OVERVIEW

This document is an abridged version of the final report of an independent value for money assessment of the UN Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD) commissioned by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and submitted by consultants Lorraine Wapling and Robin Brady on 19 December 2014. This is the first external review of the UNPRPD.
## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUD</td>
<td>Australian Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGF</td>
<td>Centre for Global Health (Trinity College Dublin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>United Nations Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO</td>
<td>Disabled People's Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDTF</td>
<td>Multi-Donor Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPRPD</td>
<td>United Nations Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE UNPRPD

The UNPRPD came about as a mechanism to promote the implementation of the CRPD, largely in response to demands from civil society. Unlike other UN conventions, the CRPD did not have a UN promotion or implementation mechanism attached to it.¹

The aim of the UNPRPD is to advance disability rights around the world. The UNPRPD supports the full implementation of the CRPD through facilitating coalition-building and capacity development at global, regional and country level.

To achieve this aim, the UNPRPD put in place a strategic framework through which to deliver activities. The overall objective of the strategic framework is: “To develop the capacities of national stakeholders, particularly governments and organisations of persons with disabilities, for the effective implementation of the CRPD, including through promoting disability-inclusive internationally agreed development goals.”

The work of the UNPRPD is guided by four broad principles:

1. Local action with a global perspective: UNPRPD mainly supports country-level programs delivered by participating UN organisations collaborating around shared capacity development goals. This is supported by regional and global level activities, such as research, advisory services, knowledge management, networking, etc.

2. Twin-track approach to promoting disability rights: UNPRPD targets interventions that directly benefit people with disabilities and their organisations through capacity building; and targets interventions that indirectly benefit people with disabilities by influencing broader systems that people with disabilities may have to interact with.

3. Strong focus on capacity development: UNPRPD supports a broad definition of capacity, which includes hard resources (human and financial) and soft resources (knowledge, social capital, political influence); with skills and resources not only being restricted to individuals, but also extending to organisations and contexts in which people with disabilities and their organisations are operating.

4. Vision for scaling up: UNPRPD supports country-level joint programs that can be effectively scaled up, not only to provide interventions to more people in a geographic region, but that can ensure that the quality of the original intervention can also be scaled and maintained within a larger, scaled-up program.

¹ Key informant interview with Emanuele Sapenza, Technical Secretariat for the UNDP, Social Inclusion at UNDP, 18 September 2014
The UNPRPD Policy Board

The Policy Board sets and reviews the strategic direction of the UNPRPD, considers major policy implications and provides oversight for the financial allocations to programs and activities. It meets once a year. Membership of the board is constituency-based:

- 1 representative for each participating UN organisation;
- 2 representatives of the UNPRPD donors; and
- 2 representatives of people with disabilities and the broader civil society
- Administrative Agent of the Fund (ex-officio member) The Board is advised by:
- The Chair of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
- The Special Rapporteur on Disability of the Commission on Social Development;
- 2 individuals whose work on promoting disability rights has distinguished them amongst their peers (this is also an opportunity to ensure broader and adequate representation at Board meetings, such as people with disabilities from the South, women with disabilities and young people with disabilities).

The board was supposed to also include 2 representatives from CRPD States Parties, however advice from the Bureau of the Conference of States Parties to the CRPD suggested that it would be better to keep the States Parties informed rather than seek active participation. This was due to the political implications of trying to identify representative countries to participate. The replacement process means that States Parties are kept informed via the Conference of States Parties to the CRPD and can get further involved if they wish.

The UNPRPD Management Committee

The Management Committee reviews applications for funding, decides on funding allocations and provides guidance and support on implementation (as necessary). Membership of the Management Committee is also constituency-based:

- 1 representative for each participating UN organisation;
- 2 representatives of the UNPRPD donors; and
- 2 representatives of people with disabilities and the broader civil society

In the same way that there were meant to be 2 representatives from States Parties on the Policy Board, the management committee was originally designed with 2 representatives from States Parties participating. For the same reasons, this part of the structure has never materialized. That the UN
agencies and the donors sit on the same management committee provides an opportunity for learning, especially in relation to article 32 of the CRPD.\(^2\)

As a fund management or grant management structure this is a typical division of strategic and operation activities. The Technical Secretariat reports that the structure works well with most of the interaction happening at a Management Committee level and good engagement with those on the Committee. This view has been echoed by IDA, who suggested in interview that the structure is close to that advocated for.\(^3\) It is quite a departure for a UN mechanism to have this high degree of stakeholder participation in the management structure; however the UNPRPD believes that this focus on participation and ‘ownership’ is crucial to the partnership’s success.\(^4\) Participating UN Agencies have echoed this view, reporting that there is currently no other example of this level of engagement anywhere else in the UN System.\(^5\) One of the newer members of the UNPRPD offered an interesting perspective. It was attracted to join because:

- It wanted to do work on disability rights, but needed support in determining how to go about it;
- Their credibility and programming would be enhanced if they took a more proactive role on disability inclusion;
- Membership of the UNPRPD made financial sense: reduced transaction costs than running an individual program;
- Their experiences and perspectives could be included in the UNPRPD if they joined; and
- When the UNCT Resident Coordinator is seen to endorse your work, your credibility is enhanced (see section iii. Effectiveness for more on this point).\(^6\)

One of the UN representatives who took part in the focus group conducted for this study also noted that the UNPRPD functions much better than the other Trust Funds he is personally engaged with. The objectives are easy to understand; its principles are clear; the application process is well set out and supported; it has clearly defined targets with clear thematic focus, good communications; and the technical secretariat is very effective.\(^7\)\(^8\)

Civil society believes that it is important that the UNPRPD exists at all. While the ideal would be a fully-fledged agency focused on the CRPD and disability, the civil society actors that participated in the focus group in New York in October highlighted that there was now a dedicated operational mechanism for disability in the UN system, where none had been before.\(^8\)

---

\(^2\) UN Agency Focus Group, New York, 30\(^{\text{th}}\) October 2014.

\(^3\) Civil Society Focus Group, New York, 30\(^{\text{th}}\) October 2014.

\(^4\) Key informant interview with Emanuele Sapienza, Technical Secretariat for the UNPRPD, Social Inclusion at UNDP, 18 September 2014.

\(^5\) UN Agency Focus Group, New York, 30\(^{\text{th}}\) October 2014.

\(^6\) UN Agency Focus Group, New York, 30\(^{\text{th}}\) October 2014.

\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Civil Society Focus Group, New York, 30\(^{\text{th}}\) October 2014.
Activities to Date

In accordance with its strategy, UNPRPD has delivered a mix of project funding and advocacy activities in 2012 – 2014. In the early period of the fund there was also a focus on establishing the UNPRPD and ensuring it was fit for purpose:

- Developing the UNPRPD strategic and operational framework (to guide the partnership) (2012).
- Developing the UNPRPD quality assurance framework (mechanisms to ensure efficient and effective implementation of projects) (2012).
- Influencing the UN System’s approach to disability (using three objectives: raising awareness, institutionalizing a collaborative culture on working on disability, enhancing participation and recognition of DPOs) (2012 onwards).
- Funding round 1: 2012, with implementation commencing in 2013 (see table below).
- Funding round 2: 2013-14, with implementation planned to commence in 2014-15.¹
- Strengthening national capacity for disability data collection (2014 onwards).
- Promoting the establishment of an African Disability Forum (2014 onwards).
- Implementing a knowledge management strategy (2014 onwards).

Table 1 UNDP Round 1 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>UNPRPD Organisations</th>
<th>Approved Budget (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>UN Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Mozambique</td>
<td>UNDP, UNICEF</td>
<td>340,046.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>National Plan for Labour Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>ILO, UNDP</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Promoting the Rights of People with Disabilities in Indonesia</td>
<td>ILO, WHO</td>
<td>327,473.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Paradigm Shift: UNCT Moldova Strategic Action Supporting CPD Implementation</td>
<td>OHCHR, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO</td>
<td>349,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji (Pacific Island Countries)</td>
<td>&quot;Pacific Enable&quot;</td>
<td>ILO, UNICEF, WHO</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Promoting the Rights of Children with Disabilities</td>
<td>OHCHR, UNICEF, WHO</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine</td>
<td>ILO, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO</td>
<td>333,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Strengthening the role of Disabled Persons Organisations to advance disability rights in Viet Nam</td>
<td>ILO, UNDP, UNICEF</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Accelerating the implementation of the UNCRPD in South Africa</td>
<td>OHCHR, UNDP, UNICEF</td>
<td>349,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Strengthening Respect for the Human Rights of Persons with Disabilities through Legislation, Services &amp; Empowerment</td>
<td>ILO, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO</td>
<td>349,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>“The new Tunisia won’t be built without us”</td>
<td>OHCHR, ILO, UNICEF, WHO</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the country-based round 1 projects above, USD 232,190 was allocated to involving people with disabilities in the post-2015 development agenda discussions as part of the Global Funding

¹ This review does not cover the Round 2 projects as they have only just been announced and no activity has taken place on these projects.
Window. This project included online consultations that received submissions from UN agencies, DPOs, NGOs and people with disabilities across 88 countries.

Monitoring reports for each project are provided quarterly to the Technical Secretariat and more in-depth reports are provided annually, with annual financial analysis, by the lead agency for each project. Currently these reports are not published, initially because it was felt that country teams would be less forthcoming. Due to the high degree of variation in quality of the initial round of reports it is deemed acceptable that these are not published however, there is now an intention from the Technical Secretariat to make such documents publicly available in future funding rounds. Financial data are available online at the Multi-Partner Trust Fund website. This data covers information on contributions (by period and donor), allocation of resources (by period, participating UN agencies, country and project); this data is updated in real time. At project and country level, expenditure is reported according to the budget categories approved by the UN Chief Executives Board (applies across the UN system). Financial data on expenditure is updated annually as per standard Multi-Partner Trust Fund practice.

Following standard procedure (and according to the grant agreements signed), donors receive an annual report. Reporting annually to donors is not unusual for core funding arrangements, however, this arrangement does not allow for real time analysis and adjustment to ensure efficiencies are being driven through the project activities.

UNPRPD is intended as a stimulus for country-level activity either where there is disparate activity on disability taking place, or where there is no activity on disability taking place.

Participating agencies are required to demonstrate collaboration in their applications for country-level projects. This was echoed in the key informant interview with the UNPRPD Tunisia officer, who highlighted that the UNPRPD could be a useful trigger for activity and working in a different way, as well as in the key informant interviews with representatives from Moldova and Togo, who also reported that the UNPRPD allowed them to progress activity in their countries more quickly. The IDDC also referred to this as being important in Indonesia during the Civil Society Focus Group.

There has been an intention to ensure that all regions are covered as a way to try and fill the gaps in advocacy and provision that exist between regions. When UNPRPD is deciding which applications to fund, regional location does play some part. UNPRPD is also intended to identify new and better ways for the UN system to work on disability and increase agency collaboration on disability, and participation of DPOs within the UN system. Both key informant interviews with representatives from Moldova and Togo agreed that the UNPRPD project had provided opportunities for DPOs to work together either around common policy goals or program implementation. In Togo there had been a desire to engage

---

10 There are eight broad budget categories agreed by the UN Chief Executives Board. It is understandable that the categories are broad, as they have to apply across the UN system, taking in multiple agencies and projects. As a result however they lead to limited budget analysis.

11 Key informant interview with Emanuele Sapienza, Technical Secretariat for the UNPRPD, Social Inclusion at UNDP, 18 September 2014. This data has been used for the financial analysis presented in this report and is dated according to the date the data was downloaded.

12 Key informant interview with Tarek Cheniti, UNPRPD Tunisia Officer, 25 June 2014; Civil Society Focus Group; KII Moldova, 30th October 2014 via Skype; KII Togo
more formally with the UN system for a few years, which the UNPRPD has made possible. The feedback received from the evaluators of Round 2 projects supported the perception that UNPRPD has encouraged greater collaboration amongst UN agencies on disability, and that the agencies are demonstrating an improved understanding of disability issues. This was also supported by the key informant interviews with representatives from Moldova and Togo. In Togo, the UNPRPD project has provided an opportunity for UN agencies such as WHO to get involved in disability-related work in Togo, where they were not previously running programs with this specific focus in the country.

Both the Technical Secretariat and the Civil Society Focus Group viewed DFAT as a “founder” of the UNPRPD, ascribing direct attribution of the UNPRPD mechanism’s existence to DFAT.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

Documents reviewed

1. UNPRPD, 2012; Round 1: Projects Selected for Funding, United Nations, New York
2. Standard Administrative Arrangement for The UN Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD): Grant 61440 (MDTF) AusAID- UNDP, 11 April 2012
3. Addendum No. 1 Agreement Number 65765 to the Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA) between the Commonwealth of Australia and the United Nations Development Program, the UN Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD) 7 January 2013
7. UNPRPD, 2013, Towards an inclusive and sustainable future for all, United Nations, New York
10. UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Costa Rica, April 2013
11. UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report, Costa Rica, Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 2014

14 KII Moldova; KII Togo, 31st October 2014 via Skype.
15 UNPRPD R2 External Evaluators Feedback, Internal Document; KII Moldova, 30th October 2014 via Skype; KII Togo, 31st October 2014 via Skype.
16 Civil Society Focus Group, New York, 30th October 2014; KII with E. Sapienza, New York 30th October 2014.
12. UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Indonesia, April 2013
13. UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report, Indonesia, Quarter 4 2013
14. UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Moldova, April 2013
15. UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report, Moldova, Quarter 1 and Quarter 2 2014
16. UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Togo, April 2013
17. UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report, Togo, Quarter 2 2013
18. UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Tunisia, April 2013
19. UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report, Tunisia, June 2014
20. UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, South Africa, April 2013
21. Minutes from the South Africa UNPRPD Meeting 26 August 2014
22. UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report, Viet Nam, July 2014
23. UNPRPD Viet Nam Joint Work Plan April 2013 – April 2015
24. UNPRPD Viet Nam Annual Work Plan 2013
26. UNPRPD Annual Progress Report Template
27. UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report Template
28. UNPRPD R2 External Evaluators Feedback
29. MPTF Office Manual for Fund Design, Administration and Advisory Services (UNDP 2014)
30. Nairobi Declaration: Inclusive Post 2015 Development Agenda for Persons with Disabilities in Africa
31. Revisions to the Project UNPRPD G1 “Strengthening the disability rights dimension of the post-2015 development framework by supporting the meaningful engagement of persons with disabilities” (UNPRPD 2014)
32. UNPRPD G1 “Strengthening the disability rights dimension of the post-2015 development framework by supporting the meaningful engagement of persons with disabilities” (UNPRPD 2013)
33. UNPRPD Analytics (October 2014)
34. UNPRPD Round 1 Progress Update as of 31 October 2014 (internal document)

Key Informant Interviews (Lorraine Wapling)

1. Key informant interview with Suki Beaver, Policy Advisor, Inclusive Political Processes, UNDP, 31 October 2014
2. Key informant interview with Emanuele Sapienza, Technical Secretariat for the UNPRPD, Social Inclusion at UNDP, 30 – 31 October 2014
3. Key informant interview with Claude Cahn, Human Rights Advisor, OHCHR (Lead, OHCHR) and Alina Grigoras (OHCHR), Moldova, 30 October 2014
4. Key informant interview with Christine Jaulmes, UNICEF Deputy Resident Representative (Lead, UNICEF), Togo, 31 October 2014

Key Informant Interviews (Robin Brady)

1. Key informant interview with Emanuele Sapienza, Technical Secretariat for the UNPRPD, Social Inclusion at UNDP, 18 September 2014
Key Informant Interviews (Sarah Dyer)

2. Key informant interview with Tarek Cheniti, UNPRPD Tunisa Officer, 25 June 2014
3. Key informant interview with Prof. Malcolm MacLachlan, Centre for Global Health (CGH) Trinity College Dublin, 12 June 2014
4. Key informant interview with Charaf Ahmimed, Chair, UN HR Working Group, Liaison between UNESCO Country Team in Indonesia and UNPRPD (NY), 25 June 2014
5. Key informant interview with Lidia Pretorius, Chief Director: M&E (Rights of People with Disabilities), Ministry of Women, Children and Disabilities (WCD), Government of the Republic of South Africa

Focus Groups

1. Civil Society Focus Group (IDA, IDDC), 30 October 2014
2. UN Agency Focus Group (UNDESA, UNFPA, UNICEF), 30 October 2014

3. FINDINGS/RESULTS

I. ECONOMY (COSTS AND INPUTS) – WHAT WENT IN?

DFAT contributed USD 5,119,300 (AUD5, 493,521) to the UNPRPD Fund. There was no specific funding target for the UNPRPD prior to contributions being sought and Fund-level financial targets are not available. DFAT’s contribution has made it the largest funder of UNPRPD at the moment.

Chart 1 UNPRPD Funding Profile as at 19 September 2014
The Annual Reports produced for UNPRPD and the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office Gateway website detail spending allocations including administration and staffing.

Table 2 UNPRPD Summary Financial Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNPRPD Funds (as at 19 September 2014 10:00 GMT)</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposits (from donor governments)</td>
<td>9,166,512.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Investment Income (from Fund)</td>
<td>14,273.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (from Participating Organizations)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total source of funds</td>
<td>9,180,785.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to Participating Organizations</td>
<td>6,176,582.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds from Participating Organizations</td>
<td>-38,116.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Agent Fee</td>
<td>91,665.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost</td>
<td>483,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>166.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total use of funds</td>
<td>6,714,242.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance with Administrative Agent</td>
<td>2,466,543.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a percentage of contributions</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90% of the total expenditure has been allocated to project activities. The refund to the fund from participating organisations only refers to activities in the Post-2015 project to be carried out by UNDESA. This was the result of a change of plan for launching a report, which was eventually delivered by UNICEF. The refund will eventually disappear as the funds get transferred to UNICEF to replace the funding they spent on the report launch event.17

The Administrative Agent’s fee is a fixed 1% of the total income available to UNPRPD. UNDG policy is to charge a fixed 1% administrative agent fee on the gross contribution (USD) to any multi-partner trust fund (MPTF). This administrative fee is then shared between the MPTF office18, UNDP headquarters and a limited number of UNDP country offices that have performed administrative functions for delegated funds.19

Since August 2014 UNDP has begun to show a greater commitment to disability inclusion which should impact positively on the PRPD facility. The new UNDP strategy (2014 – 2017) has attempted to address the ‘silo’ issues that were preventing cross-cutting issues like social inclusion from taking hold in the agency.20 The agency is now working on three main areas: Sustainable Development Pathways; Inclusive and Effective Democratic Governance; and Resilience. There is a clear statement that this new strategy should play a role in reducing inequality and exclusion and disability is referenced twice (once under ensuring participation and voice for excluded groups like the poor, women, youth, indigenous peoples and the disabled; once in the section on democratic governance – securing more equitable access to services). Although this is not a very robust approach to disability inclusive development it does provide a reasonable context in which to operate the UNPRPD and encourage UNDP offices to at least explore issues around disability in development.

17 Key informant interview with Emanuele Sapienza, Technical Secretariat for the UNPRPD, Social Inclusion at UNDP, 18 September 2014
18 The MPTF office is not the same as the UNPRPD office or team it is a separate administrative function.
19 MPTF Office Manual for Fund Design, Administration and Advisory Services (UNDP 2014)
20 Key Informant Interview: Suki Beaver, Policy Advisor, Inclusive Political Processes, UNDP, 31 October 2014
In Round 1, UNDP and UNICEF managed the majority of the available funds, across 7 and 9 projects respectively. No agency has sole responsibility for implementing a country project. Additionally funds are not distributed equally across agencies participating in a project; rather funds are allocated according to planned activities in each country project.

Table 3 UNPRPD Round I Allocation of Funds to participating UN Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>347,784.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>524,289.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>616,504.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,031,456.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,455,430.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant requirement of the funding rounds for country-level projects was that the project had to identify other funding sources to supplement the UNPRPD funding received. Budget formats for Country-level projects require proposal teams to stipulate where UNPRPD funding will be used and where cost-sharing funding will be used for each category and item in the budget. This means that at no point is the UNPRPD fund taking on the full liability for a project, thereby spreading the funding risk across more than one funding source.

Overall Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs unnecessary high and could be lowered without compromising quality</th>
<th>Costs average and meet quality requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs high which is necessary to produce level of quality required</td>
<td>Cost – low but meet quality requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs average but don’t meet quality requirements</td>
<td>Costs low – but have compromised quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average UNPRPD is funding 62.26% of the Country-level projects, whilst the cost-sharing element provided by the project is an average of 37.74% of the total project cost. In addition country-level UN staff time contributed to the country projects, but not paid for by UNPRPD total USD 717,436. This in-kind contribution would take the co-funded element of Round 1 almost to a 1:1 ratio with UNPRPD allocated funding (see table 4 above). All the projects are budgeted at less than USD1m per project, with the average total project cost sitting at just above USD 550,000. Given the level that the projects are working at (country-level) and the type of activity that the projects are delivering (advocacy and capacity building), these budgets seem typical for the kind of work that the participating agencies are delivering.
II. EFFICIENCY (INPUTS TO OUTPUTS) – WHAT HAPPENED?

The country projects have been operational for an average of 21 months, a relatively short period of time for policy and advocacy results to be actualised (see table 5 below).

Table 4 Time Elapsed in Country Projects as at 31 October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Country Projects</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>END - Adjusted to reflect extensions as relevant</th>
<th>Months to Date</th>
<th>% of Original Allocated Time</th>
<th>% of Adjusted Allocated Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>OCT 12</td>
<td>JUN 15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>OCT 12</td>
<td>DEC 14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>OCT 12</td>
<td>DEC 14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>OCT 12</td>
<td>JUN 15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>SEP 13</td>
<td>DEC 15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji (Pacific Island Countries)</td>
<td>OCT 12</td>
<td>JUN 15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>APR 13</td>
<td>DEC 15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>OCT 12</td>
<td>DEC 14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>OCT 13</td>
<td>DEC 15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>OCT 12</td>
<td>MAR 15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>MAR 13</td>
<td>DEC 15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The start date shown above relates to the date that funds were transferred to the participating UN agencies head offices. Actual project activity usually only commenced 2 – 3 months after the fund transfer date, so in fact the actual implementation period for the projects has been around 18 months on average. Country project activities can be categorised according to the UNPRPD enabling factors and thematic priorities.²¹

- Enabling Legislation
- Empowering Attitudes
- Capable, Inclusive Institutions
- Access to Services
- Access to Justice
- Accessibility Standards
- Habilitation and Rehabilitation
- Data and Evidence

²¹ UNPRPD, 2014; UNPRPD: Strategic and Operational Framework, United Nations, New York
Access to services has been the highest priority for Round 1 country projects, with legislation and capacity building institutions following.

Initial outputs of the partnership at a global level include the UNPRPD strategic and operational framework; and the UNPRPD quality assurance framework. Both documents were central to the establishment and administration of the partnership and preceded the first round of project funding. The strategic and operational framework was developed in 2012 following a consultation process that included all the partner agencies, civil society and donors. It was an iterative process commencing with the partner agencies before being widened out to include civil society and donors. The whole process took approximately six months.

In addition to the country-level projects, UNPRPD has been focused on ensuring that people with disabilities were included in the post-2015 strategic discussions and allocated funding towards this purpose. UNICEF and UNDESA led the online consultation that was supported by UNPRPD in preparation for the General Assembly High Level Meeting on Disability in 2013. Submissions from more than 60 countries were received. In addition a publication, “Towards an inclusive and sustainable future for all” was produced in partnership with the International Disability Alliance and the International Disability and Development Consortium. Whilst it is difficult to attribute increased attention to disability inclusion in the Post-2015 discussions to any one set of interventions, the current Sustainable Development Goals being debated do include reference to people with disabilities within the ‘leave no one behind’ agenda.22

An African continental conference on disability rights and the post-2015 agenda was also supported

---

during 2014. It resulted in the Nairobi Declaration on the rights of persons with disabilities, the implementation of the CRPD in Africa and an inclusive development agenda post-2015.\textsuperscript{23}

The Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office Gateway website reports that 90\% of the available funds have been transferred to participating organisations to deliver activities on behalf of UNPRPD. This includes country-level projects and funds to support participation in the post-2015 discussions.

\textbf{Chart 3 UNPRPD Use of Funds}

The overall UNPRPD December 2013 Progress Report focuses on the successes of the program and provides only examples of activities and outcomes delivered by the country-level projects. More detailed information on the variation of impact and outcome indicators is provided, together with greater detail of activities delivered, in the project specific annual reports.

A review of a sample of both the quarterly and the annual monitoring reports revealed that the quality of reporting from country project teams varies greatly, suggesting that UNPRPD’s current focus on improving capacity building of country teams is appropriate. Both types of reports follow a prescribed template.\textsuperscript{24} The quarterly monitoring reports do require projects to link expenditure with each outcome, although not many do this successfully.\textsuperscript{25,26} Where this is done successfully it is possible to do some basic calculations to determine cost and financial attribution to donors as proxy for attributing the degree of change that

\textsuperscript{23} Nairobi Declaration: Inclusive Post 2015 Development Agenda for Persons with Disabilities in Africa (UNPRPD 2014)
\textsuperscript{24} UNPRPD Annual Progress Report Template; UNPRPD Quarterly Update Report Template
\textsuperscript{25} The Annual Work Plans also require projects to link expenditure to outcomes
can be attributed to each donor in each country project. Each country project is only part financed by UNPRPD, requiring the UN partners in-country to leverage additional funds from other sources.

Table 5 Country-level Project Expenditure by Outcome as at 31 October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1 Country Project</th>
<th>Outcome 1 %</th>
<th>Outcome 2 %</th>
<th>Outcome 3 %</th>
<th>Outcome 4 %</th>
<th>Outcome 5 %</th>
<th>Total Exp.to Date (USD)</th>
<th>Total UNPRPD Fund Contribution (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp to date (USD)</td>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>Exp to date (USD)</td>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>Exp to date (USD)</td>
<td>Budget (USD)</td>
<td>Exp to date (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>19,437.32</td>
<td>19,117.50</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35,793.89</td>
<td>67,817.50</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33,536.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>191,220.00</td>
<td>184,864.70</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>128,657.00</td>
<td>122,658.00</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>68,052.00</td>
<td>68,051.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49,210.00</td>
<td>49,210.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>20,565.35</td>
<td>32,505.00</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>144,749.65</td>
<td>186,380.00</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100,364.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>42,660.90</td>
<td>40,950.00</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>73,147.12</td>
<td>133,892.00</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38,782.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji (Pacific Island Countries)</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td>507,000.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>46,300.00</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>47,924.64</td>
<td>113,425.00</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>80,170.00</td>
<td>96,300.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71,814.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>39,571.81</td>
<td>39,571.81</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>198,823.28</td>
<td>198,823.28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>201,605.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>25,022.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9,966.25</td>
<td>90,000.00</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24,604.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>88,368.00</td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>88,868.12</td>
<td>86,662.00</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>157,226.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>61,456.00</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>113,647.93</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2,364,733.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While financial reports are still being generate which may include minor differences, the project reports that all funding has been in principle expended.

Table 5 above shows the expenditure rates of the UNPRPD fund contribution by objective for each Round 1 country project. Between them the country projects are tracking activities supporting 37 outcomes. Of these outcomes, 23 have spent more than 50% of the UNPRPD funds available. Of those outcomes where more than 50% of UNPRPD funding has been spent, 83% can demonstrate outcome-level results, while most of the rest can report progress towards outcome level results.

Five outcome-level results have been achieved with less than 50% of the planned funding being used, while four outcome areas have reported no outcome-level results.

This analysis only reports on the UNPRPD fund contribution to each country project. Country projects also have to provide co-funding for project activities. It is not clear whether projects choose to spend cost sharing funds first or spend both UNPRPD funds and cost sharing funds simultaneously. Prioritising one funding source over another in expenditure can also influence the spending pattern of projects. We cannot also exclude geo-political influences when considering whether a country-level program is spending or not spending.

Although this review does not cover the Round 2 projects commencing in 2014, it is however worth noting that UNPRPD put in place technical support for country teams wishing to apply for Round 2, so that the lessons learned from Round 1 could feed into better quality applications. This helpline was facilitated by Trinity College Dublin, who has also been working on Theories of Change for country projects in Round 2 (see section 3).

---

26 The Indonesia Quarterly Update Report for Q4 2013 suggests that some projects are doing this, but it by no means clear that all projects are taking this approach.

27 Key informan interview with Emanuele Sapienza, Technical Secretariat for the UNPRPD, UNDP, 18 September 2014
### Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs were unnecessarily high and produced low outputs</th>
<th>Inputs were average and produced high outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inputs were unnecessarily high and produced high outputs</td>
<td>Inputs were low and produced high outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs were necessarily high and produced high outputs</td>
<td>Inputs were low and produced low outputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outputs in the initial set up phase focused on producing documents that would inform the governance and administration of UNPRPD. Additional outputs have been the participation of people with disabilities in the post-2015 discussions and two funding rounds. The rating selected above is mostly a reflection of the scope of the country-level project funding rounds rather than the activities undertaken directly on behalf of UNPRPD. UNPRPD argues that its primary focus is on the country level and that it is appropriate that we focus mostly on the delivery of activities within the country projects. The focus on country-level projects is a clear fulfilment of the UNPRPD strategy, however further analysis of monitoring data by UNPRPD would provide assurance that at a global level the partnership was functioning as efficiently as possible while delivering the best possible outputs for the funds available.

### III. EFFECTIVENESS (OUTPUTS TO OUTCOMES) – WHAT RESULTED?

Chart 2 in Section ii above outlined how the country projects prioritised project activities according to the UNPRPD enabling factors and thematic priorities. The Round 1 progress update to 31 October 2014 provided current data to allow UNPRPD to illustrate how actual results (progress towards outcomes and outcomes achieved) to date match planned country project priorities.

---

28 UNPRPD, 2014; UNPRPD: Strategic and Operational Framework, United Nations, New York
While most projects planned to focus on access to services, most progress to date has been on influencing capable and inclusive institutions. This might reflect that for service delivery to be effective, institutions have to have the right capacity and be inclusive. Therefore country projects are prioritising institutional improvements ahead of service delivery in the main. Enabling legislation and empowering attitudes also show significant progress. Projects can demonstrate progress of at least 50% in every category of activity in chart 4 above (excluding habilitation and rehabilitation, in which no activity had been planned or delivered). Given the difficulty of measuring advocacy and capacity building activities, that only 21 months on average has elapsed in each project delivery cycle and that Round 1 is approximately three quarters of the way through its project delivery cycle, this can be considered a reasonable performance.

In its annual reporting to donors, UNPRPD relies on examples of activities and quotes from high-level supporters to justify its approach and demonstrate potential results. UNPRPD is however aware that further data analysis of results and progress would be useful to donors and to its own internal needs.

The annual reports and quarterly monitoring reports from country projects do provide significant detail on activities that have taken place. Mostly this is a narrative description of activities and a commentary on progress towards planned outcomes, rather than an analysis of results. However as some projects have pointed out, their activity only started in 2013 (in Tunisia, Palestine, South Africa and Viet Nam projects only started in the second half of 2013) and in the short time since project inception, many of the advocacy and behaviour change outcomes intended by the projects will not have happened yet. In addition (as noted elsewhere) Palestine and Ukraine have also experienced extended periods of armed conflict during implementation, which will also have affected project delivery.

The webpages for each project on the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office Gateway website provide only a project description and financial commitment (and burn rate) for each project, but do not detail actual
outputs and outcomes. There is a general belief in International Development that advocacy and capacity building core functions in NGOs and agencies is difficult or impossible to monitor effectively and that the results that really matter take years to transpire. The impact of changing attitudes and behaviours does indeed take many years, but measuring advocacy in order to determine short-term outputs, outcomes and medium-term results and to inform strategic development is being actively tackled by other NGOs. UNPRPD is working on how to better collect, analyse and report on these activities at a fund level to ensure that its strategy developed in 2011-2012 is still appropriate and deliverable, or whether any adjustments need to be made to take account of changes.

UNPRPD has prepared analysis of Round 1 project activity and results for this case study that can form part of its future data analysis needs with further refinement.

UNPRPD is also working with Trinity College Dublin (Centre for Global Health) (CGH) to design appropriate indicators and the M&AE Framework for Round 2. CGH is supporting UNPRPD projects in the development of Theories of Change in recognition of the fact that change in advocacy and policy is not a straightforward or linear process. The causal chain process used in developing a theory of change should help UNPRPD understand what it can measure, where to look for the evidence and how to learn from this process. This work should also spark a review of the two current results chains that are in use by UNPRPD and are reflected in the Strategic and Operational Framework. These results chains do need further review to incorporate what UNPRPD has learned from Round 1 and from the Round 2 application process. Country projects only refer to outcomes that relate to persons with disabilities (result chain 1) when working on their project logframes and do not include institutional level changes (result chain 2).

Some of the annual reports reviewed do highlight that country projects have been able to access funding and support from other international development organisations and agencies. It appears that a key outcome of the UNPRPD country projects has been the closer working of the UN partners in-country and the greater awareness of disability amongst the country teams, which supports key objectives of the UNPRPD to influence the UN system, encourage collaborative working and improve the way that disability issues are handled. The Civil Society Focus group also suggested that initiating calls for proposals also generated interest and awareness. For example there were 76 expressions of interest for Round 2 (up from 63 in Round 1). A total of 35 full applications were submitted, from which 10 were chosen for funding.

UNPRPD made use of three objectives for its work on influencing the UN system and in feedback on this case study, reported on changes observed as a result of its work.

---

29 UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Moldova, April 2013; UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Tunisia, April 2013; UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Costa Rica, April 2013
30 Civil Society Focus Group (IDA, IDDC), 30 October 2014
Table 7 UNPRPD Success at Influencing the UN System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater awareness of disability as a relevant development issue among UNCTs</td>
<td>Very limited UNCT engagement in the area of disability rights as documented by UNCT annual reporting in 2011 and 2012 as well as background information contained in UNPRPD R1 submissions</td>
<td>A very large number of UNCTs (63 in Round 1, 76 in Round 2) engaged in in-depth collective discussions on the relevance of disability as a development issue and to their work - many for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of working together on disability rights within the UN system at global and country level</td>
<td>No joint UN programmatic platform on disability before 2011 (only the Inter-Agency Support Group on the CRPD for broad policy coherence and exchange of information). Four UN entities originally signing the UNPRPD MoU in 2011. No joint UN program on disability at country level before 2012.</td>
<td>Currently 8 UN entities have joined the UNPRPD making a formal commitment to working in a coordinated way through country level joint programs. UN Women has formally indicated the intention to join.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater recognition of DPOs and participation in the work of the UN system at global and country level</td>
<td>Representative organizations of persons with disabilities engaged on an ad hoc basis in a consultative capacity. Very limited engagement with DPOs on the part of UNCTs</td>
<td>Representative organizations of persons with disabilities are, through IDA, a full member of the UNPRPD MC and play an active role, on an equal footing with other members in shaping all policy, program and financial decisions. In all the countries that participated in UNPRPD calls for proposals the UNCT proactively reached out to DPOs – in many cases for the first time – and engaged in in-depth conversations about partnership options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Civil Society Focus Group reported that they had perceived a significant change in attitude towards disability since the inception of the UNPRPD (although couched in a caution that there was still a long way to go). Of the participating agencies, UNICEF emerged as the one considered to have most changed in relation to disability.

In addition, the Civil Society Focus Group, the Policy Advisor, Inclusive Political Processes at the UNDP and the two Key Informants from Moldova and Togo made reference to the convening power of the UNPRPD. When UNPRPD projects are endorsed by the UN Resident Coordinator it is reported as having a lot of political power. Work supported at country level gains a great deal of political visibility, which makes it relatively easy for both the individual UN agencies and civil society to convene meetings at the highest level.

Working alone, UN agencies could not convene the kind of meetings that a Resident Coordinator can convene. This convening power adds to raising the profile of disability inclusion at a country level.31

The participating UN agencies also made reference to the influence of the UNPRPD on their approaches to collaboration with other UN agencies at a country level. For example, in Uganda – a country selected for the second funding round - UNICEF had never worked with other UN agencies on disability before and had not engaged directly with the Ministry of Education on the issue of disability. It transpired that UNESCO and UNICEF were in fact involved in highly complementary work but had never talked to each other about joining forces until the UNPRPD Round 2 call for proposals. The agencies acknowledge that on their own they do not have the range of skills necessary to implement a UNPRPD-type program. The agencies also value the opportunity the UNPRPD provides for them to connect with DPOs on the ground. This is relatively new for most agencies but the UNPRPD facility gives them the opportunity to engage meaningfully with civil society and in particular with DPOs.32 An added benefit of such collaboration is a unified advocacy message from both UN agencies and civil society, making engagement with government much more powerful (although this is also cited as a relatively new thing at country level for both the UN agencies and for governments). In terms of the UNDP itself, the new 2014 – 2017 strategy has cited disability (see section i. Economy above) on two occasions. There is improved awareness of disability in UNDP and understanding that disability has implications for development. In interviews UNDP cited the scope of disability as a challenge. Disability could potentially affect every aspect of the agency’s work and achieving this could be difficult.33 However the new reporting framework is expected to include a requirement for UNDP country teams to report on disability.

---

31 Civil Society Focus Group (IDA, IDDC), 30 October 2014, Key Informant Interview, Suki Beaver, Policy Advisor, Inclusive Political Processes, UNDP, October 2014, Key informant interview with Claude Cahn, Human Rights Advisor, OHCHR (Lead, OHCHR) and Alina Grigoras (OHCHR), Moldova, October 2014, Key informant interview with Christine Jaulmes, UNICEF Deputy Resident Representative (Lead, UNICEF), Togo, 31 2014
32 UN Agency Focus Group (UNDESA, UNFPA, UNICEF), 30 October 2014
33 Key Informant Interview, Suki Beaver, Policy Advisor, Inclusive Political Processes, UNDP, 31 October
The UNPRPD is constantly evolving and data reporting and analysis is yet to catch up to where the activities undertaken by country projects are. Limited human resources capacity at UNPRPD Technical Secretariat level has hampered its ability to provide a higher level of technical support to countries, resulting in variable quality in reporting upwards. At a global level, UNPRPD should undertake more aggregate reporting of the funding rounds to help it better understand the broader impact that its country projects are clearly having on the ground, but which is not being fully reported upwards and outwards. Much of the activity delivered at a country level has been reliant on the UNPRPD providing funding and not all country projects have yet identified how results will be sustained beyond the lifetime of the UNPRPD funding. This is particularly true where engagement between the UN system and government or DPOs is entirely new.

Considering that the work of the UNPRPD is delivered both directly and indirectly, sustainability needs to be viewed in two ways: sustainability of the UNPRPD and sustainability of the results of the country projects. Some country projects have delivered early results, of which some are sustainable because external funding has been found, while for other projects it is still too early to tell whether the results or intended results will be sustainable. The future of the UNPRPD is almost entirely donor-dependent, and is likely to always be so, which also suggests that the UNPRPD eventually has to get better at fundraising and donor management. The difficulty here is that it is not an independent agency and therefore currently dependent on this type of support from UNDP. From the evidence collected during this review, we believe there is clear potential for sustainability of country-level results and (as it improves its practices and processes) for sustainability of the UNPRPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Outputs lead to very limited outcomes</th>
<th>Outputs led to a high level of outcomes; yet it is unclear if / how they will be sustainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs lead to an average level of outcomes</td>
<td>Outputs led to a high level of outcomes with clear potential for sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs led to a high level of outcomes which are not sustainable</td>
<td>Outputs led to a high level of outcomes across the program that are clearly sustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. EQUITY (POPULATION TARGET AND REACH) WHO PARTICIPATED AND BENEFITED?

There is evidence that a significant number of people with disabilities participated in the online consultation ahead of the General Assembly High Level Meeting on Disability and Development. The report “Towards an inclusive and sustainable future for all” produced in partnership with the International Disability Alliance and the International Disability and Development Consortium highlights the importance of inclusion and diversity to people with disabilities and suggests that there is a strong desire to be engaged in the development and capacity building of disabled people’s organisations (DPOs) and services for people with disabilities.

Interestingly the report highlights that good data is essential to understanding the needs of people with disabilities and a highlighted comment in the report says “The current system allows countries to demonstrate ‘success’ based on total numbers without ever including those who are the most difficult to reach, children with disabilities.”

In following up this work, in 2014 UNPRPD committed USD 45,000 to the development of an advocacy toolkit to build on the work of the report. In addition UNPRPD has encouraged participating UN agencies to work together to produce a single unified way to collect disability data. Although discussions have been ongoing for a while, the participating UN agencies have recently committed to working on a unified system, which could be a significant breakthrough in data collection and management globally.

Additionally a two-day conference and training seminar in Nairobi in March 2014 brought representatives from 13 countries together to discuss and issue the Nairobi Declaration on an inclusive development agenda post-2015 that could be used by DPOs and civil society, in advocacy. This was seen as a significant step forward for DPOs and advocacy groups in Africa. The Civil Society Focus Group reported that the Nairobi conference was precisely the kind of output and the declaration the kind of outcome that would have been very difficult to achieve without the UNPRPD. In addition, new stakeholders, such as African Ministers, African Union representatives and representatives from a range of women’s organisations attended the Nairobi conference, widening the traditional pool of attendees at such events.

UNPRPD considers proposed collaboration with local DPOs as part of its assessment of tenders from country teams for country projects, with close collaboration being considered essential for successful project delivery. DPOs that have participated in the UNPRPD country projects have reported increased

---

25 UNPRPD, 2013, Towards an inclusive and sustainable future for all, United Nations, New York, p32
26 Revisions to the Project UNPRPD G1 “Strengthening the disability rights dimension of the post-2015 development framework by supporting the meaningful engagement of persons with disabilities” (UNPRPD 2014)
27 Key informant interview with Emanuele Sapienza, Technical Secretariat for the UNPRPD, Social Inclusion at UNDP, 30 – 31 October 2014
28 Nairobi Declaration: Inclusive Post 2015 Development Agenda for Persons with Disabilities in Africa (UNPRPD 2014)
29 Civil Society Focus Group (IDA, IDDC), 30 October 2014
capacity (sometimes by working collaboratively) and increased participation at a country level in discussions, meetings and project delivery.40

The annual reports from projects also include case studies of individuals that have benefitted from the activities of the projects and provide some detail on which stakeholders have been involved in each activity (attending training or workshops, or supporting change in policy or law, etc.). Participation by DPOs, people with disabilities, government, companies and other stakeholders has been documented well at an activity level, with some descriptive analysis undertaken on whether participants have found activities useful and beneficial. The benefit to DPOs and CSOs of training and capacity building is a theme across the country project reports, with some annual reports highlighting an increased willingness amongst CSOs to participate in disability-inclusive development.41 While it is early days yet in terms of impact being realised as a result of this capacity building, some country reports do highlight that early outcomes (such as establishing an ombudsman for mental health in Moldova) can have radical effects on DPOs, government and CSOs and ultimately individuals.

While the strategy of the UNPRPD and the participating agencies is to work at country-level through organisational capacity building and advocacy and policy change (and these are necessary activities), the experience of the post-2015 discussions does highlight that greater inclusion of people with disabilities in the country-level policy environment and in the planning of country-level project activity is highly desirable. The Civil Society Focus group cited the visit of the Special Rapporteur to Indonesia (as part of the post-2015 consultations) was especially valuable to DPOs there, giving them the opportunity to come together and advocate around a common agenda for the first time. A similar example of increased political commitments cited was the High Level Meetings of Mayors of Inclusive Cities (also in Indonesia).42

The annual reports reviewed all highlight that the UNPRPD-funded projects have provided opportunities to access additional funding either for the country projects or for programs and activities derived from the UNPRPD country projects. Leverage is recorded in almost every project annual report including how increased capacity has enabled DPOs to form umbrella organisations and consultation groups for better representation and lobbying and how government has expanded on disability activities following interaction with the UNPRPD country project.

The governance and management structure of the UNPRPD also provides opportunity for persons with disability to serve as full members of the UNPRPD structure, which is unprecedented in the UN system.44

---

40 Key informant interview with Claude Cahn, Human Rights Advisor, OHCHR (Lead, OHCHR) and Alina Grigoras (OHCHR), Moldova, 30 October 2014, Key informant interview with Christine Jaulmes, UNICEF Deputy Resident Representative (Lead, UNICEF), Togo, 31 October 2014
41 UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Tunisia, April 2013
42 Civil Society Focus Group (IDA, IDDC), 30 October 2014
43 UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Indonesia, April 2013; UNPRPD Annual Progress Report, Tunisia, April 2013
44 Strategic and Operational Framework (UNPRPD 2014)
### Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very limited equity in the outcomes achieved</th>
<th>A high level of equity achieved in the outcomes yet it is unclear if / how they will be sustainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some components and level of equity in the outcomes achieved</td>
<td>A high level of equity achieved in the outcomes with clear potential for sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high level of equity achieved in the outcomes but are not sustainable</td>
<td>A high level of equity achieved across the partnership that are clearly sustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have rated Equity so highly in this case study not only because of the high level of engagement with DPOs through the country projects and with persons with disability during the post-2015 consultations, but also because of the increased level of disability awareness and engagement in the UN agencies participating in the UNPRPD. As one of the participants in the UN Agency Focus Group said “you can’t unthink these things.” Some of the UN agencies have already demonstrated how their systems, processes and programs have incorporated disability into them and how their ways of working have been affected by the existence of the UNPRPD.

### IV. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy: Costs average and meet quality requirements</th>
<th>Efficiency Inputs were average and produced high outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Outputs led to a high level of outcomes yet it is unclear if / how they will be sustainable</td>
<td>Equity A high level of equity achieved in the outcomes with clear potential for sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The UNPRPD has presented UN agencies, DPOs and governments with an opportunity to scale up their response to the CRPD and to disability more generally. Round 1 projects were chosen based on their ability to deliver results quickly, so generally represent countries and projects that were already in discussion or were waiting for funding to be identified. This suggests that the timing of the establishment of the UNPRPD was fortuitous, although the initial set up period was somewhat fast-tracked in order to have projects active by the start of the post-2015 consultation period.
According to the results of the key informant interviews, focus groups and round table discussions and further document reviews, DFAT could claim at least partial attribution for the following changes:

- The existence of the UNPRPD as a mechanism to promote disability issues globally;
- Increased collaboration between UN agencies at a country-level; and
- More joined up working between DPOs and better DPO capacity for policy advocacy and service delivery

The UNPRPD has had a number of challenges since its inception. Current reporting on the use of funds by UNPRPD is focused at the process level, with little reporting on how funds link to results and outcomes. This affects assessment of effectiveness and equity and could also affect assessment of efficiency at a more detailed level. UNPRPD does include highlights of successes in its annual reports to donors, however this top level review of success does not allow donors to fully determine their attribution or value for money as they may need to do for their own reporting requirements. It should be noted that not all the donors have expressed to UNPRPD that they need to demonstrate value for money or measure financial performance alongside program performance, so UNPRPD does not collect data with this type of analysis in mind. Internally projects do report on challenges and are required to link funding to outcomes, although few do. The varying quality in project reporting to the Technical Secretariat will have an impact on the content of the report to donors.

The additional aggregate analysis that UNPRPD was able to produce for this case study suggests that with better resourcing the Technical Secretariat will be able to:

- Provide better analysis of project activity and funding (including value for money); and
- Provide better support to country projects to improve their own project design, management, monitoring and reporting.

However it is good to see that UNPRPD is aware of the M&E issue and is working with CGH at Trinity College Dublin to develop Theories of Change for Round 2 projects and a broader M&E framework. The challenge however will remain that Round 1 projects have not benefitted from this monitoring input and therefore collecting comparable data on Rounds 1 and 2 could be difficult. This could affect considerations of value for money over the longer term when donors wish to conduct such analysis across both project rounds (and any subsequent funding rounds that are delivered).

It is clear from the post-2015 discussion process, engagement with DPOs in the Nairobi conference and the DPO collaboration requirement in the country project tender process that greater engagement with beneficiary groups at every level of project design and implementation is not only desirable, but also necessary. Beneficiary requirements should be informing partnership design from the outset to ensure best possible engagement and buy-in at every stage of implementation.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

For UNPRPD (UNDP)

1. Alongside the Theories of Change and M&E Framework being developed, ensure that quarterly and annual reporting of project and activity progress includes causal chain reference, evidence and analysis; and financial analysis of expenditure at both a fund and project level, linked to results (if you can get the projects to complete the current quarterly monitoring template fully, including quantitative performance data and expenditure as required, this will be possible);

2. Conduct more aggregate reporting and data analysis to get a better handle on the “big picture” of the UNPRPD;

3. Agree annual outcome-level results with donors to the Fund that can be reported against each year and repeat the exercise each year;

4. Include outcome level results analysis in annual reports, based on the outcomes agreed with donors;

5. UNPRPD should continue to broaden its donor-base, using the evidence from Round 1 projects to approach and attract more donors. This will help improve its longer-term sustainability and support its organisational development further.