Document: EB 2020/130/R.15/Rev.1/Add.1
Agenda: 8(d)
Date: 1 September 2020
Distribution: Public
Original: English



## Disaggregating Data on Persons with Disabilities in IFAD Projects

## **Addendum**

Management's Response to Member States' Comments

Executive Board  $-130^{\rm th}$  Session Rome, 8-11 September 2020

For: **Information** 

Comments from Finland	Management response
Finland welcomes the document and thanks IFAD for its commitment to disability inclusion. This pilot is a crucial step towards integrating disability disaggregation into the overall M&E and impact assessment frameworks.	
We are very pleased to note IFAD's commitment to incorporate the WG-SSQ methodology across its project cycle as well as identifying persons with disabilities as a specific target group.	
As IFAD is further developing its methodological approach and frameworks for integrating the disability disaggregation as well as the new targeting policies, we would like to make a couple of comments and recommendations for future consideration:	
Conclusions of this pilot focus on presenting different characteristics of disabilities, concluding that the number of physical disabilities outnumber those with the cognitive ones. It should be noted that cognitive, including intellectual, disabilities carry higher stigma with them, and this may partly contribute to lower reporting. As an example, family members with intellectual disabilities are very often hidden in homes or institutions and therefore are typically less visible.	This is an important consideration and is well noted. The report presented to the Executive Board summarizes the results of a pilot testing the application of data collection on persons with disabilities (PwD) using the Washington Group Short Set of Questions (WG-SSDQ). As IFAD applies the methodology to a broader sample of projects starting in the Twelfth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD12), it will be able to explore approaches for refining data collection methods to reduce potential biases.
While it is important to identify different types of disabilities and make efforts to match interventions and improve targeting, we would like to highlight the importance of ensuring the overall accessibility and disability inclusion in IFAD's mainstream projects and programs, and to create indicator to monitor these efforts.	Country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) designed in IFAD12 will provide the framework for incorporating PwD in the projects to be financed by IFAD in any given country, and will identify them as a specific target group in coordination with government counterparts. COSOPs will therefore be the entry point for IFAD's engagement with PwD.  At project level, projects approved in IFAD12 will, when appropriate, monitor and report data on PwD. To do this, IFAD will incorporate the application of the WG-SSDQ in the baseline surveys undertaken to identify IFAD's target groups. During project implementation, data collected will be disaggregated by PwD in all relevant projects through projects' individual monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. This includes data collection at output and outcome level. To enable data gathering at outcome level, IFAD will embed the WG-SSDQ in the Core Outcome Indicator (COI) Survey Guidelines ahead of the start of IFAD12.
	In addition, to ensure accessibility and disability inclusion in relevant projects, ahead of IFAD12, IFAD will undertake the necessary updates to existing policies and guidelines to ensure PwD are incorporated as an explicit IFAD target group. A new targeting policy will be put in place in advance of IFAD12 to clarify the analysis needed at the COSOP and project design stage to ensure adequate targeting (the Operational Guidelines on Targeting have already been revised). Ahead of IFAD12, IFAD will also undertake the necessary updates to existing project design, implementation and completion guidelines, as well as changes to the Operational Results Management System to enable data storage disaggregated by PwD. Lastly, in IFAD12 a PwD strategy will be developed and will act as the framework for incorporating PwD in IFAD operations.

Comments from Finland	Management response
Hence it would be interesting to see further analysis on how this data might support efforts towards strengthening the overall accessibility and inclusion and what measures might be needed for reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities in accessing IFAD projects.	As IFAD starts engaging with PwD more systematically, and as it starts to gather data on its work on PwD starting in IFAD12, by IFAD14 significant data on PwD will be available from IFAD projects. This will enable documenting and learning from experience, including on accessibility and inclusion measures.
It is important that the focus of analysis is broader than the characteristics of persons with disabilities, but rather identifies the major external barriers (physical, attitudes, communication/information sharing) in the mainstream programs that persons with various disabilities might face.	Similar to the comment made above, IFAD will be able to undertake analysis and gather lessons as its dedicated experience targeting PwD expands.
In addition to integrating disability disaggregation, programmes might require separate outcome and/or process level inclusion indicators to better track disability and non-discrimination across IFAD programs.	IFAD will incorporate the application of the WG-SSDQ in the baseline surveys undertaken to identify IFAD's target groups.  During project implementation, data collected will be disaggregated by PwD in all relevant projects through projects' individual M&E system. This includes data collection at output and outcome level. To enable data gathering at outcome level, IFAD will embed the WG-SSDQ in the COI Survey Guidelines ahead of the start of IFAD12.
It is advisable to apply the Washington Group Short Set of Questions (WG-SSQ) to entire populations without prescreening the interviewees. The questionnaire (annex) used for collecting disability data in the households in the pilot includes a question about household members with any type of disability. If this question is used to as a screener to filter respondents, it is likely to add bias to the results. We therefore recommend using the WG-SSQ methodology that deliberately refrains from references to disability directly and rather focuses on functional capacity.	This is an important point, and it is well noted. The inclusion of a filter question in the version of the questionnaire that is included in the report was a mistake when drafting the questionnaire template. This filter question was not collected when administering the WG-SSDQ during the pilot phase.

Comments from United Kingdom	Management response
The UK thanks IFAD for its commitment to disability inclusion and strong leadership in this area.	
We welcome the commitment from IFAD to include people with disabilities as one of its vulnerable target group in their operational guidelines (page 1).	
Strongly support the commitment to systematically collect data on people with disabilities for projects approved in IFAD12 using the Washington Group Short Set Disability Questions (page 13) – this is a huge step forward.	

Comments from United Kingdom	Management response
We welcome the recognition of the need to collect disability data at all stages of the programme cycle in order to make mid-corrections, if needed (page 13) and would like to ask how this will be funded given finding that data collection requires additional funding and capacity.	COSOPs designed in IFAD12 will provide the framework for incorporating PwD in the projects to be financed by IFAD in any given country, and will identify them as a specific target group in coordination with government counterparts. COSOPs will therefore be the entry point for IFAD's engagement with PwD.  At project level, projects approved in IFAD12 will, when appropriate, monitor and report data on PwD. To do this, IFAD will incorporate the application of the SSDQ in the baseline surveys undertaken to identify IFAD's target groups. During project implementation, data collected will be disaggregated by PwD in all relevant projects through projects' individual M&E system. This includes data collection at output and outcome level. To enable data gathering at outcome level, IFAD will embed the SSDQ in the COI Survey Guidelines ahead of the start of IFAD12.
	Funding for the undertaking of the baseline survey and COI Questionnaire is embedded in projects' M&E costs, so will be funded through Projects' own budget. Project management units (PMUs) normally outsource these surveys to specialized companies to overcome capacity-related issues.
It would be useful to learn about project interventions given the high prevalence of disability, particularly physical, among beneficiaries, especially amongst older beneficiaries.	There are good examples of IFAD projects working with PwD in Senegal <sup>1</sup> and Sierra Leone. <sup>2</sup> As IFAD starts engaging with PwD more systematically, and as it starts to gather data on its work on PwD starting in IFAD12, by IFAD14 significant data on PwD will be available from IFAD projects. This will enable documenting and learning from experience.
Given the COVID-19 context, it would also have been useful to hear about how this data can be collected using remote data collection methods.	The COVID-19 context poses challenge to data gathering across all domains. Alternative data collection methods are being considered. In light of the COVID-19, remote data collection modalities (phone-based or web-based surveys) are the next-best alternatives to in-person interviews. The Washington Group has published guidelines about using the Washington Group tools to collect data in the context of COVID-19.3 The guidelines conclude that while direct experience or evidence with how the questions work in these modalities is limited, generalizable experience with implementing phone and web surveys and reports received from organizations that have included the WG-SSDQ questions in phone or web surveys indicates that the WG-SSDQ questions can fielded using these modalities. The guidelines provide considerations (many of which are not unique to questions on disability) to be taken into account when implementing remote data collection. IFAD will take these considerations into account when adapting the application of the WG-SSDQ into the COI Survey Guidelines.
Are there ways IFAD could share its experience with other agencies? We encourage IFAD to take the lead on this and ensure effective exchange of lessons learnt.	This is a very important point and it is very well received. As IFAD's work with PwD expands and lessons are learned IFAD will strive to systematize its experience and share it with partners.

https://www.ifad.org/en/web/latest/news-detail/asset/41317965.
 https://www.ifad.org/documents/38714170/39150184/Investing+in+rural+people+in+Sierra+Leone.pdf/5d7b8dbd-935f-492c-8c2c-7e54d4c2e97c.
 https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/fileadmin/uploads/wg/Documents/Using-the-Washington-Group-Tools-to-Assess-the-Impact-of-COVID-19-on-Persons-with-Disability.pdf.

**Comments from Germany** 

Comments from Switzerland	Management response
We welcome the document and what it entails. It contributes to IFAD's efforts to align with the United Nations Conventions on the Rights of persons with disabilities by underlining and measuring their social participation and recognition in project reviews.	
The evaluation is a useful contribution to the body of knowledge on beneficiaries with disabilities and represents an important opportunity for sensitisation. Some of the demographic insights, such as on age distribution of disability should where possible be considered not simply as an afterthought, but taken into account at the point of programme inception.	The comment is very important, and will be taken on board moving forward.
It aligns well with other measures being put in place to not only disaggregate data according to gender, but also according to age class. May we encourage IFAD to persevere in this with vigour (as in paragraph 36f).	This point is well noted. IFAD will continue its efforts to work with partner PMUs to further data disaggregation when collecting and reporting data.
One question: You note under paragraph 24(iii) that "in beneficiary households, individuals are much more likely to be lightly disabled, though they might have more than one source of disability. The specific sources of impairment and their relative ranking appear to vary by projects", but offer no reason. Would it be possible to shed more light on this finding?	There could be multiple explanations about the reasons behind this finding including country context, demographics of the sample, etc. The sampling strategy of the projects from IFAD's impact assessment was not designed to capture directly PwD. As such, it would be difficult to provide the exact explanation of the underlying factor of this finding.

GER thanks IFAD for presenting the most recent version of the Note to Executive Board representatives on its methodological approach adopted for the development of its data collection proposal on "Disaggregating data on persons with disabilities in IFAD projects".	
GER wishes to stress that disaggregated data are needed to monitor adherence to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability (UNCRPD) and the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).  Inclusion is the guiding principle of the UNCRPD and the 2030	IFAD acknowledged the importance of collecting results data on PwD and has stepped up its commitment to it in recent years. During the Consultation on the Eleventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD11), IFAD made three complementary commitments regarding its engagement with PwD in projects financed by the Fund. (i) IFAD committed to revising its operational guidelines on targeting and to considering how best to ensure the inclusion of PwD and address their needs, in line with the central promise of the 2030 Agenda of "leaving no one behind". IFAD delivered on this commitment in 2019. The guidelines set differentiated targeting systems for identifying PwD at COSOP and project level. (ii) IFAD also committed to
Agenda for Sustainable Development. The routine collection of development indicators by disability status is required so that outcomes of people with and without disabilities can be compared. Including a succinct set of disability questions on existing data collection instruments allows for disaggregation by	providing a report that analyses the link between PwD and IFAD interventions. This was also delivered in 2019. (iii) Lastly, IFAD committed to producing a proposal for disaggregating data on PwD in IFAD projects, to be piloted in at least five projects, following methods used by the United Nations Washington Group on Disability Statistics such as the SSDQ. The report under discussion delivers on this commitment and sets the way forward for furthering IFAD's engagement with PwD, including on the use of the WG-SSDQ to gather PwD data starting from projects approved in IFAD12.

Management response

Comments from Germany	Management response
disability status for SDG indicators, and for other measures of participation across the IFAD portfolio.	
The underlying short set of questions of the Washington Group is a well-tested question set suitable for this purpose. These data collection tools are the result of global efforts to develop and test internationally comparable questions for identifying persons with disabilities in censuses and surveys.	
However, GER encourages IFAD to reflect on the limitations of the WG-SS, regarding its use as a diagnosis or targeting tool, which were evaluated by Humanity and Inclusion and Leonard Cheshire 2018. GER encourages the use of supplementary/additional questions to measure inclusion (risks, barriers & facilitators) if current data is not sufficient to inform IFADs activities.	Thank you very much for the reference to the study by Humanity Inclusion and Leonard Cheshire (2018). The report that was presented for Executive Board review focuses on the use of the WG-SSDQ as this important tool was the focus of the IFAD11 Commitment. As all methodological documents, the WG-SSDQ can be reviewed from time to time and be complemented with other surveys and questionnaires. When adapting the application of the WG-SSDQ into the COI Survey Guidelines IFAD will take the lessons of the mentioned study into account.  As regards the use of the UNICEF/WG question set on child functioning, in IFAD-financed projects, children in these age ranges are targeted indirectly through activities benefiting the household, and women in particular.
GER encourages the use of the UNICEF/ Washington Groups Question Set on child functioning, when targeting children age 2-4 or 5-17.	
We urge IFAD to avoid phrases like 'suffers from disabilities' (e.g. page 11), which suggest discomfort, constant pain and a sense of hopelessness.	This point is well taken. We have revised the report accordingly, and will be taken in due account in future documents.
GER encourages IFAD to strengthen the capacities of enumerators using the Washington Groups Trainings and other resources and to follow the advice by the World Bank i.e. "Extra attention should be given during training sessions by encouraging enumerators to have empathic interactions with respondents with disabilities. This also includes using appropriate terminology and avoiding terms such as 'disabilities', 'handicaps', and 'suffering', which are not mentioned in the WG-SS questions and have negative connotations that may result in the underreporting of conditions. Ensuring official translations of the WG-SS questions is also crucial in order to avoid this risk."	The recently finalized COI Survey, which will include an adaptation of the WG-SSDQ to capture PwD data, is administered by PMUs, as part of their M&E efforts. PMUs normally outsource these surveys to specialized companies who, in turn, provide the enumerators.  IFAD is currently training staff in the COI Survey methodology.
Regarding paragraph 33. GER encourages IFAD to consider the use of the Washington Group/ILO module on disability and employment, which is still undergoing testing, but could be "helping IFAD to determine how to ensure the greater inclusion of PwD in the economic activities it supports."	This is an important point. IFAD will follow the testing of the module with interest and looks forward to its findings.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> https://humanity-inclusion.org.uk/sn\_uploads/document/2018-10-summary-review-wgq-development-humanitarian-actors.pdf.

EB	
2020/130,	
/130/	
/R.15/	
Rev.1	
_/Add	

Comments from Germany	Management response
The measures were specifically constructed to be efficient, low cost, and easy to incorporate into the ongoing data collections of national statistical systems, making them highly sustainable and suitable for disaggregating the SDGs by disability status and monitoring progress in attaining the SDGs on an ongoing basis.	
GER supports the methodological approach forwarded and wishes IFAD every success in undertaking the necessary updates to existing policies and guidelines to ensure that persons with disabilities are incorporated as an explicit IFAD target group.	The support and encouragement are greatly appreciated.