

2016 CRPD ICT ACCESSIBILITY PROGRESS REPORT



Research Committee Chair: Martin Gould
Analyst: Viviana Montenegro

2016 ICT ACCESSIBILITY CRPD PROGRESS REPORT

A Global Analysis of the Progress Made by States Parties to the
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
to Implement its Dispositions on the
Accessibility of Information and Communication Technologies
and Assistive Technologies

Research Committee Chair: Martin Gould

Analyst: Viviana Montenegro



About G3ict

G3ict, the Global Initiative for Inclusive Information and Communications Technologies was launched in December 2006, in cooperation with the Secretariat for the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities at UN DESA. Its mission is to facilitate and support the implementation of the dispositions of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in promoting e-accessibility and assistive technologies. G3ict participants include industry, the public sector, academia and organizations representing persons with disabilities. G3ict relies on an international network of ICT accessibility experts to develop practical tools, evaluation methods and benchmarks for States Parties and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities. G3ict is the home of the International Association of Accessibility Professionals (IAAP) which counts more than 1,200 active members in 41 countries. Since inception, G3ict has organized or contributed to more than 150 awareness-raising and capacity-building programs for policy makers in cooperation with international organizations such as the ITU, UNESCO, UNITAR and the World Bank. G3ict co-produces with ITU the “e-Accessibility Policy Toolkit for Persons with Disabilities” (www.e-accessibilitytoolkit.org), which is widely used around the world by policy makers involved in the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. For additional information on G3ict, visit www.g3ict.org.

About the CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report

The *CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report* was launched in 2010 by G3ict in cooperation with Disabled People’s International (DPI) to measure the degree to which States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities implement its dispositions on the accessibility of Information and Communication Technologies. Research is conducted with the support of experts among advocacy organizations around the world who complete detailed questionnaires about their respective countries.

Acknowledgments

G3ict wishes to express its sincere appreciation for their contributions to this report:

- Martin Gould, Chair, G3ict Research Committee
- Aarti Thakur, Disabled People’s International Headquarters
- Viviana Montenegro, Analyst, G3ict
- Francesca Cesa Bianchi, Vice President, Institutional Relations, G3ict

© G3ict 2017. All Rights Reserved

Contents

.....	1
G3ict Global Research Panel	5
Executive Summary.....	12
ICT Accessibility in the CRPD	14
CRPD ICT Accessibility and Assistive Technologies Requirements	15
Treaty Implementation, and the G3ict CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report	17
Methodology.....	18
2016 CRPD Progress Report - All Countries' Results.....	21
Countries Overall Commitments, Capacity to Implement, and Actual Results	21
Assessment by Respondents of Levels of Implementation of Certain CRPD Dispositions	22
Capacity for Implementation	23
Actual Implementation and Impact	24
2016 CRPD Progress Report - Global South Countries' Results	25
Global South Countries Overall Commitments, Capacity to Implement, and Actual Results	25
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	28
Annex I: Participating Countries	30

G3ict Global Research Panel

The following experts have contributed to the collection of data for the *2016 CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report*:

- **Afghanistan, Islam Mohammadi**
Afghan Landmine Survivors Organization (ALSO)
- **Algeria, Boufekroune AHCENE**
Federation Algerienne Des Personnes Handicappes (FAPH)
- **Angola, Silva Lopes Etiambulo Agostinho**
The National Association of Disabled People of Angola (ANDA)
- **Antigua and Barbuda, St. Claire Henry/Bernard Warner**
Antigua & Barbuda Association of Persons with Disabilities (ABAPD)
- **Argentina, Alejandro C. Palermo Romera**
Ente Nacional Coordinador de Instituciones de la Discapacidad de la República Argentina (ENCIDIS)
- **Bangladesh, Salma Mahbub**
Protibondhi Nagorik Shangathaner Parishad (PNSP)
- **Benin, Geronime Tokpo**
Fédération des Associations de Personnes Handicapées du Bénin (FAPHB)
- **Bhutan, Sanga Dorji**
Disabled Persons Association of Bhutan
- **Burkina Faso**
Fédération Burkinabé des Associations pour la Promotion des Personnes handicapées du Burkina Faso (FEBAH)
- **Burundi, Alexis Hatungimana**
Union des Personnes Handicapées du Burundi (UPHB)

- **Cambodia, Nut Pove**
Cambodia Disabled People's Organisation
- **Cameroon**
Platform Inclusive Society for Persons' with Disabilities (ANAUMIC)
- **Cape Verde, David António Cardoso**
Cape Verdean Association of People with Disabilities (ACD)
- **Chad**
Union Nationale des Associations des Personnes Handicapées du Tchad (UNAPHT)
- **Colombia, Gustavo Alberto Hincapié C./ Javier Alberto Saldarriaga C.**
Tecnoayudas - Corporación Discapacidad Colombia
- **Congo, Republic of, Simon Ibovi**
Comité National Paralympique Congolais (CNPC)
- **Congo, Democratic Republic of, Zengba Zongananyolo**
Centre Intercommunautaire Congolais pour les Personnes avec Handicap (CICPH)
- **Cook Islands**
National Disability Council
- **Costa Rica, Licenciado Eduardo Lizano**
Federación Costarricense de Organizaciones de Personas con Discapacidad
- **Cote D'Ivoire, Ouattara Dabla**
Confédération des Organisations des Personnes Handicapées de Côte d'Ivoire (COPHCI)
- **Dominica**
Dominica Association of Persons with Disabilities Inc (DAPD)
- **Dominican Republic, Magino Lorenzo Corporán**
Organización Mundial de Personas con Discapacidad (OMPD)
- **Ecuador, Ramiro Calvache, Xavier Torres Correa, Fausto Villamarín, Paola Hinojosa, Verónica Sandoval, Mayra Carrasco, Liliana Zanafria, Luis Villalva, Julia Fernández, Yobani Patiño, Rosa Godo, Alondra Moncayo, Giovanny Rivadeneira and Carlos Caicedo**
Federación Nacional de Ecuatorianos con Discapacidad Física (FENEDIF)

- *Egypt, Arab Republic of, Ahmed Abady*
Seven Million Disabled Association
- *El Salvador, Angélica Monteagudo*
Asociación Cooperativa de Grupo Independiente Pro Rehabilitación Integral (ACOGIPRI)
- *Ethiopia*
Federation of Ethiopian National Associations of Persons with Disabilities (FENAPD)
- *European Union, Alejandro Moledo*
European Disability Forum
- *Fiji*
Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation
- *France, Dominique Burger*
Association BrailleNet
- *Gabon, Mihindou Régis*
Fédération Nationale des Associations des et pour Personnes Handicapées du Gabon
- *Gambia, The, Ebrima Dibbasey*
Gambia Federation of Disabled
- *Ghana, Rita Kusi Kyeremaa/Isaac Tuggun*
Ghana Federation of Disability Organisations
- *Guinea, François Dopavogui*
Fédération Guinéenne pour des Associations des Personnes Handicapées (FEGUIPAH)
- *Guyana, Ganesh Singh*
Guyana Council of Organizations for Persons with Disabilities
- *Hungary, Ormódi Róbert*
Hungarian Association of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- *Kyrgyz Republic*
Association of Parents of Disabled Children (ARDI)
- *Honduras, Yolanda Domínguez Enríquez*
Fundación Hondureña de Rehabilitación e Integración del Limitado (FUHRIL)

- **India, Shilpi Kapoor**
Disabled People's International
- **Jordan, Mona Abdeljawad/Adnan Al Aboudy**
Musawa for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
- **Kenya, Anderson Gitonga**
United Disabled Persons of Kenya
- **Lebanon, Mohammed Ali Loutfy/Sylvana Lakkis**
Lebanese Physical Handicapped Union
- **Lesotho, Rabasotho Moeletsi**
Lesotho National Federation of the Organizations of the Disabled (LNFOD)
- **Liberia**
National Union of Organizations of the Disabled
- **Malaysia, Moses Choo**
Malaysian Confederation of the Disabled (MCD)
- **Malawi, Vincent Kaunda**
Federation of Disability Organization in Malawi (FEDOMA)
- **Maldives, Ahmed Mohamed**
Maldives Association for Physical Disables (MAPD)
- **Mali, Ba Moctar /Diakité Rokiatou /Mamadou Sissoko**
Fédération Malienne des Associations de Personnes Handicapées (FEMAPH)
- **Malta, Stanley M Debono**
Foundation for Information Technology Accessibility (FITA)
- **Mauritania, Aminetou Mohamed El Moukhtar**
Mauritania Association for Women with Disabilities
- **Mauritius, Nalini Ramasamy**
Voice of Disabled People International

- **México, Raúl Hernández Alcalá**
Confederación Mexicana de Limitados Físicos y Representantes de Deficientes Mentales A.C.
- **Moldova, Vitalie Mester**
Centre of Legal Assistance for Persons with Disabilities
- **Mongolia, D. Batbold/ Tserendash Munkhsaruul**
Disabled People's International of Mongolia
- **Morocco, Ahmed Berkia**
Moroccan Union of Organizations Rights with Disabilities
- **Myanmar**
Myanmar Independent Living Initiative
- **Nepal, Shudarson Subedi**
National Federation of the Disabled Nepal
- **New Zealand, Paula Booth**
Disabled Persons Assembly, DPA (NZ) Inc.
- **Nicaragua, Wilber Torres Morales**
Organización de Revolucionarios Deshabilitados Ernesto Che Guevara
- **Niger, Alzouma Maïga Idriss**
Fédération Nigérienne des Personnes Handicapées (FNPH)
- **Nigeria, Ekaete Umoh**
Joint National Association of Persons with Disabilities
- **Pakistan, Mobin Uddin**
Pakistan Disabled Peoples International (PDPI)
- **Palestine, State of, Awad Ebayat**
Palestinian General Union for Persons with Disabilities
- **Panamá, José Batista**
Asociación Nacional para la Integración Social de las Personas con Discapacidad (ANISOPEDI)
- **Perú, Hugo León Ibáñez**
Confederación Nacional de Discapacitados del Perú (CONFENADIP)

- **Philippines, Josephine S. De Vera**
Katipunan ng Maykapansanan sa Pilipinas Inc (KAMPI)
- **Qatar, Ahmed Habib**
Qatar Assistive Technology Center, Mada
- **Russian Federation, Denis Kuleshov**
Bauman Moscow State Technical University
- **Samoa, Faatino Masunu Utumapu**
Nuanua o Le Alofa National Advocacy Organization of Persons with Disabilities Samoa
- **Senegal, Yatma Fall**
Senegalese Federation of Associations of People with Disabilities (FSAPH)
- **Sierra Leone, Solomon Sabondo**
Disability Awareness Action Group (DAAG)
- **Singapore, Marissa Lee Medjeral-Mills**
Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities
- **Slovenia, Saša Mlakar**
Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities
- **Solomon Islands**
People with Disabilities and Consultant in Community Development and Gender Advocacy
- **South Sudan, Ben Lou Poggo Waran**
South Sudan Union of Persons with Disabilities (SSUPD)
- **Spain, Verónica Martorell Martínez**
ILUNION Tecnología y Accesibilidad
- **Sri Lanka, Senarath Attanayake**
Uva Provincial Council/Wheels in Motion
- **St. Kitts & Nevis, Anthony A. Mills**
St. Kitts Nevis Association of Persons with Disabilities (SKNAPD)

- **Sudan, Mohammed Gaafar**
Edraak Organization for Persons with Disabilities
- **Suriname, Natasia Hanenberg-Agard**
National Foundation for the Blind and Visually Impaired in Suriname (NSBS)
- **Sweden, Pelle Kölhed**
The Swedish Disability Federation
- **Syrian Arab Republic, Chavia Ali**
The Cultural Forum for People with Special Needs in Syria
- **Tajikistan, A. Zikrihudoev**
Invalid Society «IMMOBILIAT»
- **Tanzania, United Republic of, Amon Anastaz Mpanju**
Tanzania Federation of Disabled People's Organizations
- **Togo, Gbapéba Analene**
Fédération Togolaise des Associations de Personnes Handicapées (FETAPH)
- **Trinidad and Tobago, Jason Clarke**
Trinidad and Tobago Chapter of Disabled People's International
- **Tunisia, Arbi Chouikh/Anwer Elhani**
Organisation Tunisienne de Défense des Droits des Personnes Handicapées (OTDDPH)
- **United Kingdom, Dan Pescod**
Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB)
- **Uzbekistan, Oybek Isakov**
Uzbek Society of Disabled Persons
- **Vanuatu, Nelly Caleb**
Disabled People's International Vanuatu
- **Viet Nam, Duong Thi Van**
Hanoi Association of People with Disabilities, Disabled People Hanoi
- **Zambia, Patience Kanguma**
Zambia Federation of Disability Organisations (ZAFOD)

Executive Summary

Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) play a major role in our lives. Accessible ICT can be effective in addressing the concerns of individuals facing social exclusion, lowering employment barriers they encounter, enhancing learning experiences, and decreasing skill gaps between the average user and those with unique needs.

ICTs have been recognized as an important catalyst for individual progress and societal transformation, an insight that motivated early 20th century telecom regulations ensuring universal access for all citizens. More recently, we have witnessed how governments, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and international stakeholders identify the use of accessible ICT to create increased participation, transparency, and accountability for: (a) persons with disabilities; (b) senior citizens; and (c) previously voiceless people in the developing nations of the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.

Two international governance instruments provide the most recent examples. The first instrument is the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and its Optional Protocol. The CRPD was adopted on 13 December 2006 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, and was opened for signature on 30 March 2007. There were 82 signatories to the Convention, 44 signatories to the Optional Protocol, and 1 ratification of the CRPD. This is the highest number of signatories in history to a U.N. Convention on its opening day. It is the first comprehensive human rights treaty of the 21st century and is the first human rights convention to be open for signature by regional integration organizations. The Convention entered into force on 3 May 2008.

The second instrument is the post-2015 development agenda which was adopted in 2015, ends in 2030, and is referred to as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The 2030 Agenda is articulated in a 35-page document; applies to all countries; and, includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), 169 targets and 231 indicators. There are seven instances in the SDGs, Targets and/or Indicators with explicit references to persons with disabilities, namely: Goal 1-Poverty, Goal 4-Education, Goal 8-Employment, Goal 10- Reduce Inequalities, Goal 11- Inclusive Cities, Goal 16- Inclusive Societies and Institutions, and Goal 17- Means of Implementation. One example of an SDG global indicator/measure which involves ICTs is: 4 .a.1 Percentage of schools with access to (i) electricity; (ii) Internet for pedagogical purposes; (iii) computers for pedagogical purposes; (iv) adapted infrastructure and materials for students with disabilities; (v) single-sex basic sanitation facilities; (vi) basic hand washing facilities.

The CRPD recently marked its 10-year anniversary, while the 2030 Agenda celebrated its first. And while they may have different dates of enactment, the 2030 Agenda and its SDGs must be aligned with, and build upon the commitments and mechanisms of the CRPD. Put another way, the CRPD and its legal obligations should serve as a guiding framework for implementing key SDGs (listed above) in order to realize the full inclusion and empowerment of persons with disabilities. In that regard, it should be noted that many CRPD Articles are cross-cutting in nature and could be applied and/or considered for the implementation of related SDGs and Targets. Conclusions about official cross-cutting SDGs, Target and Indicators, as well as corresponding CRPD Articles would be provided by the UN DESA and the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UN OHCHR).

In 2016, the two sets of surveys from the fourth edition of the *CRPD Progress Report on ICT Accessibility* were filled out by 113 local correspondents in 106 countries. Data collection for the fourth edition of the Progress Report was completed in cooperation with Disabled People's International (DPI) and various organizations of persons with disabilities and experts in countries where DPI correspondents were not available.

Where do we stand on the ongoing implementation of the CRPD in relations to key digital accessibility provisions? To what extent are persons with disabilities meaningfully involved in monitoring and reporting on their countries' implementation of the CRPD? The data and information in the chapters ahead reflect the: (i) degree to which each of the dispositions of the CRPD on Assistive Technologies (ATs) and ICTs is enacted by ratifying countries in local laws, policies and regulations and their actual impact, and (ii) nature and type of inclusive practices, policies and programs used by countries to meaningfully involve persons with disabilities in monitoring, tracking and reporting on CRPD implementation.

The report concludes with a brief set of recommendations that CRPD ratifying countries, DPOs and NGOs, national, regional and international development agencies could take to ensure: (1) increased progress in CRPD implementation and digital accessibility; (2) meaningful involvement by persons with disabilities in monitoring and reporting on CRPD implementation; (3) leveraging available model policies and effective processes for multi-stakeholder cooperation and (4) promoting innovations that allow countries to leapfrog traditional approaches in promoting accessible and assistive technologies.

ICT Accessibility in the CRPD

The significance of ICT accessibility for persons with disabilities is best described by the language found in paragraph (v) of the Preamble of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which recognizes “the importance of accessibility to the physical, social, economic and cultural environment, to health and education and to information and communication, in enabling persons with disabilities to fully enjoy all human rights and fundamental freedoms.”

While the Preamble clearly defines *accessibility* as an *enabler* for persons with disabilities to exercise their rights, Article 3 (f) of the Convention also identifies *accessibility* as one of its eight “General Principles.” Article 9 is dedicated to accessibility and stipulates: “To enable persons with disabilities to live independently and participate fully in all aspects of life, States Parties shall take appropriate measures to ensure to persons with disabilities access, on an equal basis with others, to the physical environment, to transportation, to information and communications, including information and communications technologies and systems, and to other facilities and services open or provided to the public, both in urban and in rural areas.” According to Article 9 of the CRPD, technology design should take into account accessibility and usability features for the protection and promotion of the human rights of persons with disabilities, in all policies and programs.

Furthermore, Article 2 describes reasonable accommodation and the lack thereof as *discrimination*. In the case of Information and Communication Technologies, because many accessibility and assistive solutions are available and already implemented, it can be inferred that the CRPD dispositions on reasonable accommodation apply in most cases. For example, an inaccessible web site may not allow persons with disabilities to obtain information or use a service on an equal basis with others. Yet, methods to create accessible web sites are well documented and if implemented correctly, do not cost more nor constitute a disproportionate or undue burden.

Therefore, while the CRPD does not define *accessibility* at large as a right, it carries language which establishes the accessibility of Information and Communication Technologies (“ICTs”) as an *obligation* of States Parties and society at large. The notion that discrimination occurs when an ICT based service is inaccessible is consistent with emerging jurisprudence in the United States and the United Kingdom: inaccessible web sites or inaccessible ATMs for instance do constitute discrimination against persons with disabilities because *equal access* is not provided while it could.

The obligation to provide accessible ICT based products and services and ensure equal access is also reflected in many advanced policies and programs launched or promoted by States Parties around the world. Examples of such programs include:

- Captioning or signing of television programs (implemented by 50 percent of the countries);
- Offering relay services for deaf and speech impaired users of telephony (implemented by 23 percent of the countries);
- Implementation of computer-based Assistive Technologies in schools and universities 31 percent of the countries have some level of implementation);
- A government body dedicated to ICTs (implemented by 54 percent of the countries); and,

- Libraries for the blind or public libraries with e-book services (implemented by 36 percent of the countries).

While the above list cannot be exhaustive in the context of this introduction, it confirms that States Parties have in many areas acknowledged and acted upon the *obligation* to provide *equal access* to Information and Communication Technologies and services, setting benchmarks for what constitutes reasonable ICT accommodation for persons with disabilities.

CRPD ICT Accessibility and Assistive Technologies Requirements

With the further implementation of the many articles of the CRPD with specific accessibility requirements, the principle of *equal access* has become ever more important as an increasing number of ICT applications deliver essential services in domains such as Access to Information (Article 21), Inclusive Education (Article 24) or voting procedures via electronic kiosks (Article 29). Table 1 summarizes the instances where the CRPD specifies accessibility requirements:

Table 1: Accessibility requirements specified in the CRPD

Application Areas	CRPD Article	Accessibility Dispositions with implications for ICTs	Reasonable Accommodation	Promoting Assistive Technologies
Non- discrimination	5		Y	
E-Government	9.2.a	Y		
Media and Internet	9.1,	Y		
Television	30.1.b	Y		
Private Sector Services	9.2.b	Y		
Liberty and Security	14		Y	
Living Independently	19			Y
Education	24	Y	Y	Y
Employment	27	Y	Y	
Political Rights	21, 29	Y		Y
Emergency Services	9.1.b,	Y		
Culture and Leisure	30.5.c	Y		
Personal Mobility	20			Y
Rehabilitation	2			Y

While most countries are generally aware of their basic obligation to implement ICT accessibility, many of the CRPD dispositions listed above are not translated into actual policies or programs. Unfortunately, the present report shows that 93 percent of States Parties to the CRPD do not have a systematic

mechanism to involve DPOs working in the field of digital accessibility to the drafting, designing, implementation and evaluation of laws and policies.

The CRPD recognizes persons with disabilities as primary stakeholders, active participants and equal partners in State action. This principle is prominent in Article 33 of the Convention, which makes clear that States Parties' oversight and independent monitoring of the Convention's implementation must involve the direct participation of persons with disabilities. The text of the CRPD reflects that the involvement and full participation of persons with disabilities and civil society are essential if a State is to comply with its obligations under the CRPD. Characteristics of systems for the inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities that are considered by the U.N. Committee to be important include formal mechanisms for engagement and, ideally, a permanent role for civil society in the monitoring framework.

The framework required by Article 33 has four parts. The first part is a focal point, located with government, which is tasked with overseeing the implementation process. The second part is a coordination mechanism also located within government, which ensures that government action on the Convention is properly organized. The third part is outside of government, and is an independent monitoring framework. In defining the word 'independent', the article makes reference to the Paris Principles, which guide the creation and independence of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs). The fourth part of the framework is civil society. Article 33.3 requires that persons with disabilities and their organizations be involved and participate fully in all parts of the monitoring process.

Article 33.3, on the involvement of civil society in the monitoring process in particular, should be read in conjunction with the broader requirement in Article 4.3, which applies to the entire treaty and reads as follows:

"In the development and implementation of legislation and policies to implement the present Convention, and in other decision-making processes concerning issues relating to persons with disabilities, States Parties shall closely consult with and actively involve persons with disabilities, including children with disabilities, through their representative organizations."

In 2015, at the Conference of States Parties (COSP8), after eight years of the CRPD's implementation and with respect to the CRPD's Article 31 legal obligation, Professor Kim, a member of the U.N. Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, reported the following:

"I will be stressing the importance for collecting data for purposes of monitoring the implementation rather than collection in a very or more traditional classical statistical sense... In particular, Article 31 requires States Parties to collect data to ensure the implementation of the state's obligation to identify and address various facing persons with disabilities. Since inauguration, the Committee had its thirteenth session in April 2015 and reviewed 79 States' reports. Quite a lot. Actually. The review on any State Party begins with concentration of the prevalence of the disability and what base has been used to guide the forms and policymaking. How far invariably many States Parties fail to submit facilitator, sex, age, the stereotypes and gender. And subsequently, the Committee recommends them to come up with the desegregated data... National facilitator should be relevant and robust enough to serve the needs of

monitoring the Convention, however it is most concerning to observe the overall scarce but credible data and information and the low level of data on persons with disabilities. Even though they have invariably ratified the Convention with good intention to implement it. So, there's an enormous gap between data and the Convention. My concluding position is that disability collection data should be adhered to strengthening the process of implementing the Convention consistent with post-2015 development agenda. Still we have to keep in mind the importance of maintaining the balance between quantitative and qualitative collection. There is need for data on legislative reform. Policymakers and also programs, as well as other measures directed to the link of the Convention. To be more specific it may be useful to adopt a twin track approach through data collection. I am afraid a twin track has become very fashionable in many areas, but the first track could be redirected to monitoring the implementation of the Convention that would best reflect the overall principle and monitoring of comments with the Convention. The second track is to monitor the implementation with the post-2015 development agenda." [See, COSP8 Session transcript including remarks of Professor Kim [here](#).]

Treaty Implementation, and the G3ict CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report

The G3ict *CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report* (4th edition) is uniquely suited to address key aspects of treaty implementation, as well as serving as a cross-cutting framework and monitoring mechanism for the Convention, as well as the 2030 Agenda. G3ict's 2016 CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report identifies the degree to which each of the dispositions of the CRPD on accessible ICTs and Assistive Technologies (AT) is actually enacted in local laws, policies and regulations and their impact, and includes a set of data against which the 2030 Agenda goals, indicators and targets regarding persons with disabilities can be measured. It includes data points relative to the status of ICT and AT accessibility for each country surveyed. Data is collected and presented within the following three clusters of data points:

- State Party CRPD legal and programmatic commitments;
- State Party capacity for implementation;
- Assessment of the State's implementation and actual results for persons with disabilities.

By drawing links between States' commitments and implementation/impact on persons with disabilities and comparing data from various countries including from other international information and research sources,¹ significant findings, benchmarks and recommendations may be derived from G3ict's *CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report* for policy makers, international institutions, business and industry, non-governmental organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities, and others.

Results may be used by ratifying countries in order to improve their compliance with the CRPD. For example, governments may use the results to improve the consultation, coordination and meaningful participation of organizations of persons with disabilities (DPOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations

¹ E.g., [Global Consultation Report on ICTs and Disability](#) Launched at the U.N. High Level Meeting on Disability and Development. 2013.

(NGOs) in the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation processes.

Furthermore, States could use results to request targeted training and support from their Institutions of Higher Education (IHE). Those IHEs could provide training to DPOs and NGOs, as well as government entities on critical ICT and AT issues in which the country was deemed to be out-of-compliance.

The data may also be used by international bodies as a baseline against which those bodies can estimate or judge, in part, the adequacy and focus of both their CRPD and 2030 Agenda responsibilities and commitments. International organizations can use the data to foster international cooperation and monitor existing needs for accessibility in communities. Furthermore, and in keeping with the conceptual framework and capacity building approach for the U.N. human rights treaty body system, G3ict has standardized its global survey using a structure-process-outcome data collection strategy.²

For example, U.N. agencies such as UNESCO, UNDESA, ILO, ITU or WHO in their role of providing technical assistance, may use the data to identify policies and programs required by the CRPD and determine how to best engage Member States in the implementation of those policies.

On a regional level, DPOs and NGOs can also use the data to gauge the lack of CRPD compliance by governments in order to raise the awareness of the challenges and opportunities of accessibility (e.g., ICTs and ATs for persons with disabilities and facilitate the sharing of lessons learned, good practices, tools and products.) Results could also help DPOs and NGOs to determine which actions need to be taken to facilitate the implementation of the CRPD.

Methodology

The G3ict Research Committee reviewed the text of the CRPD to identify all provisions that include the terms: Communications, technology, information or information services, accommodation, and access, accessible, and accessibility because Article 9 includes ICTs in its definition of accessibility. Through its analysis, G3ict identified 17 instances of the word “access” or “accessible” or “accessibility” and seven instances of the words “reasonable accommodation” in the text of the CRPD.

Furthermore, in October 2009, the United Nations Secretary-General issued guidelines on the treaty-specific reporting document to be submitted by State Parties under Article 35, paragraph 1, CRPD (CRPD/c/2/3). G3ict identified 52 instances of the word “access” or “accessible” or “accessibility” and five instances of the words “reasonable accommodation” in the text of the Guidelines CRPD/c/2/3.

Once identified, the Committee created an exhaustive listing which included the above provisions redrafted as “audit” items (N=50 items out of which 35 items were selected as variable components) and

² [Human Rights Indicators: A Guide to Measurement and Implementation](#), 2012

which also called for an evidentiary justification for the score given for every item. This has been referred to as the Leg #1 audit tool.

Next, the Committee created a second set of measurement scoring tool (N= 12 items), which were perceived to be directly related to the ICT provisions of the CRPD identified for the Leg #1 assessment, and which were perceived as representing the basic capacity of a country to implement the ICT provisions of the CRPD. This has been referred to as the Leg #2 audit tool.

Finally, a third measurement scoring tool (N= 10 items) was created in order to represent the systemic and/or individual impact(s) of a country's fulfillment of the ICT provisions of the CRPD. This has been referred to as the Leg #3 audit tool.

The variables and items ultimately used to construct the 1st edition of the G3ict *CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report* are a subset of those items contained in the three (3) audit tools described previously. Its methodology is based on 11 variables aggregated from 57 data points measuring: Country commitment to a Digital Accessibility Agenda; Capacity to implement it; and, Actual implementation and results.

To reiterate, in 2010, the Committee used the variables and items to create two sets of questionnaires. The survey framework was developed in a way consistent with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) guidelines on Human Rights reporting (structure, process, and outcome).

While the 2016 questionnaire retains the original framework, organization and item sequence, several refinements to the survey and data collection instruments have been made since the first edition of the CRPD Progress Report was issued in 2010. First, in 2012, 'levels of implementation' sub-questions were added to certain survey items that involved policies and programs. Second, in 2013, several questions were added addressing (1) availability of technical assistance centers, and (2) policies involving use of teleworking.

For this 4th edition of the CRPD Progress Report survey the two sets of questionnaires were completed by 113 local correspondents in 106 countries during 2016. The list of participating countries can be found in Annex 1. The 106 countries surveyed have a combined population of 4,318,077,118, meaning that the 2016 Index covers 60 percent of the world population.

Table 2. Breakdown of Countries that Responded to the CRPD Progress Report Survey in 2016

Global South	Global North
89	17
84%	16%

Africa	North Africa and the Middle East	Latin America and The Caribbean	Asia	Oceania	Europe	North America
31	10	22	22	7	13	1
30%	10%	20%	20%	7%	12%	1%
Very High Human Development	High Human Development	Medium Human Development	Low Human Development	Grand Total		
16	26	29	34	105		
14%	25%	28%	33%	100%		

*Cook Islands is not included

High Income	Upper-Middle	Lower-Middle	Low Income	Grand Total
20	25	38	21	104
19%	24%	37%	21%	100%

* Cook Islands and State of Palestine are not included

2016 CRPD Progress Report - All Countries' Results

Countries Overall Commitments, Capacity to Implement, and Actual Results

As reflected in Table 3, countries responding to the surveys report that their average degree of compliance with CRPD ICT accessibility dispositions within their general legal and regulatory framework is 42 percent.

Table 3: Overall Degree of Compliance with CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions

Survey Data Clusters	Yes
Leg 1 - Countries' Commitments	42%
Leg 2 - Countries' Capacity for Implementation	21%
Leg 3 - Countries' Implementation and Impact	41%

Table 4: Degree of Compliance of Country Legislations and Policies with CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions

General Regulatory Framework	Policies Covering Specific Application Areas	Policies Covering Accessibility for Specific ICT Products or Services	Policies Covering Specific Target Groups	Policies to Promote Accessible and Assistive ICTs
69%	45%	27%	17%	16%

Table 5: Leg 2: Degree of Compliance of Country Capacity to Implement CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions

Government Focus	Support of DPOs and NGOs	Capacity building
35%	10%	22%

Table 6: Leg 3: Degree of Implementation CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions and Impact

Telecom and Media Services and Computers	Mobile	Special Services
41%	45%	33%

Further, 21 percent of survey respondents indicate that their countries possess a capacity to implement CRPD ICT accessibility dispositions. And finally, 41 percent of survey respondents indicate their countries currently demonstrate implementation and impact with respect to select CRPD ICT accessibility dispositions.

Assessment by Respondents of Levels of Implementation of Certain CRPD Dispositions

The 2016 questionnaire included scales for respondents to provide their personal assessment of the level of implementation of laws, regulations and policies covering ICT and AT accessibility. While no independent measurement exists in most countries, this measure, while subjective in nature, gives an indication of gaps existing between establishment of CRPD requirements and full implementation.

Table 7: Levels of Implementation of Laws, Regulations and Policies Regarding ICT and AT Accessibility

Laws, regulations and policies enacted by States Parties by Level of Implementation - Does the Country:	No Implementation	Minimum Level	Partial Level	Substantial Level	Full Level
Ensure that government communications to the public using ICTs are provided in accessible formats, sign language or Braille?	53%	32%	12%	2%	0%
Define public procurement rules policy promoting accessible ICTs?	69%	20%	8%	2%	0%
Have policies for ATs and Services by Type of Disability: Blind?	32%	40%	17%	10%	1%
Have policies for ATs and services by Type of Disability: Visually Impaired?	31%	40%	19%	8%	1%
Have policies for ATs and Services by Type of Disability: Deaf?	31%	38%	20%	11%	0%
Have policies for ATs and Services by Type of Disability: Hearing Impaired?	32%	38%	21%	10%	0%
Have policies for ATs and Services by Type of Disability: Reduced Mobility?	33%	28%	27%	10%	1%
Have policies for ATs and Services by Type of Disability: Cognitive?	42%	42%	15%	0%	1%
Have laws, policies or programs to ensure that PwDs and their representative organizations are consulted in development and implementation of legislation?	34%	41%	16%	7%	2%

Table 8: Levels of Implementation of ICT and AT Accessibility Policies Covering Specific Application Areas

Specific Application Areas by Level of Implementation	No	Minimum	Partial	Substantial	Full
Emergency Response Services	66%	22%	7%	3%	2%
Primary and Secondary Education	51%	13%	30%	5%	1%
Higher Education	58%	18%	17%	6%	1%
Rehabilitation Services	54%	20%	21%	4%	1%
Health Services	65%	20%	14%	1%	0%
Electronic Kiosks	85%	13%	4%	0%	1%
Judicial Information and Legal Procedure	71%	18%	10%	1%	0%
Independent Living	65%	19%	13%	2%	1%
Reasonable Accommodation at Workplace	58%	25%	10%	7%	0%
Teleworking	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Smart Cities	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%

Capacity for Implementation

Table 9: Country Capacities for Implementation Regarding Certain CRPD ICT and AT Accessibility Policies

Government Focus - In your Country is/are there:	No	Yes
A government body specifically dedicated to Persons with Disabilities?	22%	78%
A government body specifically dedicated to Information and Communication Technologies?	47%	53%
Any government fund allocated to programs in support of Digital Accessibility?	80%	20%
A systematic review mechanism by the Country of the existing legislation and/or policies concerning digital access?	88%	12%
Statistics or data accessible for the general public about digital access by persons with disabilities?	89%	11%

Table 10 : Country Capacities for Implementation Regarding Certain CRPD ICT and AT Accessibility Policies

Support of NGOs - Is there in the Country:	No	Yes
Financial support for DPOs/NGOs in digital access for PwDs?	77%	23%
A forum for the active cooperation between NGOs working in the field of digital access and the Country?	93%	7%
Mechanism to involve the DPOs for the designing, implementation and evaluation of laws/policies?	93%	7%
Award from Government?	91%	9%
Award from Industry?	99%	1%
Award from Civil Society?	90%	10%
Awards Combined?	90%	10%

Actual Implementation and Impact

Table 11: Accessibility of Telecom and Media Services, Features for Computers, and Specific Products and Services

Does the country have:	Yes	No
Accessible web sites among the top 10 commercial and media web sites?	18%	82%
Personal Computer operating system used most frequently in the country official language supports text to speech and voice recognition capabilities?	57%	43%
Screen readers available in the country's country principal language?	61%	39%
Screen readers available in the country's country minority languages?	21%	79%
Alternative input devices (head-trackers, joy sticks, etc.) available in the country?	45%	55%
Is text-to-speech on smart phones and tablets available:	Yes	No
For the main national language?	67%	33%
For minority languages?	23%	77%
Is speech recognition on smart phones and tablets available?		
For the main national language?	61%	39%
For minority languages?	23%	77%
In the Country, are there:	Yes	No
Libraries for the blind or public libraries providing e-books services?	36%	64%
Assistive Technologies available to students with disabilities at major universities?	31%	69%

2016 CRPD Progress Report - Global South Countries' Results

Global South Countries Overall Commitments, Capacity to Implement, and Actual Results

As reflected in Table 12, Global South countries responding to the surveys report that their average degree of compliance with CRPD ICT accessibility dispositions within their general legal and regulatory framework is 33 percent.

Table 12: Overall Degree of Compliance with CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions

Survey Data Clusters	Yes
Leg 1 - Countries' Commitment's	33%
Leg 2 - Countries' Capacity for Implementation	18%
Leg 3 - Countries' Implementation and Impact	35%

Table13: Degree of Compliance of Country Legislations and Policies with CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions

General Regulatory Framework	Policies Covering Specific Application Areas	Policies Covering Accessibility for Specific ICT Products or Services	Policies Covering Specific Target Groups	Policies to Promote Accessible and Assistive ICTs
57%	34%	21%	15%	11%

Table 14: Leg 2: Degree of Compliance of Country Capacity to Implement CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions

Government Focus	Support of DPOs and NGOs	Capacity building
31%	8%	18%

Table 15: Leg 3: Degree of Implementation CRPD ICT Accessibility Provisions and Impact

Telecom and Media Services and Computers	Mobile	Special Services
36%	41%	24%

Further, 18 percent of survey respondents indicate that their countries possess a capacity to implement CRPD ICT accessibility dispositions. And finally, 35 percent of survey respondents indicate their countries currently demonstrate implementation and impact with respect to select CRPD ICT accessibility dispositions.

If CRPD Article 33.3 is read in conjunction with Article 4.3, it becomes clear that persons with disabilities must not only be involved in the Convention's monitoring framework of Article 33.2, but also the focal point and coordination mechanism of Article 33.1. In addition, States Parties to the Convention may have to work on building capacity within society to ensure that DPOs have the ability to participate meaningfully in the process of CRPD implementation and monitoring.

However, data derived from the 4th edition of G3ict's CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report - which covers 106 countries - shows that 46 percent of the countries do not have a designated focal point; 93 percent of the countries do not have a mechanism to involve DPOs; and, 62percent do not promote awareness raising and training programs about the Convention (See Table 17).

Table 17: Percentage of Countries that Include Persons with Disabilities in the Framework for Monitoring and Reporting

Does Your Country Have:	Yes	No
A designated focal point within government for matters relating to the CRPD and a framework for implementing and monitoring the CRPD?	54%	46%
A systematic mechanism to involve the DPOs (persons with disabilities) working in the field of digital accessibility to the drafting, designing, implementation and evaluation of laws and policies?	7%	93%
Laws, policies or programs that promote awareness-raising and training programs about the CRPD?	38%	62%

For monitoring processes to be meaningful, resources must be made available to persons with disabilities in accessible formats. This means ensuring that accessibility requirements are taken into account for all contents, documentation and communications, and that the CRPD is made available in a form that all civil society participants can understand. Based on data derived from the 4th edition of *G3ict's CRPD ICT Accessibility Progress Report* - a majority of the 106 countries do not have such capacity (See Table 18). Furthermore, most of countries do not have essential accessibility policies, programs, and equipment in place to ensure meaningful access by persons with disabilities to ensure their ongoing involvement.

Table 18: Accessibility Policies and Services in Place Which Ensure Civil Society Involvement in Monitoring and Reporting

General Legal and Regulatory Framework - Does the country have:	No	Yes
A definition of accessibility which includes ICTs or electronic media in law or regulation?	58%	42%
A definition of Universal Service Obligation in telecommunication legislation that includes PwDs?	79%	21%
Laws, regulations and policies enacted by States Parties - Does the country:	No	Yes
Promote access for Persons with disabilities to information and communications technologies and systems, including the Internet?	63%	37%
Facilitate access by persons with disabilities to quality mobility aids, devices, assistive technologies and forms of live assistance and intermediaries, including by making them available at affordable cost?	57%	43%
Are there any dispositions among your country laws, regulations or programs promoting the accessibility of telecommunications relay services, including:	No	Yes
Telephony Relay?	77%	23%
Video relay services?	88%	12%
Text relay services?	90%	10%
Speech-to-Speech relay services?	95%	5%
Captioned speech relay services?	95%	5%
Does your country through its laws, regulations, policies or programs:	No	Yes
Promote research and development of universally designed (UD) goods?	84%	16%
Promote incorporation of accessibility features at early stage of product development?	88%	12%
Define, promote and monitor accessibility standards for ICTs?	80%	20%
Support of DPOs/NGOs - Is there in the country:	No	Yes
Financial support for DPOs and NGOs in digital access for PwDs?	78%	22%
A forum for the active cooperation between NGOs working in the field of digital access and the Country?	93%	7%
Capacity Building - In your Country, are there:	No	Yes
Mandatory training programs for future professionals?	93%	7%
Nationwide conferences in the past 2 years by Government?	77%	23
Nationwide conferences in the past 2 years organized by Civil Society?	66%	34
Nationwide conferences in the past 2 years by Private Sector/Industry?	89%	11
Are there special services in your country such as:	No	Yes:
Libraries for the blind or public libraries providing e-books services?	64%	36%
Assistive Technologies available to students with disabilities at major universities?	69%	31%

Conclusions and Recommendations

The data and information in this report documents critical gaps in: (a) Member States' implementation of their CRPD ICT accessibility obligations, and (b) Related gaps in their capacity for meaningful ICT accessibility and assistive technologies policy development and monitoring by, with and for persons with disabilities. These facts call for further efforts by States Parties to review how to improve on policy development, implementation and monitoring with the involvement of persons with disabilities as a critical success factor. To this effect, Article 33 of the CRPD on national implementation and monitoring should be thoroughly implemented. Article 33 reads as follows:

1. States Parties, in accordance with their system of organization, shall designate one or more focal points within government for matters relating to the implementation of the present Convention, and shall give due consideration to the establishment or designation of a coordination mechanism within government to facilitate related action in different sectors and at different levels.

2. States Parties shall, in accordance with their legal and administrative systems, maintain, strengthen, designate or establish within the State Party, a framework, including one or more independent mechanisms, as appropriate, to promote, protect and monitor implementation of the present Convention. When designating or establishing such a mechanism, States Parties shall take into account the principles relating to the status and functioning of national institutions for protection and promotion of human rights.

3. Civil society, in particular persons with disabilities and their representative organizations, shall be involved and participate fully in the monitoring process.

In addition, greater focus should be placed on promoting the application of Article 31 of the CRPD on *Statistics and Data Collection*, which, according to the results of this report, is lacking among a majority of States Parties. Such gaps in statistics and data collection will also hinder the capacity of States Parties to define policy priorities.

The following three recommendations are based on G3ict's experience in promoting the involvement of persons with disabilities in policy making and monitoring among States Parties to the CRPD and are offered to give effect to this proposition.

Recommendation #1. Identify and build on working models and frameworks for CRPD national awareness campaigns and multi-stakeholder involvement, and build on those effective practices. Existing procedures and working methods provide a rich bank of experience which can be identified and disseminated so that, in so far as appropriate, they can be put into use by a Member State and its DPOs.

For example, in relation to the CRPD, G3ict and DPI have relied on a Self-Assessment Framework to help organize awareness raising multi-stakeholder meetings and assist countries to track progress regarding their CRPD ICT accessibility obligations. Through the [Self-Assessment Framework](#) and process, Member States and local stakeholders (e.g., persons with disabilities, DPOs, NGOs and other Civil Society participants), can take the initiative to evaluate their own progress toward domestic conformity with the

CRPD's treaty standards. Self-Assessment can be a constructive way to discover problem areas in extant methods of CRPD implementation.

Recommendation #2. Develop and enact systematic formal processes to involve organizations of persons with disabilities in policy making and monitoring as per Article 33 of the CRPD. Resources are readily available which can facilitate such steps.

Recommendation #3. Take advantage of available Model Policies on ICT accessibility as blueprints or as check lists of dispositions to be localized and adapted to national circumstances. Model policies on ICT accessibility, in particular, have been developed by G3ict in cooperation with the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and UNESCO based on existing good practices observed in various countries. Those model policies include specific recommendations on how to successfully involve organizations of persons with disabilities and private sector stakeholders in critically important areas of policy making for information and communication technologies accessibility as per Article 9 of the CRPD³. Of particular interest to States Parties are the following documents:

G3ict – ITU Model Policies addressing the public information infrastructure:

- Legislative adjustments
- Public access points
- Mobile
- Television and video programming
- Web sites
- Public procurement

G3ict – UNESCO Model Policy for Education:

- Inclusive ICTs for Education

Recommendation #4. Take advantage of fast evolving innovations in Information and Communication Technologies, especially those leveraging mobile and the Internet, which bring many affordable, life changing accessible and assistive solutions for persons with disabilities. Those innovations can allow countries to leapfrog traditional approaches in promoting accessible and assistive technologies. This can be best achieved by facilitating the organization of multi-stakeholder exchanges on latest innovations, international good practices to foster collaborations and initiatives between the public and private sectors with the participation of persons with disabilities.

³ www.g3ict.org

Annex I: Participating Countries

<u>Afghanistan</u>	<u>Egypt, Arab Republic of</u>	<u>Liberia</u>	<u>Qatar</u>	<u>United States of America</u>
<u>Algeria</u>	<u>El Salvador</u>	<u>Malaysia</u>	<u>Russian Federation</u>	<u>Uzbekistan</u>
<u>Angola</u>	<u>Ethiopia</u>	<u>Malawi</u>	<u>Samoa</u>	<u>Vanuatu</u>
<u>Antigua and Barbuda</u>	<u>Fiji</u>	<u>Maldives</u>	<u>Senegal</u>	<u>Viet Nam</u>
<u>Argentina</u>	<u>France</u>	<u>Mali</u>	<u>Serbia</u>	<u>Yemen, Republic of</u>
<u>Bangladesh</u>	<u>Gabon</u>	<u>Malta</u>	<u>Sierra Leone</u>	<u>Zambia</u>
<u>Barbados</u>	<u>Gambia, The</u>	<u>Mauritania</u>	<u>Singapore</u>	
<u>Benin</u>	<u>Germany</u>	<u>Mauritius</u>	<u>Slovenia</u>	
<u>Bhutan</u>	<u>Ghana</u>	<u>Mexico</u>	<u>Solomon Islands</u>	
<u>Burkina Faso</u>	<u>Guatemala</u>	<u>Micronesia, Federated States of</u>	<u>South Sudan</u>	
<u>Burundi</u>	<u>Guinea</u>	<u>Moldova</u>	<u>Spain</u>	
<u>Cambodia</u>	<u>Guyana</u>	<u>Mongolia</u>	<u>Sri Lanka</u>	
<u>Cameroon</u>	<u>Hungary</u>	<u>Morocco</u>	<u>St. Kitts & Nevis</u>	
<u>Cape Verde</u>	<u>Kyrgyz Republic</u>	<u>Myanmar</u>	<u>St. Lucia</u>	
<u>Chad</u>	<u>Haiti</u>	<u>Nepal</u>	<u>Sudan</u>	
<u>Colombia</u>	<u>Honduras</u>	<u>New Zealand</u>	<u>Suriname</u>	
<u>Congo, Republic of</u>	<u>India</u>	<u>Nicaragua</u>	<u>Sweden</u>	
<u>Congo, Democratic Republic of</u>	<u>Iraq</u>	<u>Niger</u>	<u>Syrian Arab Republic</u>	
<u>Cook Islands</u>	<u>Jamaica</u>	<u>Nigeria</u>	<u>Tajikistan</u>	
<u>Costa Rica</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Pakistan</u>	<u>Tanzania, United Republic of</u>	
<u>Cote D'Ivoire</u>	<u>Jordan</u>	<u>Palestine, State of</u>	<u>Togo</u>	
<u>Denmark</u>	<u>Kenya</u>	<u>Panama</u>	<u>Trinidad and Tobago</u>	
<u>Dominica</u>	<u>Lao, People's Democratic Republic</u>	<u>Peru</u>	<u>Tunisia</u>	
<u>Dominican Republic</u>	<u>Lebanon</u>	<u>Philippines</u>	<u>Turkmenistan</u>	
<u>Ecuador</u>	<u>Lesotho</u>	<u>Portugal</u>	<u>United Kingdom</u>	