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**UN Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities**

**UNPRPD R1 – PHASE 2 SUPPORT**

**Project Title: Pacific Enable**

**Programme duration: 24 months**

**PART 2. PROJECT PROPOSAL**

1. **Objectives and expected results**

Max 1000 words

*Based on the information provided in Part 1, please provide a concise formulation of the programme objectives (expected impact, intended outcomes and outputs) utilizing the table format provided below. In defining the project objectives, please refer to the following definitions based on the UNDG Harmonized RBM Terminology:*

* *Impact: Observable change in the conditions of life of identifiable population groups. This change amounts to the further realization of a right enshrined in internationally-agreed human rights instruments.*
* *Outcome: Short-term and medium-term effect of an intervention’s outputs, typically requiring the active participation of external partners beyond the organizations directly implementing a project. Outcomes represent changes in development conditions which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact. These changes can be of different nature: economic, socio-cultural, institutional, environmental, technological or of other types.*
* *Outputs: The products and services which result from the completion of activities within a development intervention.*

*Please also provide 1 to 3 impact indicators and 1 to 3 indicators for each of the outcomes (including baseline, goal and means of verification). When providing indicator baseline and goal information, please provide, a breakdown by gender.*

**Table 1. Expected impact** *(there will be* *only one such table in the programme proposal)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact** | | | |
| Countries in the Pacific have increased national capacity to align their legislative frameworks with the CRPD and report on CRPD implementation, taking into consideration the General Comments adopted by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities | | | |
| **Impact indicators** | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline\*** | **Goal\*** | **Means of verification** |
| Legislative frameworks are developed/reviewed to reduce discrimination and protect, promote and enforce the rights of persons with disabilities. | Legislative reviews have been undertaken in RMI, Nauru and Vanuatu.  Specific CRPD legislation has been enacted in RMI.  No regional model law exists. | One or more countries have a CRPD aligned review of all domestic laws; one or more countries have drafted CRPD compliant legislation; and regional model law is developed. | Acceptance by requesting government agencies of draft review(s) and Bill(s); and regional model provisions presented to regional ministerial or other meeting for endorsement. |
| Overdue reports are submitted to the CRPD Committee. | As of December 2016, Nauru, Kiribati, Palau, Papua New Guinea and Tuvalu have overdue reports under the CRPD. | At least three overdue reports are submitted. | Submitted reports are posted on the CRPD website. |
| Shadow reports are submitted by CSOs, including DPOs, to the CRPD Committee. | One CSO submission for the CRPD review of the Cook Islands in April 2015. | At least two CSOs (at least one of which is a national level DPO where possible, including women with disabilities) involved in submissions for each country being reviewed by the CRPD Committee. | Submitted reports are posted on the CRPD website. |

**Table 2. Expected outcomes** *(there will be as many such tables as the outcomes envisaged by the programme)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 1** | | | |
| National legislative frameworks, including disability specific legislation, sectoral legislation and national constitutions, are strengthened for compliance with CRPD, taking into consideration the General Comments adopted by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities | | | |
| **Outcome indicators** | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline\*** | **Goal\*** | **Means of verification** |
| CRPD compliant legislative review(s) drafted and submitted. | Palau, FSM & Solomon Islands - no CRPD legislative reviews. | One or more legislative reviews are completed. | Acceptance by requesting government agency(ies) of draft review(s). |
| CRPD compliant Bill(s) drafted and submitted. | Vanuatu, Nauru & RMI – little or no CRPD compliant legislation.\*  \* Note - RMI has enacted stand-alone CRPD legislation but has not yet harmonized its existing laws. | One or more Bills are drafted. | Acceptance by instructing government agency(ies) of draft Bill(s). |
| CRPD model law (or provisions) drafted and submitted. | Pacific region - no CRPD model law. There are also no model provisions in other regions. | Regional model provisions are developed through gender and disability inclusive processes. | Regional model provisions presented to regional ministerial or other meeting for endorsement. |
| **Outputs** | | | |
| **Formulation** | | | **Tentative timeline** |
| * 1. Technical assistance provided to selected country(ies) to work with ddisability focal Ministries, government legislative drafters, DPOs and other government and non-government stakeholders to develop CPRPD legislative review(s). | | | 2016-2018 |
| * 1. Technical assistance provided to selected country(ies) to work with of disability focal Ministries, government legislative drafters, DPOs and other government and non-government stakeholders to develop draft CRPD legislation. | | | 2016-2018 |
| * 1. Technical assistance provided to develop regional CRPD model legislative provisions. | | | 2016-2018 |

Please note, flexibility is needed in respect of target countries, and review or drafting assistance, as both depend on receipt of country requests.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2** | | | |
| Governments and civil society organisations, especially DPOs, submit reports to the CRPD Committee and are well-prepared for the CRPD review of their respective countries. | | | |
| **Outcome indicators** | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline\*** | **Goal\*** | **Means of verification** |
| CRPD reports in Kiribati, Palau and Papua New Guinea submitted. | No CRPD reports submitted by Governments in Kiribati, Palau and Papua New Guinea – all are now overdue. | At least 2 CRPD reports are submitted and one another being completed and/or finalised. These reports cover the situation of women and girls with disabilities, taking into consideration General Comment 3 on Article 6, adopted by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in August 2016 and any reporting under CEDAW and CRC. | Submitted reports are published on the webpage of the CRPD Committee. |
| CRPD shadow reports in Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, and Vanuatu submitted. | No CRPD shadow reports submitted by CSOs, including DPOs, in Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, and Vanuatu. | At least 2 CRPD shadow reports are submitted and the others are being completed and/or finalised. These reports cover the situation of women and girls with disabilities, taking into consideration General Comment 3 on Article 6, adopted by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in August 2016. | Submitted reports are published on the webpage of the CRPD Committee. |
| The Government and CSOs, including DPOs, are well-prepared for the CRPD review of Vanuatu and Nauru or Tuvalu. | No previous CRPD review for Vanuatu and Nauru or Tuvalu. | Quality interactive dialogue between the CRPD Committee and the Government delegation, with inputs from CSOs, including DPOs, from Vanuatu and Nauru or Tuvalu. These dialogues cover the situation of women and girls with disabilities, and include representation of women with disabilities where possible. | CRPD reviews in Geneva. |
| **Outputs** | | | |
| **Formulation** | | | **Tentative timeline** |
| 2.1. Technical assistance provided to Governments in Kiribati, Palau and Papua New Guinea on the preparation, drafting and submission of their report under the CRPD. | | | 2016 - 2018 |
| 2.2. Technical assistance provided to CSOs, especially DPOs, in Kiribati, Nauru, Palau and Vanuatu on the preparation, drafting and submission of shadow reports under the CRPD. | | | 2016 – 2018 |
| 2.3. Technical assistance provided to the Government and CSOs, especially DPOs, in Vanuatu and Nauru or Tuvalu on the preparation of the CRPD reviews in Geneva, including in the form of CRPD mock reviews. | | | 2017 - 2018 |

Please note that the list of target countries is tentative and subject to change – depending on the level of advancement in the preparation of the CRPD report in each country and the schedule of CRPD reviews, as decided by the CRPD Committee.

1. **Management arrangements**

Max 500 words; Ref. UNPRPD SOF Section 3.1.2

*Utilizing the table format provided below, indicate for each of the proposed programme outcomes: the UNPRPD Focal Point (i.e. the UNPRPD Participating Organization that will have primary responsibility for the achievement of that particular outcome); the implementing agency or agencies (specifying, when necessary, if government institution or NGO); and the main partners (within and beyond the UNPRPD) that will contribute to the realization of the outcome.*

*Briefly also describe, in this section, any other relevant management arrangements, including*

* *Overall coordination arrangements and the way in which the programme will ensure a streamlined, efficient flow of communication with national partners;*
* *The overall governance structure of the programme (e.g. role and composition of the country-level programme Steering Committee).*

*Please also indicate, if possible and relevant, the level and focus of technical support that will be expected from headquarters, regional service centers or other UNCTs.*

OHCHR has been the focal agency in the Pacific leading the development of the UNPRPD proposal. OHCHR will receive and transfer the proportion of the funds allocated for the work that will be carried out by UNESCAP and by PDF. Each of the UN Participating and Implementing agencies will be responsible for managing implementation and monitoring progress of their assigned activities as shown below. OHCHR will coordinate the compilation of monitoring, review and evaluation reports related to UNPRPD implementation. It will also be responsible for conducting quarterly meetings of the Steering Committee which will be composed of one representative from each of three organisations involved in the project. Partners from Phase 1, i.e. WHO, ILO and UNICEF, will be invited to the meetings to update on their respective work on disability.

The Steering Committee will discuss progress of implementation and provide advice and guidance to each partner agencies implementing activities. The Steering Committee will receive technical support from its members, as well as technical support from Suva-based, regional and international technical specialists on disability within UN agencies.

**Table 3. Implementation arrangements**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome number** | **UNPRPD Focal Point** | **Implementing agencies** | **Other partners** |
| 1 | OHCHR | * ESCAP | * Government partners and non-government stakeholders including DPOs and women’s organisations, including young women, in target countries * Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) * Other UN agencies |
| 2 | OHCHR | * OHCHR * PDF | * Government partners and national CSOs, including DPOs and women’s organisations, including young women, in Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu and Vanuatu * Secretariat of the Pacific Community/Regional Rights Resource Team (SPC/RRRT) * Other UN agencies |

1. **National ownership, participation and partnership-building**

Max 1000 words; ref. UNPRPD SOF Section 3.1.3

*Please describe the following:*

*7.1. The way in which Government and other relevant partners will take over the work initiated by project after the project completion;*

ESCAP’s work on legislation was undertaken in partnership with PIFS during Phase I, and it is anticipated that this will continue during Phase II. However, PIFS involvement in national work is subject to annual PIF priorities and availability of resources, and will focus on providing peer review assistance to legislative drafters. At country level, ESCAP and PIFS work in partnership with disability focal Ministries or departments, and those government agencies responsible for reviewing and drafting legislation, including parliamentary counsel. National ownership of the drafting process is a priority for governments, and PIFS - through the Pacific Legislative Drafters Technical Forum - encourages countries to take ownership of their drafting processes while receiving technical assistance, training and advice. Once legislative reviews are completed, it is the responsibility of governments to move forward with the proposed amendments, where they have drafting capacity and resources. Where drafting assistance is needed, a collaborative and inclusive approach is taken, and governments control all policy aspects of the drafting. The inclusion of model provisions in the current proposal is designed to broaden regional coverage as well as to help ensure that after the project ends all countries will have access to CRPD compliant guidelines which they can use as a benchmark to harmonise their domestic legislation.

The Pacific Disability Forum (PDF) is a key regional leading agency on disability. As one of the implementing agencies, PDF has been closely involved in the development of this proposal to ensure correct framing of the proposal from the perspectives and best interests of persons living with disability. The objectives of this proposal serve to enhance the objectives of this organization, which ultimately, aim to improve the quality of life of persons with disabilities within the region. Through the project, PDF will receive technical assistance to support its own objectives. It is anticipated that PDF will work closely both with ESCAP and OHCHR. In particular, PDF has expressed strong interest in working with OHCHR on developing its own technical expertise on CRPD reporting. In this regard, OHCHR will provide extensive support to PDF on the provision of technical assistance to national CSOs, including DPOs and organizations of women and girls. It is expected that the partnership between the three implementing agencies will continue beyond the project. After the end of the project, PDF will continue to work with national DPOs in other countries of the region on CRPD shadow reporting.

National governments involved in the project will continue to work on CRPD reporting in subsequent cycles and have further opportunities to use the skills gained during the project. Under the CRPD Convention, States parties have to report on implementation every four years.

*For 7.2 and 7.3, please formulate a concrete objective with indicators, using the table formats provided below*

The process of reviewing and drafting legislation, and the substance of the legislation itself, will be as inclusive as possible. Persons with disabilities will be consulted through their representative organisations and women’s organisations, including women with disabilities, consulted in order to improve capture of intersectional discrimination. Reviews and drafting will identify opportunities to improve representation of persons with disabilities and enhance disability mainstreaming with a gender perspective across all sectoral legislation. In addition, consideration will be given to affirmative action measures (e.g. employment quotas), ensuring strong provisions on accessibility and reasonable/procedural accommodation, and addressing gender issues, including all forms of violence against women and girls with disabilities. Legislation that discriminates against persons with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities will receive particular attention in view of the extreme marginalization of this group from political and public life.

**Table 5. Meaningful participation of persons with disabilities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meaningful participation objective** | | | |
| Persons with disabilities and National Disabled Persons Organisations (DPOs) are consulted, included and participate meaningfully in mainstreaming disability in legislative reviews and reporting processes. | | | |
| **Indicators** | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Goal** | **Means of verification** |
| Number of persons with disabilities disaggregated by sex are consulted and included in all consultations and trainings for reporting | 1 CRPD Shadow report submitted from the Pacific (Cook Islands) | CRPD Shadow reports submitted for Kiribati, Nauru, Palau and Vanuatu | CRPD Shadow reports submitted |
| Consultation, representation, and disability mainstreaming issues are addressed in legislative reviews, including through a review process that is disability and gender inclusive. | Palau, FSM & Solomon Islands - consultation and representation deficits in current legislation. | Legislative reviews promote disability mainstreaming across all sectors and the right of persons (including women and children) with disabilities to be consulted and actively engaged in all relevant decision making processes, including through mandated representation on all appropriate bodies and provisions for accessibility and reasonable accommodation. | Recommendations in legislative reviews. |
| Consultation, representation, and disability mainstreaming provisions, including accessibility and reasonable accommodation, are incorporated in draft Bills. | RMI legislation (*Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2015 and Human Rights Committee Act 2015*) contains consultation and representation provisions. Other domestic laws do not.  Vanuatu & Nauru –recommendations made in legislative reviews but provisions yet to be drafted. | Legislation promotes disability mainstreaming across all sectors and establishes the right of persons (including women and children) with disabilities to be consulted and actively engaged in all relevant decision making processes including through mandated representation on all appropriate bodies. | Legislative provisions in draft Bills. |
| Consultation, representation, and mainstreaming provisions are included in model provisions. | Pacific region - no model law. | Model provisions promote disability mainstreaming across all sectors and the right of persons (including women and children) with disabilities to be consulted and actively engaged in all relevant decision making processes including through mandated representation on all appropriate bodies. | Regional model provisions. |

The UNCTs of Fiji and Samoa, which cover between themselves 15 countries of the Pacific, are currently developing their next UNDAF (called the UN Pacific Strategy or UNPS) for the period 2018-2022. Consultations with relevant stakeholders in the various countries have been completed. The Strategic Prioritization Retreat (SPR) took place in November 2016. A training on HRBA was organized just before the SPR and OHCHR led on this. The UNPS will be finalised and signed in the first half of 2017.

**Table 6. Long-term UN engagement in the area of disability rights**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UN engagement objective** | | | |
| Integrating disability rights into UN human rights reporting in the Pacific | | | |
| **Indicators** | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Baseline** | **Goal** | **Means of verification** |
| Involvement of UN agencies in providing support for the CRPD reporting process. | So far, while both OHCHR and ESCAP have been involved in advocacy for CRPD ratification, only OHCHR provided support on CRPD reporting through a regional workshop which took place in October 2016. | UN agencies, other than OHCHR, provide support for the CRPD reporting process in countries of the region. | UN agencies other than OHCHR report to the Human Rights Quarterly Coordination Meeting on support provided for national CRPD reporting. |
| Integration of disability issues into reporting processes to other UN human rights mechanisms, such as UPR, CEDAW and CRC. | Disability issues are not systematically addressed in trainings organized by UN agencies and related other UN human rights mechanisms. | Systematic integration of disability issues in trainings and mock sessions organized by UN agencies for States | Programmes of training workshops, State reports submitted under other treaties, including CEDAW and CRC, etc. |
| Integration of disability issues in UNCT submissions to UN human rights mechanisms, e.g. treaty bodies, UPR, etc. | ESCAP and UNICEF have provided inputs on disability issues to UNCT submissions for UPR and CEDAW. | Disability issues are comprehensively addressed and mainstreamed in UNCT reports. | UNCT submissions to UN human rights mechanisms. |

*7.4. The way in which the proposed programme will promote partnership-building between governmental and non-governmental organizations, including persons with disabilities and their representative organizations, the broader civil society and social partners.*

The project will promote partnership-building between governmental and non-governmental organisations, especially DPOs including organizations of women with disabilities, by encouraging them to work together on legislation having an impact on the rights of persons with disabilities and on CRPD shadow reporting. In particular and in line with Article 4(3) of the CRPD Convention, governments will be strongly encouraged to closely consult and actively involve DPOs in the development of legislation and CRPD reports. Examples of good practices from other countries will be shared where relevant. Women’s groups are well-established and especially active in several countries of the Pacific and the project will prompt DPOs to engage more with these groups and encourage them to address the situation of women with disabilities.

Disability partnerships are strengthened through the ongoing work of the Disability Working Group which is convened by PIFS and includes various UN organisations (UNICEF, ESCAP, ILO, OHCHR), other CROP agencies (USP, SPC, FFA), donor agencies (DFAT, NZAid), and PDF. A product of the partnership is the development and drafting of a new Pacific Disability Rights Framework: 2016-2025, which includes amongst its strategic objectives effective partnerships/collaboration to support inclusive development efforts by governments.

1. **Knowledge generation and potential for replication**

Max 500 words ref. UNPRPD SOF Section 3.1.4

*Please describe the following:*

* *Arrangements for the monitoring of proposed indicators and overall progress of the programme;*
* *The way in which the proposed programme will engage persons with disabilities and other relevant stakeholders in generating insights on effective ways to mainstream disability rights into the broader work of the UN system;*
* *The way in which the proposed programme plans to document good practices and lessons learnt as well the way in which the programme will involve local, regional and international academia and other knowledge-generating institutions.*

Monitoring of indicators will be done on a rolling basis by the participating organizations, and reported under modalities made available within the Partnership. OHCHR will hold the responsibility for monitoring the overall progress of the programme. In particular, OHCHR will review progress on the indicators identified in the tables included in the present document. A final evaluation will be conducted towards the end of the two-year period, to measure overall impact and to assess the efficiency, timeliness, overall sustainability achieved by each outcome area, noting efforts to ensure broad representation of persons with disabilities, taking into account the practical realities of the Pacific\.

The programme will also generate insights on effective ways to mainstream disability rights into the broader work of the UN system. Persons with disabilities and other relevant stakeholders who take part in the activities under the programme will be asked for suggestions which will be collated and presented to the Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Group (PMEG) of the UNCT and/or the UNCT.

Good practices will be documented in a number of ways. OHCHR will publish short features on such good practices on its Facebook page (which currently has more than 6000 followers in the Pacific), in its quarterly newsletter and through web stories on the global OHCHR website. Participating organisations will be encouraged to engage with the media to discuss and publicize programme achievements. Persons with disabilities, especially women with disabilities, who have taken part in the activities under the programme, could provide inputs, e.g. testimonies or quotes, for stories on the programme.

Local, regional and international academia and other knowledge-generating institutions will be engaged. Programme implementing staff will maintain/establish contacts with academics working on disability rights, especially at the University of the South Pacific (USP) whose main campus is based in Suva, Fiji as PDF has a current MoU with the USP and works closely with the Disability Resource Center. The Disability Informal Working Group which is made up of inter-govermental agencies, UN agencies and development partners like DFAT meets quarterly and is an avenue to share information. Peer reviews of draft reviews and legislation will be sought from the USP law school where appropriate.

There is great potential to replicate the work of this proposal in other countries in the Pacific. All proposed activities are based on entry points that are currently available – where countries have requested support for legislative drafting, CRPD reporting, etc. These cover only a proportion of countries in the Pacific region. As more Pacific countries are considering ratification of the CRPD, work in this area is bound to increase in the coming years. The proposed development of model CRPD provisions encourages a shift towards a more regional focus. This will replicate country based work and generally expedite progress in developing CRPD compliant legal frameworks across the region, including in those countries that are yet to ratify the Convention. With the collaboration of PDF and other partners, this work can be promoted to all countries – lessons learnt shared and challenges minimized – at regional gatherings of PIC governments and DPO representatives. In this regard, this work is a catalyst for further comprehensive work on disability issues in the Pacific.

1. **Budget**

*Please use the template below, based on the format approved by the UNDG Financial Policy Working Group, to provide overall budget information. Please also utilize the attached Excel spreadsheet to provide a budget breakdown by fund recipient (Sheet 1) and by outcome (Sheet 2).*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall budget** | | | | | | | |
| Category | Item | Unit cost | No. units | Total cost | Request from UNPRPD Fund | UNDPRPD POs cost-sharing | Other partners cost-sharing |
| Supplies, commodities, equipment and transport |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel (staff, consultants, travel and training) | Travel of staff and other resource persons (e.g. CRPD Committee member) to 5 countries (Palau, Papua New Guinea, Kiribati, Vanuatu, Tuvalu or Nauru) | Unit costs will vary according to target countries. | 5 | 45,916 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training of counterparts | Venue and printing costs | 2000 | 5 | 10,000 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contracts | Legal specialists/ legislative drafters | 13,000\*  17,000\*  18,500  \*Unit costs will vary according to target countries. | Minimum 1 (review)  Minimum 1 (drafting)  Model provisions | 76,000 | 76,000 | (ESCAP 7%  Included in the 76,000) | Government support for consultations. PIFS/ESCAP –staff TA & travel costs. |
| Shadow Reporting | Unit cost will vary by countries. | 1 | 40,000 | 40,000 |  | DPO support for consultations at National Level |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other direct costs | Evaluation |  |  | 15,000 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal** |  |  |  | **186,916** |  |  |  |
| Indirect costs OHCHR (7%) |  |  |  | 13,084 |  |  |  |
| **Total\*** |  |  |  | **200,000** |  |  |  |

\*During the first phase of the project 350.000 US $ were transferred.