



Mainstreaming disability in the new development paradigm

Evaluation of Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities

Uganda country study – Summary



Mainstreaming disability in the new development paradigm

Evaluation of Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities

Uganda country study
February 2012



©Malek Qutteina/NCG

This is a brief summary of the findings from the Uganda case study in English.

The country study on Uganda forms part of the Evaluation of the Norwegian Support to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities for the period 2000 to 2010. Uganda is one of four case countries along with Nepal, Malawi and the Palestinian territory. The full versions of the reports, easy-read versions, as well as Chichewa, Arabic and Nepali translations of the summaries from Malawi, the Palestinian territory and Nepal can be found at www.norad.no.

The layout of the document has tried to conform to guidelines for accessibility and ease of reading, which require Arial font and left (not full) justification of the text. The report has also tried to avoid unnecessary use of acronyms and abbreviations.

Disclaimer:

The report is the product of its authors, Nordic Consulting Group Norway, and responsibility for the accuracy of data included in this report rests with the authors. The findings, interpretations and conclusions presented do not necessarily reflect the views of Norad Evaluation Department.

Lead consultant: Basil Kandyomunda,
with contributions from Nora Ingdal, Dr. Malek Qutteina & Mari Brekke Mogen.

Norad

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
P.O.Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 Oslo
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Tel: +47 23 98 00 00
Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

ISBN: 978-827548-632-3

KEY FINDING

The Norwegian funding has been crucial in influencing the disability policy landscape and practice in Uganda: a vibrant disability movement, particularly the National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda, as well as a successful national Community Based Rehabilitation program. Few indications were found that multilaterals or non-governmental organisations were including disability when working in emergencies and the humanitarian context in Northern Uganda. There are better documented results of the targeted projects than the mainstreamed ones.

1 Country context

Uganda is a landlocked country in East Africa with a population of about 31 million¹ people with a high population growth rate at 3.3% (UBOS, 2010). Uganda is a poor country with a national per capita income of USD490, and 31% of the population lives below the national poverty line - on less than one USD per day. Uganda has been and continues to be one of the priority countries for the Norwegian development and humanitarian assistance.

Prevalence of disability	7.2 % according to 2005/06 National Household Survey.
Signed CRPD	30 th March 2007.
Ratified CRPD	25 th September 2008.
National constitution	<i>Persons with disabilities ensured equal opportunities and largely through affirmative action.</i>
Law on disability	<i>Persons with Disabilities Act, 2006.</i>
Policy on disability	<i>The National Policy on Disability, 2002.</i>
National council for disability	<i>Yes, whose main role function is to act as a body through which the needs, concerns and potentials and abilities of persons with disabilities can be communicated to Government as well as monitor and evaluate the extent to which government and other actors include and meet the needs persons with disabilities.</i>

The rights of persons with disabilities in Uganda are enshrined in national legislation and internationally legally binding instruments enacted and or ratified over the last 20 years. Good examples are the Persons with Disabilities Act 2006, the National Council for Disability Act 2004, and the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. In terms of practice disability is accorded affirmative action. There are five seats in Parliament reserved for persons with disabilities, while sign language and Braille are now recognised as official languages through which business can be transacted in Parliament, courts of law, printing of official documents, etc. Disability falls under the docket of the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development and has a specific Minister of State responsible for Disability and the Elderly. Notwithstanding the rosy legislative and policy achievements the main challenge has been lack of implementation of these policies.

2 Evaluation of Norwegian support

The main purpose of the evaluation was to document and analyse the results of the Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities from year 2000-2010. The evaluation

¹ Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), Uganda National Household Survey 2009 / 2010

should include an assessment of the extent to which the support to persons with disabilities has been mainstreamed into general development and humanitarian aid.

On the Uganda case study, the evaluation team consisted of Basil Kandyomunda as lead consultant backstopped by Dr Malek Qutteina from the Palestinian territory and Nora Ingdal, the global team leader. The field studies were carried out from August – November 2011.

The evaluation revealed that from year 2000 to 2010 the Uganda received 3,4 billion Norwegian crowns (NOK) in development and humanitarian aid. Around 2% of this, 100 million NOK (17 million USD) went directly to persons with disabilities, while another 5% of the aid was mainstreamed and partly mainstreamed disability.

Main partners and programs

Uganda is one of the priority countries for Norway's bilateral support. This has largely been through the budget support framework. Although not through earmarked funding, the Government of Uganda has been committed to mainstreaming disability in key sectors as its main policy towards disability.

Most of the targeted interventions for persons with disabilities has been channelled through Disabled People's Organisations, particularly the Atlas Alliance member organisations for financing the national Community-Based Rehabilitation program and strengthening their sister organisations in Uganda, such as National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda, and Uganda National Association of the Blind.

Another big chunk of support has been channelled through Lions Aid Norway to fund the district eye care health program, a joint project with the Ministry of Health. Other Norwegian non-governmental organisations such as Save the Children, Plan Norway, Caritas, Norwegian Refugee Council, Norwegian Red Cross, Strømme Foundation and others have received funding and supported persons with disabilities through mainstreamed interventions. The non-governmental organisations and Disabled People's Organisations have played a crucial gap filling role.

3 Results and challenges

Results are more prominent in the targeted initiatives than in the mainstreamed projects in Uganda. The general Norwegian development assistance has gone to health, education, energy, environment, good governance and humanitarian through budget support mechanism. There has also been a greater focus on measures to promote human rights and democratic development in recent years, and non-governmental organisations have been important partners in this area. The main results of the Norwegian targeted support to disability are therefore found in the improvement of services for rehabilitation, education, health care and economic empowerment of persons with disabilities.

The flagship program that has recorded significant impact especially in terms of raising awareness about the rights of persons with disabilities, influencing legislation and policy framework, as well as strengthening the Disabled People's Organisations in the country is the **Community-Based Rehabilitation program** initially introduced in 12 districts of Uganda. This was later modified as a model program which is currently covering five districts (excluding the original 12). It is important to note that Community Based Rehabilitation is the adopted strategy for reaching out and serving persons with disabilities in Uganda. However it is still covering only a small part of the country, and hence benefiting a small percentage of the disabled population.

There are some noted good practices associated with the Community Based Rehabilitation program such as its ownership by local governments and the communities, but also the commitment of Government of Uganda to adopt the funding mode after the phasing out of funding from Norway in 2009.

In the context of humanitarian funding, the evaluation revealed that the major multilateral agencies and a number of other actors are not mainstreaming disability. However, Norwegian Refugee Council had responded to challenges of education for children with disabilities in Northern Uganda in response to calls from the Local Government authorities. It now has dedicated staff and budget for Special Needs Education in the area. Likewise, the United Nations Development Program supported land mine survivors program in Northern Uganda is one specific targeted intervention, which in fact has adopted a Community Based Rehabilitation approach, and to a large extent targets all persons with disabilities in the target districts.

In the field of education, training of Ugandan University teachers at Masters' levels in Norwegian Universities has been undertaken with a good amount of success. This has improved the capacity of the National Institute of Special Needs Education (now part of University of Kyambogo) to train specialist teachers in special needs and inclusive education.

The study identified good practices in mainstreaming disability among the initiatives of Uganda Human Rights Commission, Uganda Bureau of Statistics, United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the collaborative economic empowerment project between Norwegian Association of Disabled, National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda and Association of Microfinance Institutions in Uganda. Collaborative efforts between Plan Norway and Atlas Alliance (mainly in Norway) seem to be producing immense organisational learning and improving practices in both organisations.

Opportunities

The Evaluation identified a number of opportunities for elevating disability in development planning and practice. First is the high level of awareness at various levels in country that has been achieved over the last decade, particularly through representation of persons with disabilities at levels of governance, through affirmative action. Secondly, the Government of Uganda has put in place an enabling legislative and policy environment which can aid mainstreaming for those involved in doing development work, also for the Disabled People's Organisations and their allies to engage duty-bearers at all levels. A third opportunity is found with the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, being a member of the Washington City Group of Statistics, has demonstrated to be a learning organisation and has kept improving the quality of disability statistics it is generating through census and surveys.

However, one of the challenges is that the present Norwegian grant system to civil society organisations makes it difficult to adopt a holistic human rights-based approach. Norwegian civil society organisations are supposed to work mainly with their local counterparts and not government agencies. In a number of cases the main problem is the lack of awareness, competence and capacity of the local authorities and the governments abdicating their responsibilities as duty-bearers. Therefore, lasting and sustainable changes can only come from initiatives that target and involve national authorities as parties to the DPO and NGO programs.

4 Conclusions and recommendations

This evaluation challenges development practitioners on what mainstreaming disability means and how it should be done. The findings could be used by the Disabled People's Organisations and their allies in the country to engage with government and the development partners etc.

while their counterparts in Norway can engage with Norad and Ministry of Foreign Affairs to elevate disability and prioritise it among cross-cutting issues.

1. CBR has been adopted as the main strategy for reaching and serving persons with disabilities in the country, but, the outreach (both old and new models) is still limited. Major DPOs in Uganda seem to be sceptical about the viability and effectiveness of CBR. There is also a disconnection between the central and local governments because the local governments do not report to MGLSD. It is therefore recommended that:
 - a. The Government with support from stakeholders **expand CBR to cover all districts**
 - b. The National CBR steering Committee meetings should be revamped to ensure that **national stakeholders participate in decision making** regarding the program
 - c. **An impact evaluation** of the model CBR programs should be undertaken and lessons be used to inform rolling out of the programs to other districts.
2. Although disability has been given a high profile by the Government of Uganda over the last two decades, through affirmative action policies and laws, the commitment towards disability compared with other issues in terms of implementation remains low. We recommend that:
 - a) Disability is prioritised like other cross-cutting issues (gender). At least this can be in the form of asking for **disability disaggregated indicators** in planning and reporting in grant and instruction letters to Embassies, Norad, Fredskorpset and others.
 - b) The Government and development partners should agree on a **minimum set of indicators** in key development sectors, such as education; health; agriculture; employment; and recovery and development program for Northern Uganda
3. Uganda is prone to other emergencies such as floods and humanitarian crises in addition to the humanitarian situation in Northern Uganda. It is therefore recommended that:
 - a) To ensure the rights of persons of persons with disabilities are respected, the Government of Uganda should demand for **evidence of mainstreaming disability from all stakeholders involved in emergency and humanitarian work**
 - b) The SPHERE guidelines should be popularised among all agencies (international, national and local NGOs working with emergencies.
4. Capacity building for DPOs can result into a strong disability movement which can champion the rights of persons with disabilities, but only the Atlas Alliance members have done it. We recommend that mainstream Norwegian NGOs such as NRC, Save the Children, Plan Norway, Care International, and Red Cross etc. partner with and support DPOs both national and local to enable them target better the needs and rights of persons with disabilities.
5. Research is one of the areas that this evaluation found least supported. We recommend:
 - a. Further support to UBOS to continue improving its competences to include disability in all her research projects, mainly censuses and surveys.
 - b. A disability specific survey to provide primary baseline data should also be supported.

Annex I: Comments from Rightsholders

Summary of comments to the draft field visit report for Uganda regarding the Evaluation of the Norwegian Support to Promote the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, collected from two separate workshops with rights-holders and stakeholders in Kampala in November 2011.

1. The report is comprehensive and shows that Norwegian support has been substantial in influencing the disability landscape.
2. The report needs to elaborate more on the methodology and process to make it more robust.
3. Minimise use of Norwegian text especially names of organisations – alternatively provide equivalent in English
4. The study was not very clear on sampling – what was used to determine which project to visit and not. It should not have necessarily been the amount – size of the project – could have been done to balance projects across sectors.
5. Understanding meaning of the concept of mainstreaming was very restrictive –
6. The report is well written but still needs proof reading to address the typos and in some cases grammar.
7. The section on Humanitarian and Emergency section is rather scanty. Needs to acknowledge contribution to PRDP, Ministry of Gender Mine Victims Assistance project, and other efforts such as those of NRC, UNHCR, and WFP etc.
8. The report lacks a section on recommendations. An evaluation of this nature should come up with a clear set of recommendations for key stakeholders, particularly Norad, GoU, DPOs and CSOs to take action.
9. The report does not comprehensively cover the contribution of other major donors such as Denmark, Sweden, United Kingdom etc. – issues of attribution
10. Provide a more comprehensive list of references
11. Can the report provide analysis of how the budget support trickles down to the various sectors?
12. What assurance / mechanisms are in place to ensure the outcomes – particularly recommendations are implemented? It would have been good to bring Parliamentarians on board as a team that can lobby parliament and government in general to take action.