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Executive Summary

A. Evaluation Overview and Methodology

The purpose of this evaluation was to help DRF/DRAF and its key stakeholders, including its donors, learn from the Funds’ work over the past three years (2017-2019) to inform any needed course correction and to more broadly share achievements and lessons learned.

To assess DRF/DRAF’s work, the evaluation focused on five sample countries: Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Uganda. They represent DRF/DRAF’s work in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, as well as countries at different moments in DRF/DRAF’s engagement: recently entered, mid-investment, and exiting.

The evaluation team, led by BLE Solutions, included national evaluators in each of the five sample countries, as well as expertise in evaluating advocacy, and particularly disability rights advocacy, at local, sub-national, national, and global levels. The team gathered information using document and data review, individual and group interviews. The 85 interviewees included DRF/DRAF staff, board members, donors, and partners at global and country levels, and grantees. To analyze the information gathered, the evaluation team used qualitative and quantitative analysis. In Indonesia and Uganda, the team used contribution analysis to assess DRF/DRAF’s contribution to two selected outcomes. Across all the countries, the evaluation team assessed DRF/DRAF’s value for money.

B. Findings

1. DRF/DRAF are relevant and aligned.

DRF/DRAF’s logframe outcome and outputs are largely relevant to and aligned with the priorities of donors, persons with disabilities, and DRF/DRAF’s grantees. All of these stakeholders, including DRF/DRAF, seek to protect and promote human rights, including of persons with disabilities, as well as disability-inclusive development. DRF/DRAF’s goals and logframe are most influenced by the CRPD, since DRF/DRAF were conceptualized as a response to the CRPD. A wide stakeholder group, including donors, partners and grantees, provided input into DRF/DRAF’s goals and monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) framework - and that has added to its relevance to other actors.

1 For more information about BLE Solutions, please see www.blesolutions.com.
2. **DRF/DRAF’s expansive role is relevant.**

When articulating DRF/DRAF’s relevance within the global movement for the human rights of persons with disabilities, staff, board members, donors, and partners felt that DRF/DRAF are more than simply a funder. They described DRF/DRAF as a risk taker, a thought leader with deep expertise in promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities at global and grassroots levels, a connector, an amplifier of DPO voices, and a convener that brings DPOs together and helps to broaden and strengthen movements.

DRF/DRAF are seen as a risk taker. They were the first foundation to have a unique focus on the CRPD and to support DPOs in their desire to work on the rights outlined in the CRPD. They are also one of the only donors to work with small and nascent DPOs, often representing the most marginalized groups of persons with disabilities, and, in many cases as their first funders, paving the way for these DPOs to receive future funding from others.

DRF/DRAF are seen as a thought leader with deep expertise in promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities at both global and grassroots levels. DRF/DRAF bring grassroots and national knowledge into global conversations through their and their grantees’ participation in key events, as well as through the documents and reports that they produce and share. Donors particularly value the country assessments that DRF/DRAF develop and share, often noting that they have no other source for this information.

DRF/DRAF are seen as a connector, educating DPOs and national movements about global processes and helping to connect DPOs with other global stakeholders involved in promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities, including donors.

DRF/DRAF are seen as an amplifier of DPO voices, and a convener that brings DPOs together and helps to broaden and strengthen movements. One of the ways in which DRF/DRAF broaden movements is by bringing grantees together during regular grantee convenings to hear from each other and jointly build an advocacy strategy. In these convenings, DRF/DRAF purposefully bring together grantees that are national and grassroots, more established and less established, and representing more and less marginalized groups. The convenings offer DPOs an opportunity to strengthen their capacities, build ties among themselves, and make connections with government officials, other civil society actors, and other donors.

To further increase DRF/DRAF’s capacity to effectively fulfill these roles as a risk taker, a thought leader, a connector, an amplifier of DPO voices, and a convener and to strengthen DRF/DRAF’s image as constructive partners, national government representatives interviewed for this evaluation asked that DRF/DRAF communicate more directly with them about their vision and plans.
3. **DRF/DRAF’s strategy is effective.**

DPOs appreciated receiving DRF/DRAF’s financial and technical assistance, as well as assistance with networking. They felt DRF/DRAF offered them the resources they needed to strengthen their capacities and influence local and national-level change.

With support from DRF/DRAF, DPOs have influenced a large number of changes in national and local-level legislation, policy, and government programs since 2017, as validated by this evaluation, as well as before, as validated by earlier independent evaluations. In addition, DRF/DRAF support has helped DPOs to participate in international and national human rights and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) monitoring processes.

DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs are recognized for their effectiveness in these monitoring processes, according to DRF/DRAF staff and board members. A staff member stated, “*We often hear that the [DRF/DRAF-supported] DPOs are the best prepared [among those who present to the CRPD Committee].*” According to a partner very familiar with the CRPD review processes, “*In countries where DRF/DRAF are present, the DPOs will have a larger delegation and a larger impact on those CRPD review committees.*”

At national levels in all five countries, grantees reported influencing legislation and also guidelines and regulations aimed at implementing that legislation between 2017 and 2019. Because DPOs’ advocacy for and technical contributions to these changes were seen as critical to their passage or adoption, and because many of these DPOs are solely funded by DRF/DRAF, these DPOs believe that DRF/DRAF’s financial support for their efforts was essential to achieving the timely passage or adoption of these changes.

Working to advance these changes strengthened DPOs and national disability movements and helped build new and lasting cross-movement relationships. This has led to meetings and discussions that have promoted confidence and further networking of persons with disabilities with government and the broader disability movement. As a result, staff, DPOs, partners, and government officials reported that DPOs’ and the movements’ work raised DPOs’ and the movements’ profiles at local and national levels.

4. **DRF/DRAF contribute to diverse movements dedicated to the human rights of persons with disabilities.**

DRF/DRAF staff and board provided a number of examples of how DRF/DRAF’s support has helped disability movements become more inclusive of all persons with disabilities. Evidence cited showed how, thanks at least in part to DRF/DRAF’s support, people representing more marginalized disability groups are now included as DRF/DRAF grantees, representatives and members of umbrella DPOs, representatives speaking to government or at various events, or
even as leaders of movements. There were various marginalized groups cited as now being better included, including little people, people with albinism, women with disabilities, and people with psychosocial disabilities.

“In countries where DRF/DRAF are not present, the movement is not as inclusive.” — DRF/DRAF Partner

Grantees and government officials report that the expansion of the national disability movements primarily resulted from DRF/DRAF’s funding and technical assistance, which has helped build the organizational capacity of newer DPOs and helped them get registered. According to one grantee, “DRF/DRAF challenge us, [asking] ‘How inclusive is your organization?’ They have also made us aware of the marginalized categories and their potentialities and that they are part of the disability movement.”

Most donors and partners interviewed can cite examples of how DRF/DRAF are influencing disability movements to become more inclusive. In fact, one observed that “in countries where DRF/DRAF are not present, the movement is not as inclusive.”

5. DRF/DRAF contribute to DPO capacity.

DPOs’ increased capacities to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities, as a result of the support they receive from DRF/DRAF, was evident to most interviewees. Grantees were largely satisfied with the technical assistance DRF/DRAF provided, although some indicated room for improvement.

All DRF/DRAF staff and board members, most grantees, and half of the interviewed donors and partners, as well as government officials, remarked on DPOs’ increased capacities to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities, as a result of the support they receive from DRF/DRAF. Grantees were reported to better understand the CRPD and U.N. processes, as well as what needs to be included in national policies and legislation for them to be CRPD-compliant.

Grantees had more and stronger partnerships with other DPOs and with organizations in other movements who could help them advance their issues. They had gained skills and confidence. Because of their greater capacity for advocacy, DPOs noted that they have greater access to government decision-makers, are better equipped, have more empowered staff, and have been able to mobilize greater numbers of constituents. Association with DRF/DRAF increased the visibility of the DPOs in the public sphere, magnifying and strengthening their voices.

Most described DRF/DRAF’s technical assistance as “very relevant, timely, and accessible” or “relevant, timely, and accessible.” Most described the time and effort it took them to access DRF/DRAF’s technical assistance as “just right.”
This also related to support grantees received to participate in national and global advocacy efforts, saying the time and effort DRF/DRAF provided for DPO participation was “just right.”

6. DRF/DRAF is known and appreciated for its participatory grantmaking approach.

DRF/DRAF are participatory grantmakers, meaning that persons with disabilities are involved in decision making about DRF/DRAF’s funding, including strategic decisions about that funding, at all levels, from board and Grantmaking Committee2 to staffing.

Among DRF/DRAF staff, board members, donors, and partners, some felt DRF/DRAF were exemplary among participatory grantmakers. A similar number appreciated DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking practice and also identified some opportunities for DRF/DRAF to become even more participatory in their approach. Finally, a similar number felt DRF/DRAF have even more room to strengthen their participatory grantmaking approach, by for example, making Grantmaking Committee materials more accessible and easier to digest.

“The cost of using a participatory grantmaking approach is] the cost of doing business to get the most effective outcomes.” – DRF/DRAF donor or partner

According to DRF/DRAF staff, board members, donors, and partners, DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach is worth its expense. According to one donor or partner, “It’s the cost of doing business to get the most effective outcomes.”

7. Grantees largely appreciate DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking support.

The majority of DRF/DRAF grantees described DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking and support as efficient and effective; some staff members identified room for improvement. In terms of grantmaking, most grantees described DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking support as “high quality,” while some described the support as “adequate.” In response to an open-ended question, grantees in Uganda stated they appreciated that DRF/DRAF let grantees decide how they wanted to use the funds they received. If the evaluation team had asked other grantees about this specifically, more might have provided a similar response.

2 DRF/DRAF’s Grantmaking Committee (GMC) is a committee established by the boards of directors of DRF and DRAF. Its purpose is to support DRF and DRAF in pooled fund grantmaking strategy review and grants decisions. The GMC is made up of representatives from DRF/DRAF institutional donors and from the global disability community, as well as three board members.
Almost all grantees described the time and effort they put into submitting grant applications to DRF/DRAF as “just right.” They described the process as “simple and easy to understand.” They appreciated the template and guiding questions provided, as well as the technical assistance DRF/DRAF offer to help them develop their proposals, which one grantee described as uncommon to receive from donors. All grantees reported receiving their grant funds from DRF/DRAF in a very timely manner.

In contrast, half of DRF/DRAF staff and board members interviewed felt DRF/DRAF needed better grantmaking processes. At least one reported hearing similar feedback on this from grantees, contrary to what grantees reported to the evaluation team. The staff and board members recognized that the processes demand a lot of time and effort from potential grantees and program officers within a relatively short timeframe. Yet, in spite of the concerns they raised about DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking process, interviewed DRF/DRAF staff, donors, and grantees agreed that DRF/DRAF are more efficient than other donors in their grant delivery.

8. DRF/DRAF exhibits good value for money.

DRF/DRAF have demonstrated careful attention to balancing the four value for money Es: economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity, in their grantmaking and institutional systems. Some modifications would make this even stronger.

As described above, DRF/DRAF and their grantees have been very effective at achieving their intended results, and DRF/DRAF have been efficient in their delivery of grant funds, technical assistance, and support for persons with disabilities to participate in national and global advocacy.

In addition to findings described above, according to a few staff, board members, and donors, DRF/DRAF have made good progress in developing templates that program officers and other staff can use to collect information from DPOs, provide technical assistance, assess risk, review grant applications, and make decisions.

Some staff noted that other processes still need to be systematized in this way, for example, protocols and templates for monitoring progress after funds are granted, and checklists and guidance for greater clarity of budget allocations for technical assistance.

3 This may raise questions about the possibility of positive bias in grantees’ responses to the evaluation team, as noted in the evaluation limitations.
C. Conclusion and Recommendations

As evidenced in this evaluation, DRF/DRAF’s goals and objectives are relevant to DPOs, governments, other donors, and partners similarly seeking to protect and promote human rights, including of persons with disabilities, as well as disability-inclusive development. All of these stakeholders value DRF/DRAF’s leadership in the global movement to promote the human rights of persons with disabilities and appreciate opportunities to learn from DRF/DRAF’s experience. DRF/DRAF have made great progress in supporting DPOs to influence changes in policies, legislation, and programs, as well as to participate in national and international advocacy. DRF/DRAF have helped national disability movements gain strength and diversify their membership. DRF/DRAF have also helped DPOs strengthen their advocacy capacity.

All DPOs interviewed pointed to examples of changes in policy, legislation, and programs that are now sustainable, as long as countries do not experience significant changes in priorities of political leadership or emergency situations that affect them. They noted that ongoing advocacy and funding are required to ensure their implementation. Equally importantly, individual DPOs and national disability movements have gained new skills and confidence and have built new or stronger relationships with government officials – all resources that will help them continue to advocate for the human rights of persons with disabilities.

DRF/DRAF have contributed to these changes while operating efficiently in its grantmaking, technical assistance provision, and support for grantees who are participating in national and international advocacy, as assessed by this evaluation. As part of their embrace of equity and to maximize the effectiveness of their grants, DRF/DRAF use a participatory grantmaking approach that is appreciated by stakeholders. These elements contribute to DRF/DRAF’s value for money: DRF/DRAF are effective and efficient in achieving their goals and objectives, and do so in an equitable way.

Building on DRF/DRAF’s accomplishments to date and grounded in the findings presented in this evaluation, stakeholders identified a number of modifications DRF/DRAF may want to consider to further strengthen their work going forward. These recommendations were identified prior to the start of the current COVID-19 pandemic. While some of these may be possible to act on during the pandemic, others may need to wait until after the pandemic is over, and still others may need to wait until some degree of economic recovery has taken place.

1. Further increase staff numbers and modify DRF/DRAF’s organizational structure and fundraising to support them. That DRF/DRAF doubled their staff between the end of 2018 and mid-2019 is a step in the right direction. This was possibly the maximum increase that DRF/DRAF could have sustained over the course of a year. However, in the coming years, further staff growth could give DRF/DRAF much needed additional capacities, as described in this report.
To ensure DRF/DRAF’s continued efficiency and equity in its practices, the model, as DRF/DRAF grow, needs to be more decentralized than the current one, with even greater delegation of decision making to teams within DRF/DRAF. It will also require, as DRF/DRAF have already acknowledged through their 2019 hiring and development of an initial development strategy, expanding fundraising beyond private foundations and bilateral donors to access more diversified funding. Some suggested that a focused strategy on external communications could contribute to a broader donor outreach strategy. A few board members, donors, and partners already see DRF/DRAF taking these kinds of steps.

2. **Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s role within the global disability movement: develop a global influencing strategy.** DRF/DRAF have been leaders in the promotion of the human rights of persons with disabilities globally. How are DRF/DRAF acting as a thought leader and sharing their learning? How are DRF/DRAF using their position and power to advance the human rights of persons with disabilities at a global level? What is their role within the larger movement, and how does that role complement the roles of others? DRF/DRAF may want to consider developing a global influencing strategy, which defines and targets different audiences. This may mean increasing staffing to include a communications team.

Many donors, partners, and board members suggested that DRF/DRAF more systematically share lessons learned from their disability-inclusive, participatory grantmaking processes. More than one interviewee suggested that DRF/DRAF could share portions of country assessments that are safe to make more widely public.

DRF/DRAF are valued for their capacity to amplify DPO voices and bring DPO perspectives into global conversations. There may be ways to do this more systematically by setting up more channels and processes for sharing DPO experiences more broadly, for example, by producing and sharing more guides and videos describing successful models or by creating even more opportunities for DPOs to share their experiences nationally, regionally, and globally.

At a national level, national governments and national-level partners, such as international NGO representatives and donor country offices, are eager to work more directly with DRF/DRAF. More direct relationships could allow for stronger partnerships, as long as they are designed to protect the rights of persons with disabilities.

3. **Further increase the efficiency and effectiveness of DRF/DRAF’s activities, by revisiting systems and processes.** As DRF/DRAF grow in size and complexity, DRF/DRAF need to
continue revisiting their systems and processes to ensure their efficiency and effectiveness.

4. **Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s movement building approaches.** DRF/DRAF are recognized for their work helping national disability movements grow stronger and more diverse. Long country engagements are required to help these movements become sustainable. During country engagements, DRF/DRAF should continue to help movements gain greater cohesion, integrate more marginalized groups as core members, develop their leadership pipelines, and seek out strategic allies and cross-movement partnerships. Through the accompaniment that the program officers provide, program officers could focus more deeply on helping movement members build trust with each other and come to understand and appreciate different perspectives.

5. **Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s approaches to helping DPOs strengthen their capacity.** DPOs are grateful for the support they receive from DRF/DRAF to strengthen their advocacy capacity. Government officials, other donors, and partners recognize the difference this support makes. As more stakeholders become interested in the human rights of persons with disabilities, and as they increasingly see DPOs as good partners, more will be asked of them. With this in mind, DRF/DRAF may want to reflect on the capacity building support they offer. To meet more DPO capacity building needs, such as those related to organizational development, program officers may want to partner more intentionally with national-level organizations that offer those services.

DRF/DRAF may want to invest even more time and effort in equipping DPOs representing marginalized disability groups, since in many contexts, their representation is still perceived as token and their participation is not at decision-making levels.

DRF/DRAF should continue to help the DPOs they support mobilize other DPOs at a community level, where very few persons with disabilities are aware of their rights as outlined in the CRPD.

In contexts where change is happening slowly, it would be helpful to clarify the focus of grantee technical assistance. For example, in those settings, DRF/DRAF may want to focus on awareness raising to help address stigma.

To further promote DPO learning, DRF/DRAF may want to expand the learning opportunities they support, including by setting up and participating in more national, regional, and global WhatsApp groups and by providing grantees with access to more technical assistance providers with a range of technical expertise. DRF/DRAF’s quarterly e-newsletter is valued and should continue.
6. **Seek out more ways to mainstream marginalized DPOs.** DRF/DRAF are recognized for their intentionality around reaching and including more marginalized DPOs in national disability movements. DRF/DRAF may want to continue to work closely with national disability movements to help them not only include representatives of marginalized groups, but also mainstream them in their governance and promote their acceptance within the movements. In addition, DRF/DRAF may want to document, monitor, and share inclusion practices among grantees, especially with and among umbrella groups. Finally, DRF/DRAF could focus more resources on reaching remote areas. DRF/DRAF could do this directly, or they could provide even more support to larger DPOs’ efforts to reach smaller DPOs in these areas.

7. **Further articulate DRF/DRAF’s programmatic sequencing and exit strategy.** DRF/DRAF currently commit to at least six years in each target country and work in two-year cycles to develop, assess and revise country strategies. DRF/DRAF may want to articulate the logic of this timeframe and sequencing, so that it is clear how their strategy addresses the current context, and when, why, and how DRF/DRAF will exit a country. DRF/DRAF may want to rethink how they remain engaged with national movements and DPOs with which they have built relationships even after they are no longer present in country, as a part of the strategy for sustainable social change. This could be via continued participation in WhatsApp groups and periodic sharing of e-newsletters, or other methods.
DRAF/DRF Management Response

Introduction

This independent evaluation of the global Disability Rights Fund/Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (DRF/DRAF) work provides valuable strategic information that will help the organizations’ staff and Boards continue to improve upon more than a decade of participatory grantmaking towards advancing the rights of persons with disabilities. The findings of the global evaluation offer evidence of how persons with disabilities can effectively and efficiently advocate for their rights and provide new perspectives about our practices and intended results. Interestingly, the evaluation has confirmed many ongoing internal discussions about how to continue to strengthen our processes with the aim of easing administrative burdens for DPOs, increasing shared learning practices externally, and increasing staff capacity to engage more with disability movements in our target countries and at the global level.

We wish to acknowledge and appreciate the time and input of the DPOs that contributed to this evaluation with their insights and whose achievements are reflected in the evaluation’s findings. We would also like to thank the BLE Solutions evaluation team for the generous time, expertise and guidance they dedicated to this evaluation. We also wish to thank our Evaluation Advisory Board, a temporary representative body of evaluation experts, DPO staff, grantees, and donors, for the strategic advice they provided from the evaluation design to the report finalization process. The Evaluation Advisory Board included Ola Abu Al Ghaib, Director, United Nations Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; Mika Kontiainen, Director of Disability Section, Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT); Zsuzsanna Luppai, Associate Director for Program Development, Human Rights Program, Open Society Foundations; Setareki S. Macanawai, Chief Executive Officer, Pacific Disability Forum; Myroslava Tataryn, Disability Rights Program Officer, Wellspring Philanthropic Fund; and previously Cynthia Lokanata, Disability Section, DFAT and Daryl Lloyd, Statistics & Results Adviser, Disability Inclusion Team, United Kingdom Department for International Development.

We also acknowledge that this Management Response was written during the height of the COVID-19 global pandemic. The pandemic has already had a serious impact on activities of the Disability Rights Fund and the Disability Rights Advocacy Fund and on those of our grantees, and this is only likely to increase. Many global, regional, and national meetings have been cancelled or delayed until at least late 2020 or 2021. Our offices and those of our grantees have been closed. While everyone is doing their best to work remotely, this is more difficult for DRF/DRAF grantees, many of whom have no internet connection or computer at home. DRF/DRAF Program
Officers maintain regular communication with grantees primarily over smart phone and social media.

As a follow-up on our commitment to transparency and to ensure advancement of a broad understanding of disability rights advocacy, we are publishing the full report on our website and providing a document on lessons learned specifically for grantees to utilize in their advocacy and organizational development. In addition, the evaluation executive summary and the summary for grantees will be translated into Easy to Read, Bahasa Indonesia, Burmese, and French.

Management’s Views on Recommendations

Management concurs with the overall evaluation findings and recommendations and will undertake actions to address issues raised as appropriate and as organizational capacity allows. Specific responses to recommendations are given below and were written in Spring 2020 within the context of the COVID-19 global pandemic.

**Recommendation 1: Further increase staff numbers and modify DRF/DRAF’s organizational structure and fundraising to support them**

*Agree*

Prior to the COVID-19 global pandemic, DRF/DRAF envisioned and began to implement plans toward an expanded team to diversify funding sources and further develop efficiencies within the staffing structure. This expansion included the formation of a Development Team in 2018 and the increase of administrative and program staff from 2018 to 2020 with the hiring of a Deputy Director, 8 new Program Team members including a Regional Head of Programs for Africa position, and 2 critical administrative team members. The result has been a 100% increase in the team that has resulted in a corresponding increase in DRF/DRAF’s presence on the ground in target countries, a decentralization of supervision, and a more equally distributed workload among the staff. In addition, DRAF/DRF developed a Delegation Schedule in 2019, which speaks to delegation of decision-making and is now being integrated into new Finance and Administration Manuals, and an updated DRAF/DRF procurement policy.

In the future, DRF/DRAF plans to hire for a number of open and aspirational positions, particularly in regard to increased commmunications capacity to better share knowledge and best practices and complement fundraising efforts, when it is prudent and will not negatively bear upon funds available for grantmaking. Growth and expanded engagement with DPOs are
integral to the trajectory that the DRF/DRAF Board and Management have set for the organization, and the organization recognizes the value of a clear communications strategy for our internal staff and key partners. Internally we have seen that when vision is clearly outlined in a guidance document, such as the Pathway to Change, DRAF/DRF Gender Guidelines or Technical Assistance Strategy, our milestones towards those outlined objectives are consistently achieved. We will continue working practically toward this vision of expansion. We agree that DRF/DRAF’s continued growth can only be a benefit for the disability movement. With the economic effects of the COVID-19 global pandemic still unknown at this time, we acknowledge that the timetable for staff growth will shift, but we have our eyes on this goal.

**Recommendation 2: Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s role within the global movement to promote the human rights of persons with disabilities: develop a global influencing strategy**

*Agree*

Internal conversations around the development of a global influencing strategy to explicitly detail implementation of one of the three main strategies outlined in DRF/DRAF’s Strategic Plan, namely advocacy (the other two strategies being grantmaking and technical assistance), began among the staff in June 2019, as this evaluation started. Having seen the positive impact of explicit guidelines and strategies in the past^4^, DRF/DRAF staff proposed and received approval from the board in November 2019 to develop an advocacy strategy during the timeframe of the organizations’ next, revised Strategic Plan (2021-23). Staff positions have been proposed to support implementation of an advocacy strategy, which would include an advocacy lead as well as a dedicated Communications Team to support the sharing of lessons learned to a variety of audiences beyond current donors and grantees.

As confirmed in multiple independent evaluations, including this one, and lessons learned that are coming out of our COVID-19 response, DRF/DRAF is uniquely positioned to amplify the voices of persons with disabilities at global and regional levels, in addition to national levels. With program staff on the ground in our target countries, DRF/DRAF staff have a direct line to what persons with disabilities are experiencing, their needs, their strategies to realize their rights, and their success stories. For example, the Program Team quickly responded to COVID-19 impacts,

^4^ When DRF/DRAF makes its strategies explicit through guiding documents, such as its Technical Assistance Strategy, Gender Guidelines, or Grantmaking Guidelines, milestone targets for related logframe indicators are consistently achieved.
reviewing the more than 200 active projects in a matter of weeks in order to incorporate requested project changes for DPO-led advocacy messages and efforts related to COVID-19. Program officers and DPOs have been able to see how quickly their stories and information can be highlighted on a global platform through DRF/DRAF and our critical partners (like DFID and DFAT), for instance during a recent webinar on advancement of the SDGs, hosted by DRF/DRAF and featuring a number of our donors for the Skoll World Forum.

**Recommendation 3: Further increase the efficiency and effectiveness of DRF/DRAF’s activities, by revisiting systems and processes.**

_Agree_

This recommendation refers to both grantmaking processes and programmatic engagement with DPOs and grantees as well as operational processes.

In regard to the former, DRF/DRAF began a grantmaking overhaul in early 2019. An external consultant worked with staff with deep knowledge of DRF/DRAF grantmaking to complete an assessment that included a review of relevant grantmaking documents, meetings with the DRF/DRAF Grantmaking Committee, and individual interviews with 14 staff members using a standard interview protocol with 17 questions. A total of 788 comments were recorded and analyzed to provide a set of recommendations on where DRF/DRAF might make improvements in the future. Our Program Director will join our Director of Grants Management and Finance Director in leading the next steps in this important effort toward more streamlined procedures for our grantmaking, with input from all involved in the process.

While the organization has been undergoing the grantmaking overhaul assessment and is developing an implementation plan based on resulting recommendations, the DRF/DRAF Program Team continues to work toward improved engagement with newly emergent and small DPOs to support them through what may be the first grant application process they have engaged in. This includes the piloting of an Eligibility Survey for new applicants, which has been proven to be effective. In the Round 1 2020 grantmaking round, there were 150 survey responses and only approximately 10% of respondents submitted a full application. The survey clearly helped many prospective applicants save time by clarifying that their proposed projects and/or organizational structure would not meet basic eligibility for DRF/DRAF funding.

In addition, DRF/DRAF has piloted Easy to Read versions of the documents that are provided to the Grantmaking Committee to inform their decisions on grant recommendations. We are also aiming to make more of our grantmaking materials accessible to grantees, in addition to
documents that are currently available in multiple languages (Bahasa Indonesia, Burmese, and French). Revisions to the grantees oversight process are underway to provide DRF/DRAF Program Officers and grantees with consolidated information that will facilitate monitoring and reporting.

Overall, DRF/DRAF does align its budget to its Strategic Plan and will continue to further examine what broad activities are needed to achieve the goals outlined in the Strategic Plan in any particular year. This analysis will help to create a budget that can be more easily tied to the overall activities in the Strategic Plan, which can also help to track progress over time and allow the organization to pivot to address urgent needs. DRF/DRAF will also explore how to better connect higher level goals in the Strategic Plan to the organizational work plan, which operationalizes annual goals for each team. By doing so, staff will have a better sense of how their work relates to the Strategic Plan. As staff become more familiar with this, they will also better understand how the DRF/DRAF budget directly affects their work and vice versa, which will allow for more effective planning. Over the last couple of years, staff have been more involved in creating the annual budget, and we will continue this engagement to ensure an efficient and effective flow of information throughout the planning process.

**Recommendation 4: Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s movement building approaches.**

*Agree*

The DRF/DRAF Grantee Convenings have provided a legitimizing space for smaller, emergent, more marginalized DPOs within the mainstream disability movement. While the recognition of diversity within the disability community takes time, we have seen marginalized persons with disabilities gain official government recognition as specific impairment groups and even gain seats on national umbrella DPO boards. Additionally, support from donors has allowed for targeted movement building activities. This includes funding from DFAT for the piloting of specific convenings of marginalized persons with disabilities to gain confidence in their advocacy skills and knowledge and to formulate specific strategies for outreach to other human rights movements, as well as anonymous donor support for targeted capacity development of emergent DPOs and self-help groups that have added to the diversification of the movement in Uganda. While this report was being written, a new WhatsApp group for grantees in Uganda was formed, and the exchange during the COVID-19 global pandemic has been particularly beneficial to the DPOs, as they learn from one another’s advocacy efforts and develop collective actions that include marginalized groups.
**Recommendation 5: Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s approaches to helping DPOs strengthen their capacity.**

*Partially agree*

At its inception, with the input of persons with disabilities on its Board and Global Advisory Panel, DRF/DRAF made a strategic decision to invest its limited resources on capacity building in advocacy and rights knowledge rather than general managerial, financial, or fundraising capacity. Accordingly, DRF/DRAF developed a Technical Assistance strategy aimed at increasing the rights advocacy capacity of grantees in specific areas based on a strengths assessment. The organization holds itself accountable for these investments and this goal through specific indicators in the DRF/DRAF logical framework. Program Officers are hired in part based on their advocacy expertise, skills, and knowledge, which is a different skill set from organizational capacity building.

Nonetheless, recognizing the need for organizational support, DRF/DRAF Program Officers provide indirect support as part of their oversight of and support to grantees. While this report was being written a new WhatsApp group for grantees in Uganda was formed, and the exchange during the COVID-19 global pandemic with DRF/DRAF staff has been particularly beneficial to the DPOs. Additionally, DRF/DRAF began a pilot in 2020 to research civil society actors at a national level whose mission includes organizational capacity development, particularly regarding safeguarding, financial management, and budget oversight.

In regards to grantee monitoring and learning and contributing to the limited body of knowledge on how disability rights are achieved, as mentioned above, DRF/DRAF is committed to increasing lessons learned both for broader development and human rights funders and among those within the disability movement. For example, relevant findings from this independent evaluation and the concurrent independent evaluation on DRF/DRAF contributions to the disability movement in the Pacific are being condensed into a document aimed for DPO use to enhance their advocacy. The document will be translated into an Easy to Read version and multiple languages (Bahasa Indonesia, Burmese, and French) based on the national languages of DRF/DRAF target countries.
**Recommendation 6: Seek out more ways to mainstream marginalized DPOs.**

*Agree*

DRF/DRAF are committed to continuing partnership with DPOs representing marginalized groups of persons with disabilities, particularly since we are some of the few donors to make grants to ‘high risk,’ newly emergent organizations. Additionally, DRF/DRAF continue to direct support to women with disabilities through the implementation of the organizations’ Gender Guidelines. Already in numerous target countries, DRF/DRAF grantees are gaining more legitimacy and voice in other human rights movements, such as the women’s rights movements and Indigenous Peoples’ rights movements.

We know there are many other movements that intersect with the rights of persons with disabilities and need to become more inclusive. We also acknowledge that the mainstreaming of disability rights within human rights movements requires response and outreach from other rights advocates, civil society, donors, and government officials.

Within the disability movement, DRF/DRAF will continue the work with national umbrella DPOs in target countries to provide one-on-one grantee oversight and input into the complicated roles national umbrella DPOs play in both building up the movement and galvanizing a united front for persons with disabilities.

**Recommendation 7: Articulate DRF/DRAF’s programmatic sequencing and exit strategy.**

*Agree*

In the early years of DRF/DRAF’s history, country engagement was conceptualized as three 2-year stages of investment for a total of 6-years of country engagement. With a much longer history of effectiveness and advocacy achievements, DRF/DRAF is poised to continue its growth and needs to revisit this 6-year commitment to assess longer stages of engagement. More than a decade of presence in target countries such as Indonesia, the Pacific, and Uganda have shown that effective partnership with grassroots DPOs does require longer-term commitments.

In November 2012, DRF/DRAF developed a comprehensive exit strategy to guide its departure from countries. DRF/DRAF reexamine this exit strategy as needed and continue to engage with other development partners to make investments in DPOs as a part of their mission. New four-year commitments from DFID and DFAT will be incorporated into these decisions.
As a pooled fund, these decisions depend in part on the reliability of funding for longer-term commitments to disability movements in target countries and engagement with the disability movement in countries that have been exited.

**DRAF/DRF Commitment**

The staff and Board of DRAF/DRF are fully committed to our mission and to our partners and the mutual learning that is critical to sustain all efforts to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities. Accordingly, we will continue to be open and responsive to adapt to new opportunities, improve our practices, and respond to the needs of our grantees.

We commit to adjusting as appropriate and possible the processes and country-level strategies that DPOs, national governments, and other stakeholders raised through this evaluation. To hold ourselves accountable to the DPOs that participated in this evaluation and provided their input and insights, relevant staff at DRF/DRAF will conduct a bi-annual reflection process on the uptake of relevant recommendations and will inform relevant partners of progress in these areas as requested.
I. Introduction

This evaluation examines the Disability Rights Fund’s and the Disability Rights Advocacy Fund’s (DRF/DRAF’s) global work between 2017 – 2019. It begins with an overview of DRF/DRAF and the evaluation, with the latter covering the evaluation purpose and objectives, methodology and limitations. It then presents the evaluation’s findings organized according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Development Assistance Committee’s (OECD DAC’s) traditional evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and efficiency. The evaluation also examines the effectiveness of DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach, as well as value for money (VfM), in accordance with the DFID VfM definition. The evaluation conclusion is followed by recommendations that DRF/DRAF may want to consider to further increase effectiveness.

II. DRF/DRAF Overview

DRF/DRAF were launched in 2008. According to their websites,\(^5\) the Funds are “a grantmaking collaborative between donors and the global disability rights community that empowers persons with disabilities to advocate for equal rights and full participation in society. Through grantmaking, advocacy, and technical assistance, [they] support Disabled Persons Organizations (DPOs) to use global rights and development frameworks, such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs),” to promote and protect the rights of all persons with disabilities.

III. Evaluation Overview

A. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this evaluation was to help DRF/DRAF and its key stakeholders, including its donors, learn from the Funds’ work over the past three years (2017-2019) to inform any needed course correction and to more broadly share achievements and lessons learned.

The objectives for the evaluation, according to the terms of reference, are as follows:

- Provide an update on progress made towards the achievement of output and outcome-level results in DRF/DRAF’s logical framework;
- Identify DRF/DRAF’s contributions to results achieved by paying special attention to: i) capturing the mechanisms that have brought about reported changes and the assumptions behind them, particularly strategies that were the most effective and causal

\(^5\) See http://disabilityrightsfund.org/about/ and http://drafund.org/about/
linkages between DRAF/DRF’s contributions and results achieved; and ii) capturing DRF/DRAF’s specific contributions to building diverse disability movements in target countries;

- Make an overall assessment of DRF/DRAF’s value for money;
- Identify internal and external (to DRF/DRAF) factors affecting performance, at both the programmatic and organizational levels;
- Review how DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach contributes to achievements;
- Provide DRF/DRAF staff with a clear set of recommendations to improve current interventions and guide future ones.

B. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team, led by BLE Solutions, included senior-level national evaluators in each of the five sample countries, as well as two senior-level evaluators based in the United States. Of particular relevance to this evaluation, were their expertise in the following areas:

- Advocacy evaluation, examining advocacy work at local, sub-national, national, and global levels;
  - Evaluation of disability rights advocacy, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa;
- Participatory evaluation methods;
- Evaluation of social movement building; and
- Using qualitative methods, such as contribution analysis, to assess the impact of advocacy efforts.

C. Evaluation Methodology and Limitations

To undertake this global evaluation, DRF/DRAF asked BLE Solutions to focus on a sample of five DRF/DRAF countries. These included two countries that DRF/DRAF are currently exiting: Bangladesh and Ghana; two countries in which DRF/DRAF continue to be engaged: Indonesia and Uganda; and one country in which DRF/DRAF have recently begun to operate: Nigeria. The evaluation covers the time period 2017-2019.

1. Evaluation methodology

To gather information for the evaluation, the evaluation team reviewed documents and conducted individual and group interviews.

---

6 For more information about BLE Solutions, please see www.blesolutions.com.
a) Document review

The evaluation team reviewed organizational, strategic, program, and grant documents to better understand the relevance of DRF’s/DRAF’s activities, how they contribute to the composition of the disability movement and grantee activities, their efficiency in doing so, and the value for money achieved; the effectiveness and impact of DRF’s/DRAF’s efforts and the grantees’ and movements’ activities, as seen in their participation in processes towards and influence on legislative, policy, and government program changes, as well as in their participation in human rights reporting and reporting on disability-inclusive development through SDGs reporting; and the sustainability of the changes to which they have contributed.

b) Individual and group interviews

The evaluation team conducted individual and group interviews globally and within the five focus countries. Interviewees included DRF/DRAF staff, disabled persons organizations (DPOs) which are DRF/DRAF grantees, government officials, other donors, and other development partners.

The evaluation team worked closely with DRF/DRAF to develop purposive samples of interviewees. These interviewees were very familiar with DRF/DRAF’s work and could offer different perspectives on it. Many came from the disability community. Grantees included in the sample were broadly representative of the diverse disability community. The evaluation team and DRF/DRAF felt that this mix of interviewees could provide well triangulated information about DRF/DRAF and their performance.

The evaluation team interviewed a total of 85 people. Interview samples were as follows:

- **Global**: The evaluation team interviewed 20 respondents, including eight DRF/DRAF staff and board members and 12 respondents representing five donor and two partner organizations, as well as two Grantmaking Committee members.
- **Bangladesh**: The evaluation team interviewed nine respondents, including two DRF/DRAF staff members and seven grantee DPOs.
- **Ghana**: The evaluation team interviewed nine respondents, including two DRF/DRAF staff members, five respondents representing four grantee DPOs, and two government officials.
- **Indonesia**: The evaluation team interviewed 11 respondents, including one DRF/DRAF staff member, seven grantee DPOs, one government official, and two partner organizations.
- **Nigeria**: The evaluation team interviewed 9 respondents, including one DRF/DRAF staff member, five grantee DPOs, one government official, and two donor or partner organizations.
• **Uganda**: The evaluation team interviewed 27 respondents, including two DRF/DRAF staff members, 17 grantee DPOs, two national-level and three district-level government officials, one district-level politician, one representative of a partner organization, and one private sector representative.

2. **Data analysis approaches**

a) **Contribution analysis**

To better understand the degree to which grantees have contributed to changes in legislation, policy, and government programs, the evaluation team used contribution analysis. Working with the Evaluation Advisory Board, the evaluation team selected two results to which DRF/DRAF believe their grantees have notably contributed. These were achieved in Indonesia and Uganda. The evaluation team used the following steps to test grantee contribution and causal linkages:

- Reviewed relevant grantee documents;
- Interviewed relevant grantees to understand their theory of change or how they believe the result came about, mapping their contribution to it;
- Interviewed ally organizations and policy makers to test the grantees’ perceptions and test alternative explanations;
- Reviewed relevant external documents; and
- Analyzed the information collected and drafted contribution analysis stories for the grantees’ review prior to finalization.

b) **Value for money**

To assess the efficiency, effectiveness, and equity of DRF/DRAF’s investments, the evaluation team used the U.K. Department for International Development’s (DFID’s) most recent value for money (VFM) assessment guidance. The evaluation team’s approach involved document and data review and interviews with staff, grantees, and other relevant stakeholders.

---


8 See DFID’s *Approach to Value for Money*, Finance and Performance Department, Department for International Development, June 2019.
3. Limitations

The evaluation faced the following limitations:

• **Most of the sample countries did not have program officers who were very knowledgeable about DRF/DRAF’s work in those countries between 2017-2019.** In Bangladesh and Ghana, which DRF/DRAF are exiting, DRF/DRAF no longer have program officers. In Uganda, the program officer and her assistant were relatively new to their positions. The same was true in Nigeria, which was a new target country for DRF/DRAF. To compensate for this, the evaluation team also interviewed a range of global staff related to DRF/DRAF’s work in these countries.

• **The evaluation team was limited in the number of grantee organizations, government officials, other donors, and partner organizations it could interview per country.** Budget constraints limited the evaluation team’s interview sample size per country. To compensate for this, the evaluation team worked closely with DRF/DRAF to ensure that the sample of interviewees it selected per country could provide a broad perspective on DRF/DRAF’s work.

• **The evaluation team was limited in the travel it could do in country.** Budget constraints caused the evaluation team to focus its travel in just a few countries, and even in these countries, the team’s travel was limited. To compensate for this, the team also conducted some telephone interviews.

• **The evaluation team had some concerns that there was positive bias in grantees’ responses to some of their questions.** This was especially noted in grantees’ very positive responses to evaluators’ questions about DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking processes, since at least one interviewee among DRF/DRAF staff and board members reported that grantees raised concerns about these processes when talking with staff. It is possible that grantees felt their positive responses to the evaluation team were required to not jeopardize future DRF/DRAF financial support. With this possibility in mind, the evaluation team ensured a balance in their reporting on the strengths of these processes, as well as where there might be room for improvement.

• **Logframe indicator data were not consistently available.** DRF/DRAF staff record their logframe indicator data on a regular basis. However, because DRF/DRAF exited Bangladesh and Ghana, some data are missing for those countries. In addition, DRF/DRAF recently entered Nigeria, as a result of which some data have not yet been collected there. The evaluation team validated the available data.
IV. Findings and Discussion

A. Relevance

The evaluation examined DRF/DRAF’s relevance in two ways: the degree to which DRF/DRAF’s logframe outcome and outputs are relevant to and aligned with the priorities of other key stakeholders; and the degree to which DRF/DRAF’s learning is relevant to other key stakeholders.

1. DRF/DRAF’s logframe outcome and outputs are largely relevant to and aligned with the priorities of donors, persons with disabilities, and DRF/DRAF’s grantees.

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) had a great influence on DRF/DRAF’s goals and logframe, since, as reported by DRF/DRAF, “the Disability Rights Fund was conceptualized as a response to the window of opportunity opened by [it].”

Given this history and because DRF/DRAF were early donors to the disability movement, DRF/DRAF have influenced other donors’ and partners’ agendas.

At the same time, DRF/DRAF’s outcome and outputs have been influenced by donors, partners, grantees, and persons with disabilities. Donors and DPOs have provided input into DRF/DRAF’s logframe design, which has evolved every three years, based on donor funding cycles and DRF/DRAF’s learning cycles. A DRF/DRAF staff member noted that persons with disabilities helped DRF/DRAF create their original framework and monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) framework. A DRF/DRAF board member also described the creation of DRF/DRAF’s outcomes and outputs as “very reflective of the community’s goals,” in part as a result of drawing DRF/DRAF’s program officers from among activists who promote the human rights of persons with disabilities in DRF/DRAF’s target countries.

**DRF/DRAF, their donors, and partners are seen to share a number of goals**, according to donors and partners. All seek to protect and promote human rights, including of persons with disabilities, as well as disability-inclusive development. More specifically, their goals include the following:

---


10 Partners include other organizations that work to advance the human rights of persons with disabilities either globally or at a national level.

11 These have included the U.K. Department for International Development (DFID), Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), Wellspring Philanthropic Fund (Wellspring), and Open Society Foundations (OSF), among others.
• Making sure that people with disabilities are enabled to advocate for their rights at the highest levels (*Nothing about us without us*);
• Helping DPOs increase their advocacy capacity, so that they can better speak for themselves and negotiate directly at national and international levels;
• Strengthening disability movements, including by helping them increase their inclusivity;
• Encouraging the implementation of CRPD commitments at national levels, with leverage from global treaty body mechanisms; and
• Supporting persons with disabilities to engage fully in society and enjoy their full rights.

**DRF/DRAF’s country strategies and objectives are similarly seen to align with those of national disability movements, grantees, host governments, and country-level donors and partners.**

According to all or almost all DPOs, government officials, and partners interviewed in each focus country for this report, country strategies are aligned in their prioritization of the CRPD’s ratification and implementation. The government of Indonesia described DRF/DRAF and the DPOs they support as “*very serious in improving the lives of persons with disabilities in Indonesia*” and “*committed to getting the disability law passed in the legislature.*” Some governments also saw alignment in their shared commitment to empowering DPOs to have a stronger voice in shaping the policies that affect them.

All grantees, like DRF/DRAF, seek to improve inclusiveness and create space for persons with disabilities to speak out on access to justice and other rights. Many grantees, especially at the national level, also saw alignment in their shared desire to strengthen national disability movements and the capacities of smaller DPOs. In Bangladesh, DPOs involved in the national disability movement believed that this alignment has helped the movement gain momentum and confidence in its support for persons with disabilities.

**One key difference in objectives observed by DPOs in Uganda was that the national disability movement and some DPOs also promote improved livelihoods as a core objective, and DRF/DRAF, which is strictly an advocacy funder, does not, although it does support advocacy for employment rights for persons with disabilities.** One grantee observed that “*It is difficult to advocate if you are poor.*”

As more governments, donors, and other organizations focus on the human rights of persons with disabilities, largely aligned with DRF/DRAF’s goals, there is some concern about role clarity, duplication of efforts, and potential competition, as well as DPO absorption capacity, according to some staff, board members, donors, and partners. Addressing this potential conflict, and

---

12 The sample of countries selected for this evaluation included Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Uganda.
defining DRF/DRAF’s unique strengths and value add, could help lay a stronger foundation for collaboration within funding for the promotion of the human rights of persons with disabilities going forward.

2. When articulating DRF/DRAF’s relevance within the global movement for promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities, staff, board members, donors, and partners felt that DRF/DRAF are more than simply a funder.

They described DRF/DRAF as a leader in the movement for promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities, a risk taker, a thought leader, a connector, an amplifier of DPO voices, and a convener that brings DPOs together and helps to broaden and strengthen movements.

DRF/DRAF are seen as leaders and risk takers within the larger context of funders, international NGOs, DPOs, and movement activists. DRF/DRAF were the first foundation to have a unique focus on the CRPD and to support DPOs in their desire to work on the rights outlined in the CRPD. They are also one of the only donors to work with small and nascent DPOs, often representing the most marginalized groups of persons with disabilities, and, in many cases as their first funders, paving the way for these DPOs to receive future funding from others.

Donors and partners commented on their appreciation of DRF/DRAF as thought leaders, experts in the promotion of the human rights of persons with disabilities, and as supporters of other organizations’ learning on the human rights of persons with disabilities. With their deep expertise in promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities at global and grassroots levels, donors and partners stated that DRF/DRAF have insights that are unique. A couple noted DRF/DRAF’s global reach, efforts to harmonize SDGs and the CRPD, focus on inequalities at the global level, and contribution to understanding and addressing intersectionality. DRF/DRAF bring grassroots and national knowledge into global conversations through their and their grantees’ participation in conferences and meetings, as well as through the documents and reports that they produce and share. More than one donor or partner cited a desire for DRF/DRAF to ‘lean in’ to this role more, to focus strategic attention on their role as thought leader and expert. Donors particularly value the country assessments that DRF/DRAF share, noting that they have no other source for this information. At least one shares it with their mission offices, which then use it to inform their decision making at national levels.

As a connector, DRF/DRAF are seen to educate DPOs and national movements about global processes and help connect DPOs with other global stakeholders who promote the human rights of persons with disabilities. Many appreciated how DRF/DRAF’s support helps DPOs understand and navigate the U.N. system and helps movements get stronger and improve their capacity to speak for themselves. One partner commented that DRF/DRAF has a unique role in opening doors for DPOs, introducing grantees to new donors. A few valued how DRF/DRAF facilitate
donor and partner contact with grassroots groups and help them implement their disability-focused investments.

**In bringing DPOs together at a national level for grantee convenings, DRF/DRAF are seen as a convenor and amplifier.** The convenings offer DPOs – local and national, more and less established – an opportunity to strengthen their capacities, build ties among themselves, and make connections with government officials and other donors. DRF/DRAF also work with national umbrella organizations to broaden their membership to include more marginalized groups. In the case of Uganda, DPOs representing more marginalized groups such as little people, persons with cerebral palsy, people with intellectual disabilities, people with psychosocial disabilities, or people with albinism have joined the movement since DRF/DRAF have been supporting them. Partners and donors also commented on DRF/DRAF’s role in supporting cross-movement collaboration, and welcomed the opportunity to connect with organizations interested in both women’s rights and the human rights of persons with disabilities.

A few partners would like to have stronger partnerships with DRF/DRAF and to work more closely together at a global and country level. At least one donor or partner wondered if DRF/DRAF should consider having a presence in Washington, D.C. to better position itself to influence the World Bank and other Washington, D.C.-based actors.

**To further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s roles as constructive partners, national government representatives from a number of countries would like DRF/DRAF to communicate more directly with them.** They appreciate the support that DRF/DRAF provide to DPOs and the resulting good work the DPOs do in their countries. However, they would like to have conversations with DRF/DRAF about their vision, the focus of their work, and their plans for supporting the national disability movements and individual DPOs.

3. **DRF/DRAF share their learning with others, although it could be done more often and more systematically, especially among DPOs and movement stakeholders.**

**At a global level, DRF/DRAF most often share their learning with donor networks, such as the Human Rights Funders Network (HRFN), and at events such as the annual Conference of States Parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (COSP), according to staff and board members.** DRF/DRAF also share their learning via their website, social media, and a quarterly newsletter. DRF/DRAF staff believe that, by sharing their learning at a global level, they are encouraging other donors and partners to make changes to how they approach the human rights of persons with disabilities. They perceive that, as a result of their sharing, other donors are thinking more about persons with disabilities, shifting their language and processes related
to them, and taking on more participatory approaches. They also believe they are influencing how partners think about measuring their results.

**Most donors and partners report that DRF/DRAF have shared learning from their work or the work of the DPOs they support with them,** and all greatly value what they have learned, especially related to approaches for participatory and inclusive grantmaking, and the rich, detailed country-level reports, which allow them to broker relationships and build their own strategies in DRF/DRAF target countries.

**Some would like DRF/DRAF to have a more systematic influencing strategy in how they share learning, so that DRF/DRAF can contribute more to shaping the field of actors dedicated to promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities.** Some donors and partners suggested that DRF/DRAF could act more as a thought leader and share specific lessons in how to undertake thoughtful and supportive grantmaking with DPOs. These donors were concerned that, as more funding for the human rights of persons with disabilities becomes available, and more organizations – donors and international NGOs – become active in supporting DPOs, DRF/DRAF lessons need to be documented and shared. One donor felt that “DRF/DRAF... don’t share their lessons broadly with others, and there are so many lessons to share! DRF should share more lessons about how to increase capacities of DPOs. I don’t think [DRAF/DRF] see themselves as a resource for others.” A few suggested that DRF/DRAF could consider ways to share portions of their country assessments that were safe to make more widely public, as rich contributions to the field.

**At a country level, DRF/DRAF share their learning with grantees through a variety of means.** They share learning at grantee convenings, during field visits, and through platforms, such as Facebook groups and WhatsApp. They also share learning with grantees, other DPOs, and partner organizations at meetings and workshops in country or elsewhere. At least one staff member mentioned facilitating sharing among DPOs.

All DPOs valued learning from DRF/DRAF and each other at convenings and workshops. They stated that convenings helped them strengthen their advocacy capacity and programs and improve their funding proposals. As a result of what they learned, they could apply lessons from other organizations and even other countries to their own work. Partners appreciated learning via their direct communications with DRF/DRAF program officers, as well as via DRF/DRAF’s website.

**Most DPOs interviewed requested DRF/DRAF consider additional mechanisms for connectivity to DRF/DRAF and other DPOs nationally and globally.** According to one DPO, “We also need to have direct relationships with counterparts in other countries for direct sharing and learning. Currently the learning process and events are mediated by DRF/DRAF through the grantmaking processes, convenings, and other DRF/DRAF-led processes.” In the view of another DPO, since most
“convenings are currently restricted to only DPOs in [a particular country], [DRF/DRAF] could bring in some from outside [the country through] periodic calls.” DRF/DRAF have held joint convenings for Rwanda and Uganda and also for Pacific Island Countries. DPOs in other countries would like to benefit from similar opportunities.

B. Effectiveness

The evaluation assessed DRF/DRAF’s effectiveness as evidenced in the progress they have made toward achieving their logframe outcome and outputs.

1. DRF/DRAF have made significant progress towards the achievement of their output-level milestones and outcome indicators in their logframe.

DRF/DRAF’s outputs are related to:

- Changes in legislation, policy, and government programs, including those addressing the SDGs, to harmonize with the CRPD in target countries, through the participation and influence of representative organizations of persons with disabilities (Output 1);
- The participation of representative disabled persons’ organizations (DPOs) from target countries in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes (Output 2);
- The increased inclusiveness of the disability movement in target countries, reflecting the diverse voices of persons with disabilities (Output 3); and
- The increased capacity of DRF/DRAF grantees to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities (Output 4).

Making progress along these lines is helping to achieve DRF/DRAF’s outcome of improving the rights of persons with disabilities, including the right to development, in target countries in accordance with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). As reported below, DRF/DRAF are progressing toward achieving their outcome indicator annual milestones and 2020 targets, although it is too soon to see evidence of progress on the indicators in Nigeria, where DRF/DRAF recently began to work.

Indicators

- Four out of five target countries have formal participation of persons with disabilities in government mechanisms for implementing and monitoring the CRPD.
- Four out of five target countries have formal participation of persons with disabilities in government and/or civil society mechanisms for implementing and monitoring the SDG mechanisms.
- All target countries have made national legislative or policy changes addressing rights and inclusion of persons with disabilities that were secured with grantee input.
a) DPOs have influenced key changes in national and local-level legislation, policy, and government programs since 2017 with support from DRF/DRAF.

While DRF/DRAF grantees, staff, and board members are very aware of these changes, donors and partners are less aware of them. DRF/DRAF staff and board members speak most frequently about changes that have taken place in Indonesia and then Uganda, with far fewer citing examples in other countries. DRF/DRAF may want to build a communications strategy to address this.

The evaluation team reviewed DRF/DRAF’s relevant logframe indicator data for the five sample countries and verified their claimed achievements. These indicators covered DRF/DRAF grantee input to local and national-level legislation, policies, and government programs in target countries between 2017-2019. DRF/DRAF have met or nearly met all indicators in this area for these countries over this time period.

At national levels, grantees reported influencing legislation and also regulations aimed at implementing that legislation. Between 2017-2019, they influenced passage or amendment of their countries’ national laws to promote the human rights of persons with disabilities and/or the regulations that support their implementation. In each country, grantees also highlighted a number of other laws they successfully influenced:

- In Indonesia, grantees influenced a general election law that provided support for persons with disabilities to ensure their capacity to participate in elections, including persons with psychosocial disabilities. They also influenced a bill aimed at eliminating sexual violence from which they were able to eliminate a discriminatory element that would have allowed the sterilization of women with intellectual and/or psychosocial disabilities.
- In Bangladesh, grantees worked with the government to ratify the Marrakesh Treaty to facilitate access to published works for persons who are blind, visually impaired or otherwise print disabled. They also influenced the passage of the Special Education Act in 2019, the modification of the building code, and increased accessibility in the university and public transport.
- In Uganda, grantees such as UNAPD successfully advocated for adopting accessibility standards to the Building Control Act (2013), the inclusion of the accessibility standards in the building regulations to be used in the construction industry, and then the adoption of the regulations to the Act. UNAPD also worked with Makerere University’s Department of Architecture and Physical Planning to review the training curriculum of architects to include a module on disability and accessibility. DPOs continue using the Building Control Act(2013), the Building Regulations and the Accessibility Standards at national and district levels to encourage the government and other stakeholders in the construction industry.
to undertake accessibility audits in buildings, review building plans, and other required actions to increase building accessibility. Other national and district-level legislation and policies influenced inclusive cancer control, school accessibility, inclusive health service delivery, and inclusive HIV and AIDS programs.

- **In Nigeria**, grantees worked with government offices at state and national levels, partner NGOs, and U.N. bodies, to achieve improved access to justice, inclusive education, and inclusive health services. As a result of the work being done by some grantees to increase access to justice for women and girls with disabilities who have experienced abuse, the silence culture is beginning to break. Infrastructure is being built in some states to ensure that cases of abuse are resolved promptly, and more women and girls with disabilities are speaking up and demanding justice.

- **In Ghana**, grantees influenced the adoption of a national inclusive education policy.

The evaluation team used contribution analysis to more deeply examine two DRF/DRAF-supported changes: a national-level policy change in Indonesia and a government program change in Uganda.

In Indonesia, the evaluation more deeply examined DPOs’ contribution to drafting and promoting the approval of Indonesia’s Law on Persons with Disabilities’ Planning and Monitoring Regulation. The following summarizes our findings.\(^\text{13}\)

---

**Indonesia: Drafting the Planning and Monitoring Regulation (Government Regulation 70/2019) for the national Law on Persons with Disabilities (Law 6/2016)**

**Background on Indonesia’s Law on Persons with Disabilities**

*Indonesia enacted its national Law on Persons with Disabilities on April 15, 2016 as Law 6/2016. DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs had significant roles in shaping it, through holding workshops, seminars, and meetings, and using social media during the drafting process to share their expertise, knowledge, and experience as persons with disabilities. Through this process, they also raised their profiles and built relationships with relevant government officials.*

---

\(^\text{13}\) See Annex A.1. for the complete contribution analysis story.
Influencing the Planning and Monitoring Regulation

In 2016, once the DPOs had successfully influenced passage of the national Law on Persons with Disabilities, they turned their attention to helping the Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS) draft the regulations required to implement it. During the process of drafting and passing the Law on Persons with Disabilities, the DPOs had built a strong working relationship and significant trust with BAPPENAS. As a result, it was easy to continue this partnership during the development of the law’s regulations.

Stakeholders, including DPOs and other NGOs, and BAPPENAS agreed to develop eight regulations to implement the Act, and BAPPENAS, the DPOs, and other stakeholders agreed to establish working groups to help draft each regulation.

For the drafting of the Planning and Monitoring Regulation, the Director of the national Association of Women with Disabilities of Indonesia (Himpunan Wanita Disabilitas Indonesia, HWDI), a DRF/DRAF grantee, was selected as the leader, while the Center for Election Access for Persons with Disabilities (Pusat Pemilihan Umum Akses Untuk Penyandang Cacat, PPUA), Indonesian Mental Health Association (Perhimpunan Jiwa Sehat Indonesia), OHANA (Perhimpunan Organisasi Harapan Nusantara), the national Association of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia (PPDI), and the Indonesian Blind Union (PERTUNI) were also involved in the drafting process. The Center for Indonesian Law and Policy Studies (Pusat Studi Hukum dan Kebijakan, PSHK) helped them ensure the draft language was in line with legal language.

BAPPENAS trusted the DPOs and related stakeholders and relied on their experience and expertise to draft the regulation. Although each DPO had its own focus, they ensured that the interests of all persons with disabilities were reflected in the regulation. Once the draft was ready, the DPOs and other stakeholders then submitted it to BAPPENAS for further review and to be discussed with other related ministries. The regulation was finally approved and enacted on October 4, 2019 as Government Regulation (Peraturan Pemerintah, PP) Number 70/2019.

Achievements of the Planning and Monitoring Regulation

The Planning and Monitoring Regulation mandates that each planning and budgeting cycle at every government level must address the needs and fulfill the rights of persons with disabilities – something that was not happening previously.14 The government now has official guidance on

14 Because of decentralization in Indonesia, the national-level regulation can only be implemented in the regions if the respective regions establish regional regulations to guide implementation at the regional level. As of early 2020, this has not been done in every region.
where and how to accommodate the needs and rights of persons with disabilities in planning and budgeting, and DPOs have a legal basis to demand their rights be fulfilled. The government regulation allows DPOs to actively monitor the progress of planning and budgeting from discussions at the village level up to the national level to ensure that plans and budget related to their rights do not get lost or deleted in the process. All government ministries and agencies from the national level down to village level reference the regulation when developing their respective plans and budgets.

**DRF/DRAF’s Contribution**

The participating DPOs acknowledge and appreciate DRF/DRAF’s support in getting the process of drafting the regulation kicked off, as DRF/DRAF’s funding provided them with opportunities to hold relevant meetings, discussions, and workshops. DRF/DRAF’s funding enabled larger DPOs to reach out to smaller DPOs in-person and virtually to seek their input and suggestions for the regulation’s draft language. This was especially helpful, as they did not want the drafting to be a product of groups from Jakarta, but rather the result of input from DPOs across Indonesia. Further, most—if not all—DPOs involved in the regulation’s drafting were solely funded by DRF/DRAF. Had DRF/DRAF not provided financial support, it is believed that the drafting process would have been significantly delayed.
In Uganda, the evaluation team more deeply examined how DPOs influenced a change in a government program. The following summarizes our findings.\textsuperscript{15}

---

**Uganda: Strengthening access to services by refugees with disabilities in humanitarian settings**

**Project Overview and Background**

This project focused on Uganda’s commitment to strengthen the integration of disability in refugee response systems. Three DRF/DRAF grantees – the National Union of Women with Disabilities of Uganda (NUWODU), Restoration and Hope for Refugees (REHORE), and the National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU) – worked together as a consortium to strengthen access to services by refugees with disabilities in three humanitarian settings in Uganda.

The consortium, in consultation with the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), launched the project formally in 2016 with a conference in Kampala with the various stakeholders that would be part of the project implementation process, including government and U.N. officials, INGOs, national NGOs and DPOs. Besides the participating consortium members, the stakeholders that attended included representatives from the OPM, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES), national-level Disabled Persons’ Organizations (DPOs), Inter Aid, and Pan African Development Education and Advocacy Programme (PADEAP), as well as the Red Cross officer in charge of tracking refugees. The consortium members used advocacy and awareness raising activities to promote mainstreaming disability in existing programs in refugee camps and host communities.

**Influencing mainstreaming disability in services provided to refugees in Bidibidi refugee settlement camp**

In 2017, the three DRF/DRAF grantees started working in Bidibidi refugee settlement camp in Yumbe district, the biggest refugee camp in Uganda with a population of 230,000 refugees and, as of late 2019, 16,000 identified refugees with disabilities.

NUWODU, NUDIPU, and REHORE held sensitization meetings, workshops, and advocacy activities with the stakeholders providing humanitarian aid in the camp. Through the meetings, they sought to assess the level of awareness about disability in the Bidibidi refugee camp and discuss

\textsuperscript{15} See Annex A.2. for the complete contribution analysis story.
mainstreaming persons with disabilities issues into government programs. These stakeholders included the local government officials in Yumbe district, the Bidibidi refugee settlement camp staff, representatives of the Office of the Prime Minister, UNHCR, NGOs, and DPOs, as well as local leaders from the host and refugee communities.

**Project Achievements**

The goals of the project have been achieved. In the settings where the project operates, refugees with disabilities are no longer categorized as “persons with specific needs,” but rather, are mainstreamed. There is now greater inclusion of refugees with disabilities in refugee response programs. This was confirmed by the Community Liaisons Officer in Bidibidi Refugee settlement camp and the officer in the community-based services department of the Office of the Prime Minister. The government policy makers are handling disability in a more comprehensive manner. There are now more refugees and host community people with disabilities benefiting from the OPM’s education and health programs. The project has also succeeded in influencing the NGOs working with refugees to recognize the need to mainstream refugees with disabilities in humanitarian work. The NGOs working in humanitarian aid are now identifying persons with disabilities and supporting them in their program activities. Other stakeholders, such as caregivers and community leaders in the host and refugee communities, have also received information about disability and have begun to develop more positive attitudes toward persons with disabilities.

To maintain the advocacy and awareness raising activities about disability and refugee issues, NUWODU reports that it carries out continuous monitoring activities together with the other two consortium partners. However, at one point, they experienced a slowdown in project activities, due to staff turnover. In addition, an interviewee in the Bidibidi refugee settlement camp observed that NUWODU is not constantly present in the camp, negatively affecting the effectiveness of their work.

Organizations, like NUWODU, that want to influence change in settings where they are not constantly present may want to rethink their model. While regular monitoring is helpful, identifying and training someone living in the setting who can provide constant accompaniment may lead to greater and faster positive results.

---

16 The Ugandan government has a policy for programs that are implemented in a refugee setting that specifies that services should also include the host communities. This is to reduce hostilities towards refugees, as in some instances, the services provided to the refugees may be more efficiently delivered than those in the host communities.
**DRF/DRAF’s contribution**

The consortium members reported that they used DRF/DRAF support to fund the project’s meetings, workshops, and monitoring activities and to partially fund the salary of the staff member in charge of this project.

---

**Working to advance policies strengthened DPOs and national disability movements and helped build new and lasting cross-movement relationships.** Staff, DPOs, partners, and government officials reported that the work of DPOs and the broader disability movement raised DPO profiles at local and national levels. Relevant government officials now see disability movements as important partners and reach out to them for assistance on issues related to the human rights of persons with disabilities. Partners also recognize DPOs as important actors on behalf of the human rights of persons with disabilities, and perceive that their work will benefit persons with disabilities.

- In Indonesia, as a result of joint advocacy between DPOs and the women’s movement on a bill on the elimination of sexual violence, the disability movement now has linkages with the women’s movement, and they continue to undertake joint advocacy together. Similarly, DPOs in Indonesia have built relationships with various international and national human rights organizations and legal aid institutions. Together, they hold joint programs, including public discussions, seminars, and investigations, and make joint statements. As a result of these relationships, the issue of disability, which was previously a marginal issue, has become a central issue in the larger human rights movement in Indonesia. LBH Jakarta (Jakarta Legal Aid), for example, now includes disability rights material in their annual training curriculum.

**Grantees have influenced policy changes using a variety of advocacy tactics.** These have included developing work plans; holding consultations with targeted disability groups; educating the general public about the human rights of persons with disabilities; building the capacity of other DPOs and persons with disabilities to advocate for their rights; gathering information via research, consultations, and observation; holding media campaigns and events to gain support for their influence strategies; and meeting and sharing information with elected, appointed, and career government officials, NGOs, and other CSOs. With DRF/DRAF’s support, they have tended to build constructive relationships with those they seek to influence, so that they are seen as partners in advancing the human rights of persons with disabilities, as noted in examples above.
**DPOs reported that they were able to influence these policy changes because of the financial and technical support they received from DRF/DRAF.** The funds allowed grantees to undertake the advocacy activities described above. Through technical assistance, DRF/DRAF provided information, helped grantees build their advocacy capacity, and accompanied them in their work. They noted that DRF/DRAF’s support helped facilitate access to policy makers, allowed them to conduct situation analyses, and gave credibility to their work. All described DRF/DRAF as instrumental in bringing the right information at the right time to help them understand the issues better, the tools to gather information from around the country, the language and approaches to influence other stakeholders, and the platform for broad visibility on the issues. All noted that the timing of DRF’s support came at an opportune moment.

**Grantees’ influence of one bill served as an example of DRF/DRAF’s capacity to respond quickly to opportunities as they arise.** Although working on the bill to eliminate sexual violence in Indonesia was not in DRF/DRAF’s grantees’ original plans, grantees and DRF/DRAF recognized the importance of ensuring that the bill recognized the rights of persons with disabilities and gained passage. When grantees approached DRF/DRAF requesting support for this advocacy work, DRF/DRAF gave them special opportunity grants, which DRF/DRAF can award within a month or less to current grantees, to respond to emerging and more urgent needs.

**DRF/DRAF staff were proud to point to legislative and policy accomplishments; at least one also pointed to the importance of intermediate results.** This staff member noted that change can be incremental. For example, changes can gradually benefit increasing numbers of groups within the disability community or help a government gradually become fully CRPD compliant. Given the time it takes to make these changes and the effort that goes into even achieving incremental change, it could be important to place even greater emphasis on recognizing incremental changes, with a clear understanding of the theory of change that links them to intended results.

**DRF/DRAF staff noted that pushback is common in policy work and can come from a variety of sources, affecting what activists can achieve.** As a result, activists’ achievements may include contribution to a desired policy change or progress toward it, holding steady against opposition to it, or minimizing policy change in an undesired direction. It is important that DRF/DRAF continue to consider all these types of advocacy achievements when assessing progress.

b) DRF/DRAF are supporting DPOs to participate in international and national human rights and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) monitoring processes.

The evaluation team reviewed DRF/DRAF’s relevant logframe indicator data for the five sample countries and verified their claimed achievements. These indicators covered the number of reports including DRF/DRAF grantee input that have been submitted to international or national human rights mechanisms or international or national SDG mechanisms between 2017-2019.
In CRPD reporting processes, DRF/DRAF, sometimes in partnership with the International Disability Alliance (IDA), support national DPO coalitions to draft alternative reports that can be submitted to the CRPD Committee; select a diverse group of DPO delegates to travel to Geneva to present their alternative report’s key recommendations to the Committee; and work with the delegation to make their presentation and bring the CRPD Committee’s Concluding Observations back to their national disability movement for use in advocacy vis-à-vis their national governments. DRF/DRAF staff reported that this process can take two to three or more years, in part because an alternative report cannot be submitted until a government submits its report, and the process may require DPOs advocating that a government submit its report.

- In Bangladesh, DPOs completed their CRPD alternative report in 2018, presented before the CRPD Committee in the pre-sessional review in 2019, are planning to participate in the CRPD Committee concluding session in 2020, and will bring CRPD Committee Concluding Observations back to the wider movement for implementation. They are engaged in awareness raising and information campaigns, legal support, and action plan formulation, among other activities.

- In Uganda, NUPIDU coordinated DPO participation, bringing together 25 DPOs to develop the CRPD alternative report. NUWODU offered insights concerning women and girls with disabilities. After the review process was completed and with the Concluding Observations for Uganda in hand, the DPOs began working with the government to help it implement the recommendations. According to one government official, “When DPOs come in, they come in to find out the level of implementation of the CRPD. It is like a monitoring implementation tool.”

Participating in Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) monitoring processes is relatively new for DRF/DRAF: the SDGs were approved in 2015, and DRF/DRAF added funding for DPOs to engage in SDGs work at national levels and monitoring achievements in this area in 2016. Five submissions have gone forward, among which were reports from Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, and Uganda. SDGs monitoring mechanisms include Voluntary National Reviews at national level and the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) on the SDGs at global level.

- In Indonesia, the Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS) asked DRAF grantee, DPO OHANA (Perhimpunan Organisasi Harapan Nusantara) to contribute to SDGs reporting, acknowledging OHANA as a knowledgeable resource. OHANA participated in the country’s SDGs monitoring process, reviewed and commented on the
report, and is now sitting on Indonesia’s SDGs task force for the report that will be presented at a global level. Another grantee based in Yogyakarta, the Center for Improving Qualified Activity in Life of Persons with Disability (CIQAL), is advocating for a number of SDGs indicators to be included as part of the district work plan.

- In **Bangladesh**, grantees continue to monitor the inclusion of persons with disabilities as related to the SDGs. They are engaged in awareness raising and information campaigns, and action plan formulation, among other activities.

- In **Uganda**, the Prime Minister’s Office constituted a committee to discuss the SDGs and inclusion of persons with disabilities and invited DRAF grantee, NUDIPU to participate. NUDIPU extended this invitation to other DRAF/DRF grantees UNAD, NUWODU as a women’s and girls’ organization, and UNAPD because of their expertise on accessibility. As outcomes of this process, the National Curriculum Development Centre has included sign language for primary school teachers, Kyambogo University has started teaching sign language in Primary Teachers Colleges (previously, it was only under special needs education training), and the Public Service Commission in charge of providing human resources for government will provide positions for sign language interpreters in the new education structure, among other results.

- In **Ghana**, the Ghana Federation of Disability Organizations participated in the Civil Society Organizations’ (CSO) consultative process (from district to national levels), which provided opportunities to give input into the CSO report on SDGs.

To support DPO participation in international and national human rights and SDGs monitoring processes, DRF/DRAF offer grantees financial and technical assistance (directly or through grants to conduct research or to access other experts), space during convenings, and/or increased access to the media. One of DRF/DRAF’s unique contributions is the sustained funding they provide after DPO participation in global fora to help DPOs follow up with their governments. This sustained support helps explain the DPOs’ success in following up on global processes on the ground and is an example of how DRF/DRAF link global frameworks with helping national and local DPOs build their capacities to advocate with their governments.

In Ghana, government officials were unaware of DPOs participating in international forums, and in Indonesia, while government officials and partners were aware of DPOs’ participation, they were unaware that DRF/DRAF supported those activities. This again suggests that DRF/DRAF may benefit from communicating to or working more directly with government officials, donor country offices, international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), and others involved in promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities.

*In addition to contributing to advancing the human rights of persons with disabilities in their countries, the DPOs and individual delegates that participated in these processes often had*
transformative experiences. DRF/DRAF staff and board members reported that the delegates are often leaving their country and presenting in global venues for the first time. When they return to their countries, they are seen as having more legitimacy and influence by their peers and frequently also by government institutions. They also have more confidence participating in these kinds of processes and advocating to their governments on these issues.

DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs are recognized for their effectiveness in these processes, according to DRF/DRAF staff and board members. A staff member stated, “We often hear that the [DRF/DRAF-supported] DPOs are the best prepared [among those who present to the CRPD committee].” According to a partner very familiar with the CRPD review processes, “In countries where DRF/DRAF are present, the DPOs will have a larger delegation and a larger impact on those CRPD review committees.”

All global donors and partners interviewed were aware of DRF/DRAF-supported DPO participation in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes. Most listed the COSP, half listed the CRPD processes, and a few listed the Global Disability Summit of 2018, the United Nations High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF), and the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women (CSW).

Global donors and partners interviewed listed a number of benefits of DRF/DRAF’s support for DPO participation in these processes. According to almost all donors and partners interviewed, DRF/DRAF’s support results in more inclusive and diverse representation in international platforms, specifically bringing in voices and ideas from marginalized groups within the disability movement. A few also observed that facilitating participation in these processes helps persons with disabilities realize their collective power at a global level. One donor or partner felt that DRF/DRAF’s contributions made the issues, challenges, and solutions articulated by persons with disabilities much clearer and more real to CRPD members and offered them examples to share with government representatives. Another appreciated DRF/DRAF’s role in advancing the nomination and inclusion of persons with disabilities on the CRPD Committee. Another donor or partner valued DRF/DRAF’s longer-term engagement with the DPOs, which allows them to support the DPOs in their advocacy vis-à-vis their governments after they return from their participation in international processes. Like DRF/DRAF staff and board members, they also appreciated the larger professional networks and increased skills gained by persons with disabilities who participated in these processes.
c) DRF/DRAF staff and board provided a number of examples of how DRF/DRAF’s support has helped disability movements become more inclusive of all persons with disabilities.

The evaluation team reviewed DRF/DRAF’s relevant logframe indicator data for the five sample countries and verified their claimed achievements. These indicators covered the percentage of organizational members in national cross-disability umbrella organizations in applicable target countries from marginalized groups of persons with disabilities in 2019; the percentage of total pooled fund grants awarded to emergent DPOs not previously active in the public realm in 2019; the percentage of total pooled fund grants awarded to DPOs representing marginalized groups in target countries in 2019; and percentage of total pooled fund grants made to women with disabilities in target countries in 2019.

Evidence cited showed how, thanks at least in part to DRF/DRAF’s support, people representing more marginalized groups of persons with disabilities are now included as DRF/DRAF grantees, representatives and members in umbrella groups, representatives speaking to government or at CRPD events, or even as leaders of movements. There were various marginalized groups cited as now being better included, including little people, people with albinism, women with disabilities, and people with psychosocial disabilities.

- In Indonesia, DRF/DRAF staff reported that women with disabilities are now leaders in the movement. The majority of DRF/DRAF’s grantees are led by women with disabilities or at least have women in leadership positions. In addition, as a result of DRF/DRAF’s support, DPOs representing persons with psychosocial disabilities are now part of the national disability movement, and the issue of psychosocial disabilities has become an important issue within the movement.

- In Uganda, according to DRF/DRAF staff, grantees, and government officials, new DPOs representing marginalized groups, such as people with cerebral palsy, people with albinism, persons who are hard of hearing, persons with down syndrome, persons with spinal injuries, and little people, have joined the National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU), and representatives of marginalized groups are now included in the umbrella group’s governance.

- In Ghana, increased visibility of DPO advocacy initiatives attracted other groups to membership of the national umbrella organization, which grew from seven to nine since 2017, with the addition of the Burns Survivors Association, the Ghana Stammers’ Association, and the candidacy of the Little People’s Association, giving the movement presence in 230 out of the 254 metropolitan, municipal, and district assemblies in the country, thereby expanding the spaces for geographical and thematic inclusion of larger numbers of persons with disabilities.
Grantees and government officials report that the expansion of national disability movements primarily resulted from DRF/DRAF’s funding and technical assistance, which has helped build the organizational capacity of newer DPOs and helped them get registered. According to one grantee, “DRF/DRAF challenge us, [asking] ‘How inclusive is your organization?’ They have also made us aware of the marginalized categories and their potentialities and that they are part of the disability movement.” Yet, in one country, a number of grantees reported being unaware of any changes to the national disability movement, and in another, partners were unaware of DRF/DRAF’s contribution to them. In both of these cases, broader information sharing could be helpful.

Most donors and partners interviewed can cite examples of how DRF/DRAF are influencing disability movements to become more inclusive. In fact, one observed that “in countries where DRF/DRAF are not present, the movement is not as inclusive.” For these donors and partners, according to one interviewee, “more inclusive” refers to greater participation of people with intellectual disabilities, people with albinism, and little people; women and indigenous people with disabilities; and people who are deafblind, among others.

DRF/DRAF uses a number of approaches to help bring about these changes, according to DRF/DRAF staff and board members, donors and partners. At least fifty percent of DRF/DRAF grants go to DPOs representing persons with disabilities from more marginalized groups, while at least 15 percent go to women with disabilities. DRF/DRAF use Special Opportunity grants to help DPOs respond to national-level advocacy needs that often benefit the most marginalized and help build cross-movement linkages, as happened in Indonesia between women with disabilities and the women’s movement. In some cases, DRF/DRAF base their funding on grantees’ inclusion of certain groups.

Including people who represent marginalized disability groups among grantees is further facilitated by DRF/DRAF’s capacity to provide smaller amounts of funding to nascent groups to help them get started — a capacity that many donors do not have, according to donors and partners and even the grantees themselves. One noted that DRF/DRAF use their leverage as a funder to alert DPOs that inclusiveness increases the likelihood of funding. They also work with more nascent organizations to strengthen their proposals. Some grantees mentioned that they had not seen this type of funding relationship before.

Donors and partners observed that DRF/DRAF model inclusion by including persons with disabilities on their staff and board and including groups who represent marginalized disability groups among grantees. They noted that this can encourage national disability movements to be more inclusive. Both result from DRF/DRAF’s intentionality. Donors and partners appreciate DRF/DRAF’s shift to hiring program officers from the disability movement in the countries or
regions they cover. At least one would like to see greater inclusion reflected in who is hired for the headquarters-based management roles.

Program officers intentionally reach out to specific communities representing more marginalized groups. Program officers use DRF/DRAF’s convening power to bring groups, including those who are more marginalized, together and emphasize the importance of cross-disability groups and a unified national movement. Program officers try to develop cohorts of grantees that will help build a diverse movement.

**However, staff, donors, partners, and grantees raised some concerns about DRF/DRAF’s progress as well.** First, although DRF/DRAF’s influence may result in more marginalized groups attending meetings, such as DRF/DRAF’s grantee convenings, they may not feel welcome there, as discrimination and exclusion can be strong even within the disability community. One staff member offered the example of a Uganda grantee convening, where little people were included for the first time, but their presence was questioned by other participants. New groups joining the national disability movement in Ghana faced a similar challenge. Some more marginalized groups, such as those representing lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) persons with disabilities, have not yet been included, because of the stigma attached to them and national laws against them.

Worthy of further assessment is to what degree movements fully embrace new members and new impairment groups and to what degree they continue to be inclusive after DRF/DRAF funding has ended, as well as the factors that facilitate and impede this. Donors, partners, and grantees note that national disability movements vary in this regard. In addition to the challenges flagged above, they also observe that, as more groups come into a movement, competition among groups for funding may increase, which may undermine efforts to foster inclusion, unless donors like DRF/DRAF are prepared to monitor and address this. This points to the need for ongoing accompaniment from DRF/DRAF, if DRF/DRAF are truly going to help national movements embrace people representing more marginalized disability groups.

Second, access to funds can affect DPO capacities to participate in national disability movements. Many DPOs in Bangladesh, which DRF/DRAF is exiting, noted that a few DPOs have become inactive members of the national disability movement due to funding crises. They are particularly concerned about the capacity of more marginalized groups to continue their participation. A few reported that DRF/DRAF’s coalition funding streams left out DPOs representing more marginalized disability groups, such as people with albinism, because they could not find other DPOs interested in their issues.

Third, for some more marginalized disability groups, there are no national-level groups or DPOs dedicated to their concerns. Instead, these groups organize regionally. For example, one
interviewee pointed to the lack of national-level organizations of persons with psychosocial disabilities and reported that, for them, “organizing regionally is the only workable solution.” While DRF/DRAF funded regional DPO networks in the past, it stopped doing so when this became more of a focus for the International Disability Alliance (IDA).

d) Increased capacities of DPOs to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities, as a result of the support they receive from DRF/DRAF, was evident to most interviewees.

The evaluation team reviewed DRF/DRAF’s relevant logframe indicator data for the five sample countries and verified their claimed achievements. These indicators covered the number of people trained through DRF/DRAF funded technical assistance between 2017-2019; the number of instances of DRF/DRAF technical assistance that have been provided to DRF/DRAF grantees between 2017-2019; the percentage of total program budget spent on technical assistance in 2019; and the percentage of total pooled fund grants awarded to partnerships between grantees and with other DPOs and key stakeholders.

All DRF/DRAF staff and board members, most grantees, and half of the interviewed donors and partners, as well as government officials, remarked on DPOs’ increased capacities to advocate for the rights of persons with disabilities, as a result of the support they receive from DRF/DRAF.

Grantees were reported to better understand the CRPD and other U.N. processes, as well as what needs to be included in national policies and legislation for them to be CRPD-compliant. They had more and stronger partnerships with other DPOs and with organizations in other movements who could help them advance their issues. They had gained skills and confidence in strategizing their advocacy approach, writing alternative reports and presenting their recommendations in international settings, as well as in providing input to or actually drafting legislation and policies and working with other civil society organizations and government officials to promote their adoption. Because of their greater capacity for advocacy, DPOs noted that they have greater access to government decision-makers, are better equipped, have more empowered staff, and have been able to mobilize greater numbers of constituents. Association with DRF/DRAF increased the visibility of the DPOs in the public sphere, magnifying and strengthening their voices.

A Ugandan government official acknowledged increased capacity among DPOs and especially among those representing more marginalized groups, stating, “There has been development. I am seeing so many associations, like little persons, people with albinism, people with cerebral palsy. The persons with disabilities are more enlightened about their rights. They demand services now. As they demand participation in development, others are saying that they should have more representation in Parliament. This is triggered by the DPOs themselves.”

A few gains, in addition to the ones described above, merit highlighting:
• In Indonesia because of the advocacy capacity they have gained, DPOs were able to convince gender activists to include persons with disabilities in their advocacy, starting with draft legislation aimed at eliminating sexual violence. Because of the funding they received, they were also able to reach more DPOs and raise their awareness on the rights of persons with disabilities by inviting them to participate in workshops, meetings, advocacy events, and other activities.

• In states throughout Nigeria, DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs are raising the awareness of persons with disabilities and state-level decision makers about the CRPD, although they acknowledge that much more awareness raising needs to be done.

• In Uganda, some of the more marginalized disability groups in Uganda have registered with the National Union of Persons with Disabilities in Uganda (NUDIPU), which has rigorous criteria for membership.

**DRF/DRAF used a variety of approaches to help equip grantees in these ways.** Program officers spend time with grantees, mentoring them on their proposal development process and on their grant implementation. In that role, program officers are helping grantees think through their technical assistance needs and are writing those into their grant budgets. Each year, program officers provide individual grantees with technical assistance on one or two issues, such as drafting alternative reports, preparing to present alternative report recommendations to the CRPD Committee, developing a press release, or training on how to interact with political representatives. At grantee convenings, when DRF/DRAF program officers bring all DRF/DRAF grantees together from a particular country, program officers help grantees build relationships with one another and network with government officials and other donors. They also use those opportunities to provide grantees with technical assistance on topics relevant to grantees’ need, the country-level strategy, and/or upcoming advocacy opportunities.

**Donors, partners, government officials, and DRF/DRAF’s grantees highlighted some areas in which more attention to equipping DPOs is required.** First, DRF/DRAF may want to invest more time and effort in equipping DPOs representing marginalized disability groups, since in many contexts, their representation is still perceived as token and their participation is not at a decision-making level. Second, DRF/DRAF should continue to help the DPOs they support mobilize other DPOs at a community level, where very few persons with disabilities are aware of their rights as outlined in the CRPD. Third, in contexts where change is happening slowly, it would be helpful to clarify the focus of grantee technical assistance. For example, in those settings, DRF/DRAF may want to focus on awareness raising to help address stigma.

Fourth, in addition to strategic advocacy training, many grantees would benefit from access to capacity building related to administrative and financial management, as well as project management, network and coalition building, and conflict management. This could be offered by
DRF/DRAF directly or through partnerships between DRF/DRAF and other entities. In each country in which DRF/DRAF work, there are multiple actors helping DPOs strengthen their capacity, although the focus of their capacity strengthening programs differ. For example, while DRF/DRAF focus on advocacy, others focus more on organizational development. DRF/DRAF could collaborate more closely with these actors to help DPOs strengthen complementary skill sets. This is especially important, since DRF/DRAF staff and others recognize that the human rights of persons with disabilities are becoming more central to development and humanitarian assistance conversations. As this happens, they anticipate that government and outside donors will increasingly call on DPOs for assistance, demanding greater absorptive capacity of them, as well as greater capacity to scale up programs or advocacy or to provide technical input to government officials and others. This points to a need to ensure that DPOs have the organizational capacity required to respond.

2. **Most DRF/DRAF staff and board members agreed that DRF/DRAF meet or exceed their milestones the majority of the time.**

According to one program officer, “*It can be seen that advocacy activities have resulted in changes in policy and will benefit persons with disabilities in [our country.]*” Staff and board members note that influencing policy change is a worthy accomplishment, given the advocacy goals grantees set and the contexts in which grantees work. They acknowledged that the timeframe for achieving policy change is unpredictable, because it is based on many factors beyond DRF/DRAF’s and grantees’ control. Factors within the political context largely account for any delays grantees face in meeting milestones.

A few DRF/DRAF staff and board members, while impressed with DRF/DRAF’s accomplishments, are concerned that their achievement depends on staff carrying very heavy workloads. They worry that, with too much asked of staff, staff may burn out. This points to a need to review demands on staff and, if found to be too great, either reduce the demands or increase the number of staff.

**C. Impact**

To assess their impact, DRF/DRAF established proxy indicators in their logframe. The first assesses the extent to which data are collected and disaggregated by disability at national levels by government entities in target and select countries, using the Washington Group on Disability Statistics data collection methods. The second assesses the extent to which persons with disabilities and/or disability are referenced in national SDG action plans, voluntary reviews, and other SDG processes. The evaluation team reviewed and validated DRF/DRAF’s data related to these two indicators for the five sample countries, but assessing further progress toward impact was not part of the evaluation scope.
D. Sustainability

The evaluation team examined two aspects of sustainability: whether changes in policies and legislation will continue to provide mechanisms for rights engagement after DRF/DRAF funding ceases in a county, and whether disability movements are more sustainable, as a result of the support they have received from DRF/DRAF.

1. All interviewees identified ways in which DRF/DRAF is contributing to sustainable change through changes in policy and legislation and strengthening national disability movements.

All DRF/DRAF staff, board members, and grantees and most donors and partners could list a number of national and local-level policies and laws now in place that are benefiting persons with disabilities. They also pointed to stronger national disability movements that are better equipped to advocate for their rights. They noted that now, because of their experience working with government to help bring about changes in policies and legislation, national disability movements and individual DPOs are now better equipped to work with government to ensure their rights are respected, and government is more likely to see them as knowledgeable partners, trust them, and include them in relevant discussions. According to one DPO, “DPOs have become valuable resources to government officials, who seek their advice and inputs when they are developing new regulations to ensure that they are inclusive.”

As one example, in Ghana, where DRF/DRAF has recently exited, all DPOs reported that after seven years of DRF/DRAF funding, the movement that promotes the human rights of persons with disabilities is stronger. As examples, they noted that they now have a broader network for engagement, with expanding membership. This means their activities are now more visible, which in turn, attracts new constituents. The increased visibility has aroused funding interest from other donors and more requests for partnership activities, and in some cases, institutional growth. All the DPOs interviewed in Ghana felt that these changes have made it easier to engage with government counterparts. They have access to government institutions and have built new working relationships with them. As a result, DPOs have noted that, in terms of sustainability, there are now advocates, whether at Parliament or in Ministries (Gender, Children and Social Protection) who champion disability issues.

**DRF/DRAF staff, board members, grantees, donors, and partners expressed fears about potential changes in government leading to changes in policies,** or that, at a minimum, changes in appointed or elected government officials cause DPOs to have to start again building new relationships, gaining trust, and fostering buy in. They also noted that, in most contexts, promoting policy or legislation adoption must be followed by assisting with and monitoring implementation to ensure that government is held accountable for fulfilling its promises.
According to one program officer, *The national policies have shifted to offer greater support for the rights of persons with disabilities, but it is not clear that the government would allocate budgets for DPOs to be able to continue these activities....Grantees have improved skills to carry out better advocacy and have successfully engaged the government to get buy in for the inclusion of persons with disabilities, but it seems that it is a long way to go to call this sustainable. Grantees still need to continue their work to keep awareness high on this issue."

*With these concerns in mind, interviewees suggested that DPOs and national disability movements continue to receive outside support and build stronger linkages with government entities to help ensure they are equipped to face the challenges and undertake the activities described above.* One program officer felt that DRF/DRAF should help DPOs network more intentionally with government entities such as human rights commissions and equal opportunity commissions to raise their awareness and strengthen their practice of including persons with disabilities. The program officer observed the following: “In 2009, DRF/DRAF funded [DPOs to raise the awareness of] the Ugandan Human Rights Commission (UHRC). At this time, the Commission knew nothing about disability and the CRPD. We engaged the Commissioners and staff to show them how to include disability issues in their programs. This project had a lot of impact for the Commissioners. Now they cannot do any program without including issues of persons with disabilities. UHRC was the first [government] organization to print a report in braille. Each year they provide a braille report, and a blind person reads the braille report.”

On the sustainability of national disability movements, DRF/DRAF staff, board members, donors, and partners also raised a few concerns. First, as raised above, it was not clear to what degree national disability movements are truly integrating representatives from more marginalized disability groups. Second, they raised concerns about the leadership pipelines of individual DPOs and national disability movements more broadly.

Third, some raised concerns about smaller and more marginalized DPOs’ capacities to identify and access funds from other sources, given the small number of funders working to promote the human rights of persons with disabilities. Most DRF/DRAF grantees in Indonesia reported also receiving funding from other sources, such as DFAT, the European Union, HIVOS, and Oxfam. In Bangladesh, DPOs are receiving financial support from the government and a range of national and international donors. Most DRF/DRAF grantees in Uganda also reported having other funding sources, and the program officer reported that the Big Lottery Fund (now called the National Community Lottery Fund), which supports the main disability organizations in Uganda, is proposing to take on some of the marginalized DPOs within the disability movement whose capacity has been developed by the DRF/DRAF Uganda Capacity Fund. However, outside of these examples, there were concerns that more marginalized groups may not have access to other donors.
Reflecting on these concerns, interviewees were glad for contexts in which DRF/DRAF continue to engage. One provided the example of DRF/DRAF’s work in Uganda, where support for advocacy related to the Building Control Act (2013) and Accessibility Standards is being followed up with support for DPOs to educate government entities that are constructing new buildings, and to work with local governments in different districts on accessible infrastructure. Similarly, in Indonesia, DRF/DRAF funded advocacy related to the passage of the national Law on Persons with Disabilities, and is now supporting DPOs at provincial and national levels to make sure the Act is implemented.

A number of people, including donors, partners, and DRF/DRAF staff, questioned DRF/DRAF’s rationale for exiting countries. They wondered whether the timeframe for DRF/DRAF support is sufficient, or whether staying in countries longer would bring about more positive outcomes for persons with disabilities and greater sustainability of results. They encouraged DRF/DRAF to undertake some ex-post evaluations to assess this.

Grantees noted that they would highly value some form of ongoing contact with DRF/DRAF after funding has ended, since for them, their relationship with DRF/DRAF is not just about funding but also about partnership and accompaniment, technical assistance and information sharing, with the aim of using all of these supports to strengthen the disability movement and rights.

E. Efficiency

To assess DRF/DRAF’s efficiency, the evaluation examined DRF/DRAF’s approaches to delivering grants, providing technical assistance, and supporting the participation of persons with disabilities in national and global advocacy efforts.

1. The majority of DRF/DRAF grantees described DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking and support as efficient and effective, although some staff members identified room for improvement.

Most grantees described DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking support as “high quality,” while some described the support as “adequate.” In response to open-ended questions, grantees highlighted different aspects of DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking support. Grantees in Uganda appreciated that DRF/DRAF let grantees decide how they wanted to use the funds they received. In Indonesia, grantees were grateful that document templates for grantmaking and finance are in their language, which makes them easier to understand. In Bangladesh, grantees wished DRF/DRAF had had in-country program officers who could better provide technical assistance and ongoing monitoring. If the evaluation team had specifically asked all grantees about these aspects, more might have provided similar responses.
Almost all grantees described the time and effort they put into submitting grant applications to DRF/DRAF as “just right.” They described the process as “simple and easy to understand.” They appreciated the template and guiding questions provided, as well as the technical assistance DRF/DRAF offered to help them develop their proposals. One grantee appreciated the feedback DRF/DRAF provided on their proposal, which the grantee described as uncommon to receive from donors.

All grantees reported receiving their grant funds from DRF/DRAF in a very timely manner. One grantee noted that the funding arrived even ahead of the grantee’s planned implementation schedule. Another observed that this is very important since almost all of the DPOs interviewed are solely funded by DRF/DRAF.

While some grantees were satisfied with the amount of funding they received from DRF/DRAF, others felt the amount was too small. Many noted that the grant sizes limited the number of people they could reach. A few grantees reported that they did not receive funds to monitor their progress. A few grantees reported that the funding was sufficient to cover their immediate activities, but not to support the continuity of those activities, which was important, since effective advocacy relies on the capacity to maintain engagement.

Half of DRF/DRAF staff and board members interviewed felt DRF/DRAF need better grantmaking processes. They recognized that the processes demand a lot of time and effort from potential grantees and program officers within a relatively short timeframe, while both are simultaneously trying to fulfill other responsibilities. At least one felt that, as a result, DPOs do not have time to put together a good project design. Members of the DRF/DRAF Grantmaking Committee (GMC) were not sure how much the grant recommendations they reviewed, which are summaries of DPOs’ proposals, reflected the work of DPOs and how much they were the work of the program officers.

In spite of some challenges in the DRF/DRAF grantmaking process, DRF/DRAF staff, donors, and grantees agree that DRF/DRAF is more efficient than other donors in its grant delivery. Within four to six months from their initial application, DRF/DRAF grantees receive their funds. In addition, DRF/DRAF can give Special Opportunity grants to existing grantees to respond to timely events or actions, and these can be delivered within a month or less. Because DRF/DRAF have general funds available, they are able to get their grant payments out to grantees quickly, even when donors are late in delivering their funding to DRF/DRAF.

Additionally, DRF/DRAF have changed their grant review and approval process to be more streamlined. In the past, DRF/DRAF gave all proposals to the GMC for their review, marking them highly recommended, recommended, or not recommended. After improving their grant review processes and hiring program officers who live in and come from the countries (and often the
movements) in which they are working, the GMC agreed to only receive proposals that DRF/DRAF staff recommended or highly recommended. This has reduced the number of proposals the GMC has to review and has streamlined their workload.

2. **Grantees were largely satisfied with the technical assistance DRF/DRAF provided, although there was room for improvement.**

*DRF/DRAF program officers provide grantees with technical assistance in a number of ways.* They provide technical assistance at grantee convenings, taking advantage of being in the same place with all grantees from a country (or region) at the same time. They offer grantees one-on-one technical assistance, as needed. They also outsource technical assistance and help potential grantees include budgets for this technical assistance from other experts in their proposals. This relieves program officers’ workloads and gives grantees greater access to the technical assistance they need. One program officer noted that grantees’ regular reports help to keep program officers apprised of grantees’ progress. When DPOs face challenges in performing their work, the program officers offer mentoring to help them continue to advance.

One DRF/DRAF staff member observed that establishing DRF/DRAF’s technical assistance strategy has helped staff and grantees understand the kinds of technical assistance that DRF/DRAF can offer. As a result, DRF/DRAF staff are reporting providing significantly more technical assistance than they were reporting previously. This is particularly important because, according to one interviewee, few others are offering DPOs technical support.

*Most DPOs described DRF/DRAF’s technical assistance as “very relevant, timely, and accessible” or “relevant, timely, and accessible.”* Most DPOs described the time and effort it took them to access DRF/DRAF’s technical assistance as “just right.” Many reported receiving technical assistance whenever they asked for it, often via phone, email, or social media. Some received access to a consultant or other technical experts. A few received more technical assistance than they expected. One appreciated that DRF/DRAF paid for support to accommodate various disabilities when participating in the technical assistance.

However, a small number of DPOs described DRF/DRAF’s technical support as “limited.” A few wanted technical support beyond what they received during the grantmaking process and at grantee convenings. A few sought training in specific areas. Some sought organizational capacity building, which they believed would better position them to access more funding opportunities from other donors.
3. Most DRF/DRAF grantees described the support they received to participate in national and global advocacy efforts as “just right.”

To support persons with disabilities to participate in national and global advocacy efforts, DRF/DRAF provide funding and technical support. DRF/DRAF’s process for awarding grantees grants for travel is relatively easy, according to DRF/DRAF staff. Once grantees provide evidence of having been invited to a conference or other similar gathering and fill out a relatively simple form, DRF/DRAF award them the required funds. Although DRF/DRAF work hard to ensure that marginalized groups participate in global and regional advocacy, in Uganda, some grantees were concerned that this process might favor national DPOs.

Most DRF/DRAF grantees in Indonesia, Nigeria, and Ghana and approximately half of the grantees in Bangladesh described the support they received to participate in national and global advocacy efforts, as well as the time and effort they needed to invest to participate, as “just right.” In Nigeria, grantees felt the amount of funds allocated was too little, but was used to accomplish a lot. Grantees in Bangladesh reported that there were limited opportunities to participate in these kinds of activities. However, when opportunities existed, they received support.

In Indonesia, DRF/DRAF funds most often enabled DPOs to participate in national advocacy efforts, where grantees were able to strengthen their relationships with other Indonesian organizations. Participating in global advocacy activities was more limited due to funding issues and the language barrier. However, those who could not participate in global advocacy still could provide feedback and input to the DPOs representing Indonesia at these events, with the understanding that participating DPOs would voice the concerns of their Indonesian colleagues.

F. Participatory grantmaking

1. DRF/DRAF is known and appreciated for its participatory grantmaking approach.

Participatory grantmaking is about power and representation, according to DRF/DRAF staff and board members. The approach is aimed at including persons with disabilities in DRF/DRAF’s grants decision making, in line with the movement’s principle of “nothing about us without us.” It broadens decision making related to grants and funding beyond donors to include those on the receiving end of funds and/or representatives from their communities. When these decisions are being made, all are at the table.
DRF/DRAF are participatory grantmakers, meaning that persons with disabilities are involved in decision making about DRF/DRAF’s funding, including strategic decisions about that funding, at all levels, from board and Grantmaking Committee\textsuperscript{17} to staffing.

Ideally, participatory grantmaking processes result in grantmaking decisions that better respond to a target communities’ needs, because they better incorporate target communities’ perspectives and concerns. In addition, they can create opportunities for donors, implementing organizations, and those on the receiving end of funds and/or representatives from their communities to learn from each other.

Among DRF/DRAF staff, board members, donors, and partners, some felt DRF/DRAF were exemplary among participatory grantmakers. A similar number appreciated DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking practice and also identified some opportunities for DRF/DRAF to become even more participatory in their approach, as described below. Finally, a similar number felt DRF/DRAF have even more room to strengthen their participatory grantmaking approach, also as described below.

**DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach ensures that DRF/DRAF’s priorities are informed by persons with disabilities**, according to DRF/DRAF staff and board members. DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking guidelines are informed by DRF/DRAF’s strategic plan and by program officers, who are informed by grantees and other DPOs. They are then reviewed by DRF/DRAF’s Grantmaking Committee and board of directors, which include persons with disabilities. DRF/DRAF’s country strategies are reviewed by the GMC, in which persons with disabilities are well represented. According to one donor or partner, “We see unprecedented representation [of persons with disabilities] in the staff of DRF/DRAF and on the GMC.”

DRF/DRAF develop requests for proposals, which set out their funding priorities, based on the grantmaking guidelines. After program officers finish working with potential grantees on their proposals, program officers submit grant recommendations to DRF/DRAF’s GMC for their review and final decisions.

**According to DRF/DRAF staff, board members, donors, and partners, DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach is worth its expense.** According to one donor or partner, “It’s the cost of doing business to get the most effective outcomes.” A staff member concurred, noting that

\textsuperscript{17} DRF/DRAF’s Grantmaking Committee (GMC) is a committee established by the boards of directors of DRF and DRAF. Its purpose is to support DRF and DRAF in pooled fund grantmaking strategy review and grants decisions. The GMC is made up of representatives from DRF/DRAF institutional donors and from the global disability community, as well as three board members.
finding persons with disabilities to represent the community on the GMC, ensuring they can meaningfully participate and that processes are accessible, and considering the opportunity costs for them of their participation is expensive. However, this staff member also believes that these are short-term costs that have long-term benefits, as seen in the results that DRF/DRAF’s investments attain. By increasing the participation of persons with disabilities in grantmaking, DRF/DRAF are increasing equity within their operations. Ideally, this also increases the efficiency and effectiveness of DRF/DRAF’s investments by helping DRF/DRAF make more relevant and appropriate investments more quickly. However, this hypothesis requires further testing.

To further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach, DRF/DRAF staff, board members, donors, and partners had a number of suggestions. These include the following:

- Interviewed GMC members with disabilities find the grant review process more difficult and time consuming to complete than those without disabilities. While interviewed GMC members representing donors described DRF/DRAF’s processes used for grant review and approval as “easy, useful, and inclusive,” interviewed GMC members who are persons with disabilities reported that, “persons with disabilities may not have enough time to engage fully, because [sometimes] we can’t access the materials and don’t have time to read them all.” To better include persons with disabilities in the GMC grant review process, DRF/DRAF may want to identify further accommodations that could help improve accessibility and equalize the time and workload for review, for example, by summarizing key documents or otherwise producing them in more accessible formats (easy-to-read, audio, pictorial).

- It is not always clear to the GMC and board members how much of the grant application ideas and content come from the potential grantees vs. the program officers. Program officers note that some grantees still need technical assistance related to proposal writing and particularly, guidance on how to clearly state their ideas and plans in their proposals. Consider ways to further improve transparency in this regard.

- To increase national-level participation in DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking process, consider adding a national-level proposal review process that includes national-level representatives of the disability movement, in addition to the GMC review.

- Find ways to better engage youth with disabilities on the GMC.

They also offered ideas to help DRF/DRAF be more participatory and inclusive in general. These broader ideas include the following:

- Include more persons with disabilities on the management team.

- Ensure that all documents DRF/DRAF produce are in easy-to-read and accessible formats for persons with disabilities and non-English speakers, especially grantmaking templates.
• Tweak DRF/DRAF’s communications to give grantees more credit for the work they do, placing them more in the forefront of messaging.

G. Value for Money

Value for Money requires balancing effectiveness and efficiency, the benefits and costs, risks taken and opportunities gained or lost, and a careful look at who benefits. DFID, one of the leaders on this topic, has outlined the 4 Es of Value for Money: economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity. DRF/DRAF’s effectiveness and efficiency are addressed in the sections above. This section provides additional analysis of how DRF/DRAF balanced these 4 Es, assessing the degree to which DRF/DRAF are spending time and resources well, wisely, and fairly.

1. DRF/DRAF have demonstrated careful attention to balancing the 4 Es in their grantmaking and institutional systems, and some modifications would make this even stronger.

The two sections above, on Effectiveness and Efficiency, demonstrate that DRF/DRAF and their grantees have been very effective at achieving their intended results and efficient in their delivery of grant funds, technical assistance, and their support for persons with disabilities to participate in national and global advocacy. Additional data about how DRF/DRAF balance value for money efforts and resources in grantmaking and institutional systems and processes are noted below. DRF/DRAF have taken a number of steps to ensure an appropriate balance of economy, efficiency, and equity to deliver quality services in a timely fashion, minimizing cost and ensuring equity of resources.

To increase efficiency by minimizing time and workload, DRF/DRAF are restructuring and systematizing their grantmaking procedures and systems. DRF/DRAF have put into place systems to ensure alignment and consistency across the organizations, as well as to design programs that pay close attention to emerging changes in national contexts. Staff and board members noted that DRF/DRAF are making modifications to ensure greater efficiencies, effectiveness, and equity of allocation of resources.

In 2018, DRF/DRAF dissolved their Global Advisory Panel and restructured their governance, so that persons with disabilities serve in decision-making, rather than advisory roles. This has increased efficiency by eliminating the cost of bringing the Global Advisory Panel together, while increasing effectiveness and equity by better including persons with disabilities in governance, strategic, and grants decision making.

DRF/DRAF choose their meeting locations and timing to maximize the efficient use of time and money. DRF/DRAF hold their largest, all-staff and GMC meetings in June in Boston, Massachusetts to align with the Conference of States Parties (COSP) to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which takes place in New York close to that time. In that way,
all participating in DRF/DRAF’s staff and GMC meetings can easily also participate in COSP. DRF/DRAF also hold some meetings in countries in which it operates to reduce meeting costs.

According to a few staff, board members, and donors, DRF/DRAF have made good progress in developing templates that program officers and other staff can use to collect information from DPOs, provide technical assistance, assess risk, review grant applications, and make decisions. Risk assessment templates and reporting have been put into routine practice. A technical assistance strategy has provided greater clarity for staff about expectations for technical assistance. Some staff noted that other processes still need to be systematized in this way, for example, protocols and templates for monitoring progress after funds are granted, such as site visit protocols, and checklists and guidance for greater clarity of budget allocations for technical assistance.

Some grantees and board members, donors and partners asked questions about DRF/DRAF’s planned phase-out and exit strategies from countries in the context of effectiveness and value for money. Some grantees noted that DRF/DRAF could work together with the grantees, government, and other stakeholders dedicated to promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities in designing a road map for their exit from certain countries to optimize and sustain the results of their work.

One donor or partner noted that DRF/DRAF could better capitalize on the positive outcomes of their work, even after they exit from a country, through more systematic documentation and sharing of country-level processes and outcomes. This interviewee noted that such process and outcome success stories convey hope, tell activists across the globe that change is possible, and motivate others to act.

**DRF/DRAF is investing in systems and processes that contribute to being a disability-inclusive institution and grantmaker, which contribute to their effectiveness and equity.** Staff and board members reported that DRF/DRAF have added systems and processes to support inclusion of persons with disabilities within the institution and throughout grantmaking. These include making sure that Annual Reports are available in local languages and in screen-reading accessible formats. It includes budgeting for accessible hotels, sign language interpreters, and personal assistants when persons with disabilities, including staff, travel to events.

Staff, board members, and donors acknowledged the financial expense of promoting this inclusion. One partner or donor noted: “Disability programs cannot be cheap. You need a personal assistant, sign language interpreters, translators, services to help people do their jobs.

---

18 Progress against the DRF/DRAF Gender Guidelines was not part of this evaluation.
Sometimes people tend to underestimate the cost of disability.” Yet, all who acknowledged such costs felt these expenses were justified as contributing to effectiveness and equity. Another staff or board member said that “offering accessibility costs money, but the cost of not doing it far outweighs the cost of doing it.”

Some staff, board members, donors and partners suggested that DRF/DRAF re-evaluate how such accommodation costs that improve accessibility and disability-inclusive processes and systems are categorized and counted within DRF/DRAF’s own budgets and grantmaking. Rather than categorizing those costs as “administrative” costs, which non-profits aim to keep as low as possible, DRF/DRAF could consider an analysis of such costs over a specific time period in which they are tracked as “disability inclusion” costs. Some donors and partners recommended that DRF/DRAF create a separate category of disability inclusion costs organizationally and in their grantmaking, so that while comparing grantmaking budgets for work aimed at promoting the human rights of persons with disabilities and other development and human rights programming, the value for money can be more equitably compared.

To increase efficiency, effectiveness and equity of operations, DRF/DRAF have changed the staffing for program officers to national positions. DRF/DRAF have systematically replaced international program officers with national program officers. By doing this, in addition to lowering costs, DRF/DRAF now have program officers who are more familiar with the contexts in which DRF/DRAF operate and who are part of national disability movements. Geographically, they are closer to grantees, which makes site visits less expensive and possible to undertake more frequently.

More than half of DRF/DRAF staff and board members and some donors and grantees interviewed felt DRF/DRAF could increase its efficiency and effectiveness by hiring more staff. Staff, board members, and donors reported that DRF/DRAF are achieving remarkable outcomes with the limited staff they have. One said: “It’s amazing what we have been able to do based on our relatively small staff and budgets.” But most also noted that DRF/DRAF are still “too lean” and need to hire more staff. That DRF/DRAF doubled their staff between the end of 2018 and mid-2019 is a step in the right direction. This was possibly the maximum increase that DRF/DRAF could have sustained over the course of a year. However, in the coming years, further staff growth could give DRF/DRAF much needed additional capacities.

Additional staff positions would help DRF/DRAF further systematize the impact, effectiveness, and equity of their work. This would reduce staff members’ heavy workloads, and provide valuable guidance and access to cross-country or cross-organizational learning. Such positions, according to interviewees, could include the following: a second program officer per country to reduce program officers’ workloads and increase the amount of support and technical assistance
program officers can provide to grantees;\textsuperscript{19} regional directors to supervise program officers and support cross-country learning; a director to oversee technical assistance and one to oversee advocacy; a partnerships officer to coordinate efforts with others; and a larger administrative team to support DRF/DRAF’s work.

On a related note, a few raised concerns about DRF/DRAF staff salaries.\textsuperscript{20} They observed that, while current salary levels increase cost-efficiency in the short term, they might reduce sustainability and effectiveness in the long term, especially when paired with heavy staff workloads.

\textit{As another way to increase internal efficiency, effectiveness, and equity, a few staff and board members suggested further increasing staff autonomy in decision making, transparency of communications, and better coordination among departments regarding organizational decisions and directions.} They suggested including more staff in strategic, organizational, and programmatic discussions and decision making more often, and also giving staff more latitude to make decisions – a process that is currently underway. They also suggested more coordination among operations, finance, and program teams, ensuring that each team has the full picture of program progress and challenges and DRF/DRAF’s direction, citing opportunities for cross-learning and input.

2. DRF/DRAF use a number of approaches to ensure the equity of their investments.

\textit{As described above, DRF/DRAF set aside a minimum of 50 percent of their grants for marginalized groups within the disability community.} This is a global average, meaning that percentage of funding for marginalized groups per country may vary. As of FY 2018-2019, DRF/DRAF reported that 53 percent of their grant funding across target countries supported marginalized groups.

\textsuperscript{19} DRF/DRAF POs may manage fewer grantees than other funders’ POs. However, the grantees they manage come from a marginalized community – the disability community – and often include nascent organizations and represent marginalized groups within the disability community. As a result, they require more technical assistance and ongoing accompaniment than grantees in most other funders’ POs’ portfolios, making their portfolio sizes incomparable. While others could provide DRF/DRAF’s grantees with technical assistance, the grantees believe that the relationships they have with their POs and their POs’ ongoing accompaniment give them the support they need to succeed.

\textsuperscript{20} The evaluation team did not compare DRF/DRAF salary levels to those of similar grantmakers. The evaluation team understands that DRF/DRAF have benchmarked their salaries against them.
As noted earlier, some partners reported that, compared with other delegations to Geneva for CRPD processes, delegations supported by DRF/DRAF are both more inclusive of marginalized group members and more effective because of that inclusive representation. However, such representation in public forums and among grantees does not ensure that marginalized DPOs have been mainstreamed into the disability movement, nor that stigma and discrimination within the movement has shifted. Marginalized groups may still experience discrimination and exclusionary practices. Additional monitoring by DRF/DRAF about experiences of exclusion and discrimination may be helpful to provide data on how national disability movements are becoming more inclusive.

With regard to equity, staff note that grantmaking processes include evaluation of inclusion of marginalized groups in projects and budget allocations for ensuring accessibility, for example if grantees include braille, sign language, personal assistants, and/or hotels that are wheelchair accessible. As noted above, interviewees noted that DRF/DRAF may benefit from analyzing the costs and benefits for doing so and review how these costs are captured in specific budget headings such as program, administrative, or other costs.

As described above, program officers seek out remote and marginalized groups and provide them with the support they need to apply to DRF/DRAF for funding and then, the technical assistance needed to carry out their project activities. Program officers, when starting a new portfolio, will go outside cities and to rural areas to hold informational meetings about DRF/DRAF for marginalized groups, which may be self-help groups, rather than organized DPOs. They then work closely with these groups to help them get to a point of being able to apply for a grant. They also intentionally work with DPOs who work to improve access and inclusion of other marginalized groups, according to a few DRF/DRAF staff and board members. The Uganda Capacity Fund is particularly focused on strengthening emergent and marginalized groups.

Half of DRF/DRAF staff and board members interviewed observed that DRF/DRAF make cross-movement connections with women’s movements and Indigenous Peoples movements, which represent two marginalized groups within the disability community. DRF/DRAF grantees also reported how DRF/DRAF helped grantees who represent marginalized groups connect with other funders by providing introductions and/or inviting them to participate in relevant conferences, such as the African Conference on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women, where they meet other human rights movement actors and funders.

In all five countries, grantees and partners noted that DRF/DRAF funding has enabled them to better engage with marginalized groups. Program officers and DPOs say they believe they are reaching remote and marginalized groups, particularly those in rural areas, and representing their needs when carrying out advocacy, because of DRF/DRAF. Many DPOs report they are
inviting other DPOs to participate in their activities, thanks to DRF/DRAF’s support. However, one DPO lamented the logistical and resource challenges of reaching marginalized groups, particularly in rural areas. Many DPOs said that additional funding would allow them to reach a wider network of persons with disabilities, including more of those who are marginalized.

**DRF/DRAF staff and board members also noted that it takes more time and money to engage with more marginalized groups.** To maintain the low costs that seem to be required in an environment that values “value for money,” they perceive that DRF/DRAF are able to include the more marginalized by asking more of staff. Some, as noted above, believe this may contribute to staff burnout. They asked instead for more resources to do this work.

**To further improve equity, some interviewees suggested including DPOs even more often in DRF/DRAF processes and as representatives of DRF/DRAF.** DRF/DRAF could be even more transparent with grantees about DRF/DRAF processes and decisions and offer more opportunities for grantee input and feedback. For example, DRF/DRAF could make grantees more central to country strategy development and implementation, giving DPOs a greater role in advancing it. In DRF/DRAF communications, DPOs could have even more prominent visibility, with more opportunities to share their stories and have their voices heard.

### V. Conclusion and Recommendations

As evidenced in this evaluation, DRF/DRAF’s goals and objectives are relevant to DPOs, governments, other donors, and partners similarly seeking to protect and promote human rights, including of persons with disabilities, as well as disability-inclusive development. All of these stakeholders value DRF/DRAF’s leadership in the global movement that promotes the human rights of persons with disabilities and appreciate opportunities to learn from DRF/DRAF’s experience. DRF/DRAF have made great progress in supporting DPOs to influence changes in policies, legislation, and programs, as well as to participate in national and international advocacy. DRF/DRAF have helped national disability movements gain strength and diversify their membership. DRF/DRAF have also helped DPOs strengthen their advocacy capacity.

All DPOs interviewed pointed to examples of changes in policy, legislation, and programs that are now sustainable, as long as countries do not experience significant changes in priorities of political leaders or emergency situations that affect them. They noted that ongoing advocacy and funding are required to ensure implementation of changes. Equally importantly, individual DPOs and national disability movements have gained new skills and confidence and have built new or stronger relationships with government officials — all resources that will help them continue to advocate for the human rights of persons with disabilities.

DRF/DRAF have contributed to these changes while operating efficiently in their grantmaking, technical assistance provision, and support for grantees who are participating in national and
international advocacy, according to evaluation findings. As part of their embrace of equity and to maximize the effectiveness of their grants, DRF/DRAF use a participatory grantmaking approach that is appreciated by stakeholders. These elements contribute to DRF/DRAF’s value for money: DRF/DRAF are effective and efficient in achieving their goals and objectives, and do so in an equitable way.

Building on DRF/DRAF’s accomplishments to date and grounded in the findings presented in this evaluation, stakeholders identified a number of modifications DRF/DRAF may want to consider to further strengthen their work going forward. These recommendations were identified prior to the start of the current COVID-19 pandemic. While some of these may be possible to act on during the pandemic, others may need to wait until after the pandemic is over, and still others may need to wait until some degree of economic recovery has taken place.

1. Further increase staff numbers, as described above, and modify DRF/DRAF’s organizational structure and fundraising to support them.

That DRF/DRAF doubled their staff between the end of 2018 and mid-2019 is a step in the right direction. This was possibly the maximum increase that DRF/DRAF could have sustained over the course of a year. However, in the coming years, further staff growth could give DRF/DRAF much needed additional capacities, as described in this report.

To ensure DRF/DRAF’s continued efficiency and equity in its practices, the model, as DRF/DRAF grow, needs to be more decentralized than the current one, with even greater delegation of decision making to teams within DRF/DRAF. It will also require, as DRF/DRAF have already acknowledged through their 2019 hiring and development of an initial development strategy, expanding fundraising beyond private foundations and bilateral donors to access more diversified funding. Some suggested that a focused strategy on external communications could contribute to a broader donor outreach strategy. A few board members, donors, and partners already see DRF/DRAF taking these kinds of steps.

2. Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s role within the global disability movement: develop a global influencing strategy.

DRF/DRAF have been leaders in the promotion of the human rights of persons with disabilities globally. As both an early entrant and an important funder in this space, DRF/DRAF have significant influence with DPOs, broader movements, peer organizations, and other funders. How are DRF/DRAF acting as a thought leader and sharing their learning? How are DRF/DRAF using their position and power to advance the human rights of persons with disabilities? What is their role within the larger movement, and how does that role complement the roles of others? DRF/DRAF may want to consider developing a global influencing strategy, which defines and
targets different audiences. This may mean increasing staffing to include a communications team.

Many donors, partners, and board members suggested that DRF/DRAF more systematically share lessons learned from their disability-inclusive, participatory grantmaking processes. While DRF/DRAF’s donors are learning from DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking experience, this information is needed by a much broader audience of stakeholders, particularly as the amount of disability-focused funding is projected to rise. In particular, the experience and processes used by program officers in conducting country assessments, developing country strategies, and supporting grantmaking to nascent and marginalized groups over a period of years represent a rich data set about social change and would be highly valued by the human rights grantmaking and development community.

More than one interviewee suggested that DRF/DRAF could share portions of country assessments that are safe to make more widely public. While producing these takes a lot of effort on the part of DRF/DRAF staff, they are invaluable summaries of country-specific context that would be useful to movement stakeholders more broadly. If DRF/DRAF want to contribute to the movement in this way, they may need to adjust staff job responsibilities or add staffing to make this a manageable part of their work stream.

DRF/DRAF are valued for their capacity to amplify DPO voices and bring their perspectives into global conversations. There may be ways to do this more systematically by setting up more channels and processes for sharing DPO experiences more broadly.

At a national level, national governments and national-level partners, such as international NGOs and donor country offices, are eager to work more directly with DRF/DRAF. More direct relationships could allow for stronger partnerships, as long as they are designed to protect the rights of persons with disabilities.

3. Further increase the efficiency and effectiveness of DRF/DRAF’s activities, by revisiting systems and processes.

As DRF/DRAF grow in size and complexity, they need to continue revisiting their systems and processes to ensure they remain efficient and effective. DRF/DRAF are currently addressing this. Some additional suggestions to consider, according to staff and other stakeholders, are the following:

- Increase alignment and planning between DRF/DRAF’s strategic plan and annual budgets;
- Identify how program staff contribute to grantees’ programmatic goals, and allocate sufficient time for them to support grantees in these ways.
• Create more internal guidelines for making materials accessible for grantees, and ensure that staff have sufficient time to do this or the resources required to contract it out. Where possible, centralize this function to increase efficiencies. Where an unreliable internet limits accessibility, identify ways to compensate for this.
• Ask program officers to more systematically share templates with each other, for example, regarding how to contract technical assistance consultants, to reduce program officers’ burdens.
• Create checklists and guidance with clear definitions, so that the program team can more easily provide updates on progress towards the logframe indicators each year.

4. Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s movement building approaches.

DRF/DRAF are recognized for their work helping national disability movements grow stronger and more diverse. Long country engagements are required to help these movements become sustainable. During those engagements, DRF/DRAF should continue to help movements gain greater cohesion, integrate more marginalized groups as core members, develop their leadership pipelines, and seek out strategic allies and cross-movement partnerships.

As part of that, DRF/DRAF may want to consider how their strategies are focused on DPO strengths and broader movement strength. DRF/DRAF may wish to assess how their funding of DPOs is enhancing or inhibiting broader movement strengths. DRF/DRAF may also benefit from further assessments of how their funding has promoted inclusivity among DPOs or the movement in general, or how their funding has changed attention to intersectionality. Through the accompaniment that the program officers provide, program officers could focus more deeply on helping movement members build trust with each other and come to understand and appreciate different perspectives.

5. Further strengthen DRF/DRAF’s approaches to helping DPOs strengthen their capacity.

DPOs are grateful for the support they receive from DRF/DRAF to strengthen their advocacy capacity. Government officials, other donors, and partners recognize the difference this support makes. As more stakeholders become interested in the human rights of persons with disabilities, and as they increasingly see DPOs as good partners, more will be asked of them. With this in mind, DRF/DRAF may want to reflect on the capacity building support they offer.

To meet more DPO capacity building needs, such as those related to organizational development, program officers may want to partner more intentionally with national-level organizations that offer those services.
DRF/DRAF may want to invest even more time and effort in equipping DPOs representing marginalized disability groups, since in many contexts, their representation is still perceived as token and their participation is not at decision-making levels.

DRF/DRAF should continue to help the DPOs they support mobilize other DPOs at a community level, where very few persons with disabilities are aware of their rights as outlined in the CRPD.

In contexts where change is happening slowly, it would be helpful to clarify the focus of grantee technical assistance. For example, in those settings, DRF/DRAF may want to focus on awareness raising to help address stigma.

To further promote DPO learning, DRF/DRAF may want to expand the learning opportunities they support. Other learning opportunities might include (as listed by DPOs interviewed):

- Convening grantees more frequently in country or at a regional or global level to promote cross-organizational learning;
  - Invite more marginalized groups to present their experiences during these convenings.
- Promoting exchange visits between grantees within and between countries;
- Setting up more private social media groups (Facebook pages, WhatsApp groups) for grantees to share their experiences with each other, including across country boundaries;
- Continuing to produce and distribute an online newsletter for grantees to learn about each other’s work and also about news important to the disability community;
- Providing grantees with access to more technical assistance providers with a range of technical expertise;
- Providing umbrella DPOs with access to conflict resolution technical expertise;
- Funding grantees’ monitoring activities, so that they can have a better sense of their effectiveness;
- Continuing to work closely with umbrella DPOs to help them develop their skills in building the capacity of other DPOs.

6. Seek out more ways to mainstream marginalized DPOs.

DRF/DRAF are recognized for their intentionality around reaching and including more marginalized DPOs in national disability movements. This is an important niche for DRF/DRAF’s work. To further increase DRF/DRAF’s effectiveness in this regard, DRF/DRAF may want to consider the following suggestions:

- Continue to work closely with national disability movements to help them not only include representatives of marginalized groups, but also mainstream them in their
governance and and promote their cultural acceptance within the movements. This may mean specific technical support related to reducing stigma and discrimination.

- Document, monitor, and share inclusion practices among grantees, especially with and among umbrella groups.
- Focus more resources on reaching remote areas. DRF/DRAF could do this directly, or they could provide even more support to larger DPOs’ efforts to reach smaller DPOs in these areas. Monitoring marginalized DPOs especially at the rural level is key, as they require even more technical guidance if their successes are to be sustained.

7. Further articulate DRF/DRAF’s programmatic sequencing and exit strategy

Influencing changes in policies, legislation, and programs so that the rights of persons with disabilities are better protected and promoted takes time. All stakeholders acknowledge that once changes in policies, legislation, and programs are achieved, they then need to be monitored in an ongoing way to ensure their implementation. At the same time, it takes concerted effort over a long period of time to help national disability movements and individual DPOs gain sufficient strength to be able to sustain their work. Different skill sets and institutional capacities are required in moving from drafting legislation to a focus on implementation. DPOs and staff note that DRF/DRAF’s strategic planning should include anticipating and monitoring for resistance and pushback, and setting into place mitigation strategies as part of their country and global strategies.

DRF/DRAF currently commit to at least six years in each target country and work in two-year cycles to develop, assess and revise country strategies. DRF/DRAF may want to articulate the logic of this timeframe and sequencing, so that it is clear how their strategy addresses the current context, and when, why, and how DRF/DRAF will exit a country. DRF/DRAF may want to rethink how they remain engaged with national movements and DPOs with which they have built relationships even after they are no longer present in country, as part of a strategy for sustainable social change. This could be via continued participation in WhatsApp groups and periodic sharing of e-newsletters, or other methods.
Annexes
A. Contribution Analysis Stories
   1. Indonesia
   2. Uganda
B. Evaluation Data Collection Instruments
C. Evaluation Team
A. Contribution Analysis Stories

1. Indonesia: Drafting the Planning and Monitoring Regulation (Government Regulation 70/2019) for the national Law on Persons with Disabilities (Law 6/2016)

Background on the Law on Persons with Disabilities

Indonesia enacted its national Law on Persons with Disabilities on April 15, 2016 as Law 6/2016. DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs had significant roles in shaping it, including through holding workshops, seminars, and meetings during the drafting process and sharing their expertise, knowledge, and experience as persons with disabilities. The DPOs also used social media to build awareness about the importance of a national disability act. Prior to this law, issues related to disability were managed by the Ministry of Social Affairs. DPOs asserted that disability needs to be addressed as a multi-sectoral issue. With the enactment of the Law on Persons with Disabilities, disability is now officially a multi-sectoral issue, with recognized relevance to the education, health, transportation, workforce, and other sectors.

Influencing the Planning and Monitoring Regulation

In 2016, once the DPOs had successfully influenced passage of the national Law on Persons with Disabilities, they turned their attention to helping the Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS) draft the regulations required to implement it. During the process of drafting and passing the Law on Persons with Disabilities, the DPOs had built a strong working relationship and significant trust with BAPPENAS. As a result, it was natural that they would continue their partnership during the development of the law’s regulations.

Stakeholders, including DPOs and other NGOs, and BAPPENAS agreed to develop eight regulations to implement the act, since disability issues are multi-sectoral, and there is no one government body able to manage these cross-sectoral issues. These regulations would address planning and implementation for issues related to justice, education, economy and employment, social protection, and public services.

21 These eight regulations are: (1) Planning, services and evaluation to fulfil the rights of persons with disabilities; (2) Persons with disabilities in court process; (3) Education services for persons with disabilities; (4) Workforce and incentives for companies that employ persons with disabilities; (5) Social protection for persons with disabilities; (6) Habilitation and rehabilitation; (7) Disability service unit in the workforce; and (8) Accessible housing, public services and disaster handling for persons with disabilities.
BAPPENAS, the DPOs, and other stakeholders then agreed to establish working groups to help draft each regulation. Although these working groups had no formal authority, they would draft the regulation language and submit it to the relevant government body for review and passage. A DPO was assigned by internal agreement among the working group members as the team leader of each working group.

One of the regulations championed by DPOs addressed planning and monitoring implementation of the Law on Persons with Disabilities. For the drafting of the Planning and Monitoring Regulation, the Director of the Association of Women with Disabilities Indonesia (Himpunan Wanita Disabilitas Indonesia, HWDI), a DRF/DRAF grantee, was selected as the leader. Several other DRF/DRAF grantees were also part of the working group and involved in the drafting process: the Center for Election Access for Persons with Disabilities (Pusat Pemilihan Umum Akses Untuk Penyandang Cacat, PPUA), the Indonesian Mental Health Association (Perhimpunan Jiwa Sehat Indonesia), OHANA (Perhimpunan Organisasi Harapan Nusantara), the Association of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia (PPDI), and the Indonesian Blind Union (PERTUNI). They also partnered with the Center for Indonesian Law and Policy Studies (Pusat Studi Hukum dan Kebijakan, PSHK), which helped them ensure the draft language was in line with legal language.

DPOs carried out the initial national drafting workshop for the regulation, and BAPPENAS representatives participated. Although each of the DPOs in the workshop had its own focus (e.g., women’s issues, deaf/blind support focused issues, electoral issues, etc.), the discussion was able to cover most of the issues faced by persons with disabilities in Indonesia. They understood they were representing persons with disabilities in Indonesia broadly when they were gathering together to draft the regulation. Therefore, they did not push their own agenda in the discussions, but made sure that, in the regulation, they addressed as many areas as they could for the disability community across Indonesia.

The DPOs relied on their own experiences to help them draft the regulation. The DPOs also used knowledge they acquired from participating in events funded by DRF/DRAF, especially relying on what they had learned about the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). They noted that the long and medium-term planning language in the regulation should be in line with the CRPD and the Sustainable Development Goals.
DPOs finalized the draft, formally handing it over to the Ministry as a civil society contribution reflecting the perspectives of experts on disability concerns. This reflected the trust and collaboration between BAPPENAS and the DPOs, based on their years of working together.

BAPPENAS further reviewed and analyzed the draft regulation, comparing it to various international and regional policies, as well as recent national laws and policies. They prepared it to be discussed with other related ministries. At this stage, although the draft was out of the DPOs’ control, the working group’s team leader remained in regular communication with BAPPENAS.

BAPPENAS carried out coordination meetings with several related ministries, such as the Ministry of Home Affairs, State secretariat, Finance, Social Affairs, Law and Human Rights, Education, Health, Employment, Transportation, Women’s Empowerment, and Child Protection, to disseminate the draft and get approval since these ministries would be involved in the regulation’s implementation. During these ministry-level discussions, BAPPENAS made adjustments to the draft to ensure that the narratives were in line with the government’s standards. This process took a long time, as BAPPENAS had to coordinate this process with other ministries’ schedules. The regulation was finally approved and enacted on October 4, 2019 as Government Regulation (Peraturan Pemerintah, PP) Number 70/2019.

Achievements of the Planning and Monitoring Regulation

The Planning and Monitoring Regulation mandates that each planning and budgeting cycle must address the needs and fulfill the rights of persons with disabilities – something that was not happening previously. In the past, budget line items that addressed the needs and rights of persons with disabilities frequently got eliminated as a budget went through its approval process, starting at the village level and passing through higher levels of discussions. This often happened either because there were no DPOs or other stakeholders present in the discussions to ensure the disability issues were included, or because the government officer who was responsible for drafting the planning and budgeting document did not know where to allocate the plan within the template, since there was no line item in the government’s budgeting template for accommodating the needs and rights of persons with disabilities. When included, the government usually put the budget for disability issues under Social Affairs or Health.

---

22 Indonesia adopts a “bottom up” approach for planning and budgeting process, therefore the process starts from the lowest level of governance, which is the village level.
without further explanation, which often caused confusion and misallocation of the budget, with the result that, in the end, no budget was allocated for persons with disabilities.

Now with the enactment of PP 70/2019, this has changed. The government now has official guidance on where and how to accommodate the needs and rights of persons with disabilities in planning and budgeting, and DPOs have a legal basis to demand their rights be fulfilled. The PP allows DPOs to actively monitor the progress of planning and budgeting from discussions at the village level up to the national level to ensure that plans and budget related to their rights do not get lost or deleted in the process.

This regulation is very important to the implementation of the Law on Persons with Disabilities, as it affects all issues and their respective ministries. All government ministries and agencies from the national level down to village level reference it when developing their respective plans and budgets.

**DRF/DRAF’s Contribution**

The participating DPOs acknowledge and appreciate DRF/DRAF’s support in getting the process of drafting the regulation kicked off, as DRF/DRAF’s funding provided them with opportunities to hold meetings, discussions, and workshops essential to the drafting of the regulation. DPOs in Jakarta and Yogyakarta were more physically present in the drafting workshops, as they are bigger organizations and have the means and funding to be more involved, as well as face fewer geographical challenges to participating. Nonetheless, DRF/DRAF’s funding enabled them to reach out to other DPOs, sometimes via face-to-face meetings and sometimes via SMS, Messenger, or WhatsApp, to seek their input and suggestions for the regulation’s draft language. Several DPOs involved in the working groups were umbrella organizations with networks all across Indonesia. This was especially helpful, as they did not want the drafting to be a product of groups from Jakarta, but rather the result of input from DPOs across Indonesia.

Further, most—if not all—DPOs involved in the regulation’s drafting were solely funded by DRF/DRAF. Had DRF/DRAF not provided financial support, it is believed that the drafting process would have been significantly delayed and meaningful participation from the disability community would not have existed.
2. Uganda: Strengthening access to services by refugees with disabilities in humanitarian settings

Project Overview and Background

This project focused on Uganda’s commitment to strengthen the integration of disabilities in refugee response systems. Three DRF/DRAF grantees worked together as a consortium to strengthen access to services by refugees with disabilities in three humanitarian settings in Uganda: Uruchinga and Nakivale Refugee Settlements in Isingiro in the south near the Rwanda border; Bidibidi refugee settlement camp in Adjumani in the north near the South Sudan border and in Kampala, the capital, which has an urban refugee settlement camp.

Prior to this project, the Office of the Prime Minister’s refugee program had lumped issues pertaining to persons with disabilities under “persons with specific needs.” This category includes the elderly, chronically ill, unaccompanied minors, and persons with visual impairment and missing limbs, among others. The implementation of this approach leaves out a number of impairment groups and their unique needs, including persons who are deaf, persons with albinism, little people, persons with cerebral palsy, and persons with psychosocial disability. This meant that services for these other impairment groups were not being addressed in refugee response programs.

The three grantees who worked on this effort included the National Union of Women with Disabilities of Uganda (NUWODU), Restoration and Hope for Refugees (REHORE), and the National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU). Each has a specific role. NUWODU is the umbrella organization for all organizations of women with disabilities in Uganda and is the key implementing partner, coordinating the two partners NUDIPU and REHORE and responsible for disbursing funds to them. REHORE is responsible for identifying refugees with disabilities living in the camps and handling their legal concerns. NUDIPU is the national umbrella organization for persons with disabilities in Uganda and handles issues for all disabled persons organizations (DPOs) registered with it, as well as general disability issues.

Influencing Mainstreaming Disability in Services Provided to Refugees

The consortium’s project to strengthen access to services by refugees with disabilities in humanitarian settings was started in 2015 with funding from DRF/DRAF. NUWODU talked with the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) about the issue and signed a memorandum of understanding with the OPM to allow it to work freely in the refugee camps. Then, the consortium, in consultation with OPM, launched the project formally in 2016 in a conference in Kampala with the various stakeholders that would be part of the project implementation process, including government and U.N. officials, INGOs, national NGOs and DPOs. Besides the participating consortium members, the stakeholders that attended included representatives
from the OPM, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES), national-level Disabled Persons’ Organizations (DPOs), Inter Aid, and Pan African Development Education and Advocacy Programme (PADEAP), as well as the Red Cross officer in charge of tracking refugees.

The project’s goal was to ensure that persons with disabilities, and especially women and girls with disabilities, are comprehensively included in the service delivery systems aimed at benefiting refugees. The consortium members used advocacy and awareness-raising activities to promote mainstreaming disability in existing programs in refugee camps and host communities. The project implementation started in Kampala district in the urban refugee settlement camp, with a second phase in Oruchinga refugee settlement camp, followed by a third phase in the Nakivale and Bidibidi refugee settlement camps.

**Influencing mainstreaming disability in services provided to refugees in Bidibidi refugee settlement camp**

The three DRF/DRAF grantees started working in Bidibidi refugee settlement camp in Yumbe district in 2017. This is the biggest refugee camp in Uganda with a population of 230,000 refugees. To date, 16,000 refugees with disabilities have been identified in the camp.

NUWODU, NUDIPU, and REHORE held sensitization meetings, workshops, and advocacy activities with the stakeholders providing humanitarian aid in the camp. Through the meetings, they sought to assess the level of awareness about disability in the Bidibidi refugee camp and discuss mainstreaming persons with disabilities issues in government programs. These stakeholders included the local government officials in Yumbe district, the Bidibidi refugee settlement camp staff, representatives of the Office of the Prime Minister, UNHCR, NGOs, and DPOs, as well as local leaders from the host and refugee communities. The sensitization and advocacy pointed out the limited inclusion of refugees with disabilities in humanitarian aid.

**Project Achievements**

The goals of the project have been achieved. In the settings where the project operates, refugees with disabilities are no longer categorized as “persons with specific needs,” but rather, are mainstreamed. There is now greater inclusion of refugees with disabilities in refugee response programs. This was confirmed by the Community Liaisons Officer in Bidibidi Refugee settlement camp, the officer in the community-based services department of the Office of the Prime Minister, and the vice-chairperson of the district’s local council. The government policy makers are handling disability in a more comprehensive manner. There are now more refugees and host community people with disabilities benefiting from the OPM’s education and health
programs. The project has also succeeded in influencing the NGOs working with refugees to recognize the need to mainstream refugees with disabilities in humanitarian work. The NGOs working in humanitarian aid are identifying persons with disabilities and supporting them in their program activities. Other stakeholders, such as caregivers and community leaders in the host and refugee communities, have also received information on disability and have begun to develop more positive attitudes toward persons with disabilities.

Some specific examples of the changes stakeholders are making in their work in Bidibidi camp since 2017, influenced by the consortium’s efforts, are as follows:

- Accessible classrooms with ramps and latrines have been constructed.
- UNHCR has provided funds to Sign Church Aid to build an inclusive school located where the children attending are from the host and refugee communities.
- Windle Trust International is supporting refugees with disabilities to attend higher institutions of learning.
- Humanity & Inclusion (formerly Handicap International) has started implementing disability-related programs in Bidibidi refugee settlement camp. They were previously in other settlement camps, but not in Bidibidi refugee settlement camp.
- Women Refugees’ Commission is carrying out research in the refugee camps and linking the women with disabilities to international forums, so that their voices can be heard in refugee programs.

In some cases, refugees with disabilities have been selected to take up leadership positions in the refugee camps. According to one stakeholder in Bidibidi refugee settlement camp:

“There are two refugees with disabilities who have taken up two positions as welfare persons out of the five positions. These positions are equivalent to local council chairpersons in the district local government political system, as these are the head of the sub-counties in the district local governments. These two persons with disabilities were trained by NUWODU.”

In addition, NUWODU has raised awareness of women with disabilities in the refugee and host communities about how to report cases of abuse when they occur. According to NUWODU,

\[23\] The Ugandan government has a policy for programs that are implemented in a refugee setting that specifies that services should also include the host communities. This is to reduce hostilities towards refugees, as in some instances, the services provided to the refugees may be more efficiently delivered than those in the host communities.
“We have built the capacities of the refugees in terms of the service delivery of where to go and whom to contact for a service. If you are sexually abused or are experiencing gender-based violence, we have referral pathways.”

Refugee women with disabilities are also encouraged by NUWODU to form savings groups, especially those that have not joined any savings scheme in their cells or villages. These are all activities organized within the refugee settlement camps.

To maintain the advocacy and awareness raising activities about disability and refugee issues, NUWODU reports that it carries out continuous monitoring activities together with the other two consortium partners. However, at one point, they experienced a slowdown in project activities, due to staff turnover. In addition, an interviewee in the Bidibidi refugee settlement camp observed that NUWODU is not constantly present in the camp, negatively affecting the effectiveness of their work:

“Due to the long process of advocacy, there is a need to have someone on the ground, so as to continuously sensitize people, as it takes a long time for people’s attitudes to change. NUWODU tends to come to the refugee settlement camp and disappear, and when people forget, then they come back. They are not present during the meetings to help to remind the stakeholders about what has taken place. The biggest challenge is that once you lose touch with the community, it is a problem. You have to continue with the training. Some NGOs come and go, and this affects the continuity of the program.”

Organizations, like NUWODU, that want to influence change in settings where they are not constantly present may want to rethink their model. While regular monitoring is helpful, identifying and training someone living in the setting who can provide constant accompaniment may lead to greater and faster positive results.

**DRF/DRAF’s contribution**

The consortium members reported that they used DRF/DRAF support to fund the project’s meetings, workshops, and monitoring activities and to partially fund the salary of the staff member in charge of this project.
B. Evaluation Data Collection Instruments

1. DRF/DRAF Staff Members and Board of Directors

The purpose of this interview is to gather information from DRF/DRAF staff to inform our global independent evaluation of DRF/DRAF’s global programs between 2017 and 2019, particularly in Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Uganda, which were selected as sample countries to represent the DRF/DRAF global portfolio. Our evaluation questions and, therefore, also our interview questions follow the OECD DAC’s evaluation criteria, are based on DRF/DRAF’s evaluation matrix and logframe, and have been reviewed by DRF/DRAF staff.

We are gathering information from a number of DRF/DRAF staff, along with other funders, development partners, government officials, DPOs, and persons with disabilities. We will analyze all of the information we gather together, according to the type of informant (e.g., DRF/DRAF staff member). We will do our best to keep individual inputs anonymous, recognizing the challenge of this with DRF/DRAF staff members, since you form a small group with specific assignments. Nonetheless, we will do our best. Are you comfortable with this? This interview will take approximately 90 minutes. Do you have any questions?

a) Relevance

1. Please tell us about how DRF/DRAF defined (headquarters – Diana and Melanie: the logframe outputs and outcomes; country level – POs working on the 5 sample countries: the country strategy objectives) that DRF/DRAF hopes their support will help grantees achieve or influence. (HQ; POs working on the 5 sample countries; Board members)

   a. What other agencies’ or organizations’ goals (DPOs, development agencies, major human rights funders) did you consider as you designed or amended the logframe outputs and outcome? In what ways are DRF/DRAF’s outputs and outcomes similar or different? (only for HQ-level staff)

   b. What movements’, agencies’ or organizations’ goals (disability movement, DPOs, other funders) did you consider as you designed or amended the country strategy objectives? In what ways are the country strategy objectives similar or different? (only for program officers - POs working on the 5 sample countries)

   c. With which other agencies’ or organizations’ goals do DRF/DRAF goals align? (for Board members only)

      i. In what ways?

      ii. Why is this important?
2. Along the way, you have learned from DRF/DRAF’s and DPOs’ experiences. Please tell us about how you have shared any of your learning with the disability movement and donors or other partners at country, regional, and global levels. *(HQ; country level – POs working on the 5 sample countries)*

   a. What were their reactions to what you shared?

   b. Were you in any way surprised by their reactions? Why or Why not?

   c. To the extent you are aware of this, please tell us how sharing your learning has helped inform disability movements’, donors’, and/or other partners’ priorities and practices at country, regional, and global levels.

3. Along the way, DRF/DRAF staff have learned from DRF/DRAF’s and DPOs’ experiences. Please tell us about how DRF/DRAF staff have shared any of their learning with the disability movement and donors or other partners at country, regional, and global levels. *(Board members)*

   a. To the extent you are aware of this, please tell us how sharing their learning has helped inform disability movements’, donors’, and/or other partners’ priorities and practices at country, regional, and global levels.

b) **Effectiveness**

4. When you think about all the national and local-level changes in legislation, policy, and government programs that DPOs have helped influence since 2017, with support from DRF/DRAF, which changes do you believe will have the greatest impact? *(We will first review reflection discussion notes for initial information. Based on these, we will talk with POs working on the 4 sample countries (too early for Nigeria).)* *(For HQ staff; for POs working on the 5 sample countries)*

   a. Which changes that have occurred since 2017 do you think will benefit the greatest number of persons with disabilities? *(For POs; for HQ)*

   b. Thinking about the changes that have occurred since 2017 that you think will benefit the greatest number of persons with disabilities, please describe how these changes came about.

      i. What did DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs do to contribute to the observed changes?

      ii. How did DRF/DRAF’s support help them influence these changes?

      iii. Are there other individuals, groups, or events that contributed to the changes you observed?
1. How did these individuals, groups, or events contribute to the change you observed?

iv. Who will these changes benefit and in what ways? That is, how have or will the rights of persons with disabilities improve(d) in accordance with the CRPD, at least in part, as a result of the work of DPOs supported by DRF/DRAF?

5. Which changes that have occurred since 2017 did you consider were very difficult to achieve, and yet DPOs supported by DRF/DRAF helped to bring them about? Please describe these changes and how they came about. \(\text{(For POs; for HQ)}\)

a. What did the DPOs do to contribute to the observed changes?

b. How did DRF/DRAF’s support help them influence these changes?

c. Are there other individuals, groups, or events that contributed to the changes you observed?

i. How did these individuals, groups, or events contribute to the change you observed?

d. Who will these changes benefit and in what ways?

6. Please tell us about DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs that are participating in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes. \(\text{(HQ; POs)}\)

a. What are these processes? That is, to which treaty bodies (or SDG high-level forum) are DPOs submitting (independent or alternative) reports and presenting?

b. Which DPOs participated in the processes?

i. How did their participation come about?

ii. In addition to providing grant funding for these processes, how else, if at all, did DRF/DRAF support these DPOs?

iii. What difference has participation of DPOs in these processes made?

1. That is, how has DPO engagement affected the processes? How has DPO engagement influenced concluding observations?

2. How are the DPOs planning to use the Concluding Observations at country level? \(\text{(POs only)}\)

7. Please provide some examples of how DRF/DRAF have helped disability movements in Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, and Uganda to become more inclusive of all people with disabilities, including women, minority groups, and people with disabilities who are among the most marginalized, such as people with intellectual disabilities, little people, and people with albinism. \(\text{(For HQ; for POs working on the 4 countries of the sample (too early for Nigeria))}\)
a. What has enabled DRF/DRAF to influence these changes?

b. What obstacles has DRF/DRAF faced, and how has DRF/DRAF overcome them?

8. Please provide some examples of how, with DRF/DRAF’s support (grants, guidance, technical assistance, networking), grantees have gained the advocacy skills, advocacy-related knowledge, and connections necessary to advocate effectively on the rights of persons with disabilities. (For HQ; for POs working on the 4 sample countries (too early for Nigeria).)

a. Which of DRF/DRAF’s strategies (grants, TA, or global advocacy) do you believe grantees have found most useful?

b. If grantees need more support than DRF/DRAF can offer, how does DRF/DRAF help grantees meet those needs?

9. Please compare the degree of participation of DPOs and persons with disabilities in the larger disability or civil society movement or in government processes before and after they have received DRF/DRAF support. (For HQ; for POs working on the 4 sample countries (too early for Nigeria).)

10. Let’s talk about DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach, that is involving persons with disabilities in decision-making about grants. Some argue that participatory grantmaking approaches are too time consuming and costly, with the cost of using them being higher than any benefits gained. However, undergirding the disability movement, we have the principle of “nothing about us without us.” (For HQ; for POs working on the 5 sample countries)

a. What do you think about these two statements?

b. In what ways does DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach fulfill the principle “nothing about us without us?”

c. Are there any ways in which this approach might be changed to better fulfill the principle “nothing about us without us?”

c) Sustainability

11. Please provide any examples of how changes in policies or institutions that protect the rights of persons with disabilities continue to provide mechanisms or potentially could continue to provide mechanisms for DPOs’ and others’ engagement in defending the rights of persons with disabilities, after DRF/DRAF funding has ceased. (HQ; for POs working on the 5 sample countries)

a. What were the major factors that influenced or could influence positively or negatively the sustainability of these results?

b. Who influenced or might influence these changes?

c. What did they do or could they do to contribute to the observed changes?
d) Efficiency

12. What steps do DRF/DRAF take to ensure that they are efficient in delivering grants, providing technical assistance to DPOs, and supporting persons with disabilities to participate in national and global advocacy efforts? (HQ; POs working on the 5 sample countries) (Board members – about grantmaking only)

(probes: degree to which the amount of time and effort required for DRF/DRAF staff to deliver and DPOs to receive grants is reasonable; degree to which grants are delivered in a timely fashion; degree to which DRF/DRAF provide relevant technical assistance to DPOs in a timely and accessible manner; degree to which amount of time and effort required for DRF/DRAF staff to support persons with disabilities to participate in national and global advocacy efforts is reasonable; degree to which the amount of time and effort required for persons with disabilities to benefit from the support DRF/DRAF offer to help them participate in national and global advocacy efforts is reasonable)

13. To what extent do you believe that DRF/DRAF’s inputs have been sufficient to achieve (HQ: DRF/DRAF’s logframe outputs and outcome; country level: country strategy objectives)? How do you know? (HQ; POs working on the 5 sample countries)

14. To what extent have DRF/DRAF achieved their (HQ: logframe outputs and outcome; country level: country strategy objectives) on time? (HQ; POs working on the 5 sample countries)
   a. If DRF/DRAF have faced delays, what has caused these delays, and what changes have DRF/DRAF made in response to them?

15. Beyond the Grantee Survey responses, what additional feedback, if any, have DRF/DRAF received from grantees in relation to: (HQ, POs working on the 5 sample countries)
   a. adequacy of the support they received to achieve grant objectives;
   b. the timeliness of the support they received to achieve grant objectives; and
   c. the quality of the support they receive from DRF/DRAF, as compared to the support they receive from other funders or sources?

e) Value for Money

(Building on the Effectiveness and Efficiency questions above)

16. To what extent do you believe that the support that DRF/DRAF give to their grantees reaches marginalized groups of persons with disabilities? (HQ; POs working on the 5 sample countries)
   a. How are they benefitting or are likely to benefit from results that DRF/DRAF are helping grantees achieve?
   b. What steps, in your view, are DRF/DRAF taking to achieve this?
i. What else could DRF/DRAF do to achieve this aim?

17. What steps do DRF/DRAF take to ensure that they minimize the costs of the services they seek to deliver, while at the same time, delivering quality services in a timely fashion? *(HQ; POs working on the 5 sample countries)*

f) **Closing Question**

18. Thinking about the work that DRF/DRAF do and the support they are able to offer, do you have any additional suggestions that would help DRF/DRAF improve the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of their work, and better ensure the sustainability of the results that their support helps achieve? *(HQ; POs working on the 5 sample countries)*

*Thank you for your time!*
2. Government Officials

Disability Rights Fund (DRF) and its sister fund Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (DRF/DRAF) is a collaboration bridging disability activists and donors to support persons with disabilities around the world to build diverse movements, ensure inclusive development agendas, and achieve equal rights. Through grantmaking, advocacy, and technical assistance, DRF/DRAF supports disabled persons organizations (DPOs) to use global rights and development frameworks, such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Between 2008 and June 2019, DRF/DRAF awarded over $32 million in more than 1,100 grants to organizations of persons with disabilities in 36 countries. DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking especially emphasizes grants to (and inclusion of) those marginalized within the disability community (including women, youth, rural populations, indigenous, persons with albinism, little people, people with psychosocial disabilities, people with intellectual disabilities, etcetera). DRF/DRAF currently has 19 staff, spread throughout the world.

The purpose of this interview is to gather information from government officials who are familiar with DRF/DRAF’s work to inform our global independent evaluation of DRF/DRAF’s global programs between 2017 and 2019, particularly in Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Uganda, which were selected as sample countries to represent the DRF/DRAF global grantmaking portfolio. Our evaluation questions and, therefore, also our interview questions follow the OECD DAC’s evaluation criteria, are based on DRF/DRAF’s evaluation matrix and logframe, and have been reviewed by DRF/DRAF staff and our evaluation’s Evaluation Advisory Board, which is a participatory group of representative persons with disabilities and key partners.

We are gathering information from a number of DRF/DRAF staff, along with other funders, development partners, government officials, DPOs, and persons with disabilities. We will analyze all of the information we gather together, according to the type of informant (e.g., government official). We will keep individual inputs anonymous. Are you comfortable with this? This interview will take 45-60 minutes. Do you have any questions?

a) Relevance

Our first set of questions is about the relevance of DRF/DRAF’s work to the needs of persons with disabilities. DRF/DRAF seeks to support the efforts of disabled person’s organizations (DPOs) to (1) influence the harmonization of legislation, policy, and government programs with the CRPD; (2) participate in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes (by submitting and presenting alternative/shadow reports to human rights monitoring bodies and contributing to Voluntary National Reviews for the High Level Political Forum on the SDGs); (3) make disability movements more inclusive, reflecting the diverse voices of people with disabilities; and (4) have the capacity required to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities.
disabilities; with the longer-term objective of improving the rights of persons with disabilities in accordance with the CRPD.

1. In what ways are these objectives aligned with your government’s efforts to improve the lives of persons with disabilities, in line with the CRPD? In what ways does DRF/DRAF’s support for disabled persons’ organizations (DPOs) help your government achieve its objectives?

2. Are there any changes you’d recommend that DRF/DRAF make to these objectives? Please explain.

3. Have you ever been invited to or involved in DRF/DRAF Grantee Convenings or meetings with grantees or the disability community? If yes, was this helpful? Please explain.

b) Effectiveness

The next set of questions ask about any progress being made to build DPOs’ advocacy capacities, create more inclusive disability movements, increase the participation of persons with disabilities in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes (by submitting and presenting alternative/shadow reports to them), or to increase the harmonization of legislation, policy, and government programs (including those addressing the SDGs) with the CRPD.

4. Since 2017, has your government made any changes to legislation, policy, and/or government programs (including those addressing the SDGs) to better harmonize them with the CRPD so that the rights of persons with disabilities are improved? (We’ll ask about changes in the specific sample country.)
   a. If no, please explain.
   b. If yes, please explain how these changes came about.
      i. Whom will these changes benefit and in what ways?
      ii. Which parts of your government were involved in advancing these changes and how did the changes come about?
      iii. Did your government partner in any way with entities outside of the government to advance these changes? If yes, which entities, institutions, or organizations provided assistance, what did they do, and what difference did their assistance make?

5. Since 2017, are you aware of any instances when disabled persons’ organizations (DPOs) participated in international or national human rights and SDG monitoring processes, such as reporting to any UN Treaty Bodies or the High Level Political Forum? Or contributing to the State report to the CRPD or other human rights committees? If yes,
a. What are these processes? That is, for which treaty bodies (or SDG high-level political forum) or other stakeholders did the DPOs submit (alternative/shadow) reports, review or contribute to a report, and/or present information?

b. What difference has the participation of DPOs in these processes made? That is, how have they affected the processes, and/or how has their participation influenced follow-up actions by your government?

6. Since 2017, to your knowledge, has the composition of the disability movement in your country changed in any way? Who/which disability groups comprises the movement? To what do you attribute any changes that you have observed?

7. Since 2017, have you noticed any changes in the capacities of DPOs to advocate effectively to government on the rights of persons with disabilities? If yes, what have you noticed? Are there any new ways in which they have been able to contribute to advancing the rights of persons with disabilities?

c) Closing Question

8. Thinking about the work that DRF/DRAF do and the support they are able to offer, do you have any additional suggestions that would help DRF/DRAF improve the relevance and effectiveness of their work?
3. Donors and Partners

The purpose of this interview is to gather information from human rights funders and development partners working in the disability rights space and who are familiar with DRF/DRAF’s work to inform our global independent evaluation of DRF/DRAF’s global programs between 2017 and 2019, particularly in Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Uganda, which were selected as sample countries to represent the DRF/DRAF global portfolio. Our evaluation questions and, therefore, also our interview questions follow the OECD DAC’s evaluation criteria, are based on DRF/DRAF’s evaluation matrix and logframe, and have been reviewed by DRF/DRAF staff and our evaluation’s Evaluation Advisory Board.

We are gathering information from a number of DRF/DRAF staff, along with other funders, development partners, government officials, DPOs, and persons with disabilities. We will analyze all of the information we gather together, according to the type of informant (e.g., human rights funder or development partner). We will keep individual inputs anonymous. Are you comfortable with this? This interview will take 45-60 minutes. Do you have any questions?

a) Opening Question

1. Please briefly describe how you know DRF/DRAF.

b) Relevance

Our first set of questions is about the relevance of DRF/DRAF’s work to the rights of persons with disabilities. DRF/DRAF seeks to support the efforts of disabled person’s organizations (DPOs) to (1) influence the harmonization of legislation, policy, and government programs (including those addressing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)) with the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD); (2) participate in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes (by submitting and presenting alternative/shadow reports); (3) make disability movements more inclusive, reflecting the diverse voices of persons with disabilities; and (4) ensure DPOs have the capacity required to advocate on the rights of persons with disabilities; with the longer-term objective of improving the rights of persons with disabilities in accordance with the CRPD.

2. In what ways are DRF/DRAF’s objectives aligned with the objectives of your organization?
   a. Why does your organization believe that these shared objectives are important?

3. In what ways are DRF/DRAF’s objectives different from the objectives of your organization?
   a. If there are differences, could you please explain your understanding of why these differences might exist and whether they matter?
4. Has DRF/DRAF ever shared learning from its work or the work of the DPOs it supports with you?
   a. If yes, was this helpful to your organization in any way? (Probe: Did it either reinforce or cause you to change any of your priorities or practices?) Please explain.
   b. If no, would it be helpful to your organization to exchange learning with DRF/DRAF? Why or why not?

c) Effectiveness

The next set of questions ask about the effectiveness of DRF/DRAF’s work, based on the objectives it is trying to achieve that we discussed earlier.

5. DRF/DRAF is supporting DPOs to influence changes in legislation, policy, and government programs (including those addressing the SDGs) to harmonize them with the CRPD. Are you aware of any successes that DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs have had in this regard since 2017?
   a. If so, which changes do you believe will have the greatest impact?
   b. Thinking about these changes, please describe what you know about how these changes came about. (only for country-level donors and partners in any of the five sample countries)
      i. How did DPOs contribute to the observed changes?
      ii. How did DRF/DRAF’s support enable any of the DPOs to influence these changes?
      iii. Are there other individuals, groups, or events that contributed to the changes you observed?
         1. How did these individuals, groups, or events contribute to the change you observed?
      iv. Whom will these changes benefit and in what ways?

6. DRF/DRAF is supporting DPOs to participate in international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes. Are you aware of any instances in which DRF/DRAF-supported DPOs have participated in such processes? If yes, ...
   a. What were/are these processes? That is, to which treaty bodies (or SDG high-level forum) were/are the DPOs submitting (alternative/shadow) reports and presenting information?
   b. What difference has participation of DPOs in these processes made? That is, how have they affected the processes, and/or how has their participation influenced follow-up actions in their countries?
7. Through its grants, DRF/DRAF tries to help disability movements become more inclusive of all people with disabilities, including women, Indigenous Peoples, and impairment groups who are among the most marginalized within the disability community, such as people with intellectual disabilities, little people, and people with albinism. Are you aware of any examples of DRF/DRAF influencing disability movements to become more inclusive? If yes,...
   a. What enables DRF/DRAF to influence greater inclusion in the disability movement?
   b. Are you aware of any obstacles DRF/DRAF has faced with this, and how DRF/DRAF has overcome them?

8. Through its support to DPOs, DRF/DRAF aims to enable persons with disabilities to gain the skills, knowledge, and connections necessary to advocate effectively on the rights of persons with disabilities. Based on your observations, to what degree does DRF/DRAF succeed (or not) in this regard?
   a. Which of DRF/DRAF’s supports (grants, technical assistance, support for participation in national and global advocacy) do you believe are most useful and why?
   b. What additional supports do you think DPOs need to help them advocate effectively on the rights of persons with disabilities?
   v. Which organizations do you think are best placed to provide these supports?

9. (for global-level donors and partners only) Let’s talk about DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach, that involves persons with disabilities in decision making about grants in DRF/DRAF’s Grantmaking Committee and on their Board. DRF/DRAF have engaged persons with disabilities at all levels of decision-making since inception. DRF/DRAF’s strategy of grantmaking, technical assistance and global advocacy were all developed under the leadership of persons with disabilities. Yet, some argue that participatory grantmaking approaches are too time consuming and costly, with the cost of using them being higher than any benefits gained. To that DRF/DRAF, on the other hand, would argue that the principle of “nothing about us without us” which undergirds the disability movement, means that persons with disabilities need to be included in grants decision-making. In addition, DRF/DRAF believes including persons with disabilities in their grantmaking has positively influenced its outcomes and outputs.
   a. From your perspective, in what ways does DRF/DRAF’s participatory grantmaking approach fulfill the principle “nothing about us without us?”
   b. Are there any ways in which DRF/DRAF’s approach might be changed to better fulfill the principle “nothing about us without us?”
   c. From your perspective, can DRF/DRAF justify the time and costs associated with using this approach? Please explain.
d) Sustainability

The next question is about the sustainability of the results that DRF/DRAF tries to influence.

10. Are you aware of any national-level examples of how changes in policies or institutions that protect the rights of persons with disabilities continue to provide mechanisms for DPOs’ and others’ engagement in defending the rights of persons with disabilities, after DRF/DRAF funding has ceased to support the efforts of DPOs in that country?

   a. What were the major factors that influenced or will influence positively or negatively the sustainability of these results?

e) Closing Question

11. Thinking about the work that DRF/DRAF do and the support they are able to offer, do you have any additional suggestions that would help DRF/DRAF improve the relevance and effectiveness of their work, and better ensure the sustainability of the results that their support helps achieve?

   Thank you for your time!
4. Disabled Persons Organizations (DPOs)

Disability Rights Fund (DRF) and its sister fund Disability Rights Advocacy Fund (DRF/DRAF) is a collaboration bridging disability activists and donors to support persons with disabilities around the world to build diverse movements, ensure inclusive development agendas, and achieve equal rights. Through grantmaking, advocacy, and technical assistance, DRF/DRAF supports disabled persons organizations (DPOs) to use global rights and development frameworks, such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Between 2008 and June 2019, DRF/DRAF awarded over $32 million in more than 1,100 grants to organizations of persons with disabilities in 36 countries. DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking especially emphasizes grants to (and inclusion of) those marginalized within the disability community (including women, youth, rural populations, indigenous, persons with albinism, little people, people with psychosocial disabilities, people with intellectual disabilities, etcetera). DRF/DRAF currently has 19 staff, spread throughout the world.

The purpose of this interview is to gather information from DPOs to inform our global independent evaluation of DRF/DRAF’s global programs between 2017 and 2019, particularly in Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, Nigeria, and Uganda, which were selected as sample countries to represent the DRF/DRAF global grantmaking portfolio. We will be asking questions about the relevance of DRF/DRAF’s work to your efforts to advance your rights, and its effectiveness and efficiency in supporting your efforts to advance your rights, as well as about the sustainability of the results that their support helps bring about.

We are gathering information from a number of DRF/DRAF staff, along with other funders, development partners, government officials, DPOs, and persons with disabilities. We will analyze all of the information we gather together. We were hired as an outside firm to conduct this evaluation, so that we can keep the information we gather anonymous. Because of that, please feel free to speak freely. While we will share what DPOs say with DRF/DRAF, we will not share any information about which DPOs said what. Are you comfortable with this? This interview will take approximately 60 minutes. Do you have any questions?

a) Opening question

1. To begin, I’d like to ask you what terminology you would like me to use when referencing the people with disabilities your DPO serves?

b) Relevance

Our first set of questions is about the relevance of DRF/DRAF’s work to the rights of persons with disabilities. As you may know, in [NAME COUNTRY], DRF/DRAF seek to [LIST RELEVANT COUNTRY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES].
2. To what degree are DRF/DRAF’s objectives aligned or not aligned with the objectives of your organization?
   
   b. If there is alignment, in what ways are DRF/DRAF’s objectives similar to the objectives of your organization?
      
      i. Why does your organization believe that these shared objectives are important?
   
   c. If there are differences, in what ways are DRF/DRAF’s objectives different from the objectives of your organization?
      
      i. Could you please explain your understanding of why these differences might exist and how important these differences are to your work?

3. To what degree are DRF/DRAF’s objectives aligned or not aligned with the objectives of the disability movement in [NAME COUNTRY]?
   
   a. If there is alignment, in what ways are DRF/DRAF’s objectives similar to the objectives of the disability movement in [NAME COUNTRY]?
      
      i. Why does your organization believe that these shared objectives are important?
   
   b. If there are differences, in what ways are DRF/DRAF’s objectives different from the objectives of the disability movement in [NAME COUNTRY]?
      
      i. Could you please explain your understanding of why these differences might exist and how important these differences are to your work?

4. Have DRF/DRAF ever shared learning from their work or the work of other grantees with you, for example through Grantee Convenings or other means? (Not for Nigeria – too early)
   
   a. If yes, was this helpful to your organization in any way? (Probe: Did it either reinforce or cause you to change any of your priorities or practices?) Please explain.
   
   b. We understand that DRF/DRAF grantees share learning from your projects with DRF/DRAF staff in your narrative reporting, in the annual Grantee Survey, through Grantee Convenings, and in meetings with Program Officers. Is this enough? Do you feel that there are other ways that learnings could be shared?

   c) Effectiveness

   The next set of questions ask about the effectiveness of DRF/DRAF’s work, based on the objectives they are trying to achieve that we discussed earlier.

   5. Since 2017 (or mid-2018 for Nigeria), with DRF/DRAF’s support, your organization has influenced a number of changes either to legislation, policy, and/or government programs. Among these
changes, which one to two do you believe are benefitting or will benefit the most people? Let’s discuss this change/ these changes.

a. Please describe how this change came about, by responding to the following questions:

i. Whom were you trying to influence to do what?

ii. Whom will this change benefit and in what ways?

iii. What did your organization do to contribute to the observed change?

iv. With what other entities or organizations did your organization work to influence this change, and what did they do?

v. Were there other individuals, groups, or events that contributed to the change you are describing? If yes, how did they contribute to the change?

vi. Looking back on how this change came about, with all the actors you just mentioned, what difference did your efforts make? What would have been different, if your organization had not been involved in influencing this change?

vii. How did DRF/DRAF’s support help your organization influence this change?

6. (Only ask this question of DPOs that have been involved in international HR or SDG reporting.) Since 2017, with DRF/DRAF’s support, your organization has participated in [Name the international and national human rights and SDG monitoring processes we know they’ve participated in, based on DRF/DRAF reporting]. Has your organization participated in any other processes since 2017 that we didn’t list? (Not for Nigeria – too early)

a. Please describe your organization’s participation in this process/ each of these processes.

i. How did your organization become involved in this process/ these processes?

ii. What did your organization do?

iii. In addition to providing grant funding, how else, if at all, did DRF/DRAF help your organization with this process?

iv. What difference did your organization’s participation in this process/ these processes make? That is, how did your participation affect the process(es), and/or how did your organization’s participation influence any follow-up government actions in [NAME COUNTRY]?

7. Since 2017, have there been any changes in the impairment or disability groups involved in the disability movement in [NAME COUNTRY]? Have any groups left the movement? Have any new impairment or disability groups joined? What has caused these changes? (Not for Nigeria – too early)
a. Is there any way in which DRF/DRAF’s support has influenced the composition of the disability movement in [NAME COUNTRY] or not? Please explain.

8. Since 2017, has your organization’s capacity to advocate effectively on the rights of persons with disabilities changed in any way? (probe: skills, knowledge, connections) (Not for Nigeria – too early)
   a. If no, how would you describe your organization’s advocacy capacity (very strong, strong, weak, very weak). Please explain why you describe it in that way.
      i. Is there any assistance your organization needs to further improve its advocacy capacity? Please explain.
   b. If yes, what has changed?
      i. What do you have now that you did not have two years ago in 2017? (probe: skills, knowledge, or connections)
      ii. What difference, if any, have these changes made in your ability to advocate effectively?
      iii. How was your organization able to make these changes?
         1. Did the support your organization received from DRF/DRAF help in any way or not? Please explain.

d) Sustainability

The next questions are about the sustainability of the results that DRF/DRAF tries to influence.

9. Has DRF/DRAF’s support been helpful in strengthening the disability movement in [NAME COUNTRY]? (Not for Nigeria – too early)
   a. If yes, how? (e.g., expanding the number of groups in it, increasing their ties/networks with each other, building joint advocacy, etc.)
   b. If not, please explain.

10. Please explain whether or not any of the positive changes you described already have made it easier for DPOs like your organization to engage with the government to improve the rights of persons with disabilities even after DRF/DRAF funding has ended.

11. Please explain whether the positive changes you described already are sustainable over time. If yes, why? If no, why not?
    a. What are the major factors that influenced or will influence positively or negatively the sustainability of these results?
e) Efficiency

Now we would like to talk about the efficiency of DRF/DRAF’s assistance.

12. Does your organization receive funding or has your organization ever received funding from any organizations besides DRF/DRAF? If so, from which organization(s) has your organization received funding?

13. For the following questions, please think about how DRF/DRAF: processes grant applications, delivers grant funding, provides technical assistance, and supports persons with disabilities to participate in national and global advocacy efforts.

   a. How would you describe the time and effort your organization puts into receiving each of these types of DRF/DRAF support: just right, too much, too little? Please explain.

      i. Submit grant application: just right, too much, too little
      ii. Receive grant funding: just right, too much, too little
      iii. Receive technical assistance: just right, too much, too little
      iv. Receive support to participate in local/community/sub-national, national and global advocacy efforts: just right, too much, too little

   b. To what degree do DRF/DRAF deliver your grant funding in a timely fashion - very timely, somewhat timely, not very timely? Please explain.

   c. To what degree is the technical assistance that DRF/DRAF provide relevant to your project objectives - very relevant, somewhat relevant, not very relevant?

      i. To what degree is it timely - very timely, somewhat timely, not very timely?
      ii. To what degree is it accessible - very accessible, somewhat accessible, not very accessible?

14. You may have provided DRF/DRAF with feedback through their annual grantee survey. Could you please make any additional comments on the following?

   a. The adequacy of the support your organization receives from DRF/DRAF to achieve your project objectives;

   b. The timeliness of the support your organization receives to achieve your project objectives; and

   c. The cost-effectiveness in the way the support was delivered to your organization to achieve your project objectives? That is, the ability of DRF/DRAF to offer support at a reasonable cost.

f) Value for Money
(Building on the Effectiveness and Efficiency questions above)

15. To what extent does the support that DRF/DRAF give to your organization reach more marginalized groups of persons with disabilities? Please explain whom it reaches.

c. How are persons with disabilities who are marginalized even within the disability community benefitting or are likely to benefit from the work you are doing with DRF/DRAF’s support?

16. How would you describe the quality of DRF/DRAF’s grantmaking or support: High quality, adequate quality, low quality? Please explain.

g) Closing Question

17. Thinking about the work that DRF/DRAF do and the support they are able to offer (a reminder that they cannot do everything; their focus is on helping DPOs advocate more effectively on the rights of people with disabilities), do you have any suggestions that would help DRF/DRAF improve the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of their work, and better ensure the sustainability of the results that their support helps achieve?

          Thank you for your time!
5. Contribution Analysis – DPOs (Grantees)

Introduction

As part of DRF/DRAF’s current evaluation, we would like to learn about two policy changes and how they came about. One of these is [NAME OF POLICY CHANGE] in [NAME OF COUNTRY]. We would like to talk with you about this policy change, how it came about, and your organization’s role in it. In sharing the information we receive, we will do our best to not disclose our information sources. However, we are only interviewing a small number of people. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Questions

1. What was the problem that this desired policy change sought to address?
2. Why did your organization believe that this desired policy change would offer a good solution to this problem?
   a. Whom will this change benefit, and in what ways?
   b. Is there anyone who is affected by the problem who will not benefit from the policy change?
      i. If yes, who is that?
3. What needed to happen to help bring about this policy change?
4. Who needed to be influenced to help bring about this policy change?
5. What did your organization do to help influence these policymakers and to help bring about this policy change?
   a. Why did your organization believe that these activities would be successful?
   b. Were they successful? How do you know?
6. With which other entities or organizations did your organization work to influence this change, and what did they do?
7. Were there other individuals, groups, or events that contributed to the change you are describing? If yes, how did they contribute to the change?
8. Looking back on how this change came about, with all the actors and events you just mentioned, what difference did your organization’s efforts make?
   a. What, if anything, would have been different, if your organization had not been involved in influencing this change?
9. Did DRF/DRAF's support help your organization influence this change?
   a. If yes, how so?
   b. If no, why not?

10. Is there any other support you received to help your organization influence this change?
    a. If yes, from which organization or entity did your organization receive support, and what support did they provide?

11. Is there additional support that your organization needed to help influence this change, but did not receive?
    a. If yes, what was it?

   Thank you for your time!
6. Contribution Analysis – Other External Stakeholders

Introduction

As part of the Disability Rights Fund and Disability Rights Advocacy Fund’s current evaluation, our evaluation team would like to learn about two policy changes. One of these is [NAME OF POLICY CHANGE] in [NAME OF COUNTRY]. We would like to talk with you about this policy change and how it came about. In sharing the information we receive, we will do our best to not disclose our information sources. However, we are only interviewing a small number of people. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Questions

1. What was the problem that this desired policy change sought to address?

2. In what ways did this desired policy change offer a good solution to this problem?
   a. Whom will this change benefit, and in what ways?
   b. Is there anyone who is affected by the problem who will not benefit from the policy change?
      i. If yes, who is that?

3. What needed to happen to help bring about this policy change?

4. Which policymakers were in charge of bringing about this policy change?
   a. Were there any other policymakers involved? If yes, who were they?

5. Were there any events that helped bring about this policy change? If so, please describe them.

6. Were there any civil society or other external groups who helped bring about this policy change?
   a. If so, please name them and describe what they did.
   b. Which entities or organizations worked together to try to influence this policy change? Which entities or organizations worked separately?
      i. Were there ways in which these entities or organizations reinforced each other’s efforts? Please explain.
      ii. Were there ways in which they undermined each other’s efforts? Please explain.
   c. Why did these entities or organizations believe these activities would be successful?
d. Were these activities successful? How do you know?

7. Are you familiar with [NAME DRF/DRAF-SUPPORTED DPOs WHO WERE INVOLVED]? (if not already named)
   a. If yes, are you aware of anything they did to help bring about this policy change?
      i. If yes, please describe what they did.

8. How important was what [NAME DRF/DRAF-SUPPORTED DPOs WHO WERE INVOLVED] did to bringing about this policy change?
   a. Would anything have been different had they not contributed to it?

Thank you for your time!
7. Contribution Analysis — Policymakers

Introduction

As part of the Disability Rights Fund and Disability Rights Advocacy Fund’s current evaluation, our evaluation team would like to learn about two policy changes. One of these is [NAME OF POLICY CHANGE] in [NAME OF COUNTRY]. We would like to talk with you about this policy change and how it came about. In sharing the information we receive, we will do our best to not disclose our information sources. However, we are only interviewing a small number of people. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Questions

1. What was the problem that this desired policy change sought to address?

2. In what ways did this desired policy change offer a good solution to this problem?
   a. Whom will this change benefit, and in what ways?
   b. Is there anyone who is affected by the problem who will not benefit from the policy change?
      i. If yes, who is that?

3. What needed to happen to help bring about this policy change?

4. Which policymakers were in charge of bringing about this policy change?
   a. Were there any other policymakers involved? If yes, who were they?

5. Were there any events that helped bring about this policy change? If so, please describe them.

6. Were there any civil society or other external groups who helped bring about this policy change? If so, please name them and describe what they did.

7. Are you familiar with [NAME DRF/DRAF-SUPPORTED DPOs WHO WERE INVOLVED]? (if not already named)
   a. If yes, are you aware of anything they did to help bring about this policy change?
      i. If yes, please describe what they did.

8. How important was what [NAME DRF/DRAF-SUPPORTED DPOs WHO WERE INVOLVED] did to bringing about this policy change?
   a. Would anything have been different had they not contributed to it?

Thank you for your time!
C. Evaluation Team
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Phoebe Katende is an evaluation expert in the area of disability and social development. She has been involved in assessments, evaluations, reviews, and capacity building. She was an adviser in the evaluation of a community-based rehabilitation project in Lesotho, Malawi, and Zambia. This involved the performance of DPOs in lobbying and advocacy and community-based rehabilitation. She has been involved in assessments like Tanzania League of the Blind capacity building project. Currently she is assessing the impact of political representation of persons with disabilities in promoting inclusion of persons with disabilities in government structures, programs, policies, and other legal instruments in Uganda. Phoebe is well versed in quantitative and qualitative methods of research. She also has good communications skills.

Hippolyt Pul, PhD is Executive Director of the Institute for Peace and Development in Ghana. With more than 30 years’ experience in international and rural development planning, management, and evaluation, Hippolyt is a multi-disciplinary thought leader with the capacity to blend theory and practice from diverse fields to find solutions to development challenges. He has a strong background and capabilities in policy and development research, as well as advocacy planning and management, with strong expertise and practice in program and project monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning. He has consulted widely for international development agencies, such as the Ghana Office of Action for Disability and Development (UK), the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, Inc., Catholic Relief Services, Conciliation Resources (UK), and Oxfam (USA), among others. His work has been in more than 30 countries in Africa and Southeast Asia. Hippolyt has several peer reviewed publications to his credit.

Sukharanjan Suter is Chairman, IRG Development Services Ltd., Bangladesh. Mr. Suter has 30 years of professional experience in various development projects and studies. He provides consulting services for development, evaluation, assessment, and management of international cooperation projects and programs. He offers evaluation leadership and leads strong and collaborative teams. He is an innovator, self-starter, and active networker. Mr. Suter has extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation with a variety of international organizations and multi-donor-supported projects and programs. He has diversified experience working in program evaluation, project
management engineering, infrastructure, power, gas, energy, transportation, communication, agriculture, rural development, education, trade, and commerce, as well as in the financial sector. He has an excellent track record in project design, writing technical proposals, mobilizing resources, project implementation, and quality control. He has worked as Project Manager/Team Leader for various development projects in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Cambodia, Jamaica, and Indonesia.