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• What are the barriers that may negatively affect access by persons with disabilities to technology, digitalization and ICT? What good examples are there of initiatives to promote this access?

• What can be done by governments, United Nations agencies and private actors to promote access by persons with disabilities to technology, digitalization and ICT, and how can they work together to this end?
Measuring progress via the G3ict DARE Index (Digital Accessibility Rights Evaluation Index)

• A method for States Parties and in-country advocates to benchmark essential steps in implementing digital accessibility policies and programs

• **Global Outreach**: 121 Countries Surveyed; 89% of the World Population

• **Framework consistent with Human Rights monitoring:**
  • Country commitments
  • Country capacity to implement
  • Country actual implementation and outcomes

• **Our Experts**: Persons with Disabilities, advocates, researchers, and community leaders identified in partnership with Disabled People’s International (DPI), RIADIS and other advocacy organizations.
DARE Index Variables

1. Legal and policy foundations as recommended by the ITU-G3ict ICT Accessibility Model Policy report

2. Capacity to implement evaluated by presence of Key success factors identified in the ITU-G3ict ICT Accessibility Model Policy report

3. Outcomes measured by degrees consistent with CRPD notion of progressive implementation in the 10 key areas of ICT accessibility as per the DPI–IDA–G3ict 2016 Call for Action at United Nations
Capacity to implement and actual outcomes lag far behind country commitments

- Capacity to implement scores are lower than commitment scores while levels of implementation and outcomes vary significantly.

- The Middle East and North Africa scores are the next best after Northern America and Europe due to the good performance of Oman, Qatar, Israel and Egypt.

- Countries commitments and capacity to implement scores are less influenced by levels of income than outcomes.
Levels of Economic Development Influence Results

Average DARE Index Country Scores by Levels of Economic Development

- **High income**
  - Country Actual Implementation and Outcomes Average Points
  - Country Capacity to Implement Average Points

- **Upper middle income**

- **Lower middle income**

- **Low Income**

G3ict
1 - Countries Commitments – Key gaps are inclusion of ICTS in definitions of accessibility and inclusion of persons with disabilities in Universal Service Obligation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY COMMITMENTS</th>
<th>GLOBAL AVERAGE % OF COUNTRIES WITH LAW/REGULATION/POLICY IN PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRPD RATIFICATION</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL LAW PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION DEFINED</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITION OF ACCESSIBILITY INCLUDES ICTS</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSAL SERVICE OBIGATION INCLUDES PWDS</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY COMMITMENTS GLOBAL AVERAGE IN PERCENTAGE</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countries Capacity to Implement – Barriers include lack of involvement of persons with disabilities in policy making, insufficient standardization and availability of accessibility training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT</th>
<th>GLOBAL AVERAGE OF COUNTRIES WITH KEY IMPLEMENTATION RESOURCES OR PROCESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT AGENCY FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT AGENCY FOR ICT</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS TO INVOLVE PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES IN POLICY MAKING ON ICT ACCESSIBILITY</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION IN STANDARD DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT ACCESSIBILITY COURSES AVAILABLE AT MAJOR UNIVERSITIES IN THE COUNTRY</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY CAPACITY TO IMPLEMENT GLOBAL PROGRESS AVERAGE IN PERCENTAGE</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 - Country Actual Outcomes - Most Advanced Sectors Globally Measured by Policies in Process of Implementation

- Across the board, levels of implementation are very low - 60% of countries do not have any policy in place for implementation of ICT accessibility.

- Of the 38.1% countries in the process of implementing policies at various stages, 19.1% are at a minimum level of implementation such as pilot projects and 16.4% are at a partial level of implementation only, with limited impact.

- However, only 2.5% report that they have a policy but that it’s not implemented which implies that countries do try to implement ICT accessibility policies once they are adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global sectors in decreasing order of progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inclusive ICTs in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. E-books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enabling ICTs for employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. e-Government and Smart Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ATs and ICTs for independent living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Promotion of internet usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Public procurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: measured as % countries in the process of implementing policies at various stages
Key Steps for Discussion

1. Legislation, regulation and policies by States Parties reflecting the dispositions of the CRPD are essential to:
   - Cause key national stakeholders to implement the CRPD
   - Provide specific guidance as to what’s required
   - Allow Persons with Disabilities to advocate for their digital accessibility rights
   - Create a level playing field among private sector actors in a market economy

2. Capacity to implement can be greatly enhanced by the participation of persons with disabilities in policy development and monitoring, training in accessibility and adoption of international accessibility standards.

3. Solutions exist, hence lack of focus on implementation directly infringes on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
Case Study: Sugamya Pustakalaya, India

India's first and largest collection of accessible books, developed via a partnership between Indian Government, private industry and NGOs.

URL:

www.sugamyapustakalaya.in/
http://library.daisyindia.org

- Accessible content platform provided by industry (TCS), Content uploaded by Daisy Forum of India and partners, accessible content provided by publishers, in accordance with Indian Copyright law.

- Indian Copyright Law amendment to include disability fair use happened alongside negotiations for the Marrakesh Treaty in 2012, to which India was the first ratifying country.

- Hope to see more effects of Marrakesh Treaty going forward with more international books becoming available.

- WIPO’s support to the Treaty and its implementation for making books available is invaluable.
Thank you for your attention!
nnarasimhan@g3ict.org
www.g3ict.org
Appendix – G3ict DARE index – Additional Information
DARE Index Scoring and Benchmarking Method

• A simple method to benchmark progress and identify opportunities by indexing **20 key variables** for each country:
  – 5 for country commitments
  – 5 for country capacity to implement
  – 10 for country outcomes (guided scoring evaluation)
• With each of the 20 variables counted for 5 points for a maximum of 100 points for each country
• Allowing countries to compare their progress with benchmarks and peers results in essential areas
DARE Index Guided Evaluation Scores

- 0 = No policy or program
- 1 = Policy or program but with no implementation
- 2 = Policy or program with minimum implementation
  Pilot applications or limited scope
- 3 = Policy or program with partial implementation
  Deployment program proceeding, but still limited impact
- 4 = Policy or program with substantial implementation
  Deployment program in place with more than 50%
  implementation
- 5 = Policy or program with complete implementation
121 Country Dashboards Published for Transparency and Benchmarking on the G3ict Web Site