



Training on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in EU Development Cooperation

Course Notes

Module 3: The CRPD as a key driver for inclusive development



**Training on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in EU
Development Cooperation.**

Framework Contract Commission 2011

Contract Number 2012/288100

Author: Mary Keogh

"The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union".

Module 3: The CRPD as a key driver for inclusive development

This module seeks to provide an introduction to disability as a human rights issue (3.1). There is also an outline of the drafting history of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), including a discussion of some of the debates and a timeline of key moments in the development of the Convention (3.2). There is a discussion of the definition of disability in the CRPD (3.3). There is a brief outline of the Civil and Political contained in the CRPD (3.4) and how they are bound to Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (3.5). There is also an outline of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights contained in the CRPD with specific reference to economic and social rights that are particularly relevant from a development perspective (3.6). There is a short outline of the nature and scope Article 32 (3.7), which was more comprehensively discussed in module 2. Finally, there is a case study illustrating some of the issues raised in this module (3.8).

3.1 Disability as a Human Rights Issue

The rights-based perspective on disability is a relatively new approach. This is despite the fact that persons with disabilities are often described by the United Nations as 'the world's largest minority'.¹ There are approximately 1 billion persons with disabilities in the world (15 per cent of the world's population), the vast majority of whom live in developing countries.² The WHO Report on Disability, drawing on a variety of sources, reported that children with disabilities are less likely than children without disabilities to start school and have lower rates of staying and being promoted in school. Other research has indicated that violence against children with disabilities occurs annually at rates of at least 1.7 times more than children without disabilities.³ The WHO Report also found that adults with disabilities are at greater risk of violence than those without disabilities and abuse against persons with disabilities has been reported to be 4–10 times greater than that against people without disabilities. Similarly, the prevalence of sexual abuse against persons with disabilities has

¹ See Fact sheet about Persons with Disabilities. This fact sheet provides an interesting outline of statistical information on the status of persons with disabilities throughout the world. Available at: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/toolaction/pwdfs.pdf>.

² *World Report on Disability* (Geneva: World Health Organization & the World Bank, 2011), page 44.

³ See Fact sheet about Persons with Disabilities.

been shown to be higher especially for institutionalized men and women with intellectual disabilities, intimate partners and teenagers.

Despite the obvious human rights issues that affect persons with disabilities, disability has not generally been considered through the human rights perspective. It has, instead, been a mixture of charity, paternalism and social policy. The general social policy response has been to maintain people rather than to fashion pathways into the mainstream. The journey of disability to the core of the human rights agenda has been slow. The developments in the context of disability and human rights has to do with making the human being behind the disability visible and extending the benefits of 'the rule of law' to all and not just to some or to most. It has to do with treating persons with disabilities as 'subjects' with full legal capacity as distinct from 'objects' to be managed and cared for.

The migration of the human rights framework of reference has been taking place throughout the world over the last two decades. It was inevitable that it would be reflected at the global level at some point in time. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, 2006) is the single most important development to take place in the disability field for many decades. It reflects this ongoing and worldwide process of law reform in the field of disability. More importantly, it should clarify its underlying values and help to accelerate reform trends.⁴

It might even be said that although the notion of disability rights started in the United States it is now truly a global challenge. For example, the African Union sponsored the African Decade of Persons with Disabilities (1999–2009) to drive the process of reform throughout Africa. The United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) has adopted an Asian and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons (2003–2012) with similar aims. The Organization of American States (OAS) declared a Decade of the Americas for the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities (2006–2016), with the theme

⁴ Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), adopted 13 December 2006, entered into force 3 May 2008, 2512 UNTS 3. For most of the drafting history, see: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?id=1423>. There is already a growing body of literature on the convention: see Symposium on the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, *Syracuse Journal of International Law and Commerce*, vol. 34 (2007) no. 2 (Special Issue); *From Exclusion to Equality: Handbook for Parliamentarians on the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol* (Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union with the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2007); The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Special Edition of the *International Rehabilitation Review*, vol. 56 (2007) no. 1; and Grainne De Burca, 'The EU in the Negotiation of the UN Disability Convention', *European Law Review*, vol. 35 (2010) no. 2, pages 174–196.

'Equality, Dignity, and Participation',⁵ and the OAS even adopted a convention as early as 1999 against disability discrimination.⁶ At European regional level both the European Union (EU) and the Council of Europe have adopted disability strategies. The EU adopted a Disability Action Plan (2003–2010), which was replaced by the European Disability Strategy 2010–2020. The Council of Europe has its own Disability Action Plan (2006–2015). There are emerging synergies between what is required to implement principles of international human rights law as articulated in the CRPD and what is possible to achieve through national policy and systems development.

3.2 United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

The CRPD has reconceptualised disability as a human rights issue. Persons with disabilities can no longer be viewed as objects of charity rather they are rights holders entitled to the full array of human rights and are entitled to enjoy those rights on an equal basis with others.

The CRPD was negotiated during eight sessions of an Ad Hoc Committee of the UN General Assembly from 2002 to 2006, which made it the fastest negotiated human rights treaty in the history of the United Nations. The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol was adopted on 13 December 2006 at the United Nations, and was opened for signature on 30 March 2007. It is the first comprehensive human rights treaty of the 21st century and is the first human rights convention to be open for signature by regional integration organisations. The Convention entered into force on 3 May 2008. The Convention is intended as a human rights instrument with an explicit, social development dimension and to address the invisibility of persons with disabilities. It adopts a broad categorisation of persons with disabilities and reaffirms that all persons with all types of disabilities must enjoy all human rights and fundamental freedoms. It clarifies and qualifies how all categories of rights apply to persons with disabilities and identifies areas where adaptations have to be made for persons with disabilities to effectively exercise their rights and areas where their rights have been violated, and where protection of rights must be reinforced.

⁵ Information on the OAS disability activities is available at: <http://www.oas.org/consejo/cajp/disabilities.asp>.

⁶ The Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, adopted 7 June 1999, entered into force 14 September 2001.

One of the most striking features of the CRPD is the emphasis on inclusion and full participation of persons with disabilities in drafting the convention. The motto from the drafting of the CRPD was 'Nothing About Us With Out Us'. The participation and involvement of persons with disabilities in the drafting and negotiation of the CRPD was unique in many ways in terms of an international human rights treaty. The involvement of persons with disabilities transcends the treaty process. The 'full and effective participation and inclusion in society' is a general principle in Article 3 of the CRPD. Many of the Articles in the CRPD require the involvement of persons with disabilities. Specifically in the General Obligations on Article 4(3) states:

'In the development and implementation of legislation and policies to implement the present Convention, and in other decision-making processes concerning issues relating to persons with disabilities, States Parties shall closely consult with and actively involve persons with disabilities, including children with disabilities, through their representative organizations.'

The focus on the involvement and participation of persons with disabilities throughout the CRPD is aimed at empowering persons with disabilities to be included in political and social decision-making.⁷ This reflects the social model of disability that strived to break down barriers that prevented persons with disabilities participating as members of the community at all levels. Also the participation of National Human Rights (NHRI) Institutions in the drafting of the Convention was novel. NHRI's played a significant role in the drafting of the CRPD. They were very influential in terms of getting their governments to embrace the social model of disability.

At the Ad Hoc Committee in its first session decided to allow representatives of accredited NGOs to participate in all public meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Later this was extended to all informal and closed meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee. These accredited NGO's were also extended broad formal representation in the Working Group. That facilitated NGO's to make substantive

⁷ For a fuller discussion of rafting the CRPD see de Burca, G. 'The EU in the Negotiation of the UN Disability Convention' (ELR 2010) Available on SSRN at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1525611

statements on the UN floor following discussion on the different draft article. The NGO's also very active in lobbying State delegations during sessions, they received the official documents, and made written and other presentations. The *Ad Hoc* Committee actively encouraged State delegations to include persons with disabilities or other experts on disability in their official delegations at meetings.

The Ad Hoc Committee also encouraged States to consult with disability experts and DPOs in their country with a view identifying positions on different issues. This is a significant point also as the *Ad Hoc* Committee sought to achieve equal representation from NGO's from both developed and developing States. In that regard a UN Voluntary Fund on Disability was created with the aim of funding the input of civil society from poorer countries.

Article 3 of the CRPD set out the general principles underlying the CRPD. These principles are as follows:

- Respect for inherent dignity, individual autonomy including the freedom to make one's own choices, and independence of persons;
- Non-discrimination;
- Full and effective participation and inclusion in society;
- Respect for difference and acceptance of persons with disabilities as part of human diversity and humanity;
- Equality of opportunity;
- Accessibility;
- Equality between men and women;
- Respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities and respect for the right of children with disabilities to preserve their identities.

Development of the CRPD Timeline

Date	Event
2000	High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson commissioned a study on the human rights of persons with disabilities.
December 2001	Mexican proposal in the General Assembly to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to consider proposals for a comprehensive and integral international convention to promote and protect the rights and dignity of persons with

2002	disabilities Quinn & Degener 'Human Rights and Disability: The current use and future potential of United Nations human rights instruments in the context of disability' (Geneva: OHCHR, 2002).
August 2002	First session of the Ad Hoc Committee meets and sets out procedures for participation of civil society.
August 2003	Second session of the Ad Hoc Committee, which established a working group to prepare a draft text. 27 governmental representatives designated by regional groups, twelve representatives from NGOs and one representative of National Human Rights Institutions comprised the working group.
January 2004	The working group met and produced a working draft of the convention text, taking into account the numerous draft texts submitted by States and others.
May/June 2004	Third session of the Ad Hoc Committee. The Committee conducted a first reading of the working group draft. The Ad Hoc Committee discussed whether it should meet in closed session in the future or in the presence of civil society organisations and national human rights institutions.
August/September 2004	Fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee. The Committee completed the first reading of the draft text and started the second reading. The participation of civil society organisations and national human rights institutions in the sessions of the Committee was confirmed although the right to intervene was limited.
January/February 2005	The fifth session of the Ad Hoc Committee held informal consultations on specific draft articles. Civil society organisations, national human rights institutions and inter-governmental organisations were allowed to attend the informal consultations although only States had a right to intervene.

August 2005	The sixth session of the Ad Hoc Committee completed the second reading of the draft text. The Chairperson prepared a revised text, reflecting debate at the third, fourth and fifth sessions for presentation at the seventh session of the Committee.
January 2006	The seventh session of the Ad Hoc Committee completed a first reading of the Chairperson's text.
May – August 2006	Mexico led informal consultations on international monitoring.
August 2006	The eighth session of the Ad Hoc Committee finalised negotiations on the draft Convention and a separate Optional Protocol and adopted the texts subject to a technical review being undertaken by a drafting committee consisting of State representatives.
September – November 2006	Liechtenstein convened the drafting group, which undertook a technical review to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout the text and to harmonize the versions in the six official languages of the UN.
December 2006	The resumed eighth session of the Ad Hoc Committee adopted the final draft of the Convention and its Optional Protocol with the technical amendments suggested by the drafting committee.
13 December 2006	The UN General Assembly adopted by consensus the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol.
30 March 2007	The Convention and Optional Protocol opened for signature at UN Headquarters in New York. States or regional integration organizations may now sign the Convention and Optional Protocol at any time at UN Headquarters in New York. Signature creates an obligation, in the period between signature and ratification or consent to be bound, to refrain in good faith from acts that would

	defeat the object and purpose of the treaty.
3 May 2008	The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol entered into force. This marked a major milestone in the disability rights
3 April 2008	The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities received its 20th ratification on 3 April 2008, triggering the entry into force of the Convention and its Optional Protocol 30 days later.
31 October and 3 November 2008	First meeting of the Conference of States parties to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
23 – 27 February 2009	1 st session of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in (Geneva).

3.3 Definition of Disability under the CRPD

Article 2 of the CRPD provides a number of definitions. There are definitions of communication, language, discrimination on the basis of disability, reasonable accommodation and universal design. However, there is no definition of disability in the CRPD. The arguments not to include a definition stemmed from the need to have to revise a definition and that there was a need to have a flexible approach. It was argued that failure to include a definition of disability could result in State Parties seeking to avoid obligations set out in the CRPD. Some NGO's wanted a clear and exact definition of disability in this regard, as they feared certain disabilities would be excluded. State Parties negotiating the Convention also seemed to be cautious of very comprehensive definitions of disability. The conciliatory position was to include a piece on the meaning of disability in Article 1 on the Purpose of the CRPD. Article 1 Purpose states:

'The purpose of the present Convention is to promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity.

Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in

interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.'

It is noteworthy that this definition includes intentional and unintentional discrimination. However, the use of equality law terminology of 'direct discrimination' and 'indirection discrimination' is avoided. It is also significant that the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation amounts to discrimination under the definition. Article 2 defines reasonable accommodation as meaning 'necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms'.

3.4 Civil and Political Rights

The Convention is very comprehensive it requires States Parties to ensure and promote the full realisation of civil and political of persons with disabilities. Examples of civil and political rights in the CRPD, include participation in political and public life (Article 10) and the right to equal recognition before the law (Article 12), Freedom from exploitation violence and abuse (Article 16), (Article 29), the right to life. State Parties to the CRPD are required to immediately implement the civil and political rights.

3.5 Civil and Political and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The CRPD is the first human rights treaty of the twenty-first century and it cleverly combines civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights under an overarching theory of non-discrimination. It is accompanied by an Optional Protocol, which if ratified, will enable the relevant treaty monitoring body (the CRPD Committee) to receive individual and group petitions.⁸ As of November 2012, there were 63 ratifications of the Optional Protocol and 90 signatories.⁹

Paragraph 2 of Article 4 sets out the general obligations of States Parties with respect to economic, social and cultural rights contained in

⁸ Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, adopted 13 December 2006, entered into force 3 May 2008, UN doc. A/61/611.

⁹ The CRPD Committee have only just begun their work and have so far considered only a few state reports on the implementation of the Convention.

the convention. It states, echoing Article 2(1) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights:

'With regard to economic, social and cultural rights, each State Party undertakes to take measures to the maximum of its available resources and, where needed, within the framework of international cooperation, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of these rights, without prejudice to those obligations contained in the present Convention that are immediately applicable according to international law.'

The intention was to separate between 'obligations of result' or immediate effect (like non-discrimination) and 'obligations of conduct' which were to be achieved progressively. However, the language adopted in Article 4(2) may cause some interpretive problems in the future since many of the rights contained in the convention contain both 'obligations of immediate result' as well as 'obligations of conduct' and it is sometimes difficult to disentangle the two.

3.6 Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

The application of economic, social and cultural rights in the context of disability brings out something that is often forgotten about the nature of these rights. These rights are not just about human welfare viewed in a stationary sense. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights used positively have the potential to facilitate inclusive societies and economies. They help set the terms of access, entry and participation in the mainstream. They enable people with disabilities to live a genuinely independent life and to participate in their communities. Economic, social and cultural rights were included in the CRPD and tailored to tackle the various barriers faced by persons with disabilities in achieving a life of independence as well as inclusion.

Economic, social and cultural rights take are hugely important in the context of disability in essentially providing a base of social supports to maintain people. It is important because it equips people with disabilities to take their own place in society. Economic, social and cultural rights include the right to education (Article 24), the right to work (Article 27), the right to an adequate standard of living (Article 28) and the right to health (Article 25). These rights reflect a blending of the principle of non-discrimination (immediately achievable) with obligations that are more progressive in character.

Article 24 the right to education for persons with disabilities has a broader scope than for children alone (an important factor when one considers the educational deficiencies of a generation gone by and now in adulthood). Such education is said to be aimed at 'development by persons with disabilities of their personality, talents and creativity' — which is, in its own way, an insistence that every human being has some such potential. The education to be provided must be 'inclusive' at all levels. It demands that persons with disabilities should not be excluded from the general education system 'on the basis of disability'. It seeks to ensure that adequate resources are applied (including an obligation of 'reasonable accommodation') to ensure an effective right to education. Article 24(3)(c) makes specific allowance for some separate provision for children who are blind, deaf or deafblind. The relevant obligation is to ensure that their education is 'delivered in the most appropriate languages and modes and means of communication for the individual, and in environments which maximize academic and social development'.

Article 27 on the right to work is effectively a right to equal opportunities and non-discrimination (with an associated obligation of 'reasonable accommodation') with respect to work. It also embraces a right to just and favourable conditions of work 'on an equal basis with others' as well as trade union rights. The right to an adequate standard of living (Article 28) includes a right to adequate food, clothing and housing and to a continuous improvement in living conditions without discrimination on the basis of disability. However, given the high prevalence of poverty among persons with disabilities (the product of inadequate education and chronic exclusion from participation in the labour market) this article is particularly important. It embraces a right to clean water and affordable services (including public housing) and devices and a right to assistance for extra disability-related expenses. Article 28 essentially provides for a base of social provision beneath persons with disabilities, which mixes the principle of non-discrimination (immediately effective) with more programmatic elements (to be 'progressively achieved').

The substantive right to health contained in Article 25 provides that persons with disabilities have the right to the 'enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health without discrimination'. States Parties are obliged to 'provide persons with disabilities with the same range, quality and standard of free or affordable health care' which includes 'sexual and reproductive health'. In addition, Article 25(b) requires the

provision of additional services specifically on account of disability (early identification, intervention as appropriate and services designed to minimize and prevent further disabilities). The text of Article 25 is careful not to place an emphasis on prevention as such as that would not be compatible with the purpose the CRPD, which is not about prevention but more about how persons with disabilities are treated by others. As such it is framed in terms of preventing 'further disabilities'.

3.7 Article 32 of the CRPD on International Cooperation

It was understood when drafting the Convention that many countries would require assistance in meeting their obligations set out therein. 'Developed countries' accepted the argument but were concerned with the insertion of language that might lend recognition to a legal right to development. The net effect of Article 32 (international cooperation) is that States Parties to the Convention have a duty to evaluate their development aid programmes from the perspective of the rights contained in the CRPD. This does not necessarily mean they will have to spend more or even have an earmarked part of their development budget for disability. However, at a minimum it means that aid programmes should not reinforce the isolation of persons with disabilities (E.G. by building inaccessible schools) and should facilitate inclusion.¹⁰ The creation of the Global Partnership on Disability and Development (GPDD) by the World Bank and hosted by the Burton Blatt Institute at Syracuse University is an example of an initiative in this area.¹¹ The development aid and broader international cooperation side to the CRPD is likely to be of major importance as many developing countries start law and policy reform processes in respect of disability. It is noteworthy that specific provision is made in the convention for approval by the European Commission representing the institutions of the European Union and that the Commission controls the single largest development aid budget in the world (Article 44).

3.8 Example of CRPD Implementation in Different Countries

¹⁰ There is a growing literature on disability and international cooperation. See Mina Lomuscio et al., *Disability, International Cooperation and Development: The Experience of the Italian Cooperation 2000-2007* (The World Bank, June 2010); '**Article 32 UNCRPD International Cooperation**' (European Commission Disability Mainstreaming in Development Cooperation and Dutch Coalition on Disability and Development). Available at http://inclusive-development.org/toolsen/06_UNCRPD.pdf

¹¹ See <http://www.gpdd-online.org/>

Case Study – Indonesia: Inclusive Education projects to achieve
Education for all¹²

Background to project and to selected practice

Indonesia has made strides towards achieving MDG 2 (Universal Primary Education) by 2015, but progress has not been uniform. While 5–10% of non-disabled children do not go to school, the equivalent for CwDs is estimated be more than 95%. The reasons include high drop-out rates, inflexibility in current teaching practices and failure to adapt, attitudinal barriers including lack of acceptance by fellow students and lack of institutional capacity at all levels including schools and local education authorities. Indonesia's National Plan for Education 2010/15 specifically includes an objective to increase the enrolment rate of CwDs to 30%.

Overall objectives of project/programme and of selected practice

The overall objective of the project was to contribute towards increasing the number of CwDs in education, in line with MDG 2 and Article 24 of the CRPD. The specific objective was to increase the institutional capacity of Yogyakarta education authorities to implement and increase the quality of inclusive education in the Province.

Process/ strategy to implement selected practice

The following activities have were undertaken:

- an Inclusive Education Steering Team (IEST), composed of education officials from 6 local education authorities, was established;
- a school-based survey was organized in 57 inclusive schools in Yogyakarta Province from April 1 to May 12, 2010, applying 7 separate survey methods including school and class observation, interviews with school administrators and CwDs, and focus-group discussions with school supervisors, teachers in inclusive schools, school committees, and special school headteachers;
- inclusive Education technical resources have been developed for teacher training including '10 tips to teach children with disabilities' and, in collaboration with IDPN Norway, the

¹² Case study taken from 'Compilation of best practices for including persons with disabilities in all aspects of development efforts' (First Draft, 2011).

translation into Bahasa Indonesia and adaptation of 3 specialized booklets from the UNESCO Inclusive Learning-Friendly Environment Toolkit;

- a set of context-based Guidelines called 'Minimum Standards Technical Guidelines for Inclusive Education Implementation in Yogyakarta Province to Support Children with Disabilities' were developed using secondary sources and based on the school survey. The Guidelines cover the following topics: Guideline 1: Criteria for Inclusive Schools; Guideline 2: Strategy for Regular Teachers Training; Guideline 3: School Administrators' Management; Guideline 4: Monitoring Criteria and Checklist. Specific training was given to District and Provincial officials and school supervisors of the Province.

Changes achieved as result of selected practice

The project achieved results in the following areas: Policies; Resource allocation; Procedures and processes. More specifically:

- the 4 Guidelines have been adopted by the 5 Districts of Yogyakarta Province starting in July 2011 in 132 inclusive schools;
- the IEST is a trained, standing body with official Terms of Reference (ToR) and is now officially responsible for overseeing all aspects of Inclusive Education within Provinces;
- 52 District and Provincial officials, all school supervisors of the Province (94) and 93 headteachers had their awareness raised on the topic covered by the Guidelines (see above);
- a new budget has been allocated for Inclusive Education by local government in 2 Districts;
- Local regulations for Inclusive Education at District and Province levels have begun to be created;
- the Inclusive Education Resource Centre in the Province has been revitalized by the Provincial Education Authority, which is also planning to establish 5 further sub-centres at District level.

Monitoring was ensured through a KAP baseline survey with the main stakeholders (IEST members) at the beginning, middle and end of the project. The school-based survey served as a basis for data collection and to inform the IEST in charge of the monitoring of the implementation of Inclusive Education in the Province.

Factors facilitating/hindering the success of the practice

Competence of the local team (trained for several years); experience of working with the Government since 2006 and relationship of trust developed; thorough survey of existing situation, local context and available resources; use of local

expertise adapted to local needs and involvement of practitioners; participatory process and empowerment of local authorities; comprehensive awareness raising amongst all stakeholders about Inclusive Education.

Lack of proper Inclusive Education regulations especially at provincial and district level; divided responsibility for the education of CwDs (District level is responsible for managing 'regular schools' while Province level is responsible for 'assisting with the provision of Inclusive Education resources'); general lack of awareness and of available funding for Inclusive Education; lack of data and of standardized procedures to identify CwDs in schools and in communities and lack of proper framework for classification; competition with 'elitist' programme for schools (International standards).The project would have benefited from a longer period to ensure a wider and more targeted capacity building of all stakeholders.

Plans to follow up the best practice example and potential for/contraints on moving forward

The project has been disseminated at national level and it is hoped that there will be replication/adaptions in other provinces. The development of Inclusive Education is limited by the financial constraints of local authorities in charge of implementation and the limited available resources to support the children and the schools in terms of health, psychological support and specific needs.