



2015:24

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Francis Watkins
Annica Holmberg

Project Evaluation – Disability Rights Promotion International (DRPI)

Final Report

Project Evaluation – Disability Rights Promotion International (DRPI)

Final Report
June 2015

Francis Watkins
Annica Holmberg

Authors: Francis Watkins and Annica Holmberg

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2015:24

Commissioned by Sida, Unit for Democracy and Human Rights

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: June 2015

Published by Citat 2015

Art. no. Sida61879en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61879en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Table of contents	2
Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Preface.....	4
Executive Summary.....	5
1 Introduction.....	7
1.1 Scope of the evaluation	7
1.2 Background	8
1.3 Methodology	9
1.4 Structure of the Report	11
2 Findings.....	12
2.1 Relevance	12
2.2 Effectiveness	15
2.3 Impact.....	20
2.4 Sustainability	25
3 Conclusions and Recommendations	27
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference.....	31
Annex 2 – Inception report.....	35
Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix	48
Annex 4 – Documents Reviewed	53
Annex 5 – List of Persons Interviewed	55

Abbreviations and Acronyms

COD	Centre for Society Orientation
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DPO	Disabled Persons Organisation
DPRI	Disability Rights Promotion International
EIDHR	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
PWDs	Persons with Disabilities
PLWHA	Persons living with HIV & AIDS
SSHRC	Social Science and Humanities Research Council
UN	United Nations
UN CPRD	United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

Preface

This evaluation was commissioned by the Unit for Democracy and Human Rights of Sida. The evaluation covers Sida's support to the Disability Rights Promotion International (DRPI) Project, but looks more broadly at the overall effectiveness and impact of the project.

The evaluation covers all phases of the DRPI project period (from 2003 until present) and examines impact, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the DRPI project with a focus on DRPI methodology for monitoring the rights of people with disability, not only limited to the effects of Sida's contribution, and includes relevant lessons learned from implementing the DRPI methodology as a tool to achieve the protection and implementation of rights of persons with disabilities.

The evaluation was undertaken between March and May 2015 by an independent evaluation team consisting of:

- Francis Watkins (Team Leader)
- Annica Holmberg (Technical Expert)
- Sarah Gharbi (Project Manager)
- Cecilia Magnusson Ljungman (Quality Assurance).

The evaluation was managed by Indevelop, commissioned through Sida's Framework Agreement for Reviews and Evaluations with Indevelop. Anna Öberg was the Evaluation Manager for the Unit for Democracy and Human Rights of Sida.

Executive Summary

Sida has supported DRPI since 2003, over four phases of the project and a with total financial support of SEK 22 million between 2003 and 2013 and a further SEK 6 million committed for 2013-2015. The evaluation covers all phases of the DRPI project period with the dual aims of serving to: i) inform Sida's future support within the area of disability rights; and ii) support and strengthen the DRPI project.

The evaluation of the DRPI was against four evaluation criteria: relevance, sustainability, effectiveness and impact, using a set of evaluation questions. Data collection was carried out through a review of relevant documents, interviews with a range of stakeholders, and a field visit to the European regional office of DRPI in April 2015. Data analysis was carried out against each of the evaluation questions and is summarised in this report against the evaluation criteria.

There have been a number of significant achievements by the DRPI project since it was established in 2003, including:

- The development and adaptation of a unique, holistic methodology for monitoring disability rights that is built on the full participation of PWDs and that is carried out by DPOs;
- The effective implementation of an approach that works with DPOs to gradually develop their capacity to be able to collect, analyse and use data for reporting and advocacy
- Effects at three levels, i) individual PWDs, raising awareness of their human rights; ii) DPOs, giving them the tools to better understand the needs of those they work for; and, iii) coalitions of PWDs and DPOs, giving the means to come together to better understand different perspectives and to work together to claim their rights; and,
- An approach that is based on a set of core principles, has been built from the bottom up, that takes time and is well considered, and which works well in the right context.

Underpinning these achievements has been core support from Sida through four phases of the evolution of the project, providing a consistent foundation for the development of the methodology and sufficient flexibility to enable the expansion and adaptation of the approach. As a result the DRPI project has been able to develop and implement the methodology in a wide range of contexts, whilst remaining committed to the central principles of participation of PWDs and collaboration with DPOs.

Due to the rapid expansion of the project, there are a number of areas where there is only limited evidence available and where there is a need to better explore and understand both successes and limitations. Three areas are highlighted in this evaluation:

- There are both strengths and weaknesses of the project approach, so that it works well where the regional officer and the regional host organisation work effectively together and relies to a large extent on the capacities of individuals.
- There are clearly inconsistencies in the progress made across the four project regions, with Europe having made the most progress, Latin America and Asia Pacific having made more limited progress, and Africa having made the least progress, due in part to the inputs from the project, but in part also to the context in which the project works, with particularly limited capacity amongst DPOs in developing country contexts.
- The transformative impacts on individual awareness of rights and on organisational capacities to understand and advocate for the needs of PWDs are clear from anecdotal evidence, whilst there is a need to more systematically collect and analyse evidence to support these powerful anecdotes, as a means to advocate more strongly for the approach use.

Three broad recommendations are made:

- Sida and DRPI should work together to map out a way forward, considering a range of possible options, including developing an international centre as a home for the methodology, continuing to support the project approach in contexts where there is strong potential, and working with international partners to hand over the methodology and approach for further development and dissemination in developing contexts
- Sida should fund a further phase of consolidation of the project, based on the discussions of future options for the project, and
- DRPI should include a systematic approach to lesson-learning, monitoring and evaluation in this proposed consolidation phase of the project.

1 Introduction

1.1 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Sida has supported DRPI since 2003 and has provided four phases of support:

- The first phase (2003) involved research to map the environment for disability rights monitoring;
- The second phase (2004-2009) focused on the design and testing of a monitoring tool for disability rights;
- The third phase (2010-2013) aimed to build up the regional and national capacities and platforms to systematically use the tool on a global scale; and,
- The current and concluding phase (2013-2015) focuses on strengthening the sustainability of the project, and designing, testing and implementing an on-line interactive training and data collection component.

This evaluation covers Sida's support to the Disability Rights Promotion International (DRPI) Project, but looks more broadly at the overall effectiveness and impact of the project (see terms of reference in Annex 1). Sida has provided a total financial support of SEK 22 million between 2003 and 2013, the main core funding for the project, and a further SEK 6 million committed for 2013-2015. In addition DRPI has received funding of approximately SEK 34.4 million between 2006 and 2015 from over 20 projects funded by a wide range of other organisations, including international and bilateral development organisations, international NGOs, and national research and equality monitoring funds¹.

The evaluation covers all phases of the DRPI project period (from 2003 until present) with the dual aims of serving to: i) inform Sida's future support within the area of disability rights; and ii) support and strengthen the DRPI project. Specifically it is stated in the terms of reference that the evaluation:

- Is expected to provide the bigger picture of the impact, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the DRPI project with a focus on DRPI methodology for monitoring the rights of people with disability (not limited to the impact of Sida's contribution);

¹ This is an approximate figure based on total project funds for 22 projects agreed 2006 and 2015 provided by DRPI and does not include contributions made by York University or contributions in kind.

- Should include relevant lessons learnt from implementing the DRPI methodology as a tool to achieve the protection and implementation of rights of persons with disabilities.

1.2 BACKGROUND

Many Disabled Persons Organisations (DPOs) are relatively new, in comparison to other NGOs, having been set up since the International Year of Disabled Persons in 1981. Decades of work was required by this movement of organisations of persons with disabilities (PWDs) to change attitudes and approaches, particularly to progress from the initial year in 1981 to the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in 2006. As a result, the disability movement has a number of challenges, including; limited capacity of many DPOs; some groups having a stronger voice, while others still struggle to be heard; limited cross-disability cooperation; and, limited linkages between DPOs and other NGOs, particularly in the field of human rights.

The DRPI project was initiated during the negotiations of the CRPD and was developed in response to many of these challenges. The first two phases of the project focused on identifying what monitoring work was already taking place and what opportunities existed for focusing on disability rights and then on developing and testing a methodology where PWDs could fully participate and that could be implemented by DPOs. The methodology is holistic and monitors three areas: individual violations; systems, the legislative framework and government policies and programmes; and, media imagery and coverage of disability². Having tested and demonstrated the methodology, the third phase of the project developed a project approach to capacity development in four regions, Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and Latin America.

The DRPI project was established in 2003 by the two co-directors, Bengt Lindqvist and Marcia Rioux. The co-directors oversee the direction of the project and are supported by an International Coordinating Centre at York University in Toronto with a project staff consisting of a Project Coordinator and a Research Associate and Research Assistants, supported in various ways by students from the university. In the third phase of the project (2010-2013) four Regional Officers (ROs) were appointed, all of whom are PWDs and each based in the region. The ROs are each supported by regional host organisations, generally a DPO with at least some regional coverage, that receive only overhead costs for their role in administrative support. The roles of

² For more detail, see DRPI's website: <http://drpi.research.yorku.ca/welcome-drpi/>

these ROs has developed through the third phase: starting with involvement in regional trainings, initially led by staff from the International Coordinating Centre; taking more of a lead role in the training for the initial country monitoring project; to growing independence in supporting partner DPOs in preparing funding proposals for monitoring projects, leading training in collaboration with partner DPOs and supporting the analysis of monitoring data collected and the preparation of reports. The relationships between the ROs and the regional host organisations varies, from a close collaborative relationship in Europe to a more limited administrative and formal relationship in Africa.

The approach taken to project implementation in the third phase has consisted of a regional training introducing the methodology to DPOs from a range of countries, followed by an invitation to these DPOs to carry out a country monitoring project, with funds sourced by the DPO³. The country monitoring process is led by DPOs and supported by the DRPI project, in many cases with the continued involvement of DPOs from other countries, that were involved in the initial regional training. DPOs at the national level have been encouraged to work together and are responsible for identifying PWDs to take on the roles of interviewers, data analysts and site coordinators. DRPI staff provide support firstly through a comprehensive training programme for all members of the monitoring team, introducing the methodology and taking them through all steps of the process (interviewing, data analysis and report writing) in a hands-on manner. DRPI continues to provide support throughout the process, including data analysis and report preparation, although with DPOs always taking the lead.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

To assess the DRPI project against the stated evaluation criteria, a set of evaluation questions was provided in the terms of reference. These evaluation questions were elaborated against four evaluation criteria, relevance, sustainability, effectiveness and impact. In addition both Sida and DRPI expressed particular interest in the lesson learning aspects of the evaluation, with an interest in learning both how this new methodology has been developed and in its wider impact. A detailed evaluation matrix was developed (see Annex 3) with criteria for all of the evaluation questions, as well as an analysis of the reliability and availability of data.

As a starting point an analysis was carried out in the inception phase of DRPI project

³ Sida funds have been used for a limited number of pilot country monitoring projects and for some projects where other funds have not been readily available.

documentation in order to identify a goal, outcomes and outputs against which to assess progress. These are set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – DRPI Goal, Outcomes and Outputs

Goal - To create an international monitoring system for disability rights, based on three priority areas: i) an individual violations focus; ii) a systems focus that studies legislative frameworks, tracks case law before the courts and statutory human rights bodies, and analyses general government policies and programmes; and, iii) a media focus that involves tracking media imagery and coverage of disability	
Outcomes	Outputs
Creation of a disability rights monitoring system using consistent tools and methods to allow for comparative analysis among countries and the identification of best practice in disability rights legislation, policies and programmes around the world.	Capacity of persons with disabilities and disability organisations built in five regions, together with human rights NGOs, national human rights institutions, academics and students, to use the methodology and tools developed by the project.
Establishment of a solid foundation for sustainable, ongoing disability rights monitoring activities in each region, beyond the duration of Phase Three.	Further refined fully accessible training materials for monitors covering all 3 monitoring focus areas (individual experiences, systems, media), incorporating the lessons learnt during Phase Three.
Establishment of the leading role to be played by persons with disabilities and disability organisations in monitoring disability rights (consistent with the provisions of the UN Disability Convention) and enhanced capacity of these individuals and organisations to fulfil this role.	Further refined methodologies for ongoing collection, analysis and reporting on disability rights monitoring data by organisations of persons with disabilities.
	Wide dissemination of the disability rights monitoring and training methods and tools developed during the DRPI project to disability organisations and other stakeholders around the world.

The main data collection methods for the evaluation were:

- A review of relevant documents, including project reports, monitoring data and prior evaluations – see Annex 4;
- Interviews with a range of stakeholders – see Annex 5;
- A field visit to the Serbia regional office from 28-30 April 2015.

Data analysis began with the collation of evidence against the indicators in the evaluation matrix. This enabled cross-referencing and triangulation of evidence for each of the evaluation questions. The analysis proceeded with assessments against each of the indicators and, in turn, answers to each of the evaluation questions, supported by an overview of the evidence available and its quality. For the purposes of this report the

responses to the evaluation questions are summarised against the evaluation criteria.

The main limitations of the evaluation were:

- The limited timeframe for the evaluation, which meant that the evaluation team had to be selective in the stakeholders to be interviewed and could only undertake one short field visit, with only a small number of beneficiaries (PWDs and DPOs) being consulted. In addition, the field visit was to the European regional office in Serbia, which has been particularly successful, thus raising issues about its representativeness.
- The relatively limited availability of monitoring data and recording of lessons learned in the project, both issues that are discussed in more detail in the findings and conclusions.

1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this report is divided into two parts:

- Findings presented against each of the evaluation criteria
- Conclusions and recommendations.

2 Findings

2.1 RELEVANCE

The need for a different approach to monitoring disability rights was identified in an international seminar in Sweden in 2000 that took place ahead of the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in 2006⁴. The Disability Rights Promotion International Project⁵ was established in 2003 in response to the recommendations of this seminar, with a five year plan supported by Sida under the leadership of York University, Toronto, Canada. The initial plan consisted of two preparatory phases: Phase 1 consisted of research on opportunities, methodologies and training resources for disability rights reporting; while Phase 2 focused on the development and field testing of methodologies and training resources that could be used by PWDs and DPOs, focused on three areas, systems, individual experiences and the media⁶.

The time taken in these preparatory phases meant that the project was able to both clearly identify the problem - the lack of involvement of persons with disabilities (PWDs) in monitoring and the limited capacity of disabled persons organisations (DPOs) to carry out such monitoring – and to develop and test a set of principles to guide the project and a methodology for monitoring in order to address this problem. The methodology developed is holistic, covering three areas: systems, government legislation and programmes to protect, promote and fulfil the rights of PWDs; individual experiences, what PWDs have to say about their lives; and, the media, what the media says about PWDs. The methodology was implemented in a selection of pilot countries⁷ in the four project regions in Phase 3 and has been further adapted and implemented in the current phase of consolidation, Phase 4⁸.

The approach to implementing this methodology has been built and adapted from the

⁴ Let the World Know, Sweden, 2000: <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/stockholmnov2000.htm>

⁵ See History of DRPI: <http://drpi.research.yorku.ca/welcome-drpi/>

⁶ The experience of these preparatory phases of the project are set out in the report, Moving Forward: Progress in Global Disability Rights Monitoring, 2007.

⁷ The initial countries where Country Monitoring Projects were carried out included: Kenya and Cameroon in Africa; India and the Philippines in Asia-Pacific; Bolivia in Latin America.

⁸ See Table 2 below for a list of country projects and funders.

bottom up, with the principles of the full participation with PWDs and collaboration with and support to DPOs as the foundation. Both the approach and the methodology have been continuously developed and adapted in response to issues raised by PWDs, such as the participation of persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities, and to issues raised through monitoring and by DPOs, such as the need to focus on themes like employment. One of the results of this approach is that those involved in the training and the monitoring process have gained a greater sense of their rights and of the shared experiences of other PWDs⁹. Thus, the project has given many PWDs both a sense of their entitlement to their rights, as well as the motivation and tools to demand them. At the same time, the approach has given DPOs the opportunity to work with and learn from each other, something that is particularly important given the divisions that often exist between these organisations.

There are examples from the project work in Serbia that a growing number of DPOs is familiar with the methodology and that those DPOs who have been involved in the monitoring process give a high value to the project approach, recognising both the individual and the organisational impact that it has. It was particularly clear from interviews with representatives of DPOs involved in the training and monitoring process that it has both a personal impact, raising awareness of disability rights and the role of PWDs in claiming them, and an organisational impact, reinforcing the need for organisations to listen to those they were set up to serve.

Over Phase 3 of the project there is growing body of evidence that the methodology can add significant value to the work of DPOs and of their wider associations and funders. A number of the DPOs involved in the country monitoring processes have continued to work with the project to develop the methodology to focus on new themes, such as accessible elections in Serbia, have wanted to continue to work with DRPI to focus on more specific and concrete areas, such as employment (Bangladesh, India and Nepal) and have sought to ensure that those with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities are included in and covered by the monitoring process (Colombia). There are also a number of examples where DPOs involved in the regional training have sought to find ways to bring the country monitoring process to their countries, such as in the case of the Handicap International project in the Maghreb, where a DPO from Morocco had experience of the project approach from a regional training.

There are a number of examples where other organisations have become more familiar with the methodology and have, as a result, begun to look for ways to use and

⁹ As will be explored in the section on impact, this result has, in the main, been identified through anecdotal evidence.

adapt it to their own work. For example, Handicap International is currently working with DRPI on monitoring projects in Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia and has had discussions with project staff about other opportunities. An indicator of the relevance and success of the project is that DRPI has received funding of SEK 34.4 million from 22 projects other organisations for the implementation of the methodology in different countries and focused on different themes. Table 2 shows the projects and funder for each of the regions, with examples from both Asia Pacific, Europe and the Middle East and North Africa of the range of funders.

Table 2 – Monitoring Projects and Funders by Region

Region	Monitoring Projects, Date and Funder
Asia Pacific	India (CMP) – 2007 – Sida Philippines – 2008 - Sida New Zealand, 3 projects – 2010 – New Zealand Government, Ministry of Social Development India - 2011 – DRF, Lights for the World, Liliane Fonds Nepal (CMP) – 2012 - Sida Bangladesh, India and Nepal (AWARE Project) – 2014 - Canada Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Vietnam – 2014 – Canada SSHRC Australia – Australia Research Council
Europe	Sweden – 2007 – Sida Portugal – 2011 – Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian Bosnia – Herzegovina – 2012 – Austrian Development Agency, Light for the World Montenegro – 2012 - Sida Moldova – 2012 – EU EIDHR Macedonia – 2013 – EU EIDHR Macedonia – 2015 – Open the Windows Serbia (CMP) - 2013 – Sida Serbia (CMP focused on political participation of persons with disabilities) – 2014 – British Council in Serbia Serbia (CMP focused on monitoring the rights of (People Living with HIV & AIDS) – 2014 – EU Delegation Civil Society Facility Serbia Portugal – 2013— Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia
Latin America	Bolivia – 2011 - Sida Honduras – 2012 - Sida El Salvador – 2013 – Sida & CONAIPD Colombia – 2013 – Sida
Africa	Cameroon - 2006 – Sida Kenya – 2006 - Sida South Africa (CMP) – 2012 – Sida

Middle East and North Africa	Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia – 2014-2015 - Handicap International Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine and Yemen – 2012 – Stars of Hope
North America	Canada (CMP) 4 projects in total – 2007 – Canada, SSHRC Canada, Expanding the Circle – 2014 – Canada, SSHRC

The training and implementation of the methodology in the field has taken a cross-disability approach and has worked to ensure that issues such as age and gender are fully integrated. Intersectional issues have been included in the documentation that guides the training (although there is scope for a more concrete focus). In the implementation of the methodology, guidance is given to participants in the monitoring process on ensuring that different groups and different disabilities are represented and time is taken, both in training and in monitoring to learn about and develop the process to ensure that a range of voices is heard.

2.2 EFFECTIVENESS

The DRPI project approach has been built on a clear set of principles¹⁰, which has contributed to the effectiveness of implementation. These principles are:

- The participation and central role of PWDs in all steps of the process, which has contributed to raising awareness of disability rights amongst individuals and organisations;
- A rights-based approach, making dignity, autonomy, non-discrimination and equality, participation, inclusion and accessibility, and respect for diversity the basis of monitoring, rather than the provision of services and support, and looking at PWDs from a holistic perspective, focusing on the interdependence of all dimensions of their lives.
- Collaboration with multiple actors to ensure a cross-disability focus and linkages between DPOs and human rights organisations, researchers and others.
- Sustainability both in developing the capacity of DPOs, through the initial regional training and then through their continued involvement in country level training and in supporting other DPOs in implementation, to be able to use the methodology, collect and analyse data for monitoring , advocacy

¹⁰ These principles are set out, to a certain extent, in the introduction to the project online: <http://drpi.research.yorku.ca/welcome-drpi/>. They were, however, most clearly articulated in the interviews with those involved in the implementation of the project.

fund-raising, awareness-raising in collaboration with others.

A slow and considered approach has been taken in the project implementation, but an approach that has achieved significant results and that has contributed to effects beyond what was originally envisaged for the project. The remainder of this section will consider progress against the outcomes identified in the project documentation and will begin to explore the factors affecting the achievement or non-achievement of these objectives.

Against the three outcome statements identified in the inception report, there is considerable evidence that both an effective approach to disability rights monitoring has been established and that PWDs and DPOs in the lead role in monitoring disability rights. There is, however, less evidence that a solid foundation for sustainable, ongoing disability rights monitoring activities has been established in each region, which is due in the main to variations in the capacity of DPOs and coalitions of DPOs across the regions. While the most progress has been made in establishing this foundation in Europe (see Box 1), it is likely that this will take longer in Latin and Central America and a lot longer in Africa and Asia-Pacific. The evidence of progress against these indicators and an analysis of some of the factors limiting progress is presented in Table 3.

Box 1 – Effective Relations between Regional Officer (RO) and Host Organisation in Europe

The host organisation in Europe, COD, was first established to take on project activities run by Handicap International, when the organisation withdrew from the region. While COD is not a DPO, the organisation work closely with DPOs and is involved in service provision for PWDs. COD has an extensive network of other service providers and DPOs across the region. COD made contact with DRPI and offered to play the role of regional host organisation for the project. The RO for the region was appointed just ahead of the first regional training held in Serbia and has since played an active role in the development of the project activities across the region.

Both COD and DRPI have played an important role in the development of the activities and have benefitted from their implementation:

- COD have provided linkages to networks and coalitions of DPOs that they work with and have enthusiastically engaged with the methodology, adding value in the adaptation of the methodology to areas such as PLWHA
- DRPI provided initial expertise in both methodology development and regional training; while the RO has benefitted administratively and technically from the support provided by COD colleagues.

Table 3 – Progress against Project Outcomes

Project Outcomes	Evidence of Progress and Limitations
Creation of a disability rights monitoring system using consistent tools and methods	Progress – The methodology developed by the project is now well established and has been rolled out in three phases of implementation: 5 pilot country moni-

<p>to allow for comparative analysis among countries and the identification of best practice in disability rights legislation, policies and programmes around the world.</p>	<p>toring projects undertaken between 2007-2009; regional training in 2012 followed by a further round of 16 country monitoring projects from 2011-2014, many funded from other sources¹¹; and, adaptation and expansion of the methodology into thematic areas and for other groups, including employment (AWARE project in South Asia), political participation and PLWHA (Serbia), and gender (Middle East and North Africa). In addition, the monitoring using the methodology has been used in Australia, Canada and Portugal and New Zealand, with funds from those countries.</p> <p>Limitations – There is limited evidence yet of comparative analysis and identification of best practice in disability rights legislation, policies and programmes around the world. The work on the online database is still ongoing and the comparative analysis is still underway, with work on developing a set of standard indicators for monitoring disability rights and with the publication of a book drawing on the experiences of the project¹².</p>
<p>Establishment of a solid foundation for sustainable, ongoing disability rights monitoring activities in each region, beyond the duration of Phase Three.</p>	<p>Progress – There is evidence from some of the regions that DPOs that were involved in country monitoring projects have continued to be involved in new projects, such as in South Asia in the AWARE project and in Serbia in the monitoring that has been focused on the political participation and PLHIV. DRPI has, however, not systematically collected data on the extent to which DPOs involved in the regional training or in the training and implementation of the country monitoring projects have the capacity to be able to implement the methodology or to monitor disability rights independently. Nevertheless, there is some evidence of DPOs continuing to work together in the preparation of alternative reports for the Phil-</p>

¹¹ See evidence in Table 2.

¹² The book title is, Building power out of evidence: Disability, rights monitoring, and social change, and will be published by the Canadian Scholar's Press.

	<p>ippines, Colombia, Honduras and Serbia, using the data collected using the methodology.</p> <p>Limitations – There are clear variations in the progress made across the regions:</p> <p><i>Africa</i> – very limited progress has been made, with two country monitoring projects completed in Cameroon and Kenya and with delays in completing a further project in South Africa. This is due in part to a change in RO and regional host organisation, but is also due to the very limited capacity of DPOs in the region.</p> <p><i>Asia Pacific</i> – more progress has been made, with the completion of four country monitoring projects and the adaptation of the methodology in two projects in South Asia and Vietnam. The limitations of progress are due to a change in the RO and regional host organisation, as well as to limitations in the capacity for DPOs to work together effectively in coalitions.</p> <p><i>Latin America</i> - more progress has been made, with the completion of three country monitoring projects, the adaptation of the methodology to focus on psychosocial and intellectual disabilities and the continued active involvement of DPOs in disseminating experience of the project. There are active plans to implement the methodology in other countries, including Argentina, Chile and Peru, if funding can be found.</p> <p><i>Europe</i> - the greatest progress has been made in this region, with the completion of four country monitoring reports and the adaptation of the methodology to focus on political participation, with further adaptations underway. At the same time, DPOs continue to need considerable support from DRPI in finding funds for monitoring activities and in using data for reporting and advocacy. There are also limitations in the capacity for DPOs to work together effectively in coalitions. DRPI has worked to ensure a cross-disability approach in the country monitoring processes and in many cases this is the first time that DPOs have worked together.</p>
Establishment of the leading role to be played by persons with disabilities and disabil-	<p>Progress – This principle has consistently informed the implementation of the project and is evident in the training materials, reports and from interviews carried</p>

<p>ity organisations in monitoring disability rights (consistent with the provisions of the UN Disability Convention) and enhanced capacity of these individuals and organisations to fulfil this role.</p>	<p>out with a range of stakeholders. There is evidence also from the numbers of DPOs from 45 countries who have been involved in the regional trainings, of the numbers of DPOs involved in each of the country monitoring projects and from the fact that all country monitoring projects have included a range of DPOs. Looking at the 15 country monitoring reports publicly available on DRPI's website, 7 involved national federations, associations or coalitions, 6 involved between 2-13 DPOs, and the remaining 2 involved only one DPO. There is more anecdotal evidence of the empowering impact that this involvement has had on representatives from DPOs involved¹³.</p> <p>In project implementation a central principle of the project is collaboration with DPOs in training and in country monitoring, with DPOs playing an active role in the capacity-building process and taking the lead in the country monitoring process. While DRPI project staff play a supporting role in the country monitoring processes, it is DPOs who take the lead, preparing project proposals for funding of the process, organising the monitoring teams and logistics for data collection, and analysing the data and preparing the reports for publication.</p> <p>Limitations – This is an area where limited evidence of results has been collected and where there is the scope for the project to be more systematic in following up on the capacity of individuals and organisations that have been trained and supported¹⁴.</p>
---	---

DRPI's own project reporting and interviews with project staff show that there is a well-established and effective process for assessing progress and lesson learning with the project. This includes monthly staff meetings and more recent strategic meetings

¹³ The issue will be explored further in Section 2.3 Impact.

¹⁴ This is an issue that is explored in more detail in Section 2.4 Sustainability.

to share information about progress and practices. There is evidence of the effectiveness of this approach in the way that adaptations that have been made to the methodology in one region have been rapidly adopted in other regions. For instance, the focus on persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities originated in Colombia but was soon adopted in Europe and South Asia.

There is less evidence that there is a systematic approach to the collection and analysis of monitoring data or lessons learned from the project. It is clear that the main efforts have been focused on implementing and adapting the methodology in a wide range of contexts. What is currently missing, however, is a record and analysis of this implementation process. This is discussed further in the following section and in chapter 3.

2.3 IMPACT

It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to fully assess impact defined as effects at the scale of societies, communities, or systems. Nevertheless, there is evidence of the project contributing to important effects at the individual, organisational and institutional levels. The effects of the project can be seen at three important levels:

- On individual PWDs, through raising their own awareness of their rights and through the country monitoring reports enabling their voices to be heard;
- On DPOs, giving them the tools to understand the needs of those they represent and the means to address those needs at a strategic level, through the production of evidence; and,
- On coalitions of PWDs and DPOs, providing opportunities for them to listen to and understand each other's needs and perspectives and giving them the tools, through reporting, to bring them together to respond.

The evidence to support these effects varies considerably, from the anecdotal to the more robust. This section explores some of this evidence and its limitations and goes on to look at the factors that might affect impact.

A core principle of the methodology is that PWDs play a central role in all steps of the training and monitoring process. Throughout the implementation of the project all of the country monitoring processes have been led by DPOs and the monitoring has all been carried out by PWDs. The training for the country monitoring has been developed to ensure that people of all levels of experience and education can participate fully in the process and adaptations have been made to enable the inclusion of persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities.

The focus on inclusion of all PWDs and on ensuring a cross-disability perspective forms a strong basis for ensuring a practical approach to other intersectional issues, such as age and gender. In the implementation of the monitoring process, efforts are made to ensure that interviewing teams are balanced and are appropriate for the peo-

ple that they are to interview. The methodology has been, and continues to be adapted, to take account both of the issues raised by persons with disabilities and of issues raised by other groups.

There is considerable, but mainly anecdotal evidence of the individual effects of the training and country monitoring process. In interviews DRPI staff frequently referred to the transformative effect of the training on individuals: people attending the training have expressed that, this was the first time they were able to tell their stories, about their own isolation and that the training was the first time they realised there were others like them, and that, this training changed their lives.

The Country Monitoring Reports provide a perspective on the range of issues facing PWDs in different regions and contexts. The 15 reports¹⁵ currently available on the DRPI website provide a broad impression of these issues and demonstrate a variety of approaches to reporting. A number of issues stand out in some of these reports: the many barriers and obstacles that PWDs encounter in all aspects of their lives leading to isolation and a sense of exclusion¹⁶; and, the importance that PWDs attach to social participation, which is most severely affected by the discrimination and lack of equal treatment that many experience, resulting in a further isolation¹⁷.

There is a greater range of evidence of the contribution to structural effects, including building the capacity of DPOs and renewing their commitment to listening and responding to PWDs, providing opportunities for DPOs to work together and learn from their experience, and establishing and developing cross-disability coalitions, in many cases for the first time, as well as beginning to work with other civil society organisations working on human rights, for example in Serbia.

The key principles of the project lie at the heart of these individual, organisational and structural effects that have been achieved to date, with the central role of PWDs

¹⁵ These are: for Africa, Cameroon and Kenya; for Asia Pacific, India, Nepal, New Zealand and the Philippines; for Europe, BiH, Moldova, Montenegro and Serbia; for Latin America, Bolivia, Colombia and Honduras; for the Middle East and North Africa, Algeria; and, for North America, a range of reports for Canada.

¹⁶ See for example the Holistic Report for the Republic of Serbia: <http://drpi.research.yorku.ca/europe/europe-publications-resources/holistic-report-2013-monitor-your-rights/> and the Accessible Elections report for Serbia: <http://drpi.research.yorku.ca/europe/europe-publications-resources/accessible-elections-participation-of-persons-with-disabilities-in-political-and-public-life/>

¹⁷ See for example the Monitoring of Human Rights of PWDs for Colombia: <http://drpi.research.yorku.ca/latin-america/latin-america-publications-resources/2014-colombia-report/#tabs>

in all steps of the process and the importance of working with and developing the capacity of DPOs to carry out training and to support other DPOs in the implementation of the methodology. The project has focused on these principles, through the regional trainings carried out in 2011 and 2012 and the subsequent country monitoring processes and on to the adaptations and further development of the methodology that have taken place in response to a range of opportunities around the world. The main evidence available is of the impacts at the national level and to a lesser extent at the regional level. Given the recognised limitations in the capacity of DPOs, the project has contributed to the start of a shift in influence between the global south and global north, with such a strong emphasis on working with and through DPOs, although this is a shift that is yet to be fully realised.

There is some evidence that DPOs have continued to work together in the preparation of alternative reports, for example in the Philippines, Colombia, Honduras and Serbia, using the data collected using the methodology. There are other examples, such as Portugal, where the methodology has been used as the basis of the alternative report, supported by a broad coalition of DPOs. There is also evidence that DPOs, supported by DRPI, are planning country monitoring reports in preparation for submission to the UN CRPD, based on the committee's timetable for country reporting, such as Argentina which is to be reviewed in 2018. There are also examples from South Asia where coalitions of DPOs in Bangladesh and Nepal have been advocating for the formulation of new legislation on disability rights. At this stage there is, however, no evidence of direct contributions made to changes in legislation or policy as a result of advocacy based on monitoring using the methodology.

There has been progress made in beginning to roll out the project approach and methodology, with some examples of good practice, such as the RO and host organisation in Belgrade (see Box 1 above) and the establishment of an observatory in the University of Lisbon (see Box 2). However, there is a considerable way to go to develop and expand the project approach in Latin America and development settings in Africa and Asia-Pacific.

Box 2 – Observatory on Disability and Human Rights, University of Lisbon

An Observatory on Disability and Human Rights was established at the University of Lisbon¹⁸ as a means to focus attention on these issues within the institution. While the Observatory is located in the university it was established as a collaboration between DPOs and the university and has twenty organisations on the consulting body.

¹⁸ The Observatory has a website - <http://oddh.iscsp.utl.pt/index.php/en/>

The DRPI methodology was used initially to collect data in 2010, as a pilot study, and since as the basis for further data collection. The Observatory has provided the basis for the preparation of an alternative report for the UN CRPD, bringing together many organisations that had not previously worked together. The university is seen as a neutral place where these organisations can take a cross-disability approach. Although the process has taken time, a total of almost two years, the result has been that over thirty organisations have put their names to the alternative report so far. The report will be presented to the UN CPRD in June 2015.

The evidence described above comes in the main from Europe and Latin America, while there is evidence of much more limited progress in Africa and fewer effects in Asia-Pacific. The project has developed and evolved organically over Phases 3 and 4, responding to opportunities and challenges as they have emerged and, as a result, the individual, organisational and structural effects achieved have varied considerably. To date, there has been a limited focus on systematic lesson learning in the project, while recognising there have been effective approaches to communications and sharing lessons amongst the staff. Given the variations in progress and effects between regions, an attempt is made in the table below to identify the factors that contribute/impede progress and results – (see Table 4).

Table 4 – Factors affecting progress and impact

Region	Factors (<i>negative in italics</i>)
Europe	<p>Project Well-established RO and effective collaboration with regional host organisation Manageable size of region and availability of funds for monitoring projects, particularly from the EU</p> <p>Partners Established DPOs and experience of working in coalitions Capacity of organisations supported in the past – notably work by Handicap International to build capacity of DPOs</p> <p>Working Context High level of awareness of human rights in civil society EU accession process provides a broader human rights framework – both governments and civil society have a clearer framework to work within and can access support to address issues</p>
Latin America	<p>Project Well-established RO and some collaboration with regional host organisation <i>Large size of region (divided into Latin and Central Ameri-</i></p>

	<p><i>ca) and limited availability of funds for monitoring projects – only a limited number of donors still work in the region and government funds for monitoring are limited</i></p> <p>Partners Established DPOs and some experience of working in coalitions Capacity of organisations supported in the past to some extent – considerable support from donors in the past to civil society capacity building</p> <p>Working Context High level of awareness of human rights in civil society Active focus on human rights by civil society organisations</p>
Asia Pacific	<p>Project New RO and new regional host organisation <i>Very large size of region and some availability of other funds for monitoring projects – international funding is available to some extent, but not widely</i></p> <p>Partners Some established DPOs and variations in the experience of working in coalitions Some capacity of organisations supported in the past</p> <p>Working Context <i>More limited focus on human rights in civil society – focus has been on advocacy for bringing in legislation rather than on broader human rights agenda</i></p>
Africa	<p>Project New RO and new regional host organisation <i>Very large size of region and very limited availability of other funds for monitoring projects – funding tends to be focused on needs rather than rights</i></p> <p>Partners <i>Few established DPOs and little experience of working in coalitions</i> <i>Little support to capacity development – broad support to civil society capacity building available, meaning DPOs have to compete</i></p>

	<p>Context</p> <p><i>Limited awareness of human rights in civil society – active civil society only in some contexts, such as Nigeria</i></p> <p><i>Government perspectives on human rights limited – examples of governments seeking support to respond to CRPD</i></p>
--	---

The greatest impact has been achieved in contexts where the RO works in close collaboration with the host regional DPO, where there are existing coalitions of DPOs and relatively strong capacity within DPOs and where there is a supportive context, with a higher level of awareness of human rights in civil society and government and where governments are more responsive to advocacy and international pressure. The approach taken in the project has worked well in Europe (as well as in North America, Australia and New Zealand) and clearly has potential in Latin America. It seems, even from this preliminary analysis, that much more support is needed to enable the approach to work well in developing country settings, where capacity amongst DPOs is considerably weaker and where there is a limited focus on a broader human rights framework that the project can work in. This is an issue that is taken up in the final section of the report in the recommendations.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

This chapter focuses on two aspects of sustainability:

- Institutional sustainability, the capacity development of partners and the extent to which there is ownership of the approach, and
- Financial sustainability, the likelihood of there being funds from other sources to take the approach forward.

While considerable progress has been made in developing and implementing the methodology, there is still a considerable way to go before the methodology is likely to be taken up in a sustainable way. Progress has been made in adapting and applying the methodology to new contexts and new issues, with the latter focus being beyond what was originally envisaged. At the same time, less attention has been paid to monitoring and lesson learning about the process of implementation, and particularly what resources and from where are needed to support this process. Such a focus of attention is needed before a viable exit strategy can be developed. Now is the moment to take a systematic look at the support needed to continue with this process, in order to map out a path towards sustainability.

Whilst there is good evidence that the ROs are working in a more independent way, there is little evidence, as yet, that the host organisations have begun to take up and use the methodology independently. Only in Europe has the regional host organisation, COD, become actively involved in developing and implementing the methodology. There is evidence that the capacity of some national DPOs to use the methodol-

ogy has been developed, although most still need continued support both in using the methodology and using the data and analysis for advocacy purposes. There is still much that needs to be done before DPOs have the capacity to be able to independently implement the methodology and effectively use the results of the monitoring, particularly in Asia and Africa where the capacity of these organisations is still very limited. There is an opportunity now for DRPI to invest resources in better understanding what has worked and why and what remains to be done in different contexts. Such a process of detailed lesson learning will help project staff in deciding what direction the project should take and what resources will be needed to implement.

At this stage in the project there is some evidence of a growing sense of ownership in some contexts and there is some evidence of capacity having been developed. Examples are set out above of coalitions of DPOs working continuing to work together in the preparation of alternative reports. However, the project is not currently institutionally sustainable. At this point in the implementation of the project, it is unlikely that the full range of activities would continue after core donor funding ends. In the most successful examples, such as the Balkans, DPOs are generally still reliant on the support of the RO for funding applications, for the development of the methodology, for some aspects of implementation and particularly for the effective utilisation of the data and reports. In other regions, where there has been more limited progress, the project is still at the early stages of implementation. ROs and the project headquarters at York University have generally been successful in applying for project funds to develop and adapt the methodology, but this approach is resource intensive and is not always successful.

There is a range of examples where the project methodology has been adapted for monitoring projects that have been funded by other organisations, including: the Handicap International project in the Maghreb; the Stars of Hope project on women and disability in the Middle East; the AWARE project on disability and employment in South Asia; and the accessible elections project in Serbia supported by USAID. There are also examples where country monitoring processes have been implemented using project funds from the EU and bilateral donors in all of the regions. These are, however, examples rather than evidence of a strategic approach to identifying where resources are available and what organisations might most effectively access these resources.

As with institutional sustainability, while there is evidence that there are other funds available to implement the methodology in different contexts, this evidence demonstrates that the success of the DRPI project rather than being evidence of other organisations being ready to take on the methodology. There is, therefore, no strong evidence that the project approach is financially sustainable as yet.

3 Conclusions and Recommendations

There have been a number of significant achievements by the DRPI project since it was established in 2003, including:

- The development and adaptation of a unique, holistic methodology for monitoring disability rights that is built on the full participation of PWDs and that is carried out by DPOs;
- The effective implementation of an approach that works with DPOs to gradually develop their capacity to be able to collect, analyse and use data for reporting and advocacy
- Effects at three levels, i) individual PWDs, raising awareness of their human rights; ii) DPOs, giving them the tools to better understand the needs of those they work for; and, iii) coalitions of PWDs and DPOs, giving the means to come together to better understand different perspectives and to work together to claim their rights; and,
- An approach that is based on a set of core principles, has been built from the bottom up, that takes time and is well considered, and which works well in the right context.

Underpinning these achievements has been core support from Sida through four phases of the evolution of the project, providing a consistent foundation for the development of the methodology and sufficient flexibility to enable the expansion and adaptation of the approach. As a result the DRPI project has been able to develop and implement the methodology in a wide range of contexts, whilst remaining committed to the central principles of participation of PWDs and collaboration with DPOs. This funding has also provided a solid foundation for the expansion, adaptation and development of the methodology, working with a range of other funding partners. The methodology has been adapted to ensure the participation of persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities and to focus on a range of issues, such as employment, education and gender – with scope for further adaptation already being explored.

The project has expanded and developed organically, in response to opportunities and strengths in specific contexts. Over a period of 12 years, the project has grown:

- From an idea that was researched, developed and piloted in four project regions, as well as in other contexts, such as Europe and North America;
- Through a period of expansion and development in response to a range of funding opportunities, building on the strengths of ROs and DPOs as partners in the process;
- To a point at which consolidation has begun in some supportive contexts, where the methodology and approach is starting to be used in a variety of fora – including in advocacy for changes in legislation and alternative reporting at regional and international levels.

DRPI has deliberately chosen a project approach, focusing the investment of resources in developing the capacities of individuals, rather than in developing an organisation. While this approach has resulted in the achievements set out above, there is still some way to go before the project could achieve either organisational or financial sustainability, particularly in more challenging, developing contexts.

Recommendation to Sida and DRPI – Mapping out a way forward

It is recommended that Sida and DRPI work together to identify a way forward for the project. The project is currently at a crossroads, with the methodology having been clearly demonstrated and the approach showing signs of being effective in some contexts. There is a need now to both better understand where and how the approach is most effective and to identify the best means for taking it forward in different contexts.

A range of possible options for the way ahead are already being explored by DRPI. Given the preliminary analysis of where and how the methodology and the approach works in some contexts and works less well in others, there is scope to explore a range of options for different contexts. These options include:

- The establishment of an international centre as the ‘home’ of the methodology, including the continued development of online training and an online database. It seems likely that such an international centre would work best in supporting the further dissemination, adaptation and use of the methodology in Europe, North America, New Zealand and Australia;
- Continued support from DRPI as a project to develop the methodology and implement the approach in contexts where there is strong potential, such as Latin America and Asia-Pacific. This could either be done by continuing with the DRPI as a project, increasing the number of ROs in order to have greater outreach, or through looking for a suitable institutional home, such as Handicap International, to take on the role of further disseminating the methodology and approach.
- Discussions with international organisations, such as the International Disability Alliance and with Handicap International about capacity development for DPOs and further adaptation and simplification of the methodology and approach for developing contexts, such as in Africa. The focus in such discussions should be on transition from the DRPI project, leading to an eventual handover of an appropriate version (or versions) of the methodology and approach to these (or other) international organisations.

Sida and DRPI will need to find an effective way to explore together what option or combination of options works best to address the issues in different contexts. Consideration will also need to be given to Sida’s focus on the poorest developing countries and how best further support to the project could contribute to that focus.

Recommendation to Sida – Continued support

It is recommended that a further phase of the project be funded in order to consolidate the achievements made to date and enable time and space to transfer the methodology

and approach developed to an appropriate home or homes. Based on the discussions of the options for taking the project forward and for handing over the methodology and approach outlined above, Sida should consider which option (or options) best fit with the organisational goals and the focus on the 33 countries of enhanced cooperation. It is also recommended that any further support should include resources for more systematic lesson-learning and monitoring, as set out below.

Due to the rapid expansion of the project, there are a number of areas where there is only limited evidence available and where there is a need to better explore and understand both successes and limitations. Three areas are highlighted in this evaluation:

- There are both strengths and weaknesses of the project approach. It works well where the RO and the regional host organisation work effectively together and relies to a large extent on the capacities of individuals. This is an area that will need to be explored further in the next phase of the project.
- There are clearly inconsistencies in the progress made across the four project regions, with Europe having made the most progress, Latin America and Asia Pacific having made more limited progress, and Africa having made the least progress. Some possible reasons for these differences are suggested, but there is the need for more detailed exploration and analysis of the factors affecting the success or otherwise of the approach.
- The transformative impacts on individual awareness of rights and on organisational capacities to understand and advocate for the needs of PWDs are clear from anecdotal evidence and from some of the interview evidence in this evaluation. However, given the importance of the principles that lie at the heart of the approach and methodology, there is a need to more systematically collect and analyse evidence to support these powerful anecdotes, as a means to advocate more strongly for the approach use.

Recommendation to DRPI – Systematic lesson-learning and monitoring

It is recommended that DRPI develop a systematic approach to lesson-learning, monitoring and evaluation in this proposed consolidation phase of the project. This should include: lesson-learning focused on the process of implementation of the methodology; monitoring and evaluating the individual, organisational and macro-level effects; and, a comparative analysis of the main issues identified through monitoring, as the basis for the development of a set of indicators for monitoring disability rights.

There is an opportunity at this stage in the project implementation for DRPI to devote resources to a more systematic approach to lesson learning, focused on analysing the key factors in the success or otherwise of project implementation. In particular there is a need to focus on contexts where implementation has been particularly effective, such as in the Balkans, as well as on understanding contexts where progress has been slower, such as in Africa, in order to identify a range of approaches and the key areas where future capacity building needs to focus.

DRPI should be also be more systematic in collecting evidence: through follow up surveys with DPOs on a regular basis, focused on use of the methodology and the

data, involvement in lobbying and advocacy, work with other DPOs; follow up with PWDs who have had training, focused on their experience in the monitoring process, continued involvement with DPOs and/or as a volunteer, and other wider individual effects, such as demanding specific rights; and, evidence and examples of macro-level effects of the methodology, focused on the use of data and reporting at local, national, regional and international levels.

Work is already underway to develop a set of international indicators for monitoring disability rights, with interest in such indicators at a national and international level. There is scope to collate and compare the data and reporting that the project has already contributed to, as the basis for developing these indicators.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Project Evaluation - Disability Rights Promotion International (DRPI)

Framework Agreement for Sida Evaluations (case number: 2010-001697)

DRPI is a collaborative project, which started in 2003, to establish a comprehensive, sustainable international system to monitor human rights of persons with disabilities.

The intervention background

A Sida commissioned paper from 2010 “Disability as a human rights issue – background paper to conducting a dialogue¹⁹” recommends to make use of the Sida funded DRPI project which has developed a specific model for monitoring rights of persons with disability, including policy monitoring, media monitoring and research on violations.” Sida’s current agreement with DRPI ends in November 2016. Sida has supported DRPI financially since 2003. Although the final phase of the project is currently being implemented, the management of the project has informed they will apply for support for a new phase of the project in order to better assure the project’s sustainability.

Previous Sida evaluations of the DRPI work include only one, conducted in 2011. It covered only activities occurring in Year 1 and Year 2 of the three year phase. The evaluation was conducted by "Research & Evaluation Consulting".

The overall goal of the DRPI project is to establish a comprehensive and sustainable global system to monitor the human rights of persons with disabilities. This entails collecting, tracking and monitoring if and how persons with disabilities are enjoying their human rights. What is innovative and unique about the DRPI project is that the monitoring system has a holistic and human rights based approach using qualitative indicators. In many past cases, human rights monitoring has involved primarily an examination of relevant laws, policies and programs or carrying out service audits to determine whether they meet national and international human rights standards. By expanding the focus of monitoring in the disability rights context to include monitoring personal experiences and societal attitudes along with systemic monitoring, DRPI’s approach is described as cutting edge in the field of human rights and disability monitoring. DRPI maintains that monitoring in all three focus areas is not only innovative but necessary in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the extent to which persons with disabilities either enjoy, or are denied, their human rights. In-

¹⁹ Can be found on sida.se under publications

dividually, each element tells only one piece of the story. Together, the information provides a more complete picture. The evaluation of the DRPI project is intended to inform future support within the area of disability rights and human rights monitoring and to provide important input into the DRPI project.

The 2006 UN Disability Convention is the result of a long process and brings in an internationally changed view on persons with disabilities. It is a clear shift from persons with disabilities being viewed as objects of charity instead of holders of rights. DRPI is expected to have played a crucial role in the implementation of the Convention.

The intervention has consisted of different phases. The project started in 2003 and has been divided into three phases with a fourth concluding phase now ongoing. The first phase focused on research to map the environment for disability rights monitoring. The second phase focused on the design and testing of a monitoring tool for disability rights. The third phase focused on building up the regional and national capacities and platforms to systematically use the tool on a global scale. The current and concluding phase is focusing on strengthening the sustainability of the project, and designing , testing and implementing an on-line interactive training and data collection component.

The evaluation purpose and objectives

The evaluation is intended to cover the DRPI project period (2003 until present) and will serve to inform future support within the area of disability rights and serve to support and strengthen the DRPI project.

The evaluation is expected to provide the bigger picture of the impact, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the DRPI project with a focus on DRPI methodology for monitoring the rights of persons with disability (not limited to the impact of Sida's contribution).

The evaluation should include relevant lessons learned from implementing the DRPI methodology as a tool to achieve the protection and implementation of rights of persons with disabilities.

Departing from the OECD criteria for evaluation, the following standard questions should guide the evaluation. The evaluation is expected to provide suggestions or recommendations to the DRPI project and Sida with a focus on:

1) Relevance:

With emphasis on the DRPI specific methodology for enhancing rights of persons with disabilities.

- Is the project the appropriate solution to the identified problem?
- What is the value of the project in relation to priority needs of key stakeholders?
- Has intersectionality (gender, age etc.) been integrated well in the project?
- What added-value has the project had in the field of DPOs and what synergies are found with DPOs?
- Are the project outcomes beneficial to key stakeholders?
- How has the project methodology been perceived (by persons with disabilities, UN CRPD, DPOs)

2) Sustainability:

- Are project activities likely to continue after donor funding ends?
- what aspects of the project should be strengthened and improved?
- Are the results sustainable?
- Can project activities become self-sustaining financially?
- what other sources of funding have the team been able to mobilize?

3) Effectiveness:

- To what extent were the projects objects achieved/likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Are selected partnerships contributing to programme results?

4) Impact – considering that real impact can be hard to evaluate the evaluation report should at least provide a reasoning around impact based on:

With emphasis on changes produced by the DRPI project direct or indirectly, intended or unintended towards enhancing the monitoring of disability rights.

- What individual and structural effects has the project brought to individuals, communities and institutions - either in the short, medium or long-term?
- Is the impact spread globally, and how?
- Has the project had an impact on the participation of persons with disabilities in monitoring and how?
- Has the way the project has developed been responsive to persons with disabilities and other marginalized people?
- Has the project shifted the balance of the global north and the global south in development work?

Stakeholder involvement**Key stakeholders**

DRPI	Co-directors, project staff, Regional officers etc.
Donor/s	Sida
Organizational partners - DPOs	A number of DPOs including IDA (partner to Sida)
UN	CRPD in particular
Beneficiaries	Persons with disabilities
Partners - academic	York University researchers
Partners	National Human Rights Institutions, others

Evaluation methods, work plan and schedule

It is the responsibility of the evaluator(s) to develop a detailed statement on evaluation methods and work plan; however it is expected that the following methods will be part of the overall evaluation methodology;

1. Desk/document review of relevant documents and DRPI project documents, including reports, monitoring data and prior evaluation undertaken.
2. Interviews with key stakeholders, depending on the location of the key stakeholder, these interviews will be both telephonic (for key informants who are in countries that will not be visited by the evaluator) and face-to-face (an appropriate open questionnaire will be developed and used for this purpose);
3. One field visit to a regional office (specific country to be determined in coordination with DRPI)
4. Possibly, participatory techniques, including group discussions that enable the engagement of a broad spectrum of stakeholders.
5. Attendance at least one meeting of full DRPI staff (they are held once a month or so) and usually take 2 hours for the regional officers'; the headquarters and the students and staff report on their work.
6. Preferable, participation at one of the policy dialogues and discussions that the key personnel have on-going to look at future directions

The assignment should start on 13 March 2015.

Deliverables:

Draft work plan and inception report in English to be presented to Sida.

Meeting with Sida to discuss inception report and focus.

Draft report to be represented to Sida on 15 April.

Meeting with Sida to discuss the first draft of the report.

Final report to be presented to Sida on 22 April.

The consultant is expected to work approximately 20 days (4 weeks).

Evaluation team

The evaluator(s) should have thorough knowledge (5 years minimum) of the human rights field, civil society and the UN system and be familiar with the relevant policies relating to disability rights. The evaluator(s) should have thorough previous experience of evaluations (at least 5 years). The evaluator(s) should have good social-cultural competence. The evaluator(s) should speak excellent English. The evaluator(s) should be able to work within tight timelines.

Budget

The total budget of the assignment should not exceed 300 000 SEK including 6558 SEK for the digital publication of the report.

Annex 2 – Inception report

1. Assessment of the scope of the evaluation

1.1 UNDERSTANDING OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

This evaluation covers Sida's support to the Disability Rights Promotion International (DRPI) Project, but aims to look more broadly at the overall effectiveness and impact of the project. DRPI is a collaborative project with the overall goal of establishing a comprehensive and sustainable global system to monitor the human rights of people with disabilities. Sida has supported DRPI since 2003 and has provided four phases of support:

1. The first phase (2003) involved research to map the environment for disability rights monitoring;
2. The second phase (2004-2009) focused on the design and testing of a monitoring tool for disability rights;
3. The third phase (2010-2013) aimed to build up the regional and national capacities and platforms to systematically use the tool on a global scale; and,
4. The current and concluding phase (2014-2016) focuses on strengthening the sustainability of the project, and designing, testing and implementing an on-line interactive training and data collection component.

From the third phase of the project there have been five main activities:

1. The establishment and maintenance of the International Coordination Centre at York University in Toronto;
2. The appointment of four regional officers for Africa, Eastern Europe, Asia Pacific and Latin America, each based with a regional host organisation;
3. Regional Disability Rights Monitoring Trainings on the tools and methods developed by the project held in each of the four regions;
4. Carrying out holistic disability rights monitoring projects involving monitoring systems, individual experience and media;
5. The development and maintenance of partnerships with the UN, Disability Alliance, national human rights institutions, human rights NGOs, universities, research institutes and funding agencies.

Sida has supported DRPI since it was established in 2003, with a total financial support of SEK 25 million between 2003 and 2013 and a further SEK 650,000 committed for 2013-2015. DRPI has received funding from a wide range of other sources, including: Disability Rights Fund (DRF), European Commission, Canadian DFATD,

and Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).

The evaluation will cover all phases of the DRPI project period (from 2003 until present) with the dual aims of serving to: i) inform Sida's future support within the area of disability rights; and ii) support and strengthen the DRPI project. It is also stated in the terms of reference that the evaluation:

1. Is expected to provide the bigger picture of the impact, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the DRPI project with a focus on DRPI methodology for monitoring the rights of people with disability (not limited to the impact of Sida's contribution);
2. Should include relevant lessons learnt from implementing the DRPI methodology as a tool to achieve the protection and implementation of rights of people with disabilities.

To assess the DRPI project against the stated evaluation criteria, a set of evaluation questions is provided in the terms of reference. These are explored in more detail in Section 2. In interviews during the inception phase both Sida and DRPI expressed particular interest in the lesson learning aspect of the evaluation, with an interest in learning both how this new methodology has been developed and in its wider impact.

The primary users of the evaluation will be the Unit for Democracy and Human Rights at Sida and DRPI.

1.2 THEORY OF CHANGE

In the preliminary document review carried out in the inception phase, one of the tasks was to identify if there is a clear theory of change and appropriate indicators and monitoring data that can be used as the basis for the evaluation. The documentation provided for all four phases of the project includes broad goals, sets of activities, and to a certain extent indicators for tracking progress at the activity level. It is only in Phase III that there is a more detailed performance framework that provides some basis for setting out a theory of change for the project as a whole.

The overall goal of the project has been clear from the start, namely to create an international monitoring system for disability rights, based on three priority areas: i) an individual violations focus; ii) a systems focus that studies legislative frameworks, tracks case law before the courts and statutory human rights bodies, and analyses general government policies and programmes; and, iii) a media focus that involves tracking media imagery and coverage of disability. The goals for each of the phases of the project have been broadly stated as follows:

The goal of Phase I was to develop the project's infrastructure, conduct background research, explore collaboration opportunities, and investigate future funding sources.

The broad goal for Phase II involved the development and field-testing of a range of

tools, methodologies and training resources that could be used by people with disabilities and their organisations around the world to monitor disability rights. The main activities in this second phase concentrated on the development and testing of monitoring tools and training materials, building capacity to use the tools and training materials and establishing and fostering partnerships.

The Phase III goal was to use the instruments and tools developed and field-tested during Phase Two to expand capacity-building, training and monitoring activities to several countries. The main activities included monitoring activities both run by people with disabilities in five regions and acting as focal points for disability rights monitoring activities and training.

During Phase III a results-based management performance framework was developed. It can serve as a broadly stated set of outcomes and outputs for both Phase III and Phase IV – as outlined in the table below.

Goal: Entrenchment of a comprehensive and sustainable global system to monitor the human rights of persons with disabilities.	
Outcomes	Outputs
<p>Establishment of a solid foundation for sustainable, ongoing disability rights monitoring activities in each region, beyond the duration of Phase Three.</p> <p><i>Creation of a global network of persons with disabilities, disability organisations, human rights NGOs, national human rights institutions, academics and students, located around the world, with the skills and experience to collect, analyse and report on disability rights monitoring data in the three monitoring focus areas (systems, individual experiences and media), contributing to ongoing monitoring of disability rights under the UN Disability Convention and other international and regional human rights instruments, into the future.</i></p> <p>Establishment of the leading role to be played by persons with disabilities and disability organisations in monitoring disability rights (consistent with the provisions of the UN Disability Convention) and enhanced capacity of these individuals and organisations to fulfil this role.</p> <p><i>Formation of cross-disability alliances which will positively impact the ongoing ability of the disability community as a whole to influence govern-</i></p>	<p>Capacity building of persons with disabilities and disability organisations in five regions, together with human rights NGOs, national human rights institutions, academics and students, to: use the methodology and tools developed during Phase Two to collect, analyse and report on disability rights monitoring data regarding individual experiences of persons with disabilities, systemic measures and media portrayal and depiction of disability; engage in strategic decision-making, identification of priorities and design of policies to advance the rights of persons with disabilities based on monitoring data; manage, coordinate and sustain holistic disability rights monitoring activities in their region.</p> <p>Further refined fully accessible training materials for monitors covering all 3 monitoring focus areas (individual experiences, systems, media), incorporating the lessons learnt during Phase Three.</p> <p>Further refined methodologies for ongoing collection, analysis and reporting on disability rights monitoring data by organisations of persons with disabilities.</p> <p><i>Evidence-based data from at least 5 countries</i></p>

<p><i>ment action, report under the UN Disability Convention and engage in other human rights monitoring, reporting and advocacy activities.</i></p> <p><i>Formation of alliances between grassroots disability organisations (with front-line experience) and university and government researchers (with knowledge of research methods and access to resources) leading to ongoing exchange of knowledge and expertise and continued disability rights monitoring, reporting and advocacy activities.</i></p> <p>Creation of a disability rights monitoring system using consistent tools and methods to allow for comparative analysis among countries and the identification of best practice in disability rights legislation, policies and programs around the world.</p> <p><i>Overcome the marginalization of disability rights issues within the general human rights community.</i></p>	<p><i>regarding the complete disability rights picture (based on a holistic analysis of systems, individual experiences and media portrayal & depiction) to be used to advance the human rights situation of persons with disabilities in, for example: setting priorities for action; advocating for policy changes; reporting under regional and international human rights treaties (including UN Disability Convention); and raising awareness of discrimination & barriers.</i></p> <p><i>Enhanced understanding of the differential impact of disability discrimination on women with disabilities and persons with disabilities from other marginalized groups.</i></p> <p><i>Enhanced capacity of civil society, national human rights institutions and governments to identify and address gaps in legislation and policy with respect to disability rights issues, leading to improvements in the lives of persons with disabilities.</i></p> <p><i>Ongoing communication among members of the global disability rights monitoring network to exchange knowledge and expertise and set the foundation for collaboration in disability rights monitoring into the future.</i></p> <p><i>Increased awareness regarding the human rights situation of persons with disabilities at the national, regional and international levels.</i></p> <p>Wide dissemination of the disability rights monitoring and training methods and tools developed during the DRPI project to disability organisations and other stakeholders around the world.</p>
---	--

A preliminary analysis of this performance framework suggests that the stated goal could better be considered as a super-goal, a broad vision that would involve the collaboration of a wide range of international actors to be achieved. Many of the stated outcomes could themselves be considered as similarly broad visions (those in italics in the table above), whilst also including statements that could be used as outcomes. There are three statements that appear to be most closely related to the DRPI project and which could be used as outcomes are the:

1. Creation of a disability rights monitoring system using consistent tools and methods to allow for comparative analysis among countries and the identification of best practice in disability rights legislation, policies and programmes

around the world.

2. Establishment of a solid foundation for sustainable, ongoing disability rights monitoring activities in each region, beyond the duration of Phase Three.
3. Establishment of the leading role to be played by persons with disabilities and disability organisations in monitoring disability rights (consistent with the provisions of the UN Disability Convention) and enhanced capacity of these individuals and organisations to fulfil this role.

Considering the outputs in the performance framework, a number of them could be considered as ambitious additional outcome statements (those in italics in the table above), while the remaining four could be used as the basis for assessing progress in project implementation. These four output statements are:

1. Capacity of persons with disabilities and disability organisations built in five regions, together with human rights NGOs, national human rights institutions, academics and students, to use the methodology and tools developed by the project.
2. Further refined fully accessible training materials for monitors covering all 3 monitoring focus areas (individual experiences, systems, media), incorporating the lessons learnt during Phase Three.
3. Further refined methodologies for ongoing collection, analysis and reporting on disability rights monitoring data by organisations of persons with disabilities.
4. Wide dissemination of the disability rights monitoring and training methods and tools developed during the DRPI project to disability organisations and other stakeholders around the world.

The preliminary document review suggests that much of the reporting to Sida has focused on activities, rather than assessing progress against the outputs set out above. It is likely that, while the evaluation should be able to assess progress against output statements, it is unlikely that there will be strong evidence to assess progress against the outcomes identified above, although it should be possible to make proposals for indicators for these outputs and for what kind of monitoring data should be collected in order to assess progress.

2. Relevance and evaluability of evaluation questions

2.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The terms of reference includes a set of evaluation questions against four evaluation criteria relevance, sustainability, effectiveness and impact. To clarify and narrow the focus of the questions, the team proposes a few small but important changes to the

proposed evaluation questions. One minor change made in a number of the evaluation questions is to use the phrase ‘persons with disabilities’ throughout, in keeping with the wording in the convention. The suggested changes are set out in the table below.

Evaluation Question proposed in Terms of Reference	Suggested Changes to Evaluation Questions
Relevance: With emphasis on the DRPI specific methodology for enhancing rights of people with disabilities.	
Is the project the appropriate solution to the identified problem? Has intersectionality (gender, age etc.) been integrated well in the project?	No changes suggested.
What is the value of the project in relation to priority needs of key stakeholders? What added-value has the project had in the field of DPOs and what synergies are found with DPOs?	What is the value of the project to the rights of persons with disabilities? No change suggested.
Are the project outcomes beneficial to key stakeholders? How has the project methodology been perceived (by people with disabilities, UN CRPD, DPOs)	Are the project outcomes beneficial to persons with disabilities? How has the project methodology been perceived (by persons with disabilities, UN CRPD, DPOs)?
Sustainability	
What aspects of the project should be strengthened and improved? Are the results sustainable?	No changes suggested
Are project activities likely to continue after donor funding ends? Can project activities become self-sustaining financially? What other sources of funding have the team been able to mobilise?	No changes suggested
Effectiveness	
To what extent were the projects objects achieved/likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?	No change suggested No change suggested.
Are selected partnerships contributing to programme results?	No change suggested.
Impact: With emphasis on changes produced by the DRPI project directly or indirectly, intended or unintended towards enhancing the monitoring of disability rights. Considering that real impact can be hard to evaluate, the evaluation report should at least provide a reasoning around impact based on:	

Is the impact spread globally, and how?	No change suggested.
Has the project shifted the balance of the global north and the global south in development work?	Has the project affected the relationships and influence of organisations representing and/or working for persons with disabilities globally, and how?
What individual and structural effects has the project brought to individuals, communities and institutions - either in the short, medium or long-term?	What individual and structural effects has the project brought to <i>individuals and their communities</i> and to institutions - either in the short, medium or long-term?
Has the project had an impact on the participation of people with disabilities in monitoring and how?	Has the project had an impact on the participation of persons with disabilities in monitoring and how?
Has the way the project has developed been responsive to people with disabilities and other marginalized people?	Has the way the project has developed been responsive to persons with disabilities, as well as to other intersectional issues?

2.2 EVALUABILITY OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A detailed evaluation matrix has been developed with criteria for all of the evaluation questions and a preliminary analysis of the reliability and availability of data. This section provides an overview of the evaluability of the evaluation questions for each of the evaluation criteria, looking particularly at the likelihood of evidence being available and suggesting possible approaches where there is a lack of data.

Relevance

The evaluation questions consider whether the project has correctly identified the solution to the problem identified and taken into account other issues -- such as gender and age. They also address the value placed on the project by the ultimate beneficiaries -- persons with disabilities and those representing and working with them. There will be opportunities to examine questions concerning the value placed on the project and also to consider the views of those representing and working with persons with disabilities. Focusing on the value placed on the project, it will be necessary to be selective in identifying DPOs for interview, which may limit the representativeness of these interviews. Similarly, as there will be only one field visit and there may be only very limited opportunities to interview PWDs directly, this may limit the representativeness of the views expressed. Overall, there is a good prospect of obtaining a reasonable range of evidence to come to clear conclusions against the indicators and the evaluation questions.

Effectiveness

The team proposes that the effectiveness of the project be assessed against the outcome and output statements identified at the end of section 1.2. On the basis of the preliminary document review, it seems likely that these are the evaluation questions where there is the most certainty of obtaining reliable evidence. It also seems likely that it will be possible to obtain a range of evidence from document reviews, stake-

holder interviews and potentially from the field visit as well.

Sustainability

There are two sets of evaluation questions under this criteria: the first set looking at what the project has been able to achieve and what is likely to be continued; and, the second set considers what other sources of funding have been used and whether further funds can be utilised in continuing the project. Given that the project has, in the main, focused on developing, piloting and trialling the monitoring methodology, it is likely that there will only be limited evidence, other than more anecdotal evidence, of sustainability. The indicators proposed in the evaluation matrix may be useful for assessing progress towards sustainability. There may be potential for the team to propose indicators or criteria for sustainability in the medium to long-term.

Impact

The evaluation questions address impact at three levels: the adoption of the methodology internationally; the participation of persons with disabilities and the responsiveness to other forms of exclusion; and, the individual and institutional effects of the project. As is discussed in Section 1.2, the preliminary document review was only able to identify evidence of progress at the activities level. It seems likely that there will only be limited or more anecdotal evidence of impact against all of the proposed indicators. As a result, it may be necessary to instead examine the likelihood of impact being achieved over the medium to long-term. In addition, there may be the potential to propose indicators for the two overarching goals identified in the analysis of the performance framework.

Limitations

The main limitations of the evaluation are:

5. The very limited timeframe for the evaluation. The evaluation team will have to be selective in the stakeholders to be interviewed, which may affect the range of views that can be obtained. It will only be possible to undertake one field visit during which only a limited selection of partners (and hopefully with DPOs) will be interviewed. There will be particular limitations with regard to the representativeness of the field visit.
6. As is discussed above, there are potentially some issues around the project theory of change and the focus of the monitoring data, which could affect the strengths of the conclusions that can be drawn.

3. Proposed approach and methodology

The inception phase took place between 18-27 March 2015 and included start-up interviews with Sida and with the DRPI team, which gauged the expectations of the evaluation. During the inception phase a preliminary document review was undertaken, which contributed to setting out the theory of change of the phases of support and refining the evaluation questions. This analysis was used to develop the evaluation matrix presented and to finalise the methodology and work plan. A detailed list of stakeholders has been developed and is included in this section.

The evaluation will apply a participatory approach based on a close dialogue with Sida and DRPI throughout the different phases of the assignment. All stakeholders will be provided with information on the purpose and the process of the evaluation, and will be informed that we will only quote interviewees with their explicit approval (otherwise informants will be anonymous). Interview techniques will be participatory and adapted to the different stakeholders considering their level of literacy and formal education, disabilities and other relevant aspects related to power relations (like gender, position, origin, class, civil status) within groups and among different types of stakeholders.

Central perspectives for the evaluation

The evaluation will be anchored in a human rights-based approach (HRBA), ensuring that gender perspectives, child rights, HIV/Aids and disability-perspectives are considered in all stages of the evaluation. The evaluation will consider whether and how the project applies a human-rights based approach in the methodology developed, in its relations with partners and in training and capacity building. The evaluation team will address other intersectional issues, including gender, child rights, and HIV, looking particularly at meaningful and active participation, inclusion and non-discrimination.

The main data collection methods will be:

7. Review of relevant documents, including project reports, monitoring data and prior evaluations;
8. Interviews with a range of stakeholders, either by telephone or face-to-face;
9. A field visit to the Serbia regional office.

3.1 DOCUMENT REVIEW

During the inception phase the evaluation team received a full set of narrative reports from DRPI and a selection of other published reports and material. The documents also included the formative evaluation of Phase III of the project, carried out by Research and Evaluation Consulting in 2011. Whilst the documentation received so far is helpful in providing an overall perspective on the project, there is a need for more detailed documentation, if available. This should include:

- Internal reporting from the regional officers and any relevant technical inputs

- and project reporting;
- Country monitoring reports for 23 different countries²⁰ and associated reporting information;
- Documentation relating to online materials, training courses and any monitoring data related to this; and,
- Any other reviews or assessments of progress carried out at international, regional and national level.

A full document review will be carried out at the start of the main phase of the evaluation. Data gathered through the review will be examined against indicators established for the evaluation questions. This will be recorded in an evaluation matrix with references to the sources.

3.2 INTERVIEWS

A more detailed stakeholder list has been developed in the inception phase. All of the interviews will be conducted using an interview guide or questionnaire, which can be shared with interviewees before the interview. Interview guides will be developed for three categories of stakeholders:

Sida staff

- Programme staff - Charlotta Bredberg
- Policy staff – Birgitta Weibahr

DRPI staff

- DRPI Co-directors - Bengt Lindqvist and Marcia Rioux
- DRPI Project Staff, York University, Toronto – Paula Hearne; Rachael Dempsey, and students
- Regional Officers for Asia-Pacific, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa and for Portuguese-speaking countries

Representatives from project partners and other collaborators

- DPO Partners hosting regional centres - Asia Pacific: Disabled Peoples International - Asia Pacific (DPI-AP); Eastern Europe: Centre for Society Orientation (COD); Latin America: Red de Organizaciones No Gubernamentales de Personas con Discapacidad y sus Familias (RIADIS); Africa: Secretariat of the African Decade of persons with Disabilities (SADPD)
- A selection of country monitoring partners for the monitoring projects and of participants in training delivered by DRPI
- Collaborators with on-going disability rights monitoring projects not funded by Sida - Disability Rights Fund (DRF), European Commission, Canadian

²⁰ These countries include: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bosnia, Canada, Colombia, Egypt, El Salvador, Honduras, India, Jordan, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Palestine, Portugal, Serbia, South Africa, Sudan, Vietnam, and Yemen.

DFATD, and Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC)

Other stakeholders

- Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, including Ron McCallum and other members, and others with experience in human rights, including Thomas Hammerberg
- IDA (International Disability Alliance) and members, other International and regional DPOs as for example Disabled Peoples' International Asia-Pacific (DPI-AP), The Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability, African Disability Alliance (ADA), Pan African Federation of Organisations of Persons with Disabilities (PAFOD), African Union of the Blind (AFUB), The European Disability Forum, The Disability Monitor Initiative (DMI); Zero project; Stars of Hope;
- International experts on disability rights in the context of development cooperation

The Regional Officers will be asked to complete a self-assessment, to be followed up with a more detailed interview. The self-assessment will cover the evaluation questions and indicators relating to:

Effectiveness

<p>To what extent were the projects objectives achieved/likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance?</p> <p>What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?</p>	<p>Evidence of progress towards project objectives and of continued momentum in implementation.</p> <p>Evidence of analysis of monitoring data and use of analysis for adjustments to efforts across the project.</p> <p>Evidence from lesson learning within the project of factors influencing achievement and non-achievement of objectives.</p>
<p>Are selected partnerships contributing to programme results?</p>	<p>Evidence and examples of capacity of partner organisations having been built.</p> <p>Evidence and examples of partner organisations playing an active role in project activities.</p> <p>Evidence and examples of partner organisations taking on project activities and actively and systematically using project approaches.</p>

Impact

<p>What individual and structural effects has the project brought to individuals and their communities and to institutions - either in the short, medium or long-term?</p>	<p>Evidence of individual effects that have been contributed to through the project interventions.</p> <p>Evidence of structural effects that have been contributed to through the project interventions.</p> <p>Factors affecting success (or otherwise) of project interventions.</p>
<p>Has the project had an impact on the participation of persons with disabilities in monitoring and how?</p> <p>Has the way the project has developed been responsive</p>	<p>Evidence of persons with disabilities participating in monitoring processes and of their perceptions of participation.</p>

to people with disabilities, as well as to other intersectional issues?	<p>Practice of active and meaningful participation of PWDs and active non-discrimination in coherence with HRBA.</p> <p>Evidence that monitoring processes are systematically changing to ensure participation of persons with disabilities.</p> <p>Evidence of adjustments in the project approach in response to issues raised by persons with disabilities and other marginalized people.</p>
---	--

The individual interviews will be recorded in brief notes and the main evidence will be recorded in the evaluation matrix, with sources. For the purposes of the evaluation report, the results of the interviews will be anonymised, to encourage the frank expression of views.

3.3 FIELD VISIT

The field visit will be to the regional office in Serbia. It will involve conducting face-to-face interviews with the regional officer, representatives from the regional host organisation, local DPOs, Sida representatives and other donor organisations and government representatives, as relevant. The field visit will also provide an opportunity for a group discussion with DPOs and persons with disabilities, if this it is possible to arrange. Ahead of the field visit the evaluation team will: conduct a country-specific document review; review the self-assessment completed by the regional officer; and, have a brief telephone conversation with the regional officer to discuss and agree the visit.

A tentative visit schedule is set out in the table below:

Day 1	<p>10. Briefing and interview with the regional officer</p> <p>11. Interview with regional host organisation</p> <p>12. Interviews with donor representatives</p>
Day 2	<p>13. Meetings with local DPOs to discuss country monitoring report</p>
Day 3	<p>14. Group discussion with DPOs and PWDs</p> <p>15. Feedback to regional officer</p>

The field visit will be complemented with detailed interviews with the other regional officers, particularly those in Portugal and Argentina, who have some institutional memory of the project. The data collection and analysis for each of the remaining three regional offices will involve:

- Further document analysis, including consideration of national level monitoring;
- A self-assessment, to be completed by the regional office, based on the project

- documentation and the evaluation questions (see Section 3.2);
- Follow up interviews by phone or skype with the regional office and regional host organisation.

As with the document review and the interviews, the evidence from the field visit and from the more detailed interviews with other regional officers will be recorded in the evaluation matrix.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

The data analysis will begin with a collation of evidence against the indicators that are set out in the evaluation matrix. This will enable the cross-referencing and triangulation of evidence for each of the evaluation questions. Having collated the evidence, the analysis will seek to provide assessments against each of the indicators and, in turn, answers to each of the evaluation questions, supported by an overview of the evidence available and its quality. For the purposes of the evaluation report the responses to the evaluation questions will be summarised against the evaluation criteria.

The draft report will be shared with Sida and stakeholders for comments and will be finalised taking the feedback into consideration. The report will be written in English and will include an Executive Summary.

The main deliverables of the evaluation, with key milestones are set out in the table below.

Deliverable	Date
Draft work plan and inception report	27 March
Approval of inception report	1 April
Draft evaluation report to Sida	12 May
Presentation of the draft report to Sida	19 May
Feedback from Sida on first draft of the evaluation report	
Final evaluation report submission to Sida	26 May

Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix

Questions raised in ToRs	Indicators to be used in Evaluation	Methods	Sources	Availability and Reliability of Data /comments
Relevance				
<p>Is the project the appropriate solution to the identified problem?</p> <p>Has intersectionality (gender, age etc.) been integrated well in the project?</p>	<p>Identification of problem in project documentation and response in phases of the project.</p> <p>Ongoing analysis and response to problem identified through phases of project.</p> <p>Extent of inclusion of intersectional dimensions of disabilities in project documentation and reporting, including the application of HRBA principles and power analysis.</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Attendance at policy dialogues and discussions</p>	<p>External literature</p> <p>DRPI project documentation</p> <p>DRPI project staff</p>	<p>There are likely to be limited sources of data outside of the project, thus limiting the possibilities for triangulation.</p>
<p>What is the value of the project in relation to the rights of persons with disabilities?</p> <p>What added-value has the project had in the field of DPOs and what synergies are found with DPOs?</p>	<p>Coherence between “Priority needs” of end users of the project and the project outcomes.</p> <p>Key stakeholder awareness of and value given to the project.</p> <p>DPO awareness of and value given to the project.</p>	<p>Stakeholder Interviews</p> <p>Document review</p>	<p>Representatives from DPOs</p> <p>PWDs – Field visit</p> <p>External literature</p>	<p>It will be necessary to be selective in identifying DPOs for interviews, which will therefore limit the representativeness of these interviews. There will be only one field visit and there may be only very limited opportunities to interview PWDs</p>

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

	DRPI project awareness of and engagement with other initiatives and with DPOs.			directly, again limiting the representativeness of the views expressed.
Are the project outcomes beneficial to persons with disabilities? How has the project methodology been perceived (by persons with disabilities, UN CRPD, DPOs)	Awareness and perceptions of project methodology among a range of stakeholders – UN CPRD, DPOs & persons with disabilities. Awareness and perceptions of project outcomes among a range of stakeholders – UN CPRD, DPOs & persons with disabilities. Perceived benefits of the project outcomes to a range of stakeholders.	Stakeholder Interviews Document review	Key stakeholders at international level Representatives from DPOs PWDs – Field visit External literature	See comments above.
Impact				
Is the impact spread globally, and how? Has the project affected the relationships and influence of organisations representing and/or working for persons with disabilities globally, and how?	Evidence of project impact and of range of impact across regions. Evidence of project impact at international, regional and national levels. Evidence of increased influence and/or shift in influence in relations between global south and global north in development work.	Document Review Stakeholder Interviews	DRPI project documentation DRPI project staff	There is likely to only be limited or more anecdotal evidence of impact against all of the proposed indicators. It may rather be necessary to look at the likelihood of impact being achieved.
What individual and structural effects has the project brought to individuals and their communities and to institutions - either in the short, medium or long-term?	Evidence of contribution to individual effects through the project interventions. Evidence of contribution to structural effects through the project interven-	Document Review Stakeholder Interviews	DRPI project documentation DRPI project staff	See comments above.

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

	tions. Factors affecting success (or otherwise) of project interventions.			
Has the project had an impact on the participation of persons with disabilities in monitoring and how? Has the way the project has developed been responsive to people with disabilities, as well as to other intersectional issues?	Evidence of persons with disabilities participating in monitoring processes and of their perceptions of participation. Practice of active and meaningful participation of PWDs and active non-discrimination in coherence with HRBA. Evidence that monitoring processes are systematically ensuring participation of persons with disabilities. Evidence of adjustments in the project approach in response to issues raised by persons with disabilities and other marginalised people.	Document Review Stakeholder Interviews	Key stakeholders at international level Representatives from DPOs DRPI project documentation DRPI project staff	See comments above.
Effectiveness				
To what extent were the projects objectives achieved/likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?	Evidence of progress towards project objectives and of continued momentum in implementation. Evidence of analysis of monitoring data and use of analysis for adjustments to efforts across the project. Evidence from lesson learning within the project of factors influencing	Document Review Stakeholder Interviews	DRPI project documentation DRPI project staff Representatives from project partners	The evidence for these evaluation questions and indicators is likely to be the strongest and most reliable.

	achievement and non-achievement of objectives.			
Are selected partnerships contributing to programme results?	<p>Evidence and examples of capacity of partner organisations having been built.</p> <p>Evidence and examples of partner organisations playing an active role in project activities.</p> <p>Evidence and examples of partner organisations taking on project activities and actively and systematically using project approaches.</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p>	<p>DRPI project documentation</p> <p>DRPI project staff</p> <p>Representatives from project partners</p>	
Sustainability				
<p>What aspects of the project should be strengthened and improved?</p> <p>Are the results sustainable?</p>	<p>Examples of good practice and of lesson learning within the project.</p> <p>Evidence of capacity of regional officers, regional host organisations and of national partners having been built.</p> <p>Evidence of project methodology being taken up and utilised by international, regional and national organisations.</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p>	<p>DRPI project documentation</p> <p>DRPI project staff</p> <p>Representatives from project partners</p>	<p>The indicators proposed are, in the main, proxy indicators for assessing progress towards sustainability. There may be the potential, during the evaluation process, to propose indicators or criteria for sustainability in the medium to long term.</p>
<p>Are project activities likely to continue after donor funding ends?</p> <p>Can project activities become self-sustaining financially?</p>	<p>Evidence of project activities being funded through other sources and on a sustainable basis.</p> <p>Examples of project activities being</p>	<p>Document Review</p> <p>Stakeholder Interviews</p>	<p>DRPI project documentation</p> <p>DRPI project staff</p> <p>Representatives from project partners</p>	

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

What other sources of funding have the team been able to mobilize?	<p>systematically adopted and utilised by partner organisations.</p> <p>Examples of project activities influencing the development of approaches used at international, regional and national levels.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

Annex 4 – Documents Reviewed

General Publications

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities -

<http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>

Let the World Know, Sweden, 2000:

<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/stockholmnov2000.htm>

DRPI Publications

DRPI Phase I Report (2003) Opportunities, Methodologies and Training Resources for Disability Rights Monitoring

DRPI Regional Training Manual: A Guide to Disability Rights Monitoring, Participants Version (2014)

Using DRPI's Tools to Monitor the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2010)

Study on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Cameroon (2009)

State of Disabled People's Rights in Kenya (2007)

Monitoring the Human Rights of People with Disabilities in India (2009)

Monitoring the Human Rights of People with Disabilities: Laws, Policies and Programmes in India (2009)

Monitoring the Human Rights of People with Disabilities: Laws, Policies and Programmes in New Zealand (2012)

Nepal Holistic Monitoring Report (2013)

Monitoring the Human Rights of People with Disabilities: Philippines Country Report (2009)

Accessible Elections: Participation of Persons with Disabilities in Political and Public Life, Serbia (2014)

Alternative Report of the Implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina (2014)

Holistic Report: Monitoring the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in the Republic of Moldova (2014)

Alternative Report of the Implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Montenegro (2014)

Holistic Report: Monitor your Rights, Monitoring the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in the Republic of Serbia (2013)

Monitoring the Human Rights of People with Disabilities in Bolivia (2009)

Human Rights Monitoring in Persons with Disabilities, with an emphasis on Psychosocial Disability in Colombia (2014)

Monitoring the Human Rights of People with Disabilities: A Comprehensive Analysis of Compliance and Breach of Fundamental Rights in Honduras (2014)

L'inclusion sociale des personnes en situation de handicap dans la wilaya d'Alger (2014)

Are We Moving Forward: Regional Study on the Rights of Women with Disabilities in the Middle East (2015)

E Zubrow and J Woelfel (2006) Worldwide Analysis of Media Depictions of Disabilities – Media Monitoring

Sida Documentation

Sida (2010) Disability as a Human Rights Issue: Background paper to conducting a dialogue

Sida (2013) DRPI Second Phase, Contribution Completion Report

Sida (2013) Human rights for persons with disabilities; an evaluation of the work plan – Final Report

Sida (no date) Disability as a Human Rights Issue: Conducting a Dialogue

Research and Evaluation Consulting (2011) Evaluation of the DRPI Project Phase Three, Year One: Final Report

DRPI Project Reporting

DRPI (2003) DRPI Final Report on Phase I

DRPI (2004) DRPI Phase 2, Year 1, Narrative Report

DRPI (2006) DRPI Interim Progress Report

DRPI (2007) DRPI Phase 2, Year 4, Narrative Report

DRPI (2007) Moving Forward: Progress in Global Disability Rights Monitoring

DRPI (2009) Phase 2, Year 5 Narrative Report

DRPI (2009) RBM Performance Framework, Phase 3, 2009-2013

DRPI (2010) Phase 3, Year 1, Narrative Report

DRPI (2011) Phase 3, Year 2, Narrative Report

DRPI (2012) Phase 3, Year 3, Narrative Report

DRPI (2013) Phase 3, Year 4 Narrative Report

DRPI (2014) Phase 4, Narrative Report

DRPI (2015) Final Phase Project Document Application, 2013-2015

Project Finances

Sida DRPI Figures 2006/7 – in Canadian dollars

York University, DRPI Consolidated Statement of Expenditures 2010/11

York University, DRPI Consolidated Statement of Expenditures 2012/13

Annex 5 – List of Persons Interviewed

Sida

Anna Öberg, Programme Officer, Unit for Democracy and Human Rights
Birgitta Weibahr, Policy Specialist, Human Rights and Democracy Policy Support Unit

DRPI

Bengt Lindqvist, Co-director
Marcia Rioux, Co-director
Paula Hearn, Project Coordinator
Rachael Dempsey, Project Assistant
Paula Pinto, Research Associate
Jose Viera, Latin America Regional Officer
Rajive Raturi, Asia Pacific Regional Officer
Dagnachew Wakene, Africa Regional Officer
Rados Keravica, Europe Regional Officer

Field Visit to Belgrade

Mr Goran Loncar, President of Center for Society Orientation (COD)
Ms Violeta Andjelkovic, COD staff member and coordinator of project “Monitoring of rights of People living with HIV”
Ms Vesna Petrovic, Autism Society President
Ms Nevena Ciric, AID +, data analysts in the project “Monitoring of rights of People living with HIV”
Mr Radovan Radulovic, President of Will for Life
Ms Jelena Avramovic, USAID Program Officer and former NDI Program Officer on Accessible Elections project
Ms Jelena Milovanovic, Coordinator for Inclusive Development, Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Unit, Government of the Republic of Serbia

Others

Ron McCallum, member of the UN CRPD
Léo Goupil-Barbier, Handicap International
A K Dube, Africa Disability Alliance
Nora Groce, Leonard Cheshire Disability and Inclusive Development Centre, University College London
Zoltan Mihok, founder of COD and worked with Handicap International in Nepal
Salam Gomez, Fundamental Colombia
Xuan Thuy Nguyen, Mount Saint Vincent University
Cornelius Ojangole, Kenya Union of the Blind
Ola Abu al Ghaib, Stars of Hope

Jace Nair, South Africa Disability Alliance

Lee Ann Bassar, La Trobe Law School, Victoria, Australia



Project Evaluation – Disability Rights Promotion International (DRPI)

Sida has supported DRPI between 2003 and 2013, underpinning the project with core support. The evaluation covers all phases of the DRPI project period with the dual aims of serving to: inform Sida's future support within the area of disability rights; and, support and strengthen the DRPI project. The evaluation of the project was against four evaluation criteria: relevance, sustainability, effectiveness and impact. The evaluation identified a number of significant achievements, including the development of a unique methodology for monitoring disability rights and effects on individual PWDs, on DPOs, and on coalitions of PWDs and DPOs. Recommendations for the continuation of the project are made, including the need for a systematic approach to lesson-learning, monitoring and evaluation of the project.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

