



Proposal to DFAT: 2014-2017

*"The statistics on persons with disabilities and established risk factors for poverty are striking; it is estimated that persons with disabilities make up roughly 15% of the world's population, but possibly 20% of the world's poorest citizens. One household in every four contains a disabled member – which means that 2 billion people live with disability [and associated poverty] on a daily basis."*¹

*"Poverty is not only a matter of income, but also, more fundamentally, a matter of being able to live a life in dignity and enjoy basic human rights and freedoms. It describes a complex of interrelated and mutually reinforcing deprivations, which impact on people's ability to claim and access their civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. In a fundamental way, therefore, the denial of human rights forms part of the very definition of what it is to be poor."*²

I. PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Disability Rights Advocacy Fund³ (DRAF) – a unique grantmaker supporting Disabled Persons' Organizations (DPOs) in the developing world, and operating under common control with the Disability Rights Fund (DRF)⁴ – a pooled fund combining the resources of multiple governmental and private donors -- enables donors to harmonize their efforts & learning in disability-inclusive development and provides donors with an efficient way to reach marginalized populations and grassroots DPOs outside their normal purview.

Over the period 1/7/2014 – 30/6/2017, DRAF is requesting AUD 4,800,000 to empower persons with disabilities (PWDs) to participate in ratification, implementation and monitoring of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) at country, regional and international levels.

During this period, key activities will include: 1) 6 competitive grant rounds (2 per year) distributing up to AUD 2 million each year to DPOs in 23-25 countries in the developing world; 2) technical aid for grantees working on national legislative advocacy and rights monitoring; 3) enhanced partnerships with the Pacific Disability Forum, the International Disability Alliance, and others to increase capacity of the disability movement to effect change, especially in the context of the post-2015 development process; 4)

¹ United Nations, "Disability and the Millennium Development Goals: A Review of the MDG Process and Strategies for Inclusion of Disability Issues in the Millennium Development Goal Efforts," New York: 2011, p. 8.

² Arbour, Louise in foreword to *Principles and Guidelines for a Human Rights Approach to Poverty Reduction Strategies*, OHCHR: HR/PUB/06/12, p. iii.

³ The Disability Rights Advocacy Fund is a 501c4 non-profit grantmaker, operated under common control with the Disability Rights Fund, a 501c3 non-profit grantmaker. Because of US legal restrictions on lobbying, grants which support legislative advocacy or treaty ratification, are managed by DRAF; other grants are managed by DRF.

⁴ Common control refers to organizations which share a governance structure.

growth of the disability movement in Indonesia to include DPOs at provincial levels; 5) strategy assessment, development and monitoring at country level in each target country to ensure rights advancement; 6) successful exit from Latin America, India, Ukraine (and potentially Lebanon) and entry into Malawi, Myanmar and 1-2 additional new target countries with low HDI status of strategic interest to donors; 7) further development of Strategic Partnerships cross-movement and regional DPO networking grants; 8) diversification of funding to include individual donors and raise the profile of the Funds; 9) hire of a Program Director to best coordinate program staff work across regions, manage the grants review process, and ensure ongoing monitoring of results; 10) one independent learning and an impact evaluation aimed at improving Fund strategy and results; and 11) publication of Fund progress and impact, to contribute to growth of data on best practices in disability-inclusive development.

Expected **outputs** of DRAF (and DRF) funding in target countries over the three-year period - which coincide with the two core pillars of Australia's Disability-Inclusive Development Strategy⁵ - are 1) greater DPO participation in legislative, policy and program changes in accordance with the CRPD; 2) greater DPO participation in human rights monitoring at national and international levels; 3) a more diverse and representative disability movement, which includes the most marginalized (including women); and 4) grantees resourced and capacitated to advocate for and monitor implementation of rights – ultimately contributing to a society that fully includes all PWDs in every aspect of life, as envisioned by the CRPD, and thereby, enhances their quality of life.

For all years of the grant period, first of July 2014 – thirtieth of June 2017, DRAF is requesting AUD 1,600,000 each year from DFAT. In all years, this amount incorporates a contribution towards costs of independent evaluators who are supporting the Funds with revision of M&E tools, a learning evaluation (in 2014), and a preliminary impact evaluation (at end of DFID funding term in 2016). Of the total projected **budget** for this period for DRAF and DRF combined (AUD 11,802,135⁶), which includes projected grants from other funding streams outside of the competitive grants scheme, the request to DFAT represents 41%. Total re-granting projections for this period are: for 2014/15, AUD 2,393,600; for 2015/16, AUD 2,481,600; for 2016/17, AUD 2,569,600.

I. RELEVANCY OF PROGRAM TO AUSTRALIAN AID OBJECTIVES

Enhancing the lives of people with disability is one of the 10 development objectives of Australia's aid program, Making a real difference—Delivering real results. Persons with disabilities – who are one billion people globally - make up a disproportionate percentage of the poor in the developing world⁷. Despite being the world's largest minority, PWDs are still marginalized by governments, development agencies and donors, and broader civil society. As Australian Foreign Minister, Julie Bishop, stated during the 2013 High Level Meeting on Disability & Development, "Australia encourages all countries to give increased attention to including people with disability in development, through their national development plans and through aid programs and partnerships. It is not right – and it makes no economic

⁵ The Funds' focus on enhancing the ability of people with disabilities themselves (and their representative organizations) to participate in rights achievement coincides with the pillar on effective leadership in disability-inclusive development. Outputs and outcomes from this participation contribute to achievement of the other pillar, improved quality of life.

⁶ Please note that this projection has been converted from USD to GBP, using an exchange rate of 1 USD=.88 AUD.

⁷ According to the World Bank, 80% of the 1 billion PWDs live in the developing world and there, make up 20% of the world's poorest people.

sense – that a person’s disability should determine whether they can go to school, or get a job or participate in community life. The post-2015 development agenda must take account of people with disability, to ensure that we leave no-one behind.”

Because poverty and human rights are deeply connected⁸ and “disability is ... an issue of social exclusion, requiring a rights-based framework,”⁹ enhancing the participation of representative organizations of PWDs (DPOs) in implementation of rights – at national, regional and international levels - can have both a direct and indirect impact on poverty within this community.

DRAF, in collaboration with its sister fund, DRF¹⁰, provides donors with an efficient way to reach this community, assess impact from investments, and harmonize & leverage other significant inputs. By increasing support to DPOs (and DPO networks) in developing countries, including in the Pacific and Asia¹¹ (key regions for Australia), by bringing donors together to leverage funding for this community, and by providing important outcome data, DRAF can help DFAT to improve the quality of life for people with disabilities and provide effective leadership in disability-inclusive development (two of the objectives in the *Development for All* Performance Assessment Framework (PAF)). As noted, the Funds also enable donors to reach small organizations of marginalized populations outside their normal purview.

As Mr. Evan Lewis, the Australian delegate to the 2013 Conference of States Parties, said, “Australia has, through our aid program, established fruitful partnerships with organisations such as ... the Disability Rights Fund.... Their cooperation and experience helps us hear more clearly the voices of the men, women, and children with disabilities in the most marginalised communities of the world, and this is already having an impact on our disability-inclusive approaches...”

Contributing to DRAF enables DFAT to both address stated development objectives and internal strategies on disability-inclusive development as well as ensure that foreign aid commitments are in accordance with Article 32 of the CRPD, which Australia ratified in 2008.

III. PROGRAM GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE, MAJOR ACTIVITIES, & MANAGEMENT

Target countries: Over the period 2014-17, DRAF/DRF will be completing exits from present target countries in Latin America¹² as well as India and Ukraine (and possibly Lebanon), and adding – in 2014 - Malawi and Myanmar, and - in 2015/16 - an additional 1-2 other countries categorized as low in the

⁸ OHCHR, the UN General Assembly, and numerous experts and governments have recognized the direct connection between human rights and poverty. See, for example, A/RES/63/175 Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly on Human Rights and Extreme Poverty, 20 March 2009.

⁹ AusAID, *Development for All: Towards a Disability Inclusive Australian Aid Program 2009-2014*, available at <http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/dev-for-all.pdf>

¹⁰ DRAF is a 501(c)4 organization, solely supported by AusAID; DRF is a 501(c)3 organization and pooled fund supported by an anonymous donor, AJWS, the Foundation to Promote Open Society, the Leir Foundations, and UK Aid.

¹¹ In Asia, Fund target countries include Bangladesh, India (exiting), Indonesia, and Myanmar (added in 2014).

¹² The last Mexican grant to COAMEX, a coalition of DPOs who have presented an alternative report to the CRPD Committee and are participating in the review process over 2014, is winding up. Final grants for Nicaragua will end at end 2014; and the last grants in Peru will be completed at end 2015. In addition, final grants in India and Ukraine are being made in 2014, to be completed by fall 2015. These exits have freed up human & financial resources to open grantmaking to new countries, including Haiti & Rwanda in 2013 and Malawi & Myanmar in 2014.

Human Development Index, of strategic interest to donors¹³, and agreed by the DRAF/DRF Board. Ongoing target countries include: 14 Pacific Island countries; Bangladesh, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Myanmar, Rwanda, and Uganda. In 2013, grants to countries of strategic interest to Australia (Bangladesh, Indonesia, and the Pacific Island countries) made up 32% of total DRAF/DRF re-granting.

The Funds are also increasing volume of grantmaking and technical assistance in countries of strategic interest to DFAT. As a start to this, in 2014, the Funds have added Myanmar as a target country and Bahasa as an accepted language for grant applications, and have initiated the process of hiring an Indonesia Grants Consultant who will expand DRAF/DRF support at provincial levels in Indonesia, starting in Yogyakarta, Sulawesi, and Bali. In addition, Setareki Macanawai, CEO of the Pacific Disability Forum has agreed to join the Fund's Global Advisory Panel, ensuring that the MoU developed and signed between DRF and PDF in 2013 will more effectively coordinate support to Pacific grantees.

Activities: Activities which will be undertaken are:

(1) Six grantmaking rounds (two per year) in the competitive grants scheme, distributing up to AUD 2 million each year, in 23-25 countries in the developing world.¹⁴ This includes working with DRF governance to ensure that grants decision-making processes for all funding streams are clear for all stakeholders. It also includes revision to grantmaking processes, streams and priorities as needed to address issues arising from the 2014 independent learning evaluation, Country Strategy Assessments, and other lessons learned. Further, it incorporates ongoing monitoring of grantee mid-term and final reports (narrative and financial) and grantee CRPD and advocacy capacity, and monitoring of country-level CRPD advancements.

(2) Technical aid for grantees working on national legislative advocacy and rights monitoring. This includes further development and implementation of the DRF/DRAF technical aid strategy initiated in 2012 and updated in 2013. It also includes convening of grantees to share information, learn from each other and experts on CRPD advancement, speak with key stakeholders from government, NHRIs, and development agencies, and build joint advocacy strategies (grantee convenings are typically held once per year in each target country or region).

(3) Enhanced partnerships with the Pacific Disability Forum (PDF), the International Disability Alliance (IDA), and others to increase capacity of the disability movement to effect change, especially in the context of the post-2015 development process. This includes refinement/expansion of partnerships to increase resources at hand for grantee support, in the areas of CRPD knowledge and rights advocacy skills and regarding inclusion in development processes¹⁵. A joint training course will be developed and implemented with IDA (with whom the Funds already have an MoU and strong working relationship) in Indonesia during the course of 2014-17.

¹³ When considering potential new countries, DRAF/DRF will give strong attention to Australia's regional strategic priority in the Indo-Pacific region. See attached the Funds' current country selection criteria, which include as an important consideration, donor preference.

¹⁴ There will also be grants given from the new Uganda Capacity Fund – for a total of \$150,000 a year and grants given from the Strategic Partnerships funding stream – from DRAF – for up to \$300,000 a year.

¹⁵ As of 2014, a new priority area has been added to the National Coalitions funding stream: Advocacy to national or international agencies responsible for development planning to ensure that the CRPD is taken into consideration in strategy and goal development & assessment.

(4) Growth of the disability movement in Indonesia to include DPOs at provincial levels. As noted above, this includes addition of the Bahasa language and hiring of an Indonesia Grants Consultant to expand outreach to and support of DPOs at provincial levels, starting in Yogyakarta, Sulawesi, and Bali.

(5) Strategy assessment, development and monitoring at country level in each target country to ensure rights advancement. This includes strategic analysis of the structural gaps in legislation, government institutions, development, and the DPO community itself and development of country objectives (summarized in Country Briefs, Country Reports, Country Strategies, and Country Strategy Assessments¹⁶). It will incorporate revision of Country Strategies for Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, PICs and Uganda and development of Country Strategies for Haiti, Rwanda, Malawi, Myanmar, and any additional new countries. It will also include completion of exit assessments for Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, India and Ukraine.

(6) Successful exit from Latin America, India, Ukraine (and potentially Lebanon) and entry into Malawi, Myanmar and 1-2 additional new target countries with low HDI status of strategic interest to donors. In addition to working with grantees to transition out and in, this includes insertion of exit considerations into *all* grantmaking strategies and into regular communication with grantees and other stakeholders. It also includes research into the baseline situation for PWDs in new target countries as a basis for Country Strategy development.

(7) Further development of Strategic Partnerships cross-movement and regional DPO networking grants. This includes growth of work with the Indigenous people's movement, support for the emergent ASEAN Disability Forum, and initiation of work at the juncture of women's rights and disability rights. (This funding stream is solely supported by DFAT.)

(8) Diversification of funding to include individual donors and raise the profile of the Funds. This incorporates refinement of development strategy, initiation of events to raise visibility, and Board development.

(9) Hire of a Program Director to best coordinate program staff work across regions, manage the grants review process, and ensure ongoing monitoring of results. This includes ensuring cohesion of work of program officers and grants consultants in outreach to, assessment of, and day-to-day oversight of grants recipients; and it also incorporates high-level management of the grants review process, including supervision of the Grants Manager.

(10) An independent learning evaluation (in end 2014) and an impact evaluation (in 2016) aimed at improving Fund strategy and evaluation of impact of grants on the advancement of rights of PWDs. This includes refinement of a theory of change developed in 2013 & ongoing tracking and revision of the program logic, as well as publication of results of the evaluations (see M&E section below for details)¹⁷. It also includes incorporation of M&E of other activities of the Funds, including the Strategic Partnerships funding stream.

(11) Publication of Fund progress and impact to meet transparency guidelines, but also to increase data available regarding rights efforts of PWDs and encourage greater support for these efforts.

Management: DRAF is an independent 501c4 non-profit grantmaker, operated under common control with DRF, an independent 501c3 non-profit grantmaker. The Funds' unique structure includes a Global

¹⁶ Any of these documents are available, upon request, from DRF.

¹⁷ Monitoring of results includes both internal and independent monitoring. In fall 2012, evaluation firm, Universalis, conducted an independent evaluation of DRF's work in 5 target countries. Evaluation available here: <http://www.disabilityrightsfund.org/evaluation>

Advisory Panel of 12 members – the majority of whom are people with disabilities from the developing world nominated by international and regional DPO networks – which makes grantmaking strategy recommendations; a Grantmaking Committee composed of donor representatives and 4 of the advisors (*see Attachment 1 Grantmaking Committee Role*), which – through a consensus process – reviews grantmaking strategy and guidelines and makes final recommendations of grantees; and two Boards made up of the same members (*see Attachment 2 Board Role*), which finalize grantmaking guidelines, approve grants decisions, and have oversight of the Funds.¹⁸

This structure, which places people with disabilities in powerful roles within the Funds, was informed both by newer philosophies in grantmaking which strive to include grantee communities in the grantmaking process, as well as by the principles and articles of the CRPD which recognize participation as an imperative. The involvement of people with disabilities at all levels of the organization – advisory, governance, and staff – is a core strength of the organization, lending the Funds legitimacy as well as access to worldwide networks of people with disabilities from which the Funds can gather important data and through which new applicants can be assessed and information can be spread. As evaluators noted, “In its approach to strategic management and grantmaking, DRF directly includes persons with disabilities from the countries and regions where it works. This ensures that DRF grantmaking continues to respond to the needs of disabled persons communities in the regions of focus for grantmaking. Donors who were interviewed indicated that this approach had the advantage of ensuring that DRF grantmaking is informed by realities on the ground.”

Between the two organizations, there are 10 staff (Founding Executive Director, Operations Manager, Grants Manager, Program Director, 4 Program Officers, Development Coordinator, and an Operations & Program Associate). Based on their experience with grantmaking and on best practices in rights implementation for PWDs, staff propose changes to overall Fund strategy or guidelines and do the research which informs country selection. Changes to strategy are made through a dynamic exchange between staff, governance structures, and the Global Advisory Panel which involves: a) reviewing lessons learned from oversight of the projects of grantees to date, including any evaluations (as well as the overall process of CRPD implementation in target countries) and b) consulting the Funds’ goal documents (Framework document, Strategic Plan, Country Strategies, logframe).

The experience of donors is leveraged through the vehicle of the Grantmaking Committee. Donors to the Fund bring years of grantmaking expertise in human rights, poverty reduction and social justice, and many of them also have some experience in funding other disability rights work. Their experience and networks are critical for the Fund in determining and overseeing grantmaking strategy and structure.

These bodies – working together – have created the philosophy and framework of the Fund and its core strategies, including its theory of change (*see Attachment 3*) and program logic/logframe (*see Attachment 4A*).

IV. EVIDENCE PROGRAM DESIGN WILL WORK

¹⁸ Every donor can place a representative on the Grantmaking Committee, but does not have to. In addition to the DFAT representative, the Committee includes 4 of DRF’s present donors.

As noted by independent evaluators in a 2012 evaluation, “In a little less than four years, DRF has become a recognized donor for disability rights... contributing to the achievement of results for the benefit of persons with disabilities. These results include national and local level changes in legislation, alternative reports on the CRPD submitted to UN mechanisms, a more inclusive disability rights movement in target countries evidenced by grants awarded to marginalized and new DPOs, and increased grantee capacities through the formation of partnerships and growing knowledge on rights of persons with disabilities.” Despite the short time-frame, the Funds exceeded expectations in regard to outputs and outcome in the program logic/logframe.

As of end 2013, DRAF (and DRF) had distributed USD 11,902,363.77 through 564 small-modest, CRPD-related, advocacy grants to 206 different DPOs, including 25 organizations of WWDs, in 29 countries. In addition, the Funds have provided technical assistance and movement-building support to grantees in every target country / region. This support has contributed to the following important milestones in these countries¹⁹ (more details available in the program logic/logframe and the national/local legislation attachment, *Attachment 4B*):

- 1) 19 CRPD ratifications, 11 Optional Protocol ratifications; CRPD signature achieved in Fiji, and FSM (indicator of intent to ratify); Interpretative declaration on Article 12 removed in Mexico;
- 2) 6 target countries with formal DPO participation in government CRPD mechanisms (Haiti, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Uganda, Ukraine) -- with DRF grantees participating;
- 3) 12 target countries with national legislative changes addressing rights of PWDs (Bangladesh, Fiji, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Malawi, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Uganda, Ukraine, and Vanuatu) -- including new Disability Acts in Bangladesh, Haiti, Malawi, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, and Ukraine (Peruvian and Nicaraguan Acts placed before parliaments via citizens' initiatives run by DRF grantees);
- 4) With grantee input, 78 national level legislative, policy, and program changes secured or underway;
- 5) With grantee input, 54 local level legislative, policy, and program changes secured or underway (including 3 on climate change);
- 6) 5 State reports (Peru, Mexico, Cook Islands, Uganda, Ukraine) submitted to the CRPD Committee, 3 Alternative reports (Peru, Mexico, Ukraine) submitted (Peru was first DPO-led report to be submitted to CRPD Committee, and all reports were funded and technically supported by DRF);
- 7) 9 reports to other UN human rights mechanisms, with DRF grantee input (UPR: Bangladesh, Lebanon, Mexico, Peru, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine and Vanuatu; CAT: Peru);
- 8) 265 grants to especially marginalized groups within the disability community (51% of 520 total grants to March 2014; 10% of all grants to organizations of WWDs);
- 9) 87 grants to new organizations representing groups of PWDs not previously active in the public realm (17%);
- 10) All DRF-funded alternative reports to the CRPD Committee reflected the interests of marginalized sectors of the disability community;
- 11) 178 grants to partnerships among DPOs and between DPOs and other civil society groups (31%);
- 12) Average increase of 21% in capacity to plan, implement, and evaluate advocacy activities over the past year, as self-reported by grantees;

¹⁹ Milestones are measured as of March each year. Most recent milestones measured at March 2014.

13) Average increase of 21% in CRPD knowledge over the past year, as self-reported by grantees.

The Fund's theory of change illustrates how DRF/DRAF support has resulted in these advancements. The basic premise is that – in the window of opportunity offered by the CRPD - technical assistance, movement building support, and targeted grantmaking to a cohort of DPOs in any one country/region – which is informed by persons with disabilities (at ground-level and among DRF/DRAF staff, advisory and governance structures) - helps to build DPO knowledge of rights as well as capacity to advocate jointly on rights. Increasing capacity and knowledge leads to increased demand for & achievement of inclusion by people with disabilities and their representative organizations in decision-making processes. This inclusion, in turn, influences government to recognize the need for better laws, policies, programs and data on this segment of the population as well as the need for systematic inclusion of people with disabilities in development planning. Eventually, these processes lead to equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities.

Prior to the CRPD, there was no dedicated, binding international instrument that people with disabilities could invoke to gain acknowledgment of their rights or backing for inclusion in development processes. The Convention, which entered into force in May 2008, and has been signed by 158 countries & ratified by 143 to date²⁰, has provided an opportunity to dramatically alter this situation. Defining disability not as inherent in persons but as a result of “the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers,”²¹ States Parties have acknowledged for the first time the need for a rights-based, empowerment approach to disability. Drafted with the strong activism and unprecedented participation of people with disabilities, as elaborated in article 4²², the active involvement of people with disabilities and their representative organizations in implementation and monitoring is mandated. *“Full and effective participation and inclusion in society of persons with disabilities is a general principle of the Convention, which also specifically establishes the duty on States to closely consult and actively involve persons with disabilities in the development and implementation of policies that affect them.”*²³ **This provides the political opening for people with disabilities and their representative organizations to make demands on government.**

As disability legal expert, Gerard Quinn, has rightly noted, “Now that there is a high level legal instrument at the international level on disability, the main challenge ahead is to harness it effectively. First this assumes an organized and vocal civil society – one that can successfully articulate arguments for

²⁰ Data valid as of 27-03-14. See <http://www.un.org/disabilities/countries.asp?navid=12&pid=166> for dates when different States became party to the Convention.

²¹ Final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities (A/61/611), U.N. General Assembly, 61st Session, 6 December 2006, preambular paragraph (e).

²² “It bears emphasizing that Article 4.3 embodies the principle of ‘nothing about us without us’. That is, DPO[s] must be consulted and listened to...” Quinn, Gerard, “The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. National Institutions as Key Catalysts of Change,” National Monitoring Mechanisms of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, May 2008: Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos México p.128.

²³ A/HRC/10/48; Human Rights Council, “Annual Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General: Thematic Study by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on enhancing awareness and understanding of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities,” 26 January 2009, p. 6.

change based on the norms of the Convention.”²⁴ In other words, **making successful demands on government requires DPOs to be resourced financially and technically (capacitated, knowledgeable, networked).** Supporting disabled persons’ organizations in the developing world as they participate in advancement of the Convention is the main task of the Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (and the Disability Rights Fund).

The Funds’ design has been tested in the years since launch in the 27 countries where grants have been made. As described under the Monitoring & Evaluation section below, DRF is a learning organization. Each funding round brings with it new lessons learned, which are shared, discussed and integrated into changes in grantmaking strategy and process. Some key lessons learned over the last year that have been integrated into grantmaking follow:

- **Need to press for implementation of rights frameworks** - Post-ratification, and following advancement of national law to address the rights of PWDs and/or reporting to UN human rights mechanisms on the rights of PWDs, it is critical to ensure that rights are implemented, including at more local levels. This is especially pressing in federal systems and in decentralized political systems – which make up the majority of the Funds’ target countries. Supporting coalitions of DPOs to advocate for implementation is critical to ensure that rights are not only paper rights. To encourage this to occur, the Funds have integrated – within the National Coalition funding stream – support for follow-up advocacy on recommendations made by the CRPD (or other) Committees to States. For change at more local levels, the Funds have developed a new funding stream (as of 2013) for Mid-Level Coalition grants for three or more DPOs working together at state (in federal systems), provincial, regional, and district levels to advocate for legislative change (including regulatory frameworks) and/or budgetary measures for implementation.
- **Ongoing need for DPO capacity-building** – The Funds have always integrated capacity-building into their grantmaking, through provision of support and feedback to DPOs during application, project implementation, and reporting. In addition, the Funds have supported cohorts of grantees at country level with CRPD training during Grantee Convenings and via grants for internal capacity building on the CRPD and advocacy, and have supported Coalition grantees to gain expert advice on alternative reporting and legislative proposals via the Program Officer for Strategic Partnerships and through the International Disability Alliance (IDA) and other CRPD experts. However, because the DPO sector has been so neglected, there is much capacity building to achieve; many grantees lack basic organizational skills (even if they are able to carry out advocacy projects). Recognizing this, the Funds have increasingly partnered with other organizations that are providing capacity enhancement – such as IDA and the Pacific Disability Forum (with which the Funds have MoUs). Also, DRF has developed (with funding from an anonymous donor) a funding stream for organizational capacity building among Ugandan grantees.
- **Need for exit strategies** - Via the independent evaluation process, and through exit from Latin America (currently ongoing), India and Ukraine, the Funds are learning about grantmaking exits. At country-level, the Funds have six-year engagement frameworks, supported by Country Strategies (formed over the first two years in country, implemented over years two – four, and assessed in year four for exit over the following two years or for continuation). Knowing that exit may need to be flexible (depending on resources, donor priorities and the like), these frameworks – and timeframes - have not been shared with grantees in-country. Nonetheless, it has become clear that it is important that grantees understand that support is time-bound and that they are

²⁴ Quinn, p.128.

encouraged to think beyond DRF/DRAF to sustain their activities. The Funds now have a general exit strategy, reviewed and approved by the Grantmaking Committee and Board. Based on this, the Funds are making changes to grantmaking and grantee communications to ensure that exits are as positive as possible and do not disrupt achievements.

- **Need to address the data gap for M&E purposes** - Because of the dearth and inconsistency of data on disability and PWDs, especially in the developing world (but also in international monitoring such as MDG reporting), it is difficult to identify baselines and milestones that can be rigorously measured. Most countries do not even have accurate population statistics on PWDs, let alone data on participation of PWDs in education, employment, health, voting or the justice system. In addition, even if these countries have ratified the CRPD, many have not yet provided the CRPD Committee with baseline reports (and the Committee itself is behind in its review). This means that it is hard to gauge the impact of grantmaking on quality of life of PWDs. For donors to the Funds, this poses an issue in terms of substantiating the connection between Fund activities and donor priorities (especially poverty reduction), in the timeframe of donor funding. To address this issue, the Funds worked with M&E experts to come up with proxy indicators to measure impact on poverty reduction and quality of life.
- **Need to address themes arising from grantmaking** – DRF codes grants (in a grant database) to be able to track certain issues, such as number of women’s organizations supported, number of cross-disability organizations, number of partnerships, number of marginalized groups, priority areas addressed by grantees, etcetera. One thing the Funds did not track until last year was specific areas of rights which grantees are addressing, such as inclusive education, employment rights, health access, etcetera. As the Funds work to gather data on impact, address priorities of present donors, and attract new donors (with interests in thematic areas – such as education), it is critical to have better data on the areas of rights being addressed by grantees. To address this, the Funds added new coding into the grants database, coded and analyzed historical grants, discussed the analysis with Grantmaking Committee and Board, and used conclusions to revise 2014 RFPs (to include, for example, priority areas focused on Article 32, inclusive development²⁵).

V. EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAM DESIGN

Especially in the developing world, lack of access to education, employment, and community & political life, in addition to abuse have forced most people with disabilities to concern themselves with day-to-day survival rather than changes to society that might generate more sustainable solutions. As the Director-General of WHO and the President of the World Bank Group stated in their preface to the World Report on Disability, “To achieve long-lasting, vastly better development prospects that lie at the heart of the 2015 Millennium Development Goals and beyond, we must empower people living with disabilities and remove the barriers which prevent them participating in their communities; getting a quality education, finding decent work, and having their voices heard.”²⁶

DRF/DRAF grants, which often provide the first or only funds a DPO might have or at least the first funds addressing rights, allow organizations to begin to address the systemic exclusion and stigma which drastically affect the livelihoods of persons with disabilities. As an example, a USD 5000 grant to an emergent organization of little people in Uganda to hold their first membership meeting, learn about the CRPD and create a strategic plan, resulted in strongly increased integration for this marginalized group.

²⁵ This is especially important in the context of the ongoing post-2015 development process, in which Australia has been highly involved.

²⁶ WHO, *ibid*, p.xi.

With the grant, Little People of Uganda received mass media attention, were invited to speak with Ministry officials in charge of disability, and within the course of a year, achieved other donor funding to strengthen their organization and address their exclusion from Uganda's education system. A series of USD 10,000-20,000 annual grants provided through fiscal sponsorship to an emergent group of people with psycho-social disabilities in Lima, Peru has enabled them to legally register as an organization (ASUMEN), gain voice in the larger disability community, and with other DPOs, successfully challenge outdated laws which stripped them of voting rights. Similarly, a series of annual USD 20,000 grants given via fiscal sponsorship to a network of women's DPOs in Bangladesh has strengthened their capacity to gather information about violence against women with disabilities and has resulted in a partnership with a leading mainstream legal aid organization to bring these violations of rights to court and to public attention. A USD 20,000 grant given to an organization of youth with disabilities in Uganda has enabled them to work with lawyers to review employment laws and advocate to public and private sector employers for inclusion, as well as training, to increase employment prospects for youth with disabilities. These and many other grants are breaking down the walls that have kept PWDs excluded from the rest of society and living life on the margins. They are critical steps toward establishing "the capabilities, choices, security, and power needed for the enjoyment of an adequate standard of living..."²⁷

The Funds' participatory model of grantmaking, conducted with the support of global/regional disability leaders and with Program Officers (responsible for oversight of grantees) who manage no more than 35-40 grantees, ensure that good grantee partners (and the right cohort of partners in each country) are identified; gain technical assistance at proposal, implementation and monitoring stages; and increase their linkages within the larger disability and human rights community (through trainings, grantee convenings, etcetera). This movement-building or empowerment process is enhanced by the inclusion at all levels in the Funds (advisory, governance and staffing) of persons with disabilities, who lend disability expertise, credibility, and mentoring capacities to the Fund and its grantees.

Among development agencies, donors, and governments, a charity approach towards people with disabilities (i.e. viewing PWDs as objects to be treated and not as subjects who can take control of their lives) has been the norm. The belief that people with disabilities belong in the realm of welfare or health and not in the realm of rights or development is persistent. Part of the problem is the pervasive invisibility of people with disabilities and DPOs. As the WHO/World Bank 2011 World Report on Disability pointed out, "...accurate data on disability are mostly lacking for developing countries."²⁸ And as Rebecca Yeo pointed out in her 2001 paper, "Chronic Poverty and Disability," exclusion and stigma have exacerbated this data gap.²⁹ While information is expanding post-adoption of the CRPD, most development agencies, donors and governments still do not have reliable information or statistics on (conditions for) persons with disabilities, nor do they have relationships with key stakeholders in the disability movement. This constrains information about PWDs and limits development of remedies.

Precisely for this reason, the CRPD – which has been described as both a rights treaty and a development tool - mandates both improvements in state data collection (Article 31) and the involvement of persons

²⁷ Arbour, Louise, *ibid.*

²⁸ WHO, *ibid.*, p. 23.

²⁹ Yeo, Rebecca, "Chronic Poverty and Disability," Chronic Poverty Research Center: Background Paper Number Four, August 2001.

with disabilities and DPOs in implementation and monitoring (Article 4.3). DRAF/DRF grants enable DPOs to gain visibility, start dialogue, provide examples of best practices, participate in decision-making fora, monitor government practices, and press governments to report on prevalence of and conditions for PWDs. For example, a grant to a coalition of organizations in Peru supported the production of the first DPO-led alternative report to the CRPD Committee, adding critical information to that contained in the State report and influencing Committee recommendations to Peru. A grant to the disability section of the Human Rights Law Network in India enabled DPOs across India to contribute to recommendations on changes to the Disability Act, post-ratification. A grant to a Ugandan organization of albinos enabled albinos to be included in government definitions of disability, giving them access – for the first time – to services afforded to other PWDs. All these grants ensure an enhanced voice for PWDs in policy decisions and inclusion of PWDs by duty bearers in achievement of rights and development goals.

With an **impact** of equal rights and opportunities and full participation in society for PWDs in the Global South, MENA, and Eastern Europe / fSU, the **outcome** of DRAF/DRF work is advancement of rights of PWDs through the enhanced participation of the disability movement. **Outputs** towards this outcome are: 1) DPOs participating in legislative, policy and program changes in accordance with the CRPD; 2) DPOs participating in human rights monitoring at national and international levels; 3) a more diverse and representative disability rights movement; and 4) grantees resourced and capacitated to advocate for and monitor implementation of rights.

Because the impact outlined is long-term, over the period 2014-17, the Funds will be measuring progress towards it through milestones achieved on proxy impact indicators, including 1) changes in data collection regarding PWDs at national levels, and 2) inclusion of PWDs in country development plans, strategies, processes and programs.

RISKS: In terms of **risks**, supporting disabled persons’ organizations as they participate in advancement of the Convention is not an easy task. While the CRPD has introduced new national implementation and monitoring frameworks for internationally-recognized human rights, there are, as yet, few best practice models for these frameworks, and they are widely misunderstood by governments. Further, though the CRPD mandates the active involvement of organizations of persons with disabilities in these frameworks³⁰, basic disability awareness and accessibility programs which might aid participation, are, in most places, non-existent. And, many DPOs are not prepared for these tasks. In addition, “there is no agreement on definitions and little internationally comparable information on the incidence, distribution and trends of disability. There are few documents providing a compilation and analysis of the ways countries have developed policies and responses to address the needs of people with disabilities,” making evaluation difficult.

Primary risks that could adversely affect the program are as follows. A risk assessment matrix is at bottom:

³⁰ “Full and effective participation and inclusion in society of persons with disabilities is a general principle of the Convention, which also specifically establishes the duty on States to closely consult and actively involve persons with disabilities in the development and implementation of policies that affect them.” A/HRC/10/48; Human Rights Council, *Annual Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General: Thematic Study by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on enhancing awareness and understanding of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*, 26 January 2009, p. 6.

A. DRAF and DRF unable to solicit significant ongoing funding to grow and improve the funds.

High impact, medium probability. While both Funds have had good fundraising success to date, donor priorities do shift. One key donor who has been contributing since 2008 (The Sigrid Rausing Trust) has recently moved away from disability rights, and despite growing awareness, it is difficult to find new donors willing to fund in this area.

Mitigation strategy: The Funds' strategy includes advocacy to other donors and development agencies about the critical importance of funding disability rights and the opportunity the Funds give to donors in this new arena. DRAF/DRF staff (in particular the Executive Director) spend a significant amount of time presenting at donor convenings, meetings, and in print media³¹. The Executive Director also sits on the Steering Committees of the International Human Rights Funders Group and Opportunity Collaboration³² – both venues for funders. This advocacy has helped to garner existing support and will continue to grow it among foundations and development agencies. Additionally, a Development Coordinator was hired in 2013 to begin to raise Fund visibility and diversify funding, especially to individual donors. The Fund is holding its first donor event for potential individual donors in June 2014 – a stepping stone towards instituting new major gifts. Further, the Funds are in the process of expanding the Board to include individuals of wealth and individuals with fundraising & communications expertise who can contribute to growing Fund resources. In 2013, for the first time, Board members made individual donations to the Funds.

B. Majority of grantee organizations lack capacity to implement proposed advocacy projects.

High impact, low probability. While many DPOs lack some capacity, the Funds have found that with support, most projects meet their proposed outcomes, particularly over repeat grant periods. DRAF has been growing its technical aid capacities through both partnerships (formal MoUs with the International Disability Alliance and the Pacific Disability Forum – to enhance capacity building for grantees) and internal mechanisms (for example, a new funding stream, supported by an anonymous donor, for capacity building of Ugandan grantees; and monies through Australia for enhancing technical aid³³).

Mitigation strategy: DRAF is committed to provision of technical aid to its grantees. Over the five years of the Funds' existence, staff have visited every grantee and hold grantee convenings in each target country (or region) once/year. As part of these meetings, CRPD and other rights experts are brought in to provide grantees with training. Annually, a grantee capacity survey

³¹ Since 2010, the Executive Director has been a member of the Steering Committee of the International Human Rights Funders' Group – an indicator of the growing importance of disability in the agenda of human rights funders. The Director is also a member of the Steering Committee of Opportunity Collaboration, a forum of investors and others interested in poverty alleviation.

³² Due to advocacy of the Executive Director within Opportunity Collaboration (OC), for the first time ever, 4 people with disabilities (3 DRF grantee representatives and the new Operations Manager for DRF) were given Cordes Fellowships to attend the OC meeting in November 2014. This will be an opportunity to present the Funds' work with grantees to a diverse set of funders.

³³ An initial strategy for enhancing technical assistance was reviewed by the Grantmaking Committee in June 2012 and updated in June 2013.

provides a (self-) assessment of growth in CRPD knowledge and advocacy skills, due to DRAF/DRF support. This survey serves as a basis for development of additional grantee support mechanisms to ensure project impact. In certain countries/regions, specific mechanisms have been developed, such as partnership with PDF in the Pacific, a funding stream for organizational capacity-building in Uganda, and Grants Consultants on the ground in Indonesia and Ukraine.

C. Grants money is squandered through poor financial management by grantees.

High impact, low probability. Many DPOs do lack proper financial procedures, but thus far, the Funds have found that only a minority of grantees misuse funds. As elaborated in the management section above, there are a number of mechanisms in place to minimize fiduciary risk.

Mitigation strategy: Through lessons learned in the area of grantee financial management, the Funds have made changes to the grant application template, review processes, and oversight to minimize loss in this area. Changes include: questions on organizational financial health in the RFP, requirement of two years of income/expense records for grants over USD 20,000, implementation of two-tranche grants for new or low-capacity grantees (enabling the Funds to stop payment if there are issues), review of grantee accounting systems during site visits, and requirement for fiscal sponsors (known to the Fund) if the organization lacks non-profit registration in their country (as either an NGO or CBO). The Funds have also developed financial oversight training for Program Officers. Over the first year of the grant period, the Funds will also develop a zero tolerance policy for fraud to clarify to grantees and prospective grantees action steps that will be taken where and when financial mismanagement is discovered.

D. Coalitions and partnerships proposed to carry out projects are unworkable.

High impact, medium probability. Especially for the Mid-Level and National Coalition funding stream, partnering among DPOs and between DPOs and other stakeholders is essential to project success. While MoUs detailing partnership mechanisms are required as part of applications, coalition viability is carefully assessed in the review process, and support is provided during implementation, partnership is difficult and the risk of failure is real. Most partnerships are addressing complex issues, such as ratification, legislative change, and reporting & follow-up to reports to UN human rights monitoring mechanisms. During these projects, the Funds have found that the process of partnering is as important to the outcome as the end result; a good (and broad) partnership can mean stronger demand, better and more widely supported legislative proposals, and better data. DRAF's technical assistance enhances support from the Program Officer for Strategic Partnerships to these grantees.

Mitigation strategy: To better track coalition projects, DRAF has begun to ask coalition lead partners for monthly reports (by email) of activities, successes, and challenges. This enables early identification of potential issues needing intervention. Specific partnership meetings to address challenges are added, as needed, to Program Officer visits, and technical experts are brought in as necessary.

- E. Data is unavailable (or not credible) to enable measurement of progress towards indicators at impact level.

High impact, medium probability. Data on PWDs in the developing world is currently very poor or non-existent. This makes it hard to measure progress.

Mitigation strategy: The Funds have robust M&E systems, which have gathered data on indicators at output and outcome level. Currently, evaluation consultants are helping to develop mechanisms for data collection on impact-level indicators, including the new proxy indicators. A learning evaluation in 2014 will increase understanding of what is and isn't working towards impact. In addition, a new (as of 2014) area for funding is advocacy by DPOs for better data collection at national levels based on international standards. Moving forward, in addition to quantitative data gathered against logframe indicators (including the proxy indicators), the Funds will ensure that revised M&E tools include ways to gather more qualitative information for case studies to provide an adequate picture of changes to quality of life for PWDs.

- F. Despite the advocacy efforts of DPOs, governments do not change attitudes, policies, or practices towards PWDs, even with ratification of the CRPD.

High impact, medium probability. While change at legislative or policy level (including ratification) can be fairly rapid, implementation and funding of improved practices is a much slower process, affected by many factors often beyond the control of civil society (lack of resources, entrenched bureaucracy, corruption, etcetera).

Mitigation strategy: Entrenched discriminatory attitudes at governmental and societal levels and corrupt or poor practices impacting marginalized communities, like the disability community, are difficult to mitigate. DRAF hopes that its 6-year commitment to each target country will enable some change to begin. Heightening awareness of and demand for rights by persons with disabilities is the critical initial step.

- G. DRAF grantees or other DPOs are unable to carry out their work due to security risks or political upsets in their countries.

High impact, medium probability. A couple grantees have encountered threats to their security specific to their advocacy work. In addition, because DRAF/DRF targets developing countries, many of which have fragile political environments, work can be upset by evolving political situations.

Mitigation strategy: It is beyond the scope of DRAF's capacity to address large-scale political upset or security risks. On a smaller scale, DRAF has drafted a Security Protocol for Grantees which addresses prevention, response, and long-term planning. In addition, application forms now ask whether applicant organizations have security policies. Over the course of 2014-17, DRAF will work with grantees to increase their awareness of security threats as well as their ability to mitigate these.

- H. DRAF/DRF grantees dependent on DRAF/DRF funding and unable to identify other funding sources.

High impact, medium probability. Many DPOs have little history of previous funding, and DRAF/DRF makes a special point to fund emergent and marginalized groups.

Mitigation strategy: Because DRF is a pooled fund, and many of the donors involved do their own separate disability rights grantmaking, and because of DRAF and DRF's involvement in other donor fora (like IHRFG), the Funds are often able to connect grantees to other potential funding sources and to help grantees with applications and references. Numerous grantees have achieved other funding in this way. As noted under A. above, DRF also works with donors to increase funding to disability rights.

- I. Children adversely affected in the course of DRF work or funding.

High impact, low probability. DRAF/DRF do not directly fund or interact with organizations of children (with or without disabilities). However, the Funds do fund youth with disabilities organizations, parent organizations which address children with disabilities, and other DPOs addressing changes to policy or programs that affect children with disabilities. staff or sub-grantees abide.

Mitigation strategy: DRAF/DRF has worked with DFAT to develop a robust and compliant child protection policy (recently revised to meet evolving standards). The Funds are committed to policy implementation, and include, within RFPs, questions about sub-grantee policies and links to resources for development of such policies. See Attachment 5, DRAF Child Protection Policy for more details.

↑	I			
	M	<div> <div>PROBABILITY</div> <div> <div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div> </div> </div>		
	P			
	A			
	C			
	T			
	High	B, C, I	A, D, E, F, G, H	
	Medium			

Low			
-----	--	--	--

Monitoring & Evaluation: To help mitigate the risks outlined above, ensure that lessons learned strengthen Fund strategy, and monitor impact, the Funds have a robust Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system, including an M&E manual, tools and logframe. These were initially developed through a participatory year-long process completed in June 2011. The first independent evaluation of Fund progress towards outputs and outcome was finalized in November 2012. Over the period, 2014-17, there will be an independent learning evaluation (in 2014) – for learning and course correction purposes - and an independent impact evaluation in 2016, to assess progress towards impact.

The M&E system promotes upward and downward accountability, emphasizes organizational learning, and is flexible enough to adapt to changing contexts and situations. Since the field of disability rights is so new, learning is a critical part of the system; the Funds’ collaborative model (between donors and the global disability community) provides structured opportunities for engaging stakeholders in data collection, analysis, reflection, and strategic thinking. This approach enables ongoing reflection and adaptive management in order to strengthen DRF’s processes towards results.

The purpose of the M&E system is three-fold:

- (1) To facilitate strategic learning through:
 - i. Tracking activities and monitoring and evaluating grantmaking outputs, outcome, and impact;
 - ii. Assessing the effectiveness of the Funds’ grantmaking model.
- (2) To facilitate grantee learning by supporting grantees to analyze their own contexts, as well as the effectiveness of their strategies and activities in advancing the rights of PWDs;
- (3) To aggregate results in order to report on the global impact of the Funds to donors and other grantmaking and human rights stakeholders.

Ongoing data collection - critical for tracking milestones against the baselines and desired outputs and outcome in the program logic/logframe – is accomplished via a detailed grants coding system (tracked in an on-line grants database system), synchronized to our logframe, and via staff tracking of progress against logframe milestones in each country through Grantee Convenings, site visits, annual grantee surveys, review of proposals & grantee reports, and research documented for governance and advisory meetings in annual country reports (CRPD Updates, Country Strategies, Country Assessment Strategies). Tools Program Officers utilize for monitoring of grantee outputs, outcomes and expenditure include applicant evaluation, mid-term (six-month) narrative and financial reports, final narrative and financial reports, and grantee convenings and site-visits.

Monitoring is aligned with the Funds’ engagement in target countries, which is based on a six-year cycle (see table below). Years 1-2 of grantmaking occur concurrently with country research and development of a Country Strategy. Grantmaking continues over a four to six year period supported by ongoing monitoring, technical aid, and Grantee Convenings. During Year 4 of grantmaking in each country, the

Funds undertake an internal review of progress towards Country Strategy objectives and logframe outputs and outcome, as part of the process of determining exit steps or continuation planning.

Role of M&E in grantmaking in target countries:

	Years 1-2	Years 3-4	Years 5-6
Grantmaking	Grantmaking commences	Grantmaking ongoing	Grantmaking continuation or phase out
DRF/DRAF country engagement	Country research leading to a Country Strategy	Ongoing engagement with DPOs and other stakeholders	Exit/ continuation strategy
Reports	Country Report (prior to first grants decisions) Country Strategy	Country CRPD Update Country Strategy Assessment	Country Strategy Revision OR Country Exit Strategy

The first independent evaluation (completed in November 2011) coincided with year 4 of grantmaking in the Funds' first five target countries (Bangladesh, Ghana, Nicaragua, Peru, and Uganda). The objectives of the evaluation were:

- (1) To identify the impact of the Fund and ways that this can be sustained;
- (2) To record and share lessons of success and challenges;
- (3) To ensure that funds have been used effectively and efficiently to deliver results;
- (4) To enable donors (especially DFID) to monitor and evaluate the performance of the Fund as a whole, ensuring that the Fund is contributing to donor goals and demonstrating, for public accountability purposes, that the Fund is an effective use of money.

The findings of the evaluation show that the Funds are on the right track and illustrate this with examples of grantee accomplishments.

At beginning 2013, DRF strengthened its program logic/logframe to include proxy indicators that will enable evaluation of progress toward impact by 2016. One of the biggest challenges for the disability rights field is a dearth of data and evidence on the conditions and situation for persons with disabilities. National statistics and census numbers and UN/World Bank indicators do not disaggregate data for persons with disabilities. Creative methodologies are thus required to track and measure progress.

In Fall 2013, DRF engaged evaluation consultants to refine data collection tools to coincide with the revised program logic/logframe, with the purpose of collecting data across the results chain. These instruments will take into account the need for ease of collection, assessment, and utilization of data to

not place an unnecessary burden on stakeholders or staff resources. The same evaluation team will use these instruments to conduct the learning evaluation in 2014.

By March 2016, an independent impact evaluation will be conducted. This evaluation will follow a similar framework to the 2012 evaluation – with a focus on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, impact, sustainability, and innovation – to enable comparison of results and progress. Priority will be placed on evaluating progress towards proxy indicators, which measure headway towards poverty reduction, as well as on “value for money.” The evaluation will also consider: a) how and to what extent Fund support to grantees has translated into real change on the ground in the lived experience of PWDs; b) whether the proxy indicators indeed measure progress towards poverty reduction and quality of life; and c) in which sectors (education, electoral access, employment, etcetera) gains are being made and where gaps still exist and what the enabling factors are. By 2016, it is expected that there will be more data available from Fund monitoring illustrating progress towards impact, as well as more external data on disability.

The learning and impact evaluations will provide information and lessons learned that will be beneficial for Fund operations, the disability rights field, and grantees. They will help improve grantmaking processes and operations. They will contribute to the fields of international human rights, social movements, and in particular disability rights because there are currently few evaluations (and little data) about PWDs. The evaluations will also add value for DRAF/DRF donors (including DFAT) by providing information about impact of DPO advocacy on achievement of rights and poverty reduction among persons with disabilities in developing countries. Intended to be participatory, the evaluations will also help grantees and all Fund stakeholders identify indicators or reasons for program success or failure and apply lessons learned for better results.

Starting in 2014, communicating the results of M&E efforts and results to stakeholders will be a stronger component of the M&E system. Revised M&E tools will be developed with a communication lens to increase the likelihood that the information will serve the disability movement, as well as the Funds. The purpose for communicating will be: (1) To convey information about DRAF/DRF and disability rights to build awareness and support among Fund stakeholders; (2) To share feedback with grantees so that they can also learn; (3) To demonstrate results and be accountable and transparent to funders, board members, and the public; and (4) To learn, grow, and improve the Fund’s programs.

<i>Milestones</i>	<i>Summary of M&E System Process</i>
2011 June	<p>M&E System completed after a year-long participatory process with Fund stakeholders, including the Global Advisory Panel and Steering Committee. The M&E Manual provides the guidelines and describes the framework, processes, staff roles, and tools for the collection and analysis of data.</p> <p>The monitoring tools piloted and being adapted and used to track progress towards outcomes throughout the year. All data is being tracked through an online grants database system and reported bi-annually at Grantmaking Committee meetings.</p>
2011 June	First grantee survey measuring advocacy capacity and CRPD knowledge disseminated to develop a baseline for logframe output 4 (grantees have the capacity to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities). Survey had 81% response rate (43 respondents). Report analyzing quantitative and qualitative responses available upon request.
2012 January	Supervision and monitoring trip in three out of five countries by Operations Director to ensure systematic collection of data.
2012 June	Second grantee survey (same as above) disseminated to all current grantees. Survey had 63% response rate (73 respondents). Report available upon request.
2012 November	First independent evaluation finalized
2013 January	Revised logframe developed; theory of change document developed
2013 First Quarter	Baseline survey developed and tested for revised logframe
2014 August	Independent learning evaluation conducted
2016 March	Independent impact evaluation conducted

VI. EFFICIENCY OF PROGRAM

DRAF and DRF, which operates as a pooled fund – combining the resources of multiple governmental and private donors — enable donors to harmonize their efforts, provide donors with an efficient way to reach organizations outside their normal purview, and give donors essential feedback on DPO investments.

As illustrated in the table below, from the 2012 independent evaluation, even though the Funds' geographic scope of work has increased steadily, administrative and program costs have been kept low (and, in fact, diminished between 2008 and 2011). The percentage of funding allocated to grantmaking was 61 per cent in 2008 and increased to 65 per cent in 2011.

Administrative and Program Cost Compared to Amounts Dedicated to Grantmaking

Year	Administrative and Program Cost ³⁴	Amount to Grantmaking	Number of Target Countries
2008	USD 502,215 (39%)	USD 800,000 (61%)	7 countries
2009	USD 910,993 (32%)	USD 1,931,542 (68%)	14 countries
2010	USD 1,020,709 (31%)	USD 2,222,123 (69%)	15 countries
2011	USD 1,202,268 (35%)	USD 2,274,499 (65%)	18 countries

There was (and still is) a huge knowledge gap, especially among donors, about who the stakeholders are, particularly at sub-national levels. (The few donors who have contributed to DPOs at country level, have usually contributed (either directly or indirectly, via INGOs or IDPOs) to the largest groups.) Because the DRAF and DRF incorporate in their structure, leaders of the global disability community from the developing world, who are linked to international and regional DPO networks, the Funds are able to identify, outreach to, support and evaluate organizations outside of the normal purview of their donors. Many of these organizations have never before received (foreign) grants; in many cases, as the disability movement expands, they are also emergent and / or grassroots organizations, often representing the most marginalized sectors of the disability community (such as people with psycho-social disabilities or albinos or little people or women with disabilities).

With a focus on a strong, tailor-made mentoring and support role for each grantee³⁵, the Funds are able to make small – modest grants to new, grassroots, and marginalized groups which would not be eligible for other (larger) donor grants. This ability to reach beyond national-level, more well-established organizations is a unique feature, and contributes to enhancing the depth of the disability rights movement, and to including those populations which are often most excluded. By doing so, DRAF and DRF enhance implementation of the articles and principles of the CRPD, which articulate the need for

³⁴ Each donor has a different timeline so funding may not only be for the year of receipt.

³⁵ DRF currently has 3 Program Officers; one overseeing grants in MENA and Latin America & the Caribbean; one overseeing grants in the Pacific and Asia; and one overseeing grants in sub-Saharan Africa and EE/fSU. Each Program Officer has an individual relationship with each grantee in their portfolio of 30-40 grants. An additional Program Officer for Strategic Partnerships – under DRAF – supports these POs with technical aid.

participation by all persons with disabilities, and ensure that development funding reaches the most marginalized.

For donors participating in the Grantmaking Committee, the Funds' grantmaking processes also enhance the information available about the disability community worldwide. Utilizing an evaluative learning approach to improve upon grant guidelines and oversight, grant outcomes and lessons learned are aggregated for presentation to the Global Advisory Panel and Grantmaking Committee in two yearly meetings. Participating in the Grantmaking Committee enables donors to learn from the Fund's challenges and successes in outreach and rights-based grantmaking to DPOs and to apply these to their own work.

Most DPOs in the Global South are severely under-resourced. Many have no sources of funds at all and rely fully on volunteers. This is especially true in parts of Asia and the Pacific. In Africa, where development agencies have focused some funding on disability, there are a few national-level or urban DPOs which have budgets in the USD \$100,000-\$500,000 range; the more rural or more local DPOs, however, have few funds (ranging from nothing to \$50,000). Organizations sometimes have added resources from national or local government. Hardly any of these funds have directly addressed rights issues. Because of this history of being poorly resourced or when resourced, resourced as an act of charity, there is often, among DPOs, a lack of organizational (including financial) or leadership capacity coupled with poor legal understanding or poor understanding of how best to utilize rights tools (especially how to address domestication and monitoring of international rights treaties). As in any oppressed group, there is also competition within the disability community and difficulty formulating, or standing behind, a joint voice – critical for negotiating a place at the table. Further, because of internal and external stigma, the disability rights movement is most often isolated from legal and other rights communities which could be helpful in pursuing rights implementation. These gaps make it difficult for DPOs to meet the expectation of participation in CRPD implementation and monitoring that the treaty mandates.

DRAF/DRF grantees range from new and grassroots to national-level well-established DPOs, from organizations experienced in advocacy to those just starting to learn about rights. As such, they have varying capacity. Recognizing that scarcity of (financial and knowledge) resources has limited the capacity of many PWDs and DPOs to engage in decision-making which affects their lives, DRAF/DRF necessarily take on some degree of risk in grantmaking, including fiduciary risk. However, this risk is mitigated by our attention to capacity-building and by our due diligence procedures, including an intensive application review process (described below), one-on-one relationships with grantees, and extensive networks in the broader disability community which help with assessment, M&E, convening, training and mentoring. Financial risk is mitigated by (1) requiring, for grants over USD 20,000, two years of income & expenditure reports; (2) identifying, with the Grantmaking Committee, grants which will be split into two tranches, with payment of second tranche only on receipt of satisfactory financial and programmatic reports; and (3) helping new DPOs identify and work with fiscal sponsors who have greater capacity.

This tailor-made approach is time-intensive; supporting new organizations, organizations without proven financial capacity, and many small grants requires additional work. Conducting grantmaking in this way may also have more costs up-front (to account for reasonable accommodations of staff and advisors as

well as to intensively support grantees)³⁶, but, based on progress shown in the independent evaluation, we believe it also delivers more impact.

In terms of structure of the competitive grants scheme, there are two funding rounds per year (RFPs publicized in February and July³⁷), each directed at a different set of target countries. As of 2013, each funding round has three streams of funding, a smaller grant stream (USD 5000 – 20,000) directed at local, grassroots, marginalized, and emergent organizations; a mid-level coalition stream (USD 30,000 – 40,000 per year over two years) directed at coalitions of three or more organizations at state (in federal systems), provincial, regional, and district levels; and a larger grant stream (USD 50,000 per year over two years) directed at national coalitions of three or more organizations. Separating the grants into these streams allows emphasis on both movement-building (widening, diversifying and capacitating the disability rights movement in target countries) and joint action among DPOs and between DPOs and other key stakeholders towards CRPD advancement. It also allows smaller or newer groups to apply in a simplified process.

With all grantmaking aimed at supporting DPOs to advance the CRPD, eligible applicants in the small grant category include organizations and groups, based in one of the target countries, which are legally-registered DPOs (or fiscally-sponsored by these DPOs) or partnerships between other organizations and DPOs (where the DPO is the managing partner), and partnerships between non-registered self advocacy or self-help groups of people with disabilities and other organizations. Eligible applicants in the mid-level and national coalition category are coalitions of three or more of the above-described organizations, where the managing partner is a DPO, and where the coalition as a group has mid-level or national scope.

There are separate application processes – one for small grants, one for mid-level coalitions, and one for national coalitions. Application packages consist of a (downloadable) brief application form, a narrative proposal (of no more than 5 pages in the case of small grants, and no more than 8 pages for mid-level and national coalitions), descriptions of key staff, (for coalitions) a description of all participating organizations, current fiscal year organizational budget and projected project budget, list of people on the applicant organization's governing body, copies of the organization's incorporation and legal registration documents, (for coalitions) an MoU between participating organizations, and two references. In the case of a grant request larger than USD \$20,000, also requested are organizational financial statements for the past two years.

Evaluation of applications occurs in a three-stage review process – a first review by staff which culls those applications clearly not eligible for consideration, a second review also by staff which investigates the project and applicant organization in depth, and a third review by the Grantmaking Committee which uses grantmaking guidelines approved by the Board (*see Attachment 8*) to look at staff recommendations and determines final recommendations on grantees (then reviewed and approved by the DRF and DRAF Boards). Grants which fall outside of grantmaking guidelines are passed to the Board for consideration.

³⁶ Most intermediary grantmakers in the U.S. strive for a 70/30 balance, where 70% of their funding is re-granted and 30% covers other costs. DRF, still a new grantmaker and a newly independent organization with start-up expenses, at 65/35 is very close to this ideal. In addition, of the 35% not re-granted, the majority is expended on program expenses related to the grantmaking (grantee convenings, grantee training, site visits, advisory meetings).

³⁷ In 2011, DRF tested a Letter of Interest procedure and has expanded that procedure to high-applicant target countries: Bangladesh, India, Peru, Uganda, and Ukraine. Organizations successful in the LoI process are asked to submit full proposals.

The first review culls applications not from target countries, or eligible organizations/coalitions, and not addressing one of the priority areas outlined in the request for proposals, and ensures that in the second review period, any questionable areas, such as missing documents, extent of involvement of PWDs, or non-allowable activities are followed up directly with applicants for clarification. The second review looks at organizational capacity (as outlined in the application and as evident from references and other contacts on the ground), (in the case of coalition applications) viability of the coalition, and project strengths, with the latter weighted more heavily to avoid favoring only well-established organizations/coalitions. A review of organizational capacity examines mission (and link of mission to activities), past achievements, equity within the organization (especially regarding people with disabilities and gender), strategic planning, income streams and existing funds, and ability to innovate. A review of coalition viability examines the rationale for the organizations selected as members, the plan for coalition project management, and the definition of member roles. A review of project strengths examines the extent to which the CRPD has driven the development of the project, involvement of (especially marginalized) people with disabilities at all stages, collaboration aims, clarity of goals and indicators, quality of contextual analysis and consistency of project goals with needs outlined, clarity of timing of activities and budget, and extent to which project may have impact on the human rights of persons with disabilities.

The dockets presented to the Grantmaking Committee include an overview of the applications received, an update on CRPD implementation at international and national levels, country reports or CRPD updates or Country Strategies or Assessments on each of the target countries which include information on progress towards Fund milestones in the country, and as of 2013, a 1-2 page rationale for each potential grantee. Rationales give brief information on applicant organization and/or coalition, project, budget, strengths, and weaknesses and are marked with staff recommendations (highly recommended, recommended, unsure). The Grantmaking Committee receives grants dockets in advance of decision-making. In Grantmaking Committee meetings, members discuss key issues from the docket as a group and with staff. Once the Committee makes decisions on grants recommendations, recommendations are forwarded to the Board for final approval and applications are reviewed for consistency with legal and fiduciary standards (a 2-4 week process), after which acceptance letters are processed and transfers of funds occurs.

Because relatively few DPOs in the Global South have ever achieved foreign funding, the application and grantee monitoring process includes technical assistance. FAQs are posted on the Funds' grant guidelines web page, with further guidance for applicants. Grant review periods include substantial back-and-forth between DRF and DRAF and potential grantees to gather missing documents, better understand applicant goals, help applicants incorporate rights strategies into their proposed projects, and support applicants with the grantee paperwork necessary for legal compliance.

For grants from the Strategic Partnerships funding stream, opportunities for funding in the areas of cross-movement work or regional DPO network building are identified by staff and discussed with DFAT before being recommended for review and decision by a committee of the Board. These grants are not yet included in the Funds' formal M&E system; this gap will be addressed over the course of the planned independent learning evaluations in 2014.

VII. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROGRAM & PROGRAM RESULTS

DRAF/DRF provide direct support – both financial and technical - to DPOs in the developing world, to enhance their capacity to work on and participate in rights achievement. This support improves the ability of both local grantee DPOs and the broader community of persons with disabilities in target countries to demand inclusion in national and local legislative and policy frameworks and government and development programs. The Funds’ movement-building and empowerment approach increases the voice and visibility of this marginalized community among key stakeholders, including government officials, NHRIs, and development actors.

As evident from quantitative and qualitative responses to annual Grantee Capacity surveys³⁸ (quantitative responses tallied on the program logic/logframe), Fund grantees see positive leaps in their knowledge about rights and their capacity to advocate for those rights:

“DRF funded activities have really helped us to improve our capacity in talking with government and policy makers. We now could be a resource to others regarding the rights of PWDs. For example, Department of Education invited representatives from PPCI KP to be one of the members of working group implementing inclusive education in Padang City; and the local parliament and local government of Padang City approve the urgent need of a local ordinance or Perda on disability rights and inclusion and leave it to PPCI KP to design the draft Perda.”

“PWDSI is in a better position in terms of capacity; we now have young members doing awareness and advocacy in both rural and urban areas.”

The direct support which the Funds provide and which increases local resources, knowledge, visibility, and participation in decision-making fora, strengthens sustainability of results.

In addition, since grants are aimed at (and are achieving) concrete and positive changes in the rights and development frameworks (legislation, policy, institutions) affecting people with disabilities within each target country/region, results of the program have greater sustainability. Regardless of whether any single grantee organization survives over the long-term, the rights frameworks achieved provide a way for all people with disabilities in that country to improve their quality of life over time.

As fellow bilateral agency, DFID has recognized, “addressing exclusion in all its aspects is key to eliminating poverty.”³⁹ OHCHR agrees: “...effective poverty reduction is not possible without the *empowerment* of the poor.”⁴⁰ In enhancing the voice and visibility of PWDs, and increasing their participation in decision-making, DRAF/DRF funding has a direct – and sustainable - impact on poverty within this community.

³⁸ See Attachment 6, *Grantee Capacity Survey 2014*

³⁹ DFID, *Disability Equality Scheme: 2006-2009*, available at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/diversity/disability-equality-scheme.pdf>

⁴⁰ *Principles and Guidelines for a Human Rights Approach to Poverty Reduction Strategies*, OHCHR: HR/PUB/06/12, p. 4.

VIII. INCLUSIVITY OF PROGRAM

Gender: Statistics show that women with disabilities are 3 times more likely to be victims of violence than women without disabilities; violence against CWDs occurs at annual rates at least 1.7 times greater than children with no disabilities; and nearly 1 in 5 victims of violence with a disability were targeted because of their disability.⁴¹

As is true in virtually any other grouping, women and girls with disabilities have lower status than men and boys with disabilities, even among persons with disabilities. In the Funds' experience, even in vibrant DPO communities (such as those in Peru and Uganda), organizations of women are few and weak, and youth organizations are primarily headed by males.⁴²

DRAF/DRF assess the involvement of women as staff and Board members in applicant organizations⁴³ and make a concerted effort to outreach to, identify, provide technical support to, grant to, and track impact on organizations of women with disabilities. To date, the Funds have made grants to 25 WWD organizations, and many more to organizations which are led or chaired by a woman with disability.

Child protection: Because DRAF/DRF fund organizations founded and run by persons with disabilities, and children are not able in most countries to register organizations, organizations of children with disabilities are not grantees. However, parent organizations, addressing advocacy to advance the rights of people with intellectual disabilities, Deafblind, or children with disabilities can be and are grantees; youth with disability organizations are grantees; and DPOs addressing changes in policy or practices which impact children, such as inclusive education, are also grantees. DRAF/DRF are committed to the protection of children and have (a recently revised) child protection policy ensuring compliance with international standards of protection and also, with Article 7 of the CRPD on the full enjoyment by children with disabilities of all human rights and fundamental freedoms on an equal basis with other children. The Funds have worked closely with the DFAT Child Protection Officer in creating and revising this policy. Staff and Board have also been involved in its development to ensure compliance. The policy outlines what the Funds will do to broaden awareness and compliance among grantees.

Environment: Programmatically, the Funds pose little environmental risk. The headquarters office is located in a certified green building. The majority of staff work from home and so do not commute. Most Program Officers (who conduct site visits to grantees) are located in or near the regions where grantees are based so that carbon foot prints from travel are reduced. Grantees are mainly small, locally based organizations with limited carbon footprint.

⁴¹ UN Secretary General's Report on Violence against Children, Thematic Group on Violence against Disabled Children, "Violence Against Disabled Children," 2005, available at http://www.unicef.org/videoaudio/PDFs/UNICEF_Violence_Against_Disabled_Children_Report_Distributed_Version.pdf

⁴² A telling indicator of women's status in the community in Uganda, for example, is the fact that the disability community calls itself the "disability fraternity".

⁴³ This is a specific question in the application.

DRF has an environmental policy which encourages the following practices:

- Reduce, reuse, and recycle
- Use environmentally friendly products
- Conserve energy, water, and natural resources
- Use green-friendly business practices
- Make grants to organizations that do not harm the environment

Further, DRAF/DRF has an indicator on climate change in their logframe, includes resources on climate change and persons with disabilities on their website, has a section within proposal forms asking applicants what they are doing on climate change, and has a staff person acting as the responsible internal expert on climate change and disability.

Within the last year, the Funds have worked with the UNDP-Global Environment Fund (GEF) Small Grants Program (SGP) to increase disability inclusion within their work. In November 2013, Program Officer, Paul Deany (the Funds' point person on climate change and disability) coordinated a workshop together with Pacific grantees during the lead-up to the 9th International Conference on Nature Conservation in December 2013, in Suva, Fiji.

The workshop focused on an overview of DRAF/DRF, the UNCRPD (UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities), especially Article 11 (Situations of Risk and Humanitarian Emergencies) and work being done by the disability movement on climate and disasters, including that being led by Fiji-based regional DPO network Pacific Disability Forum. The workshop addressed linkages between disability and climate change/disaster risk reduction, why disability should be mainstreamed into the work of GEF SGP, and practical ways to integrate disability into SGP programs.

Participants in the conference came up with 13 resolutions, four of which were specifically on disability:

1. The Pacific Island Countries will identify and work closely with DRAF/DRF by linking with the DPOs and the Pacific Disability Forum (members in 19 Pacific countries) to have disability mainstreamed in all projects starting by March 2014;
2. The countries undertake to implement at least 1 project involving DPOs within the year 2014 (as of March 2014, three grants to DRAF/DRF grantees are being considered);
3. To ensure disability issues are considered in all projects, the VRA (Vulnerability Reduction Assessment) process will incorporate a disability question on the VRA process at the design and planning of project;
4. By 2016, SGP will work with DRAF/DRF to prepare guide on how to mainstream disability in community based adaptation projects, using the experiences from the Pacific region.

Transparency: DRAF/DRF are committed to improving the transparency of all aspects of our work and thus, aim to provide comprehensive and timely information to the public, media, and all stakeholders. This commitment is set out in the organizations' Code of Ethics. (In addition, there are other related policies including a Document Retention Policy, which outlines the timeline for retention of documents, and a Written Information Security Program, which provides instructions to staff on data privacy.)

DRAF/DRF believe that accurate and accessible information is critical to effective collaboration and strategic decision making, as well as for accountability to the public and donors.

The following outlines how the Funds fulfill transparency commitments under the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI):

- DRF is registered with [Guidestar](#), a web portal which gathers and publicizes information about US nonprofit organizations, including tax returns and other financial information.
- As of 2013, the Funds had publicized data through AidStream.
- In 2013, an Open Information Policy (*see Attachment 7*) was developed that clearly outlines the organizations' commitment to transparency.
- In 2013, DRF completed requirements for participation in the US Foundation Center's [Glasspockets.org](#), a web-based tool endorsed by major US foundations to ensure good practices for data and document sharing.

Because transparency is closely linked with communications, more comprehensive webpages (for DRF and DRAF) will be developed to ensure that information about grants and country activities, as well as annual reports for financials and results, are accessible and useful for diverse viewers.

It will take many years to ensure that PWDs and their representative organizations are full and equal participants in rights promotion, obtainment and oversight, and that this affects their standard of living. DRAF/DRF are relatively new grantmakers, with limited resources and scope. Nonetheless, the rapid growth of the Funds signify that they are occupying an important niche. Intermediate results from the first evaluation support the theory of change and program logic and, according to evaluators, are a good predictor of achieving impact. The challenges are in figuring out how best to use limited (financial and staff) resources to have the most significant impact and in figuring out how best to measure that impact. It is also important that DRAF/DRF use lessons learned and evaluations to share successes in a way that heightens awareness of DPO efforts (with other donors & development agencies, but also with other key actors such as the UN system and major human rights organizations), thereby sharing the burden of decreasing the deprivations experienced by and bringing justice to people with disabilities around the world.