the cross-cutting policy driver of gender equality and non-discrimination. The 2010-15 document explicitly references disability in outcomes 2, 4, and 10, and includes references to the most vulnerable workers, which would include persons with disabilities, in outcome 5, and non-discrimination in outcome 17. The Disability Strategy laid out a twin-track approach to disability of both mainstreaming within ILO's programmes and disability specific actions. This approach is relevant to the 2010-15 Strategic Policy Framework and the 2016-17 transition period, and remains relevant in the 2018-21 Strategic Framework and the P&B Outcomes, which have been consolidated into 10 outcomes. The Disability Strategy also included the strengthening of technical capacities within ILO through training and support, which aligns with ILO's goal of significantly reinforcing its technical capacities.

---

[1] http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/ilo-director-general/statements-and-speeches/WCMS_608271/lang--en/index.htm

Disability is also relevant to ILO's mission and strategic objectives. ILO is founded on the principle of social justice and promotes decent work for all without discrimination. Ensuring persons with disabilities have access to dignified, fair and productive work opportunities is crucial to achieving this goal. ILO's normative framework through Conventions 111 and 159, as well as Recommendation 168, and its support for the UNCRPD strengthens this commitment. ILO therefore has a duty to ensure the inclusion of disability within its work, and in this regard the Disability Strategy is relevant to achieving this.

The relevance of the Disability Strategy to staff working on disability issues within ILO was more mixed. Some regularly used the document to guide their work, demonstrate to constituents ILO's commitment to disability, and to persuade their colleagues of the need to consider disability in their work. Other staff were aware of it as a framework but stated it did not impact their day to day work, and some staff admitted they were not aware the strategy existed before being asked to participate in the evaluation, including some staff who implement or support disability programs in the field.

Validity of Design

The twin-track approach within the Disability Strategy was important in ensuring the validity of design. This allowed the disability unit to access relevant opportunities and target resources where they would be most effective. The inclusion of internal practices in the strategy was also important as ILO needed to focus on creating an inclusive environment within its own offices to support the advocacy of the importance of disability to their tripartite constituents.

In reality there has been more focus on disability-specific actions rather mainstreaming, particularly in the field. One of the challenges ILO faces is the limited awareness of disability issues among many staff. This is less of a problem in Geneva where the disability unit has more regular contact with key staff members in different branches.

Most of the indicative activities included in the action plan of the strategy remain relevant, and of those that have not been achieved, many should be priority areas for the next strategy, particularly those related to field activities. However, some of the indicators and indicative activities included in the action plan were ambitious and hard to achieve, particularly given the resources available, and changes with ILO, meant some indicators were no longer relevant. At the time of design, the disability unit was better resourced because of a large multi-country technical cooperation project. This was surprisingly not renewed, which stretched the resources of the unit quite thin and as such not all of the results have been achieved. Some of the indicators were also difficult to measure and in some cases hard to attribute causality to. There is not a monitoring and reporting process for the Disability Strategy which has reduced the effectiveness of results measurement.

The Disability Strategy also is limited in setting out accountability for results. Although GED is identified as having primarily responsibility for implementation, the action plan requires commitments from branches and offices throughout ILO, both headquarters and the field. It is not clear who is held accountable for ensuring the delivery of results.

Effectiveness

Overall the evaluation judged that ILO has been relatively effective at achieving the expected results of the strategy at headquarters but at a field level success very much varies from country to country and between regions. As the Disability Strategy was quite ambitious in design not all of the indicators have been achieved or activities completed, and this is particularly the case at the field level.

The Disability Strategy set out 6 results and one cross-cutting theme of communication:

1. Enhanced promotion of international standards relevant to persons with disabilities;
2. Disability perspective reflected in all programming and reporting;

3. Increased attention to people with disabilities in ILO's work with constituents and in its technical cooperation;
4. Disability-inclusive ILO internal practices promoted;
5. Strengthened knowledge base;
6. Strengthened strategic cooperation within the UN system.

There have been notable achievements within each result. The establishment of national business and disability networks modelled on the GBDN and the development of the GBDN charter, the engagement of particular branches of ILO including ACT/EMP and more recently ACTRAV, the strengthening of an accessible and inclusive environment in Geneva, the development of disability resources, the continued interaction with other UN agencies and involvement in UNPRPD projects, and work on disability specific initiatives in certain countries were all achievements during this strategy period.

The mainstreaming of disability at the field level is limited. Interview participants believed that many of the colleagues had limited awareness of disability issues and generally disability would not be included in project proposals unless there was a specific indication of funds being available or a requirement to include disability. Countries are required to report on the cross-cutting policy driver of gender equality and non-discrimination, and it was reported by interview participants that disability is often not addressed in the reporting.

Mainstreaming within headquarters is stronger. The disability unit have engaged a number of departments and produced joint policy papers and reports with a strong focus on disability. This includes work with the Social Protection Department, the Statistics Department, ACT/EMP, and ACTRAV. Disability is also more mainstreamed into internal policies within Geneva. Interns are required to participate in a DET session, the renovations have made the office physically more accessible, and more attention is paid to the needs of persons with disabilities attending external meetings organized by ILO.

Efficiency

The disability unit has operated on limited human and financial resources. Two permanent staff members have been assigned to the unit. A third has conducted some work on disability but has been mainly seconded to other work for the majority of the strategy period. The vast majority of field and headquarter staff interviewed for the evaluation were keen to stress their appreciation for the speed of response to requests for support from the disability unit and believed the disability unit had been strategic in how they had targeted their resources. That said, most evaluation participants, particularly those in the field stated the need for more support.

This demonstrates the challenge the disability unit will face in the next strategy period and highlights the importance of mobilizing more support and knowledge at a field level. The Regional Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists could support this as the job descriptions of newly recruited specialists focus more broadly on non-discrimination rather than just gender equality. However, they cannot be expected to absorb all of the work on disability within a region, and so securing the support of field specialists in other teams such as ACTRAV, ACT/EMP, Better Work, FUNDAMENTALS etc. is vitally important for the next strategy.

With this goal in mind, a productive use of resources in the early stages of the next strategy would be to focus on increasing awareness of disability at a field level, and reaching out to more donors who may be able to fund disability work.

Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

There are limited human resources dedicated to disability within ILO. The disability unit consists of three experts, but one has been seconded to working on another subject for most of the strategy period. At the field level, since the incorporation of disability within GED, the gender specialists in the regional offices have

been increasingly expected to include disability in their portfolio. However, many of the specialists were recruited simply as gender specialists and not all have had their job description updated to reflect the change. Many of the specialists estimated they spent 90% of their time on gender and the remaining 10% was dedicated to all other areas of discrimination. Since Irish Aid funding for disability ceased, the presence of experts dedicated just to disability in the field has been limited to a very small number of countries. At the country office level, an ad hoc system of responsibility exists. Most country offices do not have an officer responsible for disability mainstreaming. In countries where disability work is undertaken, the officer in charge of the project de facto assumes this responsibility and is often seen as the 'disability expert' by their colleagues. Disability focal points do not exist unless a country director has taken a particular interest in the subject and informally appointed somebody.

Overall ILO staff generally understood the responsibility for technical support on disability to mainly fall upon the disability unit at headquarters. Most field staff indicated they would ask for support from Geneva rather than field colleagues. Although this does mean the quality of ILO's technical response is more standardized, it does mean resources are stretched very thin. The responsibility for mainstreaming disability should lie within the country offices themselves but this is not currently the case. The lack of accountability mechanisms for disability mainstreaming contributes to this. There is no system which requires countries to report on their progress on disability issues.

For the next strategy period, the increased attention to raising awareness of disability among key regional and country staff should be accompanied by a more defined accountability system and reporting requirements, supported by high level endorsement of the strategy. For increased reporting, a balance should be found which supports the monitoring of the implementation of the strategy and gathering of information about interventions on disability but is not regarded as another burdensome reporting requirement. An annual progress report by the disability unit alongside of improved disaggregation of disability statistics and achievements in existing reports are recommended.

Sustainability

There are mixed results on sustainability. The disability unit has been successful in institutionalizing certain results. In particular, the inclusion of disability in PARDEV and EVAL checklists and manuals and the attention paid to accessibility in Geneva are positive developments. The GBDN appears to be sustainable, and the development of its charter is a notable achievement. It is self-funded, and a number of national business and disability networks have been set up during the strategy period. Additionally, in a small number of countries where ILO has worked extensively on disability, the issue is becoming more institutionalized among constituents, and demand for ILO's programmes on disability is forthcoming from them.

On the other hand, the reliance on key individuals at the field level for disability to be included in ILO interventions, rather than the mainstreaming of disability throughout regional and country offices means that many of the interventions do not demonstrate sustainability. This is demonstrated in some country offices where individuals who worked on disability have left, and the attention the country gives to the work is noticeably reduced.

To build on sustainability in the next period, ILO needs to ensure adequate resources are devoted to disability work and efforts should focus on engaging key individuals at a field level. Ensuring higher-level buy-in from the Governing Body, Director General's (DG) office, and other senior management is also critical to help raise the profile of the subject within ILO.

Recommendations

Recommendations	Addressed to:	Priority and Timeframe	Resource Implications
Increasing awareness			
1. Conduct regional disability training for key individuals. Individuals to consider include Program Officers, Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists, Monitoring and Evaluation Officers, Resource Officers, National Programme Coordinators, and DW teams.	GED, regional and country offices	High Early in the next period	Requires funding
2. Identify entry points for engaging RDs, CDs, the GB, & DG's Office.	GED	High Early in the next period	Staff time and may require funding
3. Regularly engage field staff through systems such as newsletters, disability tips, Skype calls etc. The goal of this is to constantly remind them of ILO's disability work to increase the likelihood of disability being included in projects, programmes and strategies.	GED	Medium Ongoing	Staff time
4. Include disability in various training courses such as Gender and FPRW academies in Turin	GED, FUNDAMENTALS, & International Training Centre (ITC)	Medium Ongoing	Resources required dependent on how much material is needed to be developed
Funding			
5. Coordinate closely with PARDEV and Resource Officers in field offices to identify the most promising donors and where they should be approached (i.e. their headquarters, Geneva, or the field).	GED, Program, Regional Office, & Country Offices	High Early in 2018	Staff time
6. Produce one-two pagers on how to include disability in various key project subjects (TVET, Social Protection, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP, youth, elderly etc.) which can be used by the field to help approach donors.	GED	Medium Ongoing-dependent on priority per topic	Staff time or consultant cost
7. Consider developing a fund from 1% of airline tickets similar to UNICEF's scheme, to allow countries to bid for funds to work on improving accessibility or other cross-cutting policy drivers such as greening of their offices.	ILO	Low As the opportunity arises	Will mean slightly more expensive travel budgets throughout ILO
Policy			
8. Engage with FUNDAMENTALS and NORMES to ensure that disability is favourably considered and given prominence in the recommendations of the detailed gap analysis of existing ILO standards on discrimination in employment and occupation, as requested by the ILC Resolution on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	GED, NORMES and FUNDAMENTALS	High In-line with the timeline for the re-write	Staff time

9.	Consider the feasibility of setting up a trade union network based on a similar model to the GBDN	GED and ACTRAV	Medium Early in the next strategy period	Initial set-up funding and funding for activities required-
10.	Include indicators in the next strategy on engagement of DPOs at the national and international level. This should not just include the GBDN but in other aspects of ILO's work, such as with trade unions	GED, field teams and relevant branches	Medium As the next strategy is developed	Staff time

11.	Ensure a stronger accountability mechanism in next strategy. This would include ensuring branches and departments agree on indicators under their responsibility and for shared indicators, a lead department/branch is appointed. ILO should continue to engage in the development of a UN wide disability SWAP as this provide a structure within which ILO is held externally accountability for its actions.	GED and other affected branches and departments	High As the next strategy is developed	Staff time
12.	Develop a reporting system for the disability strategy itself. Consider an annual progress report by the disability unit, supported by improved disaggregation of disability statistics and targeted activities in ILO's existing reporting systems	GED	High As the next strategy is developed	Staff time
13.	Develop sections on disability within ILO's evaluation guidance note (particular guidance notes 6 & 12)	GED and EVAL	Medium Before note 12 is finalized	Staff time
14.	Ensure disability is included as a marker/search criteria in ILO's external dashboards such as the Development Cooperation Dashboard and internal databases such as IRIS	PARDEV and EVAL, and other relevant branches	Medium Ongoing	Staff time

Internal Policies

15.	Develop an accessibility checklist which can be used by field offices.	GED and INTSERV	Medium Early in the next strategy period	Staff time or consultant cost
16.	Ensure key field based staff responsible for HR are trained on reasonable accommodation at interviews, accessibility and disability awareness.	GED and HRD	High Ongoing	Funding required-Utilize other planned training where possible

Communications

17.	Require new ILO websites to be accessible and compliant with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0	INFOTEC	Medium	Not clear what resources would be needed
18.	Work with DCOMM and other departments to ensure persons with disabilities are affirmed as key value of ILO and included in ILO's communication. Developing recommendations on how to communicate disability issues in various languages would support this effort.	GED, DCOMM and other relevant departments	Medium Ongoing	Staff time

1. Background

1.1 Background to the Disability Strategy

ILO has a long-standing commitment to promoting social justice for persons with disabilities. The development and ratification of the ILO Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159) and the Code of Practice on Managing Disability in the Workplace of 2001 are two early successes which have guided ILO's work on disability. More recently, ILO has been a strong proponent of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD). ILO has supported countries to implement a more rights based approach to disability, particularly with regard to social protection and fundamental rights and principles at work.

ILO's Governing Body endorsed ILO's work to promote disability inclusion through GB.316/POL/2. This led to the development of the disability strategy 2014-17. It was developed to take account of the views of Geneva and field based staff, and various evaluation reports and a disability inclusion survey.

The strategy lays out six results, with an additional cross-cutting communication element:

1. Enhanced promotion of international standards relevant to persons with disabilities;
2. Disability perspective reflected in all programming and reporting;
3. Increased attention to people with disabilities in ILO's work with constituents and in its technical cooperation;
4. Disability-inclusive ILO internal practices promoted;
5. Strengthened knowledge base;
6. Strengthened strategic cooperation within the UN system.

The strategy contained an action plan for each result which included indicators, targets, indicative activities, and key partners for each result. Each result had between 3-10 activities identified.

Prior to writing the strategy, disability was moved from the SKILLS branch to the Gender, Equality, and Diversity Branch. Disability is currently part of the cross-cutting policy driver of gender equality and non-discrimination, which is one of four cross-cutting policy drivers included in the 2018-21 Strategic Plan[2] approved by the Governing Body.

The disability work of GED is currently led by two staff members in Geneva, a Senior Disability Specialist and a Disability Inclusion Officer. A Disability Expert is also housed within GED but has been seconded to other work for much of the strategy period. In the field, responsibility for disability lies with the Regional Gender Specialists who are responsible for gender equality and non-discrimination.

At the time of development of the strategy, ILO was implementing the third stage of a multi-country disability focused project funded by Irish Aid. This had been implemented for over a decade and successive phases had received positive evaluations. However, a change in strategic priorities for Irish Aid led to the project not being renewed for a fourth phase. Since then for the rest of implementation stage of this strategy, ILO has not had a large multi-country disability project. Disability work has been implemented through individual projects and some work on mainstreaming at the country level, and the Global Disability and Business Network. The disability unit receives funds through the Regular Budget to fund the operations in headquarters and the support they provide to the field, as well as Extra-Budgetary Technical Cooperation funds from GBDN members for the GBDN secretariat work. However, these funds are very limited. For the

---

[2] Three of the cross-cutting policy drivers, including the one on gender equality and non-discrimination were part of the 2016-17 transition programming framework. A fourth on environmental sustainability was added to the 2018-21 Strategic Plan.

2016-17 P&B biennium, the disability unit received approximately $140,000 (not including the funding for salaries of two Regular Budget staff, of which one is seconded to other work).

1.2 Final Internal Evaluation Methodology

1.2.1 Scope

The evaluation looked at the implementation and results of the 2014-17 Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan. It included work in the field, both in disability specific project and mainstreaming, progress made at HQ among various departments, work with external stakeholders including UN agencies, NGOs and DPOs, and achievements on internal policies related to inclusion and an enabling environment within ILO's offices in HQ and the field.

1.2.2 Purpose

The main purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the performance of the ILO in achieving the six results and cross-cutting policy driver of the strategy. The TOR required the evaluator to analyse how successful ILO had been in achieving the results, identifying unintended results, and key enablers and barriers for achievement, collect good practices and lessons learned, and provide recommendations for the design of the next strategy.

1.2.3 Clients

The main clients of the evaluation are staff of the GED branch, and line managers and staff in HQ and field offices who are ultimately responsible for implementing the disability strategy. Additional stakeholders include UN agencies, DPOs and NGOs who ILO has partnered with during the strategy period.

1.2.4 Methodology

This is an internal evaluation, and thus under ILO's evaluation policy can be overseen by project or department administration. The evaluation consisted of a desk review of key documents and websites and two initial Skype briefings with two members of the disability unit (2 men). 21 Skype interviews and 1 in-person interviews with field based staff (12 women & 10 men) and 3 Skype interviews with external stakeholders (2 women & 1 man) were conducted. During the mission to Geneva, a total of 10 interviews were conducted with 11 ILO staff members (5 women & 6 man). 5 workshops sessions were also held during the mission to Geneva. One was conducted by WebEx with 3 field based staff (2 women & 1 man). Four in-person sessions were conducted with 14 ILO staff and were separated into sessions on policy (4 woman & 1 man), program (2 women & 1 man), internal policy (3 women & 1 man), and communication staff (2 men). The Senior Disability Expert and the Disability Officer participated in the workshops. At least two persons with disabilities participated in the evaluation.

1.2.5 Evaluation Questions

The criteria for the evaluation were relevance, validity of design, effectiveness, efficiency, effectiveness of management arrangements, and sustainability.

The evaluation questions were:

Relevance:

Assessment Criteria	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	• To what extent is ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 aligned with the Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 and 2016-17, in particular the link with the cross-cutting policy driver on gender equality and non-discrimination?

	• What is the potential impact of the ILO programmatic framework for 2018-21?
Validity of design	• Were the intended results of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 logical and realistic? • How appropriate and useful are the ILO Disability Inclusion Action Plan 2014-17 indicators for (i) enabling institutional mechanisms for disability inclusion in the Office (both HQ and at field offices), and (ii) disability-related programmatic outcomes? Have they effectively measured results and progress?
Effectiveness	• What results have been achieved and/or what progress has been made with the implementation of ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17? • Which gaps remain and how could these be addressed in the next Strategy and Action Plan? • To what extent has the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 been an effective instrument to help ensure mainstreaming disability across the ILO? • How well has gender equality and multiple discrimination been included in the implementation of the plan?
Efficiency	• Are resources for disability mainstreaming being used in the most efficient manner? How economically are resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) converted to results? Do the results justify the cost? • What time and cost efficiency measures could be introduced in the future without impacting negatively on the achievement of results?
Effectiveness of management arrangements	• Are the roles and responsibilities of ILO officials (in HQ and field offices), including management, who are responsible for the implementation of disability mainstreaming, clearly defined and understood? • Is the current arrangement for implementing ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 effective? • Are there any changes recommended for the new strategy?
Sustainability	• Are the results achieved in 2014-17 likely to be sustainable? • What elements need to be taken into account to ensure sustainability of outcomes in the new Action Plan?

1.2.6 Limitations

Time and resources available to conduct the evaluation is one limitation. Disability activity has been conducted in a wide-range of countries, and the evaluation budget did not allow for visits to any of these. Information from the field is mainly based on self-reporting of work to the evaluator by individuals interested in the topic in various regions. The evaluator was also not able to speak to individuals in offices not working on disability to investigate why this was the case, and so relied on the opinions of those involved in disability work as to why their colleagues were not addressing this subject in their work. To mitigate this concern, the evaluator spoke to a wide-range of individuals with differing responsibilities, as well as external

stakeholders and consultants who have worked with ILO. As such the interviews provided a broad amount of data from different sources.

Linked to time and resources was the problem of engaging field staff in the workshop discussions in Geneva. Budget was not available for field staff to travel to Geneva. Attempts were made to include field staff via a WebEx meeting, but because of time constraints, only 3 field staff were able to participate. As the majority of bilateral interviews were with field staff, this concern is also mitigated to an extent. This problem can be further mitigated by ensuring the inclusion of field staff in the development of the next strategy, and sharing and inviting discussion on the findings of the evaluation.

A third limitation comes from the lack of a reporting system on the disability strategy which means monitoring data is not available for some indicators, thus limiting the assessment of achievement against planned outcomes.

2. Key Successes and Challenges of the Disability Strategy

Key Successes

- Quality of resources developed by the disability unit.

A substantial number of tools and resources have been produced including a guide to promoting diversity by making reasonable adjustments in the workplace, various documents and guides making the business case for employing persons with disabilities, a manual on reporting guidelines for the media, and guides for including disability issues in legislation. The disability unit has also contributed to disability focused sections to mainstream publications such as the World Social Protection Report 2017-19, several Thematic Plans of the Global Initiative for Decent Jobs for Youth, and the ILO Toolkit for Quality Apprenticeships.

- Responsiveness of disability unit to requests for support.

There was near universal praise for the quality of support provided by the disability unit, with the caveat that much more would be welcomed if resources allowed. Evaluation participants highlighted the responsive of the disability unit to requests for technical support and the quality of resources produced.

- Strengthening of the Global Business and Disability Network (GBDN).

The GBDN was initiated by ILO in 2010. At a global level, its members mainly consist of large multi-national companies, but is also supported by NGOs and DPOs, academia, and national employers' organizations. During the period the GBDN charter was developed which sets out 10 principles and is signed by members[3]. The network has been replicated at a national level in several countries such as Indonesia, Bangladesh, Zambia, Ethiopia, and Egypt. In most cases this has grown out of work ILO has been doing on disability, particularly through the Irish Aid-funded PROPEL programme or ACT/EMP's work, and supported by the disability unit. The GBDN self-funds its activities through membership fees.

- Continued work on disability in specific countries and participation in UNPRPD projects.

Although patchy, there are notable countries which continue to do considerable work on disability. Much of this is linked to countries which had specific disability projects and have retained staff who are interested in the work. These include the countries involved in PROPEL such as Ethiopia, Zambia, and Indonesia. Other countries which had other projects such as Bangladesh which started work on inclusive TVET support in 2012 and worked on skills training prior to that, also have continued to work on disability. The Latin American

---

[3] http://www.businessanddisability.org/index.php/en/about-the-network/charter

region is also an example of reasonably substantial work on disability, most notably through ACT/EMP and national business and disability networks.

Although the number of UNPRPD projects ILO is involved in has reduced most recently, ILO has continued to play an active role in a number of projects at country level. The challenge for ILO in the coming years is how they can remain an active and relevant member of this work, particularly in countries where their presence is low, and there is the risk of being crowded out by the bigger agencies, most notably UNDP.

- Inclusion of disability in manuals and checklists.

One concern raised by evaluation participants was disability is often only raised in documents within gender equality and non-discrimination, so the inclusion of disability specifically in PARDEV and EVAL manuals is an important step in ensuring disability is given due consideration in project design and evaluations.

- Improvement of an inclusive and accessible environment in Geneva.

During the period, the disability unit has worked closely with the INTSERV, RELMEETINGS, and PRODOC to improve the accessibility and inclusiveness of the ILO headquarters in Geneva. This includes the purchase of evacuation chairs, increased attention to accessibility and specific needs for persons with disabilities at meetings, the purchase of a braille printer, ensuring some new ILO publications are accessible, and the development and practicing of plans for addressing disability needs during emergencies such as fires. The challenge for ILO in the next strategy period is to extend this approach to field offices, where physical accessibility is still an issue in many offices.

Key Challenges

- Limited resources of disability unit.

The disability unit has two full-time staff plus one who is mainly seconded to other work in Geneva and no disability experts in the field. The Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists are tasked with the role of supporting disability in the field, but they are covering a lot of different issues and most were recruited as gender specialists only. The budget of the disability unit is also quite small which reduces their ability to visit field sites and engage with key staff at a regional and field level.

- Limited mainstreaming of disability, particularly at a field level.

Feedback from the field suggested that ILO was quite successful in addressing disability in country offices which either had a history of disability projects, or individuals who were interested in the topic. However, it was felt the work was not mainstreamed into other work in most country offices. Reasons suggested for this included a lack of resources, a lack of awareness among colleagues on how to work on disability, and a lack of interest or seeing of disability as a priority. The absorption of disability into gender equality and non-discrimination was also viewed by many staff as having reduced the work on disability in some country offices as there was a tendency to view non-discrimination mainly through a gender lens. This opinion was not universal though as some ILO staff saw the reduction of work in country offices as being more directly linked to the loss of Irish Aid funding.

- Limited inclusion of disability in CPOs and the tendency for disability to be overshadowed by gender within the gender equality and non-discrimination cross-cutting policy driver.

The number of CPOs which specifically reference disability is quite small, and the current reporting system makes it difficult for the disability unit to follow up on the CPOs. Most of the CPOs with a disability reference were developed either during the PROPEL project or in the San Jose sub-regional office when a disability expert was working there. There is no longer a disability specific indicator within the P&B Outcomes, and

instead disability is included as part of the cross-cutting policy driver on gender equality and non-discrimination. Staff reported that many country offices report on their actions on gender but not the other forms of non-discrimination, and as a result attention to disability is often lost.

- Lack of knowledge of disability among ILO staff.

Linked to the issue of mainstreaming is the lack of knowledge on disability among many staff. The strategy laid out the goal of conducting DET training to field staff. However, this has not happened. Although there is an online course, which individuals who have taken it praise highly, it is not widely used by ILO field staff. Disability is viewed as an add-on to existing work, rather than an essential part of meeting ILO's core values and mandate.

- Reliance on key individuals.

The problems of mainstreaming, a lack of knowledge of disability among staff, and the disability not being considered a priority to include in CPOs and country office work, creates the problem where disability work in ILO is reliant on key individuals. In many countries work on disability is undertaken because of one or two individuals have an interest in the topic. There are examples of countries where considerable work has been undertaken by the country office, but this has ceased once the individual who was particularly interested in the topic has left ILO.

- Lack of funding for disability work

A commonly cited concern from the field staff was the lack of funding for disability initiatives. Many believed the lack of funding reduced the likelihood of disability being included in a country's CPOs, which then made it less likely the office would look for funding for disability work, thus creating a cycle of inaction. This issue is though exacerbated by a lack of awareness among staff of how to include disability into project designs. It was reported that too often disability is seen as an additional burden rather than recognized as an integral part of decent work or an understanding that there are many avenues available for inclusion in a project. An example from Bangladesh demonstrates how donors often see disability work as an important component of a project which strengthens the quality of a proposal, and how the inclusion of disability focused activities can ensure the successful obtaining of funding. ILO had worked on a technical and vocational education and training (TVET) project. In designing the second phase of the project, ILO did not originally include disability significantly in the logframe. The donor, aware of ILO's work on disability in previous projects requested more activities focused on persons with disabilities to strengthen the quality of the proposal.

3. Evaluation Findings and Discussion Results

3.1 Relevance

- To what extent is ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 aligned with the Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 and 2016-17, in particular the link with the cross-cutting policy driver on gender and non-discrimination?
- What is the potential impact of the ILO programmatic framework for 2018-21?

Overall the evaluation judged the Disability Strategy to be aligned with the Strategic Policy Framework and the cross-cutting driver. The Disability Strategy was designed and finalized during the period of the 2010-2015 ILO Strategy Policy Framework. At the time, this laid out 19 outcomes, which formed the outcomes in the biennial P&B biennium outcomes. ILO has since consolidated the outcomes into 10 outcomes. A continuation of the 2010-15 strategy was approved by the Governing Body for 2016-17, and a new strategy has been developed for 2018-21.

The period has also seen attention given to a series of initiatives both at ILO and throughout the UN system. In particular, ILO has launched its five flagship programs which incorporated many technical assistance projects into the five main themes[4]. The flagship programs are Better Work, Social Protection Floors for All, IPEC+, the Global Action for Prevention on Occupational Safety and Health (GAP-OSH programme), and Jobs for Peace and Resilience. In 2013, the Director General also launched the Centenary Initiatives, as a vehicle for ILO to prepare itself for the future challenges of its social justice mandate as it enters its second century in 2019[5]. The seven initiatives are the future or work initiative, the end of poverty initiative, the women at work initiative, the green initiative, the standards initiative, the enterprises initiative, and the governance initiative.

This period also saw the launch of the Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which contain a number of reference to disability. Goal 8 which aims to "promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all" is particularly relevant to ILO and also includes a reference to persons with disabilities. The UNPRPD has also been a major initiative running during this period.

The 2010-15 Strategy Policy Framework emphasised the importance of gender equality and non-discrimination, with each outcome detailing the work which will be done on this cross-cutting policy driver. Explicit reference to persons with disabilities was made in outcomes 2, 4, and 10. Outcome 5 also highlighted improvements in working conditions for the most vulnerable workers and outcome 17 focused on non-discrimination. In this regard, the Disability Strategy directly aligned with the Strategy Policy Framework as it laid out approaches to mainstream disability within ILO's work and supported directly targeted projects.

The Disability Strategy also aligned with the Strategy Policy Framework in other regards. The third pillar of the framework is the strengthening of technical capacities. The Disability Strategy aligned with this through seeking to strengthen the knowledge base through training, improvement in statistical knowledge, and the dissemination of resources. This pillar also focused on improving partnership and communication with other UN agencies which was addressed in outcome 6 of the disability and inclusion strategy. Additionally, outcome 3 of the disability and inclusion strategy focused on building the capacity of tripartite constituents, which was another key goal of the third pillar of the framework.

The number of outcomes in the P&B proposals for 2016-17 were reduced from 19 to 10, and this was continued in the 2018-19 proposals, and reflected in the proposed 2018-21 Strategic Plan. The P&B proposals and the Strategic Plan include significant references to the SDGs and Agenda 2030, and ILOs role in support their achievement. Significant indicators are included in an annex to the P&B proposals which include references to disability in SDGs 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, & 10.

The Strategic Plan lays out the goal of ILO to have 'reinforced significantly its capacities to deliver quality services to its constituents and member States to realize social justice', 'increased significantly its capacity to reach out to, and address the needs of, those most vulnerable and disadvantaged in the world of work, including those in poverty and those affected by situations of conflict and fragility, and by egregious violations of fundamental rights and freedoms', 'sustained and reinforced its normative function through a robust and relevant body of international labour standards', and 'strengthened significantly its role as a knowledge leader' (pages 6 and 7). All of these are relevant for the development of the next Disability Strategy.

The definitions of marker codes for the cross-cutting policy drivers have just been released. Country offices must self-assess themselves against drivers, giving one of 4 results. 0 is no visible potential to contribute to

[4] http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/WCMS_464271/lang--en/index.htm
[5] http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/history/centenary/lang--en/index.htm

the CCPD, 1 is limited contribution, 2A is significant contribution, and 2B is targeted action. Disability is once again included within the gender equality and non-discrimination marker, and examples are given of how disability could contribute to the assigning of a particular score. Concerns over how country offices are self-reporting on disability within this marker are addressed in the effectiveness section. However, the current strategy is relevant to the stated ILO's P&B Outcomes and cross-cutting policy drivers, and entering the next biennium, ILO continues to need a disability strategy to meet the commitments on disability made in official documents.

Relevance of disability within ILO's guiding mission and conventions

In addition to asking whether the Disability Strategy is relevant to ILO's Strategic Policy Framework, it is also important to review how ILO's mission and strategic objectives are relevant to disability work, and understand the commitments ILO has made on disability.

ILO's website and publications lay out the mission of ILO. "The International Labour Organization (ILO) is devoted to promoting social justice and internationally recognized human and labour rights, pursuing its founding mission that social justice is essential to universal and lasting peace."[6] The Decent Work Agenda "helps advance the economic and working conditions that give all workers, employers and governments a stake in lasting peace, prosperity and progress"[7] Promoting decent work includes guaranteeing rights at work which includes " obtaining recognition and respect for the rights of workers. All workers, and in particular disadvantaged or poor workers, need representation, participation and laws that protect their rights."

ILO also has many conventions, declarations, and guidelines, which guide its work on disability. The Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and Its Follow-Up (1998) lays out one of the fundamental rights at work as being "the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation"[8]. ILO Convention 159-Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention 1983, Recommendation 168, and Convention 111-Discrimination (Employment and Occupation), along with the ILO code of practice: Managing disability in the work place[9], provide a normative framework for ILO's disability work, and the UNCPRPD provides a more up-to-date framework for a rights based and social model approach to disability. The SDGs, which ILO has committed to supporting through Agenda 2030, also have numerous targets and indicators related to disability.

These statements, conventions, and frameworks are relevant to evaluating ILO's work, and provide important reference points for developing a future strategy, because they demonstrate the obligation ILO has to work on disability and the commitments it has made. As the leading UN agency promoting non-discrimination within the world of work, the statements and commitments on disability need to be operationalized in the field and resourced sufficiently if the ILO is to live up to mission.

---

[6] Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/mission-and-objectives/lang--en/index.htm, December 6, 2017

[7] Ibid

[8] http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_467653.pdf

[9] http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/disability-and-work/lang--en/index.htm

3.2 Validity of Design

- Were the intended results of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 logical and realistic?
- How appropriate and useful are the ILO Disability Inclusion Action Plan 2014-17 indicators for (i) enabling institutional mechanisms for disability inclusion in the Office (both HQ and at field offices), and (ii) disability-related programmatic outcomes? Have they effectively measured results and progress?

The Disability Strategy was designed during a time of change in ILO. Disability work had recently moved into GED, and the ILO and Programme and Budget Outcomes were consolidated from 19 to 10 outcomes in the 2016-17 biennium. Additionally, areas of critical importance were removed, and more emphasis placed on the Centenary Initiatives and the Flagship Programmes. With this in mind, some specific areas of the Disability Strategy would become less relevant or need adapting. Overall though, the ideas behind the Disability Strategy remained valid, even if the structure changed.

The overall results of the Disability Strategy were logical in addressing the key areas of work. However, some of the expectations of the Disability Strategy were ambitious given the limited resources available to the disability unit, an issue which was compounded by the loss of Irish Aid funding at the end of 2015.

As noted, the results have probably been more effectively implemented in headquarters than the field. A key recommendation for the next strategy is likely to be to focus more on field activities, and it could be argued a result particularly focused on field activities might have enhanced some of the field work.

Monitoring Progress

There is currently only a limited system for the field to report on their work on disability. Regional offices and country offices are required to self-assess the implementation of their CPOs on the cross-cutting policy driver of gender equality and non-discrimination. Feedback from staff is that in many cases this tends to be an assessment of the work the offices are doing on gender. Some responses address disability, but even this is often more on a project-based approach than from a mainstreaming approach.

There is also not a reporting structure for the disability unit to report on progress on the strategy. The disability unit has managed to track progress and develop informal documents for the evaluator for this evaluation, but this is not a structured system.

It could have been helpful to conduct a mid-term evaluation (or at least a review) of the strategy which would have allowed for the recognition of what was successful and what wasn't working, and focusing of priorities for the second half of the strategy period.

Accountability

One of the limitations of the Disability Strategy is that there is not a strong accountability mechanism behind it. The Disability Strategy does include indicators and indicative activities, and conducting a final evaluation does provide some measure of accountability. However, the Disability Strategy does not lay out responsibilities for implementing the activities and achieving the results. As noted the staff resources of the disability unit are very limited and so to achieve the results, the responsibilities need to be shared, but who is responsible is not clear. For example, one of the indicators is an increase in the number of ILO general technical cooperation projects and programmes that explicitly target persons with disabilities from a baseline of 20 to 35 in 2016-17. One of the indicative activities related to this is the 'sensitization and

capacity building provided *on request* to TC programme and project staff' (p.15, emphasis added). It is not clear who has the responsibility for increasing the number of TC projects explicitly targeting persons with disabilities. The disability unit will provide support on request, so it is the responsibility of the Regional Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists, the experts from different branches, the country offices, or the disability unit to increase the number of projects?

The section on implementing the strategy on page 10 does set out that GED will be responsible for promoting and monitoring the implementation of the Disability Strategy, that collaboration is proposed particularly with the existing network of regional gender specialists and the actual implementation will require the commitment of all ILO headquarters departments as well as field offices. However, the only section of the action plan which sets out responsibilities more clearly is result 4 on internal practices, where the branches responsible for taking the actions are listed.

The lack of a monitoring and reporting system also reduces accountability as there is not a formal system for tracking implementation of indicators and following up with those responsible for implementing certain actions. It is difficult to analyse the success of implementing some of the indicators because data on the indicators is not stored.

In the new strategy it is recommended to be clearer on responsibilities where possible for particular actions and develop a reporting system which allows monitoring of implementation. The new strategy should be a statement of ILO's general commitment to this topic, and as a cross-cutting policy driver, there should be a broad responsibility for implementation. It should not just be the responsibility of the small disability unit to implement. A mechanism which ensures accountability of high level management will help ensure the next strategy meets its targets. Research into the gender SWAP shows that 'UN entities with gender policies/plans and a mechanism in place to ensure accountability of senior managers are, on average, 9 more times likely to exceed requirements for UN SWAP indicators than those without them'[10]. It is reasonable to assume the same should be true for disability work.

3.3 Effectiveness

- What results have been achieved and/or what progress has been made with the implementation of ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17?
- Which gaps remain and how could these be addressed in the next Strategy and Action Plan?
- To what extent has the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 been an effective instrument to help ensure mainstreaming disability across the ILO?
- How well has gender equality and multiple discrimination been included in the implementation of the Plan?

The strategy laid out 6 results with a cross-cutting theme of communication. An action plan included indicators and indicative activities. Review of the work conducted during the strategy found some but not all the indicative activities have been achieved, and in certain results, there has been stronger achievements at HQ level than at the field level.

One of the challenges of evaluating the achievements is the lack of monitoring data. The action plan contained a series of indicators to monitor progress but there is often no clear way to measure these indicators, particularly given the limited resources available. The indicator on the number of projects

---

[10] Taken from Powerpoint '2016 UN-SWAP Reporting results, key drivers and lessons learnt' presented by UN Women

explicitly targeting disability is an example of this. The disability unit is aware of projects where support has been requested from them. This is not the case for all projects, and the unit does not have the resources to go through all of the 674 active projects. PARDEV has a technical cooperation dashboard which allows for search filters[11]. Using a filter for 2016-17, and 'disab' returns 30 matched projects, of which 5 are the Irish Aid PROPEL project which ended in early 2016. The search for a particular word will pick up if disability is in the title of the executive summary. The function would allow the disability unit to request more details on any project which mentions disability in the executive summary to address whether it is explicitly paying attention to disability and suggest support if necessary. However, disability can be explicitly targeted in a project but not show up using the search function. One of the projects included in the sample analyzed by the evaluator included substantive references to disability and included disability in the log-frame, but does not appear when using the above criteria in the dashboard.

The table below lists the information available on the indicators set out in the action plan. It is not an exhaustive list of achievements as monitoring information is not available for all activities. Notes have been added to provide clarification on certain indicators. Overall the results in the table show there has been considerable achievement in certain areas, but that the overall action plan was too ambitious given the resources available, and the lack of a monitoring and accountability system makes it difficult to fully track progress.

---

[11] http://www.ilo.org/DevelopmentCooperationDashboard/#bt3v8v8

Indicator and Baseline	14-15 Target	14-15 Actual	16-17 Target	16-17 Actual	Notes
Result 1					
Number of references in ILO CEACR reports to persons with disabilities or disability as a prohibited ground of discrimination (2013: 54)	70	67	90	60	For all indicators, it should be noted full statistics for 2017 may not be available yet.
Number of CRPD Committee recommendations focusing on training, employment and social protection of persons with disabilities that are in line with recommendations of the ILO supervisory mechanism (2013: 4)	18	27	20	41	
Result 2					
Number of references to disability in the outcome areas, cross-cutting themes and governance outcomes of the transitional strategic framework 2016-17. (Explicit disability indicator falls under Outcome 2"skills development" in 2010-15 SPF)	1 outcome 1 cross-cutting policy driver		Part of cross-cutting driver. No indicator		
% of reports to the GB and ILC that effectively reflect disabilities issues (2013: 31)	40	52	50	41	
% of DWCPs that explicitly mention persons with disabilities in priority or outcome statements. (48% of 61 draft or final DWCPs in April 2012)	60		75	58	The percentage of DWCPs including persons with disabilities was not calculated in 2014-15
% of 2014-15 CPOs explicitly mentioning disability issues (2012-13: 3.6)	5	0.7	8	0.65	Method for calculating the baseline is not clear
Result 3					
Number of governments introducing legal and policy changes to support disability inclusion with ILO support (2012-13: 3)	5		8		No figures available
Number of ILO general technical cooperation projects and programmes that explicitly target persons with disabilities (2013: 20)	25		35		No figures available
Number and type of initiatives undertaken with workers' organizations (None)	5		15	4	There has not been monitoring of activities at the field level
Number of ILO GBDN meetings and awareness raising trainings held for active and potential company members, and employers' organizations (2012-13: 5)	17	5	19	15	No annual report was produced in 2015 so figures for 2014-15 are not complete.

Number of active company GBDN members (2013: 23)	25	15	40	30	
Result 4					
Number of measures improving implementation of the ILO Policy on the Employment of Persons with Disabilities (No baseline)	2	3	6	5	No figures available
ILO HQ building renovation complies with accessibility standards (No baseline)			South part accessible	Yes	
Number / % of internal reports and external publications and reports that meet accessibility standards. (None)	5 GED & GBDN pubs		100% of GED + GBDN pubs		No figures available
% of content on ILO information websites that complies with the World Wide Web Consortium standards level A (No baseline)	50		70		No figures available
Results 5					
Number of active users of ILO Knowledge Sharing Platform (PLONE) on disability inclusion (2013: 145)	250		400	320	
Number of new publications and tools focused on persons with disabilities or including adequate attention to persons with disabilities (2013: 11)	14	10	18	7	
Results 6					
% of UNPRPD-funded projects at country level and globally that involve ILO field offices or HQ. (2012-13: 64)	40	63	50	30	
Number of post-2015 development targets or indicators that include reference to persons with disabilities in areas related to the ILO mandate. (None)	2	Disability is referenced in 3 SGD outcomes			
Communication					
% of ILO staff taking ILO on-line course on persons with disabilities. (None)	5		15	4.2	The course was launched in 2016.
Number of disability champions in HQ and field offices (None)	30		50		There is not a formal system for identifying disability champions
Number of visitors to and downloads from ILO disability inclusion website (2013: 8,740 visitors; 11,581 downloads)	20,000 vts 20,000 dls	15,589 vts	30,000 vts 30,000 dls	137,507 vts	There is not information available for downloads.
Number of reports on disability issues and ILO disability activities on ILO general websites and social media channels. (2013: 39)	50		70		No figures available

1. Enhanced promotion of international standards relevant to persons with disabilities;

Based on the indicators in the action plan, ILO has underachieved on the number of references in CEACR reports and overachieved on number of CRPD recommendations, although the period is not yet completed so there may be more references by the end of the year. The indicative activities which have been achieved are the development of a publication on reasonable accommodation and the (almost final) publication to promote coherence between UNCRPD and the CEACR work related to ILO Conventions No.111 and No.159. This guide will help strengthen understanding of the links between ILO Conventions and UNCRPD.

Work on mainstreaming international labour standards activities to include persons with disabilities and the assessment of the impact of relevant ILO standards for promoting the rights of persons with disabilities has been less successful. One of the challenges ILO faces is aligning use of C.159 with the UNCRPD, and ensuring that the two conventions, which were written 30 years apart can both provide utility in ILO's work. The adoption of the UNCRPD more than 30 years after C159 has brought latest development on disability rights also into the international labour standards system, reflected by increased references to the UNCRPD in State Reports to ILO and CEACR comments on the reports. During the policy workshop, it was shared that there is progress towards working on updating C.111 on non-discrimination and it was felt ensuring disability was one of the main pillars of this would be possible.

2. Disability perspective reflected in all programming and reporting;

The change in number of P&B outcomes and the movement away from areas of critical importance to the flagship programs and centenary initiatives did affect the indicative activities within this result.

In the 2014-15 P&B outcomes, there was an explicit reference to disability within outcome 2. At the time disability was housed in SKILLS and this indicator was part of the skills outcomes. Disability had recently moved into GED when the Disability Strategy was developed. The 2016-17 P&B Outcomes consolidated the outcomes from 19 to 10, and included disability within the cross-cutting policy driver of gender equality and non-discrimination (although the cross-cutting policy driver was in the 2014-15 P&B Outcomes, there is no reference to disability in the text explaining the driver). There is a mixed reaction from both field and HQ staff on the impact this has had on disability work. Most welcomed the move of disability into GED, and felt it was the natural home for it, and many evaluation participants also believed that just having an indicator within one P&B outcome meant that all attention on disability was focused on skills. However, there was concern expressed that disability loses attention within ILO because there is a tendency to focus on gender rather than the other aspects of non-discrimination at the country office level, and without an indicator, disability is less likely to be included in CPOs, and thus less likely to be a focus for resource acquisition. Therefore, although the move into GED was probably the correct one, ILO has not paid enough attention to disability to ensure the benefits of this move are fully felt, and counter the challenges created by the move.

18 countries in Africa, 2 countries in the Americas, 3 in the Arab States, 6 in Asia and the Pacific, and 4 in Europe and Central Asia include references to disability in the DCWP. The translation of references into action through inclusion of disability in projects at the country level has not been assessed. It is not clear how many CPOs refer to disability, although with the consolidation of the number of outcomes, the belief of the disability team is that the number of references, and definitely specific indicators, has reduced, and the references which exist are mainly linked to inclusion during the PROPEL project, and from the period a disability expert was working in the sub-office in San Jose. The disconnect between the relatively good mainstreaming of disability in DCWPs and the very limited inclusion in CPOs is quite stark, and presents a challenge that ILO needs to address in the next strategy period.

ILO has two main reporting processes. Reporting on the implementation of CPOs is required at the end of every biennium. During projects, progress reports are submitted. The frequency of these depends on donor requirements. The CPO reporting system requires self-assessment by the responsible office under each P&B outcome on the cross-cutting policy driver of gender and non-discrimination. Feedback from both field and

headquarters staff is that most of the CPO reports focus on gender when they report on cross-cutting policy drivers, and in fact the quality of reporting on gender itself needs improving. Within the standard progress report template, there is no requirement for the project to report on gender and non-discrimination, and thus it was noted by evaluation participants that progress reports often do not report on what attempts have been made to mainstream gender, disability, or any other type of mainstreaming.

3. Increased attention to people with disabilities in ILO's work with constituents and in its technical cooperation;

Outcome 3 had the highest number of indicative activities in the action plan. The activities related to the headquarters and the GBDN have been mainly achieved, but there has been less success in rolling some of the activities out to the field. The disability unit has been successful in including disability into the PARDEV Development Cooperation Manual, and the updating technical cooperation advice through the PARDEV 'how to' series. Although not explicitly mentioned as an activity, guidance on the need for evaluations to consider how effectively projects have mainstreamed disability is included in the 2017 updated evaluation guidelines.

Continued support to the GBDN has been provided, and is probably one of the most successful elements of the work during the current strategy. Membership fees for the GBDN provide the funds to make the network self-funding. Although the GBDN has not achieved the indicators of number of active members of the GBDN, the Disability Strategy did not include targets for setting up of national business and disability networks, and so purely focusing on the achievement of the stated indicators misses a key achievement. The setting up of national networks which mirror the GBDN has been a noticeable success during the strategy period. National business and disability networks in some countries have been active in providing access to internship and permanent employment opportunities to TVET and university graduates with disabilities. Additionally, changing membership policy to allow for NGO and DPO members who work on disability issues, has strengthened the role of civil society. The disability unit has maintained strong links with ACT/EMP throughout the strategy period. The relationship is strengthened by joint interest in the GBDN.

The disability unit provides regular advice on request on disability inclusion within projects. The PARDEV appraisal checklist contains the questions 'Does the proposal include a strategy to address the situations, needs and concerns of people with disabilities?' and a link to the how-to guidance on the inclusion of persons with disabilities in development cooperation projects. However, the resources of the team mean they respond to requests rather being able to actively work to push the inclusion of persons with disabilities, and the PARDEV appraisal checklist is not compulsory. As such disability related activities may only be included when there is genuine interest already from the country office or proposal designer.

The strategy contained a number of activities related to training and technical knowledge improvement. The achievements of the planned activities have been mixed. The DET training which ILO has deployed effectively in a number of countries, particularly the PROPEL-project countries, also provides an opportunity for ILO's staff to increase their technical knowledge. This opportunity has not been taken up in the field. Feedback from many of the evaluation participants was that it is important to increase training of country office staff. However, to date, interest from field offices for their staff to undertake DET training has been very limited. DET is given to staff in Geneva.

The goal of conducting capacity building courses for constituents has mainly been achieved through the DET courses rather than ITC Turin. There is a willingness at the ITC to develop a course on disability awareness for business managers, but would require resources to develop it. A course will be held next year on disability inclusion in the world of work. Disability issues are only included in a minimal number of courses on other topics, and there is room for more inclusion of disability topics in these courses.

The disability unit has also worked with ACTRAV towards the end of the strategy period on some initiatives which demonstrate the potential for greater engagement in the next strategy period. Work included conducting a survey on trade unions on actions to support the inclusion of persons with disabilities and

publishing a report on the results[12], which was launched at an event timed to coincide with the International Day of Persons with Disabilities 2017. ACTRAV and the disability unit also hosted a conference on decent work for persons with disabilities[13].

4. Disability-inclusive ILO internal practices promoted

This outcome is another area of the strategy where there has been success in Geneva and the next strategy will need to consider how to roll out to the field. INTSERV, RELMEETINGS, and PRODOC have all taken actions to strengthen accessibility and inclusion at Geneva. More consideration is given to the needs of persons with disabilities attending ILO meetings, a braille printer has been purchased, emergency plans are more inclusive, and the building is more accessible. Other initiatives include the requirement for all GED staff and interns to be given DET. About 60 staff have been trained on disabilities issues in a joint initiative with the Human Resources Department (HRD).

This has not been replicated at the field level. Many ILO offices remain inaccessible and although some country offices do pro-actively address these concerns, the feedback of evaluation participants was the majority do not. Lack of interest, awareness, and funds were all cited as reasons. ILO offices which are housed in government buildings also struggle with accessibility issues as it is often not possible to persuade the host government to make necessary adjustments. Ethiopia is one of the notable exceptions to this, where the same officer has worked on disability projects for over a decade, and supported the improvement of accessibility both internally within the UN and in partnership with the government counterpart ministry. Egypt is another exception, where the interest of the Country Director and a staff member has seen considerable work on disability, including a focus on increasing the accessibility of the office, which has led to ILO Egypt winning an award for their efforts.

The 2014-17 strategy was developed using knowledge gained from an ILO staff survey on disability. There was not a management response to this survey, which means it is possible opportunities to address some of the issues raised were lost.

Progress on improving the accessibility of the website is mixed. New pages are often accessible but the bulk of webpages still remain inaccessible. With the resources available, the goal of making 70% of ILO websites accessible was optimistic. For the next strategy period, ILO should consider identifying the pages which receive the most amount of traffic and ensure any which are not yet accessible are upgraded. Any new website commissioned by INFOTEC should be compliant with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 level A or AA. This requirement should be included in any TOR for an external provider developing a new website commissioned by ILO.

5. Strengthened knowledge base;

The work in this outcome is very closely linked to outcome 3 and the cross-cutting communication theme. Evaluation participants indicated that one of the key strengths of the disability unit was the publicizing of resources and publications related to disability. During the strategy period the PLONE was updated regularly, joint publications were undertaken with different departments, disability sections were included in mainstream publications. These publications are referenced in other sections of this report.

6. Strengthened strategic cooperation within the UN system.

The indicative activities in this outcome were drafted in quite an ambitious manner, and given the limited resources of the disability unit, not all have been achieved. ILO has continued to play a role on the UNPRPD policy board and at a country level in UNPRPD projects. The number of countries which have projects

---

[12] http://www.ilo.org/actrav/media-center/news/WCMS_608669/lang--en/index.htm
[13] http://www.ilo.org/actrav/events/WCMS_553261/lang--en/index.htm

involving ILO has reduced though. In 2014/15, ILO received 17% of the funds allocated for the UNPRPD, in 2016-17 this had dropped to 13%. In the first round of projects, ILO was involved in 63% and this dropped to 30% in the second round. While it is a positive success of the period that ILO continues to be involved at a policy and country level, these figures demonstrate the challenge ILO faces in ensuring continued engagement in UNPRPD projects given the smaller field presence ILO has compared to other UN agencies. Some evaluation participants noted that ILO can lose out to the bigger UN agencies, most notably UNDP. Given ILO's comparative advantages of its tripartite model and expertise in labour market issues, consideration of how to ensure continued engagement at a country level in these projects is important for the next strategy.

ILO's disability unit has been approached by UN Volunteers (UNV), the International Organization for Migration, and International Trade Centre (ITC) for advice on their own internal disability policies and practices, which demonstrates there is a strong regard for the expertise within ILO's disability unit in Geneva.

This outcome also included the activity, 'Lead and reinforce UN system wide work on the Employment of People with Disabilities, linked to the post-2015 Development Agenda'. This was an ambitious target and there are limited UN agencies working on the employment of persons with disabilities. ILO is though involved in a consultancy to understand the feasibility of implementing a UN System-Wide Action Plan (SWAP) on disability. A similar system has been used on gender since 2012. If implemented, this would help address some of the reporting and accountability issues highlighted in this report as it would mandate ILO to report on disability indicators.

7. Communicating internally and externally

Communication was not a specific outcome but considered a cross-cutting issue. Some of the achievements have been included in the outcomes listed above.

The disability unit has developed an online training course and provides advice on request to constituents and staff. As noted above, most of the DET work has been with constituents and ILO field offices have not availed themselves of the opportunity to have this training for their staff.

The strategy set a target of 50 disability champions in HQ and the field by the end of the strategy period. There has not been a formal identification of the criteria for a disability champion. The disability unit has been successful in identifying key allies and working with them, a lack of a formal system makes it difficult to assess if ILO has achieved the target of 70 champions by 2017. This issue was discussed during the workshops and is addressed in the section on discussion points and next steps in this report.

Mainstreaming

The twin-track approach laid out in the strategy presents the approaches as disability issues being included in ILO activities and means of action, including internal practices, and the promotion of disability specific actions (p.5). Success in the first approach could be measured by the level of mainstreaming of disability within ILOs actions and policies at HQ, regional offices and country offices. The evaluation found that particularly in the field there is very limited mainstreaming of disability. One of the challenges the disability unit faces is that work on disability at the field level generally depends on the interest of individual and it is not institutionalized within work. There has been success addressing disability issues in countries where the Country Director or individual officer are interested or have a background in disability background. ILO has also been fairly successful in continuing work in the countries where Irish Aid funds were used. This work though mainly focuses on the second approach of disability specific actions. There have been more notable achievements on mainstreaming in headquarters.

Mainstreaming in the field

Field staff who were interviewed for the evaluation were nearly unanimous in the belief that mainstreaming of disability in their country or regional office is very limited. Some recounted incidents of where they had needed to regularly explain colleagues why meetings and offices should be accessible, or had colleagues who felt that any disability issue would be handled by the 'disability expert' in the office. One example was shared with the evaluator of a local NGO who had approached an ILO office to ask about potential partnerships and was told ILO did not work on disability.

To triangulate this, a sampling was made of project documents available on IRIS and evaluation reports available on i–eval Discovery[14]. For the projects on IRIS, the sample was limited to projects over US$1 million. Projects were separated into regions and global, and a random number generator used to identify which projects to review. If the number generator gave two projects from the same country, another number was generated. PRODOCs and if available, progress reports were analyzed for references to disability using word search[15]. A total of 20 projects were sampled, but one was later found to not contain a full PRODOC and so was discarded giving a sample size of 19. A similar approach was used for evaluation reports, with the additional considering of sampling reports from 2015, 16, and 17. A total of 20 reports were identified. For both the evaluations and the project documents if the word search produced results, further analysis was undertaken to identify if the reference was substantive or not. For the evaluation reports, 3 were in Spanish, so the Disability Officer conducted the word search for the evaluator. Although not a deliberate sampling approach, the random selection of both the evaluations and projects did not include any disability specific projects.

The results of this exercise were mixed. Of the evaluation reports, only two actually evaluate the inclusion of disability in the project implementation and only one TOR requests the evaluator to look at disability (one of the two evaluations to look at disability was the only report not to include the TOR in the annexes so it is not possible to say if the TOR requested the inclusion of disability for this evaluation). There are fleeting references to disability in other reports, but these are references which don't impact the report. One particular example stood out, an evaluation of a DWCP program listed the DWCP outputs which included disability as a country priority, but the evaluation did not assess whether the implementation had addressed disability at all. Another evaluation adjudged performance on gender and non-discrimination to be satisfactory without referencing disability (or any other form of discrimination other than gender).

The results from the review of project documents produced slightly more findings on disability. Out of the 19 projects, only 2 included disability in their logframes. Both of these projects had a very strong focus on disability. One PRODOC, which focused on conducting a survey, stated that disability would be one of the disaggregation criteria. Two others made reference to the inclusion of persons with disabilities in project activities but did not say how they would do this. The vast majority of projects did not have progress reports uploaded to IRIS and so it is not possible to make a judgement as to whether the projects followed through on the inclusion of disability issues in their activities, or included persons with disabilities after the project had started even if they were not in proposal. The limited inclusion of disability in the logframes is a concern, as it is this which project managers will most typically pay attention to when implementing a project.

Many of the evaluation participants linked the difficulties in mainstreaming disability to funding opportunities. They argued that disability would get more attention if there were more funding opportunities, as country offices would then seek to include disability in projects to access these funds. This speaks to a need to change mindsets in field offices about the inclusion of disability in projects. Instead of

---

[14] http://www.ilo.org/ievaldiscovery/#a6y632k

[15] The term disab was put into the word search to allow for disabled, disability, and disabilities to be found.

seeing disability as an expensive or burdensome addition which is only done when funding is available, field staff could be sensitized to how disability can enhance a proposal and can be included with little additional cost. An example was shared of how the Bangladesh country office was asked by a donor to increase the activities related to disability based on ILO's previous work on this subject. Interview participants felt a pro-active approach to identifying and advocating with donors on the inclusion of disability within projects was very rare within ILO though. How to include disability in project design is included in the updated PARDEV Development Cooperation Manual, which thus provides a platform for ILO to include disability more in project design during the next strategy period.

One of the successes of the disability unit has been to ensure the inclusion of disability in the PARDEV appraisal checklist, the PARDEV how to guidance, and the new policy guidelines for evaluation. The PARDEV appraisal checklist is used to assess proposals and concept notes prior to submission to donors. It has been adapted to contain a checkpoint specifically related to disability and not just non-discrimination. Projects are referred to the disability unit for review when relevant, and feedback given to the proposal designers if PARDEV believe opportunities exist to include persons with disabilities in the project. The new guidelines produced by EVAL were published in August 2017. Unlike the previous guidelines, these contain a specific reference to the inclusion of disability into evaluations. It is still too early to see results from this, but if the guidelines are followed one would expect the number of evaluation TORs and reports which include disability to increase during the next strategy period.

Although these are positive developments, participants in the workshops and interviews stressed the importance for disability to be included at proposal design stage. The PARDEV appraisal process often comes just before the deadline for submission when it can be difficult to include new topics. Although the inclusion of disability in the evaluation guidelines may start to have an effect if country offices realise their projects will be judged on this issue at the end of the project, the effects of this will still be limited. If, however, ILO is able to encourage more consideration to disability right at the start of project design, the impact on the inclusion of disability throughout the cycle of project management should be far more substantive and sustainable.

Mainstreaming at headquarters

There has been more success in mainstreaming disability in headquarters. The disability unit has been successful in building an informal network of relationships in the office, and has managed to identify informal disability champions in many branches. As a result, the disability unit has been able to work on a number of joint policy papers, manuals, and reports with other branches. This has helped both raise the issue of disability across ILO and helped with the limited budget availability. Joint work with the Social Protection Department, the Statistics Department, SKILLS branch, the Global Initiative on Decent Jobs for Youth, ACT/EMP, and ACTRAV has led to the inclusion of disability issues in a number of their reports. A key challenge for many of these branches and departments is the same one facing the disability unit and GED, namely how to engage their field staff more on disability inclusion in the coming years.

There has also been an increased mainstreaming of disability in internal policies. HRD have been giving disability training, interns are required to attend DET sessions, the renovations have made the building more accessible, and greater consideration is given to the needs of attendees with disabilities at external meetings organized by ILO, and persons with disabilities in the emergency procedures.

The success is not uniform though and continued attention will need to be paid to mainstreaming in coming years. For example, of the 5 flagship programmes of ILO, only 1 references disability in their strategy documents (one didn't appear to publish a strategy but there is not a reference to disability on their

webpage). The ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality[16] which is the responsibility of the same branch disability is housed within only contains one fleeting reference to disability. Despite this, many of the branches and their initiatives do demonstrate a commitment to work on disability. For example, there was considerable involvement of individuals for different branches in the evaluation workshops. Initiatives such as Better Work have been enthusiastic about the inclusion of disability in some of their programmes, and the Fragile States and Disaster Response Group included a section on the impact of conflict and disaster on persons with disabilities plus numerous other references to disability in their 2016 report[17]. To continue these successes and fill some of the identified gaps, the disability unit will need to continue to engage other branches and departments with regular reminders about the importance of disability inclusion in order to ensure disability continues to be included in proposals and reports, and to push for inclusion within strategies and action plans when major initiatives are launched or renewed.

Relevance of the Strategy to the Field

During interviews, participants were asked if they were aware of the strategy and if it had been of use to them. The majority, but not all, were aware of the disability strategy. Most participants felt it had been useful in the abstract more than the practical day to day sense. They were aware of the goals and some had occasionally used the strategy in advocacy to country offices or in developing DWCPs.

Intersectionality, Gender Equality and Multiple Discrimination

There have been some initiatives at headquarters to work on inter-sectionality such as the violence in the workplace, women at work, and the care economy, where issues of multiple discrimination and disability are being considered. The disability unit has also worked on a publication with the indigenous persons specialist in GED. Many interview participants felt though ILO needed to consider inter-sectionality more in the future.

However, the inclusion of disability within the gender equality and non-discrimination cross-cutting policy driver means that openings to address disability are often through a gender lens. One of the centenary initiatives is the women at work initiative. It was though suggested by ILO field staff that in general there was not too much crossover between the work of the different sections of GED. Some of the headquarters staff felt there was beginning to be more crossover between the different sections of GED though. As with disability in general, this is probably something which has been addressed more in headquarters than the field.

The Disability Strategy did not have special actions and indicators relating to gender. Some, although not all, of the publications produced by the disability unit did include a focus on gender issues. These included the practical guide on reasonable accommodation and the discussion paper on access to training for indigenous persons with disabilities.

It is also important that gender publications and interventions mainstream disability. Currently this seems to be limited. A review of gender publications shows that disability is often not included. For example, the Gender Equality Action Plan includes only one fleeting reference to disability[18]. With an increased focus on issues such as the Women at Work initiative, opportunities exist for disability to be mainstreamed into GED's gender work but these do not seem to have been fully utilized yet.

---

[16] http://www.ilo.org/gender/Informationresources/WCMS_351305/lang--en/index.htm
[17] http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_141275.pdf
[18] http://www.ilo.org/gender/Informationresources/WCMS_351305/lang--en/index.htm

3.4 Efficiency

- Are resources for disability mainstreaming being used in the most efficient manner? How economically are resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) converted to results? Do the results justify the cost?
- What time and cost efficiency measures could be introduced in the future without impacting negatively on the achievement of results?

A common theme which reoccurred in evaluation interviews was an appreciation for the responsiveness of the disability unit and the support they were able to give with very limited resources. For the 2016-17 biennium, the disability unit was allocated approximately US$140,000 for activities. A value for money assessment is beyond the scope of this evaluation, but a review of budgeting and expenditure did not produce any areas of concern on inefficiency or wastage. There have also been activities where the costs have been shared between GED and other branches, which has increased the scope of the work the disability unit could undertake.

The budget of $140,000 did not include the salaries of the Senior Disability Expert who is funded through the general GED budget, or the Disability Officer whose salary is paid through the GBDN, and reflects the activities carried out for the secretariat of the GBDN. Additional contributions from GED come through what in-kind support the Regional Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists can give, although as noted many of them acknowledge that this is limited, and does not include financial contributions to disability work.

The critical question for the disability unit in the next strategy is how to mobilize other resources within ILO to contribute to the work on disability. The budget for the disability unit is expected to remain the same in the next biennium. Therefore, there will be limited financial resources, and also limited human resources. To ensure the best use of time of the disability unit, focusing initially on expanding disability awareness to key individuals at a regional level is important so that other staff and branches can take some responsibility for including disability. Resourcing of disability projects, either through inclusion in other projects or disability specific projects should also be targeted with the need to increase human resources focused on disability.

ILO should consider whether the regular budget allocation is enough for them to meet their stated commitments to work on disability issues and the most vulnerable individuals in the world of work. The need to ensure the non-discrimination of persons with disabilities is stated in a number of ILO documents and statements by the DG. Increasing the budget allocated for this work would signal a statement of intent by ILO's senior management of the importance of disability work.

3.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

- Are the roles and responsibilities of ILO officials (in HQ and field offices), including management, who are responsible for the implementation of disability mainstreaming, clearly defined and understood?
- Is the current arrangement for implementing ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 effective?
- Are there any changes recommended for the new strategy?

Roles and Responsibilities

Disability has been housed with the GED branch of the ILO during the period of this strategy. Disability forms part of the cross-cutting policy driver on gender equality and non-discrimination which is a critical part of ILO's biennium P&B proposals. As such GED is responsible for non-discrimination in gender, disability, indigenous people, sexual orientation and HIV/AIDs.

The disability unit in Geneva consists of a Senior Disability Expert and a Disability Officer. The Senior Disability Expert has overall responsibility for the implementation of the disability strategy and reports to the Chief of Branch of GED. A Disability Expert is part of GED but has mainly been seconded to work on another topic during the implementation period.

Since the incorporation of disability within GED, the gender specialists in the regional offices have increasingly been expected to include disability in their portfolio. For the most part these experts were recruited before the inclusion of disability within GED and have not had their job descriptions formally changed to include disability. They have also not been given additional training or resources for working on this topic. Their primary expertise is gender, and many expressed during interviews that they had limited insight into disability issues. Job descriptions of recruited regional specialists since the merger have included disability and other forms of non-discrimination, of which the position in the DWT-San José is an example.

Responsibility for disability issues elsewhere within ILO is more informal. At the field level, some offices which have a history of working on disability have an informal disability champion, usually someone who has been responsible for working on disability projects in the past. This is not a formal position, although in at least one case the CD asked the individual to be a disability focal point. Colleagues are aware of the work these individuals are doing on disability and will often ask for technical support and guidance. In some cases, the individuals are pro-active about addressing inclusion issues within the office as well, but on an ad hoc basis.

A common theme which was raised by field staff is the need for disability resources in the field. This should come from different avenues, including more attention to disability from the gender and non-discrimination specialists, greater responsibility on the subject being taken from specialists from other branches, and the empowering of disability champions. The role of the gender and non-discrimination specialists was addressed by most interview participants. Some participants indicated that the expertise required for disability was considerably different to that needed for gender and other issues within the non-discrimination theme and thus it was difficult for these specialists to provide the necessary support on disability. Others felt GED needed to strongly stress the need for the non-discrimination specialists to focus on all aspects of discrimination more evenly than is currently done, and emphasized that the specialists' role should be to bring attention to these issues and identify expert support where needed rather than providing in-depth support on each area of non-discrimination.

As previously stated, evaluation participants believed a strategy for increasing awareness and knowledge of staff in the field needs to be developed, and attention should be paid to empowering disability champions.

The idea of appointing focal points on disability was rejected by the majority of evaluation participants who believed this was not an effective strategy for mainstreaming disability, and focus should be put on providing support to those who voluntarily chose to champion disability.

Implementation and Monitoring

As noted in the design section, there is not a formal system for monitoring or reporting on the implementation of the plan, nor was an activity or workplan with time-bound milestones developed. The reporting structure within ILO which focuses on the results-based management system and the self-assessment of achievement on cross-cutting policy drivers, makes it difficult for the disability unit to gain a full picture of the work on disability which has been achieved. This barrier increases the need for a reporting and monitoring system to be developed for the next strategy, and it will allow a platform for trying to fill some of the information gaps which currently exist.

3.6 Sustainability

- Are the results achieved in 2014-17 likely to be sustainable?
- What elements need to be taken into account to ensure sustainability of outcomes in the new Action Plan?

Overall there are some areas of sustainability, most notably through some of the successes achieved at headquarters and through the GBDN. However, to secure the long-term future of disability inclusion, ILO needs to ensure greater ownership of the issue among other branches and departments, and particularly at the field level. Sufficient human and financial resources need to be dedicated to disability issues to ensure this.

Areas where sustainability can be potentially identified include the work done on producing resources which are used throughout the organization. The guides and manuals can continue to be used beyond the end of the strategy period. The inclusion of disability in PARDEV and EVAL manuals also provides evidence of sustainability. An initial assessment of the work on internal policies in Geneva suggests some level of sustainability, particularly in the attempts to make the building accessible during the renovations. Other areas such as making meetings and evacuation plans more inclusive should be sustainable so long as individuals within those departments continue to reinforce the importance of these policies.

The GBDN and the national counterparts also have good potential for sustainability. The GBDN and some of the national business and disability networks are self-funding, and appear to reflect an awareness in certain enterprises of the business case for employing persons with disabilities. ILO will need to ensure it continues to fund a position to support the GBDN to maintain its influence in this work.

Challenges to sustainability come from a lack of funding for disability work and the limited nature of disability mainstreaming in country offices. As noted much of the country focus on disability comes from an individual's interest or the country's history in implementing disability work. In a few countries such as Bangladesh and Ethiopia, the work may be sustainable because constituent interest is at a level where they will continue to demand ILO work on this subject. But in many others, there is a risk that if the key individual leaves ILO, then work on the topic will stop. Strengthening knowledge of the importance of disability inclusion among field staff is a key need for the next strategy if ILO is seeking to ensure sustainability in this work.

High level commitments to disability need to back up the work at both headquarters and the field. This commitment would help to ensure the issue is given due prominence within ILO. The DG's statement for the

International Day of Persons with Disabilities 2017 reflected the need to do much more to ensure persons with disabilities are fully included in the world of work without discrimination.[19] This statement is as valid for ILO itself as for the world of work in general, and restating ILO's commitment to disability through endorsement of the strategy, along with a genuine accountability structure, will help build sustainability and strengthen ILO's disability work.

3.7 Discussion points and potential future directions

During the bilateral interviews and the workshops sessions, the evaluator collected a series of recommendations and ideas for how ILO can strengthen its work on disability and shape the direction of the next strategy. These discussions are summarized below in various categories. Many ideas were suggested and unless there is a substantial increase in resources of the disability unit, not all can be implemented. The challenge for the disability unit and GED in developing the next strategy will be to identify what actions will have the most impact.

Increasing involvement and disability awareness among staff

- Identify key staff to engage in regional and national offices

One of the recurring themes of the interviews was the limited awareness of field staff on disability issues. It was also noted that the work load and knowledge specialization of the Regional Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists limited the resources available in the field for staff working on disability. To address this, ILO should identify key staff to engage on disability who can be involved in ensuring the inclusion of disability within resource mobilization, project development, and the work of different branches. It was highlighted by a number of interview participants that for ILO to meet its commitments on disability, responsibility needs to be absorbed by a range of individuals and branches in the field, and not just left to the Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists.

Discussions during the workshop sessions centred on both how to roll out awareness raising out to the field and who were the key individuals to target.

- o Training

The DET training which has been used successfully by ILO with constituents is designed as a three-day training, and it was acknowledged it would be difficult to secure participation among many staff for three days. ILO has adapted the training to be a one-day training, and it is currently given to interns in Geneva by a GED team member who is a certified DET facilitator. This length of workshop would be more likely to attract participation.

The other challenge concerning training is the number of facilitators available to conduct DET. ILO has one staff member who is certified as a DET trainer, and still has connections to the external consultant who originally designed the training. There are facilitators who have been certified in various countries, but these are generally in countries where ILO has a stronger disability footprint and has implemented disability projects. Therefore, there is limited facilitator resources available to conduct this training. Given the number of countries ILO works in and the resources available, it would not be possible to the awareness raising strategy to be focused at the country level.

Instead, conducting DET or another disability awareness training at a regional level is recommended, with key individuals from the regional offices and specific countries being invited to attend. The training should not just be a stand-alone training but needs to be linked to a more comprehensive approach. The

---

[19] http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/ilo-director-general/statements-and-speeches/WCMS_608271/lang--en/index.htm

development of DWCPs or simply the roll out of the new strategy and how it will impact a regional could be potential approaches to take.

o   Field Based Staff

There was near universal agreement that the nominating of focal points on disability in country and regional officers is not a productive approach to follow. The selection of focal points is often arbitrary without consideration of their interest in the subject, their skills and knowledge, or what resources they need to conduct the work. Instead work should focus on raising the interest and awareness of key staff within regional and country offices, and identifying ways to support and recognize those staff who chose to champion disability.

Suggestions for individuals to focus on include:

➢ Regional Programme Officers
➢ Resource Mobilization Officers
➢ Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officers
➢ Regional and Country-Based specialists from other branches such as ACT/EMP, ACTRAV, and FUNDAMENTALS
➢ Other members of DW teams
➢ OSH coordinators/focal points

The training would not necessarily need to be done in one session and different groups may require different approaches. In addition to the list above, Regional Directors and Country Directors are critical to engage on disability awareness but may be difficult to engage for a whole day. Identifying opportunities where Regional and Country Directors are gathered for retreats or other trainings could provide one entry point for work at this level.

o   Geneva

The disability unit has successfully engendered interest in a number of unofficial 'disability champions' in various departments and branches in ILO's headquarters. This includes staff in policy, programme, internal policy and the communications department. One of the participants interviewed during the evaluation, described the process as one of 'slow infiltration', and argued this approach has been successful in increasing disability interest within ILO. What is needed for the next strategy period as well as extending this success to the field, is to ensure high level support from key individuals in Geneva. To address this, it is recommended for the next strategy to include a foreword by the Director-General stressing the importance of disability to ILO. Additionally, the GED branch should try to identify disability supporters among the Governing Body who can promote the issue regularly. Finally, to support the development of the new strategy a short working session of the heads of departments should be conducted to discuss what commitments each department can make towards working on disability during the next 3-4 years.

Parallel to the engagement of senior staff and the Governing Body, the disability unit should continue to conduct GED training for HRD staff and interns, and engage interested parties in key departments and branches.

• Recognition of Disability Champions

The current strategy included a target of increasing the number of disability champions in HQ and the field to 30 in 2014-15 and 50 in 2016-17. In reality there is no formal system of disability champions. This is a term which the disability unit uses to refer to those it works closely with and are supportive of advancing the issue of disability within ILO. As noted in the challenges section of the report, one of the concerns of how ILO

addresses disability work is its reliance on individuals to take an interest in the issue, rather than the institutionalization of disability issues. The work many of the individuals do is additional to the responsibilities listed in their job description. ILO needs to ensure the key individuals continue their interest and work on disability but that they have institutionalized support behind that recognizes their work and ensures the topic is understood and approached by a broader range of staff as well.

How ILO can recognize the work of disability champions was discussed during the workshops and interviews. In particular, it was suggested that this work could be included in the ILO's performance appraisal system, so an individual can nominate work on disability within a country or regional office, or their work in HQ, and be appraised on what they have achieved at the end of the appraisal cycle. To implement this approach, there would need to be support from the line management of these individuals, an identification of resources the staff member would need (such as training), and a commitment to work to identifying projects where disability could be included.

Other means of supporting an informal system of disability champions could be to identify resources to support retreats, conducting regular videoconferencing sessions with the disability unit, and recognizing the champions on the disability unit's webpage.

Policy

In addition to the discussions on how to engage staff, a number of other suggestions were made in each workshop section on upcoming opportunities.

- Analysis of gaps in existing ILO standards on discrimination in employment and occupation.

During the policy workshop, it was shared that steps would soon be taken in the near future to undertake a gap analysis of C.111 on non-discrimination and it was felt including disability as one of the additional prohibited ground of discrimination would be possible. The Office has been mandated to conduct a gap analysis of the existing ILO instruments on discrimination in employment and occupation, and it is expected work will start in 2018. Participants in the workshop believed there was a good opportunity to ensure disability was included as one of the prohibited grounds of discrimination in the convention. Disability is considered a less controversial topic than some issues, such as LGBT rights.

- Expanding the work with ACTRAV: development of equivalent of GBDN

The disability unit has engaged more with ACT/EMP during the current strategy period. This is because the GBDN was already well established and it was believed employers, and in particular multi-national firms, were more open to working on disability issues than trade unions. Given the limited resources of the disability unit, directing efforts in this direction does appear valid. However, in the second half of the strategy period, the disability unit has engaged more with ACTRAV and conducted a survey of trade unions on their engagement on disability. The survey found there was far more interest in the topic than expected. ACTRAV have indicated a willingness to try to expand this work. Engaging the field faces similar challenges as noted elsewhere in this report but an opportunity to engage more with trade unions exists. ACTRAV representatives also expressed an interest in the development of a trade union network on disability modelled on the GBDN.

- Developing technical factsheets specific to particular topics

Participants in the policy workshop believed it was important for the disability unit to produce short 4-8 page factsheets on disability related to particular topics such as TVET, engaging trade unions, labour laws etc., which are specifically aimed at ensuring staff have necessary facts and information when developing projects, and at other key times in the project management cycle.

- Ensuring disability is included in FPRW academies

FUNDAMENTALS is starting to organize fundamental principles and rights academies, which will be modelled on the gender academies currently run in Turin. Developing a module on disability would provide an opening for increasing disability knowledge. The disability component of the gender academies themselves could also be strengthened.

- Disability disaggregation

The SDGs provide an opportunity to continue to strengthen the partnership with the Department of Statistics in the coming strategy period. The disability unit has worked closely with the Department of Statistics during the current strategy period. The SDGs require disability disaggregated reporting for a number of indicators. As ILO has committed to Agenda 2030 and supporting the realization of the SDGs, this provides an opening for the disability unit to advocate for more attention to disability indicators in labour force statistics. This presents an opening for persuading both constituents of the importance of disability disaggregation in statistics, and also field colleagues of the need to include disability in project proposals related to strengthening of national statistics capacities.

As noted, there are very few CPOs with disability references, and reporting of work on Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination is often more focused on gender equality. The P&B indicators for 2018-19 are now set. However, advocating for changes to the 2020-21 is possible if there is high-level support for greater disaggregation of non-discrimination indicators and reporting.

- Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)

Refugees and IDPs will continue to receive considerable news coverage and attention from donors. Persons with disabilities are particularly vulnerable during a crisis, and so ensuring the mainstreaming of disability into ILO's crisis response work is strongly advised. It is likely to be an area where there is a considerable need for programming for persons with disabilities and will be received favourably by donors. ILO has a normative framework to support this as R205- Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 contains many disability references. Working with the Fragile States and Disaster Response department, the MIGRANT branch and the flagship programme on jobs for peace and resilience should be an important priority for the next strategy period.

Programme
- Leverage the design of programmes

There was universal agreement among evaluation participants that the key moment to ensure the inclusion of disability into ILO's work comes at the design phase of a project. Although the inclusion of disability at other stages of the project cycle, such as PARDEV's appraisal checklist and evaluations is important, if disability is not included at the design stage, it is highly unlikely activities will be undertaken during a project.

The means to do this is linked closely to many of the other suggestions, particularly increasing the knowledge of staff throughout ILO on disability, the development of factsheets, and the engagement with donors. Documenting and highlighting successful case studies where including disability enhanced a project's effectiveness and appeal to a donor would also help improve the inclusion at the design stage. Resources officers in regional and country offices should be included in the key individuals at the field level targeted for disability awareness raising and DET by the disability unit.

- Internal dashboards

Since the development of the last strategy, several departments in ILO have developed user-friendly dashboards which allow ILO staff and the general public to access information on ILO's work. In particular,

PARDEV have developed a development cooperation dashboard[20] and EVAL have installed the i-eval discovery tool[21]. As technology continues to develop, search functions should become easier, so making sure disability is easily searchable in these and any new dashboards is important.

It was also suggested that ILO's internal project database, IRIS could be adapted to include disability markers so as to increase the visibility of disability internally. IRIS already has gender markers and so adapting it to include disability markers should be straight-forward.

- • Include disability in EVAL guidance notes

The evaluation guidelines were updated and published in August 2017. They include a specific reference to the need to consider disability within an evaluation. Currently EVAL is working on developing new and updating existing EVAL guidance notes to accompany the new policy. As such there is an opening for the disability unit to engage with EVAL to strengthen the inclusion of disability within evaluations. Guidance note 12 'Applying cross-cutting policy drivers' is still under construction and disability should be included in this note. Additionally, including a short note on disability in guidance note 6, 'The evaluation manager: Role and function' would help ensure disability is included in more TORs. Two other guidance notes, no. 8, 'Data collection methods', and no. 11, 'Evaluation models' which are both currently under construction, could also include references to how to include disability issues and persons with disabilities during an evaluation.

- • Leveraging funding

One of the key concerns raised during field interviews was the lack of funding for disability. Many participants believed if funding opportunities existed, then their colleagues would focus more on disability. They advocated for more attention to be paid to helping the field obtain funding. Discussion in various of the workshops and interviews at headquarters also focused on this issue. It was generally agreed a multi-pronged approach is needed. It is possible opportunities exist to fund a large-scale multi country technical project, similar to the Irish Aid funding in the past, but it is more likely ILO will need to rely on smaller scale funding opportunities for disability specific work or the inclusion of disability within a larger scale project. For projects which include disability along with other work, it is recommended for the log-frame to include specific indicators, outputs or outcomes on disability. One caveat to the suggestions below is that if projects are being managed globally at headquarters, funding would need to include additional resources for Geneva, as time does not allow for the current disability unit to also take on the management of a global project without additional human resources. At the regional and national level, financial proposals should include funds for technical support if necessary through either field visits from Geneva or suitably qualified consultants.

Suggestions on funding raised by evaluation participants included:

- o Identifying and approaching donors

Participants in the programme workshop identified opportunities to approach donors who have made commitments to including disability in their work. It is important for the engagement of donors to be done at both headquarters and the field level. Although PARDEV and the disability unit can try to advocate with donors at their headquarters, and pursue the possibility of identifying funding for a multi-country technical cooperation project, more funding decisions are being devolved to embassies in the field, and so field level staff will need to engage with donors. This should be on disability specific projects but also it is important to work with donors to ensure support for the inclusion of disability outcomes in mainstreamed projects.

---

[20] http://www.ilo.org/DevelopmentCooperationDashboard/#aglfcqn
[21] http://www.ilo.org/ievaldiscovery/#bqwws42

Specific donors which were identified during the evaluation included DfID, Irish Aid, Finland, and Australia. This should not be seen as an exhaustive list. The new Secretary for International Development has pledged to make tackling discrimination against persons with disabilities at the heart of the United Kingdom's development strategy. DfID is planning to organize a global disability summit in July 2018, and is already requiring 4 UN agencies (ILO is not one of these) to respond on how they intend to mainstream disability. ILO has an historic relationship with Irish Aid on disability and Australia and Finland are also prioritising disability in their work.

- o Inclusion in project developed at the field level

It is recommended the next strategy period focus more on translating the gains made at headquarters to the field. This needs to include strong efforts to increase the inclusion of disability in project development. To ensure disability is meaningfully included, disability specific outcomes, outputs or activities should be included in logframes. As noted above, this will need to include the engagement of field level staff and also the embassies of donors in the field.

- o Inclusion of disability in initiatives of other branches/departments

The disability unit has successfully partnered with ACTRAV to implement a survey on disability work among trade unions and develop a report describing the results. This is an example of a successful partnership which developed through the engagement of the disability unit, and allowed work to be undertaken which the disability unit did not have the resources to finance on its own. Many branches have funding constraints at the moment, but there should be opportunities to identify partnerships to either jointly fund work, or ensure disability is included in proposals these branches are developing.

One potential opportunity specifically raised during the workshops was Better Work Ethiopia. Better Work is currently negotiating setting up a Better Work system in Ethiopia and considerable funding should be available. ILO Ethiopia is one of the success stories of disability inclusion work. Dating back to the start of Irish Aid funding and continuing more recently with UNPRPD funding, ILO Ethiopia has worked on disability for over 10 years, successfully engaging many Ministries, the trade unions, and the employers' federations. Ensuring the inclusion of disability within a Better Work project in Ethiopia would seem a natural fit.

- o Funding of disability initiatives through internal policies

UNICEF has a scheme where 1% is added to every flight purchased within the organization. This is put into a fund which allows countries offices to bid on proposals on how to make their offices either greener or more disabled friendly. This call for proposals is issued every six months and a committee allocates funds to the best proposals. The volume of flights taken by ILO would not be as large as UNICEF, but this initiative would still raise funds at a fairly negligible cost to each individual project and branch, and would allow ILO to support internal action on two of its cross-cutting policy drivers.

Internal Policies

- • Create an accessibility checklist

Field staff who were interviewed for the evaluation were asked if offices in their regions and countries were accessible. The response was mixed. Many staff who worked in newer offices reported offices were accessible. Regional offices were more likely to be accessible than country offices, although this was not uniform. The regional office in Beirut has a number of accessibility challenges. ILO has more leverage to ensure accessibility in buildings it runs itself. When offices are rented in office blocks, it can be difficult to persuade landlords to make changes. Additionally, in many countries ILO is given office space by counterpart ministries, where it can again be difficult to persuade ministries of the need to make changes to accessibility.

Participants in the workshop suggested the development of an accessibility checklist which could be used by OSH focal points. Due to the limited awareness of accessibility among field staff, simple changes which can be made to improve accessibility are probably often missed. ILO has a guide on promoting diversity through reasonable workplace adjustments[22], which was developed for businesses. ILO should be leading by example on developing inclusive workplaces, and so promoting this manual, along with a checklist on disability can support the expansion to the field of the recent successes on accessibility in Geneva.

- Strengthening awareness of reasonable accommodation in interviews and for employees

Interviews with field staff suggested awareness among staff on internal policies related to disability was limited. The staff survey on disability in 2014 found 62% of field staff were unaware of ILO's reasonable accommodation provision, compared to 46% of headquarter staff who were unaware. The general belief of field staff was this percentage would not have changed much during the strategy period. It was also suggested that recruiting staff in the field would be generally unaware of techniques for ensuring reasonable accommodation at the job application and interview stage of the recruitment process.

In addition to the training opportunities listed above, participants in the internal policy session suggested the yearly regional finance and HR training could be an entry point for training HR staff from the regional and country offices. A training specifically tailored to recruitment and other internal policies on disability is recommended.

Communication

- Increase disability branding in promotional material

Increasing disability branding with all ILO materials, not just disability related, is encouraged. The inclusion of persons with disabilities in videos and brochures, even when the topic does not relate to disability can have positive effects. The simple inclusion of persons with disabilities raises the profile of disability both within and outside the organization. For external stakeholders, it helps identify ILO as an organization responsive to disability. Internally, it would provide a regular reminder to staff of ILO's work on disability. ILO should encourage improvements in accessibility at all levels on the website. Any new website developed by an ILO project, branch or department should meet level A or AA of the WCAG 2.0 standards. Adding sign language and sub-titles to videos would also increase accessibility.

- Identify key big days/events and share with DCOMM

DCOMM can be an effective ally for the disability unit in promoting disability. DCOMM is currently working on its action plan for the coming biennium. To ensure maximum coverage of disability events, a calendar of major events or launches should be shared with DCOMM so they can fit the publicity into their planning.

- Develop a guideline on appropriate disability related language

ILO developed guides for media organizations during the PROPEL project. Participants in the communications workshop suggested a similar tool for ILO staff themselves would be useful to ensure disability sensitive language is being used in communication products (and proposals). It was acknowledged this would have to be specific to different languages, as appropriate terminology in English will not necessarily translate other civil society groups working on disability at a country level. Requesting support on this guide from local DPOs can provide an entry point for initial relationship building.

Additional General Observations from the Interviews and Workshop Sessions

- DPOs

---

[22] http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/equality-and-discrimination/WCMS_536630/lang--en/index.htm

The involvement of DPOs in the GBDN is a positive approach which brings the voice of persons with disabilities into the work of the network. Opportunities exist to strengthen partnerships with DPOs, particularly at the field level. As part of its focus on disability rights, supporting the 'nothing about us without us' concept is important. ILO has built good partnerships at a global level with DPOs and NGOs who work on disability at a through the GBDN. These organizations have strong links to grassroots civil society organizations at the national level, which as ILO seeks to strengthen its field work, would offer strong potential for partnership in targeted interventions.

- High level commitment

In his statement to mark the International Day for Persons with Disabilities 2017, the DG focused on the importance of disability to ILO's mandate: 'The ILO's founding mandate has always led it to promote greater equality of treatment and opportunities for persons with disabilities in the labour market in partnership with its tripartite constituents, members of the UN family, organizations of people with disabilities and other stakeholders.'

As demonstrated in this evaluation, while there have been notable successes at headquarters, a handful of individual countries, and through the GBDN, overall, the ILO's mainstreaming of disability and inclusion in its projects is quite limited.

If ILO is to meet its objectives and commitments on disability, it needs to ensure the topic is given due prominence by senior management. Statements such as these are positive but need to backed by actions such as endorsing a new strategy, ensuring staff are fully aware of ILO's work on disability, and committing to finding resources to achieve ILO's mandate.

- Regular reminders of disability

One of the evaluation participants stated the process of being involved in the evaluation had reminded them to include disability in an action plan they were working on, and recommended that regular reminders about disability were useful to ensure the subject remanded in the forefront of staff's thinking, and thus more likely to be included in their work. Options for doing this could include a regular email with disability tips, a newsletter, sharing and reminding of disability resources, or skype or WebEx meeting invites. The disability unit is already quite good at sharing resources, but identifying ways to widen the number of people they reach with more regularity would be helpful in the next strategy.

4. Lessons Learned, Emerging Good Practices, and Conclusions

4.1 Lessons Learned

1. **Disability mainstreaming requires support from various branches and positions. It cannot be left solely to GED.**

One of the findings of the evaluation was disability has been more successfully mainstreamed in headquarters than in the field. One of the key reasons for this has been the building of relationships with officers from other units who have taken on responsibility for implementing disability related actions. This needs to be translated to the field during the next strategy period. While the Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists do have a responsibility to work on disability, and probably should devote more time to this issue, they do not have the time or resources to be the only individual responsible for disability

at a regional level. Staff from other units also need to mainstream disability into their work to ensure ILO is living up to its commitments on this issue.

2. **Trade Unions are interested in implementing activities focused on persons with disabilities**

There was an assumption made during this strategy period that businesses were the main entry point for disability work in the field. It was believed trade unions had limited interest in the subject. However, a joint survey by ACTRAV and the disability unit demonstrated much more interest in disability from trade unions that had previous been considered. The use of a survey helped to support the partnership between ACTRAV and the disability unit through recognizing the potential for work in this field.

3. **Without a monitoring structure or clear responsibility for achieving indicators and activities, it is difficult to ensure accountability for the strategy.**

One of the challenges identified is the lack of a reporting and accountability structure for the disability structure. A monitoring and reporting system was not built into the development of the last strategy. The strategy did also not contain clear lines of responsibility for achieving results within the action plan. The lack of reporting structure and lines of responsibility means it is difficult to ensure accountability for delivering the expected results of the strategy. The reporting structure needs to be developed to sit within existing reporting systems and not be seen as an additional add-on for staff in the field and other branches.

It is recommended that avenues be explored to improve the disaggregation of disability related statistics and reporting of disability activities in existing reporting structures. The disability unit should produce an annual progress report which reports on progress towards expected results. Other branches and departments which have responsibility for particular outputs would need to agree to send brief summarized information on progress to the disability unit.

4. **Without awareness or engagement from headquarters or the regional offices, disability is unlikely to be included in projects. Disability specific indicators/outputs/outcomes/activities need to be included in PRODOCs to ensure disability is included in project implementation.**

One of the findings of the evaluation was the limited inclusion of disability in projects at a country office level. With the limited resources of the disability unit and the lack of disability specialists in the field, country offices are less likely to identify opportunities for including persons with disabilities in project proposals. Engagement with the field will help support more inclusion of disability issues in ILO's interventions.

4.2 Emerging Good Practices

1. **DET is a good way to engage staff. It has worked well with the interns and GED, and needs to be rolled out to the field**

The DET has proved to be an excellent tool for engaging constituents in the countries where ILO has had disability focused projects. The training receives excellent feedback from participants and has produced positive results. ILO has used a version of DET to increase awareness and understanding of disability among GED staff and interns. The 2014-17 Disability Strategy set out the goal of giving DET to field offices but this has not been successful. At the field level, DET has been enthusiastically received by tripartite constituents, but the disability unit has not managed to engage ILO staff in field offices. Identifying key staff at a regional level and delivering a version of the DET training during the next strategy period is very important in achieving the goal of mainstreaming disability throughout the organization.

2. **Engagement of DPOs and disability-focused NGOs**

The GBDN has been a success of the strategy period. During this period, new businesses have joined as members, national bodies have been formed, and DPOs and NGOs have become active members of the network. While there has been a DPO represented on the steering committee for many years, the decision to allow DPOs and NGOs to join the network was taken during this strategy period, and is a positive step forward in ensuring the inclusion of civil society with ILO's disability work. The NGOs and DPOs provide a connection to the grassroots organizations working on disability and help amplify the voice of persons with disabilities in ILO's work. A challenge for ILO in the next strategy period is how to strengthen the relationship with civil society at a national level. This should not just include ILO's work on business networks, but should extend into the work in other areas and projects as well.

3. **Joint products or activities are an effective approach to support disability mainstreaming and ensuring the minimal regular budget for disability work has maximum impact**

The disability unit has engaged with a number of different branches and departments to produce joint products and organize joint meetings including ACTRAV and the Social Protection Department. This helped to mainstream disability into products developed at headquarters and strengthened the partnership between the disability unit and other departments. The regular budget allocated to the disability unit is very limited, and thus engaging other departments and branches to work on joint publications and meetings has considerably expanded the output of the disability unit. The disability unit should continue working with other branches and try to leverage these partnerships to ensure greater engagement on disability by the field based staff of these branches.

4. **Work on disability in Bangladesh provides a good example of how a field office can ensure continued interventions on disability through multiple projects and responsible officers**

The work on disability in Bangladesh is one of the success stories of field work during this strategy period. The work there provides an example of good practices which can help overcome the challenges of disability mainstreaming and awareness in the field, described elsewhere in the report. The Bangladesh office originally undertook a small pilot project on training, and then began more significant work on disability through a TVET project. This project did not originally have a disability component but the topic was addressed through the interest from various staff. Bangladesh was able to use the interest generated in the topic after the Rana Plaza disaster to continue disability work in TVET projects, and bring into other projects they are working on. The recognition of the quality of work they are doing on disability is demonstrated by one donor specifically requesting more emphasis be placed on disability work in a recent TVET proposal.

4.3 Conclusion

The disability unit and GED branch have made some strong steps to advancing disability issues within ILO during the strategy period. Within headquarters in Geneva there has been increased understanding of disability issues among various departments. The challenge for the next strategy period is to ensure that gains made within headquarters are extended to the field where there is currently limited awareness of disability or disability mainstreaming into projects and programmes.

During the strategy period, ILO has strengthened the GBDN through the development of national business and disability networks modelled on the GBDN, and the inclusion of NGOs and DPOs which work on disability issues. The disability unit has coordinated with other departments and branches on the inclusion of disability within their work, most notably ACT/EMP and the Department of Statistics, and more recently ACTRAV. The disability unit has also worked closely with various internal policy units in Geneva to strengthen ILO's inclusive internal practices. Notable successes include a strong awareness being paid to accessibility in the current renovations and greater attention paid to ensuring an inclusive environment at meetings for persons

with disabilities. The disability unit has also successfully worked with PARDEV and EVAL to include disability in checklists and manuals for project appraisals and evaluations.

In the next strategy period, ILO needs to reinforce its commitment to disability inclusion throughout the organization, and in particular needs to work to extend the recent successes to the field. Disability work relies on individuals who are interested in the issue rather than being institutionalized throughout the organization. Certain countries have continued to effectively work on the issue of disability and examples of their success need to be shared and replicated elsewhere. This need applies to both ILO's work with its constituents and its internal practices in field offices.

To meet the needs in the field, it is recommended ILO focus on awareness raising and training of key individuals at regional training. Suggestions for attendance include the Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists, regional and country level experts from other branches such as ACTRAV, ACT/EMP, and FUNDAMENTALS, monitoring and evaluation staff, Regional Programme Officers, and HRD staff. Either at the same time or during other retreats, it is also recommended to develop a half-day session on disability for Regional Directors and Country Directors.

Additional support needs to be given to disability champions, particularly those in the field, and it cannot just come from the disability unit. Ways of recognizing the work of disability champions should be found, such as through performance appraisals, and listing disability champions on the disability page on the website. Developing a system for networking of champions and sharing of successes and lessons learned would also strengthen their work.

High level commitments from the Governing Body, DG's office, and senior management are also needed to ensure the importance of disability within ILO's work is recognised both inside and outside the organization. As a leading UN agency which stands for justice and decent work opportunities for all, ILO has an obligation to support the implementation of the UNCRPD, various ILO conventions and statements on disability and non-discrimination, and the Agenda 2030 objectives and the SDGs. To do this it needs to lead by example and ensure its programs, internal policies, and staff are addressing disability and enabling inclusive work places. While the disability unit has made important progress in working towards these goals, ILO as whole needs to strengthen its approach to disability. Disability needs to be sufficiently resourced through either disability specific interventions or inclusion in other projects, staff at headquarters and the field need to have sufficient knowledge and awareness to be confident to include disability in ILO's work, and senior management need to endorse the work of the disability unit and GED on this issue to demonstrate the importance of the subject to ILO. The disability unit has worked well to engage individuals and branches in this work, but needs sufficient resources for the subject and a strong commitment throughout ILO, particularly in the field and among senior management, to ensure ILO will lives up to the standards expected of a global leader on non-discrimination and decent work for all.

5. Recommendations

Recommendations	Addressed to:	Priority and Timeframe	Resource Implications
Increasing awareness			
1. Conduct regional disability training for key individuals. Individuals to consider include Program Officers, Gender Equality and Non-	GED, regional and country offices	High Early in the next period	Requires funding

	Discrimination Specialists, Monitoring and Evaluation Officers, Resource Officers, National Programme Coordinators, and DW teams.			
2.	Identify entry points for engaging RDs, CDs, the GB, & DG's Office.	GED	High Early in the next period	Staff time and may require funding
3.	Regularly engage field staff through systems such as newsletters, disability tips, skype calls etc. The goal of this is to constantly remind them of ILO's disability work to increase the likelihood of disability being included in projects, programmes and strategies.	GED	Medium Ongoing	Staff time
4.	Include disability in various training courses such as Gender and FPRW academies in Turin	GED, FUNDAMENTALS, & International Training Centre (ITC)	Medium Ongoing	Resources required dependent on how much material is needed to be developed
Funding				
5.	Coordinate closely with PARDEV and Resource Officers in field offices to identify the most promising donors and where they should be approached (ie their headquarters, Geneva, or the field).	GED, Program, Regional Office, & Country Offices	High Early in 2018	Staff time
6.	Produce one-two pagers on how to include disability in various key project subjects (TVET, Social Protection, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP, youth, elderly etc) which can be used by the field to help approach donors.	GED	Medium Ongoing-dependent on priority per topic	Staff time or consultant cost
7.	Consider developing a fund from 1% of airline tickets similar to UNICEF's scheme, to allow countries to bid for funds to work on improving accessibility or other cross-cutting policy drivers such as greening of their offices.	ILO	Low As the opportunity arises	Will mean slightly more expensive travel budgets throughout ILO
Policy				
8.	Engage with FUNDAMENTALS and NORMES to ensure that disability is favourably considered and given prominence in the recommendations of the detailed gap analysis of existing ILO standards on discrimination in employment and occupation, as requested by the ILC Resolution on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work	GED, NORMES and FUNDAMENTALS	High In-line with the timeline for the re-write	Staff time
9.	Consider the feasibility of setting up a trade union network based on a similar model to the GBDN	GED and ACTRAV	Medium Early in the next strategy period	Initial set-up funding and funding for activities required-
10.	Include indicators in the next strategy on engagement of DPOs at the national and international level. This should not just include	GED, field teams and relevant branches	Medium	Staff time

the GBDN but in other aspects of ILO's work, such as with trade unions		As the next strategy is developed	
Accountability, Reporting, and Monitoring			
11. Ensure a stronger accountability mechanism in next strategy. This would include ensuring branches and departments agree on indicators under their responsibility and for shared indicators, a lead department/branch is appointed. ILO should continue to engage in the development of a UN wide disability SWAP as this provide a structure within which ILO is held externally accountability for its actions.	GED and other affected branches and departments	High As the next strategy is developed	Staff time
12. Develop a reporting system for the disability strategy itself. Consider an annual progress report by the disability unit, supported by improved disaggregation of disability statistics and targeted activities in ILO's existing reporting systems	GED	High As the next strategy is developed	Staff time
13. Develop sections on disability within ILO's evaluation guidance note (particular guidance notes 6 & 12)	GED and EVAL	Medium Before guidance note 12 is finalized	Staff time
14. Ensure disability is included as a marker/search criteria in ILO's external dashboards such as the Development Cooperation Dashboard and internal databases such as IRIS	PARDEV and EVAL, and other relevant branches	Medium Ongoing	Staff time
Internal Policies			
15. Develop an accessibility checklist which can be used by field offices.	GED and INTSERV	Medium Early in the next strategy period	Staff time or consultant cost
16. Ensure key field based staff responsible for HR are trained on reasonable accommodation at interviews, accessibility and disability awareness.	GED and HRD	High Ongoing	Funding required- Utilize other planned training where possible
Communications			
17. Require new ILO websites to be accessible and compliant with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0	DCOMM	Medium	Not clear what resources would be needed
18. Work with DCOMM and other departments to ensure persons with disabilities are affirmed as key value of ILO and included in ILO's communication. Developing recommendations on how to communicate disability issues in various languages would support this effort.	GED, DCOMM and other relevant departments	Medium Ongoing	Staff time

Annex 1: List of Stakeholders Interviewed

Date	Name	Gender	Position	Branch, Country Office or Organization	Method	Location (of interviewee)
31/10	Esteban Tromel	M	Senior Disability Advisor	GED	Skype	Geneva
	Jurgen Menze	M	Disability Officer			
07/11	Esteban Tromel	M	Senior Disability Advisor	GED	Skype	Geneva
	Jurgen Menze	M	Disability Officer			
08/11	Emanuela Pozzan	F	Gender and Non-Discrimination Specialist	Regional Office for Arab States	In-person	Beirut
	Mari Schlanbusch	F	JPO			
09/11	Patrick Daru	M	Senior Skills and Employability Specialist & Coordinator for Amman Decent Work Country Programme	Jordan	Skype	Jordan
13/11	Kishore Kumar Singh	M	Chief Technical Advisor	Bangladesh	Skype	Bangladesh
13/11	Andres Yuren	M	Especialista Actividades con Empleadores	ACT-EMP	Skype	Costa Rica
14/11	Tendy Gunawan	M	Programme Officer	Indonesia	Skype	Indonesia
14/11	Fantahun Melles	M	National Programme Coordinator	Ethiopia	Skype	Ethiopia
14/11	Gehan Elsharkawy	F	National Project Coordinator	Egypt	Skype	Egypt
14/11	Peter Fremlin	M	Consultant	Independent	Skype	Egypt
15/11	Fatime Ndiaye	F	Gender and Non-Discrimination Specialist	West Africa Regional Office	Skype	Senegal
16/11	Haibin Zhou	M	Former ILO staff member	China	Skype	China
16/11	Mariko Ouchi	F	Gender and Non-Discrimination Specialist	Europe and Central Asia Regional Office	Skype	Budapest
17/11	Jorge Illingworth	M	Programme Manager	ITC ILO	Skype	Turin
20/11	Maria Jose Chamorro	F	Gender and Non-Discrimination Specialist	Regional Office for Central America	Skype	Costa Rica

21/11	Pia Korpinen	F	Former ILO staff member	Zambia	Skype	Ethiopia
21/11	Mwila Chigaga	F	Gender and Non-Discrimination Specialist	Regional Office for Southern Africa	Skype	South Africa
21/11	Thais Faria	F	Oficial Técnica Princípios e Direitos Fundamentais no Trabalho	Brazil	Skype	Brazil
22/11	Maureen Gilbert	F	Consultant	Independent	Skype	Ireland
22/11	Jovan Protic	M	National Programme Coordinator	Serbia	Skype	Serbia
22/11	Esther Gomez	F	Development Cooperation Support Officer	PARDEV	Skype	Geneva
24/11	Herve Bernard	M	Inclusion Unit Manager	Handicap International	Skype	France
27/11	Ruth Warick	F	Senior Accessibility Advisor	University of British Colombia & Representative of IDA on the Steering Committee of the GBDN	Skype (due to technical difficulties the interview responses were given via typing	Canada
28/11	Joni Simpson	F	Gender and Non-Discrimination Specialist	Regional Office for South East Asia	Skype	Bangkok
28/11	Shauna Olney	F	Chief of Branch	GED	In-Person	Geneva
28/11	Syed Mohammad Afsar	M	Senior Technical Specialist	GED	In-person	Geneva
28/11	Faustina Van Aperen	F	Senior Relations Officer	ACTRAV	In-person	Geneva
	Nezam Qahoush	M	Regional Desk Officer for the Arab Region Bureau for Workers' Activities			
29/11	Ilka Schoellmann	F	Technical Specialist on Equality and Non-Discrimination	GED	In-person	Geneva
29/11	Azza Taalab	F	Global Collaboration and Support Unit	International Labour Standards Department	In-person	Geneva

29/11	Guy Thijs	M	Director	EVAL	In-person	Geneva
01/12	Peter Rademaker	M	Unit Head	Development Partners Relations, PARDEV	In-person	Geneva
01/12	Margherita Licata	F	Expert	GED	In-person	Geneva
01/12	Henrik Moller	M	Senior Advisor	ACTEMP	In-person	Geneva
04/12	Ina Lykke Jensen	F	Programme Coordinator	Disabled Peoples Organizations Denmark	Skype	Denmark

Annex 2: Participants in Workshop Sessions

Name	Gender	Position	Office
Field Workshop: November 29th, 09.00-10.30			
Joni Simpson	F	Gender and Non-Discrimination Specialist	Regional Office for South East Asia
Kishore Kumar Singh	M	Chief Technical Advisor	Bangladesh
Gehan Elsharkawy	F	National Project Coordinator	Egypt
Esteban Tromel	M	Senior Disability Specialist	GED
Jurgen Menze	M	Disability Officer	GED
Chris Morris	M	External Consultant	N/A
Policy Workshop: November 30th 09.00-10.45			
Faustina Van Aperen	F	Senior Relations Specialist	ACTRAV
Lisa Wong	F	Senior Technical Officer, Non-Discrimination	FUNDAMENTALS
Valentina Stoevska	F	Senior Statistician	STATISTICS
Brigitte Zug-Castillo	F	Senior Advisor	GED
Ippei Tsuruga	M	JPO	SOCPRO
Esteban Tromel	M	Senior Disability Specialist	GED
Jurgen Menze	M	Disability Officer	GED
Chris Morris	M	External Consultant	N/A
Program Workshop: November 30th 11.30-12.30			
Francesca Fantoni	F	Programme Analyst	PROGRAM
Esther Gomez	F	Development Cooperation Support Officer	PARDEV
Parth Ajit Kanitkar	M	Programme Officer	PARDEV
Esteban Tromel	M	Senior Disability Specialist	GED
Chris Morris	M	External Consultant	N/A
Internal Policy Workshop: November 30th 14.00-16.00			
Sylvie Layous	F	HR Officer	HRD
Eloy Alonso-Maestre	M	Occupational Safety Officer	FACILITIES
Raya Ubenova	F	Digital Publications Officer	PRODOC
Mihoko Ito	F	HR Officer	HRD
Esteban Tromel	M	Senior Disability Specialist	GED
Jurgen Menze	M	Disability Officer	GED
Chris Morris	M	External Consultant	N/A
Communications Workshop: November 30th 16.30-17.30			
Alexander Belopopsky	M	Head of Internal Communications	DCOMM
Adam Bowers	M	Planning and Coordination Officer	DCOMM
Esteban Tromel	M	Senior Disability Specialist	GED
Jurgen Menze	M	Disability Officer	GED
Chris Morris	M	External Consultant	N/A

Annex 3: Schedule of Evaluation

Activity	Dates
Preparation of Terms of Reference	October
Initial briefing with Senior Disability Specialist and Disability Officer	30 October
Initial Desk review of documents	30 October-03 November
Skype calls with field staff and external stakeholders	08 November-05 December 2017
Submission of briefing paper/inception report	23 November
Feedback on briefing paper/inception report	24 November
Bilateral interviews during Geneva mission	27 November-1 December
Workshop with field staff via WebEx	29 November
Workshops with policy, programme, internal policy, and communication staff	30 November
Submission of draft final report	11 December
Circulate draft evaluation report to key stakeholders and consolidate comments	11-15 December
Submission of revised final evaluation report (including explanations why comments were not included)	21 December

Questions for Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination Specialists

1. Please explain how your role relates to disability?

2. What work has been done on mainstreaming disability throughout the region?

3. What tools on disability are you aware of? (reasonable accommodation, online training course, etc)

4. What impact has the grouping of gender equality with the other elements of non-discrimination (including disability) had?

5. How inclusive are the offices in the region? Are persons with disabilities able to access them and do persons with disabilities work with ILO?

6. Who are the strongest allies on disability in the region? Do you work with businesses, trade unions, DPOs etc?

7. Do you have suggestions for the next disability strategy? Is there more support you need?

8. Are there others I should talk to you?

Annex 5: List of Documents Consulted

Documents referred to during the evaluation included:

Disability Unit:

- Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014–17
- ILO staff survey on disability inclusion
- Disability inclusion: Governing Body Document; GB.316/POL/2
- GBDN Annual Report 2014
- GBDN Annual Report 2016
- GBDN Achievements 2017-Powerpoint
- Trade Union action on Disability and Decent Work: A Global Overview
- Promoting Diversity and Inclusion Through Workplace Adjustments: A Practical Guide
- Indigenous Persons with Disabilities: Access to Training and Employment
- Technical Meeting on Inclusive Social Protection for Persons with Disabilities: Summary Report

GED:

- ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17

General:

- Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2014-15
- Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2016-17
- Programme and Budget for the Biennium 2018-19
- Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15; 'Making Decent Work Happen'
- Draft transitional strategic plan for 2016–17 and preview of the Programme and Budget proposals for 2016–17
- ILO's Strategic Plan for 2018-21
- Occupational Health and Safety: Global Action for Prevention
- IPEC+ Flagship Strategy: International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour and Forced Labour
- Building Social Protection Floors for All Global Flagship Programme Strategy (2016-20)
- Towards 2017. Better Work Phase III Strategy. Promoting Good Working Conditions Across the International Garment Industry
- ILO Flagship Programme on Jobs for Peace and Resilience-Summary Sheet
- ILO Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All-Summary Sheet
- Employment and Decent Work in Situations of Fragility, Conflict and Disaster
- Decent Work and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
- Introducing the ILO: The UN agency for the world of work

Program, Policy and Evaluation

- Development Cooperation Manual
- ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation. Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations (3rd Edition)

UN Documents:

- UNPRPD Round 1: Projects Selected for Funding
- UNPRPD Round 2: Projects Selected for Funding
- 2016 UN-SWAP Reporting results, key drivers and lessons learnt-Powerpoint presentation

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Internal Evaluation of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The ILO has a longstanding commitment to promoting social justice for people with disabilities, dating back to the 1920s. Highlights in the ILO work promoting equal opportunities for persons with disabilities in the world of work through all its means of action, are the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983 (No. 159) and the Code of Practice on Managing Disability in the Workplace of 2001.

With the major international policy shift to a human rights-based approach to disability, there is a far greater emphasis on promoting disability inclusion and tackling discrimination faced by people with disabilities. This shift was marked by the adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in 2006, which, among other provisions, promotes fundamental principles and rights at work and social protection.

Following up on the ILO Governing Body's endorsement of the ILO's work to promote disability inclusion (GB.316/POL/2, as amended), a Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 to guide the work of the ILO was adopted.

2. Background: Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17

The Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 plan took account of the views of ILO managers and staff, gathered through consultations with relevant departments at ILO Headquarters and a questionnaire survey of ILO field offices, as well as the findings of the Disability Inclusion Initiative (DII) benchmarking and evaluation reports of 2009 and 2012 and the results of the 2014 ILO staff survey on disability inclusion. It built on the accessibility improvements made in the HQ building since 2001 and on the DII pilot tested in the Employment Sector from 2009.

The Disability Inclusion Strategy set out to achieve six results which were supported by communication measures:
7. Enhanced promotion of international standards relevant to persons with disabilities;
8. Disability perspective reflected in all programming and reporting;
9. Increased attention to people with disabilities in ILO's work with constituents and in its technical cooperation;
10. Disability-inclusive ILO internal practices promoted;
11. Strengthened knowledge base;
12. Strengthened strategic cooperation within the UN system.

A twin-track approach was adopted to achieve these results with disability issues being included in ILO activities and means of action, including internal practices, and at the same time disability-specific actions being promoted as necessary to address situations of particular disadvantage. The measures and actions to achieve the results were outlined in the Disability Inclusion Action Plan 2014-17.

3. Purpose and clients

The main purpose of the evaluation of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 is:
- To assess the performance of the ILO in achieving the six results;
- To identify barriers and enablers for their achievement:
- To determine unintended or unexpected results;
- To identify lessons learned and good practices; and
- To provide recommendations for a subsequent ILO Strategy and Action Plan on Disability Inclusion for the period 2018-21.

The principal clients of the evaluation are:
• The ILO's Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED), which has the primary responsibility for promoting the implementation of the current and future Disability Inclusion Strategies and Action Plans;
• Line managers and staff both in headquarters and field offices, who are the ultimate implementers of the Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan on a daily basis;

4. Key evaluation questions and analytical framework

In the assessment of (i) relevance, (ii) validity of design, (iii) effectiveness, (iv) efficiency, (v) effectiveness of management arrangements, and (vi) impact and sustainability of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17, the evaluation will seek to address the following evaluation questions:

Assessment Criteria	Questions to be addressed
Relevance	• To what extent is ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 aligned with the Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 and 2016-17, in particular the link with the cross-cutting policy driver on gender and nondiscrimination? • What is the potential impact of the ILO programmatic framework for 2018-21?
Validity of design	• Were the intended results of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 logical and realistic? • How appropriate and useful are the ILO Disability Inclusion Action Plan 2014-17 indicators for (i) enabling institutional mechanisms for disability inclusion in the Office (both HQ and at field offices), and (ii) disability-related programmatic outcomes? Have they effectively measured results and progress?
Effectiveness	• What results have been achieved and/or what progress has been made with the implementation of ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17? • Which gaps remain and how could these be addressed in the next Strategy and Action Plan? • To what extent has the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 been an effective instrument to help ensure mainstreaming disability across the ILO? • How well has gender equality and multiple discrimination been included in the implementation of the Plan?

Efficiency	• Are resources for disability mainstreaming being used in the most efficient manner? How economically are resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time etc.) converted to results? Do the results justify the cost? • What time and cost efficiency measures could be introduced in the future without impacting negatively on the achievement of results?
Effectiveness of management arrangements	• Are the roles and responsibilities of ILO officials (in HQ and field offices), including management, who are responsible for the implementation of disability mainstreaming, clearly defined and understood? • Is the current arrangement for implementing ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17 effective? • Are there any changes recommended for the new strategy?
Sustainability	• Are the results achieved in 2014-17 likely to be sustainable? • What elements need to be taken into account to ensure sustainability of outcomes in the new Action Plan?

5. Methodology

This internal evaluation will have a workshop facilitated by an external facilitator as a core element of the evaluation process.

This internal evaluation will be based upon the ILO's evaluation policy and procedures, which adhere to international standards and best practices as articulated in the OECD/DAC Principles and the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System approved by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in April 2005, as well as by ILO EVAL guidelines.

The external facilitator is encouraged to look at the methodologies used by independent evaluations of gender mainstreaming of other UN agencies, but should develop its own approach based on the core norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

The following is the suggested methodology for the evaluation. The methodology can be adjusted by the external facilitator if considered necessary in accordance with the scope and purpose of the review. This should be done in consultation with the Senior Disability Specialist.

5.1. Document review, scoping and inception report

The external facilitator will receive a briefing by the disability inclusion team in GED and review relevant documents that relate to performance and progress in disability mainstreaming and disability-specific actions, which will be compiled by GED and provided prior to the start of the evaluation (including baseline information, policy documents, Governing Body documents, etc.). In addition, the external facilitator will conduct electronic and/or telephone interviews with a few selected key stakeholders, i.e. a sample of field-based/HQ staff. A number of face to face interviews will also be held during the mission to Geneva.

The facilitator will produce **an inception report** based on initial desk review to serve as the basis for the discussions in the project workshop. It will include a summary of key findings from the desk review and the interviews, the programme and background presentation for the 1-day workshop and the outline of the evaluation report.

5.2. Workshop

The external facilitator will facilitate a one-day workshop which will include participation of field-based/HQ staff. Participation of field-based staff will be organized by videoconference (special consideration should be done to the different time zones).

The external facilitator will design the programme of the day and the relevant background presentation (PowerPoint) which will guide the discussion throughout the day.

The external facilitator will be responsible for consolidating all comments during the workshop and reflect them in the evaluation report.

5.3. Debriefing

After the workshop a debriefing session with the disability team in GED will take place regarding, specially, changes that have been suggested by the workshop. This will focus on the implication of the proposed adjustment in the strategy for the remaining period of the evaluation.

5.4. Evaluation report

Based on the inception report and the inputs from the workshop and follow-up meeting, the external facilitator will draft the evaluation report. The draft report will be sent to ILO by the external facilitator for comments that will be considered by the external facilitator for finalizing the report.

6. Deliverables

Deliverables	Submission by
1. Inception report, including workshop programme and background presentation	15 November 2017
2. Draft evaluation report	1 December 2017
3. Final evaluation report	15 December 2017

6.1. Evaluation report and evaluation summary

The evaluation report will include an executive summary (using ILO standard format) and a full report with findings and recommendations (following the ILO checklist of quality evaluation reports), to be finalized by the team leader. The contents of the report include:

- Title page (follow ILO standard template)
- Table of contents
- Executive summary (follow ILO standard template)
- Acronyms
- Background and project description
- Purpose of evaluation
- Evaluation methodology, evaluation questions and limitations
- Findings on the six results (plus communication) of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Lessons learned and examples of good practice
- Annexes:
  a. Terms of Reference
  b. Data collection instruments
  c. List of persons and organizations interviewed
  d. List of publications cited
  e. Other relevant information
  f. Inception report

The evaluation report should be concise and not exceed 35 pages excluding annexes (supporting data and details can be included in annexes). The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklists 4, 5, 6 & 7 (see Annex).

The Evaluation Summary should follow ILO's standard format, and will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 8 (see Annex).

The report and all other outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for Windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the external facilitator. The copyrights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

6.2. Main outputs/deliverables/timeframe

The proposed timeframe for this evaluation is from November 2017 to February 2018 in accordance with the following schedule:

Phase	Description	Tentative Dates	Responsible persons
1.	Preparation of Terms of Reference	October 2017	Evaluation Manager
2.	Briefing with Evaluation Manager (phone)	30 October-3 November 2017	External facilitator
3.	Review of documents and phone interviews with selected HQ and field staff	6 November-17 November 2017	External facilitator (5 days)

4.	Face to face interviews during Geneva mission, one-day evaluation workshop and debriefing with disability team	18-22 November 2017	External facilitator (5 days)
5.	Draft evaluation report	1 December 2017	External facilitator (4 days)
6.	Circulate draft evaluation report to key stakeholders, consolidate comments and send to external facilitator	4-11 December 2017	Evaluation Manager
7.	Submission of revised final evaluation report (including explanations why comments were not included)	15 December 2017	External facilitator (1 day)

Estimated number of working days of consultancy: 15 days.

7. Management and responsibilities

The external facilitator will report to the Evaluation Manager and should discuss any technical, methodological or organizational matters with the Evaluation Manager.

The evaluation will be carried out with logistical and administrative support of the disability inclusion team in GED.

The Senior Disability Specialist will act as Evaluation Manager.

7.1. Quality assurance

The external facilitator will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. It is expected that the report shall be written in an evidence-based manner such that all observations, conclusions, recommendations, etc., are supported by evidence and analysis.

7.2. Qualifications of the external facilitator

The external facilitator will have the following competencies:

• Knowledge of the ILO's role and mandate, tripartite structure and disability policies; knowledge of disability inclusion twin-track approach;
• Demonstrated experience in results-based management in the UN system;
• Extensive experience in the evaluation function of national and international organizations and a full understanding of the UN evaluation norms and standards;
• Ability to write concisely in English;
• No relevant bias related to ILO, or conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

7.3. Final report submission procedure

For this independent final evaluation, the following procedure is used:
- The external facilitator will submit a draft evaluation report to the Evaluation Manager.
- The Evaluation Manager will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comment and factual correction.
- The Evaluation Manager will consolidate the comments and send these to the external facilitator.
- The external facilitator will finalize the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate and providing a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated. He/she will submit the final report to the Evaluation Manager who then forwards it to EVAL for approval.
- The Evaluation Manager officially forwards the evaluation report to key stakeholders.

Internal Evaluation of the ILO Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan 2014-17

Briefing Paper of Initial Findings and Proposed Workshop Schedule

Chris Morris

November 23rd, 2017

Contents

Introduction

In November 2017, the International Labour Organization (ILO) commissioned a final internal evaluation of the 2014-17 Disability Inclusion Strategy and Action Plan. This document serves as a background report for the evaluation. It introduces the context and background of the project, briefly summarizes the evaluation purpose, scope, and methodology, summarizes the achievements of the project so far, and gives a review of key initial findings. Additionally, the document presents suggested questions the workshop should consider.

Background

ILO has a long-standing commitment to promoting social justice for persons with disabilities. The development and ratification of ILO Convention 159, the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention in 1983 and the Code of Practice on Managing Disability in the Workplace of 2001 are two early successes which have guided ILO's work on disability. More recently, ILO has been a strong proponent of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD). ILO has supported countries to implement a more rights based approach to disability, particularly with regard to social protection and fundamental rights and principles at work.

ILO's Governing Body endorsed ILO's work to promote disability inclusion through GB.316/POL/2. This led to the development of the disability strategy 2014-17. It was developed to take account of the views of Geneva and field based staff, and various evaluation reports and a disability inclusion survey.

The strategy lays out six results, with an additional cross-cutting communication element:

13. Enhanced promotion of international standards relevant to persons with disabilities;
14. Disability perspective reflected in all programming and reporting;
15. Increased attention to people with disabilities in ILO's work with constituents and in its technical cooperation;
16. Disability-inclusive ILO internal practices promoted;
17. Strengthened knowledge base;
18. Strengthened strategic cooperation within the UN system.

The strategy contained an action plan for each result which included indicators, targets, indicative activities, and key partners for each result. Each result had between 3-10 activities identified.

Prior to writing the strategy, disability was moved from the SKILLS branch to the Gender, Equality, and Diversity Branch. Disability is currently part of the cross-cutting policy driver of gender and non-discrimination, which is one of five cross-cutting policy drivers included in the 2018-21 Strategic Plan approved by the Governing Body.

The disability work of GED is currently led by two staff members in Geneva, a Senior Disability Specialist and a Disability Inclusion Officer. A Disability Expert is also housed within GED but has been seconded to other work for much of the strategy period. In the field, responsibility for disability lies with the Regional Gender Specialists who are responsible for gender and non-discrimination.

At the time of development of the strategy, ILO was implementing the third stage of a multi-country disability focused project funded by Irish Aid. This had been implemented for over a decade and successive phases had received positive evaluations. However, a change in strategic priorities for Irish Aid led to the project not being renewed for a fourth phase. Since then for the rest of implementation stage of this strategy, ILO has not had a large multi-country disability project. Disability work has been implemented through individual projects and some work on mainstreaming at the country level, , and the Global Disability and Business Network.

Purpose, Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation

The final internal evaluation will review the implementation of the disability strategy both in Geneva and the field. It will review what has been accomplished, the impact the achievements have had, and what challenges/barriers to implementation occurred. The evaluation will follow the usual ILO criteria of relevance, validity of design, effectiveness, efficiency, effectiveness of management arrangements, and sustainability. Impact is not included in the criteria, but questions of impact will be addressed under the effectiveness criterion.

The methods used for the evaluation consisted of an initial briefing on the strategy by the disability specialists in Geneva and desk review of key documents. Skype calls were conducted with a series of key internal and external stakeholders including the Gender Specialist in the regional offices, and staff who have worked on disability focused projects. External stakeholders included former ILO consultants and officers from disability focused NGOs who have collaborated with ILO during the period of the strategy. Participants were initially suggested by the Senior Disability Expert and the Disability Officer and a snowball sampling technique was used as interview participants suggested additional people to talk to.

The consultant will hold bilateral interviews and workshop meetings with a series of HQ staff during the evaluation mission to Geneva. Suggested participants include staff from GED, ACT-EMP, ACTRAV, PARDEV, PROGRAM, EVAL, INTSERV, RELMEETINGS, FUNDAMENTALS, BETTERWORK, SKILLS, STATISTICS, and Social Protection.

A workshop will be held during the evaluation mission consisting of a series of sessions with different key stakeholders. Questions for discussion during the workshop are proposed below. Different groups will be mobilized for the individual sessions. The planned sessions include policy, program, internal polices and communication. Remote sessions via skype or video conference will also be held with key stakeholders in different field locations split up by time zone.

The evaluator will keep notes during the workshop and record a series of agreed recommendations for the next strategy. The results of the desk review, interviews, and workshops will be consolidated into a report to be produced after the workshop.

Key Achievements of the Strategy

The next two sections of key achievements and challenges are based on initial observations from the desk review and interviews with ILO staff and consultants. The vast majority of interviews have been with field based staff and thus the observations may be heavily biased towards field views. More work with Geneva based staff will be done during the mission week which may lead to a revision of findings on achievements and challenges.

The strategy was designed in 2014 to run for three years, and thus is nearing completion at the end of 2017. The strategy laid out six results focusing on different areas of the work including policy, program, partnership, and internal policies. The strategy laid out a series of indicators and activities for each result. Overall, ILO has been able to achieve some but not all of the planned activities and results. During the period, the most notable achievements were:

- The development of tools and resources on disability. A substantial number of tools and resources have been produced including a guide to promoting diversity and making reasonable adjustments in the workplace, various documents and guides making the business case for employing persons with disabilities, a manual on reporting guidelines for the media, and guides for including disability issues in legislation. The disability unit has also contributed disability focused sections to mainstream publications such as the World Social Protection Reports.

- The strengthening of the Global Business and Disability Network (GBDN) and development of a number of similar national bodies. The GBDN was initiated by ILO in 2010. At a global level, its members mainly consist of large multi-national companies, but is also supported by NGOs and DPOs, and national employers' organizations. The network has been replicated at a national level in several countries such as Zambia, Ethiopia, and Egypt. In most cases this has grown out of work ILO has been doing on disability, particularly through PROPEL or ACT/EMP's work, and supported by the disability unit. The GBDN self-funds its activities through membership fees.
- Improvement of an inclusive and accessible environment in Geneva. During the period, the disability unit has worked closely with the INTSERV, RELMEETINGS, and PRODOC to improve the accessibility and inclusiveness of the ILO headquarters in Geneva. This includes the purchase of evacuation chairs, increased attention to accessibility and specific needs for persons with disabilities at meetings, the purchase of a braille printer, and the development and practicing of plans for addressing disability needs during emergencies such as fires. The challenge for ILO in the next strategy period is to extend this approach to field offices, where physical accessibility is still an issue in many offices.
- Participation in UNPRPD committees and projects. Although the number of projects ILO is involved in has reduced most recently, ILO has continued to play an active role in a number of projects at country level. The challenge for ILO in the coming years is how they can remain an active and relevant member of this work, particularly in countries where their presence is low, and there is the risk of being crowded out by the bigger agencies, most notably UNDP.
- Continued work on disability in specific countries. Although patchy, there are notable countries which continue to do considerable work on disability. Much of this is linked to countries which had specific disability projects and have retained staff who are interested in the work. These include the countries involved in PROPEL such as Ethiopia, Zambia, and Indonesia. Other countries which have had other projects such as Bangladesh which started work on inclusive TVET support in 2012. The Latin American region is also an example of reasonably substantial work on disability, most notably through ACT/EMP and national disability and business networks.
- Including of disability in key PARDEV and EVAL manuals and checklists. One concern raised by evaluation participants is that disability is often only raised in documents within gender and non-discrimination, so the inclusion of disability specifically in PARDEV and EVAL manuals is an important step in ensuring disability is given due consideration in project design and evaluations.

Challenges moving into the next strategy period

Despite the achievements noted above, there are a number of challenges which ILO need to consider as they move into the next strategy period.

- Strengthening the mainstreaming work: Feedback from the field suggested that ILO was quite successful in addressing disability in country offices which either had a history of disability projects, or particular individuals who were interested in the topic. It was felt though that the work was not mainstreamed into other work in most country offices. Reasons suggested for this included a lack of resources, a lack of awareness among colleagues on how to work on disability, and a lack of interest or seeing of disability as a priority. The absorption of disability into gender and non-discrimination was also viewed by many staff as harming the work on disability as there was a tendency to view non-discrimination mainly through a gender lens.
- Disability knowledge among ILO staff: Linked to the issue of mainstreaming is the lack of knowledge on disability among many staff. The strategy laid out the goal of conducting DET training to field staff. However, this has not happened. Although there is an online course, which individuals who have taken it praise highly, it is not widely used by ILO field staff. Disability is viewed as an add on to existing work, rather than an essential part of meeting ILO's core values and mandate. Addressing

ways to change this culture is essential if ILO is to play a full role in support international initiatives on disability such as meeting the indicators within the SDGs.

- Relying on key individuals: much of the work ILO does on disability seems to be driven by individuals who have a particular interest in the topic. The work in Latin America can be linked to it being pushed by 2 or 3 individuals who had experience in the topic and were interested to push forward the work. The same can be seen in Egypt where the CD and one officer have an interest in the topic. China is quite a good example of how the interest of the country office has reduced since the main individual who worked on disability has left. Although the idea of slowly building a solid network on disability champions throughout the organization through personal contact and referral has been effective during the current strategy, this does highlight the challenges of mainstreaming and ensuring disability is included in CPOs, DWCPs, and mainstream projects. Identifying a way to continue to use disability champions, but ensuring other staff take an interest and include disability in their work is a key challenge for ILO.
- Providing more support in the field: the disability unit nominally consists of 3 individuals, but one has been seconded to other work for much of the period of the strategy. The capacity to support countries throughout the globe is challenged by the limited human and financial resources the disability unit has. Most participants in the evaluation praised the responsiveness and availability of the disability unit in reacting to requests for support. There were though some participants who felt a stronger field presence was needed. This is probably reflective of the limited resources available which tends to mean the disability unit responds to requests for support rather than being able to take initiative to strengthen disability awareness and knowledge in under-represented areas. This problem is compounded by the fact that responsibility for disability in the regions has passed to the gender specialists, most of whom acknowledge they have limited knowledge of disability, and thus requests for support tend to go directly to Geneva. As one gender specialist said 'we don't automatically become experts overnight because our job description changes'. To strengthen the support given in the field, ILO needs to address how to strengthen knowledge within regional offices.
- Funding: the lack of funding for disability projects was commonly raised as a reason for limited work on disability. Since the loss of Irish Aid funding, there has not been a large multi-country disability program in the ILO, and other funding is limited (often to UNPRDP or business network activities). As such, even if countries have disability in their DWCP or CPOs, they often do not work on the issue. Part of this problem can be linked to the issues of mainstreaming and lack of disability knowledge. Considerably more work could be included in mainstream projects if disability was not viewed as an expensive add-on. However, identifying projects which can demonstrate how disability projects can be successful, and spark more requests for support from constituents, could help support the inclusion of disability in more projects.
- Gender and non-discrimination: This subject has been included above in other issues. There was a general feeling that disability has been given less attention since it is included within gender and non-discrimination, as the focus remains firmly on gender, and then the other topics within non-discrimination are often regulated to the background.
- Internal inclusion and accessibility in the field: Despite the good improvements in accessibility in Geneva, there has been limited work on improving accessibility and the inclusive environment in ILO offices in the field. The work that has been achieved, often comes from the individuals who are interested in disability pushing colleagues to consider accessibility issues. Given ILO has produce a guide on reasonable accommodation for businesses, strengthening internal practices in the field should be a priority.
- Inter-sectionality of discrimination: Many ILO staff indicated they felt there was limited awareness of how to address the inter-sectionality of discrimination. Recognising multiple discrimination and

addressing it effectively in projects which sees not only disability work mainstreaming gender and other forms of discrimination but also gender and other vulnerable groups work mainstreaming disability is a challenge for the next strategy phase.

Summary of Key Initial Findings

Relevance

The disability and inclusion strategy was designed and finalized during the period of the 2010-2015 ILO Strategy Policy Framework. At the time, this laid out 19 outcomes, which formed the outcomes in the biennial P&B biennium outcomes. ILO has since consolidated the outcomes into 10 outcomes. A continuation of the 2010-15 strategy was approved by the Governing Body for 2016-17, and a new strategy has been developed for 2018-21.

The period has also seen attention given to a series of initiatives both at ILO and throughout the UN system. In particular, ILO has launched its five flagship programs which incorporated many technical assistance projects into the five main themes. The flagship programs are Better Work, Social Protection Floors for All, IPEC+, the Global Action for Prevention on Occupational Safety and Health (GAP-OSH programme), and Jobs for Peace and Resilience. In 2013, the Director General also launched the Centenary Initiatives, as a vehicle for ILO to prepare itself for the future challenges of its social justice mandate as it enters its second century in 2019. The seven initiatives are the future or work initiative, the end of poverty initiative, the women at work initiative, the green initiative, the standards initiative, the enterprises initiative, and the governance initiative.

This period also saw the launch of the sustainable development goals (SDGs) to continue the work of the millennium development goals which contain a number of reference to disability. The UNPRPD has also been a major initiative running during this period.

The 2010-15 Strategy Policy Framework emphasised the importance of gender equality and non-discrimination, with each outcome detailing the work which will be done on this cross-cutting policy driver. Explicit reference to persons with disabilities was made in outcomes 2, 4, and 10. Outcome 5 also highlights improvements in working conditions for the most vulnerable workers, which persons with disabilities will often be, and outcome 17 focuses on non-discrimination. In this regard, the disability and inclusion strategy directly aligns with the strategy as it lays out approaches to mainstream disability within ILO's work and support directly targeted projects.

The disability and inclusion strategy also aligns with the Strategy Policy Framework in other regards. The third pillar of the framework is the strengthening of technical capacities. The disability and inclusion strategy aligns with this through seeking to strengthen the knowledge base through training, improvement in statistical knowledge, and the dissemination of resources. This pillar also focuses on improving partnership and communication with other UN agencies which is addressed in outcome 6 of the disability and inclusion strategy. Additionally, outcome 3 of the disability and inclusion strategy focuses on building the capacity of tripartite constituents, which is another key goal of the third pillar of the framework.

The number of outcomes in the P&B proposals for 2016-17 were reduced from 19 to 10, and this was continued in the 2018-19 proposals, and reflected in the proposed 2018-21 Strategic Plan. The P&B proposals and the Strategic Plan include significant references to the SDGs and Agenda 2030, and ILOs role in support their achievement. Significant indicators are included in an annex to the P&B proposals which include references to disability in goals 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, & 10.

The Strategic Plan lays out the goal of ILO to have 'reinforced significantly its capacities to deliver quality services to its constituents and member States to realize social justice', 'increased significantly its capacity to reach out to, and address the needs of, those most vulnerable and disadvantaged in the world of work, including those in poverty and those affected by situations of conflict and fragility, and by egregious violations of fundamental rights and freedoms', 'sustained and reinforced its normative function through a robust and relevant body of international labour standards', and 'strengthened significantly its role as a knowledge leader' (pages 6 and 7). All of these are relevant for the development of the next disability and inclusion strategy.

Validity of Design

The strategy was designed during a time of change in ILO. Disability work had recently moved into GED, and the strategic plan of ILO and Programme and Budget Outcomes were consolidated from 19 to 10 outcomes. Additionally, areas of critical importance were removed and more emphasis placed on the Centenary Initiatives and the Flagship Programmes. With this in mind, some specific areas of the disability and inclusion strategy would become less relevant or need adapting. Overall though, the ideas behind the strategy remained valid, even if the structure changed.

The overall results of the strategy were logical in addressing the key areas of work. However, some of the expectations of the strategy were ambitious given the limited resources available to the disability unit, an issue which was compounded by the loss of Irish Aid funding at the end of 2015.

As noted, the results have probably been more effectively implemented in headquarters than the field. A key recommendation for the next strategy is likely to be to focus more on field activities, and it could be argued a result particularly focused on field activities might have enhanced some of the field work.

Monitoring Progress

There is currently only a limited system for the field to report on their work on disability. Regional offices and country offices are required to self-assess the implementation of their CPOs on the cross-cutting policy driver of gender and non-discrimination. Feedback from staff is that in many cases this tends to be an assessment of the work the offices are doing on gender. Some responses address disability, but even this is often more on a project-based approach than from a mainstreaming approach.

There is also not a reporting structure for the disability unit to report on progress on the strategy. The disability unit has managed to track progress and develop informal documents for the evaluator for this evaluation but this is not a structured system.

It could have been helpful to conduct a mid-term evaluation (or at least stock-take) of the strategy which would have allowed for the recognition of what was successful and what wasn't working, and focusing of priorities for the second half of the strategy period.

Effectiveness

The strategy laid out 6 results with a cross-cutting policy driver of communication. An action plan included a number of indicators and indicative activities. Initially review of the work conducted during the strategy suggests that some but not all of the indicative and activities have been achieved, and there has probably stronger achievements in certain results at HQ level than the field.

8. Enhanced promotion of international standards relevant to persons with disabilities;

The indicative activities which have been achieved are the development of a publication on reasonable accommodation and the (almost final) publication to promote coherence between UNCRPD and the CEACR work related to ILO Conventions No.111 and No.159.

Work on mainstreaming international labour standards activities to include persons with disabilities and the assessment of the impact of relevant ILO standards for promoting the rights of persons with disabilities has been less successful. One of the challenges ILO faces is the C.159 is quite out of date with the current developments on disability rights. The UNCRPD has superseded this convention. Given one of ILO's strengths is its normative framework, one workshop question for discussion for the next strategy is should attempts be made to update the convention or develop new guidelines laying out ILO's stance on disability?

9. Disability perspective reflected in all programming and reporting;

The change in number of P&B outcomes and the movement away from areas of critical importance to the flagship programs and centenary initiatives did affect the indicative activities within this result.

The inclusion of disability in the gender and non-discrimination cross-cutting policy driver, and movement away from the SKILLS department, coupled with there no longer being a specific indicator on disability in the P&B outcomes, has affected the attention paid to disability, and will be a key discussion point during the workshops.

31 countries in Africa, 3 countries in the Americas, 3 in the Arab States, 11 in Asia and the Pacific, and 9 in Europe and Central Asia include references to disability in the DCWP. It is not clear how many CPOs refer to disability, although with the consolidation of the number of outcomes, the belief of the disability team is that the number of references, and definitely specific indicators, has reduced.

A sample of PRODOCs, progress reports and evaluation reports will be analyzed to understand how many reference disability. This will take place during the week of the mission to Geneva.

10. Increased attention to people with disabilities in ILO's work with constituents and in its technical cooperation;

Outcome 3 had the highest number of indicative activities in the action plan. The activities related to the headquarters and the GBDN have been mainly achieved, but there has been less success in rolling some of the activities out to the field. The disability unit has been successful in including disability into the PARDEV Cooperation Manual, and the updating technical cooperation advice through the PARDEV 'how to' series. Although not explicitly mentioned as an activity, guidance on the need for evaluations to consider how effectively projects have mainstreamed disability is included in the 2017 updated evaluation guidelines.

Continued support to the GBDN has been provided, and is probably one of the most successful elements of the work during the current strategy. Membership fees for the GBDN provide the funds to make the network self-funding.

The disability unit provides regular advice on request on disability inclusion within projects. The PARDEV appraisal checklist contains the questions 'Does the proposal include a strategy to address the situations, needs and concerns of people with disabilities?' and a link to the how-to guidance. However, the resources of the team mean they respond to requests rather being able to actively work to push the inclusion of persons with disabilities, and the PARDEV appraisal checklist is not compulsory. As such disability related activities may only be included when there is genuine interest already from the country office or proposal designer.

The strategy contained a number of activities related to training and technical knowledge improvement. The achievements of the planned activities have been mixed. The DET training which ILO has deployed effectively in a number of countries, particularly the PROPEL-project countries, also provides an opportunity for ILO's staff to increase their technical knowledge. This opportunity has not been taken up in the field. Feedback from many of the evaluation participants was that it is important to increase training of country office staff. However, to date, interest from field officers for their staff to undertake DET training has been very limited. DET is given to staff in Geneva.

The goal of conducting capacity building courses for constituents has mainly been achieved through the DET courses rather than ITC Turin. There is a willingness at the ITC to develop a course on disability awareness for business managers, but would require resources to develop it. A course will be held next year on disability inclusion in the world of work. Disability issues are only included in a minimal number of courses on other topics, and there is room for more inclusion of disability topics in these courses.

11. Disability-inclusive ILO internal practices promoted

This outcome is another area of the strategy where there has been success in Geneva and the next strategy will need to consider how to roll out to the field. INTSERV, RELMEETINGS, and PRODOC have all taken actions to strengthen accessibility and inclusion at Geneva. More consideration is given to the needs of persons with disabilities attending ILO meetings, a braille printer has been purchased, emergency plans are more inclusive, and the building is more accessible.

This has not been replicated at the field level. Many ILO offices remain inaccessible and although some country offices do pro-actively address these concerns, the feedback of evaluation participants was the vast majority do not. Lack of interest, awareness, and funds were all cited as reasons. ILO offices which are housed in government buildings also struggle with accessibility issues as it is often not possible to persuade the host government to make necessary adjustments. Ethiopia is one of the notable exceptions to this, where the same officer has worked on disability projects for over a decade, and supported the improvement of accessibility both internally within the UN and in partnership with the government counterpart ministry.

The 2014-17 strategy was developed using knowledge gained from an ILO staff survey on disability. There was not a management response to this survey, which meant it is possible opportunities to address some of the issues raised were lost.

12. Strengthened knowledge base;

The work in this outcome is very closely linked to outcome 3 and the cross-cutting communication theme. Evaluation participants indicated that one of the key strengths of the disability unit was the publicizing of resources and publications related to disability. During the strategy period the PLONE was updated regularly, joint publications were undertaken with different departments, disability sections were included in mainstream publications.

13. Strengthened strategic cooperation within the UN system.

The indicative activities in this outcome were drafted in quite an ambitious manner, and given the limited resources of the disability unit, not all have been achieved. ILO has continued to play a role on the UNPRPD policy board and at a country level in UNPRPD projects. The number of countries which have projects involving ILO has reduced though and a challenge ILO faces is how to ensure continued engagement in these projects in countries where it does have a significant country presence or history of work on disability. Some evaluation participants noted that ILO can lose out to the bigger UN agencies, most notably UNDP. Given ILO's comparative advantages of its tripartite model and expertise in labour market issues, consideration of how to ensure continued engagement at a country level in these projects is important for the next strategy.

This outcome also included the activity, 'Lead and reinforce UN system wide work on the Employment of People with Disabilities, linked to the post-2015 Development Agenda'. This was an ambitious target and there are limited UN agencies working on the employment of persons with disabilities.

14. Communicating internally and externally

Communication was not a specific outcome but considered a cross-cutting issue. Some of the achievements have been included in the outcomes listed above.

The disability unit has developed an online training course and provides advice on request to constituents and staff. As noted above, most of the DET work has been with constituents and ILO field offices have not availed themselves of the opportunity to have this training for their staff.

The strategy set a target of 50 disability champions in HQ and the field by the end of the strategy period. There has not been a formal identification of the criteria for a disability champion. The disability unit has been successful in identifying key allies and working with them, but does not seem possible to actually formally report on the number of champions. Whether there should be a more formal process is suggested as a discussion point for the mission week.

Relevance of the Strategy to Country Offices

During interviews, participants were asked if they were aware of the strategy and if it had been of use to them. The majority, but not all, were aware of the disability strategy. Most participants felt it had been useful in the abstract more than the practical day to day sense. They were aware of the goals and some had occasionally used the strategy in advocacy to country offices or in developing DWCPs.

Gender Equality and Multiple Discrimination

The inclusion of disability within gender and non-discrimination means that openings to address disability are often through a gender lens. One of the centenary initiatives is the women at work initiative. It was though suggested by ILO field staff that in general there was not too much crossover between the work of the different sections of GED. As noted above, many ILO staff indicated they felt there was limited awareness of how to address the inter-sectionality of discrimination.

Efficiency

The evaluation questions within the efficiency criterion focus on whether the results justify the cost and if the resources are being use in an efficient manner. Work on assessing the use of the limited budget available for the disability unit will be discussed during the mission to Geneva, and thus more included in the final report.

Feedback from the field mainly recognized the limited resources available to the disability unit, and understood that with only two people in the unit, it was difficult to provide the level of support needed. It was suggested that the next strategy needs to focus more on the needs of the field, and with that consider how the resources can best be used to target field staff more effectively.

Feedback was also given that more donor resources on disability would help support the understanding of disabilities in the field. This was based on the idea that funding availability often drives priorities in country offices, and that demonstration of disability projects is the best way to spark interest among colleagues. Many evaluation participants believe there is a passive understanding of the need to work on disability, but very limited pro-active attempts to work on the issue. Availability of funding would help this and could have a snow-ball effect within the country office. I.e. one project on disability could help lead to a greater awareness and attempts to mainstream disability among other colleagues. There are examples which support this idea. For example, the long-term work on disability in Zambia and Ethiopia, has helped raised awareness of disability to some extent among other colleagues. With this in mind, one recommendation for the more effective use of resources, would be to dedicate more Geneva staff time to identifying funding opportunities for different regions, which would help raise the profile of disability work in those offices.

Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

Roles and Responsibilities

At the time the strategy was developed, disability was housed within SKILLS. This changed in 2014 and work on disability is now housed with the GED branch of the ILO. Disability forms part of the cross-cutting policy driver on gender and non-discrimination which is a critical part of ILO's biennium P&B proposals. As such GED is responsible for non-discrimination in gender, disability, indigenous people, and HIV/AIDs.

The disability unit in Geneva consists of a Senior Disability Expert and a Disability Officer. The Senior Disability Expert has overall responsibility for the implementation of the disability strategy and reports to the Chief of Branch of GED. A Disability Expert is part of GED but has mainly been seconded to work on another topic during the implementation period.

Since the incorporation of disability within GED, responsibility at a regional level for disability has been given to the Gender Experts based in the regional offices. For the most part these experts were recruited before the inclusion of disability within GED and have not had their job descriptions formally changed to include disability. Their primary expertise is gender, and many expressed during interviews that they had limited insight into disability issues. Job descriptions of recruitments since the merger have included disability and other forms of non-discrimination, of which the position in Costa Rica is an example. However, most of the regional gender experts have not have their TOR changed formally.

Responsibility for disability issues elsewhere within ILO is more informal. At the field level, some offices which have a history of working on disability have an informal disability champion, usually someone who has been responsible for working on disability projects in the past. This is not a formal position, although in at least one case the CD asked the individual to be a disability focal point. Colleagues are aware of the work these individuals are doing on disability and will often ask for technical support and guidance. In some cases, the individuals are pro-active about addressing inclusion issues within the office as well, but on an ad hoc basis.

A common theme which was raised by field staff is the need for focal points on disability. Participants indicated that the expertise required for disability was considerably different to that needed for gender and other issues within the non-discrimination theme. The merger of the different non-discrimination themes in GED was considered to have diluted the attention paid to disability; a point made by both staff who have worked on disability directly, and the gender specialists themselves. It was felt that more attention needed to be paid to training staff in the field on disability. The caveat to the identification of focal point on disability is that evaluation participants believed it was important for focal points to be interested in disability, and not just have the responsibility allocated to someone in the office who sees it as an additional burden.

Implementation and Monitoring

As noted in the design section, there is not a formal system for monitoring or reporting on the implementation of the plan, nor was an activity or workplan with time-bound milestones developed. One discussion point during the week in Geneva, will be whether this should be altered in the next phase of the strategy.

Sustainability

More reflection on sustainability will be given in the final report after the mission to Geneva and the workshop sessions. Based on initial discussions with field staff a few observations can be made though.

Areas where sustainability can be potentially identified include the work done on producing resources which are used throughout the organization. The guides and manuals can continue to be used beyond the end of the strategy period. The inclusion of disability in PARDEV and EVAL manuals also provides evidence of sustainability. An initial assessment of the work on internal policies in Geneva suggests some level of sustainability, particularly in the attempts to make the building accessible during the renovations. Other

areas such as making meetings and evacuation plans more inclusive should be sustainable so long as individuals within those departments continue to reinforce the importance of these policies.

The GDBN and the national counterparts also have good potential for sustainability. The GDBN and some of the national networks are self-funding, and appear to reflect an awareness in certain enterprises of the business case for employing persons with disabilities. ILO will need to ensure it continues to fund a position to support the GDBN to maintain its influence in this work.

Challenges to sustainability come from a lack of funding for disability work and the limited nature of disability mainstreaming in country offices. As noted much of the country focus on disability comes from an individual's interest or the country's history in implementing disability work. In a few countries such as Bangladesh and Ethiopia, the work may be sustainable because constituent interest is at a level where they will continue to demand ILO work on this subject. But in many others, there is a risk that if the key individual leaves ILO, then work on the topic will stop.

Strengthening knowledge of the importance of disability inclusion among field staff is a key need for the next strategy if ILO is seeking to ensure sustainability in this work.

Key Questions for the Workshop

During the mission to Geneva, the evaluator may meet bilaterally with key staff based in Geneva, will hold discussions with the disability unit, and conduct a series of workshop sessions. The workshops have been separated into different groupings. On Wednesday 29th November, group skype sessions with field based staff will be held. To accommodate different time zones, these will be split into Asia, Africa and the Americas based staff. On Thursday 30th November, workshops will be held on policy, program, internal policies, and communication. The workshop will consist of a brief presentation of evaluation findings by the consultant, a brief summary of key issues from the Senior Disability Expert, and then a series of discussion questions will be posed to the participants.

Initial draft questions are:

Policy:

- What are the critical emerging issues which ILO will be working on in the coming 5 years and how should disability be mainstreamed into them?
- How can ILO leverage the references in the SDGs to disability in their work?
- Should a formal statement of ILO's stance towards various disability issues be developed?
- Should the next strategy include statements/indicators on refugees and displaced persons with disabilities?
- Should the next strategy include statements/indicators on disability issues related to the elderly?
- Who and what are the key access points for disability in the coming years?
- Are different approaches needed with businesses, governments and trade unions, and in different regions/countries?
- Mainstreaming-esp field

Program:

- How can disability issues be better included in proposals, progress reports, and final reports?
- Will it be possible to identify funds for a major multi-country disability project in the coming years?
- Are there ways to include specific disability indicators in future strategies, P&B outcomes, other ILO goals? Assessment function
- Eval

Internal Policies:

- How can successes at HQ be translated to the field in the coming years?
- How can reasonable accommodation and accessibility be mainstreamed into ILO's regional and country offices?
- Which are the key gaps which can still be worked on at HQ?
- Staff with disabilities at both field and HQ?

Communication:

- Is it possible to reinvigorate the joint skype calls for field staff working on disability?
- Could there be a more systematic approach to disability champions?
- Can more tools and resources be made available in different languages?

Field Teams:

- Should there be a more formal system of identifying/nominating disability champions? High level support?

- How do you make disability more visible within the cross-cutting policy driver of gender and non-discrimination?
- Can disability be more mainstreamed into gender work?
- How can more funds for disability work be found?
- How can disability knowledge among all ILO staff be increased?
- How can engagement with the UNPRPD be strengthened?

Disability Unit:

- Discuss the sample of projects-getting the reports etc
- Can a more formal monitoring, management, and reporting system be developed?

SWAP work-would require agencies to report to themselves how they are working on this area. Would require ILO to strengthen its reporting system on disability.

GB adoption or signature from DG should be worked on. Formal, official training for members of the GB.

- Should there be a focus on trying to reach more countries/constituents, or focus on strengthening the work in the countries and with constituents where there is currently success?

Expand the number-

- What opportunities exist for work with other UN agencies?

Nothing amazingly new. Did a project on statistics with UNICEF and WHO. Will have a social protection project led by ILO. Partnerships are the ones which already exist. There might be scope for more collaboration with the regional UN bodies.

- Can there be a more structured approach to working with field teams? Could regional training sessions be organized?

- How can more field input into the development of the next strategy be obtained?
- Should DPOs and civil society be given more of a focus in the next strategy?

Henrick: how more can we engage the field colleagues of ACTRAV and ACTEMP? ACTEMP-can they get more employer organizations interested in disability?