## Fact sheet:

## Disability inclusiveness of development and humanitarian aid in **ITALY**

|  |
| --- |
| **The** [**Italian Agency for Development Cooperation**](https://www.aics.gov.it/language/en/) **(AICS) has taken some important and sometimes innovative steps to encourage disability inclusion in its international cooperation and humanitarian action, and its policy guidance sets a relatively high level of ambition. However, awareness, tools and incentives are not yet sufficiently developed to integrate disability inclusion systematically throughout Italian Official Development Assistance. Italian organisations of persons with disabilities (DPOs) have participated extensively in the development of official policy guidance on disability through the** [**Italian Network on Disability and Development**](https://www.ridsnetwork.org/) **(RIDS), but the role of DPOs in the Global South is less clear.**  **(Please note: Italian Official Development Assistance spending is disbursed through a range of public sector bodies, but this analysis focuses largely on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation / the Italian Agency for Development Cooperation).** |

**Methods used:** review of documents in the public domain (in English); review of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Creditor Reporting System database; interview with DPI Italia; exchange with the Italian Agency for Development Cooperation. The review took place between July and September 2020.

For important context on the scope of the work, please refer to [link to methodology document].

### **Key facts**

### **STRATEGY AND LEADERSHIP**

Clear commitments in strategy documents and leaders’ statements have a key role to play in driving the department-wide changes needed for disability inclusion.

* **Ministry in charge of international development and humanitarian action**: [Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation](https://www.esteri.it/mae/en/cooperaz_sviluppo) (MAECI). Under supervision of MAECI, the [Italian Agency for Development Cooperation](https://www.aics.gov.it/language/en/) (AICS) manages funds and implements programmes.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Italian Official Development Assistance (ODA) spending is relatively decentralised: out of total allocable ODA in 2018, MAECI and AICS only comprise around 55%.[[2]](#footnote-2) Please note not all the commentary below would apply to spending through other ministries and parts of government.

* **National strategy/policy on disability**: [The national biannual programme on disability is here](https://www.gazzettaufficiale.it/eli/id/2017/12/12/17A08310/SG). The plan contains a section on international cooperation, although the document is only available in Italian, so the author of this fact sheet was not able to review it in detail.
* **Law on ODA:** Italian ODA is governed by [Law no. 125 of August 2014](https://www.aics.gov.it/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/LEGGE_11_agosto_2014_n_125_ENGLISH.pdf). The law contains two brief references to disability in the context of operational issues - employment and refurbishment of inaccessible housing – but does not discuss the inclusion of persons with disabilities in programmes.
* **Overall strategy/policy on international cooperation and humanitarian action**: Overarching strategies and policies are set out in the [Italian Development Aid Programming and Policy Planning Document](https://www.esteri.it/mae/resource/doc/2018/07/pro_triennale_2017-2019_en.pdf). The latest (2017-2019) version of this 28-page document contains three brief mentions of disability, of which the most substantive is on education: “particular attention will be dedicated to the categories at greatest risk of exclusion, such as … students with disabilities”.[[3]](#footnote-3)
* **Strategy/policy on disability in international cooperation and humanitarian action:**  The approach to disability in Italian cooperation and humanitarian action is set out in the 2018 [guidelines](https://www.aics.gov.it/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Guidelines_disability2018.pdf) for mainstreaming disability and social inclusion in aid projects. These give brief recommendations for strengthening disability mainstreaming in each of the sectors of education ; health ; employment ; violence prevention, support and protection ; and emergency response. They also recommend a wide-ranging set of actions that can be taken to reinforce AICS’ institutional readiness for mainstreaming (see ‘DPO engagement’, ‘internal capacity’ and ‘management and reporting’ sections below). The 2018 guidelines are underpinned by more detailed sector-specific documents (see ‘internal capacity’ section below). However, while the 2018 guidelines convey a vision for enhancing disability inclusion like a strategy, they are strictly speaking only non-binding guidance, and further research would be required to establish how far they are used by field staff.
* **Charter on inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian action:** Italy has endorsed the [charter](http://humanitariandisabilitycharter.org/). In addition, AICS delegated a representative from the Italian Network on Disability and Development (RIDS) to the team, under the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, tasked with developing guidelines on the Charter’s implementation.[[4]](#footnote-4)
* **Evidence of senior commitment to disability inclusion in international cooperation and humanitarian action:** An English-language search did not identify any high profile statements on disability inclusion by the current Foreign Minister.
* **Engagement in the** [**Global Action on Disability (GLAD) Network**](https://gladnetwork.net/): Italy does not take part in the GLAD Network.
* **Other engagement on disability inclusion with international actors in the fields of development cooperation and humanitarian action**: No prominent examples came to light in the documents reviewed online, but this is probably more a reflection on the nature of the documents (mostly guidance notes) than on Italy’s activities.

### **ENGAGEMENT WITH ORGANISATIONS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (DPOs)**

High-quality engagement with DPOs is fundamental. Not only does it make development cooperation and humanitarian action legally compliant and technically stronger in the short term. By strengthening the disability movement and making space for real participation – as the “subject of action”, not the “object of intervention”,[[5]](#footnote-5) it also contributes to the redistribution of power that is a pre-requisite for sustainable disability-inclusive development in the long-term.[[6]](#footnote-6)

* **DPO engagement in Italy’s ODA**: Members of RIDS – a consortium of two DPOs[[7]](#footnote-7) and three other civil society organisations working on disability –engage frequently with MAECI’s and AICS on disability policy, and are named contributors to many of the guidelines on disability, alongside ministry officials.[[8]](#footnote-8) Correspondingly, the documents themselves make ambitious proposals on opportunities for further DPO engagement (in the 2018 guidance note, proposals include DPO participation in undertaking baseline studies; disaggregated data collection; implementing humanitarian activities; monitoring and evaluation; and emancipatory research).[[9]](#footnote-9)

Looking more broadly at DPO engagement in **mainstream** policy and programming, the review undertaken for this factsheet did not find evidence of widespread DPO participation, either from the Global North or the Global South. It is a positive first step that AICS expects DPOs should take part in local level project planning and implementation for civil society-led humanitarian projects (although only where deemed ‘relevant’).[[10]](#footnote-10) However, DPO engagement across AICS programmes does not yet appear to be the norm, even in projects with a disability focus: in 2018 AICS asked the managers of all projects that had been reported as disabilty-relevant (either mainstream or targeted)[[11]](#footnote-11) to respond to a voluntary survey. Of those projects represented in the responses, 32% had not involved DPOs in project planning, and a further 32% had done so only partially.[[12]](#footnote-12)

In terms of funding, it appears that none of Italy’s disability-targeted ODA spending in 2018 flowed directly to civil society organisations such as DPOs in the Global South (although of course it may have reached them indirectly through intermediaries in the Global North).[[13]](#footnote-13)

### **INTERNAL CAPACITY**

Successfully implementing disability-inclusive development cooperation and humanitarian action requires sufficient staff with relevant skills and experience.

* **Human resources for work on disability**: As at 2019, AICS had 200-300 staff.[[14]](#footnote-14) Of these, one works full-time on disability, and another staff member works part time as the focal point on emergency and disability. In addition, most country level offices have a staff member responsible for social and human rights projects (including emergency projects), whose portfolio would include projects targeting persons with disabilities.[[15]](#footnote-15)
* **Tools and guidance for work on disability:** AICS has produced a number of guidelines on disability inclusion. These include a ‘vademecum’ on humanitarian action and disability and a statement on inclusive education[[16]](#footnote-16) (which were written in collaboration with RIDS). They also include guidelines for the accessibility of buildings funded by MAECI’s directorate for development cooperation.[[17]](#footnote-17) However, a study in 2018 suggested that knowledge of the guidelines among those implementing programmes was not yet consistent.[[18]](#footnote-18) Based on the documents reviewed for this fact sheet, it was not possible to build up a complete picture of whether AICS offers more formal training opportunities on disability, although the review did find that some training activities had taken place under the ‘Bridging the Gap’ project.[[19]](#footnote-19)
* **Recognition for staff work on disability:** This review did not find any evidence of specific performance incentives for staff work on disability.

### **MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING**

It is essential for management and reporting processes to create positive incentives that foster disability inclusion, and avoid perverse incentives that lead to exclusion.

* **Budgeting for disability inclusion:** Based on documents reviewed online, there does not yet seem to be an over-arching policy on budgeting for inclusion. On the one-hand, some guidance documents propose an innovative “accommodation fund” to cover the extra costs of DPO participation.[[20]](#footnote-20) But on the other hand, the accessibility guidelines say that “an excessive burden in terms of cost” can be an acceptable reason to depart from the standards that the guidelines set out.[[21]](#footnote-21)
* **Programme management:** Programme proposals are screened against some dimensions of disability-inclusiveness and allocated a ‘marker’ if they are deemed to be inclusive (see ‘spending’ section below).[[22]](#footnote-22) Proposals for cooperation initiatives must also describe how they applied AICS’ accessibility guidelines.[[23]](#footnote-23) And the selection criteria for humanitarian projects include specific marks on projects’ alignment to AICS guidelines, including those on disability.[[24]](#footnote-24)
* **Grant management:** Based on an English language review of documents in the public domain, MAECI and AICS seem not require that grantees make their work disability inclusive, although the system for screening proposals against a marker may encourage them to do so, as may references to the ‘vademecum’ on disability in most calls for proposals for humanitarian projects.[[25]](#footnote-25) (Please note that this review focused on incentives to include persons with disabilities in the work of civil society and multilateral partners. It was beyond its scope to examine incentives through other channels, e.g. ODA investments in private sector companies, but this would be an important area for future research).
* **Procurement:** No information on procurement policies was found during the online review (language may have been a limitation).
* **Disaggregated data and other reporting:** AICS reports annually on its implementation of the latest guidelines on disability.[[26]](#footnote-26) The 2018 guidelines explicitly recommend the use of disability-disaggregated data.[[27]](#footnote-27) Based on documents online, it was not clear whether the recommendation on disaggregation is yet being put into practice, but AICS is currently reviewing its results-based management system,[[28]](#footnote-28) which presents an opportunity to integrate disability-disaggregated reporting more comprehensively. (Please see ‘spending’ section below for reporting using the ‘DAC marker’).
* **Checks to detect and prevent ODA spending on activities that contravene the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) - e.g. forced psychiatric treatment:[[29]](#footnote-29)** Based on documents reviewed online, it was not possible to determine whether any checks are in place to detect projects that contravene the CRPD. One of AICS’ guidance notes – on humanitarian action – contains a short section which at first sight appears to risk CRPD-non compliance with an emphasis on consulting care staff, rather than persons with pshychosocial disabilities, in emergency situations:[[30]](#footnote-30) but further analysis on how this guidance is applied would be necessary before this could be confirmed.

### **SPENDING**

Spending data shows the scale of an ODA provider’s investment in international cooperation and humanitarian action. Subject to some limitations, it also gives a snapshot of how much that ODA provider’s spending aimed to be inclusive of persons with disabilities.

* **Italy’s total Official Development Assistance (ODA) spending**: US $ 4.9 billion (4.3 billion Euro) in 2019. This was 0.24% of Gross National Income.[[31]](#footnote-31)
* **Percentage of allocable ODA spending screened using the disability ‘DAC marker’ in 2018:[[32]](#footnote-32)** 23%.[[33]](#footnote-33) Before the DAC marker was introduced, AICS had been an innovator in introducing its own disability marker from 2014.[[34]](#footnote-34)
* **Percentage of total allocable ODA spending[[35]](#footnote-35) with disability inclusion as at least one objective in 2018**: 10%.[[36]](#footnote-36) (In interpreting this result, please note that reporting is based on self-assessment and there is no ex-post process to check different ODA providers’ reported results for methodological consistency). [Please refer to this link for listings of the individual projects](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/16uwIrUBFcKRtMrI1_h4bACOYsvuA-Gv5--eu5CNupls/edit?usp=sharing) that had disability inclusion as at least one objective [please note the link contains two separate sheets].[[37]](#footnote-37)

### **Annex A: Key questions for future analysis and advocacy[[38]](#footnote-38)**

1. What steps does AICS plan to take to strengthen further the systematic participation of DPOs in the implementation of all its projects (mainstream as well as disability-targeted) in future ?
2. How does AICS plan to ensure that its ambitions on disability inclusion are consistently implemented? For example:
   1. How will AICS make sure that all staff have a sound knowledge of all its guidelines on disability inclusion?
   2. AICS’ selection process for programmes and projects already includes some steps to encourage the selection of projects that are inclusive of persons with disabilities. What plans does AICS have to reinforce these steps, in order to ensure that Italian funds never support programmes that are not inclusive of persons with disabilities?
   3. AICS is currently reviewing its results based management system. Does it expect that the new system will require (not just recommend) data to be disaggregated by disability?
3. Although Italy has had its own disability spending marker for some time, it only screened 23% of its allocable ODA spending against the disability ‘DAC marker’ in 2018. What steps will Italy take to increase its use of the DAC marker in future years?
4. It is essential that persons with disabilities are never excluded from programmes because there is not enough budget available. Has AICS considered making an explicit statement on the need for Italian-funded programmes to budget for the full inclusion of persons with disabilities?[[39]](#footnote-39)
5. Integrating requirements on accessibility into ODA procurement practices can create an important incentive for private sector suppliers to change their practices (for example, if suppliers are required to make information technology equipment accessible). Is accessibility already a requirement in Italian ODA procurement? If not, what are AICS’ views on introducing an accessibility requirement in future?

### **Annex B: Italy’s priority countries**

Italy’s priority countries for development cooperation are: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Mozambique, Myanmar, Niger, Pakistan, Palestine, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, and Tunisia.[[40]](#footnote-40)

### **Annex C: key DPO and other contacts**

### DPO-CSO coalition engaged in advocacy on disability inclusion in ODA: [Italian Network on Disability and Development](https://www.ridsnetwork.org/) (RIDS)

* To ensure coordination with wider civil society messaging on the quantity and quality of Italian ODA, advocates may also want to consider contacting [CONCORD Italia](http://www.concorditalia.org/) and [ActionAid Italia](https://www.actionaid.it/).
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