

External Evaluation of the Pacific Enable Project

Submitted to UNICEF on 19 November 2015

Michael Szporluk

Evaluation Commissioned by: UNICEF

Locations of the evaluation: Pacific Enable project was implemented in Fiji, Vanuatu, Republic of Marshall Islands, Nauru, and Samoa. Field visit for the evaluation was to Fiji and Vanuatu only.

Evaluation Time-Frame:

Desk Review: 7 September – 18 September 2015

Field visit: 20 September – 7 October 2015

First draft submitted 12 October 2015

Second draft submitted 2 November 2015

Final draft submitted 19 November 2015

Acknowledgements: I would like to extend my thanks to all those individuals who took time to be interviewed for this evaluation (see Appendix 1 for list of persons interviewed).

Abbreviations

BMF	Biwako Millennium Framework
CBR	Community Based Rehabilitation
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CROP	Council of Regional Organizations of the Pacific
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DPA	Disability Promotion and Advocacy Association (Vanuatu)
ECCE	Early Childhood Care and Education (department in Ministry of Education, Vanuatu)
ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
HRC	Human Rights Committee Act (Republic of Marshall Islands)
ILO	International Labour Organization
MoJ	Ministry of Justice and Community Services (Vanuatu)
NHRI	National Human Rights Institution
NSO	National Statistics Office
PDF	Pacific Disability Forum
PE	Pacific Enable (project that is the subject of this evaluation)
PIFS	Pacific Island Forum Secretariat
PRSD	Pacific Regional Strategy on Disability
RPD	Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (Republic of Marshall Islands)
RRRT	Regional Rights Resource Team (operates under the SPC)
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
TVET	Technical Vocational Education and Training (Vanuatu)
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNPRPD	United Nations Partnership for the Promotion of Rights of Persons with Disabilities
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
VEJA	Vanuatu Early Childhood Association
VNSO	Vanuatu National Statistics Office
VSDP	Vanuatu Society for Disabled Persons
WHO	World Health Organization

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
2. INTRODUCTION	8
2.1. DESCRIPTION OF THE INTERVENTION EVALUATED	8
2.1.1 PACIFIC CONTEXT	9
2.1.2 PACIFIC ENABLE PROJECT	13
2.1.3 RELEVANT CRPD CONCEPTS FOR PACIFIC ENABLE	15
2.1.4 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION	16
2.2. EXPECTED RESULTS OF THE INTERVENTION	16
3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	16
3.1 METHODOLOGY	16
3.1.1 DESK REVIEW	16
3.1.2 FIELD RESEARCH	17
3.2 METHODOLOGY CONSTRAINTS	17
3.3 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	18
4. SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS	19
4.1. EMPLOYMENT	19
4.1.1. ILO MAINSTREAMING AND TARGETED ACTIVITIES	19
4.1.2. WHO AND CBR WORK	20
4.2. LEGISLATION	21
4.2.1. LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT – REPUBLIC OF MARSHALL ISLANDS, NAURU AND VANUATU	21
4.2.2. OTHER SUPPORT – MARSHALL ISLANDS	22
4.2.3. SAMOA	23
4.2.4. UPCOMING PLANS	23
4.3. DATA AND STATISTICS	23
4.3.1 REGIONAL ADVOCACY	23
4.3.2. IN VANUATU	24
4.3.3. IN SAMOA, SOLOMON ISLANDS AND FIJI	25
4.4. EARLY CHILDHOOD IDENTIFICATION	26
4.5. UN AND PARTNER AGENCIES ARE COORDINATED AND SUPPORTED	28
4.5.1. ONGOING MONITORING	28
5. FINDINGS BASED ON EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND SURVEY	30
5.1 RELEVANCE AND TIMELINESS	31
5.2 EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT	32
5.3. EFFICIENCY	41
5.4. SUSTAINABILITY	42
5.5. GENDER AS A CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE	44
6. CONCLUSIONS	45

7. RECOMMENDATIONS	47
APPENDIX 1: PERSONS INTERVIEWED	51
APPENDIX 2: ROUND 1 UNPRPD PROJECTS	53
APPENDIX 3: TERMS OF REFERENCE	54
APPENDIX 4: OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS PER PROPOSAL	58
APPENDIX 5: INTERVIEW GUIDES	60
APPENDIX 6: SURVEY	62
APPENDIX 7: DOCUMENTS CITED AND CONSULTED	65

Tables

Table 1: Population and Human Development Index Rank, page 10

Table 2: Outcome areas, lead agencies, and countries where activities implemented, page 14

Table 3: Expenditures, page 42

Text boxes

Text box 1: Some issues with project design, page 29

Figures

Figure 1: Map of the Pacific, page 8

1. Executive Summary

Pacific Enable (PE) was one of the eleven projects that were approved for funding through the UNPRPD funding mechanism. This report presents the findings, analysis, and recommendations of an external evaluation of the first phase of the PE project that was implemented in several countries in the South Pacific through the United Nation's Promoting Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD) mechanism. While the offices of the UN partners were based in Fiji (with the exception of WHO, whose technical lead was based in Manila), project implementation occurred in Vanuatu, Republic of Marshall Islands, Nauru, Samoa, as well as Fiji.

The Object of the Evaluation

This evaluation was designed to describe the context in which the UN implementing agencies were operating, to document the main outputs of the work done, to understand the factors that have led to the achievement (or non-achievement) of expected results in each of the outcome areas, and to recommend approaches and activities for phase II of the project.

This evaluation finds that the PE project was well-suited, conceptually, to support the advancement of the rights of persons with disabilities in the Pacific, and finds that the outcome areas were appropriate given the needs of persons with disabilities and other work on disability in the region. PE had five outcome areas, and different UN agencies had the lead for implementing activities within each area. The project looked at employment, legislation and policy, statistics, early child identification, and coordination. Overall, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was the designated lead, and UNICEF has commissioned this evaluation.

International Labour Organization (ILO) and World Health Organization (WHO) led activities to improve conditions and opportunities for persons with disabilities with respect to employment. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (ESCAP) and Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS) worked on legislation and policy. UNICEF and WHO worked on improving data collection on persons with disabilities. UNICEF developed and tested a tool on early identification for children with disabilities. Finally, UN Volunteers placed a staff person to facilitate coordination between implementing partners.

The overall budget for the project was 350,000 USD.

Evaluation Objectives and Intended Audience

Per the Terms of Reference, the primary objectives of the evaluation were to provide feedback on the outputs achieved during phase one, to review the accountability of the UN agencies involved, and to inform future programming. The Terms of Reference indicate the primary audience is the donor and the secondary audience is the implementing agencies.

Evaluation Methodology

Per the Terms of Reference, the methodology combined a desk review and field visit. Two weeks were set aside for the desk review, and to identify and arrange interviews for the field visit. The field visit was approximately two weeks, with two and a half days in Fiji, four and a half days in Port Vila, Vanuatu, and one and a half days in Luganville, Vanuatu.

For the desk review, project documents were provided by the different implementing agencies. In addition to those documents, the evaluator reviewed best practice documents on employment of persons with disabilities, early childhood identification, and statistics.

The field research consisted of key informant interviews, two focus group discussions, and the administration of a survey to staff from the implementing agencies.

Most Important Findings and Conclusions

Overall, this evaluation finds that PE partners were able to achieve some impressive results, especially bearing in mind the regional scope and the challenges of working in the Pacific region in particular. This evaluation notes that Pacific Enable (PE) was the only regional project to be part of the first round of projects funded through the UNPRPD funding mechanism.

There are strong aspects, and there are aspects that could be strengthened in every project. In terms of what PE did well, this evaluation finds that significant and positive contributions have been made in the following areas:

- Legislative and policy reforms (led by the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific [ESCAP] and the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat [PIFS]); and
- Knowledge about and use of disability statistics, both through regional advocacy on the importance of standardizing questions on disability in data collection (for demographic surveys, for example), as well as through hands on technical support to the Vanuatu National Statistics Office (VNSO).

In terms of areas for improvement, this evaluation finds there is a need to:

- Strengthen the design and monitoring framework, especially in light of the regional scope and limited funds available;
- Ensure that design of interventions and the trainings offered are linked sufficiently to the CRPD; and
- Ensure that trainings are sufficiently coordinated with the work undertaken by other partners in country.

Although this evaluation is critical of work done in particular outcome areas, the aim is to provide constructive feedback to support the ability of partner organizations to ensure their activities have lasting impact. Phase I achieved some impressive results, and this evaluator is convinced that funds for Phase II could build off those achievements, and can go a long way in supporting the capacity of persons with disabilities to exercise their rights and be integrated into the community on an equal basis with others.

Main Recommendations

This evaluation makes several recommendations for phase two of the project. This evaluation has found that two primary factors led to the most successful results (in outcome areas two and three): knowledge of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) amongst key staff and openness to collaboration with other organizations. For phase two, therefore, implementing agencies should ensure that key staff understand and can apply the CRPD, and that they have motivation and capacity to work with others.

This evaluation has found that the approach of one-one trainings (in several of the outcome areas) has led to limited outputs. Thus, going forward the approach for phase two should account for the provision of more technical support to project partners and beneficiaries in the field. This evaluation recommends the development of pilot projects (with ongoing technical support) in targeted communities to test, for example, the early identification tool that was developed, to support entrepreneurs with disabilities to develop and implement their business plans, and to support the implementation of CBR action plans.

The approach taken with regard to employment (outcome area one) was, per the view of this evaluation, unnecessarily restricted (to supporting self-employment). In phase two, this evaluation recommends working with government and private sector to create support for waged employment of persons with disabilities.

The strong working relationship forged between ESCAP, PIFS, and PDF should continue to be utilized to support the review of legislation and policies (outcome area two), and the development of new policies and legislation to accord with the CRPD.

With respect to statistics (outcome area three), this evaluation has found that UNICEF and WHO were effective in their regional advocacy efforts, and thus this evaluation recommends the continuation of such advocacy, with the aim of gaining full buy-in of the Statistics Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

With regard to early childhood identification (outcome area four), a more collaborative approach is warranted, especially bearing in mind the expertise of WHO, and the need to involve multiple national and local stakeholders to ensure children with disabilities get the support they need once they have been identified.

Finally, with regard to coordination (outcome area five), and given the disperse set of activities across the Pacific, this evaluation finds there is a need to strengthen monitoring of activities at the national level (since not all agencies have a ongoing presence in each of the countries where activities are implemented). Given the lack of a presence in each country, it is important to develop mechanisms for the different UN agencies to share more information and support one another (at a regional level information sharing worked well).

Forum or PDF).² The design of the project focused on four related themes embedded in the CRPD: “strengthening legislative and regulatory frameworks (Articles 4, 5 and 12); improving education outcomes for children (Article 24); increasing work and employment opportunities (Article 27); and strengthening national-level data collection processes (Article 31).”³ These four themes were grouped into five outcome areas: 1) employment; 2) legislation and policy; 3) statistics; 4) early child intervention; and 5) coordination.

To this end, **PIFS and PDF** were to research barriers to ratification and advocate with governments to ratify, and to support communication with governments and DPOs respectively. **ESCAP** was to support the development of legislative frameworks. **UNICEF** was to lead three areas: (1) support the development of national child policies in Cook Islands and Vanuatu; (2) support the development of an early detection system “to identify children not developing on par with their age-appropriate peers” in Vanuatu; and (3) work with the Pacific Statistics Steering Committee (PSSC) and national offices to address collecting and analyzing “adequate data and evidence” on disability. **WHO** was to work with the Government of Vanuatu “to support and promote inclusive livelihoods” through community based rehabilitation (CBR), linked to Vanuatu’s national disability policy. **ILO** would pursue mainstreaming and targeted strategies to promote the right to work on an equal basis with others. The mainstreaming strategy was to be achieved through “the development of focused policies and programmes, capacity-building initiatives and advocacy.” The targeted strategy was “to provide skills-building and gender-responsive training to suit specific needs of women and men with disabilities.” Finally, **UNV** was tasked with responsibility for overall coordination of the various efforts.⁴

2.1.1 Pacific Context

The island nations of the Pacific are diverse, relatively small in size and population, and are spread across an immense area. The region covers 15% of the earth’s surface and has an overall population of 2.3 million.⁵ 89% of that population lives in one of the countries in Melanesia.⁶ Only Palau and Fiji are among the top 100 countries according to HDI rank, and aside from Fiji each of the PIF member island countries has lost ground in the last few years (not looking at New Zealand and Australia).

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) is a body that provides technical support to PIFS. The most relevant branches for this report are the Regional Rights Resource Team (RRRT) and the Statistics Division. RRRT and PIFS are located in Suva. The Statistics Division is located in Noumea, New Caledonia.

² Pacific Disability Forum is a network of disabled persons organizations (DPOs) and disability service providers across the Pacific region. They have 32 full members and 27 associate members. Based in Suva, they focus on capacity building and advocacy. Their primary funding comes from Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), New Zealand aid (NZ AID). They also receive some funding from Disability Rights Fund.

³ Pacific Enable, Project Proposal, page 3.

⁴ All quotes from Pacific Enable, Project Proposal, pages 3-4.

⁵ World Bank (undated), “*Pacific Islands Overview*”, accessed from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/pacificislands/overview> on 12 October 2015.

⁶ Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2013 Pocket Statistical Summary, (Noumea, New Caledonia), accessed from http://www.spc.int/prism/images/downloads/Pocket_summary_2013-FINAL.pdf on 12 October 2015

Table 1: Population and Human Development Index Rank⁷

Region/ Country	2013 Population ⁸	2013 HDI Rank ⁹	Change in rank 2011-2013	2011 HDI Rank
Melanesia	9,133,200			
Fiji Islands	859,200	88	+12	100
Papua New Guinea	7,398,500	157 (tied)	-4	153
Solomon Islands	610,800	157 (tied)	-15	142
Vanuatu	264,700	131	-6	125
Micronesia	294,300			
Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)	103,000	124	Not applicable	Not ranked
Kiribati	108,800	133	-11	122
Marshall Islands	54,200	Not ranked	Not applicable	Not ranked
Nauru	10,500	Not ranked	Not applicable	Not ranked
Palau	17,800	60	-11	49
Polynesia	317,400			
Cook Islands	15,200	Not ranked	Not applicable	Not ranked
Niue	1,500	Not ranked	Not applicable	Not ranked
Samoa	186,500	106	-7	99
Tonga	103,300	100	-10	90
Tuvalu	10,900	Not ranked	Not applicable	Not ranked

Challenges of working in the Pacific

The indigenous populations in the different sub-regions have unique cultures, traditions and languages. Inhabitants of Vanuatu, for example, speak 113 indigenous languages, and use Bislama as a unifying language.¹⁰ In terms of political and economic life, Tonga alone has never lost its independence. The World Bank has classified the following Pacific states as fragile: Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Republic of Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, and Tuvalu.¹¹ Several persons interviewed as part of this evaluation have indicated that governments have low technical capacity, and limited financial resources to fulfill human rights obligations.¹²

Cultures in the Pacific Islands tend to stigmatize individuals with disabilities and their families, and this is evident in the derogatory terms used to describe persons with disabilities.¹³ Persons

⁷ Unfortunately Gini Co-efficients, which measure the extent to which there are deviations from equal distribution of income, are not available for Pacific island countries.

⁸ Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2013 Pocket Statistical Summary, (Noumea, New Caledonia), Accessed from http://www.spc.int/prism/images/downloads/Pocket_summary_2013-FINAL.pdf on 10 October 2015. Estimates are for 2013.

⁹ United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Reports: Table 1: Human Development Index and its Components*, Accessed from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/table-1-human-development-index-and-its-components> on 10 October 2015. Rankings are for 2013.

¹⁰ West, Barbara (2009), *Encyclopedia of the Peoples of Asia and the Pacific*, (New York, Infobase publishing). p.864

¹¹ World Bank (2015), *Harmonized list of Fragile Situations FY 15*, Accessed from <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/pubdocs/publicdoc/2014/7/425731404933583114/FY15FragileSituationList.pdf> on 8 October 2015.

¹² Notes from Pacific Enable key informant interviews (KII) (comments made on condition of anonymity).

¹³ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

with psychosocial disabilities and persons with intellectual disabilities tend to face more pronounced barriers, not only in society in general but also within the disability community. There are very few user groups for persons with psychosocial disabilities, and few peer support groups for persons with intellectual disabilities.

For international organizations working to promote rights of persons with disabilities the high cost of travel poses a barrier, and it can be difficult to identify strong national or local organizations that understand disability from a rights perspective and are able to undertake effective advocacy campaigns.

With regard to the Pacific Enable thematic area of education, this evaluation notes several studies in Vanuatu look at education rates and achievements for children with disabilities. While precise estimates are not possible due to different areas of focus, and different questions asked, the comparative analysis of data undertaken during the Pacific Enable project concluded, “children with disabilities are much less likely to attend primary school than their non-disabled peers, and to an even greater extent with regard to secondary school.”¹⁴

With regard to the Pacific Enable thematic area of economic activity, the same analysis notes,

People with disabilities are more likely to be either self-employed or to work in the family business. Indeed, the rate of employment among people who were asked about employment was basically the same for people with and without disabilities. However, people with disabilities were much less likely to be employed outside the home. This shows that despite the willingness and capability of people with disabilities to undertake productive activities, there are barriers preventing them from obtaining employment.¹⁵

The final challenge, and this affected directly the implementation of the project, is that the region is vulnerable to natural disasters. Cyclone Pam hit Vanuatu in March 2015, leading UNICEF, WHO, and ILO to either move activities to other locations or to postpone them, and to redirect work to the cyclone response.

Disability within the regional framework

Several key regional strategies have promoted the rights of persons with disabilities.

First, the Biwako Millennium Framework (BMF) for Action towards an Inclusive, Barrier-free and Rights-based Society for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific was adopted in 2002. Of the seven priority actions, three (early detection, training and employment, and poverty alleviation through livelihoods) are connected directly to Pacific Enable (outcome areas one and four). The BMF ended in 2012, but ESCAP has used BMF framework as a model for partnering with Pacific governments to advocate for CRPD ratification through the Incheon Strategy 2013-2022, and a campaign called “make the rights real.”¹⁶ The ten goals of the Incheon strategy

¹⁴ UNICEF Pacific and Vanuatu National Statistics Office, *Children, Women and Men with Disabilities in Vanuatu: what do the data say?*, UNICEF, Suva, 2014, p.44. Accessed from http://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/Children_Women_and_Men_with_Disabilities_in_Vanuatu.pdf on 11 October 2015.

¹⁵ UNICEF Pacific and Vanuatu National Statistics Office (2014), at supra note 14, p 40-41.

¹⁶ United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific, “Incheon Strategy to ‘Make the Right Real’ for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific”, accessed from <http://www.maketherightreal.net/> on 19 October 2015.

include: increasing job opportunities for persons with disabilities (goal 1), increase government support services to persons with disabilities (goal 4), provide more support to children with disabilities, including early intervention and education (goal 5), treat men and women with disabilities equally (goal 6), make data reliable and comparable (goal 8), support ratification and implementation of the CRPD (goal 9) and encourage international, regional and sub-regional cooperation (goal 10).¹⁷

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Pacific Sub-Region (UNDAF) is inclusive of persons with disabilities. The preparation document notes that persons with disabilities in and near urban centers are amongst the most vulnerable.¹⁸ In particular (and in connection with outcome one of Pacific Enable), employment discrimination against women with disabilities is noted:

Women are more prone to be poor due to lower levels of formal / vocational training and less access to formal employment with many being active in the informal sector. Based on observations and anecdotal evidence, women with disabilities, rural women and widows appear to often face particular hardship due to being marginalized in society, lack of access to infrastructure and applied customs that discriminate against women..¹⁹

UNDAF noted that non-communicable diseases are at crisis levels.²⁰ One of the goals of CBR (outcome area one) is to reduce incidence of non-communicable diseases. Another UNDAF priority, focusing on early childhood care and education, accords with outcome area four of Pacific Enable. UNDAF highlights that a major challenge is the lack of standardization and monitoring in ECCE programs.²¹ Finally, addressing climate change (including impact of climate change on persons with disabilities), and violence against women and children (including against women and children with disabilities) are highlighted as priorities.²²

PIFS organized a Disability Ministers Meeting (that was also attended by PDF) in the Cook Islands in 2009. One outcome from that meeting was the adoption of a *Pacific Regional Strategy on Disability 2010-2015 (PRSD)*. That strategy identified six thematic areas for attention:

- 1) Strengthen Political Leadership and an Enabling Environment;
- 2) Recognition and Protection of the Human Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
- 3) Strengthen Partnerships: Coordination and Collaboration;
- 4) Disability Inclusive Development;
- 5) Enhancing the Central Role of Persons with Disabilities; and
- 6) Mobilization of Resources.

¹⁷ United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (2012), “Incheon Strategy to ‘Make the Right Real’ for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific” accessed from <http://www.unescap.org/publications/incheon-strategy> on 13 October 2015.

¹⁸ United Nations Common Multi-Country Assessment for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories Under the Fiji and Samoa Multi-Country Offices in Preparation for the United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Pacific Sub-Region 2013-2017, (2011), page 14.

¹⁹ United Nations Common Multi-Country Assessment (2011), at supra note 18, page 15.

²⁰ United Nations Common Multi-Country Assessment (2011), at supra note 18, page 36.

²¹ United Nations Common Multi-Country Assessment (2011), at supra note 18, pages 38-39.

²² United Nations Common Multi-Country Assessment (2011), at supra note 18, pages 47, 56.

Those priorities closely align with Pacific Enable priorities. Priority one (national ownership), priority two (emphasis on rights) and priority three (focus on partnership building), and priority six (resource mobilization) are evident as features underpinning the PRPD approach described on page 14. Priority area four (disability inclusive development) is linked to outcome areas one, three and four of Pacific Enable.

PIFS has convened a Disability Working Group, which includes various UN organizations (UNICEF, ESCAP, ILO, OHCHR) and PDF, in the development and drafting of a new regional disability framework known as the Pacific Disability Rights Framework: 2016-2025.²³ That framework has identified five strategic objectives: 1) enhanced participation of persons with disabilities in development work; 2) effective partnerships/collaboration to support inclusive development efforts by governments; 3) raised awareness about disability “as a priority for inclusive rights-based development and poverty reduction”; 4) “improved evidence-based decision-making”; and 5) effective mainstreaming of disabilities at all levels and sectors.

Vanuatu went through the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) in 2009, and OHCHR compiled comments to the Human Rights Council Working Group. The CRC Committee recommended “allocating the necessary resources for programmes and facilities for children with disabilities, to develop early identification programmes to prevent disabilities, establish special education programmes for children with disabilities and further encourage their integration into the educational system and their inclusion in society.”²⁴ The CRC Committee also recommended that the Government of Vanuatu seek technical assistance to train persons working with and for children with disabilities.²⁵

The Working Group on the UPR referenced ILO’s Decent Work Country Programme for Vanuatu, mentioning one of the priorities as labor legislation reform, and promotion of decent employment opportunities for persons with disabilities.²⁶

This region benefits from the unique and close relationship between governments (through Pacific Island Forum Secretariat) and the Pacific Disability Forum. Overall there is a significant degree of congruence between what the governments and regional DPOs have identified as priorities (*through the Incheon Strategy, UNDAF, PRSD and PDRF*) and the priorities as defined by the Pacific Enable partners. This suggests Pacific Enable was well placed to make a difference.

2.1.2 Pacific Enable Project

1. UNPRPD intervention / brief description of mechanism and their approach

²³ Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, *Pacific Disability Rights Framework 2016-2025 (draft)*, (Suva, PIFs). Accessed from <http://www.addc.org.au/content/resources/draft-pacific-disability-rights-framework-2016-2025/1579/> on 13 October 2015. DFAT and NZAid are also part of the working group.

²⁴ OHCHR report (2009), Compilation prepared by OHCHR to the Human Rights Council working group on UPR, para 41

²⁵ OHCHR report (2009), at supra note 24, para 53

²⁶ Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review Vanuatu (4 June 2009), para 14.

The UNPRPD mechanism brings together UN organizations that have made “an explicit commitment to working together at country level to advance national capacity for the implementation of the CRPD through joint programmes and other common initiatives.”²⁷ The UNPRPD Strategic and Operational Framework explains that the approach is expected to facilitate “common learning across multiple organizations” and “maximize synergies within the UN System”, thereby generating greater “effectiveness, efficiency and innovation.”²⁸

The approach has four key features: (1) A ‘One UN’ approach to disability; (2) Focus on partnership building; (3) A focus on joint learning and knowledge creation; and (4) A catalytic approach aimed at leveraging existing UN funds as well as domestic resources. These features imply an agreement that the partners should ensure open communication and learning, seek to identify opportunities to collaborate, understand and promote the rights-based approach to the issue of disability, commit funds from their own agencies to further project goals, and leverage funds from other sources.

2. Five outcome areas of Pacific Enable

During the course of implementation, three main changes were made to the five outcome areas: first, UNICEF’s task to support the development of national child policies was dropped; second, ESCAP’s legislative work centered on Republic of Marshall Islands, Nauru, and Vanuatu; and third, UNICEF’s work on statistics included support to Samoa. Table 1 reflects these changes and shows where each lead agency implemented its activities.

Table 2: Outcome areas, lead agencies and countries

Outcome area	Lead agency	Countries where primary activities implemented
1. Persons with disabilities have...greater opportunity to secure decent waged and self-employment to achieve a livelihood.	ILO	Fiji, Vanuatu
	WHO	Vanuatu
2. Legislative and policy frameworks are compliant with CRPD and support reduced discrimination against PWD and improved service provision for PWD	ESCAP UNICEF ²⁹	Republic of Marshall Islands, Nauru, Vanuatu
3. Improved data, analysis, research and advocacy on disability	UNICEF	Vanuatu, Samoa
	PDF/PIFS	Fiji
4. Children with developmental delay are detected during the first five years of life and supported with appropriate education services in pilot areas in Vanuatu	UNICEF	Vanuatu
5. UN and partner agencies’ activities addressing the rights of PWD are coordinated, supported, monitored and are represented in broader development discourses.	UNV, PDF	Fiji

²⁷ UNPRPD Strategic and Operational Framework (2014), page 7

²⁸ UNPRPD (2014), at supra note 27, pages 16-17

²⁹ UNICEF was originally intended to support development of child policies in Vanuatu, but this component was dropped within the first year of the project.

2.1.3 Relevant CRPD Concepts for Pacific Enable

Given PE's focus and recognition of the importance of CRPD³⁰, and UNPRPD's emphasis on advancing CRPD, it is important to highlight some key CRPD key principles and concepts that are of particular relevance to the outcome areas of PE.

Principle of participation: One of the eight overarching principles of the CRPD is the principle of participation. The CRPD states that States Parties have an obligation to “consult with and actively involve persons with disabilities”(Article 4[3]) through their representative organizations “In the development and implementation of legislation and policies to implement the present Convention, and in other decision-making processes concerning issues relating to persons with disabilities.”

Non-discrimination and equality before the law: The CRPD emphasizes the importance of non-discrimination and equality before the law in Articles 2, 4, 5 and 12.

Reasonable accommodation: The CRPD defines reasonable accommodation as: “necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms.”³¹ Reasonable accommodation can be requested in any area of life (education, health, employment, transport, etc.) to facilitate the enjoyment of a good or service on an equal basis with others. The denial of reasonable accommodation, unless it is determined that it would impose an undue burden, is considered discrimination on the basis of disability.

Education and early childhood identification: While the PE proposal refers to education (Article 24), early identification also brings in elements from health (Article 25) and habilitation and rehabilitation (Article 26). The CRPD states a clear preference for inclusive education (Article 24), and notes that States Parties have an obligation to “provide early and comprehensive information, services and support to children with disabilities and their families.” (Article 23 [3]). The CRPD identifies health services as responsible for “early identification and intervention as appropriate, and services designed to minimize and prevent further disabilities (Article 25 [b]). Those services are to be provided “as close to possible to people’s own communities, including rural areas.” (Article 25 [c]).

With respect to rehabilitation and habilitation, programs for persons with disabilities should “begin at the earliest possible stage, and are based on the multidisciplinary assessment of individual needs and strengths.” (Article 26[1][a]). In addition, programs should “Support participation and inclusion in the community and all aspects of society, are voluntary, and are available to persons with disabilities as close as possible to their own communities, including in rural areas.” (Article 26[1][b]). Finally, “States Parties shall promote the development of initial and continuing training for professionals and staff working in habilitation and rehabilitation services.” (Article 26[2]).

³⁰ Pacific Enable, Project Proposal, pages 1-3.

³¹ CRPD, Article 2.

Work and employment: The CRPD emphasizes the right to employment is multi-faceted and includes prohibiting discrimination, ensuring just and favorable conditions for work, ensuring that persons can exercise their labor and trade union rights on an equal basis, ensuring the provision of reasonable accommodation in the workplace, promoting access for persons with disabilities to vocational training and guidance, promoting their employment in the private sector, as well as promoting opportunities for self-employment.

Statistics: The CRPD obliges States Parties to comply with established safeguards to ensure confidentiality, and ensure that data collected should help “to assess the implementation of States Parties’ obligations under the present convention.” (Article 32[2]). Further there is an obligation of States Parties to disseminate information on statistics, while ensuring “their accessibility to persons with disabilities.” (Article 32[3]).

2.1.4 Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

Per the Terms of Reference, “The principle objective of the review is accountability, to provide feedback on the impact of implementation of Phase 1 of Pacific Enable in meeting the targets set out in the proposal documentation” (See Appendix 3 for Terms of Reference). The efficiency, timeliness and sustainability of each outcome area are to be considered, and the primary audience is the donor, with secondary audience as the participating agencies. The terms advise “the evaluation may also inform future programming.” Finally, the terms of reference identified gender as a cross-cutting issue.

2.2. Expected Results of the Intervention

The expected impact according to the proposal was defined as follows: “Countries in the Pacific have increased national capacity in justice, economic, education and statistics sectors to provide increased opportunities for children, young people and adults with disabilities to participate in social and economic development.”³² The full list of expected outcomes and outputs per the proposal is found in Appendix 4.

3. Evaluation Methodology

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Desk Review

The review of materials began two weeks prior to the field visit. Aside from material provided by UNICEF and partner agencies, additional documents were reviewed to provide more context for the evaluation. This included information on good practices in early childhood care and education, community based rehabilitation, statistics, et cetera.

³² Pacific Enable, Project Proposal, page 5.

3.1.2 Field Research

Field visit dates

The field visit took place from 22 September to 7 October, and time was allocated as follows: 2 ½ working days in Suva (Fiji), 4 ½ working days in Port Vila (Vanuatu), and 1 ½ working days in Luganville (Vanuatu).

Key informant interviews

Four sets of interview guides were developed for the different types of stakeholders consulted: United Nation's Children's Fund (as the lead UN agency), other United Nations agencies, Governmental stakeholders, and civil society organizations (including organizations of persons with disabilities). Some questions pertaining to the specific organization, context, and the outcome area were added. Skype interviews were conducted with stakeholders in Nauru, Samoa and Philippines. These were based on the informant interview guides, with some additional questions pertaining to the specific organization, context, and the outcome area.

Survey

A short survey was developed, and shared with UNPRPD staff prior to the commencement of the field visit. This survey, comprising 13 multiple choice and open-ended questions, was provided to twelve stakeholders at the regional offices in Suva (see Appendix 6). Seven persons from five agencies completed the survey, two persons indicated they were unable to complete the survey, and three persons have not yet responded.³³

3.2 Methodology Constraints

a) Desk review

Some of the documents referenced in the proposal and annual reports were not provided until the field visit had already begun.³⁴ This made it more difficult to assimilate the information in a timely manner and meant there were some missed opportunities to ask informants questions (because relevant information had not yet been received).

b) Field visit to Vanuatu and Fiji

Given the scope for the evaluation, there was sufficient time to travel to Vanuatu and Fiji only. While the vast majority of the Pacific Enable project activities took place in those two countries, outcome area 2 (legislation and policy) was primarily undertaken in Republic of Marshall Islands and Nauru. Many of the most impressive outputs and outcomes occurred in those two countries. Had the ToR allowed for field visits to those countries, more comprehensive information about those positive accomplishments could have been documented.

c) Limitation of survey instrument

³³ The survey was given only to current and former staff ILO, ESCAP, UNICEF, PIFS, PDF, and WHO responsible for implementing Pacific Enable. For the sake of anonymity, the names of persons to whom the survey was given and the names of persons who completed the survey have been kept confidential.

³⁴ The PDF report on CRPD ratification, for example, has not yet been finalized and thus has not been reviewed as part of this evaluation. Once it is completed, it can and should be used to raise awareness and to inspire DPOs and governments on the steps needed to facilitate ratification in other Pacific Island countries.

Given the timeline and small sample sizes, it was not feasible to develop multiple survey instruments to assess each of the outcome areas for each country. Despite the more general survey, the sample size is still too small to be confident in the results from the multiple-choice questions.³⁵ As such, this report uses (as direct quotes) the responses provided to the open-ended questions only. It would have been of interest to ask an open-ended question about whether and how Pacific Enable had influenced other activities carried out within each of the implementing organizations. This would have given valuable information to answer the extent to which each organization has been open to integrating disability into their strategies and workplans.

d) No opportunity to meet some members of the disability community

There were no opportunities to meet with persons with intellectual disabilities and persons with psychosocial disabilities during the field visit. Thus, this evaluation was not able to assess properly the extent to which the project has been inclusive in that regard.

e) Short time frame for draft and final evaluation

The field visit ended on 7 October. In the SoW initially the draft report was due on the same day. UNICEF adjusted the timeline, giving me three working days to submit the draft report. Given the tight timeline, this meant there was not enough time to get replies from some follow-up questions (for example, from my meeting on 7 October).

f) Lack of information about some PE components

The PDF report on factors leading to ratification has not yet been finalized, and thus a review is not possible. With respect to outcome area 1, requests for information sent to the Chair of the SYB sub-committee went unanswered, and thus it was impossible to obtain full information about its work. Finally, though requested, no details have been provided on the trainings for teachers and parents on early identification (outcome area 4).

g) Incomparable information on partner contribution and leveraging

The different organizations used different methods to calculate their own contribution of funds (including staff time), and the funds they were able to leverage. This evaluation had assumed a standard had been agreed upon (for PE reporting to UNPRPD), and had anticipated being able to use that data for this analysis. During the first draft review (23 October 2015), it became clear that no standard had been used. Given that lack of standard, it has proven difficult to evaluate the efficiency aspect of the project results. This is explained in more detail in section 5.3.

3.3 Ethical considerations

While no attempt was made to obtain written informed consent of those individuals who were interviewed, all participation in the field interviews was strictly voluntary, and payment was neither offered nor given as compensation for participation. Participants were free to leave at any time, and were not obliged to answer any question. No children under the age of 18 were interviewed. To the best of my knowledge no persons had any conflict of interest that would

³⁵ The survey was given to 12 individuals. Seven completed the survey, three persons did not complete the survey, and two indicated they didn't have enough information to complete the survey. For information on the risks of interpreting data from small survey sizes, see Kahneman, Daniel (2011), *Thinking, Fast and Slow*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, chapter 10 (pages 109-118).

have influenced their statements. The evaluator also affirms no conflict of interest with regard to this evaluation.

A survey has been given to representatives of the partner organizations (but to no one else) regarding their views on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of the project. While I know the responses given by each individual, precautions have been taken to ensure their responses remain anonymous. Findings from the survey are included in this report, but in such a way that the privacy and confidentiality of each individual have been maintained.

As far as I have been able to ascertain there were no indications of unethical conduct during the program implementation.

4. Summary of activities and outputs

4.1. Employment

4.1.1. ILO Mainstreaming and targeted activities

In terms of the mainstreaming strategy ILO's work has centered on a report that analyzes legislation in Vanuatu with regard to the right to work for persons with disabilities. The analysis and ILO's technical input was provided during a validation meeting in May 2015 in Port Vila with the Tripartite Labour Advisory Council. The meeting included representatives of government, employers and workers, as well as the DPOs. ILO wrote, "*the purpose of the validation discussion was to discuss the draft findings and seek further feedback from tripartite constituents and identify what, if any changes would be needed to the findings in this area. No further changes to the report were recommended.*"³⁶ In addition some ILO materials on the right to work for persons with disabilities were printed.³⁷

As part of a previous project ILO staff had drafted an Employment Relations Bill (final draft from June 2012). In light of the analysis of legislation done as part of PE, ILO has decided to revisit and review the bill.

In terms of other work done by ILO, in the PE 2014 Annual Report there is reference to a paper ILO presented during the PIFS Disability Focal Point Meeting in which "ILO proposed to the officials to consider self-employment as an alternative to wage employment for people with disabilities to support livelihoods and engaged in economic development."³⁸

With regards to the targeted strategy, ILO organized a Training of Trainers (ToT) on starting your own business (SYB). The training was for persons with disabilities, representatives from some service organizations, and some governmental officials from four countries (ten persons from Fiji, eleven persons from Vanuatu, two persons from Solomon Islands and one person from Tuvalu took part in the training). Two follow on Trainings of Entrepreneurs (ToE), facilitated by

³⁶ Boyd, Anne, email communication, 22 October 2015.

³⁷ The following are some examples: 1) Count us in – how to make sure that women with disabilities can participate effectively in mainstream women's entrepreneurship development activities; 2) the right to decent work of persons with disabilities; and 3) Achieving Equal Employment Opportunities for People with Disabilities through Legislation – Guidelines.

³⁸ Pacific Enable Project, 2014 Annual Report, page 9.

participants from the ToT, were held in Fiji to provide persons with disabilities some practical advice on starting their businesses. Those two trainings reached a total of 36 individuals. ILO is planning to use its own funds to hold one ToE in Vanuatu, tentatively scheduled for November 2015.

In Fiji a SYB sub-committee has been set up to support the participants who attended the ToE training. This evaluation found the description (*in the draft end of project report*) of the work of the sub-committee unclear. Requests for further information about how the sub-committee functions have been sent out to ILO, PDF, and Spinal Injuries Association. Unfortunately at the time of finalizing this evaluation it is still not possible to describe the work of the SYB sub-committee.

4.1.2. WHO and CBR work

World Health Organization (WHO) had previously sponsored travel for the disability desk officer at the Ministry of Justice and Community Services (MoJ) to attend a regional Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) Forum in Nadi, Fiji in 2012.³⁹ At that forum WHO committed to host three sub-regional workshops across the Pacific. In January 2014 WHO arranged for a delegation of three representatives from Fiji (the desk officer, one NGO service provider, and one DPO representative) to attend a sub-regional CBR workshop in the Solomon Islands. The workshop included representatives from DPOs, governmental focal points, and service providers from 4 countries (Fiji, Vanuatu, PNG and Solomon Islands). At that workshop the team presented their vision for CBR in Vanuatu. The MoJ funded a national workshop in May 2014 that looked at how to develop a national action plan for CBR. WHO provided technical support and facilitation for that workshop. Immediately following that workshop, an action plan was produced (in June 2015). That action plan outlined three overarching goals and seven key objectives. Goals comprised awareness raising, provision of full access to services, and implementation of WHO's CBR "components and elements" to provide services to persons with disabilities.

WHO provided funds to the MoJ for three provincial workshops, and reported that all three (in Sanma, Torba and Malampa).⁴⁰ However only the workshop in Malampa, which occurred in December 2014, could be confirmed by this evaluation. The report from that workshop recorded the following outcomes: 1) participants learned about disability; 2) CBR mapping enabled participants to learn what services exist for people with disabilities; 3) CBR action plans were developed to be implemented by the Area Council Secretaries; 4) Area Council Secretaries increased understanding of how the TVET Centre is inclusive of persons with disabilities; and 5) Area Council Secretaries agreed to establish registers to track locations and needs of persons with disabilities.⁴¹

³⁹ That Forum was jointly convened by PDF, PIFS, and WHO, and was possible due to considerable support from DFAT.

⁴⁰ Pacific Enable Project, 2014 Annual Report, page 9. Note, the draft end of project report refers to a "series of provincial training."

⁴¹ Ministry of Justice and Community Services (2014), *Malampa Province CBR Workshop Report*, pages 3-4.

4.2. Legislation

4.2.1. Legislative support – Republic of Marshall Islands, Nauru and Vanuatu

ESCAP has worked on disability for a long time. It led the process of the development of the BMF in 2002 and the subsequent Incheon strategy. Prior to the start of this project previous social development regional advisors at ESCAP had been involved in supporting the development of national policies geared toward addressing inequities for persons with disabilities and promoting disability-inclusive development.

Within the framework of Pacific Enable, ESCAP had the lead on legislative analysis and drafting legislation. While previous policy analyses had been undertaken, this represented the first time ESCAP was involved in reviewing domestic laws benchmarked against the CRPD and drafting new legislation to accord with the CRPD.⁴² Project funding enabled ESCAP to hire a CRPD expert consultant (a former CRPD Committee member) to work with the ESCAP-PIFS policy and drafting team on analysis of legislation and recommendations for legislative amendment in Nauru and Vanuatu. In the Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI), the work of two other consultants (analyst and legislative drafter) required closer direction and supervision, and the ESCAP-PIFS team was involved more directly in both the review work and drafting. It also had responsibility for preparing the final draft Bills that were tabled at two separate parliamentary sessions (February and September 2015) and finally enacted.

With respect to RMI, the request for assistance came to PIFS-ESCAP in December 2014 for technical assistance to develop CRPD compliant legislation. Initial discussions with government officials focused on CRPD ratification possibilities, including advice by ESCAP on strategic sequencing, and the inclusion of disability as a prohibited ground for discrimination in the Constitution.⁴³ Once RMI realized that harmonization did not need to precede ratification, the Government agreed to proceed with ratification (accession) first. It requested ESCAP assistance with the drafting of the accession (parliamentary) resolution and adopted the proposed plan “for CRPD compliant legislation, following which a consultant analyst was recruited to undertake a legislative review and draft drafting instructions.”⁴⁴ The Office of the Attorney General and other stakeholders were able to advocate successfully for accession. The accession resolution was passed in parliament without dissent in early January 2015 prior to the tabling of disability legislation later in the same session. Formal accession followed on 17 March 2015.

ESCAP’s consultants completed legislative reviews for RMI and Nauru in June 2015.⁴⁵ ESCAP staff, together with PIFS, visited Nauru to lead a series of consultations with different stakeholders to identify key challenges and priority issues for legislation and policy reform. This information was in turn used to support the work of the consultant responsible for the CRPD legislative compliance review. The Nauru review was submitted to the Government in July following further legal research, revisions and editing by ESCAP.

⁴² Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

⁴³ At that time ESCAP realized that the RMI government had a fundamental misconception about the requirements for ratification, namely that all their laws had to be harmonized with the CRPD prior to ratification. In reality, ratification can occur prior to or after harmonization of legislation. Different international organizations and governments prefer and promote different approaches to answer this question.

⁴⁴ Pacific Enable Project, 2014 Annual Report, page 10

⁴⁵ ESCAP (2015), Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities- Compliant Legislative Review; and ESCAP (2015), Nauru: A Legislative Review for Compliance with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

A first draft of the Vanuatu review was also completed in June 2015, and final work is now underway following consultations with the Government in October. Legislative reviews have been done with full support not only from ESCAP but also from the Legislative Drafting Officer at PIFS. In respect of RMI, valuable support was provided by OHCHR (in particular the Geneva desk).

The Human Rights Committee Act (HRC) and Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (RPD) were drafted and presented to the Parliament in RMI during their February 2015 session. While it was seen as not possible to include a provision that would create a National Human Rights Institution (NHRI) in line with the Paris principles, a monitoring mechanism has been included as a short-term measure (until a mechanism that complies with the Paris Principles is developed). A public consultations period followed the first reading during the February session of Parliament, and the second and third readings occurred in September 2015. The Parliament adopted the HRC and RPD bills on 29 September, the second to last day of Parliament before dissolution pending national elections in November 2015.⁴⁶

ESCAP and PIFS worked together to provide support throughout this process, “including inputs to the legislative plan and drafting instructions, reviewing the draft bills, supporting the consultation process, and working to ensure the successful development of compliant legislation.”⁴⁷ Proposed constitutional amendments drafted by ESCAP have been endorsed by the Attorney-General’s Office and Ministry of Internal Affairs, and await consideration by a parliamentary committee early in 2016.

With regard to Vanuatu, ESCAP completed an extensive review of legislation, assessing 232 laws of which 76 were identified as in need of amendment for CRPD compliance. ESCAP’s mission to discuss and agree on a proposed legislative development plan, undertake legal research, gather a full set of laws and identify gaps in laws (with respect to CRPD compliance) with all stakeholders in Vanuatu, is occurring at the time this evaluation is being drafted.

4.2.2. Other support – Marshall Islands

Toward the end of the project a request was made by ESCAP to the Steering Committee for the reallocation of some unspent funds (USD 10,000) to support awareness raising and some advocacy work in Marshall Islands through earmarking funds for translation of a number of documents including the text of the CRPD into Marshallese. This will enable Marshallese speaking stakeholders, including persons with disabilities, to have access to information in their native language and will assist with CRPD implementation. The following texts are being prepared: (1) a simplified abridged English language version of the CRPD; (2) translations into the vernacular of the CRPD in full, the abridged version of the CRPD, and the national disability policy; and (3) the production of an audio (vernacular) version of the CRPD. It is intended that the audio version will be broadcast by radio and be distributed as a CD.

⁴⁶ Emberson-Bain, Atu, email communication, 1 October 2015

⁴⁷ Pacific Enable Project, 2014 Annual Report, page 10.

4.2.3. Samoa

The Government of Samoa, PIFS and ESCAP co-hosted, organized and funded the 5th Pacific Legislative Drafters' Technical Forum Meeting held from 29 September – 2 October 2015 in Samoa. In total legislative drafters from twelve Pacific countries took part in the meeting. ESCAP and PIFS were able to reserve two full days of the four-day meeting for an extensive training on the legislative implementation of the CRPD. Approximately 45 lawyers, legislative drafters and civil society members (including PDF and the Samoa Disabled Persons Organisation) participated in the training. ESCAP had arranged for the main modules to be led by Carlos Rios, the former CRPD Committee member who had taken the lead in the legislative reviews for Nauru and Vanuatu and undertaken a peer review of the RPD Bill for Marshall Islands. ESCAP and PIFS supervised the preparation of training modules, resource materials and drafting exercises, and facilitated all sessions over the two days of training.

4.2.4. Upcoming plans

ESCAP and PIFS undertook a joint field visit to Vanuatu in mid-October 2015, and have received requests from Federated States of Micronesia and Palau for technical assistance with developing CRPD compliant legislation. Requests for drafting assistance are also expected to be confirmed for Nauru and Vanuatu in 2016, and Nauru has asked ESCAP to undertake legislative compliance reviews for CEDAW and CRC. Subject to funding, a final round of work is scheduled for RMI in early 2016 (during the grace period of the RPD and HRC Acts) in order to harmonize other legislation with the two new laws, and to draw up a legislative implementation plan.

4.3. Data and statistics

4.3.1 Regional advocacy

In 2013 UNICEF worked in collaboration with WHO and ESCAP to advocate for measures to improve data collection on children and adults with disabilities. They were able to present their findings and recommendations at the Regional Disability Stakeholders' Consultation Workshop organized by PIFS in Nadi, Fiji in June 2013, and were able to get a session to be focused on disability statistics during the 4th Regional Meeting of Heads of Planning and Heads of Statistics (HOPS) hosted by the Statistics for Development Division (SDD) of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in Noumea, July 2013.

Three recommendations and two action points from the session on disability statistics were included in the conference report. The three recommendations were for:

- 1) Governments “to revisit and assess their data collection methods for adult and childhood disability in light of international standards, and consider including standard disability questions into regular household survey activities;”⁴⁸
- 2) National Statistics Offices (NSOs) “to re-analyse existing census data on disability to obtain richer information, such as on ‘equalization of opportunities;’”⁴⁹ and,

⁴⁸ 4th Regional Conference of Heads of Planning and Statistics (HOPS) (2013), Conference Report, appendix 1, recommendations and action points, recommendation 46.

⁴⁹ HOPS Conference report (2013), at supra note 47, recommendation 48.

3) SPC to include disability as a theme within their National Minimum Development Indicators (NMDI) database.⁵⁰

In terms of actions, the following were delegated:

1) UNICEF and WHO were asked to continue to engage with NSOs, PIFS, SPC and others on “the topic of disability statistics, including on secondary analysis of census data to obtain information on social inclusion and ‘equalization of opportunities’”⁵¹

2) PIFS, PDF and WHO had planned, it was noted, “a regional workshop on disability statistics for country statisticians and economic planning officers in November 2013.”⁵²

In November 2013 PIFS, WHO and PDF did, in fact, convene the regional disability inclusive budgeting and statistics workshop for governmental focal points, representatives from statistics, planning and finance departments, PDF members, SPC, ESCAP, WHO, the Washington Group, and International Disability Alliance. Information and trends were shared, challenges and opportunities were discussed, concrete steps in the short and medium term were identified. The workshop report identified four key recommendations: 1) using a Pacific hub, such as SPC, to provide technical assistance to countries on disability data collection and analysis; 2) that disability needs to be mainstreamed in strategic planning and that the Pacific Statistics Steering Committee “would be a useful forum for further strengthening disability statistics;” 3) that disability should be included in budget line items to enable better tracking of disability spending; and 4) there is a need for collaboration at the country level.⁵³

UNICEF and WHO prepared a background paper on disability statistics for the Forum Disability Ministers Meeting in 2014. This included an overview on the status of disability statistics in the Pacific to show that substantial data had been gathered, and advised governments to synchronize their data collection approaches (using tools such as WHO’s International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health and the Washington Group’s short set and extended set) in order to allow for cross country comparisons. The paper recommended ensuring their approaches were consistent with international standards and practices, integrating standard disability questions into surveys and censuses, and including disability as a theme in the NMDI database.

4.3.2. In Vanuatu

UNICEF worked on several activities to promote better data collection on disability in Vanuatu.

Disability pilot survey

While not a part of the PE project, as background, the Ministry of Justice undertook a pilot study on disability in four communities with funding from DFAT. WHO contributed some PE funds

⁵⁰ HOPS Conference report (2013), at supra note 48, recommendation 48. NMDI is the National Minimum Development Indicator Database.

⁵¹ HOPS Conference report (2013), at supra note 48, action point 36.

⁵² HOPS Conference report (2013), at supra note 48, action point 37.

⁵³ PIFS (2013), Final Report, Regional Disability Inclusive Budgeting and Disability Statistics Workshop, November 2013, page 13

for Sally Baker, a disability inclusive development advisor from the Nossal Institute, to write a report on the findings from that pilot study. In addition, Sally provided technical support to Daniel Mont for his work on the Disability Monograph (mentioned below).

Workshop on disability with Washington Group

UNICEF was able to hire a member of the Washington Group (Daniel Mont) to undertake a comparative analysis of the advantages and limitations of the main instruments the Government of Vanuatu used to collect data on disability. Mont's research compared four instruments:

- The 2009 National Population and Housing Census (NPHC);
- The 2013 Vanuatu Demographic and Health Survey (VDHS),⁵⁴
- The 2014 Vanuatu Disability Pilot Survey (VDPS);
- Vanuatu's Education Management Information System (VEMIS) (on children in school).

Once the analysis had been completed and drafted UNICEF developed a communication plan and a dissemination plan, targeting the key stakeholders in government, humanitarian development actors and civil society.

UNICEF and the Vanuatu National Statistics Office organized a workshop on disability and statistics in Port Vila Vanuatu on 22 August 2014. Daniel Mont led two half-day discussions on identifying persons with disabilities and analyzing data. According to attendance sheets roughly 30 people attended the workshop, including representatives from donors, several government branches (Ministry of Education, Ministry of Justice, Vanuatu National Statistics Office), international aid agencies (Oxfam, Save the Children) as well as representatives from main civil society organizations (DPA, Rainbow Theater, VSDP, etc).

The Disability Monograph

The final report (known locally as the Disability Monograph), *Children, Women & Men with Disabilities in Vanuatu: What do the data say?*, is available online.⁵⁵ Key findings were made with respect to education, poverty, economic activity and domestic violence.⁵⁶ One stakeholder stated, "Given the quality of the analysis and recommendations, it was worth whatever it cost."⁵⁷ An official launch and dissemination has been further delayed, unfortunately, due to Cyclone Pam and the El Nino drought emergency.

4.3.3. In Samoa, Solomon Islands and Fiji

UNICEF supported Samoa with the inclusion of disability modules into their 2014 national Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), and began working with Solomon Islands and Fiji on

⁵⁴ Vanuatu's 2013 Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) for the first time included high-quality disability module (using the Washington Group questionnaire).

⁵⁵ UNICEF Pacific and Vanuatu National Statistics Office (2014), at supra note 14.

⁵⁶ For example, children with disabilities are significantly less likely to attend primary school (and even more unlikely to complete secondary school). Persons with disabilities are much more likely to be poor. Persons with disabilities are active in economic activity, but this activity is much more likely to be home-based. They are much less likely to have wage employment, suggesting that there are barriers that prevent them from economic opportunity on an equal basis with others. Finally, children with disabilities experience violent disciplinary measures more frequently than their non-disabled peers; while husbands of women with disabilities were less inclined to justify violence against their spouses in certain circumstances.

⁵⁷ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

disability modules for their DHS surveys scheduled for 2015. Support to the Government of Samoa “involved technical support for the questionnaire design and training for the enumerators.”⁵⁸ The Samoa DHS acknowledged the technical support from UNICEF Pacific for developing the Nutrition and Disability Module.⁵⁹ Further, they linked the decision to use the Washington Group short set of questions to the presentation given at the HOPS meeting in Noumea.⁶⁰ As a result, three sets of questions were included: for those between two and four years old, for those between five and seventeen years old, and for those eighteen and over.⁶¹ While the analysis of disability modules has not yet happened, it is anticipated.⁶²

In addition, technical advice was provided to the national statistical offices in Fiji and Solomon Islands with regard to inclusion of children’s issues in survey modules.⁶³

4.4. Early childhood identification

For context, it is important to note that primary school teachers in Vanuatu are not paid regular salaries for their work, rather they are given support from the communities where they are based. They receive little training and standards are low. Over a third of all teachers in Vanuatu have not completed secondary school, and teacher absenteeism is considered a major challenge.⁶⁴ With regard to preschool teachers, most do not have a secondary school education, and they have not received training in early child development.⁶⁵

The International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE) observed that many rural schools lack basic teaching equipment, facilities and materials, while the level of physical infrastructure is often poor.⁶⁶

Although preschool enrollment is low (an estimated 13% of preschool aged children are enrolled in Port Vila), classrooms are often overcrowded. Several sources, though reference that preschool education has been given increased attention by the Ministry of Education. ICDE reports that “*The Ministry funds the Vanuatu Early Childhood Association (VEJA), a NGO which has existed since the early 1980s. Working with the VEJA, the Ministry of Education is currently addressing a number of pressing issues. The Ministry has approved guidelines on preschool standards and funds a network of Preschool Coordinators, who train preschool teachers and work to raise community awareness.*”⁶⁷ ICDE assessed the main constraint to be the relatively meager amount of funds allocated for that work.⁶⁸

⁵⁸ Pacific Enable Project, 2014 Annual Report.

⁵⁹ Samoa Bureau of Statistics (June 2015), Samoa Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) 2014, p XVI.

⁶⁰ Samoa DHS (2015), at supra note 59, page 7.

⁶¹ Samoa DHS (2015), at supra note 59, pages 7-8.

⁶² Gelders, Bjorn, email communication, 12 October 2015.

⁶³ Gelders, Bjorn, email communication, 12 October 2015.

⁶⁴ International Council for Open and Distance Education (undated), Country Profile: Vanuatu, accessed from http://www.icde.org/projects/regulatory_frameworks_for_distance_education/country_profiles/vanuatu/education_system/ on 2 Nov 2015.

⁶⁵ UNESCO (undated), Education System Profiles: Vanuatu, accessed from <http://www.unescobkk.org/education/resources/resources/education-system-profiles/vanuatu/early-childhood/> on 2 Nov 2015.

⁶⁶ International Council for Open and Distance Education (undated), at supra note 64.

⁶⁷ International Council for Open and Distance Education (undated), at supra note 64.

⁶⁸ International Council for Open and Distance Education (undated), at supra note 64.

UNICEF and WHO had been recognized by the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC Committee) as being “instrumental” in helping countries to set up and implement programs for children with disabilities.⁶⁹ The CRC Committee further noted,

The process of knowledge exchange is also valuable in sharing updated medical knowledge and good practices, such as early identification and community-based approaches to early intervention and support to families, and addressing common challenges.⁷⁰

UNICEF was the lead organization for this particular outcome area. At the time the PE project started UNICEF was engaged in undertaking an Early Childhood Development (ECD) Scales Validation Activity, the aim of which was to “give governments the opportunity to track early childhood development, and have the potential to provide Vanuatu with not only a great deal of information on the state of the young children, but also to provide feedback on individual child development indicators to include in Vanuatu’s early detection tool.”⁷¹ In their next quarterly report UNICEF noted that the early identification tool “will take a more holistic approach to disability, focusing on cognitive disabilities, language, hearing and vision impairment and other social disabilities.”⁷² That report noted that partnership will be taken with Save the Children and a local DPO called Disability Promotion Advocacy and Awareness Association (DPA). The following quarterly report notes that the early identification tool had been drafted and was under review.⁷³ A workshop using the draft tool was conducted in Port Vila for 25 participants, including representatives from VSDP and DPA, teachers and local chiefs.⁷⁴

The tool, titled “What is Early Identification,” was developed by Teresa Gonzalez, a consultant for UNICEF, and finalized in March 2014. Teresa worked closely with the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) department of the Ministry of Education, and co-facilitated, with the director of ECCE, Jenny James, a series of trainings for teachers and parents. Initially the plan was to roll out the training in all six provinces. At the time Cyclone Pam hit (in March 2015), they had covered three provinces, and given the damage caused by the cyclone, the remainder of the trainings were postponed. In total 231 teachers and 42 parents received the training. Despite several requests, no further information (dates, objectives, locations, numbers of participants, action steps, etc.) about the trainings was obtained.

As a result of these trainings, UNICEF reports that six children were identified. Based on the conversations with staff in country and the draft end of project report, it is unclear what support, if any, those six children are receiving. There appears to have been no agreed upon or formal system of coordination in place to ensure that children or their families receive support of any kind (educational, health, nutritional, social or protective services). UNICEF reports, though,

⁶⁹ UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), *General comment No. 9 (2006): The rights of children with disabilities*, 27 February 2007, CRC/C/GC/9, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/461b93f72.html> [accessed 16 November 2015], para 22.

⁷⁰ CRC (2006), at supra note 69, para 22.

⁷¹ Pacific Enable (2013), Quarter 1 report.

⁷² Pacific Enable (2013), Quarter 2 report.

⁷³ Pacific Enable (2013), Quarter 3 report.

⁷⁴ Pacific Enable (2013), Quarter 4 report.

they have been in discussions post-cyclone with local DPO, VSDP, about an arrangement to provide support to children who have been identified.

In terms of next steps, UNICEF has reported that recent communication with representatives from Tonga indicate that they have formally requested support towards a national survey, and UNICEF has provided funding for this through its core funds.⁷⁵

4.5. UN and partner agencies are coordinated and supported

The final outcome area was aimed to support coordination between the different agencies, monitor work of the different agencies and to contribute to broader development discourse. To achieve this a UN Volunteer was placed in the office of Pacific Disability Forum. Each partner organization had representation in Suva, and this enabled quarterly meetings to be held which served a dual function of information sharing and encouraging collaboration between partners.

4.5.1. Ongoing monitoring

The proposal indicates that a monitoring framework would be developed, but instead the logframe in the proposal was used (see box 1 on the next page for an example of how the logframe was not adequate). The UNICEF M&E staff in Vanuatu, Patrick Shing (in Vanuatu until November 2013) and Rebecca Olul (in Vanuatu from August 2014 to current) were not tasked with monitoring implementation of the project in country. UNICEF M& E staff member Asenaca Vakacegu (in Fiji) also indicated a lack of familiarity with the PE project.

The UNV located at the PDF office had the responsibility for organizing quarterly meetings and filing quarterly updates. Quarterly reports were submitted throughout 2013, but in 2014 only the second and third quarter reports have been made available. It has been understood that the 2013 annual report should be considered as the midterm report, but it is unclear if the 2013 annual report served the same function described in the proposal, namely to provide the opportunity for “a more substantial mid-term review will be conducted at the end of 2013, with involvement of all relevant stakeholders to the proposal.”⁷⁶ It has also been understood that the second annual report served the same function as the 2014 fourth quarter report. However, this still leaves unaccounted for two quarterly reports in 2014 and the two quarterly reports in 2015 (during the period of the no-cost extension).

The lack of a monitoring framework has led to some errors in reporting. For example, the PE Annual Report (2014) mentions CBR workshops held in three locations. However, only the workshop in Malampa could be confirmed.

⁷⁵ Rich-Orloff, Wendy, email communication, 29 September 2015; and UNICEF comments on first draft.

⁷⁶ Pacific Enable proposal, page 11.

Box 1: Some issues with project design

The indicators, baseline and means of verification from the proposal are inadequate for a monitoring framework. Moreover, some of the indicators are uncountable, are not linked sufficiently to the means of verification, or are not sufficiently connected to the work that was actually done. To be clear, **this example** serves to illustrate the disconnect between the monitoring framework and the work actually done. This is an indicator, baseline and means of verification from outcome one:

Indicator	Baseline	Means of Verification
No. of people with disabilities engaged in decent waged and self employment, as a result of skills development.	89% of people with disabilities unemployed in Fiji	Employers with 50 or more workers in Fiji work progressively to employ people with disabilities at a rate of at least 2% of its total number of workers.

The indicator, baseline and means of verification are unrelated to the activities ILO undertook (the indicator aggregates waged and self-employment, though ILO's work focused on self-employment only). ILO offered one ToT and two ToEs. They did not work with any organizations that had 50 or more workers. Instead they specifically targeted persons who were self-employed or unemployed but interested in starting a small business. Even if they had been able to target larger businesses, it would have been impossible to calculate their contribution to any change in the baseline. ILO lacked the monitoring framework to track the indicator. Even if ILO could calculate how many people with disabilities had gained waged or self-employment as a result of training, it would be impossible to calculate a change from the baseline since the overall percentage of persons with disabilities employed in Fiji is subjected to numerous external factors far beyond ILO's control.

5. Findings based on evaluation categories and survey

For this evaluation a document review was completed, surveys were administered and key informant interviews were held. The following sections evaluate the relevance, timeliness, effectiveness, impact, efficiency, sustainability of the project components, and assess the extent to which the cross-cutting issue of gender was addressed in the different outcome areas.

Overall, this evaluation finds mixed results. Some outcome areas, notably in legislation (outcome area two) and statistics (outcome area three) achieved very impressive results. The facilitation of ratification of CRPD in RMI, the review of legislation to ensure CRPD compliance, and the drafting of new bills (that have been adopted into law) is extremely positive. Likewise, the advocacy work of WHO and UNICEF, and the technical support and capacity building provided by UNICEF (and by extension the Washington Group) to key government stakeholders in Vanuatu is likewise a major contribution, and has already served to provide a model to other Pacific island nations on how to strengthen data collection.

WHO's technical support to the Ministry of Justice for the development of an CBR action plan is also a key positive development. The Disability Desk Officer has recently successfully advocated for additional staff to be responsible for managing the CBR program, and they have made additional commitments to make progress with regards to the realization of the objectives in their CBR national action plan. WHO is committed to continue to support this work.

With regard to ILO's work, the analysis of the employment legislation is solid, and has provided the impetus to push for their review of their previously drafted Employment Relations Bill (that draft was from June 2012 and thus pre-dates Pacific Enable). This work is ongoing, and ILO Pacific is currently seeking technical input from ILO Geneva and ESCAP on how to ensure CRPD compliance for the Employment Relations Bill. A mission to Vanuatu is planned to engage stakeholders later this year, with the goal of introducing a revised bill to Parliament early in 2016. On the other hand, with regard to ILO's targeted work, this evaluation has found some shortcomings. First, the training materials for the ToT were not sufficiently adapted for an audience of persons with disabilities (and an audience of trainers who would be training persons with disabilities). Second, while the trainings were sufficient for some participants to gain the confidence to train others or start their own businesses, other training participants have taken few to no steps toward starting their own businesses. Had ILO had stronger systems in place to monitor participants post-training, they could have provided the support to ensure more of an impact from the trainings.

Finally, with regard to UNICEF's work on early identification, this evaluation finds there were several important oversights. Most significantly, the overall approach of the early identification outcome area did not take the CRPD into account, and it is unclear whether the outputs (number of people trained, number of children identified) will lead to any lasting outcomes.

5.1 Relevance and Timeliness

The evaluation of relevance and timeliness focuses on the extent to which the project is responsive to the needs within the region and the project's fit with the work of other organizations. The PE project was both relevant and timely (see above section 2.1.1. on the context). The outcome areas, considered in sum, present a coherent approach and are responsive to regional efforts, including the BMF, Incheon Strategy and the PRSD and current discussions on the Pacific Disability Rights Framework.⁷⁷

Initially ratification rates in Pacific were relatively low, with only Vanuatu and Cook Islands ratifying before 2011. Between 2012 to 2015, however, six countries in the Pacific ratified.⁷⁸

The flurry of ratifications has led to an increased number of requests for technical assistance in legislative reviews, drafting new legislation, and policy reforms to accord with the CRPD. For this reason ESCAP's work on legislative review and drafting new legislation is both timely and very relevant. Not only has RMI ratified the CRPD, they also have legislation (as of 29 September) that has been harmonized with the CRPD. Given advocacy by the international community for states to ratify, it is logical and advisable for the international community to step up technical support to facilitate legislative and policy reforms.

The lack of data has been recognized as a gap that needs to be addressed, not only in the Pacific but also in other regions of the world. The SDGs, for example, place emphasis on the importance of collecting quality data that can be disaggregated by disability, gender and age.

UNICEF and WHO's efforts to raise awareness, and UNICEF's work in collaboration with the Washington Group and the Vanuatu National Statistics Office is the type of model partnership that was envisioned to happen through the PRPD mechanism. As one project partner ironically remarked, "we've been handicapped by the lack of data."⁷⁹ The activities implemented have shown how the international community can address this by supporting national ownership and building capacity of national institutions to gather, analyze and use disability statistics.

WHO has a CBR regional strategy, and the Pacific Enable project allowed WHO to expand their network into Vanuatu. Another benefit of their involvement in Pacific Enable is the strengthened link with UNICEF with regard to the advocacy on the importance of disability statistics.⁸⁰

UNICEF is the Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Council for Early Childhood Care and Education (PRC4ECCE). They are well-positioned to take a lead in early identification, so their involvement in Pacific Enable is relevant and presents an opportunity to promote a rights-based approach to disability.

⁷⁷ The Pacific Disability Rights Framework is happening concurrently, but is independent of Pacific Enable activities.

⁷⁸ According to the UN Enable website: Vanuatu ratified the CRPD on October 23, 2008; Cook Islands ratified the CRPD and OP on May 8, 2009. Nauru ratified the CRPD on June 27, 2012; Palau ratified the CRPD and OP on June 11, 2013; PNG ratified the CRPD on September 26, 2013; Kiribati ratified the CRPD on September 27, 2013; Tuvalu ratified the CRPD on 18 December 2013; and RMI ratified the CRPD on 17 March 2015.

⁷⁹ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

⁸⁰ The regional meeting of the CBR network happened at the same time as this evaluation, so it is not possible to include outcomes from that meeting in this report.

5.2 Effectiveness and Impact

This section looks at the effectiveness and impact of each organization's work.

Outcome area 1 - Employment (ILO)

Mainstreaming strategy

Although the activities in the mainstreaming strategy are limited, the analysis produced on the extent to which legislation promotes or protects the rights of persons with disabilities in employment, is of high quality, and ILO provided opportunity for national stakeholders to comment on the analysis during a validation meeting, as mentioned above. The technical lead for that work has noted that the Tripartite Labour Advisory Council has been involved in the development of the Employment Relations Bill (with technical assistance from ILO), and the importance of explicitly prohibiting discrimination against persons with disabilities in employment.⁸¹

With regard to ILO's proposal to consider self-employment as an alternative to waged employment, this evaluation finds that advocacy counter-productive as it absolves the government and business sector of the responsibility to recognize and address barriers to employment (and thus cannot be understood as supporting "mainstreaming"). Moreover, this is damaging because ILO has thus far only run Training of Entrepreneurs (ToE) workshops in one country (Fiji), while telling governmental focal points across the region that alternatives to waged employment are preferred. Of course, ILO has not provided ToE workshops in those other countries to support persons with disabilities to become self-employed.

ILO has presented the following rebuttal to this critique: *"Promoting self-employment is better than not being employed. ILO is working with Governments in the Pacific to revise Labour Laws to have inclusive policies for persons with disabilities to have decent work. Due to limited opportunities in formal employment PwD's needs to have alternative ways to earn a living and self-employment is encouraged."*⁸²

The rebuttal, however, misses the point. This evaluation is not against the promotion of self-employment. It is, however, against presenting self-employment as an alternative to waged employment. There are enough barriers to waged employment.⁸³ ILO's core documents on the right to work for persons with disabilities are quite clear on the need to address barriers, and the

⁸¹ ILO (2015), Analysis of Legislation Promoting and Protecting the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Employment in Vanuatu, page 1

⁸² ILO Comment on first draft of PE Evaluation. ILO has further responded, *"The ILO is not promoting self-employment as a superior to waged employment. Engagement in formal employment and self-employment are both legitimate pathways for people to improve their economic livelihoods. In the Pacific a significant amount of work has been undertaken to provide technical assistance to support countries remove discriminatory barriers in legislation that lead to the exclusion of some groups (particularly women and people with disabilities) from participation in formal employment. However, it is still the case that other pathways such as self-employment should also be available to people – particularly in countries where the formal sector is limited."* This evaluation, though, finds that explanation unconvincing. Had ILO proposed that governments undertake policies and programs to support self-employment pathways for persons with disabilities (through tax breaks, financial supports or other measures), then this evaluation would look at this issue differently. But ILO has provided no evidence that was done. Instead, preference for self-employment had the effect of enabling governments to take no further action.

⁸³ The Disability Monograph (2014), at supra note 14, for example, provides evidence that persons with disabilities face the largest barriers in attaining wage employment (and thus find themselves restricted to self-employment only).

need to promote the right to work in the public and private sectors. The core documents never recommend self-employment as an alternative to waged employment.⁸⁴

While ILO reports they are doing work with governments to revise labor laws and to have inclusive policies, those efforts are outside the scope of the PE project, and thus have neither been reviewed nor evaluated. No further comment can be made about that work. This evaluation can only comment on ILO's decision to propose self-employment as an alternative to waged employment, and can only conclude that proposal is not aligned with the CRPD, nor is that consistent with ILO's other work.

The CRPD Committee has recognized the obligation of States Parties to create “an enabling and conducive environment for employment, including in the private sector.”⁸⁵

The Committee further observes that article 4, paragraph 1 (a), of the Convention imposes on the State party the general obligation to adopt all appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the rights recognized in the Convention related to work and employment. It also observes that article 3 establishes that in its legislation, policies and practice the State party should be guided by respect for inherent dignity, individual autonomy including the freedom to make one's own choices, and independence of persons; non-discrimination; full and effective participation and inclusion in society; and equality of opportunity.⁸⁶

While acknowledging that Fiji has signed, but not ratified the CRPD, it is important for UN organizations to advocate with the Government of Fiji to open employment opportunities in the public and private sector.

Targeted strategy

The targeted strategy consisted of one Training of Trainers (ToT) workshop for participants from four countries (the vast majority of whom were from Fiji and Vanuatu), and two ToEs for participants from Suva and Tukavesi in Fiji.

A review of the SYB training materials for the ToT training has shown that they were not in any way adapted for the audience of persons with disabilities. There is no mention of disability in the materials or any issues or challenges that persons with disabilities might face with regard to employment.

⁸⁴ See O'Reilly, Arthur (2007), *The right to decent work of persons with disabilities*, Geneva, International Labour Organization, p. 67 for a set of measures that are recommended to promote greater activation of the labor market for persons with disabilities. Measures include: decreasing welfare dependency, mainstreaming employment and training services, incentives to participate in educational training and work initiatives, more involvement of employers, improving support services, more effective implementation of anti-discrimination legislation, and greater enforcement of quota schemes. See also, International Labour Organization (2002), *Managing disability in the workplace. ILO Code of practice*, Geneva, pages 10-15 for lists of duties of employers and competent authorities with regard to ensuring persons with disabilities have access to employment. In neither document is it considered acceptable to promote self-employment as an alternative to waged employment. See also ILO, *Achieving Equal Employment Opportunities for Persons with disabilities through legislation - Guidelines* (2014), pages 97-99 for suggestions on prohibition of discrimination, quotas and employment support measures.

⁸⁵ Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Communication 2/2010, CRPD/C/D/2/2010, 7 July 2014, page 17.

⁸⁶ Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Communication 2/2010, CRPD/C/D/2/2010, 7 July 2014, page 17.

Two focus group discussions were had with participants of the ToT and ToE workshops in Fiji, and key informant interviews were held with participants from Vanuatu of the ToT workshop held in Fiji.

Several participants of the ToT (from Fiji as well as from Vanuatu) had significantly different impressions about the quality and impact of the training. One attendee from Fiji mentioned that participants had to adjust the training to “fit the disability perspective.”⁸⁷ This included considerations of accessibility and location. One person in Vanuatu reported that the participants who represented their organization at that training have not lived up to the obligations to involve others. On the other hand, another participant from Vanuatu indicated complete satisfaction with the training, and said they personally had undertaken a lot of follow on work, and are identifying and supporting several entrepreneurs who are persons with disabilities.⁸⁸ This underscores an important point – in the absence of coordination and monitoring on the ground, it is up to each individual to determine how they apply what they’ve learned after the training.

With regard to the 36 individuals who attended the two ToEs in Fiji, ILO has relied on a SYB sub-committee to provide technical support and monitoring. Participants from the training in Suva mentioned the creation of a strategic plan and the creation of the SYB sub-committee, but the last communication from the SYB sub-committee was in July 2015.⁸⁹ It has not been possible to evaluate, fully, the work of the SYB sub-committee for reasons explained above.

Outcome area 1 - CBR (WHO)

In Vanuatu the National CBR Action Plan 2014-2024 was developed with support of WHO. WHO has indicated that they will continue to support the disability desk officer at the Ministry of Justice and Community Services (MoJ). The Disability Desk Officer at the MoJ stated from his perspective the work on CBR and legislation were the most important outcomes of the PRPD. His office has been able to sign a memorandum of understanding with two companies from Australia for the delivery of materials for the construction of a national rehabilitation center, which is one of the key objectives in the CBR National Action Plan.⁹⁰

The one concern about WHO’s work is that its monitoring needs to be strengthened (it’s unclear how three workshops could be reported when only one has been documented).

WHO held a regional CBR meeting during the time of this evaluation, so it isn’t possible to provide as up to date information as desired, but WHO has stressed that the support through Pacific Enable has allowed WHO to extent their CBR network to Vanuatu, and as a result of the cost savings they have been able to allocate funds to deepen their involvement in other countries. They’ve also indicated that PRPD has facilitated the expansion of their CBR work, and work on data.⁹¹

⁸⁷ Notes from Focus Group Discussion in Suva.

⁸⁸ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

⁸⁹ Notes from Focus Group Discussion in Suva.

⁹⁰ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

⁹¹ Response to Pacific Enable Survey.

Outcome area 2 – Legislation (ESCAP and PIFS)

The work of ESCAP and PIFS was extremely effective. In terms of impact, they helped to facilitate RMI's ratification of the CRPD, completed legislative reviews in RMI and Nauru, and a draft review for Vanuatu, developed draft bills for RMI (which were adopted into law in September 2015), are currently undertaking a field mission to Vanuatu, and have plans to visit other countries before the end of this year. Draft constitutional amendments are in development aimed at including disability as a prohibited ground of discrimination and removing discriminatory provisions (such as restrictions on participation in political and public life, and involuntary committal and treatment).

With respect to process, ESCAP and PIFS have strengthened their working relationship, and that has led to joint efforts to promote CRPD implementation, most recently at a training of legislative drafters from 12 Pacific states in Samoa in late September – early October 2015. During that training two whole days were dedicated to looking specifically at regional commitments to disability, the CRPD, and drafting exercises to ensure the officers deepened their ability to review their legislation from the disability lens, and identify sections in need of review and revision. Collaboration has also been enhanced with ILO, the Asia Pacific Forum for National Human Rights Institutes, and OHCHR, most directly in RMI with critical early support, advice and peer reviews of consultant analysis and early drafting (Geneva Office) and later peer reviews of the RPD and HRC Bills (Pacific Office). Staff at OHCHR Geneva proclaimed that an earlier draft of the RPD bill could be (*if certain issues were addressed*) considered “a top model law.”⁹²

Finally, ESCAP's work as part of Pacific Enable has had an indirect effect on their work in other areas, including informing reporting for the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process, inputs to regional disability strategy and the informal working group on disability convened by PIFS.

In an email to ESCAP former CRPD Committee member Carlos Rios wrote, “*I have reviewed the Marshall Islands act on disability and I think it is a very solid piece of work that effectively enshrines the rights of persons with disabilities that are recognized in the CRPD.*”⁹³

With regard to their work in Nauru, a letter from the Republic of Nauru Government summarizes the added value of ESCAP's work. Though a lengthy excerpt, it is important to note the extent of the impact the work of ESCAP (and in particular the work of Dr. Atu Emberson –Bain) had with respect to advancing rights of persons with disabilities (and the spillover effect on advancing other international treaties). The Secretary of the Department of Justice and Border Control wrote a letter in September 2015 expressing their gratitude:

“2. We now have a completed legislative review which will be used to further enhance our work on promoting and protecting the rights of persons with disabilities in particular the development of a specific legislation for persons with disabilities. The legislative review will also be used as a guiding document in the strengthening of

⁹² OHCHR, email communication, 26 February 2015. A lot more work was done to ensure greater compliance after the email was sent but the final version has not yet been reviewed or assessed by Geneva office.

⁹³ Rios, Carlos, email communication, 16 July 2015.

government policies in ensuring that persons with disabilities are considered in every aspect of government planning and processes.

3. In addition, the legislative compliance review facilitated by staff from your office, PIFS and the Department of Justice and Border Control have also allowed for more partnerships between various government departments and NGOs with regards the promotion and protection of the rights of persons with disabilities.

4. Additionally, as a result of the success of this joint partnership we envisage on going collaboration between your organisation and the Department of Justice and Border Control with regards a similar exercise but for the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women. A letter of request will be sent to your office by the end of September 2015.”⁹⁴

One positive aspect worth highlighting is that ESCAP has been sensitive to the need to address discrimination against persons with psychosocial disabilities and intellectual disabilities, and this has been reflected in their legislative reviews, advocacy, and proposed amendments to existing laws. The new RMI legislation contains provisions to safeguard the rights, ensuring equality before the law, liberty and security of the person, and the right to live independently and in the community. ESCAP has further noted, “the constitutional amendments memo drafted for government by ESCAP (and now under consideration) seeks to amend Articles that permit involuntary committal and disqualification of rights to vote or stand for political office for persons ‘certified as insane’.”⁹⁵ The RMI legislation also is comprehensive in its inclusion of provisions and supports for women with disabilities.

Outcome 3 – data collection and analysis (UNICEF)

Activities were divided between regional advocacy work and support specifically to the Vanuatu National Statistics Office and in Samoa with the Demographic and Health Survey.

Regional work

UNICEF staff explained how they were able to leverage the funds earmarked for statistics. First, along with WHO and ESCAP they conducted “advocacy and ‘behind-the-scenes’ negotiations to achieve high-level, political commitment to enhance data and evidence on disability in the Pacific region.”⁹⁶ Three recommendations from their presentation at the HOPS 2013 meeting were endorsed by member countries.⁹⁷

Finally, the background paper prepared by UNICEF and WHO raised awareness about the importance of disability and statistics at the Forum Disability Ministers’ Meeting. A communiqué from PIFs noted, “the national statistics offices have a crucial role and may require

⁹⁴ Aingimea, Kionel, Secretary Department of Justice and Border Control, letter to Head of ESCAP Subregional Office for Pacific, ESCAP, 11 September 2015.

⁹⁵ ESCAP Comment on first draft of evaluation.

⁹⁶ Gelders, Bjorn, email communication, 4 November 2014.

⁹⁷ HOPS Conference report (2013), at supra note 47.

additional financial and technical resources, capacity and commitment.”⁹⁸ The Ministers therefore proposed, “a national pilot be considered on improving data collection systems including ICT tools and better sharing of data between agencies.”⁹⁹

Work in Vanuatu and Samoa

The analysis provided in the Disability Monograph is invaluable, not only for the Vanuatu National Statistics Office, but also for other governments interested in strengthening their capacity to gather and analyze data on disability. Daniel Mont argued persuasively that governments should use the Washington Group short set of questions when undertaking censuses and surveys, while the extended set of questions should be used for in-depth surveys or the scaling up of pilot surveys on disability.¹⁰⁰

One statistician at VNSO reported that the workshop and further technical assistance from the Washington Group and UNICEF opened their understanding of the challenges and importance of gathering data on disability.¹⁰¹ The Head of Office, Simil Johnson, noted the increased capacity to undertake statistical work on disability, not only at VNSO, but also at the Ministries of Health and Education. He expressed interest in looking more in depth at barriers caused by traditional customs (“kastom”) and other barriers persons with disabilities experience. However, they now lack the financial resources to undertake additional studies.

The approach used by UNICEF in collaboration with the Washington Group, namely the process of undertaking comparative analysis and providing technical support to national offices, and already has been seen as a model as evidenced by requests from Samoa and Tonga for similar support. While support was given to the Government of Samoa for the inclusion of disability modules in their 2014 DHS, the report, published in June 2015, does not contain any analysis of the disability statistics that had been gathered. This underscores the need for greater technical support for the analytical work (and this differentiates the impact of the work in Vanuatu from the support provided to Samoa).

Outcome area 4 - Early identification (UNICEF)

UNICEF has supported the office of Early Childhood Care and Education (Ministry of Education) by funding the development of a tool on early identification. The main output for this area was the tool and trainings that were based on the tool.

Guidance on best practices

As background it is important to note that the CRC Committee has commented on early childhood identification and support. In their General Comment 7 the CRC Committee noted:

It is a priority to ensure that they have equal opportunities to participate fully in education and community life, including by the removal of barriers that impede the realization of their

⁹⁸ PIFS (2014), Forum Disability Ministers’ Meeting, Communiqué 14(13), Pohnpei, FSM and Cairns, Australia, page 5.

⁹⁹ PIFS (2014), at supra note 98, page 5.

¹⁰⁰ UNICEF and VNSO (2014), at supra note 14, pages 43-44.

¹⁰¹ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

rights. Young disabled children are entitled to appropriate specialist assistance, including support for their parents (or other caregivers).¹⁰²

In General Comment 9 the CRC Committee described the need for collaboration amongst more diverse stakeholders:

Early identification requires high awareness among health professionals, parents, teachers as well as other professionals working with children. They should be able to identify the earliest signs of disability and make the appropriate referrals for diagnosis and management. Therefore, the Committee recommends that States parties establish systems of early identification and early intervention as part of their health services, together with birth registration and procedures for following the progress of children identified with disabilities at an early age. Services should be both community- and home-based, and easy to access. Furthermore, links should be established between early intervention services, pre-schools and schools to facilitate the smooth transition of the child.

Following identification, the systems in place must be capable of early intervention including treatment and rehabilitation providing all necessary devices that enable children with disabilities to achieve their full functional capacity in terms of mobility, hearing aids, visual aids, and prosthetics among others. It should also be emphasized that these provisions should be offered free of cost, whenever possible, and the process of acquiring such services should be efficient and simple avoiding long waits and bureaucracies.¹⁰³

There are general resources on the CRPD that use simplified language, and even pictorial representations of the CRPD that could have been incorporated. Such resources include UNICEF's explanation of the CRPD (*It's About Ability*), UN Enable's official easy-to-read version of the CRPD, Harvard Project on Disability's *We Have Human Rights*, and Equality and Human Rights Commission's easy read version of the CRPD.¹⁰⁴

There are practical resources based on the rights-based approach to early child identification, and those resources stress the importance of ensuring a holistic approach to early identification, one that is grounded in CRPD. The social model of disability emphasizes that disability is caused when a person with a particular health condition faces discrimination due to legal, environmental or attitudinal barriers (including lack of supports, inaccessible buildings, stigma, fear, embarrassment, et cetera). A UNICEF publication from 2009 contains a set of guidelines on establishing early childhood intervention services, including a set of guiding principles and information about what range of services are commonly offered.¹⁰⁵ UNICEF's Pacific

¹⁰² UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), *General comment No. 7 (2005): Implementing Child Rights in Early Childhood*, 20 September 2006, CRC/C/GC/7/Rev.1, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/460bc5a62.html> [accessed 16 November 2015] para 36 (d), page 17.

¹⁰³ UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) (2006), at supra note 68, para 56-57.

¹⁰⁴ Resources accessed from http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_43893.html;
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/345108/easy-read-un-convention.pdf;
<http://www.hpod.org/pdf/we-have-human-rights.pdf>;
http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/documents/publications/uncrpd_guide_easyread.pdf on 10 October 2015. See appendix 7 for full citations of each of these resources.

¹⁰⁵ Vargos-Barón, Emily, Ulf Janson with Natalia Mufel (2009), *Early Childhood Intervention, Special Education and Inclusion: Focus on Belarus*, (UNICEF, regional office for CEE/CIS). See p 69-78 for section on guidelines. Pages 72-73 offer a common set of interventions that can be undertaken.

Guidelines, even, recommend a broad approach that allows for integration and partnerships. UNICEF’s Pacific Guidelines, for example, refer to five components that “interact and comprise a quality ECCE framework.” Those components are: 1) policy /legislation and governance; 2) human resources; 3) curriculum, child assessment and environment; 4) performance monitoring and assessment; and 5) family and community partnerships.

In 2012 WHO and UNICEF published a discussion paper on early childhood development and disability. That paper cites CRC and CRPD frequently, and describes the importance of a broad approach to early childhood identification (ECI):

ECI comprises a range of services and supports to ensure and enhance children’s personal development and resilience, strengthen family competencies, and promote the social inclusion of families and children. Examples include specialized services such as: medical; rehabilitation (e.g. therapy and assistive devices); family-focused support (e.g. training and counselling); social and psychological; special education, along with service planning and coordination; and assistance and support to access mainstream services such as preschool and child-care (e.g. referral). Services can be delivered through a variety of settings including health-care clinics, hospitals, early intervention centres, rehabilitation centres, community centres, homes and schools.¹⁰⁶

Promoting development in young children with disabilities requires a twin-track approach. This approach recognizes that children with disabilities and their families have ordinary needs and must have access to mainstream programmes and services such as health care, child care and education, and also may need access to targeted services such as ECI. Building on existing health and education service structures for all children is essential, avoiding as much as possible the organization of separate and/or parallel services.¹⁰⁷

A recent study by Brown and Guralnick provides an overview of the CRC and the CRPD, as the foundation for applying a human rights-approach to early identification and intervention work for young children.¹⁰⁸ They present ten overarching principles based on their reading of those two conventions. Their principles indicate the following: a framework should inform all components, that integration and coordination at all levels are essential, the inclusion and participation of children and families in community programs are essential, the establishment of early detection and identification procedures, effective surveillance and monitoring, individualization of program components, a process for evaluation and feedback is in place, cultural sensitivity, the formulation of evidence-based recommendations to families, and a systems perspective.¹⁰⁹

Recently the International Centre for Evidence in Disability (ICED) has published a guide that

¹⁰⁶ World Health Organization and UNICEF (2012), *Early Childhood Development and Disability: a Discussion Paper*, page 12.

¹⁰⁷ World Health Organization and UNICEF (2012), at *supra* note 106, page 21.

¹⁰⁸ Brown, Sharan E., and Michael J. Guralnick (2012), *International Human Rights to Early Intervention for Infants and Young Children with Disabilities: Tools for Global Advocacy*, *Infants and Young Children*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 270–285

¹⁰⁹ Brown, Sharan E., and Michael J. Guralnick (2012), at *supra* note 108, pages 280-283.

proposes a community-based method for identifying and supporting children with disabilities.¹¹⁰ The approach trains community volunteers to identify children with disabilities and to help them to advocate for access to services. UNICEF and WHO may want to consider such methods in Phase II.

UNICEF's Approach

The approach that UNICEF took, in contrast to the above principles and UNICEF's own guidance, is fairly narrow in scope. The main critique, then, isn't about the tool. It is relatively easy to correct the outdated and medical language, and to add some fundamental concepts from the CRC and CRPD. The issue is that UNICEF's staff for this outcome area didn't follow UNICEF's own guidance or the guidance of the CRC Committee when thinking about the broader approach. While work was done on the early identification tool and training, it was not coordinated with work in other areas such as policy, legislation, monitoring, and human resources (*nor with other stakeholders such as health care officials or other PE partners such as WHO, even though WHO co-authored the 2012 discussion paper on early childhood development with UNICEF*). According to persons interviewed for this evaluation, teachers felt uneasy being tasked with identifying impairments, which underscores the need for a more coordinated approach (in other words, unless they are given more substantial guidance and ongoing support, then primary school teachers probably should not be tasked with diagnosing impairments in the classroom). Why didn't UNICEF work with WHO? Why didn't UNICEF work with VEJA or with officials from the Ministry of Health?

Tool development: What is Early Identification?

With regard to the core tool (*What is Early Identification*), this evaluation recognizes the tool has value, and that the training has allowed some teachers and parents to begin to have conversations about disability, perhaps for the first time. Persons involved in this work in Vanuatu spoke of the deep-seated shame and unease about disability, so if the toolkit and the trainings enabled people to have first conversations about their children with disabilities and thinking about their support needs, that is an important step and thus is acknowledged as positive. That said, there are several concerns about the tool.

First, some of the messages included in the book are no longer appropriate given the context of the CRPD, including the use of medical ("dyscalculia" and "dysgraphia") and repeated use of outdated language ("normal" and "special needs"), and the emphasis on "delay" rather than acceptance of certain impairments that may not be medically correctible.¹¹¹ While focusing on children with intellectual disabilities, the Australasian College of Physicians points out, the labeling of children as "delayed" can lead to frustrations or anger when some children simply do not move beyond being delayed.¹¹² The College of Physicians stresses the importance of "a person-centred approach and family centered practice," and thus they recommend not imposing requirements to have medical diagnosis.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ International Centre for Evidence in Disability (ICED) (2015), *Using the Key Informant Method to identify children with disabilities: A working guide*, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

¹¹¹ Of course, children with other impairments, such as visual impairments, may be able to have eye examinations and corrective lenses prescribed.

¹¹² The Royal Australasian College of Physicians: Paediatric & Child Health Division (2013), Position Statement: Early Intervention for Children with Developmental Disabilities, page 6.

¹¹³ The Royal Australasian College of Physicians: Paediatric & Child Health Division (2013), at supra note 112, page 3.

Second, the UNICEF tool missed the opportunity to use some of the key concepts that are contained within the CRPD, including the important notion of the diversity of disability and the importance of identifying the supports that are needed rather than dwelling on the “problems” and symptoms. For example, there is no mention of “reasonable accommodation” in the tool, a concept that is extremely important for supporting children with disabilities and their families. Other important concepts include adherence to principle of universal design in new construction, the need to train teachers on how to support inclusion and active participation of children with disabilities, that measures to ensure inclusion should be free of charge for the student with disability (and their parents), opportunities for peer support should be available, and finally, that support should be appropriate to the child and the conditions of their parents.

Trainings

With regard to the trainings – several email requests for basic information that were sent to UNICEF/Vanuatu and ECCE have gone unanswered. UNICEF Suva has indicated they don’t have that level of information. If Suva doesn’t have that information, it begs the question: how could UNICEF Suva provide adequate and appropriate technical support to and monitoring of the team on the ground? How could they ensure the program was on (or off) track? Given the insufficient information providing, it is impossible to evaluate this aspect.

Outcome area 5 – Coordination (UNV)

The main outputs in the proposal are: 1) study on ratification; 2) regular steering committee meetings; 3) steering committee provides guidance to UNCT on establishment of UN Working Group on disability, and the development of a work plan of joint activities; and 4) UNV leads a series of “brown bag” sessions for UN agencies.

While participants praised the coordination process in terms of the quarterly meetings, in other respects the functioning of the coordination mechanism had mixed results. The monitoring framework was never developed, and it is unclear whether, as indicated in the proposal, that a midterm review with all stakeholders was held. One of the key outputs, research on factors that have facilitated ratification, is still being finalized, and thus has not been included in this evaluation. With regard to the output of “brown bag” sessions, the 2014 annual report and draft end of project report refer to the first “brown bag” held in early 2015.

5.3. Efficiency

Efficiency looks at the value for money for the different outcome areas, bearing in mind not only the funds provided through UNPRPD, but also each organization’s contribution of their own resources. Since each organization has its own methods for calculating its own contribution amounts, it is not possible to compare efficiency by using the contribution amounts cited by each organization. Data on expenditures per outcome area are as follows:

Table 3: Expenditures¹¹⁴

Outcome area	Agency	PRPD funds spent
1	ILO	64,200
	WHO	40,000
2	ESCAP	60,000
3	UNICEF	58,420
	PDF	
4	UNICEF	31,650
5	UNV	22,937
Totals		277,207

In the absence of being able to compare expenditures with contributions, this evaluation can only share anecdotal information about contributions from and leveraging by PE partners.¹¹⁵

- UNICEF has provided 103,000 USD to the Samoan Bureau of Statistics for the development and inclusion of survey modules on nutrition and disability. This includes sponsoring the field visit to Samoa of a technical expert from the Washington Group on Disability Statistics¹¹⁶
- ILO will contribute 10,000 USD of its own funds for a SYB ToE workshop in Vanuatu to occur in November 2015.
- WHO contributed 23,000 USD for activities in support of outcome area 3 (pilot disability study plus regional advocacy). In addition, WHO contributed 21,000 USD for activities in support of outcome area 1 (CBR regional evaluation, technical assistance and participation in different CBR workshops).¹¹⁷
- According to the end of project report ESCAP's contribution of funds amounted to 25,661 USD.¹¹⁸ That estimate does not include staff time.

In the time allotted for the evaluation it was not possible to gather sufficient, let alone comprehensive information about the ability of PRPD partners to leverage funds from others. It is understood that there are ongoing negotiations with DFAT about funding a regional disability project.

5.4. Sustainability

Sustainability can mean different things depending on the context and activity in question. In some cases it can mean that a certain change has occurred in how an organization approaches a particular issue, while in other cases it can refer to the extent to which the results from a

¹¹⁴ Expenses not included in the table are: salary of the UNV (28,625) and administration (24,500) and the costs for the final evaluation.

¹¹⁵ The information on the contributions are based on statements made by representatives of the different partner organizations, but have not been independently verified.

¹¹⁶ Gelders, Bjorn, email communication, 12 October 2015.

¹¹⁷ Kleintz, Pauline, email communication 13 October 2015.

¹¹⁸ UNICEF (2015), Pacific Enable – Phase 1 - End of Project Report, page 25

particular outcome area are likely to continue in the future. Per outcome area, this evaluation finds the following:

Outcome area 1

ILO's decision to undertake another review of the Employment Relations Bill, specifically looking at compliance with the CRPD, is a step forward, and it is encouraging that ILO Pacific has reached out to ESCAP and ILO technical support in Geneva. ILO has outlined a process for consultations in country and if that is followed a revised bill could be introduced to Parliament in the beginning of next year. With regard to the targeted strategy, however, ILO's work does not appear to be sustainable. ILO's funds were not sufficient to provide monitoring, so they worked through PDF to ensure follow-up support for the trainings provided.¹¹⁹

WHO has indicated that they want to continue to work in Vanuatu to support the implementation of the CBR National Action Plan. In addition, they will continue to work with PDF and PIFS at the regional level. They are currently working with PDF, PIFS and the Pacific CBR Network on finalizing a 6 year Pacific CBR Action Plan.¹²⁰

While at a certain baseline level it is good for the Government of Vanuatu to have a National Action Plan, and to have supported a new dedicated staff member in CBR (who previously was trained in CBR in Fiji for 1 year), the Government is yet to set aside core funding for the implementation of the activities in the plan. Thus the Disability Desk at the Ministry of Justice is reliant on donors. While some donors may be interested in supporting specific components of the National Action Plan, it is unlikely that donors will support all of the components, meaning that implementation may be uneven. It may also be difficult for donors to coordinate amongst themselves and to monitor the work of the Ministry of Justice.

Outcome area 2

Pacific Enable has achieved impressive results in this outcome area. There is a direct link between the ESCAP and PIFS consultations with RMI and RMI's decision to ratify the CRPD. Further, ESCAP and PIFS drafted CRPD compliant bills that the RMI Parliament has adopted.

Their work in other countries has shown very positive intermediate outputs, with the completion of analysis of legislation in Nauru, and the holding of modules on disability for legislative drafters at the recent Pacific Legislative Drafters Forum Meeting in Samoa. A clear sign pointing to sustainability is the level of interest expressed by different governments in the Pacific region for the support that ESCAP can provide.

Outcome area 3

It is impressive that UNICEF and WHO were able to bring attention to the need to strengthen data collection on disability in particular, and that their recommendations were taken on board.

UNICEF's work on promoting the use of disability statistics regionally, and the support provided specifically to the Vanuatu National Statistics Office has led to concrete and positive results. As

¹¹⁹ ILO comments on first draft of PE External Evaluation.

¹²⁰ WHO comments on first draft of PE External Evaluation.

evidenced by the requests from Samoa, Solomon Islands, and more recently Tonga, more countries are interested in including disability modules in their demographic and health surveys. In addition, the Vanuatu National Statistics Office has increased their interest in disability data and capacity to gather it. It is anticipated that the recommendations from the Disability Monograph will be incorporated into the next census (scheduled for 2019), but they will need additional funding from donors to carry out any additional disability pilot surveys.

PIFs has played and can continue to play an important role in promoting efforts to gather and analyze data on disability, and the ideal long term solution would be to have the SPC division on statistics act as the technical support to countries in the region (perhaps with Washington Group providing additional support as needed).

Knowledge on the importance of disability data has been shared, and the Governments of Vanuatu and Samoa have been able to apply that knowledge. The regional advocacy, which has led to the endorsement of recommendations from UNICEF and WHO, and the successful outcomes of specific technical support in country suggest that the time is ripe for further advancement in this outcome area.

The technical lead for UNICEF is no longer with the agency, so it is unclear if UNICEF staff have the interest or capacity to continue to do the work. Over the longer term, of course, the solution must be to hand off responsibility for this work to NSOs and the SPC. The challenge is how to ensure the progress gained and the momentum is not lost.

Outcome area 4

The main outputs from outcome area four are 1) the publication and dissemination of the Early Identification tool; and 2) the trainings for teachers and parents. While UNICEF has summary data on the number of persons who received training, the outcome (what has changed as a result of the training and production of the tool), remains unclear. This evaluation finds some concerns regarding the quality of the tool, as mentioned above.

5.5. Gender as a cross-cutting issue

The evaluation terms of reference indicated gender as a cross-cutting issue. Certain outcome areas (legislation and statistics) have considered gender and have addressed it through the deliverables (legislation, disability modules, and the VNSO Disability Monograph). In other outcome areas, gender differences were not given as much consideration. In outcome area one, the primary way ILO addressed gender in its targeted strategy was to aim to have gender balance amongst participants. The training material, however, did not adequately cover the ways in which women with disabilities face discrimination in employment opportunities, nor did it cover strategies for ensuring women with disabilities receive the support and protection they need. The CBR action plan for Vanuatu has one objective stating that men and women and boys and girls should benefit equally from CBR efforts. This includes recommended actions of proactively reaching out to women with disabilities to ensure they benefit equally from programs and the

identification of opportunities for women with disabilities to take part in decision-making.¹²¹ Outcome area four did not adequately address differences in how boys and girls are viewed differently in the Vanuatu culture, and what support girls (and especially girls with disabilities) may need from their parents, and their communities to ensure they have the support they need to access education on an equal basis with others.

6. Conclusions

This section presents brief concluding remarks on each of the outcome areas.

Outcome 1

While ILO's analysis of legislation in Vanuatu is of value, and the work on reviewing the Employment Relations Bill is ongoing, this evaluation has found two areas of concern with respect to the ILO approach.¹²²

First, advocacy for self-employment as an alternative for waged employment is more detrimental than beneficial. Had ILO accompanied its proposal to governments for "self-employment" with specific recommendations to government to facilitate self-employment of persons with disabilities (through tax breaks, financial support, or other governmental measures), then this evaluation would be less critical of the preference for self-employment. Instead, the ILO proposal reads as a request to governments to support ILO's targeted work for entrepreneurs with disabilities.¹²³

Stating a preference for self-employment (without obliging government to take specific measures to support self-employment) absolves the government and the private sector of taking responsibility for addressing the disparities in employment that exist. It places the burden for social change on persons with disabilities, who by virtue of the discrimination they have faced, most often live in conditions of poverty and have few to no resources they can utilize to advance their economic, social and educational rights and interests. A better approach would have been to follow ILO's guidance on promoting employment opportunities for persons with disabilities through a combination of different measures and supports.

Second, with regard to the targeted strategy, this evaluation finds one-off trainings (that were not, in fact, tailored for persons with disabilities) have limited lasting value, especially when monitoring and technical support is delegated to other organizations.

With regard to WHO's work, this evaluation notes the development of the national action for CBR is a positive step for the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). Nonetheless, closer monitoring of the MoJ is warranted, and additional technical support to the MoJ is needed. One way to achieve

¹²¹ Ministry of Justice and Community Service (2014), *The National Community-Based Rehabilitation Plan of Action 2014-2024*, (Port Vila, MoJ), objective 7.

¹²² The evaluator notes that ILO has argued that this evaluation has not correctly interpreted the views of ILO with regard to the their proposal for self-employment to be an alternative to waged employment.

¹²³ International Labour Organization (15-17 July 2014), "AGENDA ITEM X: Session Two: Global/International Issue on disability", Regional Disability Officials Meeting, Nadi, Fiji.

both is to set stronger reporting requirements, including broader stakeholder engagement (with Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, other UN agencies, and with DPOs).

Outcome areas 2 and 3

Both outcome areas achieved significant positive results in a relatively short period of time. For outcome area two this included (but is not limited to) technical support that facilitated ratification of the CRPD in RMI, the review of legislation in RMI, Nuaru and Vanuatu, and the drafting of new legislation that accords with the CRPD in RMI. ESCAP and PIFS strengthened their working relationship during the process, and they have agreed to work together on several different tasks, as described in the main body of this report. For outcome area three, UNICEF and WHO were able to bring disability onto the agenda of several important regional meetings, and were able to get endorsements for their recommendations. At a national level, UNICEF and the Washington Group's work with the Vanuatu National Statistics Office (VNSO) led to the impressive analysis of the different mechanisms that had been used to gather data on disability. The technical support provided to VNSO has helped build the capacity of the office to employ a rights-based approach to disability statistics collection. Finally, that support has led to other collaborative efforts to improve disability statistics (in Samoa, for example) through the introduction of disability modules in regular surveys.

Outcome 4

This evaluation finds that outcome area 4 was weakened primarily due to the overall design/approach, and to a lesser extent by the narrow scope of the tool that was developed (in other words, the scope of the tool was narrow due to the overall approach). Precisely because funding amounts were small, this evaluation finds the results would have been stronger if UNICEF and ECCE had worked more closely with others, including health officials, WHO, and national and local stakeholders to set up a structure for early detection and identification, with clear roles for all, an emphasis on information sharing and coordination, supporting capacity to deliver services locally, and community capacity to hold authorities to account.

Outcome 5

This evaluation finds mixed results with regard to outcome five. On the positive side, the coordination meetings and information sharing at the regional level have worked well. The study on factors that facilitated ratification of the CRPD was not finalized in time for this evaluation, and thus is not considered. This also means, of course, that project partners have not been able to use the study as intended, namely to educate governments, and to develop advocacy strategies to encourage ratification. At the national level, given the prominence of Vanuatu in all outcome areas: as participants in the ILO workshop, ILO's analysis of legislation, and WHO's work in CBR for outcome area one, analysis of legislation for outcome area two, work on statistics for outcome area three, and early child identification for outcome area four, it would have been important to create a mechanism to facilitate more information sharing, technical support, and the identification of opportunities for collaboration.

7. Recommendations

This section makes use of many ideas and quotes from persons interviewed during the process. This is noted as a way of showing that a shared set of guidance emerged from the persons most closely associated with the project. As a preface for this section, one key informant provided guidance on the importance of linking PE to national initiatives and being modest in scale (but not scope):

“Choose a few places – not every island – commit to it and do it well. And integrate what you do with an issue that is important to the (relevant) Ministry. If you present it as a stand alone issue, it will never get woven into their priorities. Look at what they are gung-ho about. Before our trainings there had been no work in this area (which is why it didn’t take off).”¹²⁴

Several recommendations based on the findings from this evaluation are offered:

First, it is of utmost importance that staff involved in implementing the project are aware of and able to incorporate key guidance from the CRPD. Real gains were made (in outcome areas two and three) where staff had a background and expertise in the CRPD. This may have also influenced their willingness and motivation to reach out to other stakeholders in the region. In both outcome areas new partnerships were forged and existing partnerships were strengthened. Implementing partners need to ensure that any trainings are up to the standard of the CRPD.

Second, involve persons with disabilities as implementers. None of the persons interviewed for this evaluation, with the exception of the CEO of PDF, self-identify as persons with disabilities.¹²⁵ The 2010-2015 PIFS-PDF Strategy and the Pacific Disability Rights Framework: 2016-2025 refer to the necessity of actively involving persons with disabilities¹²⁶, as does the CRPD (through, inter alia, article 4[3]).

Third, the gains made in some areas strongly suggest that there is receptivity to the CRPD amongst national governments and other national and local stakeholders (civil society, DPOs). One survey respondent explained the achievements of Pacific Enable in the following terms:

“Effective collaboration between partners that have funding for the same purpose...PE has really been the leverage of change for ensuring that this happens. PIFS /PDF as well as OHCHR, ESCAP etc. would like to support work on rights of persons with disabilities having the funding to complement our work strengthens the partnership and creates an environment to enable this activity.”¹²⁷

¹²⁴ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

¹²⁵ While ESCAP engaged a consultant who is a person with a disability to undertake the CRPD review and facilitate the training in Samoa, none of the key staff from the partner organizations are persons with disabilities.

¹²⁶ Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (2009), Pacific Regional Strategy on Disability 2010-2015, Forum Disability Ministers’ Meeting, Cook Islands, pages5-6. See also, Pacific Disability Rights Framework 2016-2025, page 7.

¹²⁷ Response to Pacific Enable Survey.

To ensure traction is gained, it is important for partners to share information, coordinate activities and monitor those activities at country level. While partners working in Vanuatu reported up to their supervisors in Suva, there was not as much communication across the implementing partners in Vanuatu.

Fourth, the old cliché “think global, act local” is applicable for the Pacific region. There are three implications: *first*, persons implementing the project need to be aware of good practices globally and regionally in the outcome area they are implementing. *Second*, as key informants in Vanuatu noted, rather than fly a few people from Vanuatu to Fiji for a training, a larger impact would be felt if trainers came to where the communities are (and not just to Port Vila). Otherwise, impact depends too much on whether the individual trained in Fiji does anything upon their return. Vanuatu based attendees of the ILO training, for example, met once after the training in Fiji, but not thereafter. If ILO does not have the resources to monitor and support, then they should ensure the participants’ organizations can hold them accountable and clearly defined action steps should be defined before attendees take part in a training. *Third*, acting local enables better monitoring and ongoing support. This evaluation found that technical support and monitoring were problematic with regard to WHO’s intervention in outcome area one, ILO’s targeted work also in outcome area one, and UNICEF’s early childhood identification work in outcome area four. Going forward, PE partners will need to ensure stronger monitoring of activities in the field, and have mechanisms to verify what is reported to them.

Fifth, as the opening quote in this section suggests, there is a need to be more selective about where organizations work, and a need to accept that fact that work can’t be done everywhere. The UNICEF approach to the trainings in early identification, for example, consisted of a series of one-off trainings in three provinces (with more one-off trainings in three other provinces postponed due to Cyclone Pam). The logic of this component was flawed. The aim of the trainings was to test the tool, but how much additional information can you get from different communities who have not been involved in the process of creating the tool, and don’t know what you are doing with the tool after the one-day training?

Given the difficulty of the subject matter and the biases that exist, it is hard to test in a one-day training the appropriateness of a tool aimed at affecting change in attitudes and addressing environmental barriers that prevent children with disabilities from education on an equal basis with others. A better approach would have been to select one or two communities and to co-create the tool, giving the members of the community time to own and contribute to the tool, and give the agency the ability to track any changes over time. A more focused approach, with more prolonged engagement in a few select communities offers the promise of more knowledge creation and sustained change for persons with disabilities.

Sixth, it is important to ensure that the UN agencies responsible for leading particular outcome areas use their work to inform/influence other work by the agency. In other words, Pacific Enable should not be the only project run out of a particular UN office that promotes the rights of persons with disabilities.

Seventh, ILO core documents recognize that efforts to increase employment opportunities for persons with disabilities should focus on those realms where they are even more significantly

under-represented (public sector, private sector). Some countries and cities have adopted commitments to be model employers of persons with disabilities. These could be studied, and applicable lessons could be drawn.

In addition, several recommendations are made specifically to guide the development of phase II concept note and project design.

First, there is a need for strengthening monitoring and provision of technical support for phase two. This is especially pronounced at the country level, where staff working on other projects do not appear to have information about Pacific Enable and what it is trying to achieve. Staff of other projects have other contacts and connections that can serve the interest of Pacific Enable, and thus it is important to have more integration at the field level. Some key informant interviewees have advocated for more participatory project design, and greater involvement of ministries (i.e. not just the disability desk of the Ministry of Justice and Community Services).

Second, in those countries that have been involved significantly in phase one (Vanuatu, Fiji, RMI), it is recommended that focus shifts from the realm of policy and legislation to implementation of pilot projects on the ground. Pilot projects would serve a dual function of raising awareness and capacity in government administration, as well as testing the viability and appropriateness of the pilot models. One survey respondent, for example, noted that there was a flaw in the early identification work since no system was in place to provide support to children once their disabilities have been identified (for this reason the early identification work needs to be more coordinated and holistic). There are different options, including a referral system, peer support, introducing and training teaching assistants, a database of persons who can be contacted to assist in schools or communities, et cetera. One person interviewed suggested linking early identification work to VSDP, and providing support to VSDP to ensure those who are identified receive the support services they need.¹²⁸

Third, in other countries, where there has hitherto been minimal or no interventions, a focus first on legislation and policy reform may be warranted given the recent spate of ratifications and given the strength of the working relationship between PIFS and ESCAP and the positive outcomes they've already achieved.

Fourth, the PDF-PIFS relationship provides a real opportunity for gains on the ground. This unique relationship should be utilized to support all outcome areas. One survey respondent advised increasing focus on the Council of Regional Organizations of the Pacific as a way to help mainstreaming disability "in areas where disability is still invisible."¹²⁹

Fifth, work on statistics is extremely important, and a strategy for forging closer working relationships with the SPC Statistics Division and the Pacific Statistics Steering Committee (as indicated in one of the recommendations from the November 2013 workshop) is important for longer-term sustainability. One respondent to the survey wrote, "*Data still important. Assistance to integrate Washington Group questions remains important as does helping countries generate*

¹²⁸ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

¹²⁹ Response to Pacific Enable Survey.

*data in other ways, for example in identification of persons for social protection programmes or national registries.”*¹³⁰

Sixth, as mentioned in several survey responses, the information sharing and coordination function may be better served by having a more senior person be responsible. One respondent wrote, *“The coordinator, who should be a highly ranked or respected person, should travel to countries where project is happening and have high level meeting and also inform high level (officials) about the projects happening in which country. Once they see the benefits, and statistics for it, they will take ownership of it.”*¹³¹ A more senior person may be better positioned to ensure proper monitoring. During phase one there were missed opportunities for collaboration between CBR, employment, early childhood identification, and statistics.

Seventh, it is important to keep realistic expectations about the possibilities. This is the only PRPD project that is regional in scope, and travel costs are high. Given the amount of funds, and relatively low capacity of governments, the project design needs to be especially strategic. One respondent wrote, *“Pacific governments often have limited capacity. To develop the ownership takes slow work building capacity, lots of in-country technical assistance and capacity building based on their context. It really requires assistance at country level for weeks or months at a time to convert the workshops and reports into real change. A UN country office presence really helps.”*¹³²

Eighth, be cognizant of the limited and often immeasurable impact of one-off trainings. As one person who was interviewed for this evaluation stated, *“That’s the problem with one-off trainings. Instead, you should create regular reporting processes, and link that to someone who is accountable. You have to create a more concerted monitoring framework, either directly or through the organizations the participants represent.”*¹³³

Finally, in Vanuatu it would be important to develop a service mapping and analysis tool, and to encourage greater collaboration between WHO and UNICEF on the development of tools and provision of support services for persons with disabilities (in early intervention, for example).

¹³⁰ Response to Pacific Enable Survey.

¹³¹ Response to Pacific Enable Survey.

¹³² Response to Pacific Enable Survey.

¹³³ Notes from Pacific Enable KII.

Appendix 1: Persons Interviewed

Interviews prior to field visit (people in locations other than Fiji and Vanuatu)

Date	Person and Position	Agency
14 September	Natalia Mattioli, Technical Coordination Specialist,	UNDP
14 September	Sally Baker, Disability Inclusive Development Advisor	Nossal Institute
16 September	Satoshi Sasaki, Decent Work Specialist	ILO
20 September	Bjorn Gelders, Social Policy Officer	UNICEF (ex-staff member)

Field Interviews (Fiji and Vanuatu)

Date	Person and Position	Agency
22 September	Laisa Qalo, Research Officer	PDF
23 September	Sinta Satriana, Social Policy Consultant	UNICEF
23 September	Pauline Kleinitz, Technical Lead, Disability and Rehabilitation	WHO
23 September	Ada Moadsiri, NCD, and focal point for disability in Suva	WHO
23 September	Raj Bimlesh, Program Officer	ILO
24 September	Focus group discussion: participants from ToT	FDPF, SIA,
24 September	Focus group discussion: participants from Training of Entrepreneurs	FDPF, SIA
24 September	Setareki Macanawa, Chief Executive Officer	PDF
24 September	Anthea Moore, Planning Specialist	UNICEF
25 September	Laisiasa Merumeru (Lai), Disability Coordination Officer	PIFS
25 September	Atu Emberson-Bain, Regional Adviser, Social Development and Planning	ESCAP
25 September	Flight to Vanuatu	
28 September	Andy Calo, Statistician	Vanuatu Stats office
28 September	Wendy Rich Orloff, ECD specialist	UNICEF
29 September	Jenny James, National Pre-school Coordinator, Early Childhood Care and Education unit	Ministry of Education
29 September	Sherol George (VESP), Jim Allenson (Inclusive Education), and Liku Jenny (Senior Mapping	Vanuatu Education Support Program (VESP),

	Officer)	and Ministry of Education
30 September	Rebecca Olul, M&E Officer	UNICEF
30 September	Miranda Guizzo, Riaz Deen, Claire Ibell	Australian volunteers at VSDP
30 September	Megan Williams, civil society network	Oxfam
1 October	Nelly Willy, Vanuatu country representative	Pacific Leadership Program
1 October	Simil Johnson, Statistician	Vanuatu National Statistics Office
1 October	Anne Boyd, Labor Standards Specialist	ILO
1 October	Elison Bovu, Director	VSDP
2 October	Larissa Burke, Australian volunteer	TVET
2 October	Flight to Luganville	
4 October	Rebecca Olul, M&E Officer	UNICEF
5 October	Christina Lulu-Karae, Consultant early child care education	UNICEF
5 October	Raj Bimlesh, Program Officer	ILO
6 October	Doriane Nailupis, coordinator	Sanma Frangipani Association and Desk Officer at Sanma Province Govt
6 October	Nelly Caleb, National Coordinator	Disability Promotion and Advocacy Association in Vanuatu
6 October	Simeon Banga,	Malampa CRPD workshop attendee
6 October	Simeon Bage, TVET BDS Coordinator, and Moulin Tabouti, TVET Center Manager, Sanma	Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET), Luganville
7 October	Sam Kaiapam, Disability Desk Officer	Ministry of Justice
7 October	Return flight to USA	
8 October	David Smith, Deputy Director	ESCAP
8 October	Pauline Kleinitz, Technical Lead	WHO
9 October	Teresa Gonzalez, Consultant early identification tool	UNICEF
11 October	Filipo Masaurua, Senior Solicitor,	Ministry of Justice and Border Control, Nauru Government

Appendix 2: Round 1 UNPRPD Projects

Country	UNPRPD organizations	Project title	Approved budget (USD)
Costa Rica	Resident Coordinator's office ILO, UNDP, UN	National Plan for Labor Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities	350,000
Indonesia	ILO, WHO, UN Resident Coordinator's office	Promoting the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia	327,473
Moldova	OHCHR, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO	Paradigm Shift: UNCT Moldova Strategic Action Supporting CRPD Implementation	349,890
Mozambique	UNICEF, UNDP	United Nations Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Mozambique	340,046
Occupied Palestinian Territories	Resident Coordinator's office, ILO, UNDP, UNICEF, WHO	Strengthening Respect for the Human Rights of Persons with Disabilities through Legislation, Services and Empowerment	349,890
Pacific Island Countries	UN Resident Coordinator's Office, ILO, UNICEF, WHO	Pacific Enable	350,000
South Africa	OHCHR, UNDP, UNICEF	Accelerating the implementation of the UNCRPD in South Africa	349,890
Togo	UNDP, ILO, UNICEF, WHO	Promoting the rights of children with disabilities	350,000
Tunisia	UN Resident Coordinator's Office, OHCHR, ILO, UNICEF, WHO	"The new Tunisia won't be built without us"	350,000
Ukraine	UNDP, ILO UNICEF, WHO	Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine	333,600

Note: Pacific Enable is the only project that is regional in focus.

Appendix 3: Terms of Reference

On behalf of and in cooperation with its partners in Pacific Enable, UNICEF is undertaking an evaluation of Phase 1 of the Pacific Enable project. The purpose is to assess the project against the project proposal and to inform future programming. The methodology of the evaluation should combine: a desk review of reports, surveys, legislation and other materials; with targeted key informant interviews (conducted in person or by teleconference/skype). The project is to be evaluated against the specified impact indicators and means of verification set out in the project proposal (see attachment A). In addition, the efficiency, timeliness and sustainability of each outcome area should be assessed.

1. Purpose and Objective

The purpose of the evaluation is to examine the impacts of the Pacific Enable Project. The timing of the review is at the completion of Phase 1 of Pacific enable (June 2015).

The principle objective of the review is accountability, to provide feedback on the impact of implementation of Phase 1 of Pacific Enable in meeting the targets set out in the proposal documentation (see annex A). The evaluator should consider the efficiency, timeliness and sustainability of each outcome area. The primary audience is the donor and the secondary audience is the participating agencies. As a potential Phase 2 of Pacific Enable Project is currently being considered, the evaluation may also inform future programming.

2. Background

Acknowledging the widespread discrimination, exclusion and marginalization faced by persons with disabilities, the United Nations General Assembly adopted in 2006 the Convention on the Rights of persons with disabilities (CRPD), which is a legally binding framework that recognizes the duty of state parties to take all appropriate measures to protect, promote and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities.

The UN partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD) is a unique collaborative effort that brings together UN Organisations, Governments, Disabled People's Organisations (DPOs) and other partners to promote the rights of persons with disabilities. The UNPRPD Fund, a joint UN fund on disability rights is a multi- partner Trust Fund which has been established to generate and manage resources in support of the UNPRPD. As such, the UNPRPD will build on the existing UN infrastructure on disability and advance it through a process with four distinctive features.

- A 'One UN' approach to disability;
- Focus on partnership building;
- A focus on joint learning and knowledge creation
- A catalytic approach aimed at leveraging existing UN funds as well as domestic resources.

The UNPRPD supported "Pacific Enable" project in the Pacific Islands started in 2012 and ended in June 2015. The Pacific Enable project sought to provide a range of activities with the overall goal of improving the lives and opportunities of persons with disabilities in selected Pacific Island Countries (PICs). The activities were targeted to meet existing gaps and to act as catalysers for further work that will be undertaken by governments and/or development partners.

Assistance with legislative drafting and policy development was to be provided to countries that had ratified, or were about to ratify, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). This was to be the catalyst for those countries to undertake further work related to the CRPD.

Employment opportunities and building sustainable livelihoods are critical for persons with disabilities. Pacific Enable sought to work at the policy level, advocacy with employers, as well as service provision through targeted skills development and a community based rehabilitation approach. The activities sought to provide leverage for persons with disabilities to move beyond lives of poverty and dependence.

The lack of reliable data on disability prevalence in the Pacific was to be addressed through work on statistics, in particular through census and national surveys processes. This drew on global and regional expertise and strengthen ongoing work by the Pacific Statistics Steering Committee. In addition, research was to be conducted to explore the barriers to ratification to the CRPD. This research was to support the development of a regional advocacy strategy to increase ratification to the Convention.

Early identification and detection of disabilities is fundamental to improving the lives of children with disability. Pilot work in early detection systems was to provide a strong basis for this to be replicated throughout the Pacific.

The project had five main outcomes listed below with agencies responsible for achievement of the outcome

- People with disabilities in Fiji and Vanuatu have greater opportunity to secure decent waged and self-employment to achieve a livelihood (ILO/WHO).
- Legislative and policy frameworks are compliant with CRPD and support reduced discrimination against PWD and improved service provision for PWD (ESCAP/UNICEF).
- Improved data, analysis, research and advocacy on disability (UNICEF/WHO/ESCAP/PDF).
- Children with developmental delay are detected during the first five years of life and supported with appropriate education services in pilot areas in Vanuatu (UNICEF).
- UN and partner agencies' activities addressing the rights of PWD are coordinated, supported, monitored and are represented in broader development discourses (UNV).

3. Scope

The review will focus on the impact and outcomes of the implementation phase of Pacific Enable Phase 1. Where relevant, the conceptualisation, design and targeting of the project may also be considered as well as lessons learnt for future programming. While various components of Pacific Enable were implemented in several countries, Vanuatu was the only country where all components were implemented, therefore fieldwork will be focused on Vanuatu.

4. Management of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be led by UNICEF in collaboration with its partners in Pacific Enable being WHO, ILO, UNESCAP, UNV and the PDF who will constitute a reference group for the evaluation. All deliverables set out under Section 8 – Work Schedule are to be submitted to UNICEF who will be responsible for prompt dissemination to the reference group and coordinating timely feedback to the consultant.

5. Evaluation Questions

Relevance:

- To what extent is the project aligned to the existing UN infrastructure on disability?
- To what extent is the project aligned to relevant national needs and goals?
- Are project activities linked to the global and regional activities and needs?

Effectiveness

- What is the level of progress towards achieving the projects outcomes?
- Are there any critical emerging issues that is not within the scope of the project?
- What are the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives/goals?
- Are there any unexpected outcome of the project either positive or negative that had not been planned for?

Efficiency

- To what extent has the availability and use of resources (human, financial, time) enabled or constrained the implementation of the project during 2014-2015?
- Were there any other resources made available to contribute to the achievement of the project goals including leveraging of additional resources from UNPRDP members and from governments?
- To what extent do coordination and management mechanisms of the agencies and the project itself support implementation and contribute to reducing transaction costs?
- Have there been additional benefits as a result of increased 'mainstreaming' of disability?

Impact:

- In what ways and to what extent has the project contributed to changes in the situation of disabled people in the region?

Sustainability:

- To what extent has capacity (human and financial resources) been built into line ministries to effectively work on disability issues?
- To what extent has the project promoted national ownership?
- In what ways and to what extent has the implementation of the project strengthened the PDF?

Cross-cutting concerns

- To what extent has the project integrated gender and disparity reduction approaches?

6. Methodology

The evaluation process will take a contribution analysis approach using mixed methods including the following:

- A desk review of documents related to the project such as international frameworks, progress and annual reports, the disability monograph, relevant national legislation and policies, survey data and analysis and other relevant documents.
- Key informant interview will include relevant partners/groups/communities in the three countries. Consideration should be given to gathering views from people with different types of disabilities representing different constituencies. It is recommended that face to face meetings are done in Vanuatu as it is the only country where all elements of the project were implemented. For other interviews, telephone or skype is recommended.

7. Ethical Considerations

The UNICEF Procedure For Ethical Standards In Research, Evaluation, Data Collection And Analysis which conform to the UN Ethical Guidelines will apply, the contractor should ensure compliance with all relevant provisions. Where appropriate, informants should be assured confidentiality.

8. Work Assignment

The overall responsibility for commissioning the evaluation will be led by UNICEF in consultation with an evaluation reference group from agencies involved in Pacific Enable. The Consultant will review all existing documentation related to the project and plan evaluation methodology tools and to ensure that sufficient information is gathered to make an informed assessment in line with the evaluation objectives. The consultant will also set up and conduct interviews, provide qualitative and quantitative data analysis findings, recommendations and lessons learned to the required standards. Throughout the evaluation process, the Consultant will be responsible for ensuring the quality of the data collected as well as ensuring that all data collection activities are in compliance with the ethical standards. The evaluation report must include a section identifying anticipated or actual ethical issues throughout the programme as well as the measures and methods anticipated or adopted to address or mitigate against these issues.

Appendix 4: Outcomes and outputs per proposal

Outcome 1: People with disabilities in Fiji and Vanuatu have greater opportunity to secure decent waged and self-employment to achieve a livelihood.

Outputs:

- 1.1. Technical assistance provided to government and social partners in developing and implementing disability inclusive employment, vocational training policies and programme in Fiji and Vanuatu
- 1.2. Sensitize employers Organizations on disability inclusive employment policies, programmes and practices in Fiji and Vanuatu
- 1.3. Tools and methodologies with technical support provided to employers organizations to employ people with disabilities
- 1.4. Technical assistance, training and financial support to strengthen the capacity of Vanuatu disability and rehabilitation services to develop and deliver coordinated services regarding inclusive livelihoods for persons with disabilities, building on existing training and skill development initiatives and working towards integration with mainstream employment strategies.
- 1.5. Technical assistance and financial support to pilot livelihood approaches through CBR programmes in Vanuatu and development of a resource collating Pacific experiences in this.

Outcome 2: Legislative and policy frameworks are compliant with CRPD and support reduced discrimination against PWD and improved service provision for PWD.

Outputs:

- a. Technical assistance provided to work with national legal drafters and other stakeholders on CRPD compliant legislation in Vanuatu
- b. Technical assistance provided to work with national legal drafters and other stakeholders on CRPD compliant legislation in Papua New Guinea.
- c. Technical assistance and financial support for consultations provided to government and non-government stakeholders, including children, to develop CRPD and CRC compliant child policy in Cook Islands
- d. Technical assistance and financial support for consultations provided to government and non-government stakeholders, including children, to develop CRPD and CRC compliant child policy in Vanuatu

Outcome 3: Improved data, analysis, research and advocacy on disability

- 3.1 . Technical assistance provided to Pacific Statistics Steering Committee and government counterparts from National Statistics Offices in the Pacific region, to strengthen disability

questionnaire modules in line with global best practices (UN Washington Group, WHO/World Bank).

3.2. Technical assistance for inclusion of disability module in one national census/surveys in at least two countries (Vanuatu and one other)

3.3. Technical assistance for secondary analysis and mapping of existing survey and census data to determine disadvantage in different sectors, eg. health, labour etc, and opportunities for technical support in the region.

3.4. Technical assistance (UNV) provided to PDF to conduct Study on Barriers to Ratification. DPOs in the region will undertake components of the research in their countries.

3.5. Advocacy strategy for use of Barriers to Ratification Study developed and implemented by PIFS, with support from PDF, to increase PIC ratification to CRPD

Outcome 4: Children with developmental delay are detected during the first five years of life and supported with appropriate education services in pilot areas in Vanuatu

4.1. Technical assistance provided to develop Early Detection System in Vanuatu, including trialing, revision and finalization.

4.3 Pilot implementation of Early Detection Systems in Vanuatu¹³⁴

Outcome 5: UN and partner agencies' activities addressing the rights of PWD are coordinated, supported, monitored and are represented in broader development discourses.

5.1. UNV placed with PDF undertakes Study on Barriers to Ratification

5.2. UNV conducts regular Steering Committee meetings and monitors progress of UNPRPD implementation of activities

5.3. Steering Committee provides guidance to UNCT on establishment of UN Working Group on Disability and the development of a work-plan of Joint UN activities to increase prominence of disability-related results within the UNDAF.

5.4. UNV leads and delivers, with the support of participating (UN Focal Points) and partner agencies (PDF and PIFS) in the UNPRPD Steering Committee, a series of 'Brown Bag' sessions for UN agencies, to provide information on the CRPD and discuss key regional development issues with regards to disability.

¹³⁴ 4.2 is missing from the proposal.

Appendix 5: Interview Guides

Note – I envisioned four main types of stakeholders who would be interviewed and these were the base questions for each interview. Questions were amended, added, or removed depending on the specific scope of work of the individual interviewed.

Questions for UNICEF

1. To what extent is the project aligned to the existing UN infrastructure on disability?
2. What is the level of progress towards achieving the projects outcomes?
3. What are the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives/goals?
4. To what extent has the availability and use of resources (human, financial, time) enabled or constrained the implementation of the project during 2014-2015?
5. To what extent do coordination and management mechanisms of the agencies and the project itself support implementation and contribute to reducing transaction costs?
6. In what ways and to what extent has the implementation of the project strengthened the PDF?
7. Are there any unexpected outcome of the project either positive or negative that had not been planned for?
8. Have there been additional benefits as a result of increased ‘mainstreaming’ of disability?
9. Are there any critical emerging issues that are not within the scope of the project?
10. To what extent has the project integrated gender and disparity reduction approaches?

Questions for other UN partners

1. Are project activities linked to the global and regional activities and needs?
2. What are the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives/goals?
3. Were there any other resources made available to contribute to the achievement of the project goals including leveraging of additional resources from UNPRDP members and from governments?
4. To what extent do coordination and management mechanisms of the agencies and the project itself support implementation and contribute to reducing transaction costs?
5. Are there any unexpected outcome of the project either positive or negative that had not been planned for?
6. Have there been additional benefits as a result of increased ‘mainstreaming’ of disability?
7. Are there any critical emerging issues that are not within the scope of the project?
8. To what extent has the project integrated gender and disparity reduction approaches?

Questions for National Governments

1. To what extent is the project aligned to relevant national needs and goals?
2. Were resources made available to contribute to the achievement of the project goals (including leveraging of additional resources from UNPRPD members and from governments)?
3. To what extent has capacity (human and financial resources) been built into line ministries to effectively work on disability issues?
4. Are there any unexpected outcome of the project either positive or negative that had not been planned for?
5. Have there been additional benefits as a result of increased ‘mainstreaming’ of disability?
6. Are there any critical emerging issues that are not within the scope of the project?
7. To what extent has the project integrated gender and disparity reduction approaches?

Questions for organizations of persons with disabilities (and workshop participants)

1. To what extent is the project aligned to relevant national needs and goals?
2. In what ways and to what extent has the project contributed to changes in the situation of disabled people in the region?
3. To what extent has capacity (human and financial resources) been built into line ministries to effectively work on disability issues?
4. In what ways and to what extent has the implementation of the project strengthened the PDF?
5. Are there any unexpected outcome of the project either positive or negative that had not been planned for?
6. Are there any critical emerging issues that are not within the scope of the project?
7. To what extent has the project integrated gender and disparity reduction approaches?

Appendix 6: Survey

Pacific Enable – Survey for External Evaluation

Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. The first section (A) asks a few brief questions about you (your answers will be anonymous); and the second section asks 12 multiple choice and open-ended questions about the work of the Pacific Enable project. The survey should take no more than 15-20 minutes to complete. Thank you.

A. Respondent’s demographic information

Gender:

(male / female / transgender)

Age:

(under 20 / 20-29 / 30-39 / 40- 65 / over 65)

Disability status:

(Y/N)

Nationality:

B. Multiple Choice and Open-Ended Questions

1. Pacific Enable (PE) interventions were linked to the priority national needs and goals in the country

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) neither agree nor disagree
- d) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

Fill in what you think the priority areas for PE should be (open ended):

2. Pacific Enable interventions were linked to the work of other international cooperation efforts

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) neither agree nor disagree
- d) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

Fill in which international cooperation efforts you think PE should be linked to (open ended):

3. In general how would you rate the quality of PE in terms of progress toward its expected outcomes?

- a) excellent
- b) very good

- c) good
- d) fair
- e) poor

Fill in which outcome area has seen the most progress:

[Outcome 1: greater opportunity to secure decent waged and self-employment; Outcome 2: legislative and policy frameworks are compliant with CRPD; Outcome 3: improved data, analysis research and advocacy on disability; Outcome 4: children with developmental delay are detected and supported]

4. What are major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of objectives/goals? (open ended)

5. The PE project has led to other initiatives (by government, other UN agencies or local civil society) to focus on addressing needs of persons with disabilities.

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) neither agree nor disagree
- d) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

6. To what extent has the PE project led to additional benefits as a result of inclusion of persons with disabilities? (open ended):

7. The PE project has contributed to positive changes in the situation of disabled people in the region.

Outcome 1: greater opportunity to secure decent waged and self-employment:

Outcome 2: legislative and policy frameworks are compliant with CRPD:

Outcome 3: improved data, analysis research and advocacy on disability:

Outcome 4: children with developmental delay are detected and supported:

For each outcome area, please rate to what extent you believe the project has contributed to positive changes using the below scale: [(a) strongly agree; (b) agree; (c) neither agree nor disagree; (d) disagree; (e) strongly disagree]

If PE has led to other changes, please add (open ended):

8. Please explain how these changes have had a positive impact on persons with disabilities and their families (open ended):

9. The outcomes of the Pacific Enable project are likely to be sustained / continued.

Outcome 1: greater opportunity to secure decent waged and self-employment:

Outcome 2: legislative and policy frameworks are compliant with CRPD:

Outcome 3: improved data, analysis research and advocacy on disability:

Outcome 4: children with developmental delay are detected and supported:

For each outcome area, please rate to what extent you believe it is likely to be sustained using the below scale: [(a) strongly agree; (b) agree; (c) neither agree nor disagree; (d) disagree; (e) strongly disagree]

10. The Pacific Enable project has promoted national ownership for this work.

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) neither agree nor disagree
- d) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

Fill in what you think should PE do to facilitate greater national ownership for the work (open ended):

11. This project has looked at the different needs of men and women.

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) neither agree nor disagree
- d) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

If you agree, how so? (open ended):

12. This project has focused on the different circumstances for persons with disabilities and non-disabled persons.

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) neither agree nor disagree
- d) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

If you agree, how so? (open ended):

13. Please provide any suggestions you have for a second phase of the Pacific Enable project (open ended):

Appendix 7: Documents cited and consulted

Documents cited

Aingimea, Kionel, Secretary Department of Justice and Border Control, “letter to Head of ESCAP Subregional Office for Pacific”, ESCAP, 11 September 2015.

Brown, Sharan E., and Michael J. Guralnick (2012), “International Human Rights to Early Intervention for Infants and Young Children with Disabilities: Tools for Global Advocacy”, *Infants and Young Children*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 270–285.

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, available at:
<http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>.

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010), *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: What does it mean for you?*,
http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/documents/publications/uncrpd_guide_essayread.pdf

4th Regional Conference of Heads of Planning and Statistics (HOPS) (2013), Conference Report.

Helsa, Bret and Mary Kay Kennedy (2008), *We have Human Rights*, (Cambridge, Harvard Project on Disability) available at <http://www.hpod.org/pdf/we-have-human-rights.pdf>.

Human Rights Council (2009), *Universal Periodic Review: Report Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review Vanuatu*, A/HRC/12/14.

International Centre for Evidence in Disability (ICED) (2015), *Using the Key Informant Method to identify children with disabilities: A working guide*, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

International Council for Open and Distance Education (undated), “Country Profile: Vanuatu”, available at
http://www.icde.org/projects/regulatory_frameworks_for_distance_education/country_profiles/vanuatu/education_system/

International Labour Organization (2014), *Achieving Equal Employment Opportunities for Persons with disabilities through legislation - Guidelines*, (second edition, Geneva, ILO).

International Labour Organization (2015), *Analysis of Legislation Promoting and Protecting the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Employment in Vanuatu*, (Suva, ILO).

International Labour Organization (2002), *Managing disability in the workplace. ILO Code of practice*, (Geneva, ILO).

International Labour Organization (15-17 July 2014), “*AGENDA ITEM X: Session Two: Global/International Issue on disability*”, Regional Disability Officials Meeting, Nadi, Fiji.

Kahneman, Daniel (2011), *Thinking, Fast and Slow*, (New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux).

Ministry of Justice and Community Services (2014), *Malampa Province CBR Workshop Report*, (Port Vila, MoJ).

Ministry of Justice and Community Service (2014), *The National Community-Based Rehabilitation Plan of Action 2014-2024*, (Port Vila, MoJ).

O’Reilly, Arthur (2007), *The right to decent work of persons with disabilities* (Geneva, ILO).

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2009), *Report: Compilation prepared by OHCHR to the Human Rights Council working group on UPR*.

Pacific Enable, Project Proposal

Pacific Enable, annual reports, quarterly reports, and draft end of project report.

Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (2009), *Pacific Regional Strategy on Disability 2010-2015*, Forum Disability Ministers’ Meeting, Cook Islands.

Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, *Pacific Disability Rights Framework 2016-2025 (draft)*, (Suva, PIFs). Available at <http://www.addc.org.au/content/resources/draft-pacific-disability-rights-framework-2016-2025/1579/>.

Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (2013), *Final Report, Regional Disability Inclusive Budgeting and Disability Statistics Workshop*, November 2013.

Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (2014), Forum Disability Ministers’ Meeting, *Communiqué 14(13)*, (Pohnpei, FSM and Cairns, Australia).

The Royal Australasian College of Physicians: Paediatric & Child Health Division (2013), *Position Statement: Early Intervention for Children with Developmental Disabilities*.

Samoa Bureau of Statistics (June 2015), *Samoa Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) 2014*.

Secretariat of the Pacific Community, “2013 Pocket Statistical Summary”, (Noumea, New Caledonia), Available at http://www.spc.int/prism/images/downloads/Pocket_summary_2013-FINAL.pdf

United Nations, *Common Multi-Country Assessment for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories Under the Fiji and Samoa Multi-Country Offices in Preparation for the United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Pacific Sub-Region 2013-2017*, (2011).

United Nations Children’s Fund Pacific and Vanuatu National Statistics Office (2014), *Children, Women and Men with Disabilities in Vanuatu: what do the data say?*, (Suva, UNICEF).

Available at:

http://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/Children_Women_and_Men_with_Disabilities_in_Vanuatu.pdf

United Nations Children’s Fund and the Victor Pineda Foundation (2008), *It’s About Ability – An explanation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (New York, UNICEF). Available at http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_43893.html.

UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2014), *Communication 2/2010*, CRPD/C/D/2/2010.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), *General comment No. 7 (2005): Implementing Child Rights in Early Childhood*, 20 September 2006, CRC/C/GC/7/Rev.1, available at:

<http://www.refworld.org/docid/460bc5a62.html>.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), *General comment No. 9 (2006): The rights of children with disabilities*, 27 February 2007, CRC/C/GC/9, available at:

<http://www.refworld.org/docid/461b93f72.html>.

United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Reports: Table 1: Human Development Index and its Components*, Available at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/table-1-human-development-index-and-its-components>.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (2015), *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities- Compliant Legislative Review*.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific, “Incheon Strategy to ‘Make the Right Real’ for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific”, available at:

<http://www.maketherightreal.net/>.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (2012), “Incheon Strategy to ‘Make the Right Real’ for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific” available at

<http://www.unescapsdd.org/publications/incheon-strategy>.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (2015), *Nauru: A Legislative Review for Compliance with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.

United Nations Enable (undated), *International Agreement on the Rights of Disabled People* (EasyRead version), available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/345108/easy-read-un-convention.pdf

United Nations Partnership to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2014), *Strategic and Operational Framework*, (New York, UNDP).

UNESCO (undated), “Education System Profiles: Vanuatu”, accessed from <http://www.unescobkk.org/education/resources/resources/education-system-profiles/vanuatu/early-childhood/>.

Vanuatu Ministry of Health, Vanuatu National Statistics Office and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (2014), *2013 Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) Final Report*. (Noumea, New Caledonia, SPC).

Vargos-Barón, Emily, Ulf Janson with Natalia Mufel (2009), *Early Childhood Intervention, Special Education and Inclusion: Focus on Belarus*, (regional office for CEE/CIS, UNICEF).

West, Barbara (2009), *Encyclopedia of the Peoples of Asia and the Pacific*, (New York, Infobase publishing).

World Bank (2015), *Harmonized list of Fragile Situations FY 15*, available at <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/pubdocs/publicdoc/2014/7/425731404933583114/FY15FragileSituationList.pdf>

World Bank (undated), “*Pacific Islands Overview*”, available at <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/pacificislands/overview>

World Health Organization and UNICEF (2012), *Early Childhood Development and Disability: a Discussion Paper*, (Geneva, WHO), ISBN 978 92 4 150406 5.

Additional documents consulted

International Labour Organization (June 2012), *Employment Relations Bill – Vanuatu*.

International Labour Organization (2015), *ILO ‘Start Your Business’ training to Support People with Disabilities, Suva, Central Division, Fiji Report*.

International Labour Organization (2015), *Start Your Business Training Report for Fiji: Tukavesi, Buca Bay*.

International Labour Organization (undated), *Start and Improve Your Business Trainer Reader*,

International Labour Organization (2001), *Start Your Business Programme: Business Awareness*.

International Labour Organization (2001), *Start Your Business Programme: Business Planning*.¹³⁵

¹³⁵ The Start and Improve Your Business Trainer Reader, and the Start Your Business Programme Business Awareness and Business Planning documents were the primary resources for the ToT workshop. None of the three documents refer to persons with disabilities.

Ministry of Justice and Community Services (2014), *Report: Vanuatu Disability Pilot Survey, Findings and Recommendations*.

Pacific Disability Forum (June 2012), *Mapping of the disability policy and program frameworks in the Pacific: A report on mapping work completed by the Pacific Disability Forum (PDF) working with the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)*.

Piawu, Peter (May 2015), *Capacity Building Training Report: Training of Trainers Workshop on Start Your Business to Support People with Disabilities*.

Vanuatu Ministry of Education and Training, Vanuatu Education Support Program (VESP), *Revised Gender, Disability and Social Inclusion Strategy, October 2014 – June 2017*.

Vanuatu National Statistics Office (2009), *2009 National Census of Population and Housing*.
Vanuatu Ministry of Education and Training, Vanuatu Technical and Vocational Education and Training Sector, *Disability Inclusion Strategy, 2014-2016*.

Washington Group on Disability Statistics, documents on statistics available online at:
http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/washington_group/wg_documents.htm