

FINAL EVALUATION OF JOINT DISABILITY PROJECT (JDP) IN GHANA

Phase II, 2010-13

Report produced for:

Danish Association of the Blind (DAB)

By:

David Korboe
(davidkorboe@gmail.com)

February 2014

Contents

Contents	i
Acronyms and Abbreviations	ii
Summary	1
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Project description and purpose	6
<i>Specific objectives of the project</i>	6
<i>Project content</i>	6
1.2 JDP's intervention logic	6
1.3 Evaluation objectives	7
1.4 Methodology	7
2. Advocacy achievements at national and local levels	8
2.1 Key advocacy outcomes	8
2.2 Key advocacy shortfalls	9
<i>Physical accessibility at schools and health facilities</i>	9
<i>Availability of SLI services at health facilities</i>	10
2.3 Lessons learned re advocacy/ influencing	11
2.4 Recommendations re advocacy/ influencing	11
<i>Strategy for exiting the old districts</i>	11
<i>Strategy for future phase</i>	12
3. Organisational capacity at central and local levels	13
3.1 Membership and participation	13
3.2 Leadership effectiveness	13
3.3 Organisational learning	14
3.4 Results of disability-specific components	16
<i>Community-based rehabilitation (CBR) (of GBU)</i>	16
<i>Microcredit and savings scheme (of GSPD)</i>	16
<i>Sign language (SL) training (of GNAD)</i>	16
3.5 Shortfalls, with explanations	17
3.6 Gender	17
4. Partnership coordination, collaboration and governance structure	18
4.1 Coordination and collaboration	18
4.2 Macro-level dynamics	18
4.3 M&E system	19
4.4 Relationship with other stakeholders	20
Annex 1: Terms of reference (ToR)	21
Annex 2: Persons interviewed	26
Annex 3: Key documents consulted	31

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AoG	Assemblies of God
CapManEx	Capital Maintenance Expenditure
CBR	Community-Based Rehabilitation
CGD	Center for Global Development
CHRAJ	Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice
CoC	Church of Christ
CS	Civil Society
DA	District Assembly
DAB	Danish Association of the Blind
DACF	District Assemblies Common Fund
DCF	Disability Common Fund
DDF	District Development Facility
DDHS	District Director of Health Services
DFMC	District Fund Management Committee
DHMT	District Health Management Team
DICAP	Deaf Information and Communication Access Improvement Project
DPO	Disabled People's Organisation
DSW	Department of Social Welfare
FBO	Faith-Based Organisation
FCUBE	Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education
FM	Frequency Modulation
FOAT	Functional and Organisational Assessment Tool
GBU	Ghana Blind Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GFD	Ghana Federation of the Disabled
GH¢	Ghana Cedi (also written as GHS; equivalent to US\$0.43 on 01 Jan 2014)
GHS	Ghana Health Service
GIA	Ghana Institute of Architects
GMA	Ghana Medical Association
GNAD	Ghana National Association of the Deaf
GNAG	Ghana National Association of Garages
GNTDA	Ghana National Tailors and Dressmakers Association
GoG	Government of Ghana
HQ	Headquarters
HYAF	Half-Yearly Advisory Forum
IGIS	Independent Governance Institution of State
JDP	Joint Disability Project
LDF	Local Development Fund
LI	Legislative Instrument
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCSS	Micro Credit and Savings Scheme
MFA	[Danish] Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoFEP	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MoGCSP	Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection
MoH	Ministry of Health
MTDP	Medium-Term Development Plan
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NADMO	National Disaster Management Organisation
NCCE	National Commission for Civic Education
NCPD	National Council for Persons with Disability

NDPC	National Development Planning Commission
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NHIA	National Health Insurance Authority
NHIS	National Health Insurance Scheme
OD	Organisation Development
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OISL	Opportunity International Savings and Loans
OPWD	Organisation of Persons with Disability
PM	Project Manager
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
PWD	Person with Disability
RBA	Rights-Based Approach
SEND	Social Enterprise for Development
SLI	Sign Language Interpretation
SMS	Short Messaging Service
SSC	South Steering Committee
STAR	Strengthening Transparency Accountability and Responsiveness
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNCRPD	United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
VAT	Value Added Tax
VSP	Vocational Skills and Informal Sector Support Project
YAF	Yearly Advisory Forum

Summary

Considering the lives of seclusion and despair which disabled persons experienced as well as the dearth of attention to disability policy and legislation prior to commencing the Joint Disability Project (JDP), it is evident that the project has made some very impressive gains (see Section 1.1 – Advocacy Outcomes). These gains need to be consolidated and scaled up. However, there are also some thematic areas of weakness that need further reflection and reformulation.

The evaluation suggests the following as some of the most significant drivers of the advocacy successes thus far:

- *A united front with shared values and clear roles:* The overwhelming support for a collective impact approach has been highly instrumental in driving the quite impressive successes that have been achieved thus far.¹ However, the potential for even greater impact has also been dampened by a deficit in the clarity of roles (Section 4.1 – Coordination);
- *Proactiveness in identifying policy opportunities:* At the central level, the Advocacy Committee has been proactive in exploiting windows in the policy landscape. Building on these opportunities, the committee has mounted pointed pressure and made valuable disability-interest inputs during occasions such as the UN Day for Persons with Disability, the 2012 Presidential Debate series and during the review of the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) framework for formulating district medium-term development plans (MTDPs);
- *A strong and committed critical mass of internal champions:* The passion and resolve of the national-level Advocacy Committee has been instrumental in keeping the campaign effort alive in the face of resistance and in proactively looking out for new windows of opportunity.
- *Prioritising the civil society logic over a service delivery one:* Where the OPWDs have persisted in asserting their rights (e.g. to the DACF and NHIS exemptions) – backed by relevant legislation and evidence – the gains they have achieved hold greater promise of longevity and scalability than where they have attempted to provide services incrementally through their own limited resources;
- *Information sharing and transparency:* Group advocacy has been more successful and more consistent in a district like Saboba, where local leaders have been assiduous about disseminating information and knowledge, and where continuous engagement with the broad membership is the norm rather than the exception. At the national level, fora such as the [H]YAFs and the Directors Meetings have been helpful for keeping leaders informed and for resolving misunderstandings. By contrast, there is evidence at the national level and between the international partners that when information flow or feedback has been slow (or deficient or even lacking), this has had a tendency to kindle avoidable misunderstandings and undermine delivery effectiveness;
- *Democracy and legitimacy:* Where decision-making is perceived by members to be inclusive and leaders are seen as subordinating their personal interests to those of the collective (Saboba is, again, a good example), it has had a positive influence on group cohesion, meeting attendance and the quality of joint action;
- *Self-esteem and confidence:* Whether pursued through member education, mentoring or an abiding resolve to ensure inclusiveness, self-esteem is enabling members to pay more attention to their own wellbeing as well as participate more actively in joint efforts, improving the image of PWDs in the sight of duty bearers and the wider public;
- *A set of core metrics on which the collective can focus and also jointly champion:* The joint database has served as a rallying point, assisting in sharing and enhancing knowledge about each other's components. By contrast, expecting high-level joint monitoring to cover much more of a particular OPWD's

¹ Except for a small but vociferous minority within one OPWD, participants in the interviews and workshops at both national and local level were unanimous about prioritising collective impact over disability-specific needs. It is important that the abiding resistance of this small minority does not undermine the collective ethos.

disability-specific component has a tendency to undermine the partnership spirit among the national organisations.

There are positive signals that, where inter-organisation cooperation has been strong, the project has made some impressive progress. For example, GFD's Advocacy Committee has pursued some innovative approaches including courting a body of complementary social purpose champions among Ghana's media houses and parliament. This investment in leveraging new champions and building strategic partnerships has enabled the disability movement to amplify its voice for accelerated action on the state's commitments to the movement. The national-level media partnerships have fuelled a four to five-fold surge in the disability content of press coverage,² increased the reporting of violations and are helping to dismantle erroneous beliefs and prejudices against PWDs. At sub-national level, collaboration with FM radio stations in particular (often in the form of panel discussions) is helping to reverse deep-seated and culturally-defined mindsets that treat disability as a curse. Similarly, an emerging cooperation with some religious institutions with practical competencies in basic sign language interpretation (SLI) is enabling some GNAD branches to access practical support in the form of basic-level training and interpretation services.

The design of a new phase of the cooperation between the Ghanaian and Danish disability organisations will require a better internalisation of the Danida Civil Society Strategy. It should also aim to reflect more fully current global thinking on civil society and partnerships by taking account of the thinking underpinning the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, 2011. For convenience, a key message that is particularly salient to the Ghanaian disability movement is the shift to a new paradigm of "*development effectiveness*" which extends the narrower one of "*aid effectiveness*". The latter was widely perceived by civil society to side-line *policy advocacy processes* (with potential to change how vital institutions function) as well as the array of *social purpose allies* (whose complementary roles are vital in the collective business of championing, co-financing and sustaining lasting change) – see, for example, Hayman, 2012.³

Currently, the Ghanaian disability movement remains too reliant on occasional projects (as opposed to dedicated, long-term sources of funding) to be self-sustaining.⁴ This is even more pressing in the light of Ghana's re-designation as a lower middle-income economy, following the discovery of oil and the generally upward trend in gold prices over the past decade. One significant outcome in terms of the Ghanaian aid architecture is that grants and other concessional forms of aid from traditional sources are being replaced by other modes of financing such as public-private partnerships (PPPs) and debt financing, often by emerging-economy donors such as China, South Korea and Turkey. These new donors have, thus far, demonstrated considerably less interest in the development of civil society. The effective watering down of the Paris principles (particularly the principle of mutual accountability) by Busan and the gradual exit of traditional donors of the OECD bloc will also leave these traditional donors less legitimate space to support civil society by demanding accountability from the Ghanaian state. This raises potential sustainability challenges for civil society which need pre-empting and proactive action.

² The estimate is based on GFD's content analysis of newspaper reporting.

³ Hayman, R (2012): The Busan Partnership: Implications for Civil Society, Oxford: INTRAC Policy Briefing Paper 29

⁴ On occasion, it has contributed to an unhealthy competition for funds from the STAR Ghana portfolio.

A potential response which has yet to be explored creatively is that of developing funding-oriented alliances. While the Disability Network has been quite helpful as a social purpose ally (and *organisational* partner) on the *voice* front, there is not as yet an equivalent body (or agenda within the Disability Network) geared towards mobilising *financial* support for the movement's initiatives or core costs. With regard to that agenda, the renowned think tank, Center for Global Development (CDG), concludes that partnering *individuals* tends to be more effective than partnering organisations.⁵ Consideration should be given to re-engineering the Disability Network to accommodate this enlarged agenda and to draw in a larger body of influential individuals and entrepreneurs.

Equally important for sustainability, GFD should aim to ring-fence a portion of the decentralised statutory grant for disability – informally referred to as the “*disability common fund*” (DCF) – as a sustainable source of core funding as well as for financing joint initiatives of the sort that the Danida civil society grant has been funding thus far. The DCF amounts to 0.015% of Ghana's GDP, and is currently in the region of US\$6m annually and set to rise significantly as oil proceeds increase, the DACF is absorbed into an enhanced District Development Facility (DDF) in the next couple of years and a raft of new indirect taxes gain root.⁶

When civil society is itself financially dependent and not well endowed, an incremental, self-led approach to service delivery will lack scalability and is resource inefficient. The leap from incremental service delivery to widespread adoption will require an embedding of rounded models in the wider policy and service delivery ecosystems. Thus, an agenda for scaled impact ought to be driven more purposively by a singular focus on influencing and altering the way in which pivotal institutions set public policy, allocate available resources and deliver their services.

There are several key observations that should guide the uses to which the DCF would be best put in future. First, for most recipients, the small one-off type grant has gone mainly into provisioning rather than genuinely profitable investments. With Ghana continuing to lack credible research matching occupational skills with the demands of the labour market, it is unsurprising that several of the investments which PWDs have been guided to embark upon have proved challenging to sustain or have failed outright. Thus, the “enterprise plans” which applicants are generally expected to submit as a condition for accessing individual grants cannot be a sound basis for allocating the grant. Indeed, the perception that the principal hurdle has been the low quantum of individual grants is highly contestable and not borne out by wider evidence on sustainable livelihoods in Ghana.

Neither does the allocation of this major resource align with the project vision and the driving agenda of collective impact.⁷ For now, LDF-type (joint advocacy) initiatives have not been accorded greater priority in the DCF allocation arrangement. Yet, in all but one of the interviews with representatives of the movement, participants were unambiguous in prioritising collective impact above individual/

⁵ MacDonald, L and Moss, T (2014): Building a Think-and-Do Tank: A Dozen Lessons from the First Dozen Years of the Center for Global Development

⁶ The new taxes include levies on farm equipment, locally-produced pharmaceuticals, bank transactions and airfares, as well as duties on a range of non-commercial imports. These are on top of a 2.5% rise on the pre-existing value added tax (VAT) rate and the plugging of a range of collection leakages.

⁷ Some high-quality discussions outlining the essentials of collective impact are available at the following links: http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/rereading_collective_impact_three_lessons?utm_source=Enews&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=SSIR_Now&utm_content=Title and http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact

OPWD interest.⁸ Inasmuch as budgets are an expression of *de facto* priorities, it is important that the way in which the DCF is allocated begins to reflect this priority more consistently. Such an approach would also make the movement more sustainable – both in organisational as well as in financial terms.

Equity remains a challenge in the distribution of the DCF. Local executives, fund managers and DA officials observed routine disaffection over how personal grants are allocated. At the root of this disaffection is the lack of an objective formula for sharing the pie, resulting in perceptions of inequity and of leaders putting self-interest ahead of the group interest. Contrary to the principles underpinning social protection, anecdotal evidence suggests that the better endowed (particularly the most educated/least disabled and, hence, those with greatest access to social and human capital) often receive much larger grants partly because they are able to present more articulate proposals and also because they tend to have greater exposure and thus more ambitious investment aspirations. Maintaining this *status quo* would simply transfer the prevailing inequality between the able and disabled communities into an *intra*-disability phenomenon, with adverse consequences for the movement. Indeed, throughout history, high and widening disparities have tended to fuel discontent and undermine group cohesion.⁹

The evaluation also revealed that the recurrent education expenditures (but also some healthcare needs) of a small minority can easily eat up the bulk of the fund. In practice, it is common for the same small cohort to benefit repeatedly from the first cut of each tranche, depriving other needy members of a bite at the pie. In Mampong, for example, such so-called priority costs easily take up some 70% of a quarter's budget.

Going forward, and in a spirit of continuous improvement, it will be helpful to **invest some quality time and resources towards developing a more credible and equitable methodology for prioritising and allocating the DCF**. A high level of inclusiveness and iteration will be vital to the process of crafting an allocation methodology that is acceptable to the broad membership of the disability community. The principle of equity will also require applying greater discernment by prioritising the most vulnerable PWDs in line with the purpose of social protection – which, in essence, is to buffer the weakest rather than to sustain the average. Giving greater attention to pro-disability services (e.g. sign language interpretation) and infrastructure (e.g. accessibility of public facilities) would be a more effective way of targeting the most disabled with the DCF. The current disbursement regime has been very weak at addressing this equity concern.

Considering the existing weaknesses in allocating the fund, it would be helpful to **advocate more robustly for GFD to be legally acknowledged as the umbrella organisation formally representing disabled people**, as is the case with Ghana's professional associations.¹⁰ Such a move would make for greater

⁸ The sole exception was the GBU secretariat, at headquarters level. According to a recent report, the Government of Ghana (GoG) too “has tasked [the disability movement] to do more collectively using a common platform” (Nkum, 2013, Section 2.4)

⁹ A helpful reminder of the damaging outcomes of inequality is the recent Oxfam publication – Fuentes-Nieva, R and Galasso, N (2014): Working for the few: Political capture and economic inequality, Oxfam Briefing Paper, 20 January 2014.

¹⁰ Architects, engineers, doctors and pharmacists, for example, are not eligible to participate professionally in ring-fenced state contracts if they are not registered with the relevant professional bodies. There is also a history of state projects – notably the Vocational Skills Project (VSP) – where master-craftsmen were only eligible to participate if they were pre-approved by recognised professional groupings such as the Ghana National Association of Garages (GNAG) or the Ghana National Tailors and Dressmakers Association (GNTDA)

transparency, enhance prospects for consultation and coordination of state support and reduce existing perceptions of leakage in the allocation of the disability common fund.

High-quality **communication products needed to support the replication of best practice models and to facilitate further evidence-informed advocacy** (including mobilising the broader public to join in demanding change) have been largely lacking during this phase of the project. This deficit **is one vital area which an extension or successor project will have to address as a priority**. For now, there is not much beyond the routine project reports that get prepared. By comparison, a more reflective set of communication products would offer multiple potentials:

- * for deepening sensitivity among the non-disabled public and their appreciation of pro-disability responses;
- * for assisting the current crop of pro-disability converts to join more effectively in social advocacy on behalf of the movement;
- * for more convincingly persuading potential social entrepreneurs and innovators to commit to pro-disability initiatives; and
- * for facilitating more effective adoption and scaling by the state.

In particular, it is important to appreciate that the kind and range of communication products that will be most effective for each of these agendas will differ. For example, a concise and well-evidenced policy brief will be more appropriate for a minister while radio discussions will be more effective for engaging the hearts of the wider public.

1. Introduction

1.1 Project description and purpose

At its heart, the Joint Disability Project (JDP) seeks to build relevant capacity of the disability community, dissolve constraining boundaries and broker dialogue and consensus towards the broader aim of producing a robust movement able to assert its right to equal opportunities and claim its entitlements from the state and duty bearers. From the outset, there has been a clear recognition of the need to amplify voice and foster a spirit of collective impact in the uphill task of changing unfavourable policies and intractable behaviours that are prejudicial to the wellbeing of the disabled community.

Specific objectives of the project

The Joint Disability Project concerned itself with three key objectives:

- * strengthening advocacy;
- * organisational development of the individual DPOs; and
- * internal collaboration and co-ordination of the disability movement.

Project content

The project included both:

- Joint activities – essentially:
 - * training designed to enhance rights awareness and organisation effectiveness,
 - * a Local Development Fund (LDF) to facilitate innovative collaborative initiatives employing the skills acquired through training,
 - * co-ordination of the activities of the OPWDs and
 - * advocacy; as well as
- Separate, disability-specific activities – namely:
 - * sign language interpretation (SLI) training to serve the deaf;
 - * a microcredit/ savings scheme for those with impaired mobility (a.k.a. the physically disabled); and
 - * community-based rehabilitation (CBR) for the blind and partially-sighted.

1.2 JDP's intervention logic

The project was funded through a Danish grant under its window for civil society strengthening.¹¹ By signing onto the Danida grant, the project partners implicitly associated with the logic underpinning the civil society strengthening strategy of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). “*The Civil Society Strategy*” – as it is widely known – seeks to unleash the potential of civil society by:

- * developing their capacities and
- * promoting advocacy as the main tool for securing access to the rights of social citizenship.

Within the context of that strategy (but also across the contemporary literature on international development), the *incremental* delivery of services by civil society is not an appropriate approach. Rather, service delivery ought to be strategically oriented towards developing capacity (typically reflective learning) and advocacy work (through, for example, developing and persuasively showcasing evidence-based models as a way of influencing the state to adopt more effective and transformative approaches at scale). The partnership strategy of DPOD notes explicitly that “*DPOD's partnership*

¹¹ For a concise summary of “*The Civil Society Strategy*” – together with a download link – visit <http://www.danida-publikationer.dk/publikationer/publikationsdetaljer.aspx?PIId=855e73d4-2c34-414a-98da-8c47e4627784>

strategy has its roots in Danida's development strategy'¹² and further identifies “*mutual learning*” as a key pillar of the approach.

The project document for the JDP echoes this agenda, describing the goal as “*acquisition of basic capacity resulting in skilful participation in own organisational work and joint fora like local GFD committees*”. In addition to acknowledging the project’s instrumental and capacity strengthening ethos, the design also affirms that the joint activities and the separate, disability-specific activities were, **together**, “*meant to develop the DPOs and increase joint pressure on political authorities both at national and local level in order to promote the rights of PWDs ...*” at scale. Thus, from the outset, an explicit collective impact approach was coupled with a civil society logic.

That said, a close reading of the project document and the way in which the project has been implemented reveals a certain fundamental incoherence. In the main, the disability-specific components employ a typical *service delivery logic* while the joint component thrives on a *civil society logic*. In the former (a *service delivery logic*), partners prioritise and deliver incremental services in response to the needs of primary stakeholders. By contrast, a *civil society logic* concerns itself with building capacity of primary stakeholders’ to assert their right to public services through advocating for the state (and/ or other duty bearers) to fulfil their side of the social contract and honour their legal obligations.

1.3 Evaluation objectives

The evaluation addressed the following key objectives:

- * Achievement of project objectives;
- * Effectiveness – including the scale and spread of achievements, quality of achievements, relevance of results achieved, policy uptake/ spontaneous side-take by non-JDP districts and appropriateness of indicators/ results;
- * Efficiency – resource-effectiveness, prioritisation between expenditure choices;
- * Choice of strategies – usefulness of methods/ strategies and designed indicators/ results;
- * Sustainability – ownership (e.g. dues, utilisation of DACF), dependency and quality of collaboration; and
- * Civil society (CS) strengthening and organisation development (OD)

1.4 Methodology

The evaluation methodology entailed a mixed-methods approach combining:

- * a rapid scan of relevant best practice literature;
- * self-assessment by the OPWDs;
- * focus group discussions mainly with project participants (primary stakeholders, committees, OPWD staff) and duty bearers;
- * a small number of one-on-one interviews with selected key informants and stakeholders external to the project;
- * continuous reflections with representatives of the OPWDs on the interim findings and to re-strategise for the remaining days of the fieldwork; and
- * a debriefing/ validation workshop

¹² <http://www.disability.dk/Handicappuljen/strategies/partnership>

2. Advocacy achievements at national and local levels

2.1 Key advocacy outcomes

The movement is increasingly acknowledged by the state (both at central and district levels) as the collective voice of PWDs. During the interviews conducted under the evaluation, its growing clout was repeatedly observed by the district-level officials. The guidelines for managing the DCF explicitly identify GFD as the mouthpiece of PWDs in issues regarding the fund. On the global stage too, the movement has further been acknowledged in a recent address to the UN General Assembly by the Minister responsible for Gender, Children and Social Protection – herself a pro-minority campaigner prior to her appointment as minister. However, GFD does not yet have the kind of *legal* recognition as the *categorical* representative of the disabled community that other equivalent entities such as Ghana Institute of Architects (GIA) and the Ghana Medical Association (GMA) have. This raises challenges in monitoring the transparency of DCF allocations, making legitimate claims to a dedicated share of the DCF as core funding for the OPWDs and in consulting and representing PWDs effectively when large swathes of PWDs remain beyond GFD's ambit.

The project has facilitated greater collaboration and joint action between the diverse disability-specific organisations, both at national level and in the districts supported by the project (see Section 4.1 – Coordination). Participants interviewed observed that joint action was rare prior to the initiation of the project. At district level, the GFD Committees, comprising executives of the disparate branches, continue to meet once a month to review their action plans and to re-strategise. However, the quality of the action plans and advocacy strategies suggest a need for some remedial training.

Through joint action at national level, the OPWDs were able to secure a decentralised, ring-fenced grant from the state – informally referred to as the disability common fund (DCF), equivalent to 2% of the statutory DACF. However, PWDs have had to take further joint action at the local level in order to actually access the fund. In several cases, this has entailed some persistent engagement with the district authorities. Depending on whose figures one uses (the District Assemblies 'or those of the GFD Committees), disabled persons in the project districts as a whole are currently assessing between 80 and 96 per cent of the DCF. In several cases, officials from the national level (particularly, the GFD Advocacy Officer, the PM-South and the Programme Officers of the individual OPWDs) have had to intervene by accompanying local leaders to assert their claim more forcefully during monitoring visits to the districts. Access to the relevant bank statements also continues to prove elusive for the local leaders.

Anecdotal evidence suggests some coincidence between those with enhanced livelihoods (from investing their DCF grants), those exhibiting the most confidence and those observed to participate most actively in associational and social life.¹³ However, the *direction* of the correlation between successful livelihoods, esteem and participation is not so straightforward. Further, among the lot who have received the grants, those who have succeeded in securing their livelihoods are the exception rather than the norm. For most recipients, the limited one-off grant has gone mainly into provisioning rather than into genuinely profitable investments. Of the limited number met, a significant proportion of those with successful livelihoods were practising previously acquired artisanal skills. This suggests a positive role of human capital accumulation in facilitating livelihood security and strengthens the case for prioritising advocacy for genuinely equal access to education and training.

¹³ Petty commerce and farming are common among the livelihood projects.

Regarding the NHIS, joint petitioning by the local branches has contributed to various NHIS scheme managers agreeing to classify all PWDs who apply for exemptions as “*indigent*” in order to qualify under Ghanaian law for the exemptions. Other social purpose organisations who contributed to the advocacy for premium-free NHIS subscriptions include SEND Foundation and SNV. More recently, there has been a mass registration of PWDs nationwide under a social protection initiative of the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (MoGCSP).

At the national level, dedicated pursuit of GFD’s advocacy plan has yielded additional fruit, with disability now captured as a variable in the national census database – even if, for now, the relevant field is limited to “*severe disabilities*” quantified at 3% of the national population. Similar advocacy efforts contributed to other major changes in national legal and policy frameworks. These include the ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of PWDs, the reconstitution of the executive board of the National Council for Persons with Disability (NCPD) and the establishment of that for the Mental Health Authority, following an ultimatum to the government. The new NCPD board has an accomplished disabled academician as its chair and is much more acceptable to the disability movement. As yet, however, the legislative instrument (LI) to operationalise the Persons with Disability Act (715) is not in place and engagement is ongoing to bring the law in line with the UN convention (by increasing attention to the preventive and promotional dimensions rather than treating disability as merely a welfare concern and by fostering greater inclusiveness of lesser-recognised disabilities such as autism and albinism). The movement also lobbied for the appointment of a disabled person as a minister of state. While the specific nominee proposed by GFD did not make the finish line, a visually-impaired lawyer has been nevertheless appointed to the position of Minister of Chieftaincy and Traditional Affairs in the current (Mahama) administration. This is a significant achievement, considering that Ghanaian cultural codes generally frown on chiefs being led by disabled persons.

Neglect to take account of the safety needs of disabled persons in the construction of the George Walker Bush Highway (a.k.a. the M1) incurred the wrath of the movement and prompted them to file a lawsuit against the state. The movement has also assisted in pursuing other violations of the PWD Act in various law courts in Ghana. Through effective engagement with the National Disaster Management Organisation (NADMO), GFD is also represented on that organisation’s Technical Committee, working to protect the peculiar interests of the disabled community in disaster situations. Again, a strong representation by the Advocacy Committee, aided by the ongoing cooperation with national media houses, resulted in the landmark inclusion of pro-disability guidelines in the national framework prescribing how districts ought to prepare their medium-term development plans. While these guidelines do not yet prescribe clear standards for pro-disability infrastructure, the move has compelled districts to begin to take more serious account of the mobility needs of their disabled populations.

2.2 Key advocacy shortfalls

Physical accessibility at schools and health facilities

Local advocacy, backstopped from the centre, has increased the number of ramps at public basic-cycle schools. The overwhelming majority of new school buildings (but almost none of those completed pre-2010) have some form of ramp. However, in all districts visited, the provision of ramps has been largely nominal, implemented with the view to satisfying a nagging legislation rather than to facilitate genuine accessibility for persons with mobility challenges. The sole consistent exception has been at the larger health facilities where the standard has been guided by the facilities’ own need to transport

seriously ill patients via trolley. Even so, the washrooms are often inaccessible. In no case did school ramps conform to the movement's accessibility standards or comply with global guidelines (especially the threshold gradient of 1:12). Even the faulty ramps merely aim to provide access to the classroom verandas, not to the classrooms themselves or to the lavatories. Neither is the ubiquitous “*dual desk*” used in Ghanaian classrooms disability-friendly. Even at the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) in Winneba, the primary ramp is completely unusable – hazardous even – with a gradient in the region of 40 degrees!

Further engagement will be needed at both local and national level to **champion the accelerated institution and enforcement of accessibility standards for public premises** as specified in the Disability Act.¹⁴ This advocacy effort should seek to **cement the relevant specifications in NDPC's instructions for developing district medium-term development plans** to ensure greater traction and enhance annual accounting under the Functional and Organisational Assessment Tool (FOAT) exercise.¹⁵

Availability of SLI services at health facilities

Overall, health facilities still make no provision for sign language services for hearing-impaired patients. Contrary to the inclusive provisions of Article 29 (6) and Article 38 (1) and (2) of the Constitution, interpretation of the “*right of accessibility*” has, thus far, tended to be limited to the nominal provision of ramps for mobility-impaired persons, side-lining the mobility needs of the blind community and the communication needs of deaf persons wishing to avail themselves of key public services. The inordinately slow pace of progress is also influenced by the fact that Ghana's health sector (and indeed the wider public service) currently does not have room for dedicated sign language interpreter (SLI) *positions*. Nor is a change in that situation likely in the near term, owing to a tacit policy of attrition recently embarked upon by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MoFEP) – whereby vacancies created by retiring and deceased public servants are deliberately left unfilled, owing to recent budgetary challenges provoked by a steep rise in the wage bill and by other expenditure overruns. What this means is that alternative models of accessing SLI *services* will need to be explored in the movement's advocacy for public financing of SLI as a public good.

It has been suggested – in a reflective discussion with the District Director of Health Services (DDHS) at Saboba – that GNAD/ GFD could consider redirecting the thrust of the sign language advocacy drive towards including sign language in the *regular* training curriculum for *front-line* health workers – typically nurses and community health promoters. That way, the expectation is that these health workers would graduate with relevant SLI skills, obviating the need to recruit *specialised* SLIs at health facilities. The key target audiences of that line of advocacy would be the political leadership of the health ministry, the Health Promotion Unit of Ghana Health Service (GHS) and the Director of Training at the Ministry of Health (MoH). However, GNAD perceives that such a supply-led approach would be accompanied by a high risk of trainees losing the requisite SL skills (as they would generally not very little opportunity to interact with deaf people). **A preferred (and more demand-based) option**

¹⁴ The widely accepted threshold gradient in global architectural practice is 1:12 – see e.g. sites listed under https://www.google.com.gh/search?q=recommended+gradient+for+ramps+wheelchair+access&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a&gws_rd=cr&ei=uBDXUsLnIYOC4ATbl4GYAQ. However, the movement is willing to accept a slightly steeper and more cost-conscious threshold of 1:10.

¹⁵ The FOAT is a formal instrument by which all districts are assessed annually, with significant financial rewards and sanctions tied to the assessment indicators.

would be for interested health care personnel to be offered relevant SL training and then redeployed to SL-deficient areas, building on the strategy documented in the last paragraph of Section 3.4.

Isolated examples also exist of districts (e.g. Mampong and Effutu) which have rolled out informal arrangements for SLI services at targeted facilities, paid for through the DCF. Augmented with a directory of local sign language interpreters who are available on call, this is improving access to interpretation services in those localities. **This bridging model could be developed into an effective communication product with which to advocate other District Health Management Teams (DHMTs) and assemblies.** As a civil society initiative, it is important that this approach is marketed as a scalable model for embedding in the mainstream public service delivery system rather than implemented as an incremental service delivered by GNAD.

Further, while the local branches have become relatively more articulate and have been assisted to secure a range of important advocacy gains with their duty bearers, it remains too easy for them to accept casual verbal commitments from the latter. In future, it will be useful, when duty bearers make verbal agreements during an engagement, for the local OPWDs to **demand timelines and then to proactively document the conclusions in the form of an aide memoire to serve both as an actionable reminder as well as fall-back evidence for subsequent advocacy.** Getting such commitments implanted in the respective districts' MTDPs would secure even greater traction for the agreement.

2.3 Lessons learned re advocacy/ influencing

For the most part, starting the advocacy by aiming for the lower-hanging fruits (particularly in terms of project indicators) enabled the movement to secure some “*quick wins*”, inspire confidence in the value of advocacy and build momentum for further joint advocacy. What remains is to **build on the current drive and volume to explore longer-span systemic strategies and more ambitious goals – for example, campaigning for a more liberal interpretation of Art 29 (6) of the Constitution (on accessibility of public services) or to ensure that disabled persons obtain a just equivalent to the fee-free tuition which the non-disabled population enjoys in public secondary and tertiary institutions.** Indeed, in the secondary sector, the subsidy would also include feeding and residential costs. Thus, where adequate public options do not exist for special education, the state should cover the equivalent costs in private/ non-state institutions offering relevant services. While more challenging, it is precisely such harder-to-achieve and farther-reaching responses that have the greatest potential to truly transform the situation of disabled people sustainably.

The interviews with public officials at the district level show that the strategy of “*immersion*” can be very useful for assisting non-disabled duty bearers to appreciate the challenges which PWDs live with on an everyday basis. Getting duty bearers to make their entry into a training workshop via wheelchair was particularly effective in Mampong. Following that activity, the assembly has made stronger verbal commitments to increase the number of ramps and also monitor the appropriateness of those built with state/ DA resources. Equivalent **immersions in deaf and blind experiences would enhance a fuller appreciation of disability.** The approach could also be explored more creatively towards enlarging the body of social champions among duty bearers while media engagement is used to build understanding among the wider public.

2.4 Recommendations re advocacy/ influencing

Strategy for exiting the old districts

The most vital issues with which the exit strategy ought to concern itself include deepening members' ownership of the change agenda and process (in order to secure their continued and lasting commitment) and consolidating and protecting the sustainability of the processes initiated and of the gains made during the course of the project. To this end, it will be important to take additional steps to enhance *practical* knowledge and appreciation of the rights-based approach (RBA) and the multiple strategies available for more effective advocacy. Similarly important will be facilitation of consensus towards a regime in which movement development initiatives and joint advocacy work are funded *more routinely* via a dedicated share of the DCF.

More explicitly, the fieldwork suggests that such an effort would benefit from firmer understandings of:

- * Article 38 of the 1992 Constitution (which secures the right to benefit from the full cycle of basic education under the *Directive Principles of State Policy*);¹⁶
- * the inalienability of the broad rights and entitlements of disabled persons articulated in the PWD Act (715)¹⁷ and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD);
- * the right of accessibility of public facilities and services enshrined in Clause 6 of Article 29 of the Constitution; and
- * the fact that the DCF is not a gift to which access and information needs negotiating but an enforceable entitlement.

Also important will be longer-term efforts to foster and strengthen alliances with a wider diversity of stakeholders. This will entail multiple dimensions such as:

- * proactively guarding and further strengthening existing intra- and inter-OPWD relationships;
- * proactively identifying and engaging sympathetic and influential duty bearers (including working to enlarge the existing seven-person parliamentary caucus as well as building relationships with other targeted members of the policy-making class in relevant sectors); and
- * continuing to sensitise and mobilise the larger citizen public through the ongoing media effort.

Attention will also need paying to more equitable ways of allocating the DCF and pre-empting conflict-of-interest situations. For example, prioritising allocations to pro-disability *infrastructure* (e.g. accessibility of public facilities) and *services* (e.g. sign language interpretation) would make targeting more self-selecting and socially efficient as the greatest benefits would then accrue to those with the most serious disabilities.

Strategy for future phase

Beyond the exit processes described above, it will also be important – in the spirit of nurturing alliances – for the organisations to be more proactive in eliciting and acknowledging the vital contributions of other key actors and drivers of the changes achieved. Otherwise, perceptions that the OPWDs are taking undue credit for gains made risk denting partnership relations.

¹⁶ This right is etched in various stipulations in the Constitution's *Directive Principles of State Policy*. While Art 36 (1) *prescribes a duty of social protection* (i.e. public assistance to protect the most vulnerable from utter destitution), Art 38 (2) prioritises *universal basic education* as mandatory – placing this sub-sector firmly ahead of the secondary, tertiary and adult education sub-sectors in terms of resource allocation.

¹⁷ When asked about the Act, a female member at Saboba noted thus: “*We have heard ... but we don't understand it.*”

It would also help to facilitate a fuller appreciation of what a civil society strengthening project entails and how that differs from a typical project rooted in a service delivery logic. Closely related to this, it is important that the design of any new initiatives should include a clearer and more credible assessment of how the gains and/or approaches will be sustained. Unless civil society has an adequate sources of non-project funds, much greater clarity will be required regarding the strategy for embedding the initiative into the state's regular service delivery system.

3. Organisational capacity at central and local levels

3.1 Membership and participation

The progress reported in terms of associational life and its outcomes suggests a significant improvement in organisational capacity at the district level. Prior to signing up to the project, the OPWDs had very low memberships at the branch level. Many branches have grown by 50-100% since affiliating with the project. While attendance at the monthly meetings of the disability-specific OPWDs remains sub-optimal in most cases, it is nevertheless a marked improvement on the state of play prior to the JDP and is also an important avenue for socialisation between PWDs, especially in Saboba. Overall, the organisations are now better organised, with constitutions, functional committees and elections to term positions – with local branches of the participating OPWDs now existing in all 14 districts that took part in the JDP. However, the shortfall in both *consistent* meeting attendance¹⁸ and in the payment of membership dues¹⁹ do raise some concern regarding the depth of ownership and the longevity of associational advocacy. Disaggregated data for the disability-specific OPWDs suggest unsustainable payment rates of 19% for the GBU membership, 52% for GNAD and 36% for GSPD (Nkum, 2013).

Across all districts visited, self-esteem has risen considerably in the disabled community, due to a combination of purposive member education by the local leaderships and mentoring support from the headquarters OPWDs. PWDs are now better aware of their options and, during the interviews conducted as part of the evaluation process, many shared inspiring testimonies of how they are no longer depressed and cloistered in their rooms but increasingly confident to engage in social life. Consistently, participants shared experiences such as: *“previously I didn't keep myself clean, but I do now,”* *“I used to be miserable and just stayed indoors until the ‘Danida project’ came,”* *“we didn't know before that [sign language] interpreters existed anywhere,”* *“I now do my own cooking and can go to church and travel to other towns without an aide,”* *“I now participate in public events and make more of an effort to be presentable and sociable,”* *“my life before was one of isolation and self-pity; ... now I am independent and participate in social activities,”* and *“we were not aware that it was possible to educate a deaf child.”* Indeed, visual evidence during the fieldwork corroborates the widespread claim that PWDs now pay more attention to their physical appearance. The proportion of PWDs who are getting married is also reported to be increasing as a result of the project's investment in enhancing members' sense of self-worth, confidence and sheer desire to live normal lives.

3.2 Leadership effectiveness

The district branches now have greater access to their respective district authorities. In Saboba and some other districts, PWDs have even secured seats in the assemblies. Member education by the

¹⁸ Participation rates tend to be well under 50%. Examples are 30-50% for the OPWDs in Effutu, 15-50% for those in Mampong and around 90% for the aggregate group in Saboba.

¹⁹ Depending on the disability-specific OPWD, only 10-40% of members have paid their dues in Mampong, 25-50% in Effutu and around 90% in Saboba.

respective GFD Committees has combined with the DCF to put many more deaf children into school. In Saboba, the enrolment statistic for deaf children has risen from a single child at the start of the project to 15 currently in school, mainly at the Savelugu School for the Deaf. In Mampong too, the GFD Committee creatively employed an immersion strategy to enhance duty bearers' practical appreciation of the challenges which mobility-challenged persons face accessing public facilities (Section 2.3 – Lessons learned).

The enhancements reported in organisational capacity at the local level owe much to the two-pronged approach employed in building advocacy capacity. A series of training workshops facilitated jointly by the Programme Officers from the discrete OPWDs has assisted local leaders to acquire some relevant theoretical knowledge while field-based shadowing and mentorship (known as “*accompaniment*” among project staff) has helped in honing practical advocacy skills. At Saboba, the GFD secretary was not only impressively organised with her minutes and archiving, but also acutely aware of on-goings in the disparate OPWDs. Several pieces of information sought by the evaluator were promptly retrieved by her. Impressively, she acquired these skills mainly through occasional coaching by HQ staff during their monitoring visits.

However, **several key areas remain in which local leaders need a fuller appreciation of the fundamental concepts (of, e.g., enshrined rights, public goods, the social contract and conflict of interest) needed for effective advocacy.** Thus far, it appears that too many of the advocacy successes at local level were achieved through such direct “*hand-holding*” by HQ staff. GFD is yet to find the right balance between the agendas of intervening to solve local advocacy problems on the one hand and mentoring on the other. As implied above, the intensity of this form of “*accompaniment*” is not strategically designed to taper off over the life of a district's participation in the project. The approach thus fuels the risk of dependency and is anathema to sustainability. **GFD needs to rationalise its accompaniment strategy, such that “*hand-holding*” support is available to local leaders during the *initial* stages of their tenure (while they navigate the unfamiliar road of engaging the state) while systematically moving towards an “*arms-length*” approach over time.**

There have been instances where imbalances in power have allowed leaders to capture disproportionate shares of the DCF pie. In the three most cited cases mentioned to the evaluator, the culprit executives are also staff of the respective assemblies or members of the District Fund Management Committees (DFMCs) that oversee its utilisation. This suggests a conflict-of-interest situation. Serving simultaneously in the positions of primary stakeholder/ right holder and duty bearer clearly places them in an advantaged position that is easy to abuse in the process of allocating limited resources. In one case, the cost of the individual's private university costs are repeatedly charged to the DCF, seriously disadvantaging the rest of the membership. The other allegations involve individual executives endorsing projects for themselves or their favourites which are far in excess of what the average member has been entitled to.

These suggest a **need for further attention to strengthening internal democracy and accountability** not only for their intrinsic value (e.g. sustaining organisational cohesion) but also as for their instrumental value (enhancing traction, setting duty bearers a proper example and leaving them less scope to deflect the focus of advocacy by turning accusing fingers on the movement). For now, too, candidates' electability tends to be driven almost exclusively by popularity which, while important, is not an adequate criterion for successful leadership. In a future phase, therefore, **election processes should include a more purposive member education component revolving around the roles of and desirable attributes and skills for each position.**

3.3 Organisational learning

At local level, too many in the disability movement (even among the executives) still perceive the DCF as a gift rather than an enforceable entitlement. This perception has the tendency to undermine their resolve to assert their right to full disclosure on the DCF account. Other significant pockets remain in which PWDs' appreciation of their rights and entitlements from the Ghanaian state remain highly deficient. For example, huge gaps persist in the general appreciation of the Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (FCUBE) policy and the non-negotiable right of every child of school-going age, regardless of (dis)ability, to a full cycle of basic education. Many more disabled children are getting into school (as a result of increasing awareness creation for households affected by disability and because districts are generally setting aside a portion of their DCF resources for educational top-ups). However, participants in Saboba District reported that disabled children continue to drop out of special schools because of the often late arrival of the DACF. Further, rural households affected by disability find the hidden costs entailed in special education (typically boarding) to be prohibitive. When disabled children are unable to get into or remain in school, they also automatically lose out on related social protection instruments such as the free school uniform policy and the school feeding programme. The deficit in appreciation of the broader implications of the FCUBE provisions has to be worrying, considering that there is no singular tool beyond a quality education with potential to maximise human potential and help the disadvantaged break free of the poverty trap.

While member education has indeed been undertaken on various important policies and laws relevant to the disability movement, it appears that it has not been frequent enough to facilitate an adequate understanding and internalisation by the broad membership. The education on rights which the broader body of PWDs have had (mainly through cascading from the training received by selected executives of the OPWDs) has tended to be specific to the DCF, NHIS, physical accessibility and sign language – in descending order of efficacy. Currently, and in descending order, knowledge and appreciation of the disability-relevant sections of the Constitution such as the implications of the directive principle on FCUBE and the provisions on equal opportunity and equity, the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability and the PWD Act (715) tend to be weak at district level – even among OPWD executives. When a cross-section of the Saboba District leadership was asked what they knew about the PWD Act, a substantial proportion had never heard about it.²⁰ Even among those who were aware of it, an otherwise articulate female executive observed: “*We have heard ... but we don't understand it.*”

Going forward, it is important for group education to be more continuous, both because meeting attendance tends to be inconsistent and also because new members keep joining the movement. Refresher education should link more firmly to:

- * the concept of citizenship rights/ the rights-based approach (RBA);
- * specific constitutional provisions such as Articles 29 and 38 and their implications for the disabled public;
- * an understanding of the social contract between the state and its citizens and the duty of the state to account for its stewardship to its citizens; and
- * an appreciation of the vital distinction between public and private goods.

²⁰ By contrast, most of the executives in Effutu did know about the Act.

GFD may wish to explore the possibility of sharing the delivery of such training with the decentralised offices of independent governance institutions of state (IGISs) such as the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ) and the National Commission for Civic Education (NCCE). The logistical costs involved could be facilitated through nominal allocations from the DCF, if necessary.

It is further recommended that **serious consideration is given to developing handy compendiums which paraphrase the most relevant legislations and commitments** made by the state. Such a move would be helpful for expanding policy literacy across the disability movement. For a start, versions of the compendium should be prepared both in simple English as well as in the most dominant vernaculars to enable leaders to better educate their members as well as to permit members to read the text for themselves or, at the very least, have the text read to them by their literate peers or kin.

3.4 Results of disability-specific components

Community-based rehabilitation (CBR) (of GBU)

In general, the blind members met appeared to have gained the most from the disability-specific efforts. Consistently, they were the most emphatic about becoming empowered to live relatively normal lives. In all three districts visited (and even in Effutu, where the CBR effort has been limited to working at the individual rather than the family or community level), it was common to hear the blind make comments like: “*Previously, I just stayed indoors ... and didn't keep myself clean, but all that has changed since the 'Danida project' came ... and educated me.*”

Microcredit and savings scheme (of GSPD)

The microcredit and savings scheme (MCSS) has been quite vibrant in the small minority of districts with schemes managed by Opportunity International Savings and Loans (OISL) Ltd – a 26-branch company specialising in delivering microfinance services.²¹ However, performance has been much less impressive in the larger majority of districts where the scheme relies on regular banking services provided by mainstream banks. While some members in the latter category of districts have indeed benefited from loans, the subscriber numbers are too low to be viable, as the analysis below demonstrates. It appears that the broader membership is not really convinced about the viability and effectiveness of the scheme. In Saboba, for example, 33 (16%) of the district's GSPD members participate in the scheme and the statistic continues to decline. Equivalent statistics for Mampong and Effutu are 14 (25%) and 15 (14%) respectively, and falling. In all cases, the low patronage rate was attributed to high poverty levels among PWDs.

With such small subscriber numbers scattered across an entire district (not a community!), it is very unlikely that the members of the notional “*solidarity groups*” will know each other well enough. Sadly, the evaluation literature in Ghana is replete with examples of failed solidarity groups created by projects across the country. By sheer logic, small, dispersed populations of thrift savers will also make the unit cost of running the scheme entirely inefficient and unviable when implemented by an institution whose core business entails regular retail banking rather than specialist microfinance services. Further, the interest rates they offer on deposits tend to be well below the level of inflation, resulting in capital erosion for the undiscerning saver. Equally undermining the justification for a bank-managed micro-credit scheme is the pleading of poverty as the excuse for the low and declining subscription rates.

²¹ http://www.opportunityghana.com/v3/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=75&Itemid=80

What that means in essence is that the scheme simply isn't viable – except, of course, where alternative institutions structured to deliver dedicated micro-finance services on a win-win basis (such as OISL or Sinapi Aba) exist.

Sign language (SL) training (of GNAD)

In Saboba, some non-GNAD members of the disability movement have acquired skills in SLI with which they are supporting their deaf counterparts. A significant number of public staff are also participating in a GNAD-led SLI training initiative at Mampong, while similar plans are under consideration in Effutu. GNAD is financing the initial four months of training, with the expectation that the assemblies will take up the remaining cost needed to complete the training. However, no formal agreements were sealed before the training commenced.

3.5 Shortfalls, with explanations

While the disability-specific components are understandable and address legitimate needs of members of the OPWDs, they are nevertheless pursued in a manner that is largely oriented towards *incremental* service delivery rather than towards modelling for scaling by pivotal institutions in the wider service delivery system. Continuing disaffection over the sharing of the DCF pie also has a tendency to undermine the depth and longevity of associational harmony.

It appears that many of the branch offices of the movement are not properly equipped with computers and printers. To that extent, it seems ironic that Saboba, which is better equipped with several computers, is not making good use of them while Mampong, for example, is soliciting for such support.

Several branches have entered into quite sub-economic investments (typically renting out furniture and space), without adequate attention to carefully analysing the real costs – particularly the recurrent expenditures and life-time capital maintenance expenditures (CapManEx) – involved in their operations.

3.6 Gender

According to the self-assessments by the OPWDs, gender awareness was already rising within the leadership of the disability movement prior to the commencement of the joint project. The fieldwork at local level confirms that women in the OPWDs are more empowered than is usual in the respective cultures. In each of the districts visited, the evaluator found some very confident and passionate women in the leadership. Despite this achievement, male voice still dominates and gender tends to be relegated to the domain of “*Other Matters*” during business meetings at that level. Some internal reports also observe that women tend to have lower ownership of decisions and activities, suggesting room for further improvement.

4. Partnership coordination, collaboration and governance structure

4.1 Coordination and collaboration

The evaluator found a high degree of joint planning and monitoring particularly at national level as well as in Saboba District and, to a lesser degree, in the other two districts visited. At the executive and management levels, OPWDs with little or no previous history of collective action are now meeting regularly to reflect on their situations and strategise (if not always effectively – particularly at the local level – owing to deficits in reflection skills at that level). At the local level, OPWDs are also increasingly relying on their sister organisations to assist in resolving disputes.

Feedback between the national and district levels also appears to be improving, with the national secretariats providing mentoring and education during their monitoring visits while simultaneously receiving updates on local activities. Information flow between the HQ offices and the local branches as well as between and within OPWDs in each district has been facilitated by the mobile phone, with the Short Messaging Service (SMS) facility favoured by GNAD members.

In all three districts visited during the evaluation, the OPWDs share common office facilities, suggesting an increasing appreciation of the value and cost-effectiveness of joining up. In Saboba, the OPWDs hold one joint meeting each month, with the overwhelming majority of members attending. Socialisation has been an important, if tacit, agenda at these meetings and has been a helpful strategy for building and strengthening bonds between members with different disabilities. In that district, a member of GSPD has acquired sign language skills and assists in interpreting discussions for her deaf peers.

At central level, OPWD resources such as meeting spaces, transport and communications expertise are commonly shared with sister organisations. The yearly and half-yearly advisory fora (YAFs and HYAFs respectively) have provided opportunities for shared learning around best practices and for conferring over challenges. In the process, the OPWDs have come to better appreciate each other's priorities and work, enabling them to input suggestions to the activities and strategies of the other OPWDs or to solicit their views on various issues. A key result of the enhanced collaboration is that the needs of the deaf cohort (who tended to feel marginalised even within the movement) are increasingly recognised and prioritised by the collective.

4.2 Macro-level dynamics

There are indications of some avoidable misunderstandings at all levels (local, national and international), revolving mainly around a lack of clarity around the respective roles. The national boards of the OPWDs have not been effective in their fund-raising (and somewhat also in their policy guidance) roles. Staff opine that the boards have difficulty ceding authority for the day-to-day functions to the directors/ full-time managers. Board members reportedly attempt to micro-manage the secretariats, sometimes giving instructions directly to individual staff without as much as informing the relevant line managers. All the boards were also reported to dabble in implementation (e.g. training), contrary to convention and creating potential conflict-of-interest challenges. The role of the PM-South also seems unclear to some members of the South Steering Committee (SSC). The lack of clarity surrounding roles has been partly responsible for conflicting applications and occasional competition between disability-specific organisations and GFD or even within OPWDs (branches vs. HQ) when submitting proposals to pooled fund mechanisms such as STAR Ghana.

Somewhat related to the deficit in appreciation of roles, information delivered from GFD to the OPWD Directors often does not filter down to other relevant parties in the respective organisations. In this era of electronic communication, **a less bureaucratic (and, thus, more inclusive and time-efficient) alternative would be to simply copy in all relevant staff when posting emails to the OPWD leads.**

It appears that both between the OPWDs participating in the national movement and also between the international partners, the preparatory partnership negotiations would have benefited from a lengthier cycle of reflective, facilitated discussion. While some measure of evolution and adaptation are to be expected in any meaningful partnership, it nevertheless appears that the start-up process did not give adequate time and attention to the absolutely fundamental issues of fostering a broad-based vision of the desired change state or to interrogating shared values, priorities, understandings and risks. Neither were the roles adequately anticipated for key actors in the change process – especially the state, local civil society, the Danish partner and the funder; but also the SSC vis-à-vis the directors/ managers of the participating organisations. The consequence of this gap in initial diligence has been a predictable deficit in the clarity of some key roles – both within the partnership as well as externally, with some residual tensions that could largely have been avoided. Particularly troubling has been the weak appreciation of the Danish civil society strategy resulting in an ongoing mis-direction of civil society energies and finances into actions that should properly be the role of the advocated state (e.g. training of sign language interpreters and financing of the tuition costs of disabled students at various levels of the education cycle). Based on lessons from the previous experience, the ongoing process of developing a short-term extension appears to entail more dialogue and collaboration, though further improvement would be desirable in developing a more comprehensive extension.

A section of staff feel that reporting formats are changed too often by the Northern partner. If so, that would be inconsistent with the principles of partnership elaborated in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. There have also been delays in transferring funds from Denmark, affecting project delivery. The evaluator's assessment is that these delays are largely attributable to bottlenecks in honouring agreed reporting deadlines or in addressing the North's requests for clarification. The evaluation reveals a tendency among a minority of staff to externalise blame when assessing delivery shortfalls and partnership relations. While some of this may be absolutely valid, such an approach risks fuelling inertia and leaves participants expecting more from others than they demand of themselves. **A partnership relationship workshop is under discussion as a way of addressing the underlying challenges and is highly supported by the evaluator.** It will also help, within that forum, for participants as a whole to begin to learn/ re-learn the routine of introspection as a strategy for better identifying areas within their direct control that they can improve on.

4.3 M&E system

The joint database (comprising the higher-level monitoring framework designed to provide a snapshot of performance on the core monitoring indicators) has become more vibrant since the mid-term review (MTR). This follows the appointment of a dedicated Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer. **The possibility of including some high-performing local executives on the joint (inter-OPWD) team which undertakes the periodic so-called “overall monitoring” activity has been mooted by the leadership of the movement and seems commendable.** Such a step would help build local monitoring capacity, improve cross-learning and lay the foundation for a more sustainable peer-based monitoring approach in exit districts.

In spite of the evident progress in monitoring, conflicts are still common between the data in the joint database and those in reports of the disability-specific OPWDs. On the one hand, the accessibility indicators lack adequate detail, as elaborated in Section 2.2. On the other, and especially for an advocacy-oriented project, some of the indicators (e.g. those attempting to measure the effectiveness of the DACF, training and membership drive efforts) tend to be lacking in ambition. The opinion presented by the local OPWDs suggesting that outcome-level indicators should be wholly within their capacity to deliver is not consistent with current development thinking and would lead to (cosmetic) indicators of overly low ambition if the position is taken into the design of a potential successor phase. Indeed, by definition, outcome and goal-level indicators *cannot* be wholly within the implementer agency's capacity to deliver. That is precisely what makes the advocacy effort relevant – to contribute towards influencing behaviours outside the implementer agency in the hope of securing genuinely meaningful changes. It will be important for partners to appreciate that the fact that an indicator is not met will not necessarily generate a criticism. Indeed, as a credible evaluator will take due account of whether there were extraneous factors over which the implementer did not have full/ adequate control. At all cost, partners need to be resolute in avoiding selecting indicators that are so unambitious that their achievement will not make a significant dent in the pre-existing adverse conditions which the project aims to change.

4.4 Relationship with other stakeholders

Over the life of the project, the OPWDs – and the GFD Advocacy Committee in particular – have fostered and deepened relations with a range of key actors and potential social purpose allies. The most significant among these include the electronic (particularly radio) and print media, the state parliament (via a seven-member caucus), NCPD (especially following its reconstitution), the Disability Network and DSW (especially at the local level in respect of access to the DCF and NHIS exemptions). Other institutions with which the movement has actively sought collaborations include the National Health Insurance Authority (NHIA) and the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (regarding premium-free NHIS subscriptions). A number of faith-based organisations (FBOs) such as the Catholic Bishops Conference, Church of Christ (CoC), Assemblies of God (AoG) and Ahmadiyya Mission have demonstrated an interest in acquiring and/or supporting informal training in sign language skills. This represents a pragmatic, half-way solution to the enormous deficit in SLI services. However, **the greater effort must remain on advocating the state to live up to its long-term responsibility to recognise and deliver sign language services as a *public good*.**

As observed in Section 2.1, the relationship with the newly reconstituted NCPD is good. Seeing as the Council is an ear of the government and with greater access to the appointing authority (the state President), this provides excellent opportunities for the federation to accelerate its advocacy in the coming years. Such an agenda will **require greater resolve to secure Council representation and feedback during review-oriented fora of the federation.**

While the collaborations with the above state and non-state actors have been helpful, the movement could do with additional investment in amplifying its voice through additional means. In particular, **the strategy of developing a fraternity of [social purpose] allies outside the OPWDs could be pursued more innovatively and intensively.** For example, it would be helpful to invest in enlarging the Disability Network to include a larger body of influential middle-classes and institutions with a record in social advocacy (especially on the social contract, demanding social justice, efficiency and accountability in the delivery of public goods, defending constitutional rights, etc.). This would enable the network to serve more fruitfully as a reflective and articulate support coalition working alongside the NCPD in championing the rights of PWDs. To be successful, however, an effort to lobby additional middle-

class activists will need to be more firmly grounded in legislation and will have to more reflective/ data-driven – entailing a more robust body of communication products specifically targeted at that kind of audience.

Annex 1: Terms of reference (ToR)

Terms of Reference Final Evaluation of Joint Disability Project in Ghana

1. Background

Since 2010 the Ghanaian disability movement, in particular Ghana Federation of the Disabled (GFD), Ghana National Association of the Deaf (GNAD), Ghana Blind Union (GBU) and Ghana Society of Physically Disabled (GSPD) has received financial support from DANIDA for a joint project. The project aims at strengthening advocacy, internal collaboration and co-ordination of the disability movement – as well as organisational development of the individual DPOs. The total budget for the entire period (2010-2013) is 20,303 million DKK, which is shared between all on an annual basis according to a pre-agreed key.

Danish partners involved in the project are the sister organisations; Danish Association of Physically Disabled (DAPD), Danish Deaf Federation (DDF), Disabled People Organisations – Denmark (DPOD) and Danish Association of the Blind (DAB). Together they form the overall responsible body of the project - the Northern Steering Committee (NSC) which is mirrored in Ghana by the Southern Steering Committee (SSC) - tasked to oversee implementation. Day-to-day management is carried out by the DPO Directors together with two Project Managers - one in Ghana and one in Denmark.

In order to satisfy interests of all DPOs involved, the project includes both joint activities mainly handled by the umbrella GFD and separate disability specific activities handled by the individual DPOs. The disability specific components focus on sign language interpretation training, a Micro Credit Scheme for physically disabled and Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) for blind and partially sighted. The goal is that members of GFD's member organisations build basic capacity in order to participate skillfully in own organisational work and joint fora like local GFD committees. Joint activities mainly focus on meetings and training of key men and women with disability representing the disability movement at district and national level, a Local Development Fund (LDF) used to support smaller initiatives, general co-ordination and advocacy.

This two-fold focus in combination with the disability specific initiatives is meant to develop the DPOs and increase joint pressure on political authorities both at national and local level in order to promote the rights of PWDs. In particular, the right to receive the earmarked 2% of the District Assembly Common Fund (DACF). Geographically speaking the project activities mainly take place in Accra and 14 selected districts.

Prior to the project an inception phase of 18 months (July 2008 to December 2009) also financed by DANIDA took place. All organisations with the exception of GNAD and DDF were involved. The objective of the inception phase was to prepare well for the core activities of this joint project (phase I), particularly in terms of a strategic framework. During the 18 months an analysis of the context was made and a number of strategies produced (gender, advocacy, organisational development etc.). Districts involved in testing of training material and approaches to capacity building were Manya Krobo, Birim South, and Ho. At the conclusion of the inception phase, an evaluation was carried out. Based on the findings, the design of Phase I (2010-2013) was developed.

A comprehensive Midterm Review (MTR) was carried out by external consultants in February – April 2012. The review undertook field work in four districts Lawra, Bimbila, Wiawso and Asutifi. The resulting list of general and organisation-specific recommendations were subsequently put together in a Progress Action

Plan which since has provided direction for project implementation. Among the key overall recommendations were the hiring of a full-time M&E officer, discontinuation of the Flex Fund, and remaking of the Micro Credit Scheme into a Savings and Loans Scheme.

The on-going Phase I of the project began in January 2010 and is planned to be finalized in December 2013. The project partners have agreed to initiate and apply for funds for a one year extension of the project (Jan-Dec 2014) as well as a new Phase II which is to commence January 2015 through December 2017. With effect from the extension phase, two new project partners will engage in the project, i.e. Inclusion Ghana, working to promote the rights and living conditions of persons with learning difficulties and its Danish sister organisation, LEV.

2. Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the evaluation is three-fold (in prioritised order):

1. To assess whether the project has met its stated objectives and results with adequate, effective and efficient means
2. To produce recommendations for adjustments which could improve project implementation during the projected one-year extension phase
3. To draw up lessons learned which could be utilized in the projected Phase II of the project cooperation

3. Scope of work

The evaluation will aim to conduct **an overall assessment of the degree to which the project has met its stated objectives and results**. Whereas the evaluation will take into consideration the full length of the project, it will draw heavily on the findings generated by the MTR. As such the evaluation will concentrate on project progress since May 2012, including the efforts made to adjust project design and implementation to the recommendations contained in the MTR.

The evaluation will be based on a general review of the project with particular emphasis on choice of strategies and sustainability of project interventions at district and national level. Recommendations will be provided as appropriate, including input to exit strategies in the existing project districts. The following points will be addressed with specified attention to section A and B.

A: Assessment of progress and impact of the advocacy interventions at national and local level since the MTR, and in particular 3 selected districts (refer below Methodology) (related to Immediate Objective 1)

This assessment must include:

- Assessment of relevance, adequacy, effectiveness and efficiency of the implemented activities within advocacy (national and local level), including training activities
- Identification of good practices, where possible, in particular in relation to access to DACF and NHIS, joint advocacy activities, use of and effect of media coverage, and use of LDF
- Assessment of the practice of information sharing from national to local level and vice versa, and of the ability and success in coordinating national and local advocacy interventions
- Identification and assessment of any unexpected results and project spin-offs
- Identification of barriers to expected progress and results, in particular with regard to physical accessibility at schools as well as availability of sign language interpretation at health facilities
- Lessons learned and recommendations (short and medium term)

B: Assessment of the organisational capacity at central and local level (related to Immediate Objective 2)

The assessment must include:

- Overview and assessment of the anchoring and outreach of the DPODs to their member base and local branches
- Brief assessment of the capacity of local GFD Committees in the 3 selected districts in terms of implementing effective advocacy and monitoring
- Assessment of planning, management and results of disability specific components of the project (CBR/O&M/DLS, savings and loans scheme, and sign language training)
- Identification of good practices and barriers towards sound, efficient and effective planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring at central and local level, including local collaboration between DPODs
- A brief overview of where and how gender considerations are included in project activities with attention to the gender strategy of GFD
- Identification and assessment of any unexpected results and project spin-offs
- Lessons learned and recommendations (short and medium term)

C: Assessment of communication and coordination between project partners, including organisational and governance structure of the project (related to Immediate Objective 3)

The review must include:

- Assessment of the extent and efficiency of communication and coordination between partners in terms of day-to-day project planning and implementation
- Assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisational and governance structure of the project
- Assessment of the feasibility of and interplay between separate (disability specific) and joint project components, as well as between local and national interventions
- Specific review of the joint database and the M&E system put in place since the MTR, including roles and involvement of the different stakeholders
- Brief overview and assessment of relationship with stakeholders within and outside the disability movement, including (potential) donors
- Lessons learned and recommendations (short and medium term)

4. Deliverables

- Drafts of main questionnaires and checklists to be used for the field study
- Outline of main findings and recommendations
- 15-20 pages final report including recommendations for a relevant and effective continuation of the project - in terms of project design, planning and implementation procedures, exit strategies in existing project districts, budget, and overall monitoring and management of the project
- Annexes including TOR, literature, list of persons interviewed, questionnaires and checklists used to collect data
- Presentation of findings to SSC and NSC and other relevant stakeholders in Ghana

5. Methodology

The review shall apply different, simple and context informed methods for data collection, which take into consideration that a major part of the beneficiaries of the project are illiterate and many only able to communicate at a very basic level with the help of one or several sign language interpreters. Methods shall target collection of both quantitative and qualitative data in order to establish a broad impression of

expected and unexpected results as well as effectiveness and efficiency of project interventions. It is expected that the following methods will be used:

- Desk study
- Self-assessment by each of the four DPOs in Ghana
- Simple and/or semi structured questionnaires
- Interviews
- Possible phone interviews with Danish partners and stakeholders
- Focus group discussions
- Case study and stories of Most Significant Change

A field study will be conducted in three project districts – Saboba, Mampong and Effutu - covering different geographical sectors of Ghana and with varying degree of success in terms of project progress on key indicators.

Stakeholders to be contacted for collection of data must include but not necessarily be limited to:

- Involved Danish DPOs: DAB, DAD, DDF, DPOD (NSC members)
- Involved DPOs in Ghana: GFD, GSPD, GBU, GNAD (SSC, political leadership at central and local level, key administrative staff and local members)
- The GFD Gender and Advocacy Committees
- Local authorities responsible for/involved in DACF, NHIS and general accessibility of health institutions and schools in the 3 selected districts
- National Government representatives and/or officials (e.g. Director of Social Welfare Department)
- Local Fund management Committees in the 3 selected districts
- Relevant members of the National Disability Network
- Relevant international and national NGO representatives with activities in the project area
- PM South and PM North
- M&E officer
- Other key informants of relevance.

6. Timing, process and reporting

Self-assessment form: Completed by 10 December 2013

Submission of report outline (incl. questionnaires etc.): 12 January 2014

Field visit: 12 – 22 January 2014

Debriefing in Accra: 23 January 2014

Submission of main findings and recommendations: 30 January 2014

Submission of first draft of report: 17 February 2014

Comments from stakeholders to first draft: 21 February 2014

Submission of final draft of the report: 28 February 2014

Presentation of final draft of the report to SSC, NSC and other relevant stakeholders in Ghana: Early March (possibly by video conference)

7. Composition of team

Team Leader: David Korboe

David Korboe will be accompanied and supported by PM South or the M&E officer and a representative from the OPWDs.

8. Literature

- Project Documents including revisions (application and annexes submitted to DANIDA 2008)
- Joint database
- Midterm Review 2012
- Revised project budget
- Annual Accounts 2012
- Quarterly plans, budgets and reports 2012-13
- Annual report to DANIDA 2012
- Overview of LDF per December 2013
- Minutes of relevant meetings (NSC, SSC, Disability Network, YAF, Board meetings etc.)
- Policies, strategies and guidelines developed as part of the project (to be specified)

Annex 2: Persons interviewed

Date: 9th January 2014

Name	Organisation	Position	Venue
Diana Akuamoah Boateng	GSPD	Programme Manager	GSPD office
Francis Nadugbe	GSPD	Accountant	GSPD office
Moses Fordjour	GFD	M&E Officer	
Kwami Ansre	GFD	PM South	
James Sambian	GNAD	Executive Director	GNAD Conference Room
Johnson Mahama	GNAD	Programme Manager	GNAD Conference Room
Afua Tweneboah Kodua	GBU	Programme Manager	GBU Conference Room
Dr. Peter Obeng Asamoah	GBU	Executive Director	GBU Conference Room
Ralph Opoku Manu	GBU	Accountant	GBU Conference Room
Yaw Ofori Debra	GBU/GFD	President	GBU Conference Room
Frederick Ofosu	GFD	Programme Manager	GFD Conference Room
Isaac Tuggun	GFD	Advocacy Officer	GFD Conference Room
Lawer Harrison	GFD	Accountant	GFD Conference Room
Rita Kusi	GFD	Executive Director	GFD Conference Room

Date: 10th January 2014

Name	Organisation/ Group	Position	Venue
Yaw Ofori Debra	President GFD	Chairman of Advocacy Committee	GFD Conference Room
Isaac Tuggun	GFD	GFD Advocacy Officer	GFD Conference Room
Mrs. Bruce-Lyle	GFD/NCPD	Member Advocacy Committee	GFD Conference Room
Alice Appiah	SSC	Member	GFD Conference Room
Emmanuel Sackey	SSC	Member	GFD Conference Room
Yaw Ofori Debra	SSC	Chairman	GFD Conference Room
Diana Akuamoah Boateng	GSPD	Ag. Administrator	GFD Conference Room
James Sambian	SSC	Member	GFD Conference Room
Frederick Ofosu	SSC	Member	GFD Conference Room
Robert Frimpong Manso	GNAD	SLI	GFD Conference Room

Date: 13th January 2014

Group: GFD Committees and Members

Name	Organisation/ Group	Position	Venue
Helen Dondo	GSPD	GFD secretary	Saboba Resource Centre
Bilikuni Stephen	GSPD	GFD Chairman	Saboba Resource Centre
Nalidu Osuma Azuma	GBU	Treasurer	Saboba Resource Centre

Mary Chagmado	GSPD	Women's Leader	Saboba Resource Centre
Nadin Uwumborgee	GNAD	Member	Saboba Resource Centre
Tiodonpampi	GNAD	Vice President	Saboba Resource Centre
Bukari Tekuni	GBU	Chairman	Saboba Resource Centre
Nteliye Nsinbi	GBU	Vice Chairman	Saboba Resource Centre
Nnagma Babin	GBU	Member	Saboba Resource Centre
Wamoa Bayii	GBU	Member	Saboba Resource Centre
Ntilen B. Cynthia	GSPD	Interpreter	Saboba Resource Centre
Maclin Nyimanyi	GNAD		Saboba Resource Centre
Nsila N. David	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
Bukari Lazirus		Guide	Saboba Resource Centre
Nyeleye Hellena		Guide	Saboba Resource Centre
Bili Teri Binangma		Guide	Saboba Resource Centre
Helen Dondo	Fund Management Committee	GSPD	Saboba Resource Centre
Osman Alidu	Fund Management Committee	FMC Chairman	Saboba Resource Centre

Date: 14th January 2014

Saboba Day 2

Name	Organisation/ Group	Position	Venue
Helen Dondo	GSPD	GFD Secretary	Saboba Resource Centre
Bilikuni Stephen	GSPD	GFD Chairman	Saboba Resource Centre
Ntilen Cynthia	GSPD	SL Interpreter	Saboba Resource Centre
David Nsila	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
Halidu Osuman Azuma	GBU	GBU Treasurer	Saboba Resource Centre
Robert N Wunada	GES District Directorate	Planning Officer	Saboba Resource Centre

			Saboba Resource Centre
DISTRICT ASSEMBLY			Saboba Resource Centre
Helen Dondo	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
Bilikuni Stephen	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
Ntilen Cynthia	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
David Nsila	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
Halidu Osuman Azuma	GBU		Saboba Resource Centre
Adolf Ali		DCE	Saboba Resource Centre
Chimsi Musah		DCD	Saboba Resource Centre
Seidu Chirazuaa	AD2B	Administrator	Saboba Resource Centre
DISTRICT HEALTH DIRECTORATE			Saboba Resource Centre
David Nsula	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
Stetpen Bilikuni	GSPD		Saboba Resource Centre
Mark Abugri	District Health Directorate	District Director	Saboba Resource Centre

Date: 16th January 2014

Name	Organisation/ Group	Position	Venue
Victoria Bonsu	GBU	GBU Women's Wing President	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Obour Prince Mensah	GSPD	Secretary-GFD/GSPD	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Martin Dwumfour	GBU	Member	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Kwabena Yeboah	GSPD	Financial Secretary-GSPD	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Joseph Osei	GBU	President-GFD/GBU	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Stephen Yaw Amankwah	GBU	PRO- GFD/GBU	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Linda Mensah		Guide	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Agyeiwah Mavis		Guide	GFD Office Ashanti

			Mampong
Fati Salifu	GSPD	Member	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Akua Sarpongmaa		Guide	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Sarfo Jonas		Interpreter	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
T.K Acheampong	GNAD	Member	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Comfort Aduakon	GNAD	Secretary/GNAD	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Akwasi Duah	GNAD	Treasurer/GNAD	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Michael Asare	GBU	Field Officer	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Shaibu Yahaya	GBU	Field Officer	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Sarpong Boateng Francis	GNAD	President- GNAD	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Hannah Owusu Dwomoh	GSPD	Treasurer	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
			GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Shaibu Yahaya	GBU	Field Officer	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong
Michael Asare	GBU	Field Officer	GFD Office Ashanti Mampong

Date: 17th January 2014

Name	Organisation/ Group	Position	Venue
Enoch Oko Otoo	NHIA Mampong	District Manager	Ashanti Mampong
Mawulolo Kofi Semogh	NHIA Mampong	District Accountant	Ashanti Mampong
Hannah O. Dwomoh	GSPD		Ashanti Mampong
Obow Prince Mensah	GSPD		Ashanti Mampong
Sarpong Boateng Francis	GNAD		Ashanti Mampong
Joseph Osei	GBU		Ashanti Mampong
Jonas Sarfo		Field Officer	Ashanti Mampong
Shaibu Yahaya		Interpreter	Ashanti Mampong
Matilda Asante	DSW	ADSW	Ashanti Mampong
Joseph Opoku k. Osei	MMA	MPO	Ashanti Mampong
Antwi Akowuah	MMA	MBO	Ashanti Mampong
Kofi O. Damoah	GHS	Nutrition Officer	Ashanti Mampong
Kwame Agyeman	MMA	Accountant	Ashanti Mampong
Obedina Appiasie	DSW	DSA	Ashanti Mampong
Tirtaaso Richard	MMA	AMPO	Ashanti Mampong

Kwabena			
David Doe	GES	A&F	Ashanti Mampong
Enoch Oko Otoo	NHIS	Dist. Manager	Ashanti Mampong

Date: 20th January 2014

Venue: Winneba

Organisation: GFD

Name	Organisation/ Group	Position	Venue
Rev. Samuel B. Dadzie	GBU		Effutu Municipality
Savana Sam	GBU		Effutu Municipality
John Sackey	GSPD		Effutu Municipality
Albert Kittoe	GSPD		Effutu Municipality
John Cobbina	GSPD		Effutu Municipality
Alhassan Kone	GNAD		Effutu Municipality
Kofi Akpadey	GNAD		Effutu Municipality
Kojo Victor	GSPD		Effutu Municipality
Mathew C. Ennim	GBU		Effutu Municipality
Joseph Ben Donkoh	GNAD		Effutu Municipality
George Kingsley Akorful	GNAD	Interpreter	Effutu Municipality
Augustina Ghartey	GSPD		Effutu Municipality
Dora Ayreba	GBU		Effutu Municipality
Cynthia Dampson	GNAD	V. President-GNAD	Effutu Municipality
John Amo	GSPD	Advocacy-GFD	Effutu Municipality

Date: 21th January 2014

Venue: Effutu

Name	Organisation/ Group	Position	Venue
Francis Adu Besseah	GHS	MH/Information Officer	Effutu Catholic Church
E. K. Dadzie	DSW	Deputy Director	Effutu Catholic Church
Ebenezer Kow Abraham	GES	Personnel Officer	Effutu Catholic Church
S.E. Ampomah	EMA	Work Engineer	Effutu Catholic Church
Joseph Ben Donkoh	GBU President	GFD Vice President	Effutu Catholic Church
John K. Takyi	GSPD	GSPD President	Effutu Catholic Church
Gabriel Kofi Akpadey	GNAD	GNAD President	Effutu Catholic Church
George Kingley Akorful		Interpreter	Effutu Catholic Church
Alberta Kittoe	GSPD	Women's wing President	Effutu Catholic Church
Richard Donkoh		Guide	Effutu Catholic Church
Odonkor Richard	NHIS-Winneba	Public Relation Officer	Effutu Catholic Church

Annex 3: Key documents consulted

Self-assessments by the Ghanaian OPWDs

Advocacy action plans for Saboba GFD

DPOD Partnership Strategy

Fuentes-Nieva, R and Galasso, N (2014): Working for the Few: Political Capture and Economic Inequality. Oxfam Briefing Paper, 20 January 2014

Ghana Federation of the Disabled (GFD) Communications and Media Strategy

Ghana Federation of the Disabled (GFD) Operational Guidelines: Regional and District GFD Committees

Ghana National Association of the Deaf (GNAD) Directory of Sign Language Interpreters in 6 Project Districts

Ghana Society of the Physically Disabled (GSPD) Advocacy Strategy

Joint Database – Analysis of Progress (10 January 2014)

Legislative Instrument (L.I) 1809, National Health Insurance Regulations, 2004

MacDonald, L and Moss, T (2014): Building a Think-and-Do Tank: A Dozen Lessons from the First Dozen Years of the Center for Global Development

Mid-Term Review of Strengthening the Disability Movement in Ghana, Phase II, 2010-13

Minutes of sundry meetings (of SSC, YAF, branch OPWDs, etc.)

MoF (2013): 2014 Budget Statement and Economic Policy. Accra: Ministry of Finance

MoFEP (2014): 2014 Budget Statement and Economic Policy. Accra: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

National Health Insurance Act, 2003 (Act 650, repealed)

National Health Insurance Act, 2012 (Act 852)

Nkum, J (2013): Report on LFA Workshop, Erata Hotel, Accra, 17-19 June 2013

Persons with Disability Act (Act 715)

Quarterly reports 2012-13

Report on Final Evaluation of the Deaf Information and Communication Access Improvement Project (DICAP)

Republic of Ghana (1992): Constitution of the Republic of Ghana, 1992

Strategy for Danish Support to Civil Society in Developing Countries, 2008-2011. Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Strengthening the Disability Movement in Ghana, Phase I: Project Proposal, 2010-2013