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# Executive Summary

The Disability Rights Fund (DRF) and the Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (DRAF) exist to support disabled persons’ organisations (DPOs) through grant-making and related support. DPOs play a crucial role in the global movement towards realisation of the rights of persons with disabilities and disability inclusive societies.

As part of its ongoing accountability and quality assurance processes, DRF/DRAF commissioned an evaluation of its grants to Pacific DPOs for the period 2017 to 2019. The evaluation was undertaken in the first half of 2019 and included visits to Papua New Guinea and Fiji, where national DPOs have received the largest grants from DRF/DRAF under coalition arrangements. Early in the evaluation process, 22 Pacific DPO representatives participated in discussions about design aspects of the evaluation at a workshop. A total of 52 people, the majority from Papua New Guinea and Fiji, provided information to the evaluation team via face-to-face interviews and survey responses.

**Contribution to DRF/DRAF’s outcome statement**

DRF/DRAF’s stated outcome is: ‘Rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability (CRPD), are advanced in DRF target countries by the enhanced participation of the disability movement.’ The evaluation found that in Pacific countries where grants have been provided, there has been positive progress since 2017 in both participation of the disability movement and rights of persons with disabilities. The extent of these changes varies between Pacific countries: each is influenced by different factors, including the history of and context for DPOs (see **Annexes H** and **K**). The extent to which DRF/DRAF grants contribute to these changes also varies, reflecting diverse issues related to each specific national and DPO context and program of activities.

**Contribution to DRF/DRAF’s outputs**

**Output 1:** **Legislation, policy and government programmes (including those addressing the SDGs) undergoing harmonization with the CRPD in target countries through the participation of representative organizations of persons with disabilities**

DPOs in Pacific countries are participating in processes to change legislation, policies and government programmes. Examples include a national consultation process between Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled People (PNG ADP) for the Disability Authority Bill, and collaboration between Fiji DPOs and the Government of Fiji on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act. Examples of other reported changes include: advocacy on accessible elections (Fiji, Solomon Islands); inclusion of Washington Group Questions in the national census (Solomon Islands); and advocacy on inclusive schools (Kiribati).

**Output 2:** **Representative DPOs (DRAF/DRF grantees) from target countries participating in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes**

One DPO (Vanuatu Disability Promotion and Advocacy Association (DPA)) reported participation in international monitoring processes with funding provided by DRF/DRAF, and two DPOs reported involvement in national human rights and SDG monitoring (Fiji Disabled Persons’ Federation (FDPF) and DPA).

**Output 3:** **Disability movement in target countries is inclusive, reflecting the diverse voices of persons with disabilities**

Based on increased awareness of the importance of more inclusive DPOs, the evaluation found efforts are being made by DPOs to include groups of persons who have previously been excluded, such as deaf people[[1]](#footnote-2). The overall picture is of gradual improvement.

**Output 4:** **DRAF/DRF grantees equipped to advocate on rights of persons with disabilities**

DPOs which have received grants from DRAF/DRF have strengthened their advocacy skills through leadership and staff efforts, on-the-job experience, stronger organisational systems and increased outreach to members in rural areas. The provision of DRF/DRAF grants over consecutive years, enables DPOs to attract and retain staff and contributes to increasing expertise and confidence to tackle more complex advocacy.

**Factors contributing to success to date**

The work to achieve national level results has been undertaken by Pacific DPO staff themselves with diverse sources of technical support and collective action, including regional support. In summary, DPOs identified the following success factors:

* *Individual and collective efforts and leadership*
* *Recognition by Pacific governments of CRPD*
* *Regional support and frameworks, including the Pacific Disability Forum (PDF) and the Pacific Framework for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (PFRPD)*
* *Engagement with international DPOs and broader civil society in meetings, training workshops and other forms of collaboration and partnership*
* *Grants, other support and advocacy from donors and development partners.*

**Links between DRF/DRAF grants and changes**

The evaluation found that DRF/DRAF grants have been used directly by Pacific DPOs to enable them to achieve positive changes in the recognition of the rights of persons with disabilities and strengthened voices of people with disabilities. All interviewees confirmed that DRF/DRAF’s grants have been significant in supporting DPO efforts and that DPO efforts have been significant in the achievement of changes in disability rights. DPO officials confirmed that without funding provided by DRF/DRAF, progress would have been more limited and the barriers to inclusion would remain in place.

In terms of DRF/DRAF’s grant making, in summary, the evaluation found:

* DPOs value the fact the grants are provided by DRF/DRAF over a long period
* DPOs which receive multi-year funding within coalitions find this particularly helpful
* DPOs seek longer-term funding agreements to enhance their ability to develop the expertise of staff and retain them over time
* DPOs hold mixed views about DRF/DRAF’s flexibility and responsiveness to requested changes in activities or budget allocations
* Some DPOs seek more engagement from DRF/DRAF on technical aspects of their work within partnership arrangements, to balance compliance reporting
* The extent to which changes in Pacific government legislation, policies and programs can be attributed to grants and technical assistance provided by DRF/DRAF varies.

Overall, DRF/DRAF grants to Pacific DPOs have supported DPOs to engage effectively with governments in relation to the rights of persons with disabilities. Stakeholders confirmed that the realisation of rights in Pacific countries takes considerable time, and development partners, such as DRF/DRAF, will continue to be important, as they have been to date.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made on the basis of the evaluation:

1. DRF/DRAF and other development partners should continue to support DPOs to be the voices of persons with disabilities in Pacific countries, in relation to CRPD implementation and SDGs, enabling them to collaborate with governments in increasingly more complex and technical areas as national legislation and policies are implemented.
2. DRF/DRAF and other development partners should continue to support DPOs along their respective journeys of technical capacity strengthening. This will ensure those which seek to provide specific advice to their respective governments and development partners on how rights can be realised in practice (e.g. in inclusive education, disaster risk reduction (DRR) or employment), are better able to do so.
3. DRF/DRAF and other development partners should consider ways to enable DPOs to continually strengthen their organisations, for example by accessing locally or regionally available expertise (e.g. in leadership development, governance, program management, reflective learning or monitoring systems) or collaboration with other DPOs with stronger capacity.
4. DRF/DRAF should consider more ways to recognise and support regional collaboration between DPOs in the Pacific region.
5. DRF/DRAF should continue to consider ways to improve grants management processes from the perspective of DPOs, including through minimising excessive reporting, facilitating more flexible activity implementation and expanding multi-year funding arrangements.

# DRF/DRAF Management Response

Introduction

This independent evaluation of the Disability Rights Fund/Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (DRF/DRAF) grantee portfolio in the Pacific is a new area of engagement for the organization’s learning and evaluation. Commissioned with more flexibility than DRF/DRAF has had in any prior evaluation, this evaluation was designed to uphold best practices in participatory evaluation. Grantees in the Pacific played a key role in the evaluation design by developing the evaluation questions and principles and had the option to participate in the preliminary review of the data analysis, even before DRF/DRAF staff and the Evaluation Advisory Board saw the evaluation findings and results. The aim was to allow DPOs to be the owners of the findings – and not just points of data extraction.

As a result, this evaluation provided interesting and applicable strategic information that will help DRF/DRAF continue to improve how it engages with PICs DPOs towards the fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities. The findings and recommendations of the Pacific evaluation offer key insights into how disability rights have evolved in recent years in the Pacific – lessons that may be applied to other DRF/DRAF target countries that have similar political, geographic, or environmental contexts.

We wish to acknowledge the time and expertise of the evaluation team lead by Deborah Rhodes that included Ranjesh Prakash in Fiji and Sandra Gambro in Papua New Guinea, as well as the time dedicated to this evaluation by our key stakeholders – our grantees throughout the Pacific, whose achievements are reflected in the evaluation’s findings, and our Evaluation Advisory Board.[[2]](#footnote-3) The Evaluation Advisory Board included Ola Abu Al Ghaib, Director, United National Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; Mika Kontiainen, Director of Disability Section, Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT); Zsuzsanna Luppai, Associate Director for Program Development, Human Rights Program, Open Society Foundations; Setareki S. Macanawai, Chief Executive Officer, Pacific Disability Forum; Myroslava Tataryn, Disability Rights Program Officer, Wellspring Philanthropic Fund; and previously Cynthia Lokanata, Disability Section, DFAT and Daryl Lloyd, Statistics & Results Adviser, Disability Inclusion Team, United Kingdom Department for International Development.

We also acknowledge that this Management Response was written during the height of the COVID-19 global pandemic. The pandemic has already had a serious impact on activities of the DRF/DRAF and on those of our grantees, and this is only likely to increase. Many global, regional, and national meetings have been cancelled or delayed until at least late 2020 or 2021. Our offices and those of our grantees have been closed. While everyone is doing their best to work remotely, this is more difficult for DRF/DRAF grantees, many of whom have no internet connection or computer at home. DRF/DRAF Program Officers maintain regular communication with grantees primarily over smart phone and social media.

As a follow-up on our commitment to transparency and to ensure advancement of a broad understanding of disability rights advocacy, we are publishing the full report on our website.

**Management’s Views on Recommendations**

Management concurs with the overall findings of the evaluation and most of the recommendations as they relate to DRF/DRAF and will undertake actions to address issues raised. Specific responses to recommendations are given below.

**Recommendation 1: DRF/DRAF and other development partners should continue to support DPOs to be the voices of persons with disabilities in Pacific countries, in relation to CRPD implementation and SDGs, enabling them to collaborate with governments in increasingly more complex and technical areas as national legislation and policies are implemented.**

*Agree*

While DRF/DRAF cannot speak to the commitment of other development partners active in the Pacific, we agree that capacity building focused on advocacy and CRPD and SDGs knowledge are critical to DPOs in the region. Under the guidance of persons with disabilities on the Board and the former Global Advisory Panel, DRF/DRAF made a strategic decision to invest limited resources on capacity building in advocacy and rights knowledge. Accordingly, DRF/DRAF developed a Technical Assistance strategy that aims specifically to increase the rights advocacy capacity of grantees around the CRPD and SDGs, and developed the post of a Technical Assistance Coordinator. Piloted work on Technical Assistance has occurred in the Pacific in partnership with the Pacific Disability Forum (PDF), a regional DPO network. DRF/DRAF sets milestones and targets for these investments through specific indicators in the DRF/DRAF logical framework.

Since mid-2019, DRF/DRAF has intended to expand Technical Assistance capacity through the hiring of a Technical Assistance Director. With the economic effects of the COVID-19 global pandemic still unknown at this time, we acknowledge that the timetable has shifted for this hire, but continue to be committed to expanding this critical area.

**Recommendation 2: DRF/DRAF and other development partners should continue to support DPOs along their respective journeys of technical capacity strengthening. This will ensure those which seek to provide specific advice to their respective governments and development partners on how rights can be realized in practice (e.g. in inclusive education, disaster risk reduction, or employment), are better able to do so.**

*Agree*

While DRF/DRAF cannot speak to the commitment of other development partners active in the Pacific, we agree that individual DPO technical capacity strengthening is an effective tactic. Accordingly, in mid-2018 DRF/DRAF made the commitment to hire a Pacific Program Officer. Based on the recognition that grantees in the Pacific needed a person on the ground who understands the unique contexts of the disability movement in each Pacific Island country and has deep connections with regional disability organizations, such as PDF, the addition of the Pacific Program Officer has been very beneficial to the disability movement in the region, as acknowledged by grantees in this evaluation. As the Pacific Program Officer continues to provide excellent one-on-one grantee technical assistance to DPOs and opportunities for learning exchange, such as the 2019 Pacific Grantee Convening that took place in conjunction with the PDF Annual Conference in Fiji, we look forward to increased communication and partnership with DPOs in the region. We also anticipate further strengthening of Technical Assistance as discussed in response to Recommendation 1.

**Recommendation 3: DRF/DRAF and other development partners should consider ways to enable DPOs to continually strengthen their organizations, for example by accessing locally or regionally available expertise (e.g. in leadership development, governance, program management, reflective learning or monitoring systems) or collaboration with other DPOs with stronger capacity.**

*Partially agree*

Again, while DRF/DRAF cannot speak to the commitment of other development partners active in the Pacific, we do recognize the need for organizational strengthening among most DPOs in the Pacific despite the fact that this is neither an area of investment nor expertise of DRF/DRAF. As noted throughout this evaluation, PDF plays a critical capacity building role in the Pacific for its DPO members. The Pacific Disability Forum and DRF/DRAF have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) regarding sharing of support to DPOs in the Pacific. DRF/DRAF will explore enhancing communication about grantee needs to PDF in real time through the new DRF/DRAF Pacific Program Officer.

As referenced above, DRF/DRAF Program Officers provide indirect support as part of their responsibilities related to grants oversight. In addition, DRF/DRAF began a pilot in 2020 to research the civil society actors at a national level whose mission includes organizational capacity development, particularly regarding safeguarding, financial management, and budget advocacy. If this proves to be a beneficial mechanism for organizational capacity strengthening, DRF/DRAF may expand this to other target countries/regions, such as the Pacific as well.

**Recommendation 4: DRF/DRAF should consider more ways to recognize and support regional collaboration between DPOs in the Pacific region.**

*Agree*

DRF/DRAF agrees that support for systematic engagement of grantees in regional advocacy opportunities and partnerships is needed, whether this be through the Pacific Framework on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as mentioned in below in the full evaluation report, the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, the Small Island Developing States Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA Pathway), the Incheon Strategy, the Sendai Framework for DRR, or the Asia and Pacific Decade of Persons with Disabilities, which comes to an end in 2022. We have dedicated a staff person to track these regional advocacy opportunities. While COVID-19 caused the postponement of a planned April 2020 PICs convening focused on building regional collaboration between women-led DPOs and women’s rights groups, DRF/DRAF intends to reschedule once the pandemic is no longer a threat.

At the grantmaking level, for the first time in the 2019 Round 2 Grantmaking DRF/DRAF provided a two-year grant to a multi-national coalition in Samoa, Kiribati, Fiji, and Papua New Guinea for a project to build the capacity of the respective national deaf associations to influence government planning and programs to be inclusive of deaf persons. If successful, this model may be used for other advocacy efforts in PICs as well.

**Recommendation 5: DRF/DRAF should continue to consider ways to improve grants management processes from the perspective of DPOs, including through minimizing excessive reporting, facilitating more flexible activity implementation and expanding multi-year funding arrangements.**

*Agree*

DRF/DRAF understands the administrative responsibilities that are associated by necessity with receiving funding. With ensuring a match of responsibility and capacity in mind, DRF/DRAF began a grantmaking overhaul process in early 2019. An external consultant with deep knowledge of DRF/DRAF grantmaking review processes completed an assessment that included the review of relevant grantmaking documents, meetings with the DRF/DRAF Grantmaking Committee, and individual interviews with 14 staff members using a standard interview protocol with 17 questions. A total of 788 comments were recorded and analyzed to provide a set of recommendations on where DRF/DRAF might make improvements in the future. As DRF/DRAF examines these recommendations, our commitment to marginalised persons with disabilities means that in the Pacific (as elsewhere), we will continue to improve accessibility by exploring alternative communication methods, such as Easy to Read versions of Small Grant applications and reporting templates, or grantee video recording to replace written reports.

As we continue to examine how to best minimize burdens on grantees while meeting our legal and donor requirements, we acknowledge there are unique challenges in the Pacific Region, such as banking, information and communication technologies, and reliable internet access, that need to be considered. Our MOU with PDF, mentioned above, outlines for example coordination of the PDF Annual Conference and the DRF/DRAF PICs Grantee Convening to minimize grantee travel and burdens. Exploration of revision to this MOU between PDF and DRF/DRAF will include a discussion on this recommendation.

Lessons learned from our COVID-19 response include alternative procedures to respond to grantee requests and alternative administrative reporting methods. For example, the DRAF/DRF Program Team quickly responded to COVID-19 impacts, reviewing 200 projects in a matter of weeks in order to incorporate grantee-requested project changes for DPO-led advocacy messages and efforts related to COVID-19. Half of the Pacific grantee project change requests were processed by end April 2020. As the field of philanthropy responds to the crisis and learns lessons from participatory grantmaking and trust-based philanthropy, which offer a corrective to power imbalances and new ways to support community leaders to do their best work, DRF/DRAF may be able to make further adjustments.

**DRAF/DRF Commitment**

The staff and Board of DRF/DRAF are fully committed to our mission, our partners, and the mutual learning that is critical to sustain all efforts to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities. Accordingly, we will continue to be open and responsive in order to adapt to new opportunities, improve our practices, and respond to the relevant needs of our grantees.

We commit to adjusting as appropriate and possible the processes and country-level strategies that DPOs, national governments, and other stakeholders raised through this evaluation. To hold ourselves accountable to the DPOs that participated in this evaluation and provided their input and insights, relevant staff at DRF/DRAF will conduct a bi-annual reflection process on the uptake of relevant recommendations and inform our partners of progress in these areas as requested.

# Introduction

The Disability Rights Fund, and its sister organization the Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (DRF/DRAF), provide grants to disabled persons organisations (DPOs) in Pacific countries to support them to undertake advocacy towards the advancement of rights of persons with disabilities and disability-inclusive development. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) details these rights, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) confirms them, and an increasing body of literature and donor policies describe concepts related to disability-inclusive development[[3]](#footnote-4). Funding is provided through DRF/DRAF to DPOs for this purpose from the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), Open Society Foundations, the Ford Foundation and other sources. Grants have been provided to Pacific countries from DRF/DRAF since 2010.

In early 2019, DRF/DRAF commissioned an independent evaluator to facilitate a process to generate understanding about the value of its contribution to achieving the organisation’s outcome and related outputs since 2017. The evaluation also sought to identify ways in which support for Pacific DPOs and efforts to support implementation of the CRPD can be improved. This is the first time that DRF/DRAF has commissioned a region-specific evaluation: others have been undertaken at a global level[[4]](#footnote-5). This Pacific evaluation is being undertaken in parallel with a separate global evaluation.

This report covers the independent evaluation on DRF/DRAF grant-making in the Pacific region. The approach to the evaluation reflects the particular cultural and DPO contexts in which funding is provided. While the evaluation had a relatively limited scope and budget, the process sought to maximise the voice of persons with disabilities in Pacific countries.

# Context

## Disability rights in Pacific countries

There have been significant changes in regard to the recognition of rights of persons with disabilities in Pacific countries in the past decade. Most Pacific Governments have now signed and ratified the CRPD (see **Table 1** below), a key step in recognizing the rights of persons with disabilities. Most countries also now have national disability policies and strategies. At the time of this evaluation, there has not yet been a great deal of progress on the implementation of recent legislation and policies overall, although there are signs of positive progress.

The Pacific Disability Forum’s (PDF) SDG-CRPD Monitoring Report 2018[[5]](#footnote-6) provides an excellent overview of progress in disability inclusion in the Pacific region, with specific reference to the SDGs and Articles in the CRPD. The report describes progress in Pacific countries along with recommendations for further development and sustainability. The Executive Summary of this report is provided as **Annex B**, for ease of reference, as it provides the most up-to-date and relevant summary analysis of the context.

**Table 1** below lists countries and year of government ratification of CRPD. For those using screen-reader software or Braille, the table includes two columns, with the name of each Pacific country included in this evaluation in the first column and the year of CRPD ratification in the second column (subsequent tables in the main report follow this explanation).

### Table 1 Pacific countries ratification of CRPD

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country of DPO grantees** | **Year of Government ratification of CRPD** |
| Vanuatu | 2008 |
| Kiribati | 2013\* |
| Papua New Guinea | 2013 |
| Tuvalu | Acceded in 2013\*  |
| Marshall Islands | Acceded in 2015\* |
| Federated States of Micronesia  | 2016 |
| Samoa | 2016 |
| Fiji | 2017 |
| Solomon Islands | NOT YET RATIFIED |
| Tonga | NOT YET RATIFIED |

\* Accession ‘is the act whereby a state accepts the offer or the opportunity to become a party to a treaty already negotiated and signed by other states. It has the same legal effect as ratification.’[[6]](#footnote-7) This option may be used when a country’s foreign affairs responsibilities are undertaken by another country. For example, Marshall Islands has a Compact of Free Association with the United States of America.

Pacific countries are very diverse and this is highly relevant to any analysis of grants to the whole region. While most have relatively small populations on a global scale, Papua New Guinea and Fiji have substantially larger populations than other countries in the region. Social and economic indicators vary widely: some countries provide basic services for their populations but most face considerable economic constraints. The situation of persons with disabilities varies from urban to rural settings and between islands and countries. Having a disability in some households and countries does not equate to likely poverty, but in others, it does. Some Pacific governments are more interested and able to work collaboratively with DPOs on disability rights issues than others, and this changes over time, depending on personalities, politics and other influences. While it is clear that what applies in one context may not apply in another, some common themes between Pacific countries related to disability inclusion include:

* Pacific countries are largely independent (although several retain links with colonising countries)
* Pacific countries collaborate a great deal at regional levels on various social, economic, development and political issues, through sophisticated regional agreements, organisations and structures
* Where populations are relatively small, DPOs’ capacity is limited by the low number of persons with disabilities who are available to work, voluntarily or for a salary
* Where populations are relatively large, DPOs’ ability to access persons with disability in rural and remote parts of the country is of critical importance to their success
* Pacific cultural values (e.g. related to power and relationships) and approaches to achieving change (e.g. collective decision-making and preference for stability) play an important role in strengthening capacity of DPOs[[7]](#footnote-8)
* The dominant voices in disability until the adoption of the CRPD in 2006, were service providers, where they existed, and it is only in the last decade, that DPOs’ voices are now heard.

## Pacific DPOs

DPOs now exist in all Pacific countries. Most have operated at national levels for at least a decade. In Fiji, DPOs began to develop in the 1970s. Some DPOs are still emerging and fragile as organisations. Research undertaken in 2011-12[[8]](#footnote-9) found diverse capacity among Pacific DPOs in terms of governance, organisation, effectiveness and resilience. Their relationships with governments and development partners also varied. At that time, DPO staff and boards were found to have good understanding of the importance of their leadership role and the need to apply a range of disability, development and governance principles in practice, despite the barriers they faced in terms of resources and accessibility. They varied in their experience of undertaking advocacy and related activities, with some having extensive practice and others in the early stages of mobilising and organising.

Since the early 2010s, a great deal of work has been undertaken by DPO leaders, staff and members themselves. There have been changes in their operating contexts and within organisations, reflecting changes in personnel and other factors, but overall, the picture is one of positive growth and expansion of DPO capacity. **Annex H** provides a short history of each DPO. The evaluation found that ongoing efforts are needed to sustain positive progress (see Recommendation 1).

The overall picture for the work of DPOs is one of rapidly increasing complexity. In 2011-12, a small number of development partners, including DRF/DRAF, were already working closely with Pacific DPOs to support their advocacy, representation and programming objectives. DPOs had also established working relationships with respective national governments. Since then, there has been substantially more engagement between Pacific DPOs and others, with governments (both national and donors), UN agencies and many NGOs seeking collaboration, particularly in relation to the CRPD. In some cases, these organisations respond to DPO priorities. While there may be some shared goals related to the promotion and protection of disability rights and disability inclusive development between DPOs and this new set of development partners and governments, and benefits from additional funding, consequential demands and expectations on DPO capacity have created some negative consequences for DPOs. For example, some DPO officials have experienced high levels of workplace stress and have departed. In other cases, DPO boards and staff have faced tensions related to accessing external funding and managing complex governance, organisational and reporting responsibilities. DPOs have variously managed the strengths and challenges associated with increasing complexity.

## Contributions to Pacific regional, national and sub-national DPOs

Pacific DPOs receive financial support from a wide range of sources, including DRF/DRAF, with considerable variations each year. There has been a significant increase in the number of organisations engaged with Pacific DPOs, and increasing complexity in funding and partnership arrangements in recent years. One stakeholder advised that their organisation had decided to reduce funding for DPOs because it had become ‘a crowded field.’

A large proportion of funding for DPOs is provided by the Australian Government DFAT international development program through various means, including that through DRF/DRAF. Most DRF/DRAF funding for Pacific DPOs is sourced from the Australian Government DFAT international development program. In addition, the Australian Government provides substantial core, multi-year funding to PDF, which also distributes annual grants to Pacific DPOs as well as provides technical and organisational support with this funding (see Box 1). Bilateral programs of the Australian Government DFAT international development program in Samoa and Kiribati also provide funding for DPOs. The Australian Volunteer Program[[9]](#footnote-10) funds the placement of personnel in several Pacific DPOs and other Australian development NGOs[[10]](#footnote-11) also directly or indirectly provide financial support to Pacific DPOs. Pacific DPOs also access small grants from Australian Embassies and High Commissions.

***Box 1 Australian Aid for Pacific DPOs***

The Australian Government DFAT International Development Program has provided substantial core, multi-year funding to PDF since 2012. This funding supports regional advocacy efforts on CRPD as well as contributes to the operational costs, capacity strengthening, projects and priorities of member DPOs. This has included funding for training for DPO staff, volunteers and board members of Pacific DPOs on CRPD, inclusive budgeting, project design, organisational management, and related topics. Australian Government DFAT International Development Program as well as other funding through PDF also contributes to DPOs’ costs of offices, office equipment and transport, and global and regional advocacy and related activities which involve members. DPOs apply to PDF for rounds of funding, and report to PDF accordingly, which in turn reports to DFAT. PDF support has also contributed to reviews of CRPD-compliance in Pacific Governments’ legislation, and engagement and support for partnerships in a number of prioritised sectors.

Other donors and development partners contribute funds to Pacific DPOs, either directly or through the regional efforts of PDF. For example, PDF’s 2018 Monitoring Report was financially supported by UK Aid, International Disability Alliance (IDA), DFAT International Development Program, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) and the European Union.

In addition to funding provided by DRF/DRAF, technical or sector-specific support is also available to Pacific DPOs from various organisations. Examples include IDA, CBM Australia, UN agencies (such as UNDP, UNESCO, UN-ESCAP, ILO and WHO) and regional organisations such as PIFS and the Pacific Secretariat. This support includes training on the CRPD and the SDGs, efforts to strengthen governance and capacity of DPOs, core funding for operations, funding for DPOs to undertake advocacy and related activities, and opportunities for training with civil society and other organisations on specific topics, issues or sectors.[[11]](#footnote-12)

At the national level, several Pacific DPOs have received contributions to core operational funding, from national governments. For example, PNG ADP received a very small one-off grant from the Papua New Guinea Department of Community Development and Religion in 2018, the first in many years. FDPF receives sporadic grants from the Fiji Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation, though this is unpredictable funding.

An increasing number of regional and multilateral agencies are involved in disability-inclusive development more broadly. Some provide direct or indirect support to DPOs, and others draw on DPO expertise. The following is a list of development agencies which currently collaborate in this area of development in the Pacific (it may not be complete, but illustrates the wide range of agencies involved):[[12]](#footnote-13)

* Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)
* The Pacific Community (SPC)
* University of the South Pacific (USP)
* Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO)
* UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR)
* World Health Organisation (WHO)
* Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
* International Labour Organisation (ILO)
* UN Women
* UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF)
* UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)
* UN Education and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (UNESCAP).

# Evaluation

## 3.1 Objectives and evaluation questions

The TORs (see **Annex A**) specify that the purpose of the evaluation is both summative and formative and the objectives are to:

* Provide an update on progress made towards the achievement of output- and outcome-level results in DRF/DRAF’s logical framework;
* Identify DRF/DRAF’s contributions to results achieved by paying special attention to capturing the mechanisms that have brought about reported changes and the assumptions behind them, particularly strategies that were the most effective;
* Identify internal and external (to DRF/DRAF) factors affecting performance, at both the programmatic and organizational levels;
* Provide DRF/DRAF staff with a clear set of recommendations to improve current interventions and guide future ones.

Based on these objectives and results of a preliminary evaluation workshop with grantees (see 3.2 below), the following evaluation questions were agreed upon:

1. What have DRF/DRAF funds been used for?
	* What is the purpose of the funding requested?
	* What is the nature and scope of funding provided?
	* What activities have been undertaken with DRF/DRAF funding?
	* To what extent have outputs been completed?
2. What changes have occurred in terms of the rights of all persons with disabilities in Pacific countries in the past decade and particularly in the last 3 years?
3. What changes have occurred in terms of the roles of DPOs in Pacific countries in the past decade?
4. What is the nature of the link between DRF/DRAF funding (relative to other contributions) and changes in the rights of persons with disabilities, government legislation and policy, inclusion and the roles of DPOs?
5. Have DRF/DRAF contributions been regarded as useful and if so, how and for whom?
	1. How are marginalised groups within the disability movement included and benefitting from these activities?
6. What examples (stories) exist of success in implementation of activities funded and supported by DRF and their contribution to outcome and output level objectives?
7. What factors have contributed to efficiency and success?
8. Are there signs that positive changes are likely to contribute to sustained benefits?
9. What improvements are recommended in relation to partnerships between DRF/DRAF and Pacific DPOs?

These questions form the structure for findings in Section 4 below, with question 8 addressed directly in Section 5.3.

## 3.2 Research Participants

At a workshop organised by DRF/DRAF prior to the Sixth Pacific Regional Conference on Disability (February 2019), 22 Pacific DPO representatives considered and made helpful suggestions about the evaluation scope, questions and methods, prior to data collection.

A total of 52 people from eight countries, were directly included in the evaluation (see **Annex C)**. Forty-eight (48) people were involved in face-to-face interviews, in workshops or interviewed by phone, and an additional four DPO staff responded to a written questionnaire. Most participants are from Fiji and Papua New Guinea. The majority of respondents are persons with disabilities.

## 3.3 Methodology

The evaluation team comprised three personnel. The main evaluator has expertise in the rights of persons with disabilities, disability inclusive development, participatory evaluation approaches and Pacific countries. As the main evaluator had led a Pacific-wide research activity in 2011-12 with PDF, addressing Pacific DPO capacity issues, a comparison on some aspects of DPOs was possible.[[13]](#footnote-14) The aim of including co-evaluators in Papua New Guinea and Fiji was to demonstrate inclusive and participatory processes and to maximise relevance. Two team members have lived experience of disability and experience in DPOs.

The TORs describe a two-phase evaluation process, including a first phase focused on reaching agreement about the scope, nature and focus of the evaluation and a second phase involved data collection and analysis. The TORs specified that field visits should be undertaken in two countries, Papua New Guinea and Fiji.

The main evaluator prepared an Evaluation Plan, approved by DRF/DRAF in May 2019. The Evaluation Plan focused on learning and accountability for grants provided and activities undertaken. The evaluation process sought to balance robust evaluation methodology with respect for priorities expressed by Pacific DPOs themselves. This approach recognises that cultural perspectives on partnership, development, accountability, change and inclusion vary between ‘western’ countries (e.g. US, Australia and UK) which are the sources of funding, and Pacific countries, where the funding is allocated. The Evaluation Plan also recognised that all research/evaluation methods have strengths and limitations so efforts were made to maximise the benefits and manage the limitations, consistent with the principles of disability inclusion, human rights and cross-cultural engagement.

The evaluation sought to maximise participation of Pacific DPOs through:

* An opportunity for DPO representatives to develop a shared understanding of the evaluation’s scope as well as suggest evaluation questions and methods (the preliminary evaluation workshop in Fiji in February 2019)
* Consultation with PDF and new DRF/DRAF Pacific Program Officer on the Evaluation Plan
* Organisation of a feedback/confirmation session for PNG ADP Executive Committee in May 2019 to share analysis and confirm recommendations
* Opportunity for DPOs to review the first draft report prior to submission to DRF/DRAF staff and Evaluation Advisory Board[[14]](#footnote-15)
* Opportunity for DPOs to review summary versions of the evaluation report prior to finalisation (managed by DRF/DRAF).

Phase 2 of the evaluation included analysis of available written reports, data collection from DPOs in countries where funding was provided, visits to Papua New Guinea (May 2019) and Fiji (July 2019) and drafting of this report (July to September 2019).

**Annex D** includes details of evaluation questions, sources and methods, **Annex E** includes interview guides for in-country interviews, **Annex F** includes a consent form and **Annex G i**s the questionnaire for data collection from countries other than Papua New Guinea and Fiji.

## 3.4 Limitations

This evaluation was limited in scope, coverage and resources, mitigated in part by the concurrent global evaluation commissioned by DRF/DRAF. The findings and discussions in this report must be read in the context of the limitations. The budget was sufficient for short visits to two of the nine countries where DPOs have received funding. Only one consultant undertook the role throughout the process: the other two evaluation team members participated in data collection during field visits only. Another limitation was unavailability of some key personnel during field visits.

# Findings

This section includes findings against each of the evaluation questions listed in Section 3.1 above. The last question is discussed in Section 5.3.

**Table 2** below includes DPOs which have received grants from DRF/DRAF in 2017-19, and countries. Names are in the first column and countries in the second column.[[15]](#footnote-16) (A table listing all grantee Pacific DPOs since 2010 is provided at **Annex J**).

### Table 2 List of DPOs which have received DRF/DRAF funding since 2017

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DPO** | **Country** |
| 1 | Fiji Disabled People’s Federation (FDPF)  | Fiji |
| 2 | Fiji Association of the Deaf (FAD) | Fiji |
| 3 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons (PNG ADP) | Papua New Guinea |
| 4 | People with Disability in Solomon Islands (PWDSI) | Solomon Islands |
| 5 | Te Toa Matoa | Kiribati |
| 6 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association (DPA) | Vanuatu |
| 7 | Nuanua O Le Alofa Inc (NOLA)  | Samoa |
| 8 | Deaf Club Samoa/Deaf Association of Samoa (DCS/DAS) | Samoa |
| 9 | Fusi Alofa | Tuvalu |
| 10 | Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organisation (MIDPO) | Marshall Islands |
| 11 | Tonga National Visual Impairment Association (TNVIA) | Tonga |
| 12 | Naunau ‘o e ‘Alamaite Tonga Association (NATA) | Tonga |
| 13 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization (PCO) | Federated States of Micronesia |

## Use of DRF/DRAF funds

This section answers Question 1: ‘What have DRF/DRAF funds been used for?’ and each sub-section below details data on the following sub-questions:

* What is the nature and scope of funding provided?
* What activities have been undertaken with DRF/DRAF funding?
* To what extent have outputs been completed?

When applying for DRF/DRAF funding, DPOs are requested to specify objectives of the grants, within the priorities set by DRF/DRAF. DRF/DRAF’s own goal in its logical framework is:

* ‘Rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the CRPD, are advanced in DRF target countries by the enhanced participation of the disability movement.’

DRF/DRAF has the following output-level objectives:

1. Legislation, policy and government programmes (including those addressing the SDGs) brought in line with the CRPD in target countries through the participation of representative organizations of persons with disabilities
2. Representative DPOs (DRF/DRAF grantees) from target countries participate in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes
3. Disability movement in target countries is inclusive, reflecting the diverse voices of persons with disabilities
4. DRF/DRAF grantees equipped to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities.

### 4.1.1 Nature and scope of funding provided

In the period 2016-18, DRF/DRAF granted a total of US$735,400 to 13 DPOs in ten Pacific countries (listed in Table 2 above)[[16]](#footnote-17).

**Table 3** below summarises the funding provided to each DPO over the evaluation period. It has the name of each DPO in the first column, then funding provided in 2016, 2017 and 2018 in subsequent columns.

### Table 3 Grants to Pacific DPOs 2016-18 (US$)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DPO** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Deaf Club Samoa |  $ 10,000.00  |  |  |
| PWDSI |  $ 12,000.00  |  $ 20,000.00  |  $ 20,000.00  |
| DPA |  $ 30,000.00  |  $ 30,000.00  |  |
| DPA - special opportunity |  |  |  $ 48,000.00  |
| FAD |  $ 20,000.00  |  |  |
| FDPF |  $ 40,000.00  |  $ 40,000.00  |  $ 50,000.00  |
| Fusi Alofa |  $ 17,000.00  |  $ 14,000.00  |  |
| MIDPO |  $ 20,000.00  |  $ 20,000.00  |  |
| PNG ADP |  $ 35,000.00  |  $ 40,000.00  |  $ 45,000.00  |
| TTM |  $ 17,000.00  |  $ 20,000.00  |  $ 20,000.00  |
| NOLA |  |  $ 40,000.00  |  |
| NATA |  |  $ 16,500.00  |  |
| TNVIA |  |  $ 11,500.00  |  $ 16,000.00  |
| PCO |  |  |  $ 45,000.00  |
| PDF - TA and off docket grant |  |  $ 38,400.00  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  **$ 201,000.00**  |  **$ 290,400.00**  |  **$ 244,000.00**  |

In the period 2016-18, there is a close match between the requests made by DPOs and funding provided by DRF/DRAF. A small number of DPOs did not receive the total amounts requested, following decisions made by DRF/DRAF.

The nature of work undertaken by DPOs using DRF/DRAF grants is defined in three ways in this evaluation: DRF/DRAF categories; priorities determined by DPOs themselves; and the type of activities funded.

Each applicant DPO is required to identify which of the DRF/DRAF priorities its planned work fits into. The priorities are as follows:

1. Increasing DPO capacity to participate in advocacy and decision-making processes regarding implementation of rights at local levels
2. Advocacy for inclusion of persons with disabilities in government programs and in government budget planning and implementation at the local level
3. Increasing DPO capacity to participate in advocacy and decision-making processes regarding implementation of the SDGs
4. Advocacy for inclusion of persons with disabilities in local government development programs (as part of SDG implementation) and in government budget planning and implementation
5. In Pacific Island countries only: Ratification of the CRPD and/or the Optional Protocol (where not ratified).

By definition, all grants fit into one or more of these priorities, so there is little value in analysing the data further in this regard.

The objectives identified by DPOs in their applications are a useful source of information about the nature of the work that is expected to be undertaken. **Annex I** includes the stated objectives of grants, compiled from DPO applications to DRF/DRAF for the years 2016, 2017 and 2018. These objectives are expected to apply to the subsequent year’s activity implementation. The following is a summary of these objectives, which unsurprisingly reflects the five categories of grants, set by DRF/DRAF:

1. CRPD ratification, where needed
2. Ensuring national legislation is aligned with the CRPD
3. Implementation of the CRPD by governments
4. General awareness-raising and advocacy on the rights and inclusion of persons with disabilities in alignment with the CRPD and/or the SDGs.

To address these focus areas, funding was allocated to four areas within DPOs: personnel, programs, administration and technical assistance. DRF/DRAF provided additional funds for global advocacy. **Figure 1** below shows the allocation of funding across these categories in the three-year period 2016-18.[[17]](#footnote-18) The figures that are presented in the figure are: Program 41%; Personnel 23%; Administration 10%; Technical Assistance 9%; and Global Advocacy 17%.

**Figure 1**: **Allocation of funding to Pacific DPOs**

At an operational level, funding has been used by DPOs to address the challenges they face in functioning as organisations and achieving their core mandates, within usually low-resource and diverse development, political and cultural circumstances. Grants have assisted DPOs to address a variety of internal capacity issues, including paying salaries of advocacy and program staff, building skills and knowledge of staff and board members, and organisation of events and processes associated with advocacy.

Grants have also contributed to DPOs’ ability to operate as members of federations/coalitions at sub-national, national and regional levels as well as to support sub-national or impairment-specific DPOs and members themselves, within the advocacy and disability inclusive development topics. In addition, grants have enabled DPOs to initiate processes and respond to demands from others for engagement on rights, inclusion and development issues. DPOs have worked with government agencies, development partners and service providers in this regard.

A small number of additional grants have also been provided to either Pacific DPOs or PDF in this reporting period (called Technical Assistance, Special Opportunity Grants or Off-Docket Grants by DRF/DRAF):

* In 2016, DRF/DRAF provided a grant through the Fiji Association of the Deaf (FAD) to build regional skills on rights and inclusion of the deaf community in Fiji, Papua New Guinea, and Kiribati. Funding was granted to FAD to strengthen relationships between the deaf communities between the three countries during 2017, with the aim of advocating to increase deaf people’s participation in DPOs in Kiribati and PNG. This funding addressed a gap within the disability movement because accessibility for deaf people had not previously been prioritised.
* In 2017, a grant was provided to PDF in 2017 with the objective ‘To build the knowledge and skills of DPOs in Papua New Guinea and Tuvalu to engage in CRPD monitoring and reporting processes, as well as monitoring and reporting to other UN human rights monitoring processes’ which involved piloting a participant sign-in sheet to collect anonymous information on participants’ disability and gender at training sessions
* In 2018, a Special Opportunity grant was provided to DPA to enable members to participate in the 2019 dialogue before the CRPD Committee’s review of Vanuatu and to develop a policy brief and recommendations on budget allocations to implement the Committee’s Concluding Observations (to cover travel expenses to Geneva, Switzerland).

### 4.1.2 Activities undertaken

DPOs have undertaken activities with DRF/DRAF funding each year which are largely consistent with the intended purpose, nature and funding provided (as per Section 4.1 above and **Annex I**). In summary, activities have focused on national and sub-national advocacy processes and events (including for CRPD ratification where needed, or national disability policies and legislation), skills training and learning workshops, government consultations, capacity building for emerging DPOs, and broader community awareness.

Those DPOs which have received higher levels of funding have undertaken more activities, while those DPOs which have received funding from other sources for related work, have used DRF/DRAF funding in more specific ways. To illustrate the diversity of activities, **Tables 4 and 5** below provide details of activities undertaken by the FDPF Coalition and PNG ADP across the 3 years. Each table has three columns, one for each year.

### Table 4 Activities undertaken by FDPF Coalition using DRF/DRAF grants across 3 years

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Advocated to Government of Fiji for CRPD Ratification.Delivered training courses for media, educational and police organisations on the CRPD.Delivered training for various ministries (e.g. Fiji Election Office, Ministry of Youth and Sports and Fiji Bureau of Statistics) on various aspects of inclusion.Advocated for allocation of budget for CRPD implementation. Advocated for the passage of the Disability Rights Bill. | Collaborated with Ministry of Women, Children & Poverty Alleviation on data on disability allowance scheme.Advocated to the Government of Fiji on implementation of the CRPD and budget allocation.Advocated for the passage of the Disability Rights Bill and mainstreaming these into relevant government ministries’ policies and legislation.Collaborated with Fiji Election Office on accessible election.Delivered training for police, prison officers, magistrates and judiciary on CRPD and access to justice.Advocated for disability inclusion in DRR. | Collaborated with Ministry of Women, Children & Poverty Alleviation on data on disability allowance scheme, to advocate to ministries responsible for education, health, and employment.Advocated in Parliament on disability rights, resulting in the Government of Fiji passing the Rights of Persons with Disability Act of 2018.Participated in Election Disability Access Working Group Committee and signed agreement with Election Office for inclusive and accessible elections.Made a submission to Fiji National Disaster Management Office regarding the Disaster Act, using CRPD, for consideration of disability inclusive preparedness, response and recovery.Advocated with Ministry of Economy on inclusion of people with disabilities for the 2019-2020 budget. |

### Table 5 Activities undertaken by PNG ADP using DRF/DRAF grants across 3 years

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Conducted training workshops on CRPD in provinces.Compiled issues to form the basis of consultation on the Disability Legislation discussion paper (continued in 2017). | Participated in joint National Civil Society Round Table Meeting, followed by the Annual National Development Forum, which drafted a Position Paper with 6 priority areas for government action, including the fast-tracking of drafting the Disability Legislation Act.Provide training for DPO leaders of Momase and Highlands provinces.Submitted Position Paper to government in August 2017, and advocated for action.Formalised and finalised collaborative arrangements with coalition partners and focal point government departments. | Collaborated with Papua New Guinea Government organisations to plan for implementation of government directives to Constitutional Law Reform Commission (CLRC) to start drafting Disability Rights Bill.Contributed to launch of draft Disability Rights Bill, organised and led 3 regional consultation workshops (requirement for Disability Rights Bill to go to Parliament to be passed as an Act). |

### 4.1.3 Outputs completed

Written reports by DPOs were the main source of data for this analysis, however data available on the extent to which outputs have been completed by DPOs varies widely. In part this may reflect different understanding of language used in DRF reporting formats compared with that used by other development partners (such as DFAT)[[18]](#footnote-19). The effect of this, and perhaps other interpretations of such terms (which rarely translate into local languages with the same meaning) is that the type of information provided by DPOs in reports about outputs is not necessarily consistent between DPOs. For example, one DPO may describe a similar ‘output’ as ‘advocacy meeting on CRPD,’ another may describe it as ‘increased awareness of CRPD’ and another as ‘government policy changed to align with CRPD.’ Just as officials of donors and development partners disagree among each other about this language, the staff of Pacific DPOs may not have a shared or consistent understanding and use of the concepts.

To illustrate the challenges of analysis of outputs across DPOs and programming years, in reports submitted by FDPF in 2017, no information is provided at output level. Extensive details are provided about activities completed and some reference is made to ‘results’. In comparison, information provided by PNG ADP under ‘outputs’ in its 2018 report, could easily be understood as ‘outcomes:’ e.g. ‘Positive on-going media awareness….’ and ‘...progressive and on-going reviews being currently carried out by Constitutional Law Reform Commission on [various laws].’ The language used in reporting formats used by DRF/DRAF may be a contributing factor to this situation.

In reports from other national DPOs, there are mixed levels of information. This may reflect the following factors:

* most activities are ongoing across multiple years
* DPO capacity in describing projects, monitoring, writing reports in English, and managing funds varies
* reporting on activities which are jointly funded by various sources and which require different written formats and interpret terms differently, is particularly challenging
* complexities associated with reporting to a context which is very different from that where DPOs operate.

While it is not possible to definitively state that all planned outputs have been completed across all DPOs, **Table 6** below provides a summary of available information from reports of outputs completed during the years 2017 and 2018 (reports of work during 2019 are not yet due at the time of this evaluation). The first column lists the DPO name, the second column lists the outputs and the third column lists relevant objectives.

### Table 6 Outputs completed by DPOs using DRF/DRAF grants and relevant objectives

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DPO** | **Outputs** | **Relevant Objectives** |
| PWDSI | Successfully advocated for amendment to the Electoral Act to ensure voter materials and polling processes are disability accessible, especially for deaf people.Creation of job opportunities for youth with disabilities, who were part of voter registration team.Trained Statistics Office staff members on CRPD, and discussed Washington Group Questions.Participated on Steering Committee with National Statistics Office for 2019 Census, resulting in inclusion of Washington Group Questions. | Accessible electionsImproved data on persons with disabilities |
| TTM | Organisation of workshops on outer islandsEstablished two local DPO affiliates on 2 outer islands.Facilitated CRPD training that focused on education and accessibilityAdvocated to Ministry of Education, contributing to establishment of 6 model inclusive schoolsPromoted accessibility understanding that led to the building of a ramp in one village  | Community awarenessInclusive educationImproved accessibility |
| DPA | Conducted workshops and community consultations across 6 provincesOrganised a new DPA Volunteer program and a Deaf Lunch MeetingConducted school visits to raise awarenessEstablished new DPOs at provincial level to strengthen the voices of people with disabilities Prepared and presented Alternative Report on CRPD (the latter in 2019) | Community awarenessIncreased membershipAlternative reporting |
| Fusi Alofa | Conducted CRPD awareness activities, including trainings and workshops, both for members and the general publicSign language training and the use of radio programs and production of merchandise (i.e.t-shirts). Advocated to the government to implement CRPD.  | Community awarenessIncreased DPO capacity Advocacy to Government |
| MIDPO | Increased members from 40 to 60Conducted awareness events and established partnerships with NGOs and local organisationsConducted CRPD training and workshop with the parliamentAdvocated for national Disability Policy | Increased DPO capacity Advocacy to MPs and officials re policies |
| TNVIA  | Conducted CRPD awareness in local communities (4 workshops to 36 villages)Translated CRPD into local languageDelivered 1 in-house training workshop for members, family members and caregiversConducted 3 x half-hour radio programs | Community awareness |

Analysis of these outputs suggests the following overall summary:

* each Pacific DPO has identified and undertaken work towards achieving outputs that are relevant to the history and context of the country
* some outputs are part of ongoing awareness-raising processes with members or communities
* many DPOs are undertaking work related to advocacy to government officials, ministries and MPs on policies and strategies, with target agencies or topics varying over years
* half the DPOs in this list are involved in strengthening their own capacity through increasing membership or training staff and members
* some outputs are unique to one or two DPOs, such as improving accessibility, improving data collection, addressing inclusive education or alternative reporting on the CRPD.

It is possible that DPOs are achieving additional outputs that may be funded from other sources or may be described differently in their reporting. This reflects the reality that DPOs are involved in a variety of processes, activities, partnerships, opportunities for engagement and learning that are not always described or reported on, in the same way.

## 4.2 Changes in rights

As noted in Section 2 above, there have been substantial changes in terms of official recognition of rights of persons with disabilities in Pacific countries in the past decade. Formal acknowledgement by Pacific governments of rights and stated intentions in draft or approved new national disability policies and strategies occurred largely prior to 2017. Within the evaluation reporting period (2017-19), significant changes included the launch of a Draft Disability Rights Bill in Papua New Guinea (2018) and ratification of CRPD in Fiji (2017). The production of substantial documents (national policies, strategies and action plans) prior to 2017 is a sign of recognition, but as most have yet to be implemented, not a demonstration that rights are now realised. As one interviewee said, ‘the rights are recognised on paper, but in reality, changes will take time and we’ll need the right people to make them happen. We are just at the starting stage.’

The extent to which policies and strategies have been formalised varies between countries. The extent to which these policy changes and stated intentions have actually contributed to changes in the realisation of rights of persons with disabilities appears to be relatively limited to date across the region. Few stakeholders are surprised by the slow progress on realisation in most countries, recognising that implementation takes time. Some examples of rights being realised were provided in Fiji, but few were found in the other countries. There are signs in most countries that governments will implement commitments included in new policies in the next 3-5 years, particularly if the current mix of advocacy and development partner support for DPOs and Pacific governments continues. Two non-DPO stakeholders noted that while advocating for disability rights appears to have been ‘relatively easy’ compared with other rights (i.e. women’s rights and children’s rights), implementation of changes may be more challenging, if and when increased budgets are sought. Another non-DPO stakeholder highlighted that Pacific governments have committed to objectives described in the Pacific Framework for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2016 – 2025[[19]](#footnote-20), which interprets the CRPD and the SDGs into the Pacific regional context.

DPOs reported on a range of experiences of engagement with Government. DPOs in Fiji and Papua New Guinea reported mixed views about changes, with one in Fiji saying ‘things have really improved now’ and another in Papua New Guinea saying ‘we are hopeful that now the policies are in place, things will start to happen.’ In Solomon Islands, a DPO representative wrote ‘I see that some positive changes have happened along the way as the outcomes of our advocacy work.’

Several countries, including Solomon Islands and Fiji, have held recent elections which have been regarded as accessible and inclusive, as a result of DPO advocacy. In Vanuatu, the grantee DPO reported seeing some signs of greater engagement in this area from the Government (as well as more from civil society).

Overall, analysis of changes in rights suggests the following:

* there have been positive achievements in the official recognition of rights across Pacific countries in official policies and strategies, largely prior to 2017, except in Fiji and Papua New Guinea (see tables 4 and 5)
* DPOs have played a key role in advocacy in most Pacific countries on rights, resulting in draft or finalised government policies and strategies
* in each country, there is more progress in some sectors than others: progress towards inclusive disaster risk reduction, inclusive education, access to employment and public buildings was mentioned in several countries.

## 4.3 Changes to roles of DPOs

DPO capacity has been steadily increasing over the past decade, although not necessarily evenly or consistently, within or across Pacific countries. While some DPOs have remained stable in terms of staff, others have experienced turnover leading to uneven attention to advocacy, as new staff learn key concepts and approaches, and others have grown in size.

Fijian DPOs have grown significantly in the last two years, with some doubling in staff numbers, using funds provided from various sources. For example, in Fiji, FDPF (Fiji) has grown from 6 to 12 paid staff in recent years and PSA has grown from 2 to 6 paid staff. This has meant the range of work has expanded, including outreach, policy engagement, project management, representation on various committees and regional and international engagement.

DPOs with a stable staff have usually increased in their own perceptions of capacity. Those with a high turnover self-identified that they face challenges in terms of their ability to engage consistently and appropriately with governments and development partners. Some DPO staff focus largely on raising awareness of their members. For example, NATA in Tonga reported it has undertaken four training events, including ‘supporting people with disabilities to stand up and contribute to the community.’

DPOs’ status and roles within their respective countries have also changed. DPO efforts have been instrumental in contributing to disability-inclusive national legislation, policies, and strategic plans, as well as community awareness. By engaging both with communities and governments, DPOs in some countries have become much more established organisations as well as more experienced in placing their efforts within the broader governance, civil society and social accountability contexts. Some, such as DPOs in Fiji, have a high profile and are well-recognised, included in national committees (which bring key stakeholders together for example on human rights), in major towns, in communities where they have branches, and in the media. FDPF members attended Parliament House sittings when discussions were held during the passing of the new Disability Act and their presence was noted by Parliamentarians and the media. One interviewee said:

*‘We are recognised and acknowledged and overall we are now more included – this is a big change in the past decade. As a result of our work, people know what disability is and what is involved in inclusion. No-one can tell our story as well as we can. Our engagement motivates families and communities.’*

Other DPOs struggle to maintain themselves as organisations, let alone a presence in the media and in formal government settings. A mix of factors, specific to the context, is usually involved, rather than one single factor. Examples of factors include personality issues, low levels of experience of organisational governance and financial management, turnover of office holders, health issues affecting office bearers and lack of health care services.

DPOs in Fiji are clearly stronger than in previous years in several respects: as representatives of their members, with more branches in rural locations[[20]](#footnote-21); as partners in policy development, planning and implementation with Government of Fiji; as advocates for the rights and priorities of their members; as partners with a range of international, regional and national organisations; and as largely well-governed organisations. While all organisations face challenges and experience difficulties from time to time, the federation of DPOs in Fiji is clearly a positive example overall to others.

DPOs’ consultations, awareness-raising and advocacy efforts have reflected their own learning to date, through experience, formal and informal learning and technical support, as well as funding and other support from donors such as DRF/DRAF over an extended period of time. There is not one single or shared story for all DPOs – each is on its own journey.

Some DPOs with a high public profile, for example those in Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu and Samoa are more frequently consulted by others, nationally, regionally and even internationally. This profile has helped embolden staff, board members and other members to take on responsibilities that would not have been possible a decade ago. Compared with previous years, DPOs have either started or continued to gain more influence over national policy and government, particularly in Fiji, where a DPO representative worked with the Disability Unit of the Government to prepare a joint CRPD national report, for example. This expanded influence contributes to the ongoing capacity strengthening of DPOs on a national and regional level, in a continuous cycle.

In some Pacific countries, deliberate efforts have been made to increase the number of DPOs at sub-national level or for different groups of people (e.g. Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Samoa) but in others, various issues have led to the creation of new DPOs (e.g. Tonga, Federated States of Micronesia). In small countries, the evolution of organisations over time can often reflect changing allegiances, relationships and prospects.

DPOs have also been more deliberately invited to collaborate with a wider range of development partners which are increasingly working towards disability-inclusive strategies. For example, UNESCO actively engages Pacific DPOs in its work in education, sports and social issues, inviting them to participate in events, meetings and consultations. Several DPOs noted their shift into particular sectors, as a result of new funding and other opportunities.

Finally, issues associated with implementing the CRPD in some Pacific countries demand a shift in attention from general advocacy to specific and complex policy and programming systems: this is sometimes a challenge for DPOs. Some are not yet in this space, some are not able to make the shift for various reasons, and some are clearly involved in this shift now. In Fiji, a DPO official said ‘DPOs are now waking up to the rapid and complex changes that are occurring in disability inclusion in Fiji. We are trying to keep up, ask questions and engage at very senior levels. For example, one of us is on the national Human Rights and Justice Committee and another on the Legal Aid Committee. We are now part of everyday Government decision-making …it will be interesting to see if donors can keep up.’

A short history of the major DPOs included in this research is provided in **Annex H**, to illustrate changes over time in each context and contextualise DRF/DRAF’s contributions.

## 4.4 Links between DRF funding and changes

This section addresses the nature of links between DRF/DRAF funding and changes in rights, government legislation and policy, inclusion, and DPO roles in Pacific countries. Section 5.3 discusses the nature of collaboration between DRF/DRAF and DPOs in the grant making process.

The evaluation found that overall, DRF/DRAF funding has been used directly to achieve positive changes in terms of recognition of the rights of persons with disabilities in Pacific countries and strengthened voice of people with disabilities. All those interviewed confirmed that the contribution of DRF/DRAF funding has been significant to DPO efforts and that DPO efforts have been significant in the achievement of changes in disability rights. DPO officials confirmed that without funding provided by DRF/DRAF, progress on disability rights awareness and policies would have been much more limited and the barriers to inclusion would remain in place. For example, one said ‘before the other donors came in, DRF paved the way and enabled us to build capacity.’ In Fiji, almost all interviewees were clear that the work of DPOs, in part funded through grants from DRF/DRAF, has been the major and most critical contributor to the changes which have occurred in the rights of persons with disabilities. Those interviewees who were not clear about this role comprised a small number of stakeholders outside DPOs, who were probably not aware of the details of funding sources for DPOs.

Thus, there is strong evidence that the funding provided by DRF/DRAF has been a major contributor in enabling DPOs to advocate for and achieve the changes described above. While the state of disability rights, inclusion, and CRPD alignment varies across countries, it is evident that funding from DRF/DRAF has helped make it possible for local and national DPOs in each of the countries to carry out their priority activities towards goals which are directly aligned to DRF/DRAF objectives.

Most DPO activities funded by DRF/DRAF relating to policy and legislation changes were already in motion prior to 2016 (prior to the period covered by this evaluation), many of which were supported by grants provided by DRF/DRAF. Since then, grants have contributed to providing DPOs with the means (the staff and funds) to continue this work, addressing relevant priorities each year. Consistent funding from DRF/DRAF for rights advocacy goals of Pacific DPOs has contributed to DPOs’ growing capacity, scope, and expertise, which, in turn, has influenced the visibility, relationships and understanding that DPOs have been able to achieve at community and governmental levels.

The quality of relationships and the nature of the partnership between DRF/DRAF and Pacific DPOs was largely described as positive, respectful and supportive. All DPOs which have successfully obtained DRF/DRAF grants asked the evaluator to pass on gratitude for the support provided. Those which have not succeeded with previous applications asked for their upcoming proposals to be supported.

Several DPOs requested changes in future collaboration. These include:

* greater acknowledgement by DRF/DRAF of the realities experienced by DPOs and the complexities they face, with funding systems adjusted to suit
* promoting more focus on learning and sharing information about how to achieve success in advocacy (rather than how to comply with reporting requirements) within partnership arrangements
* allowing for longer-term/multi-year grants
* more flexibility in grants management, meaning encouragement and support for DPOs to change plans in response to lessons learned, changes in the environment and emerging priorities, i.e. fewer demands associated with DPO requests to change activities or re-allocate budgets and quicker approvals. (See Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 5.)

Finally, non-DPO stakeholders all reported knowledge of DRF/DRAF’s contributions to DPOs. For example, government officials in Papua New Guinea and Fiji as well as DFAT officials are aware of grants and recognised the importance of external support for the work of DPOs.

## 4.5 Who has been included and who has benefited?

This section answers the questions ‘Have DRF/DRAF contributions been regarded as useful and if so, how and for whom?’ In particular it seeks to understand progress on the inclusion of marginalised groups within the disability movement.

***Who has benefited?***

All DPOs reported that people with disabilities have benefited generally as a result of advocacy efforts, which in part have been supported by grants from DRF/DRAF. However, these benefits are only just beginning to be evident and not necessarily in all contexts. One DPO reported that ‘the lives of persons with disabilities have changed but it is not easy to see, because inclusion isn’t always obvious. People tell me they are starting to feel included but we can’t stop advocating now.’ Another DPO official reported that ‘we feel more included now and this is what it’s all about.’ Others reported that while ‘having a voice’ is a benefit, this has not yet translated into inclusion or social or economic benefits.

In Fiji, almost all interviewees emphatically stated that efforts undertaken by DPOs, supported by funding provided by DRF/DRAF and other external sources, have led to beneficial outcomes for people with disabilities in Fiji. They highlighted the provision of new welfare payments under the ‘social protection’ banner and the provision of a transport subsidy which enables some people with disabilities to access free transport[[21]](#footnote-22) as clear signs of direct benefits for individuals and their families. Views about the extent to which Fiji society has become more inclusive are more contested. Several interviewees highlighted that some current efforts to recognise people with disabilities, while beneficial for individuals, may be using more of a welfare/charity approach than a rights-based approach. Many mentioned that while there is some progress on changing the attitudes of government officials, employers and families and churches towards inclusion rather than welfare approaches, there is still a long way before all those with authority understand and apply rights-based approaches.

As the majority of DPOs are not involved in the provision of services[[22]](#footnote-23), benefits of membership in DPOs may not yet translate into direct improvement in the daily personal lives of individuals and their families. Inclusion in DPOs may not be understood as a benefit in itself, particularly by those with no interest in administration of an organisation or being involved in awareness raising or advocacy. The benefits of membership relate to broader aspects of collaboration with others, sharing stories and having a voice and influence in the formulation of national policies and inclusion. All those interviewed acknowledged that while the benefits of the work of DPOs are positive, and work is underway to make their efforts as inclusive as possible, some groups have not been included to date.

***Are DPOs inclusive?***

In terms of whether DPOs are becoming more inclusive of groups which have been previously excluded, the overall picture is of gradual improvement. One person said for example: ‘there are many diverse groups of people with disabilities and some feel they have been left behind, but there have been recent changes and positive progress.’ Another interviewee noted ‘we have seen some good changes in inclusion of deaf people recently: more deaf children in school, a good resource team, more access to interpreters, sign language in Parliament and in education. In addition, we are active members of the DPO coalition and our collective efforts are effective and visible.’

The evaluation found that Pacific DPOs have made efforts in recent years to include people with disabilities who have not previously been included, consistent with broader international efforts. For example, PNG ADP has recently included new groups in its work, such as Women with Disabilities and Sign Language Interpreters Association. It continues to encourage the formation of new groups and provide support as they develop. For example, at the time of the field visit, a group of people with Down Syndrome was forming and after the visit, the group wrote to PNG ADP to seek formal membership. In Fiji, the coalition supported by DRF/DRAF grants comprises DPOs representing a range of people with diverse impairments. Fiji is the only country where there is an established DPO comprising people with psychosocial disabilities, Psychiatric Survivors Association. This DPO plays an active role in the FDPF coalition, undertakes outreach activities and has expanded recently to be able to respond to increased expectations and to make the most of the opportunity of new funding. DPOs described their efforts to include people who are deafblind and people who have intellectual disabilities. In Vanuatu, for example, the DPO reported ‘marginalised groups are partially included and we are trying our best.’

All interviewees in Papua New Guinea and Fiji recognise differences in awareness, access and benefits between communities in rural and urban settings, between those with physical and those with psycho-social and intellectual disabilities, and between those with and without access to education. They highlighted current efforts to address these differences, and there are clear signs that more outreach work is underway than in previous years, including the consultations on the draft Disability Act in Papua New Guinea and outreach by Government officials and DPOs travelling together in Fiji. Both PNG ADP and FDPF staff are well aware of the need to support marginalised groups and to work inclusively. They seek to determine approaches to overcome barriers such as the absence of sign language or lack of experience in how to support participation. NOLA identified that a highlight of its recent work has been the development of a new DPO for deaf people in Samoa.

## 4.6 Success factors

This section summarises answers to the question ‘What factors have contributed to efficiency and success?’ recognising that a wide range of answers was provided by DPOs.

*Individual and collective efforts*

In all countries, stakeholders referred to the exceptional leadership and hard work of a small number of individuals, and it was evident from the visits to Papua New Guinea and Fiji, that there is a high level of passion, initiative and commitment among DPO leaders and staff. The extent to which people with disabilities work together and organise themselves in committees, DPOs, events, and consultation processes was also identified as a key factor in the success achieved to date. As in all sectors of the community, there are sometimes personality clashes and other divisions between people in DPOs, and there are varying degrees of expertise with DPOs to navigate and resolve them. In Fiji, the long-term commitment of leaders and others over a 40-year history was seen as a key success factor.

*Acknowledgement by governments of CRPD obligations*

The fact that most Pacific governments now understand and are beginning to implement their CRPD obligations, was identified as a factor contributing to changes in recent years. DPOs value the efforts made by their respective governments, and understand that their own advocacy efforts have contributed to change. In Papua New Guinea and Fiji, it was clear that some government officials are more ready to support the recognition and realisation of disability rights than others. Reporting on the CRPD and participation in cross-government committees and ongoing policy implementation processes are likely to expand the proportion of government officials who are engaged over time. Recent trust-building efforts and collaboration between the Government of Fiji and some DPO members in writing the State CRPD report was identified as a sign of government acknowledgement.

*Regional support and frameworks*

Support from PDF for strengthening the skills of Pacific DPOs over an extended period, was highlighted by all stakeholders as a critical success factor. The major and extensive work of PDF in representation, training, coordination, DPO exchanges, ongoing funding, political and moral support and engagement both regionally and internationally was described by Fiji DPOs in particular, but also others. The presence, expertise and efforts of PDF are significant contributors to disability inclusion successes in the Pacific overall and in individual countries. Substantial funding for PDF and through PDF to Pacific DPOs, provided by the Australian Government DFAT international development program, was highlighted as a key success factor. The fact that DFAT funds are provided to Pacific DPOs both through PDF and through DRF/DRAF, requiring different systems and reporting, was raised by several interviewees.

The existence of the Pacific Framework for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, endorsed by Ministers from across the region (and its links to other regional agreements, strategies and frameworks) was also identified as a contributor to government actions in relation to the rights of persons with disabilities.

*Engagement with international DPOs and broader civil society*

Most DPOs mentioned the benefits they received from opportunities to learn from multiple training workshops provided over many years by the international disability movement (e.g. IDA) and other development partners in civil society. In both Fiji and Papua New Guinea, DPOs mentioned thata success factor has been increased involvement with civil society at national levels, meaning they are now invited to participate in various topic-specific events and processes as part of inclusion agendas. In Papua New Guinea, PNG ADP is a member of Consultative Implementation and Monitoring Council (CIMC) which links government and civil society agendas. In Fiji, FDPF is increasingly represented in cross-civil society processes. In Vanuatu, a civil society network on disability successfully coordinates activities across a variety of service providers, DPOs and others.

*Support, funding and advocacy from other donors and development partners, including in specific sectors*

All DPOs mentioned that the work of other development partners, beyond the support of DRF/DRAF mentioned in Section 4.4. above, has also been critical for the changes achieved. Some new partnerships have recently been established. For example, DPOs in Papua New Guinea and international NGOs are working together on human rights and climate change. In Fiji, DPOs are working with various NGOs and UN agencies on disaster risk reduction, climate change and gender-based violence. Several interviewees noted that because NGOs working in these sectors are required by donors to be disability inclusive, this was a way to include DPOs and to raise advocacy opportunities on disability rights. The focus of attention among donors (described by some as ‘pressure from external agencies’) has also forced aid programs to include disability issues. One DPO in Fiji noted that ‘the UN Secretary General recently announced that all UN agencies have to be inclusive, so they are more actively engaged in bringing about changes and have to work with DPOs[[23]](#footnote-24)’.

## 4.7 Sustainability

This section answers the question ‘Are there signs that positive changes are likely to contribute to sustained benefits?’ The data in response to this question was more tentative than answers to other questions. While some stakeholders were able to identify factors to contribute to likely sustainability of benefits, the overall message was that there are still risks and vulnerabilities for DPOs and for the future of rights of persons with disability in Pacific countries. One interviewee said ‘awareness-raising is working, but has to be ongoing. We have to do a lot of advocacy now that we have more data about the issues of our members and the government is wanting us to help them work out how to achieve its commitments.’

Two stakeholders with a more regional perspective raised the idea that a true test of previous achievements was whether Pacific governments will actually implement their obligations in policy and practical terms. They noted that the shift to implementation, in those countries where the shift is occurring, will require different skills and processes from those supplied by DPOs to date.

DPOs noted the existence of laws and policies were good signs of sustainability, as well as new committees and collaboration between DPOs. The effective governance of DPOs themselves was identified as a sign that their advocacy and representation work can continue, but reports suggest that some smaller DPOs continue to struggle with the core elements of governance, financial management and staff retention, for various reasons.

On the other side of the sustainability ledger, Papua New Guinea’s yet-to-be enacted Disability Authority Bill will place disability issues formally on the Government’s agenda, but there are few signs that the Government has the skills, resources or commitment for implementation, despite high expectations among people with disabilities and their families. Planned meetings of the National Disability Coordination Committee (a cross-Government Committee) will be held in several different Departments (Ministries) from 2019, so this is expected to raise awareness of Government responsibilities. Similar stories from other Pacific countries were shared, reflecting the passage from the production of national strategies and policies to the actual realisation of rights.

In Fiji, while the Government provided a significantly higher budget allocation for disability in 2018 (a total of F$1.1m (approximately US$0.5m) compared with previous years, in 2019, this had been cut to F$0.4m (approximately US$0.18m). One DPO leader noted ‘there are massive risks this financial year and we are trying to mitigate them. DPOs took on more staff last year, with Government funding, and now the future of their jobs and the work they are doing in various sectors are at risk.’

All stakeholders recognise that changes take a long period of time in Pacific countries and ‘ups and downs’ will occur. One said ‘changes don’t happen overnight and in a straight line’ but nearly all expressed optimism that gradually, the rights of people with disabilities will be realised and societies and institutions will become more disability inclusive. Most stakeholders confirmed that partnerships with external development partners will be required for the future as locally available funding will remain limited and uncertain (Recommendation 1).

# Discussion

This section analyses findings presented in Section 4 under DRF/DRAF’s global outcome and outputs, discusses the relationship between DRF/DRAF and Pacific DPOs, and briefly discusses three other themes which emerged from the findings.

## 5.1 Contribution to DRF/DRAF’s outcome statement

DRF/DRAF’s stated outcome is: ‘Rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the CRPD, are advanced in DRF target countries by the enhanced participation of the disability movement.’ The evaluation found that in Pacific countries where grants have been provided, there has been positive progress during the period covered by the evaluation in both participation of the disability movement and rights of persons with disabilities. The extent of these changes varies between Pacific countries: each is influenced by diverse factors, including the history of and context for DPOs. The extent to which DRF/DRAF funding contributes to these changes also varies between DPOs and countries, reflecting context-specific and programming issues, including the length of time for which grants have been provided.

## 5.2 Contribution to DRF/DRAF’s outputs

DRF/DRAF’s four outputs (see Section 4.1) provide the framework for the organisation’s global grant-making and related activities. The evaluation found there have been some positive changes in relation to all four outputs in Pacific countries. The following summarises findings against the four outputs.

**Output 1:** **Legislation, policy and government programmes (including those addressing the SDGs) undergoing harmonization with the CRPD in target countries through the participation of representative organizations of persons with disabilities**

In Papua New Guinea, changes in legislation, policy and government programmes are beginning to be evident, and are described by national stakeholders as ‘in the early stages’. In 2018, the Government undertook a national consultation process for the Disability Authority Bill, supported by the DPO, PNG ADP, and reflecting CRPD. DRF/DRAF funds have provided the salary of two staff of PNG ADP, who worked actively in the consultation process, including through arranging participation by members and other stakeholders at provincial levels: the focus of the application for funding was on advocating to Government on this Bill. The Disability Authority Bill is yet to be approved by Parliament and once it is passed, is expected to lead to changes in policies and programs across the public sector, however at the time of the evaluation, despite a degree of optimism, there were few signs that this will happen quickly.

In Fiji, the Government of Fiji enacted the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act in March 2018, and it includes CRPD Articles. Fiji DPOs were actively involved in advocating for and consultations related to the development of the Act over many years. Funding provided by DRF/DRAF contributed to DPO costs and salary of personnel who worked on this and related advocacy efforts during the early period covered by this evaluation. At the time of the evaluation, some implications of the new Act are beginning to be addressed, including changes to staffing of the National Council for Persons with Disabilities and welfare programs for persons with disabilities.

In other Pacific countries, few specific changes in Government legislation, policy and programs, were reported by DPOs in the period covered by this evaluation, either in their written reports or in responses to questionnaires. Two DPOs reported successful advocacy on accessible elections (in Fiji and Solomon Islands), one reported inclusion of Washington Group Questions in the national census (Solomon Islands) and one successfully advocated to the Government on inclusive schools (Kiribati). Advocacy on CRPD (Marshall Islands) and awareness raising among Government officials more broadly were also noted by DPOs’ in their engagement with Government.

All DPOs involved in this evaluation confirmed the centrality of the CRPD for their activities. For those in countries where governments have national disability policies, strategies and action plans, DPOs will continue to use CRPD reporting processes to hold governments to account. With Fiji demonstrating how DPOs and Government officials can work together on CRPD reporting, this may be a model that some other Pacific countries can follow. Most DPOs work with governments in relatively collaborative ways, reflecting collectivist cultural values and some shared interests in complying with CRPD over time. The quality and depth of relationships between DPOs and government officials vary widely, but are important to the effectiveness of advocacy efforts to date and future collaboration.

**Output 2:** **Representative DPOs (DRAF/DRF grantees) from target countries participating in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes**

One DPO (Vanuatu DPA) reported direct participation in international monitoring processes with funding provided by DRF/DRAF in 2019, and two reported involvement in national human rights and SDG monitoring reporting (FDPF was involved in the Fiji report on CEDAW and DPA was involved in reporting on CRPD). In Fiji, DPO personnel reported that they worked closely with the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation to develop a joint national report on the CRPD[[24]](#footnote-25).

**Output 3:** **Disability movement in target countries is inclusive, reflecting the diverse voices of persons with disabilities**

DPOs in Fiji and Papua New Guinea reported on their efforts towards becoming more inclusive of persons who have previously been excluded. In Fiji, the Psychiatric Survivors Association has been an active member of the Fiji Disabled Persons Federation for at least a decade. In Papua New Guinea, groups of sign language interpreters and women with disabilities have recently been included and new groups, including one comprising people with Downs Syndrome, are being formed and seeking participation in the national DPO. Recent efforts to understand the situation of deaf people in the region, funded separately by DFAT, has helped to focus attention on this group and several DPOs are working more inclusively with deaf members, including NOLA in Samoa and PWDSI in Solomon Islands. Awareness of the importance of more inclusive DPOs is influenced from a number of sources, including DRF/DRAF.

**Output 4:** **DRAF/DRF grantees equipped to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities**

Pacific DPOs have been developing expertise to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities over many years, some over decades, with support from multiple sources. Those DPOs which have received grants from DRAF/DRF have been able to strengthen their skills through practice. The addition of DRF/DRAF funding for technical assistance, largely in the form of a workshop in 2018 conducted by PDF, has supplemented this, contributing to existing knowledge on advocacy and CRPD.

The provision of grants, which are successfully obtained over consecutive years, allows DPOs to more easily attract and retain staff who develop expertise through practice, access to training/professional development opportunities and collaboration with others. In Papua New Guinea and Fiji, where DRF/DRAF funds have been provided to coalitions, DPOs have been able to extend their engagement with members in rural areas, thus hearing the voices of diverse people with disabilities, to inform their advocacy. In both countries, advocacy efforts with national governments have been extended through stronger relationships with and growing respect from governments for the role of the DPOs.

DPOs are increasingly confident of their role, skills and influence in disability rights in Pacific countries, with one official saying: ‘without our visibility, skills and efforts, governments wouldn’t have done anything’ and ‘DPOs’ role has been critical and we epitomise the saying ‘nothing about us without us.’

DPOs have exhibited a remarkable capacity to learn from past and ongoing challenges, demonstrating a willingness and ability to address issues and rectify mistakes to the best of their ability. Some DPOs bounce back from challenges, others maintain a steady hand and others have rapidly expanded their capacity in the past three years, but overall, most DPOs have become stronger in this period. Some are now well-recognised consultative bodies to the government in drafting certain policies and bills and play critical roles in civil society contexts. The reports from DPOs confirm a willingness to learn from experience, reflect on success factors and strengthen their ability to plan for future efforts. In interviews they seek ongoing collaboration with partners to learn more and continue to grow.

Overall, DPOs appear to have a good awareness of areas for improvement over time, responding to the local context and their ability to access technical and funding support. While some remain largely focused on awareness-raising, others are increasingly responding to demands for high-level engagement in official contexts and greater demands for sectoral expertise. Overall, DPOs have exhibited a consistent and high level of resilience, motivation, and enthusiasm for the work they do despite the barriers they face.

A small number of DPOs struggle with governance, financial management and personnel issues at local levels. Many DPOs are clearly maximising opportunities for funding, training, engagement at regional and international levels and collaboration with civil society, government and international organisations. Pacific DPOs still face challenges and barriers in relation to attitudes and willingness of respective governments to address disability inclusion, but boards and staff recognise this and persist in strengthening relationships.

There has been substantially increased demand for DPO personnel to engage with other partners in recent years on disability rights and inclusion. This includes demand from Government agencies, civil society organisations, international NGOs, UN agencies and diverse development contractors responsible for aid program implementation. As predicted in the research undertaken in 2011-12, this has meant that Pacific DPO resources have often been strained, particularly in the face of unforeseen events and uncontrollable external factors. The process of identifying personnel with the capacity to become DPO leaders, training them and providing opportunities for them to develop their capacity takes several years at minimum. When there is staff turnover, including through the availability of scholarships for example (which now seek out people with disabilities specifically), then DPOs can face considerable staffing constraints.

Some DPOs have expanded their activities, as they become more confident and have greater access to resources. This includes establishing a number of local DPOs and DPO affiliates in other islands to increase awareness, activities and visibility; travelling to other islands for CRPD awareness trainings and to build community support and knowledge; and reaching out to different government ministries and public institutions such as universities and schools to ensure disability inclusion and awareness.

Pacific DPOs have demonstrated strong motivation, resilience and openness to learning in the past decade, and specifically in the past three years covered by this evaluation. Developments in the disability movement are due to the DPOs’ work themselves, and they are supported by a number of organisations and partnerships. Together, DPOs and their partners have contributed to some impressive changes in the recognition of rights and inclusion of people with disabilities in government legislative changes and policy development and all are keen to continue strengthening their own capacity, in collaboration with partners (see 5.3 below and Recommendation 2).

## 5.3 Relationship between DRF/DRAF and DPOs

DPOs which have received grants from DRF/DRAF in the last three years were invited to make suggestions to improve grant-making systems and relationships, in interviews and the written questionnaire. Overall, DPOs value and seek respect-based collaborative partnerships which include funding, joint efforts and shared learning. DPO staff were largely reluctant to critique organisations which provide funding and support and very few responded to this opportunity. This is consistent with Pacific cultural values, which prioritise harmonious relationships. However, a number of points were raised in written reports and interviews, worthy of consideration.

Overall, DPOs praised the grants provided by DRF/DRAF, for some of them, over many years. For example, one expressed appreciation for the focus on rights advocacy, flexibility in response to requested changes during implementation and support provided by DRF. The respondent asked that this be expanded in future, through the provision of more technical support on the implementation of CRPD, greater networking among DRF-grantees to share lessons, as well as increased funding. Others also commended grants provided over many years by DRF/DRAF, with one saying ‘DRF should be acknowledged for its contributions to DPO capacity’ and ‘they have been the backbone of the disability sector and their support hasn’t wavered for a long time and they have been flexible’ and ‘their support is well-received and we are thankful.’ Another positive aspect of collaboration with DRF/DRAF was support provided by the previous Program Officer in submitting proposals.

Several DPOs mentioned that they prefer to work with partners who can collaborate in ways that extend beyond funding administration, based on shared understanding of the context and how to maximise the effectiveness of their work[[25]](#footnote-26). They value partners who give them constructive feedback on the basis of their knowledge of the local context, in order to extend and improve the quality of their work. DRF/DRAF’s distance from the Pacific and its lack of engagement beyond proposal administration and between 2-yearly grantee meetings, were noted as limits to the depth of the relationships.

DPOs described the benefits of more face-to-face interaction with their development partners, so partners get to understand their context better, the challenges they face and opportunities for learning new ways. For example one said ‘we would like the manager to come here and learn about our work, and give us feedback about how we improve, as this is very helpful to us’ and another said ‘we would prefer to engage more in discussion about how we are progressing rather than just sending reports after a year, so that we learn about how to strengthen our work.’ This was confirmed in a progress report from one DPO, with the comment: ‘we need to build up communication with DRF staff during period of our grant [and have] more regular communication from DRF where we can share our challenges and work together to address it.’Another report noted: ‘What DRF staff can help us with to work towards our objectives is to keep the communication up to date and inform us what is happening so that we don’t worry whether we are doing the right or wrong thing please.’AnotherDPO official said they would prefer to submit shorter, simpler reports more regularly if they received constructive feedback on how to strengthen future efforts, rather than provide end of year reports when no changes can be made.

DPOs valued the opportunity to participate in meetings with other Pacific DPOs (called Grantee Convenings by DRF/DRAF) every two years. They value the appointment of the new Program Officer (Fa’aolo Utumapo-Utaleisolo) based in the Pacific region and are positive and optimistic this will strengthen communications and increase understanding of the Pacific within DRF/DRAF. For example, one said ‘now we have Fa’aolo, communication is better.’

As noted in Section 4.6, DPOs value the deep regional collaboration made possible through membership of and involvement in the governance of PDF. For example, one grantee included the following statement in the application for funds for 2017: ‘the DPA National Coordinator is co-Chair of the Pacific Disability Forum and a Board member of the International Disability Alliance, which drives regional and international cooperation to further improve the rights of people with disability. This role also brings back learnings to Vanuatu.’ Consistent with discussion about the importance of regionalism for Pacific DPOs, stakeholders generally encouraged DRF/DRAF to give more consideration to regional approaches. Several respondents specifically recommended that DRF/DRAF consider the option of providing funding to Pacific DPOs through PDF. This reflects the fact that the majority of DRF/DRAF funds are derived from DFAT, which also funds PDF to support its members (the same DPOs) to work on the rights of persons with disabilities (the same focus area as DRF/DRAF). In this context PDF is much closer to the regional context and also has existing accountability systems for compliance with DFAT requirements. From the DPO perspective, there could be benefits in reducing duplication of grant application and reporting. Of course, broader issues are relevant to this situation from the donors and development partners’ perspectives and will be taken into account if this option was considered.

DPOs also wanted to communicate their view that the system used by DRF/DRAF to manage grants needs to be more responsive to the diverse situation of Pacific DPOs. They commented that there are differences between DPOs’ contexts, approaches and ways of working, which means a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach does not necessarily work. For example, Papua New Guinea is a significantly bigger country and more expensive to operate in than other Pacific countries, particularly in terms of transport to conduct awareness raising and advocacy at provincial levels. While it is clearly challenging for granting agencies to respond to the diversity of DPO contexts and priorities, it is also important to ensure that systems and processes do not constrain the work of DPOs because of the grantee’s perceptions of consistency.

DPOs in Fiji highlighted the value of coalition funding, enabling DPOs to come together for more effective advocacy, such as attendance at Parliament House during consideration of the Disability Act. However, coalition members and those DPOs not included in the coalition confirmed that not all their advocacy agendas are shared and they sought opportunities to undertake separate as well as collaborative activities. To be clear, they therefore seek to be able to apply for two lots of funding for different purposes.

There were mixed views about the extent to which DRF/DRAF uses contemporary approaches to aid management, e.g. use of systems which promote flexibility and adaptability to suit deepening knowledge of each context, ongoing learning, changes in the environment and opportunities to achieve the same goals in different ways[[26]](#footnote-27). Some commended DRF/DRAF’s flexibility and responsiveness to information about the local context, while others were critical of a lack of flexibility. For example, several said that they had planned for particular advocacy activities in proposals, but when they were requested to undertake other important activities (e.g. by government agencies in particular sectors) that were not planned or when they realised that other ways to achieve the same goals would be more effective, DRF/DRAF took considerable time to respond to or approve requests for change, by which time critical momentum was lost and opportunities missed.

DPOs from several countries noted that DRF/DRAF asked for detailed information that seemed unnecessary from their perspective, and then asked for more information once that had been provided, further delaying decision-making and activity implementation. Efforts required by DPOs to explain local contexts and reasons for relatively small shifts in payment from one line to another was regarded as disproportionate. Several DPOs mentioned 3-month and 6-month delays to activities as a result of long approval processes. For example, one said ‘in one case, it took 6 months to do a simple change form, so this meant we are now 6 months late in implementation, so will need another 6 months to complete the task.’ Contemporary partnership principles suggest improvements could be considered. For example, it may be possible that DPOs which have a strong track record of performance, be given more latitude to work flexibly, within agreed overall objectives, consistent with contemporary development practice (see Recommendation 5).

Several DPOs suggested that if changes are requested to the use of funding, after initial approval has been given, this should be considered by DRF/DRAF as positive rather than negative and barriers should not be erected to insist on compliance with old plans which are no longer relevant. DPOs should be supported to learn about how best to achieve higher level objectives over time, rather than dissuaded from changes to suit external audiences, because of unnecessary compliance and reporting.

Some DPOs also raised specific suggestions about how to improve grant-making and support for Pacific DPOs, including the following:

* Consideration of acceptance of a single narrative report for all development partners (with separate financial acquittals) was proposed by several DPOs
* Recognition that DPOs are undertaking ongoing advocacy processes, rather than one-off projects, so ongoing funding/multi-year support is preferred over project funding
* Whether the relationship between DRF/DRAF and Fiji DPOs will be sustained as focus shifts away from advocacy on CRPD ratification, towards implementation of Government policies and strategies – one asked ‘can DRF help us as we move towards more focus on quantitative and qualitative data related to Government policies?’
* The particular use of program management terms and formats by DRF/DRAF was raised by several stakeholders. For example, one said ‘DRAF/DRAF’s M&E checklist confuses some Pacific DPOs as terms are used in ways that differ from other development partners: this makes reporting difficult and confuses staff.’ Another said ‘current formats for proposals and reporting are not well suited for a coalition approach and forms require repetitive information, making the proposal-writing effort highly inefficient.’
* The requirement for DPOs to report in US$ caused concern for several DPOs. One noted the challenges and time involved in managing exchange rate variations with DRF/DRAF funding. While they are used to working with A$, as this is a commonly used currency in Pacific countries, having to work in 3 currencies and manage volatile exchange rate variations is particularly onerous for DPOs with few staff.

## 5.4 Additional evaluation themes

The following three themes emerged from analysis of evaluation findings, beyond the topics addressed in Sections 5.1 to 5.3 above:

* Regional collaboration between Pacific DPOs
* Ongoing collaboration and partnerships are sought
* Focus on sustainability of gains achieved.

### 5.4.1 Importance of regional collaboration

As noted in section 4.7 above, Pacific countries and organisations place a high value on regional cooperation, given shared cultural values and a history of mutual support and collective learning. The evaluation highlighted that DPOs are well-aware of the similar and overarching issues all DPOs face across the Pacific and place high value on opportunities from learning and sharing the journey towards realisation of rights and more disability inclusive societies. Also, while there are obvious benefits associated with international and regional collaboration, DPO officials also sometimes find that engaging at both national and regional levels stretches their resources. In Papua New Guinea and Fiji, this research found that demands of working at sub-national levels is particularly resource-intensive and demanding for national DPOs (see Recommendation 5).

The countries of the Pacific, at both government and civil society levels, place high value on regional collaboration and it is a strong feature in many sectors (e.g. fisheries, climate change, higher education). The *Pacific Framework for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 2016 – 2025* which interprets CRPD to the local context is a useful point of reference for regional support to DPOs (see Recommendation 4).

### 5.4.2 Ongoing collaboration and partnerships required

Pacific DPOs are clearly working with many more partners in a wide variety of ways, compared with the situation a decade ago. The technical, financial and collaborative contributions made by partners are highly valued. The nature, scope and quality of partnerships varies. DPOs particularly value and seek partners with whom they can build ongoing trust-based relationships, undertake collaborative learning, jointly strategize to achieve shared objectives and generate moral support. One said ‘I’m positive that things will continue, but mindful of political challenges, so we have to be strategic, work together and support each other. It’s not really about the money, but about long-term collaboration and solidarity.’

DPOs are largely resigned to the fact that different organisations have different frames of reference, reporting requirements and expectations, requiring complex navigation, negotiations and reflection. Several suggested that it would be desirable if a single annual report could be provided to all development partners, with individualised financial acquittals (see Recommendation 5).

Some DPOs are happy to continue as they have done, comfortable with the support provided to date. Others are seeking more sophisticated relationships, based on mutual respect, collaboration and feedback, and responsiveness to complex and changing demands, rather than donor-recipient arrangements. With each DPO at a different stage along different pathways, DPOs seek relevant support which acknowledges their strengths, circumstances and priorities (see Recommendation 3).

### 5.4.3 Sustainability of gains achieved

There are mixed signs related to sustainability of the gains achieved to date (see Section 4.7). As most Pacific governments have ratified CRPD and are now responsible for reporting on progress on implementation and many have national policies or strategies in place, formal foundations now exist for institutionalising changes in recognition of rights. However, at the time of this evaluation, the extent to which implementation will actually translate into improvements for persons with disabilities and societies overall is not yet evident and not uniform across Pacific countries.

DPOs confirmed that while they can celebrate the effectiveness of advocacy efforts to date in many cases, they face a long process of ongoing advocacy and collaboration with government officials to implement respective policies.

Documents and interviews identified a number of challenges that all DPOs have faced or continue to face, which have affected their advocacy efforts or may do so in future. These include the following, although not all of these apply to all countries to the same extent:

* lack of government communication and support
* challenging political, social and economic conditions
* operational issues and the need for more technical and strategic/solidarity-related support and staff training
* responding to natural disasters and unpredictable weather, affecting transport.

# Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussion above, the evaluation has identified the following recommendations:

1. DRF/DRAF and other development partners should continue to support DPOs to be the voices of persons with disabilities in Pacific countries, in relation to CRPD implementation and SDGs, enabling them to collaborate with governments in increasingly more complex and technical areas as national legislation and policies are implemented.
2. DRF/DRAF and other development partners should continue to support DPOs along their respective journeys of technical capacity strengthening. This will ensure those which seek to provide specific advice to their respective governments and development partners on how rights can be realised in practice (e.g. in inclusive education, DRR or employment), are better able to do so.
3. DRF/DRAF and other development partners should consider ways to enable DPOs to continually strengthen their organisations, for example by accessing locally or regionally available expertise (e.g. in leadership development, governance, program management, reflective learning or monitoring systems) or collaboration with other DPOs with stronger capacity.
4. DRF/DRAF should consider more ways to recognise and support regional collaboration between DPOs in the Pacific region.
5. DRF/DRAF should continue to consider ways to improve grants management processes from the perspective of DPOs, including through minimising excessive reporting, facilitating more flexible activity implementation and expanding multi-year funding arrangements.

## Annex A TORS for Evaluation

**Summary**

The Disability Rights Fund and the Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (DRF/DRAF) seek a research (team) to conduct a review of the organization’s Pacific Island Countries

(PICs) regional grantmaking portfolio from 2017- 2020. The review is being conducted with the support of the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) and the Australian Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), two donors to the Funds, but applies to all DRF/DRAF stakeholders, particularly the disabled persons organizations (DPOs) who receive grants from DRF/DRAF. The timeframe for the evaluation, including completion of the report, is January 2019 to February 2020.

The total budget should be in the range of $35,000 USD (inclusive of fees, travel, office, printing, meeting, and any and all other costs).

**Background Information**

The Disability Rights Fund supports persons with disabilities around the world to build diverse movements, ensure inclusive development agendas, and achieve equal rights and opportunity for all. DRF provides resources to organizations led by persons with disabilities, primarily in Africa, Asia, the Pacific Islands, and the Caribbean, that are leading efforts to secure rights and inclusion in development. Its sister fund, the Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (IRS 501(c)4), supports lobbying projects, strategic partnerships, and other special projects.

Through grantmaking, advocacy, and technical assistance, DRF/DRAF supports

DPOs to use global rights and development frameworks, such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the SDGs.1 In most target countries, DRF/DRAF has also conducted regular Grantee Convenings (which include CRPD/SDG training, grantee information exchange, and opportunities to dialogue with government or national human rights or development officials and with other donor representatives), aimed at strengthening national disability rights movements.

The DRF/DRAF pooled fund has three funding streams: Small Grants, Mid-Level Coalition Grants, and National Coalition Grants. The average small grant has been in the range of USD 20,000; coalition grants have been close to the maximum (USD 80-100,000 over two years). DRF/DRAF funding has targeted DPOs and DPO-led collaborations (at local and national levels) in 33 countries. Between 2008 and June 2018, DRF/DRAF have provided more than 1,000 grants totaling $25 million to DPOs. Of those grants 91 were provided to DPOs in the PICs, totaling more than $1.8 million.

DRF/DRAF have developed a robust Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) system that began with a year-long participatory process, completed in June 2011. The first independent evaluation was finalized in November 2012, and the second learning evaluation was completed in 2015. This, however, is the first independent research on DRF/DRAF grantmaking in a specific region.

**Scope of the Research**

This research will cover all grants given between April 1, 2017 – March 31, 2020 in the following target countries in PICs as a sample of DRF/DRAF’s PICs grantmaking:

1. Papua New Guinea, and

2. Fiji.

The research consists of the following task:

1) Conduct research, which will assess the extent to which outputs and outcomes as defined in our logframe are being reached, as well as operational aspects, such as value for money, and efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, sustainability, and impact. The review should focus on recommendations to DRF/DRAF to better ensure interventions achieve the desired impact (as measured by proxy indicators in the logframe).

The research will not cover impact level changes, short-term impact of the new

DRF/DRAF Technical Assistance Strategy or Gender Guidelines, or global advocacy efforts supported by staff.

**Purpose of the Research**

The purpose of the research is both summative and formative. DRF/DRAF has committed to its key stakeholders to conduct an independent assessment of its pathway to change as a guide for its ongoing and future operations. The objectives for the research are as follows:

* Provide an update on progress made towards the achievement of output- and outcome-level results in DRF/DRAF’s logical framework;
* Identify DRF/DRAF’s contributions to results achieved by paying special attention to capturing the mechanisms that have brought about reported changes and the assumptions behind them, particularly strategies that were the most effective;
* Identify internal and external (to DRF/DRAF) factors affecting performance, at both the programmatic and organizational levels;

Provide DRF/DRAF staff with a clear set of recommendations to improve current interventions and guide future ones.

The primary intended users of the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations are:

* DRF/DRAF, who will have additional evidence for strategic decisions;
* DRF/DRAF grantees; and
* DFID and DFAT, who will be able to report back to their respective taxpayers use of state funds; monitor their contribution to disability-inclusive development; and strategize their future partnership with DRF/DRAF and, more broadly, the disability field.

Secondary users include other DRF/DRAF donors and any other organizations (DPO or not) working or interested in the disability rights and disability-inclusive development.

**Proposed Tasks and Deliverables**

Phase 1: Planning and Preparation (10%)

• Be thoroughly familiar with DRF/DRAF (e.g., past evaluations, logframe, pathway to change, strategies at organizational and country levels, M&E system, grants review system, participatory model, DRF/DRAF 2017-2020 Strategic Plan etc.) through a desk review.

• Consult with DRF/DRAF management on how the work will best be conducted using a theory based approach to evaluation; how other staff and stakeholders will be involved; what the timetable is for fieldwork and reporting; and how feedback on conclusions will be organized.

• Agree with DRF/DRAF and main funding agencies on the methodology.

• Agree what the research will address.

• Deliverable: work plan with timeline and timing of deliverables.

Phase 2: Research (90%)

• Assess results and progress towards impact, in terms of outcomes and outputs, based on the actual and potential impact on primary stakeholder groups (DPOs) in sample target countries.

• Identify where the organization’s PICs Regional Strategy, and potentially strategy in other small island countries, needs adjusting/reorienting in order to increase its effectiveness in reaching target groups.

• Identify what is working well, DRF/DRAF’s contribution to outcomes and outputs at national and local levels in sample target countries, and what could be improved and why/how. Produce a clear set of recommendations that improve current interventions and guide future ones.

• Deliverable: Research Report, including a version suitable for submission for publication to a peer-reviewed journal.

## Annex B Executive Summary of the SDG-CRPD Monitoring Report 2018

This excerpt from the above report prepared by Pacific Disability Forum provides the best summary of the current situation of disability rights in the region.

 *In the last five years, Pacific Island countries’ leaders have strengthened their commitments to tackle barriers faced by persons with disabilities, with most countries now having ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The adoption of the 2016-2025 Pacific Regional Framework for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (PFRPD) represents another important step forward. PIC Governments have also prioritized empowering persons with disabilities as one of the issues that require collective attention in the 2017 Roadmap for Sustainable Development. Those commitments have begun to translate into greater efforts and progress in terms of awareness raising, legal harmonisation, data collection, inclusive education, vocational training, and access to assistive devices, social protection, disaster risk reduction and humanitarian response. Engagement with Organisations of People with Disabilities has significantly increased in many countries.*

*A key factor in this progress has been the unique and fruitful regional and multi-stakeholder collaboration between government, DPOs, regional bodies, UN agencies, and development and donor partners, including the sustained support of the Australian Government for disability inclusive development in the Pacific.*

*However, overall domestic resource allocation for the inclusion of persons with disabilities is still below 0.15% of the GDP for most countries. There remains a strong reliance on ODA to invest in developing required disability-specific and disability inclusive services. Countries often prioritise few issues and have not yet adopted a whole-of-government approach to inclusion. There is also a need for more effective regulatory changes across sectors and development of support services to enable significant improvement in the life of persons with disabilities and their families. While more can be done to make the most of existing resources, the intrinsic geographic, economic and institutional constraints faced by many countries are curtailing investments that would be needed to further decisive progress.*

*The Pacific Disability Forum and its members call on all countries to pursue their efforts to implement the CRPD and inclusive SDGs in close cooperation with DPOs.*

*Considering the inherent constraints of many countries and competing priorities imposed by climate change, PDF calls also for deepening partnership towards an Inclusive Pacific 2030 notably through the formalisation of an efficient and innovative regional and multi-stakeholder mechanism in support of the PFRPD that would allow for mutualisation of investments, further coordination of technical assistance and gain in economy of scale in relation to procurement, development of human resources and access to services.*

## Annex C List of persons involved in the evaluation

A total of 74 people participated in the evaluation overall, of whom 52 provided data.

* 22 participated in a pre-evaluation consultation workshop (see Table 1 below)
* 10 were interviewed in PNG (Table 2)
* 23 participated in a 2-day DPO workshop observed by the evaluators (Table 3)
* 13 were interviewed in Fiji (Table 4)
* 2 interviews were held by phone (Samoa and Vanuatu)
* 4 DPO representatives responded to a written questionnaire (see list below)

**Table 1 Participants in the pre-evaluation workshop (February 2019, Fiji)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Organisation, country** |
| 1 | Ms Lanieta Tuimabu | FDPF, Fiji |
| 2 | Ms Fa’aolo Utumapu-Utailesolo | DRF/DRAF, Samoa |
| 3 | Ms Mere Rodan | SIA, Fiji |
| 4 | Ms Sera Osborne | PSA, Fiji |
| 5 | Ms Savaira Tinai | FDPF, Fiji |
| 6 | Ms Zeena Sivi | PNG ADP, PNG |
| 7 | Mr Isoa Nabainivalu | FAD, Fiji |
| 8 | Ms Angeline Chand | PDF, Fiji |
| 9 | Ms Destiny Tolevu | CINDC, Cook Islands |
| 10 | Ms Anaseini Vakaidia | UBP, Fiji |
| 11 | Ms Naomi Tai | PWDSI, Solomon Islands |
| 12 | Ms Una Halafihi | NATA, Tonga |
| 13 | Ms Suria Apulu Tapela | NOLA, Samoa |
| 14 | Mr Tekamangu Bwauira | TTM, Kiribati |
| 15 | Ms Mine | Fusi Alofa, Tuvalu |
| 16 | Mr 'Fe'ofa'aki Lek | TNVIA, Tonga |
| 17 | Mr Andrew Taofi | NOLA, Samoa |
| 18 | Ms Kassandra | NOLA, Samoa |
| 19 | Mr Kevin Akike | PNG ADP, PNG |
| 20 | Mr Afa’aki Levi | TNVIA, Tonga |
| 21 | Ms Tina Mareu | FAD (sign language interpreter) |
| 22 | Ms Makareta Sobanivalu | FAD (sign language interpreter) |

**Table 2 Interviewees in Papua New Guinea**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name**  | **Position** | **Organisation** |
| 1 | Mr Tole Wia | Chairperson | Papua New Guinea Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association  |
| 2 | Mr Kaman Wasup | ChairpersonAnd Treasurer  | Papua New Guinea Association of Blind and Visually ImpairedPNG ADP |
| 3 | Mr Ross Tito | Executive Officer/ Program Manager | PNG ADP |
| 4 | Mr Kevin Akike | DRF Program Manager | PNG ADP |
| 5 | Ms Jane Ilam | Program Manager, Sub National Development & Disability Focal Point | Australian High Commission |
| 6 | Mr Chan Apakas | Policy Officer | Consultative Implementation & Monitoring Council  |
| 7 | Ms Konio Doko | First Assistant Secretary, Disability, Elderly & Religion Branch | Department for Community Development and Religion (DFCDR) |
| 8 | Ms Roselyn Willie | Interim Chair | PNG Sign Language and Interpreters Association |
| 9 | Ms Lois Stanley | Director, Drafts and Advisory Division (Acting Secretary) | Papua New Guinea Constitutional and Law Reform Commission  |
| 10 | Ms Jacquie Garoau | Chairperson | PNG ADP |

**Table 3 Participants in PNG-ADP hosted workshop on 28-29 May, attended by evaluators**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Organisation** |
| 1 | Ms Jeane Sliviak | Department for Community Development and Religion |
| 2 | Ms Mary Ikupu,  | Papua New Guinea Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association |
| 3 | Hon Raymond Genebayo | Papua New Guinea Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association |
| 4 | Ms Lucia Rifu,  | Papua New Guinea Deaf Association |
| 5 | Mr Josh Yembo | Papua New Guinea Deaf Association |
| 6 | Ms Elina Seko,  | PNG ADP |
| 7 | Ms Maggie Thomasmanu  | Papua New Guinea Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired |
| 8 | Mr Simon Kwalaku  | Papua New Guinea Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired |
| 9 | Ms Janet | Personal Assistant |
| 10 | Ms Donna Kei  | Personal Assistant |
| 11 | Mr Andria Kalepo,  | PNG Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Association |
| 12 | Ms Taita Ikupu,  | Personal Assistant |
| 13 | Ms Raymond,  | Personal Assistant |
| 14 | Mr Noah Agino,  | Papua New Guinea Deaf Association |
| 15 | Ms Heidi Otiwani | Papua New Guinea Deaf Association |
| 16 | Ms Theresia Karukuru  | Papua New Guinea Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired |
| 17 | Ms Esther Odori | Papua New Guinea Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired |
| 18 | Mr Daniel Odori | Papua New Guinea Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired |
| 19 | Mr Gabriel Ogia | Papua New Guinea Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired |
| 20 | Mr Newton Masive  | Department for Community Development and Religion |
| 21 | Ms Zeena Sivi  | PNG ADP |
| 22/23  | Two participants | (names not provided) |

**Table 4 Interviewees in Fiji**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name**  | **Position** | **Organisation** |
| 1 | Ms Emily Elliot | Program Manager, UN Engagement and Leadership | Australian High Commission  |
| 2 | Ms Mere Roden | Executive Officer | Spinal Injuries Association |
| 3 | Ms Sera Osborne | Project Officer | Psychiatric Survivors Association |
| 4 | Ms Anaseini Vakaidia | Project Officer | United Blind Persons |
| 5 | Dr Sitiveni Yanuyanutawa | Executive Director | National Council of Persons with Disabilities |
| 6 | Ms Angeline Chand | Team Leader, Program | Pacific Disability Forum |
| 7 | Ms Salote Biukoto | Principal Welfare Officer, Disability Services | Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation |
| 8 | Mr Isoa Nabainivalu | Project Officer | Fiji Association for the Deaf |
| 9 | Ms Melinia Nawadra | Social Inclusion Adviser | Pacific Forum Secretariat |
| 10 | Mr Joshko Wakaniyisi | President | Fiji Disabled Persons Federation |
| 11 | Mr Martin Child | Senior Human Rights Adviser | Regional Rights Resource Team, Pacific Community |
| 12 | Ms Lanieta Tuimabu | Office Manager | Fiji Disabled Persons Federation |
| 13 | Ms Savaira Tinai | Projects Officer | Fiji Disabled Persons Federation |

One **phone interview** was undertaken (from Fiji) with Ms Nisha, Director of Office and UNESCO Representative to the Pacific, Samoa

One **phone interview** was undertaken with Ms Nellie Caleb, DPA in Vanuatu

The following four DPOs provided **written responses** to an emailed questionnaire, representing their own views and/or views of their colleagues:

* PWDSI (Solomon Islands)
* TTM (Kiribati)
* NOLA (Samoa)
* NATA (Tonga).

|  |
| --- |
| Annex D Details of overall evaluation questions, sources and methods |
| **Evaluation questions** | **Sources** | **Methods** | **Comments** |
| 1. What have DRF/DRAF funds been used for?
	1. What is the purpose of the funding provided?
	2. What is the nature and scope of funding provided?
	3. What activities have been undertaken?
	4. To what extent have outputs been completed?
 | DRF/DRAF and DPO reports | Document review and synthesis | Collated in final report |
| 1. What changes have occurred in terms of the rights of all persons with disabilities in Pacific countries in the past decade, and three years in particular?
 | DPOs and external reports | Document review and synthesis | Included as context/evidence of change |
| 1. What changes have occurred in terms of the roles of DPOs in Pacific countries in the past decade, and three years in particular?
 | DPOs and external reports | Document review and interviews |  |
| 1. What is the nature of links between DRF/DRAF grants (relative to other contributions) and changes in rights of persons with disabilities, government legislation and policy, inclusion and roles of DPOs?
 | DPOs, NGO officialsGovernment and other stakeholders | Interviews Phone or email questionnairesThematic analysis | Core question to be asked in various ways for different sources |
| 1. Have DRF/DRAF contributions been regarded as useful and if so, how and for whom?
	1. How are marginalised groups within the disability movement included and benefitting from these activities?
 | DPOs,Government and NGO officials and other stakeholders | Interviews and focus group meetingsPhone or email questionnairesThematic analysis | Expected to generate rating vs other contributions  |
| 1. What examples illustrate success in implementation of activities funded and supported by DRF/DRAF and their contribution to outcome and output level objectives?
	1. What factors have contributed to efficiency and success?
 | DPO representativesGovernment and NGO officials and other stakeholders  | Document reviewInterviews in PNG and FijiPhone or email questionnaires | Case studies will be developed to illustrate dominant findings |
| 1. Are there signs that positive changes are likely to contribute to sustained benefits? If so, what are these signs?
 | DPO representativesGovernment and NGO officials and other stakeholders | Interviews in PNG and FijiPhone or email questionnaires | Expected to generate list of factors influencing sustainability |
| 1. What improvements are recommended in relation to partnerships between DRF/DRAF and Pacific DPOs? (in terms of DPO access to funding, efficiency of support for implementation of funded activities, monitoring and achievement of sustainable benefits and complementary collaboration, and the relationship with PDF.
 | DPO representatives | Interviews in PNG and FijiPhone or email questionnaires | Recommendations will be based on findings and tested with DPOs prior to finalisation |

## Annex E Interview guides for in-country interviews

**For DPO board members, staff and members in Papua New Guinea and Fiji**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research which has been commissioned by DRF/DRAF.

My name is Deborah Rhodes and this is Sandra Gambro/Ranjesh Prakash. We have been appointed to undertake the research.

As you know, DRF/DRAF provides grants to DPOs such as yours, in 14 Pacific countries. These grants support DPOs to undertake advocacy towards the advancement of rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the CRPD. Funding is provided for this purpose from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the British Department for International Development (DFID) and other sources. DRF/DRAF has commissioned an independent evaluation to ascertain the contribution of its funding towards its own objectives, as well as identify ways in which support for DPOs and efforts to support implementation of CRPD can be improved in future.

Please can I ask you to consider the consent form and provide written or verbal consent?

We have 10 questions to ask you today and we are most grateful if you are able to share with us your views and experiences in relation to these questions. If there is other information you would like to share with us, we are happy to hear this too.

**Questions**

1. To get started, can you tell us your current role in X (name of DPO) and what is your connection to DRF/DRAF funded activities both in the past and now?
2. Please can you tell us what you know about activities funded by DRF/DRAF?
3. Please can you describe the current situation in relation to the rights of all persons with disability in Papua New Guinea/Fiji and what changes have occurred in the last few years?
4. Do you think the activities you have undertaken with DRF funding have contributed to changes in terms of the changes you mentioned? If so, to what extent?
5. What other factors may have also contributed to the changes you described?

[prompts: signing of CRPD, changes in government legislation/policy, differences in inclusion in communities/formal networks, increased responsibilities/capacity of DPOs, other grants]

1. Have the changes related to the work supported by DRF/DRAF been regarded as useful and if so, how and for whom? Have these activities included and reached all people with disabilities, including men and women, young people and people with intellectual disabilities and those in rural areas?
2. Can you think of any examples/stories which tell you about the success of your activities funded and supported by DRF/DRAF?
3. What factors have contributed to the success you have described?
4. Thinking about the future, do you think that positive benefits associated with DRF/DRAF funded activities are likely to be sustained in the longer-term. If so, what are the signs?
5. Given your experience of working with DRF/DRAF and your knowledge of their role, can you think of any improvements you would recommend in how you work together?

[prompts: DPO access to funding, support for implementation of funded activities, monitoring and achievement of sustainable benefits and complementary collaboration beyond funding

Finally, do you have any other information you would like to share with us about your experience of working with DRF/DRAF and receiving funding and other kinds of support from them?

*Thank you for participating in this research. We are very grateful for your time and thoughtful discussion about these issues.*

**For Government officials and representatives from NGOs and other development partners**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this evaluation which has been commissioned by DRF/DRAF.

My name is Deborah Rhodes and this is Sandra Gambro or Ranjesh Prakash. We have been appointed to undertake the evaluation.

As you may know, DRF/DRAF provides grants to DPOs such as FDPF or PNG ADP, in 9 Pacific countries. These grants support DPOs to undertake advocacy towards the advancement of rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the CRPD. Funding is provided for this purpose from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the British Department for International Development (DFID) and other sources. DRF/DRAF has commissioned an independent evaluation to research the contribution of its funding towards it’s own objectives, as well as identify ways in which support for DPOs and efforts to support implementation of CRPD can be improved in future.

Please can I ask you to consider the consent form and provide written or verbal consent?

We have some questions to ask you today and we are most grateful if you are able to share with us your views and experiences in relation to these questions. If there is other information you would like to share with us, we are happy to hear this too.

**Questions**

1. To get started, can you tell us your current role and organisation and your connection to disabled people’s organisations (known as DPOs) (in Fiji or Papua New Guinea) or any particular DRF/DRAF funded activities both in the past and now?
2. Do you know about the grants that DRF/DRAF has provided to PNG ADP or FDPF? If not, here is a summary of the grants provided.
3. How would you describe the current situation in Papua New Guinea or Fiji in terms of disability rights and what changes have occurred in recent years?
4. What do you believe might be the links between the work of the DPO and these changes?

[Prompts: advocacy in relation to signing/ratifying CRPD, changes in government legislation and policy, changes in awareness, differences in inclusion in communities, sectors and formal networks, increased responsibilities/capacity of DPOs]

What else may have contributed to the changes you have described?

1. From your knowledge, have DRF/DRAF contributions to the DPO been useful and if so, how and for whom?
2. Can you think of any examples which tell you about the success of the activities which have been undertaken by the DPO?
3. What other factors have contributed to the changes that you have described?
4. Thinking about the future, are there signs that positive benefits associated with changes in disability rights are likely to be sustained? If so, what are these (signs)?
5. Do you have any other information you would like to share with us about your experience of working with the DPO and its activities which are supported by DRF/DRAF?

## Annex F Consent Form

DRF/DRAF has commissioned a piece of independent research on the contribution of its funding towards the organisation’s objectives. It is also keen to find out how its support for DPOs and efforts to support implementation of CRPD can be improved in future.

DRF/DRAF’s objectives (called expected outcome and related outputs) are:

* ‘Rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the CRPD, are advanced in DRF target countries by the enhanced participation of the disability movement.’ (outcome)

* Legislation, policy and government programmes (including those addressing the SDGs) undergoing harmonization with the CRPD in target countries through the participation of representative organizations of persons with disabilities
* Representative DPOs (DRAF/DRF grantees) from target countries participating in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes
* Disability movement in target countries is inclusive, reflecting the diverse voices of persons with disabilities
* DRAF/DRF grantees equipped to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities (4 outputs)

The research will be undertaken in 2019 and will include visits to Papua New Guinea and Fiji.

If you agree to participate in the research, there are options in relation to confidentiality.

**Ask: Would you like to participate in the research?**

□ Gave approval □ Declined invitation

**Confidentiality (please choose one statement)**

□ I agree to be identified by having my name in the back of the report

OR

□ I prefer not to be identified by name. You can use my thoughts but do not include my name anywhere in the document

If I agree to my name being included in the back of the report, I request the researcher to make efforts to de-identify anything I say, so it is not clear to the reader that these were my words.

**Name**

**Signed**

**Date**

## Annex G Survey questionnaire for Pacific countries other than PNG and Fiji

*[This questionnaire could either be completed in writing or on the basis of a phone/skype call, depending on the preference of the relevant DPO representatives]*

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire, as part of an evaluation commissioned by DRF/DRAF. I am an independent evaluator appointed by DRF/DRAF and I’m very grateful for your time and effort in responding to this questionnaire.

As you know, DRF/DRAF provides grants to DPOs such as yours, in 9 Pacific countries. These grants support DPOs to undertake advocacy towards the advancement of rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the CRPD. Funding is provided for this purpose from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the British Department for International Development (DFID) and other sources. DRF/DRAF has commissioned an independent evaluation to research the contribution of its funding towards its own objectives (see below), as well as identify ways in which support for DPOs and efforts to support implementation of CRPD can be improved in future.

DRF/DRAF’s objectives are:

* ‘Rights of persons with disabilities, as outlined in the CRPD, are advanced in DRF target countries by the enhanced participation of the disability movement.’ (outcome)
* Legislation, policy and government programmes (including those addressing the SDGs) undergoing harmonization with the CRPD in target countries through the participation of representative organizations of persons with disabilities
* Representative DPOs (DRAF/DRF grantees) from target countries participating in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes
* Disability movement in target countries is inclusive, reflecting the diverse voices of persons with disabilities
* DRAF/DRF grantees equipped to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities (4 outputs)

**Questions**

1. What is your current role in your DPO?
2. What experience or responsibilities have you had with DRF/DRAF funded activities both in the past and now?
3. What changes have occurred in relation to disability rights in your country in recent years (since you have been involved in the DPO or before that)?

[Examples: signing of CRPD, changes in government legislation and policy, differences in inclusion in communities and formal networks, increased responsibilities/capacity of DPOs]

1. What factors have contributed to these changes?

[prompts: your own efforts, DRF/DRAF funded activities, efforts by Governments and regional/global groups, funding from other sources]

1. From your perspective, what is the connection between the work of your DPO and the changes you describe?
2. How important has DRF/DRAF funding been in comparison with other sources?
3. Have DRF/DRAF contributions been regarded as useful and if so, how and for whom?
4. Can you think of any examples which tell you about the success of your activities funded and supported by DRF/DRAF?
5. What factors have contributed to the success you have described?
6. Thinking about the future, are there signs that positive benefits associated with DRF/DRAF funded activities are likely to be sustained? If so, what are these signs?
7. Given your experience of working with DRF/DRAF, what improvements would you recommend in the ways you work together?
8. Do you have any other information you would like to share with me about your experience of working with DRF/DRAF, receiving funding and other kinds of support from them?

***Thank you for participating in this research. We are very grateful for your time and thoughtful answers about these issues.***

## Annex H Brief history of Pacific DPOs

**Fiji Disabled People’s Federation (FDPF)**

Previously called the Fiji Disabled People’s Association (FDPA), FDPF has had a long history of activity in Fiji, including being involved in the development of the CRPD at the global level. Established in the 1970s, it slowly strengthened despite lack of recognition and financial support, a reliance on volunteers with limited time availability, and the exclusion of people with disabilities from many public institutions. Early on, a source of funding for FDPA was a small and irregular annual allocation from the Fiji Government. The Government also provided offices for FDPA and its affiliates in 2004. Early funding was also provided by the British Government, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency, and TEAR Australia.

A number of individuals in FDPA were involved in international networks, having been involved in Disabled People’s International at the Oceania Sub-region, Asia-Pacific Region, and at the global level, during the development of CRPD. FDPA has also been actively involved in the Biwako Millennium Framework and the establishment and ongoing operations of the Pacific Disability Forum[[27]](#footnote-28).

Over the last three years, FDPF has had significant influence over national disability legislation. Apart from their advocacy efforts resulting in the 2017 ratification of the CRPD, they also advocated towards a Disability Bill and Act on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, enacted in March 2018. FDPF has also taken part in consultations with the Ministry of Women, the Fiji Election Office, the Ministry of Planning, the Fiji Bureau of Statistics, and other government departments to ensure that budgets, national elections, education, national census, and other public areas of government planning and services are inclusive of and accessible to persons with disability.[[28]](#footnote-29)

**Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled People (PNG ADP)**

PNGADP is a national, cross-disability DPO based in Port Moresby. It was officially launched as a DPO in 2009 and is actively involved in PDF. Its first strategic plan (2009) has been a valuable guiding document for PNGADP to date. The strategic plan is also well-linked to the Government’s first Disability Policy, appropriately reflects the CRPD, and is comprehensive enough to provide a framework for PNGADP’s development for the medium term.

Prior to PNGADP’s official launch in 2009, advocacy in the disability sector in PNG was primarily dominated by service providers such as Red Cross and Callan Services. PNGADP has been instrumental in increasing awareness about the rights of people with disability and empowerment of members. The PNG Government has recognised the role of PNG ADP for many years and provided support in the early years, but relatively recently, this status has been more formally acknowledged.

According to PNG ADP, advocacy and efforts to improve policies were progressing well in 2016. However, the absence of formal recognition until relatively recently, meant that implementation of CRPD at provincial, district, local, and ward levels has been limited.

The role of DPOs in PNG has grown in importance in recent years. PNGADP has encouraged and assisted the PNG Government in drafting disability-inclusive policies. Notably, this includes the formalisation of sign language as a fourth language.

**People with Disability Solomon Islands (PWDSI)**

PWDSI commenced in the 1980s and is the national cross-disability DPO for Solomon Islands. It has received funding from PDF (through the Pacific FPO Fund and Capacity Development Initiative Program), APIDS, and DRF/DRAF.

Since its inception, PWDSI has sought working relationships with relevant government ministries, specifically the Ministry of Health, which has the role of Government focal point on disability.

A 2013 analysis of PWDSI found that it has contributed to the development of disability policy in the country. Notably, PWDSI facilitated the establishment of Self-Help Groups (SHGs) in seven provinces in the Solomon Islands, which has amplified awareness about the rights of people with disabilities in communities and villages. A PWDSI Youth committee was also established in 2014.

In recent years, PWDSI has built its capacity in advocating for the rights of people with disabilities, especially in the government. This has led to an accessible national election, with trial runs having been implemented in three constituencies in Honiara for the 2019 elections and the inclusion of the Washington Questions in the 2019 national health and demographic study by the National Statistics Division.

**Te Toa Matoa (TTM)**

TTM was established in 1999 and is the national cross-disability DPO in Kiribati. It is unique in its use of drama and musical performances to raise public awareness of the capabilities as well as the rights of people with disabilities as well as engage members in empowerment processes. TTM has collaborated with various community groups, churches and sporting associations, to strengthen its own capacity and raise awareness.

Over the past three years, TTM has focused on building relationships with government ministries, aiming to gain more influence over creating more inclusive national policies. TTM has targeted their efforts towards inclusion in health and education recently, to expand their influence over government decisions.

**Vanuatu Disability Promotion and Advocacy Association (DPA)**

DPA is the national, cross-disability DPO, officially registered in 2002. From establishment to 2007, DPA operated independently. It sought to demonstrate the capacity of people with disabilities by establishing itself and undertaking a wide range of advocacy, awareness-raising, and policy development activities in Vanuatu. DPA’s early work achieved substantial gains in terms of Government recognition of the rights of people with disabilities, including at provincial levels, and in contributing to the Government’s policy development. At the national level, DPA helped draft the Vanuatu Disability Policy, and contributed to the Inclusive Education Policy and Strategic Plan 2010 - 2020. DPA has been effective in raising awareness and bringing about changes within provincial government settings, i.e., having Disability Coordinators in the provinces of Shefa and Sanma. It has affiliated groups and volunteers in 6 provinces who organise disability inclusivity discussions with villagers.

Since 2016, DPA has increased its visibility and influence on government policies. The Government invited them to present on disability inclusion and further consulted them in drafting the National Sustainable Development Plan, which was launched in early 2016 and is inclusive of persons with disabilities. DPA has also been consistent in submitting policy briefs to the Government, including one for the national budget allocation, also reflected in the National Disability Inclusive Development Policy 2018 - 2025.

**Nuanua O Le Alofa (NOLA)**

Nuanua o le Alofa was established in 2001 as the national DPO and focal point for disability issues. NOLA is a central, registered, urban-based non-profit organization with a constitution, an elected board, full-time, part-time, paid and voluntary staff and secure office facilities. It is an organisation founded by and managed by people with disability in Samoa, to advocate for the rights of people with disability and to work together to improve their situation in Samoa.

From 2004 until 2010, NOLA received funding from the New Zealand Agency for International Development for core staff and operational costs. For 2013, NOLA has received grants from PDF, Australia Pacific Islands Disability Support (APIDS) and DRF/DRAF. Samoa’s Community Sector Support Program (CSSP) provided annual grants to NOLA for several years, and since 2013, the National Disability Program, funded by DFAT, has provided core funding.

## Annex I Purposes of funding requested by Pacific DPOs

NB This data was compiled from each application form completed by DPOs, with wording extracted about objectives from various parts of the forms. It has been edited to a minor degree for the purpose of table presentation, but in most cases, language and words have not been changed. Language from the application forms is the responsibility of the DPO applicant. Any transcription errors are the responsibility of the evaluator.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DPO** | **Objectives 2016** | **Objectives 2017** | **Objectives 2018** |
| Fiji Disabled People’s Federation  | 1. To promote disability inclusive development and mainstream CRPD to government ministries’ policy and legislation equalizing opportunities to persons with disabilities.
2. To provide monitoring & evaluation to government for the outcome statement of disability inclusive development within their policy and legislation.
 | 1. To effectively advance and mainstream CRPD to national government legislation, policies and strategies, also linking to SDGs.
2. To identify gaps and influence selected government departments to mainstream CRPD articles into policies and plans.
 | Same as 2017 (year 2 of coalition funding) |
| Fiji Association of the Deaf  | 1. Sign language interpreters in PNG and Kiribati
2. Deaf students advancing to high school in in PNG and Kiribati
3. More implementation of Disability inclusive policies in government
4. Equal employment opportunities for the Deaf in Fiji, Kiribati and PNG
5. Ratification of CRPD in Fiji
6. Disability Bill to be legislated
7. Accessible communication needs for Deaf persons
8. Awareness and actions to combat climate change and its impacts
9. An inclusive and enabling environment in Fiji and the Pacific region.
 | N/A | N/A |
| PNG Assembly of Disabled Persons  | 1. To create a national consultative dialogue avenue between the disability sector stakeholders and the key responsible national government departments for a national consultative forum discussion on the formulation processes and procedures involved in the formulation of the Disability Inclusion Act.
2. To enable a nationwide collective consultative UNCRPD alignment input into the formulation processes of the Disability Inclusion Act through coalition stakeholder’s provincial representation participation

during this national forum.1. To raise wider awareness in the country on the formulation establishment of the Disability Inclusion Act to enable effective alliance lobbying and advocacy around the recognition and implementation of the Disability Inclusion Act.
 | 1. To establish a CRPD Alignment Disability Legislation Act to enable development for all in Papua New Guinea and especially addressing issues of persons with disabilities in the country as a progressive developmental obligation of the Papua New Guinea government based on the ratification of the CRPD.
 | (Continuation of objective from 2018) with the aim of capacity building of an in country CRPD resource team that will focus on advocacy work on implementation of the Disability Inclusion Legislation and also focus on the monitoring of the CRPD implementation for reporting purposes to the UN where the national DPO PNG ADP with the national coalition support from Civil Society Organizations to compile the shadow country report to the United Nations.  |
| People with Disability in Solomon Islands  | 1. To make necessary amendments to Government Acts and policies to ensure the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the areas targeted.
2. To increase DPO Participation in Decision-Making Processes Related to Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goal 6 Safe Water and Sanitation.
3. To influence implementation strategies to ensure inclusive development as well as influencing the WASH sector through PWDSI participation in events and learning workshop
4. To participate to addressing the implementation of the CRPD and SDGs.
5. To advocate to Government to ratify CRPD.
6. To lobby and highlight inclusive policies and practices according to the CRPD and SDGs.
 | 1. To further develop accessible avenues for persons with disabilities in their voting rights.
2. To seek inclusion of Washington [Group] 6 question for the 2019 census pursued at all cost.
3. To research and advocate for approval of government policies on specific areas, including Inclusive Education Policy and National Disability Inclusive development policy.
 | 1. Conduct a Marine Transport Sector Accessibility Audit
2. Advocate for disability inclusive policies
3. Improve PWDSI’s organizational capacity
 |
| Te Toa Matoa | 1. To strengthen awareness on CRPD throughout the outer islands.
2. To take action in pushing the government to implement the CRPD from a grass-root level.
3. To conduct outreach awareness and advocacy programs on the rights of persons with disabilities for the general community, persons with disability, government officials and leaders on outer islands (Onotoa and Beru)
4. To change perspectives from the community about their understanding about Disability from traditional to social model views. This is hope to improve the persons with disabilities experiences at a community level and garner communal support for disability development in terms of advocating to government to meet CRPD articles.
5. To use Media to advocate on the rights of PWD using radio program and press releases.
 | 1. Increased awareness about including primary school aged children with disabilities in school
2. Increased community awareness about inclusive education
3. Advocate for system change to make education inclusive for all
 | 1. To review the accessibility and experiences of people with disabilities of health services
2. To make a submission to change relevant health laws and make a submission
 |
| Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy  | 1. To advocate for and support the implementation of the UNCRPD through the National Disability Policy and Plan of Action 2008 - 2015.
2. To raise awareness of the rights of people with disability.
3. To assist partners including Government departments, non-government organizations, donors and community groups to support and promote the rights of people with disability.
4. To strengthen the capacity of DPA to continue to implement its work.
5. To build skills of people with disabilities.
6. Enhance coordination with government and non-government disability partners.
 | 1. Improved genuine consultation with people with disability
2. Strategic cooperation to monitor CRPD implementation
 | 1. Strengthening DPA capacity on the linkages between SDG & CRPD (Article 5/28
2. Strengthening DPA staff and Board Capacity to develop submission/Policy Brief for budget process.
3. Partnership to influence budget process for disability inclusion i.e. Disability allowance for high support needs, core support to DPO and Ministry budget to implement the National Disability Inclusive development policy.
 |
| Nuanua O Le Alofa  | N/A | 1. Ensure the passage of disability-equality legislation (‘Disabilities Bill’) and consequential amendments in Samoa
2. Empower people with disabilities to draft disability-equality legislation
3. Train stakeholders to implement disability-equality laws
 | N/A |
| Deaf Club Samoa/Deaf Association of Samoa  | 1. To develop deaf-lead advocacy, the confidence of persons who are deaf to communicate in their own
2. language, strengthening the capacity of interpreters and enhanced partnerships with
3. partners and DPOS to bring out the voice of persons who are deaf in decision making
 | N/A | N/A |
| Fusi Alofa | 1. To raise awareness, knowledge and understanding of DPOs on the sustainable development goals and its linkages to the CRPD
2. To increase capacities of DPOs for policy advocacy with specific articles of the CRPD and SDG
3. To advocate for mainstreaming of disability.
 | 1. To develop a formal FAA organisational structure that includes an FAA branch on each of the 8 islands that will be managed from the head office in Funafuti.
2. To prepare and deliver awareness training to the 3 northern islands to empower them to build the capacity for each island to have their own CRPD awareness training champions.
3. Conduct a needs analysis training survey throughout Tuvalu to confirm the type of disability training programs (Article 24 education) required to increase the likelihood of independence and employment.
4. Increase communication skills through a basic sign language course on each of the three northern islands for the hearing impaired, their carers and interested members of the community
 | N/A |
| Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organisation  | 1. To diversify and build a broader membership which will strengthen the capacity of the Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organization in order to advance knowledge and support of the CRPD across the Marshall Islands.
2. To educate the members of the Parliament, national and local officials on the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and move towards its eventual ratification in the Marshall Islands.
3. To launch and advocate the National Disability Policy at national and local level.
 | 1. To strengthen DPO capacity to influence National Government Policies for inclusion.
2. To build the capacity of MIDPO to engage and be influential at the policy level.
 | N/A |
| Tonga National Visual Impairment Association  | N/A | 1. To reach out into the local communities on creating awareness on the CRPD
2. Enhancing the knowledge of TNVIA members on the CRPD
3. Utilising the Media
 | 1. To reach out into government ministries, non-government organizations and local communities on creating awareness on the CRPD.
2. Utilizing the Media to raise awareness on the rights of persons with disabilities
 |
| Naunau ‘o e ‘Alamaite Tonga Assocation  | N/A | 1. To support NATA members by strengthening their capacity in areas of leadership, management, advocacy, information, youth and gender issues and increasing their membership and voice.
2. To seek national and state governments support in the ratification of the CRPD, implementation of conventions, policies and strategies affecting persons with disabilities
3. To strengthen the governance and operations of the NATA by strengthening our capacity to operate and increasing our membership and voice at all level.
 | N/A |
| Pohnpei Consumer Organisation  |  | 1. To establish a national coalition of the four FSM State DPOs to effectively participate in national policy development, state and national budgeting decisions, and implementation activities under the CRPD.
 |  |

## Annex J Full list of DPOs which have received DRF/DRAF grants since 2009

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Grantee Name** | **Country** | **Year** |
| 1 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2009 |
| 2 | Youth Champs for Mental Health | Fiji | 2009 |
| 3 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2009 |
| 4 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons Association | Papua New Guinea | 2009 |
| 5 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2009 |
| 6 | Fiji Association of the Deaf | Fiji | 2010 |
| 7 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2010 |
| 8 | United Blind Persons of Fiji | Fiji | 2010 |
| 9 | Youth Champs for Mental Health | Fiji | 2010 |
| 10 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2010 |
| 11 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons Association | Papua New Guinea | 2010 |
| 12 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2010 |
| 13 | Fusi Alofa, Inc. | Tuvalu | 2010 |
| 14 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2010 |
| 15 | Cook Islands National Disability Council | Cook Islands | 2011 |
| 16 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2011 |
| 17 | Psychiatric Survivors Association of Fiji | Fiji | 2011 |
| 18 | Te Toa Matoa | Kiribati | 2011 |
| 19 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2011 |
| 20 | OMEKESANG | Palau | 2011 |
| 21 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons Association | Papua New Guinea | 2011 |
| 22 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2011 |
| 23 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2011 |
| 24 | Cook Islands National Disability Council | Cook Islands | 2012 |
| 25 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2012 |
| 26 | Psychiatric Survivors Association of Fiji | Fiji | 2012 |
| 27 | United Blind Persons of Fiji | Fiji | 2012 |
| 28 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2012 |
| 29 | Nuanua O Le Alofa Inc. | Samoa | 2012 |
| 30 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2012 |
| 31 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2012 |
| 32 | Fiji Association of the Deaf | Fiji | 2013 |
| 33 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2013 |
| 34 | Psychiatric Survivors Association of Fiji | Fiji | 2013 |
| 35 | United Blind Persons of Fiji | Fiji | 2013 |
| 36 | Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organization | Republic of the Marshall Islands | 2013 |
| 37 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2013 |
| 38 | Nauru Persons with Disability Organisation | Nauru | 2013 |
| 39 | OMEKESANG | Palau | 2013 |
| 40 | Gulf Province Disabled Persons Organisation | Papua New Guinea | 2013 |
| 41 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2013 |
| 42 | Naunau 'o e 'Alamaite Tonga Association Incorporated | Tonga | 2013 |
| 43 | Fusi Alofa, Inc. | Tuvalu | 2013 |
| 44 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2013 |
| 45 | Cook Islands National Disability Council | Cook Islands | 2014 |
| 46 | Fiji Association of the Deaf | Fiji | 2014 |
| 47 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2014 |
| 48 | Psychiatric Survivors Association of Fiji | Fiji | 2014 |
| 49 | United Blind Persons of Fiji | Fiji | 2014 |
| 50 | Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organization | Republic of the Marshall Islands | 2014 |
| 51 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2014 |
| 52 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2014 |
| 53 | Fusi Alofa, Inc. | Tuvalu | 2014 |
| 54 | Fiji Association of the Deaf | Fiji | 2015 |
| 55 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2015 |
| 56 | Pacific Disability Forum | Fiji | 2015 |
| 57 | Psychiatric Survivors Association of Fiji | Fiji | 2015 |
| 58 | Te Toa Matoa | Kiribati | 2015 |
| 59 | Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organization | Republic of the Marshall Islands | 2015 |
| 60 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2015 |
| 61 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons Association | Papua New Guinea | 2015 |
| 62 | Fusi Alofa, Inc. | Tuvalu | 2015 |
| 63 | Fiji Association of the Deaf | Fiji | 2016 |
| 64 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2016 |
| 65 | Te Toa Matoa | Kiribati | 2016 |
| 66 | Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organization | Republic of the Marshall Islands | 2016 |
| 67 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons Association | Papua New Guinea | 2016 |
| 68 | Deaf Association of Samoa, Inc. | Samoa | 2016 |
| 69 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2016 |
| 70 | Fusi Alofa, Inc. | Tuvalu | 2016 |
| 71 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2016 |
| 72 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2017 |
| 73 | Pacific Disability Forum | Fiji | 2017 |
| 74 | Pacific Disability Forum | Fiji | 2017 |
| 75 | Te Toa Matoa | Kiribati | 2017 |
| 76 | Marshall Islands Disabled Persons Organization | Republic of the Marshall Islands | 2017 |
| 77 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons Association | Papua New Guinea | 2017 |
| 78 | Nuanua O Le Alofa Inc. | Samoa | 2017 |
| 79 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2017 |
| 80 | Naunau 'o e 'Alamaite Tonga Association Incorporated | Tonga | 2017 |
| 81 | Tonga National Visual Impairment Association | Tonga | 2017 |
| 82 | Fusi Alofa, Inc. | Tuvalu | 2017 |
| 83 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2017 |
| 84 | Fiji Disabled Peoples Federation | Fiji | 2018 |
| 85 | Te Toa Matoa | Kiribati | 2018 |
| 86 | Pohnpei Consumer Organization | Federated States of Micronesia | 2018 |
| 87 | Papua New Guinea Assembly of Disabled Persons Association | Papua New Guinea | 2018 |
| 88 | Disabled Peoples' Association of Solomon Islands | Solomon Islands | 2018 |
| 89 | Tonga National Visual Impairment Association | Tonga | 2018 |
| 90 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2018 |
| 91 | Vanuatu Disability Promotion & Advocacy Association | Vanuatu | 2018 |

## Annex K Success case studies

Each DPO and stakeholder identified a range of case studies to illustrate and signify the success of their advocacy efforts, which to various degrees have been funded and supported by DRF/DRAF. Many of these are mentioned in Section 3. Examples provided in this section are a selection of those suggested to illustrate the different ways in which advocacy efforts contribute to DRF/DRAF’s outcome and output level objectives and those of the DPOs themselves.

*Training the judiciary*

In 2018, in Papua New Guinea, PNG ADP staff (with salaries provided through the grant from DRF/DRAF) participated in a one-day training workshop for 40 members of the national judiciary on the CRPD and its implications for the justice system. This event was highlighted by several stakeholders as a great success, demonstrating collaboration between government and DPOs and the importance of engaging with people who have authority and can influence disability inclusion and rights in legal settings.

*Inclusive elections*

Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands held national elections in 2018 and 2019 and for the first time in all countries, DPOs successfully advocated for the elections to be accessible and inclusive. DPO staff used funding from DRF/DRAF to fund advocacy efforts. In Fiji, a law needed to be changed, since previously only presiding officers were allowed to assist anyone at polling booths, but DPOs argued that some persons with disability preferred someone they knew and trusted to record their vote. A formal agreement with the election authorities will ensure future elections are also inclusive and accessible. In Papua New Guinea, persons with disabilities were given the priority to be served first at polling stations and special assistance was provided when sought. Persons with disabilities also participated as observers during the election period. Advocacy by DPOs, funded partially or fully by grants from DRF/DRAF, resulted in these changes.

*New government committees and dedicated units*

In Papua New Guinea, DPOs highlighted the formation of national and provincial committees for coordination on disability issues, which are expected to provide leadership and guidance on implementation of the soon-to-be approved Disability Authority Act. This was the result of advocacy by officials of PNG ADP, the salaries for whom were provided by the grant from DRF/DRAF. In Fiji, many interviewees highlighted the establishment of a Disability Unit in the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation as a sign of success of DPO advocacy, which in part has been funded by the grant from DRF/DRAF. While the Unit’s work to date has largely focused on welfare, there is potential for more rights-based orientation through building on the good relationships established to date.

*Data availability*

Several DPOs noted their advocacy has resulted in the inclusion of Washington Group Questions in national census processes. For example, in Fiji, the 2017 census included these questions and DPOs are working with data to inform various policies and advocacy efforts. In Solomon Islands, the questions were included in the 2019 National Health and Demographic Study by the National Statistics Division. Advocacy efforts by DPOs have been partially funded by DRF/DRAF grants.

 *Inclusive education*

Several stakeholders noted changes in access to education for children with disabilities as a positive change. In Kiribati, the DPO reported that the Ministry of Education has a new inclusive education policy, has produced a teacher’s guide book related to students with disabilities, offered a course at the Kiribati Teachers College for teachers’ assistants who work with children with disabilities and established and renovated six model schools which are accessible. Kiribati used the DRF/DRAF grant to advocate for changes in inclusive education. In Fiji, DPOs reported on substantially increased numbers of people with vision impairments in post-school education through dedicated scholarships and other inclusion efforts, which have been advocated for, using DRF/DRAF grant funds.

*Support for those in rural areas*

All Pacific countries have large proportions of their populations living outside main cities or towns. In many countries, people live in remote communities accessible only by boat or plane and most basic services are not available locally. Each DPO involved in this evaluation identified different ways of reaching their members, engaging them in advocacy work and including their views in national policy processes. DRAF/DRAF grants have been used by some DPOs to travel to members outside capital cities/major towns to hear their voices and include them in advocacy processes. In some cases, DPOs, such as Spinal Injuries Association and Psychiatric Survivors Association in Fiji (PSAF), are also seeking to provide some services for members in rural areas. PSAF recently established the first Community Watch Zone in outer islands, to support persons with psycho-social disabilities.

Engagement with government officials in sub-national roles was also mentioned by several DPOs. For example, in Tonga, NATA mentioned that its connections with town officers and district officers have been important and that engagement with them was made possible with the grant provided by DRF/DRAF.

*Employment opportunities*

In Fiji and Vanuatu, DPOs reported on increasing numbers of employed persons with disabilities, after advocacy and collaboration in skills training and private sector campaigns, which have in part been supported by DRF/DRAF grants.
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