

Participation of disabled people in the PRSP/PEAP process in Uganda

Andrew K Dube
Managing Director
Samaita Consultancy and Programme Design
April 2005

Edited by Eleanor Stanley

Abbreviations and acronyms

ADD	Action on Disability and Development
AIDS	Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
BWIs	Bretton Woods Institutions
CAS	Country assistance strategy
CBR	Community-based rehabilitation
COMBRA	Community Based Rehabilitation Alliance
CSO	Civil society organisation
CWDs	Children with disabilities
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DPI	Disabled Peoples International
DPO	Disabled people's organisation
DRT	Development, research and training
DSI	Danish Council of Organisations of Disabled People
DWNRO	Disabled Women's Network and Resource Organization
EAFOD	East African Federation of Organisations of the Disabled
HIPC	Heavily indebted poor country
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
IMF	International Monetary Fund
KaR	Knowledge and Research (programme)
LC	Local council
LGDP	Local government development programme
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
MDG	Millennium development goal
MFPED	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development
MHU	Mental Health Uganda
MTEF	Medium-term expenditure framework
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NGO	Non-government organisation
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation
NUDIPU	National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda
PAF	Poverty Action Fund
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMA	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture
PPA	Participatory Poverty Assessment
PPA2	Second Participatory Poverty Assessment
PRSP	Poverty reduction strategy paper
PWD	People with disabilities
SFG	School facilities grant
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UNAB	Uganda National Association of the Blind
UNAD	Uganda National Association of the Deaf
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPACLED	Uganda Parents Association of Children with Learning Disabilities
UPE	Universal primary education
UPPAP	Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDC	Uganda Society for Disabled Children

Contents

Acknowledgements	4
	5
Executive summary	
1 Introduction	11
Background to the small-scale research	
Scope of work	
Methodology	
Report outline	
Constraints	
2 Uganda: key facts	13
Geographical data	
Population	
Disability statistics	
Primary and secondary education	
3 The poverty reduction strategy paper process	14
Background	
Uganda's Participatory Poverty Assessment process	
4 Participation of disabled people in the PRSP/PEAP process	17
Brief introduction	
The role of NUDIPU	
5 NUDIPU proposals for the PEAP	23
Constraints	
Best practices and lessons learnt	
6 Conclusion and recommendations	28
7 References	
Annexes	
Annex 1: NUDIPU PEAP position paper	
Annex 2: The 1995 Constitution and disability (specific provisions on disability)	

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge with thanks the logistical support and transport provided by the Danish Council of Organisations of Disabled People (DSI) in Uganda and Denmark. We express our thanks and gratitude to Secretariat of the National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU) for co-ordinating all appointments for the researcher and providing secretarial and staff support.

Executive summary

Since the population and housing census in 2002, Uganda's population has grown at an annual rate of 3.3 per cent to approximately 26.8 million (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2003). This population is expected to double in another 21 years. According to the Ugandan definition of disability, 4 per cent of the population – about 1,072,000 people – had a disability in 2002, considerably higher than the 1.1 per cent recorded in the 1991 census.

Uganda was the first country to develop a poverty reduction strategy plan (PRSP). Disabled people were involved in the development of the third phase of the PRSP/Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). The research on which this report is based sought to document the experience of the disability movement in its engagement with the development and evolution of the PEAP, and to draw out potential lessons for disability movements in other countries involved in PRSP processes.

The main methods of information gathering were interviews, a field visit to Uganda and review of relevant documents. The sample was generally representative of the institutional arrangements of the disability movement and other stakeholders in Uganda.

The main report presents the background to Uganda, and discusses objectives and the process of the PRSP/PEAP process. The participation of disabled people in the process is discussed in detail.

Main findings

The poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP) process

The revised Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) is Uganda's comprehensive development framework. The PEAP has guided the formulation of government policy since its inception in 1997. Under this plan, Uganda is being transformed into a modern economy in which agents in all sectors can participate in economic growth.

The PEAP has four pillars that represent the major goals for the action plan:

- fast and sustainable economic growth and structural transformation
- good governance and security
- increased ability of the poor to raise their incomes
- increased quality of life of the poor.

Uganda is an agricultural country. The livelihood of the people is largely dependent on agriculture. It is necessary, therefore, that people with disabilities are empowered to participate in the mainstream economy.

The Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process is a partnership between the Government of Uganda (represented by the Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development, known as MFPED), local governments, NGOs, academic institutions and donors. The revision of the PEAP in 2000 drew on the progress made since 1997, including the development of sector-wide approaches and the participatory research carried out by the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment project.

The preparation of the 2000 PEAP was highly participatory, with wide circulation of drafts supervised by a steering committee, strong involvement from civil society,

general consultative workshops, the receipt of written comments, and regional and political consultations.

An initiative called the 'Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project' (UPPAP) was implemented. This was an initiative of the Government of Uganda that sought to bring the perspectives of poor Ugandans, through consultations, into the formulation and the implementation of policies and planning for poverty reduction at both district and national levels.

Participation of disabled people in the PRSP/ PEAP process

The rights of people with disabilities are stipulated in Article 35 in the Constitution 1995 (see Annex B):

“Persons with disabilities have a right to respect and human dignity and the State and society shall take appropriate measures to ensure that they realise their full mental and physical potential.”

Disability issues in Uganda have reached a level where they are part and parcel of the country's general concerns that are to be addressed in national policies and programmes. A number of legal provisions, such as the Parliamentary Elections Statute 1996, the Children Statute 1996, the Local Government Act 1997, the Land Act 1998, the Uganda Communication Act 1997, the Traffic and Road safety Act 1998, the UNISE Act 1998 and the Movement Act 1998, attempt to address the needs of disabled people. Each of these pieces of legislation mainstreams disability and provides regulations aimed at improving accessibility of disabled people to service delivery.

The disability movement did not make a co-ordinated effort to ensure that people with disabilities were included in mainstream poverty eradication programmes until the most recent PEAP process.

During the process of revising the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP 2002), the Government of Uganda invited various stakeholders, including disabled people's organisations (DPOs), to participate in the process.

Reflecting on the role of leadership in the PRSP/PEAP process, respondents pointed out that their leaders lobbied and advocated for the inclusion of disability components in the PEAP.

The strategy of the National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU) for participation included the following elements:

- close interaction with the centre of government
- active mobilisation of district and sub-counties
- setting up disability indicators for the PEAP – particularly, but not limited to, universal primary education (UPE), HIV/AIDS, and agriculture.

Senior NUDIPU staff played a useful role in the PEAP process. The staff handled technical work in terms of pulling together the views of the various disabled people's organisations who participated in the process. NUDIPU personnel also attended and provided inputs into the stakeholder and sectoral meetings and consultations on the PEAP process.

NUDIPU's organisational strategy was not confined to the national NGO network and uni-disability groups. The organisation also worked at district and sub-county levels.

Some respondents recalled that the major difficulty was that there was no clarity on the needs of disabled people to be addressed in the PEAP. Although the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) was interested in accommodating the needs of disabled people, it was not aware of what to include.

The level of involvement of disabled people's organisations and other civil society organisations in the formulation of PRSP/PEAP in Uganda seems to have been a function of:

- the experience and preparedness of local disabled people's organisations, NGOs, civil society organisations (CSOs), and individual members of civil society
- the willingness of the government to consult and take civil society views into account.

In addition to establishing a unified movement and building consensus among disabled people's organisations, NUDIPU created alliances with:

- the NGO Forum
- the Community-Based Rehabilitation Alliance (COMBRA)
- Uganda Society for Disabled Children (USDC)
- Uganda National Institute of Special Education
- government departments – particularly the ministries of Gender Labour and Social Development, Education and Health.

NUDIPU also created a working relationship with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and World Vision.

NUDIPU's proposal for the PEAP

The process of developing the position paper *Participation of Organizations and Partners for Persons with Disabilities in the PEAP – 2003 Revision* (Ddamulira 2003) included reviewing a wide range of literature on disability and poverty in Uganda, interviewing several representatives of DPOs and partners, and deliberating in all stakeholders' meetings on the different proposals and options outlined in proposals.

The position paper argued that the PEAP treated issues about disabilities under the general headings of 'vulnerable groups', 'marginalised groups of society' and 'disadvantaged groups'. However, in most cases this kind of grouping had failed to give explicit strategies and relevant policy interventions for the intended target groups.

In addition to general concerns and issues raised in the position paper (see Annex A), NUDIPU proposed focused interventions (Ddamulira 2003) that needed to be incorporated in the revised PEAP. These included the following extracts from the position paper:

Pillar I: Creating a framework for economic growth and transformation

- Public expenditure allocations – medium term and annual – should indicate specific amounts to finance policy interventions for disability.
- DPOs should be consulted and involved in all planning, design, and implementation processes of the PEAP.
- Formal and informal employment for people with disabilities should be supported.

Pillar II: Good governance and security

- PEAP should set targets (indicators) to reduce factors that increase the incidence of disability – this could be part of monitoring process, especially of disability caused by insecurity.
- Legal systems should recognise the rights of people with disabilities in terms of protecting their social, economic, political and civil rights.
- There is a need for capacity building of the representatives (councillors) of people with disabilities in order to improve their capacity to effectively influence processes mainly in favour of people with disabilities.
- Participation and representation of people with disabilities in decision-making should be extended to tender boards, service commissions, and so on.

Pillar III: Actions which directly increase the ability of the poor to ease their incomes

- PEAP should recognise that people with disabilities need special support such as skills, appropriate technology, and access to information.
- People with disabilities should have access to land.
- People with disabilities should be availed with key agricultural technologies (including technical advice in processing, storage, preservation and so on) from government to boost their productivity.

Pillar IV: Actions which directly enhance the quality of life

- PEAP needs to provide avenues that enhance accessibility and utilisation of universal primary education (UPE) facilities by children with disabilities.
- Besides UPE, it is also important to address education concerns at secondary and other higher institutions.

Furthermore, NUDIPU called for DPOs and government to work out key indicators that could be used to measure progress in poverty reduction among people with disabilities. PEAP therefore needed to recognise the involvement of people with disabilities and DPOs in implementation and monitoring effective progress on poverty reduction in the country.

Constraints

The Uganda experience shows that deliberate efforts are needed to first build the capacity of DPOs – especially the national organisations – if they are to have greater impact on policy planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Capacity building includes recruiting high-calibre, skilled and well-trained staff to implement some of the strategic programmes.

DPOs in Uganda acknowledge that they have had their own capacity constraints, including insufficient numbers of staff (whether at national or local level) qualified to engage donors and policy makers in dialogue on macro-economic policy issues. However, they felt that they had much to gain by taking the opportunity offered to participate in the PRSP/PEAP.

In the case of Uganda, the pressure was on for the PRSP to be completed as quickly as possible. There was great internal urgency to qualify for debt relief, but this was compounded by external pressure from donors who needed a successful example of a country benefiting from the enhanced heavily indebted poor country (HIPC) initiative. As a result, the PEAP process, in which civil society had been meaningfully involved, became constricted to a six-month PRSP process from which they found themselves, to some extent, squeezed out.

Another challenge was to use DPO influence and achievements. The idea was to mainstream DPO inputs into the general policy-planning process. Some government officials, however, regarded DPOs' and CSOs' participation merely as an exercise to legitimise the PRSP process in the Ugandan government agenda.

Best practices and lessons learned

If resources had permitted, DPOs could not only have actively participated in the thematic working groups, but also established parallel working groups to provide dedicated input in mainstream sessions. Furthermore, the DPO movement in Uganda would have launched its PRSP process with an awareness campaign so that disabled people were made aware that the PRSP existed, knew what it was all about and would have, therefore, been prepared to participate in its formulation.

A small drafting team consisting of local and international disability consultants and DPO representatives would have added value, had it been recruited at the start of the PEAP process.

It is clear that the disability movement in Uganda did not have adequate capacity to engage in the PRSP/ PEAP process.

Conclusion and recommendations

Whether the disability movement continues to play a significant role in future donor-government policy planning process remains to be seen. What is clear is that for DPOs to effectively influence policies, in Uganda and elsewhere in Africa, the policy environment must be conducive to the participation and inclusion of disability components in government and other programmes. Disabled people's participation in the formulation of the PRSP in Uganda increased democratic ownership of the process.

In Uganda, economic growth and macro-economic stability are now targeted towards poverty reduction. Thus, while the economic growth model is not completely discarded, the poverty perspective that has become a major focus of macro policy formulation clearly demonstrates a paradigm shift on the part of the Bretton Woods Institutions (Gariyo 2002).

The demand has already been made that the government should involve civil society in the formulation of PRSPs/PEAP, and it has made some successful attempts to do so. Given the links between the PRSP/PEAP and the national poverty reduction initiatives of Uganda, this has often led to greater involvement of DPOs and other civil-society organisations in the latter as well.

The guarantee of the effectiveness of the PRSP/PEAP for disabled people in Uganda should be extensive, with a very high level of DPO participation at all levels, but neither the donors themselves nor Ugandan government have shown a consistent commitment to this principle – particularly in terms of taking into account all the issues raised by the disability movement and allocating adequate fiscal resources to back planned activities.

The PRSP/PEAP has some potential to transform the relationship between DPOs and government/donors. However, a key challenge is to ensure the mainstreaming of disability components and consistency in addressing the real needs of disabled people, as expressed in the NUDIPU PEAP presentation.

Recommendations

- Although the disability movement participated in the PRSP/PEAP process, it faces the challenge of sustaining this policy involvement. Therefore the capacity of disabled people's organisations should be enhanced substantially, in order to sustain their participation and involvement in the development process.
- A process of formulating disability indicators and performance benchmarks that cut across key sectors of government, donors, and civil society organisations should be implemented.
- Advocacy for implementation of legislation and pro-disability poverty alleviation strategies within the PEAP should be accelerated, with the active involvement of organisations that represent different categories of disability.
- Ongoing advocacy and lobbying is recommended, alongside efforts to mainstream disability in all the pillars of the PEAP.
- The disability movement should continue to lobby for a share of resources flowing from the development co-operation and debt relief. NUDIPU should advocate for budget for disability programme components, and for the making of actual funding allocations to poverty-focused projects that benefit disabled people.
- NUDIPU should develop capacity to influence development co-operation – particularly in relation to disability-funding policies of agencies such as USAID, DANIDA, and NORAD, among others.
- Monitoring of PEAP poverty-alleviation strategies for people with disabilities should be based on both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

1 Introduction

The Disability Knowledge & Research (KaR) Programme is funded by the Central Research Department of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and managed by Healthlink Worldwide and the Overseas Development Group at the University of East Anglia in the UK.

The focus of the programme is to develop knowledge and research on the issue of mainstreaming disability issues in the development process. The programme comprises several components including the Disability Policy Project, under which this research came. (For further details, see the programme website at www.disabilitykar.net.)

The research in Uganda was carried out by Andrew K Dube, Managing Director of Samaita Associates, a company that specialises in disability planning and research work.

After several unsuccessful attempts to go Uganda, a trip was eventually conducted in mid-April. The National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU) hosted the researcher and provided logistical support in relation to appointments.

Scope of work

The research was set against the background of Uganda having been the first country to develop a poverty reduction strategy plan (PRSP). The Government of Uganda has finalised the process of completing its third PRSP, the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). A report on the latest PEAP is not yet publicly available.

Disabled people were involved in the development of the PEAP. This research sought to document the experience of the disability movement in its engagement with the development and evolution of the PEAP, and to draw out potential lessons for disability movements in other countries involved in PRSP processes.

The consultative process involved:

- conducting working sessions with individual disabled people's organisations in Uganda
- completion of a key informant interview questionnaire
- drafting a report.

NUDIPU established a project reference group to gather additional information and feed back on the research process and content.

The scope of work was limited to the extent to which the disability movement in Uganda participated in the PRSP/PEAP processes and lessons learnt thereof.

Methodology

The main methods of information gathering were interviews, a field visit to Uganda, and review of relevant documents.

Specifically, the methodology included:

- a review of policy documents and other reports related to the PRSP/ PEAP in Uganda
- interviews with stakeholders in the disability sector in Uganda

- collection of data using document review methods, key informant interviews, information from presentations, internet sites, and statistical data. Information reviewed in documents was verified by key informant interviews.

Progress from fieldwork and preliminary findings of the research were discussed, analysed and corroborated with evidence from the fieldwork and research tools and secondary sources.

Sampling framework

The sample of interviewees, site visits, and documents for review was based on the scope of work outlined above.

The sampling framework was as follows:

- respondents from among a sample of DPO leaders
- the Ministry of Disability and the Elderly and a Member of Parliament
- a project reference group, organised by NUDIPU
- senior members of staff of disabled people's organisations
- individual disabled people not active in the disability movement
- funding agencies that supported the PRSP process for disabled people.

While statistical representation was not the aim, the sample was generally representative of the institutional arrangements of the disability movement and other stakeholders in Uganda.

Report outline

The following sections of the report present background to Uganda, including brief analysis of statistical data. In addition, the report discusses the background and objectives, and the process of the PRSP/PEAP process.

The participation of disabled people in the process is discussed in detail.

Constraints

A major constraint was the difficulty experienced in securing a local resource person ahead of the festive end-of-year season in December 2004 and early January 2005. With most organisations away on holiday or doing end-of-year fieldwork, it was difficult to track down key contacts that had been established at the Disability KaR roundtable in Malawi see (http://www.disabilitykar.net/roundtables/malawi_rt.html)

In Uganda, initial attempts to hold one meeting were unsuccessful, partly due to the fact that representatives of DPOs arrived at different times. Several meetings were held with different DPOs and respondents.

This was the researcher's second visit to Uganda (following a first visit in 1995), and many new developments were found to have occurred in the country generally. The researcher was not fully familiar with the transformation processes that had occurred since 1995 and had to catch up with events, with adequate time, through literature review and informal discussions.

2. Uganda: key facts

Uganda covers a total area of 236,036 sq km, and is situated in East Africa, bordered by Sudan to the north, Kenya to the east, Tanzania and Rwanda to south and the Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire) to the west. It lies astride the equator with a minimum altitude of 620m and maximum of 5,110m above sea level. Its landscape consists of mountains, highlands, undulating plains, lakes, rivers, and marshland. Almost 25 per cent of the country's surface is water and rivers, the largest and longest being Lake Victoria and the River Nile respectively (Winsbury 1995).

Population

Since the Population and Housing Census in 2002, Uganda's population has grown at an annual rate of 3.3 per cent to approximately 26.8 million (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2003). The population is expected to double in another 21 years.

The population of central Uganda was projected to be 7.1 million in 2005. The western and eastern regions have 6.8 million people each and the northern region 6.1 million..

Overall, there are 95 males to every 100 females. Women outnumber men in most districts, although the reverse is true in Kalangala, where there are 150 men to every 100 women. Yumbe district is the fastest growing, with a population increase of 7.9 per cent per annum, while Mpigi has the lowest population growth rate, estimated at 1.3 per cent.

The biggest tribe is the Baganda, which makes up 17.3 per cent of the population, followed by the Banyankole (9.8 per cent), the Basoga (8.6 per cent) and the Bakiga (7 per cent). The smallest tribe is the Vonoma, with only 128 people at the time of the census: 60 males and 48 females. Other tribes with fewer than 10,000 people include Mvuba (870), Mening (2,227), Bahehe (3,403) and Batwa (6,738). The biggest eight tribes make up 70 per cent of the population, while the remaining over 40 tribes constitute 30 per cent.

Catholics remain the biggest religious group at 41.9 per cent of the population, followed by the Church of Uganda (Anglican) at 35.9 per cent, Islam 12.1 per cent and Pentecostals 4.6 per cent.

Disability in Uganda

According to the Ugandan definition, disability is a condition that denies a person a normal economic and social life, which has lasted, or is expected to last, six months or more.

In Uganda, epilepsy and rheumatism are classified as disabilities, although internationally they are not (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2003). Using the Ugandan definition, 4 per cent of the population (approximately 1,072,000) had a disability, compared to a figure of 3.3 per cent using the international definition. These figures, recorded in 2002, are considerably higher than the 1.1 per cent noted from the 1991 census. This apparent increase in the number of people with disability may be partly due to improved method of data collection.

The numbers of disabled people are not evenly distributed throughout the country. Statistics from the 2002 census show that northern region had the highest incidence of disability (4.4 per cent) while the western region had the lowest (2.9 per cent).

Eastern and central regions had incidence of 3.6 per cent and 3.1 per cent respectively.

Primary and secondary education

In 1997, a new government initiative called universal primary education (UPE) was implemented, with the intent of broadening access to primary schooling, largely through reducing costs of such schooling. Its effects were dramatic. In 1996, primary school enrolment was about 3.1 million. In 1997, this surged to 5.2 million – an increase of approximately 68 per cent. Primary school enrolments continue to increase, and in 2003 there were 7.6 million primary school pupils, of whom 49.3 per cent were female.

Between 2000 and 2003, the number of disabled people attending primary schools increased from 157,920 to 247,953 . However, during the same period, the number of disabled people in secondary schools rose from 8,808 to 10,699 – a much lower increase, as shown in Figure 1 below. The table reflects a very high drop-out rate following primary school.

Figure 1: Enrolment of disabled children in primary and secondary schools

Year:	2000	2001	2002	2003
Primary schools				
Number of disabled children	157,920	173,143	218,286	247,953
Secondary schools				
Number of disabled children	8,808	8,573	10,899	10,699

While tremendous achievements have been made in primary school enrolment, formidable problems remain. These include lack of classroom capacity and scholastic materials, and inadequate numbers of teachers and teacher training. In addition, pupil performance is declining. Further still, UPE has created a high demand for secondary education (Danish Council of Organizations of Disabled People 2001, pp 8–15).

3. The poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP) process

Poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) are a mechanism designed by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), by which heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) can obtain debt relief and become eligible for renewed financial support. The PRSP provides a framework for IMF lending, and for the World Bank's Country Assistance Strategy (CAS), which covers the World Bank's medium-term business plan and its proposed lending options. The document should articulate the government's commitment to, and strategy for, poverty reduction – in other words, how the government would utilise the savings created by debt reduction. A comprehensive PRSP includes poverty diagnostics based on good indicators of poverty (African Forum and Network on Debt and Development 2002, p 1).

The revised Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) is Uganda's comprehensive development framework. The PEAP has guided the formulation of government policy since its inception in 1997. Under this plan, Uganda is being transformed into a modern economy in which agents in all sectors can participate in economic growth. This implies a number of conditions (MFPED 2000):

- The economy requires structural transformation, including the modernisation of agriculture and the development of industries that build on demand and supply linkages from agriculture.
- The poor must be able to participate in this growth, both by expanding smallholder agriculture and by expanding employment in industry and services, as well as in rural non-farm enterprises.
- The economic growth must be sustainable.

Provided these conditions are met, poor people benefit from economic growth through increased incomes from self-employment and wage employment, and improved services delivered by state and community.

The PEAP has four pillars, which represent the major goals for the action plan:

- fast and sustainable economic growth and structural transformation
- good governance and security
- increased ability of the poor to raise their incomes
- increased quality of life of the poor.

Uganda is an agricultural country, and the livelihood of its people is largely dependent on agriculture. It is necessary, therefore, that people with disabilities are empowered to participate in the mainstream economy. The agriculture sector has three main relevant goals with respect to people with disabilities:

- food security
- increase of income
- empowerment of farmers with disabilities to participate in agriculture.

The Government's Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) provides a strategic and operational framework for environmentally sustainable rural development and agricultural transformation from subsistence to commercial agriculture. The PMA aims to increase incomes and to improve the quality of food crop producers (who are mostly women and form the largest group of the poor) to ensure food security and create gainful employment.

Agriculture is central to the process of transformation because it generates incomes that create effective demand for the market for industrial output. Employment

creation depends on the modernisation of the workforce and attitudinal change among the rural population.

Uganda's Participatory Poverty Assessment process

The Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) process is a partnership between the Government of Uganda (represented by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, known as MFPED), local governments, NGOs, academic institutions and donors. The process was implemented by Oxfam UK up to September 2002, and is funded by Government of Uganda, DFID, World Bank, UNDP and Sida (MFPED 2002).

The second Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA2) was carried out in 60 communities in 12 districts (Mubende, Wakiso, Rakai, Jinja, Bugiri, Soroti, Moroto, Kitgum, Arua, Bundibugyo, Ntungamo and Masindi). It was conducted under the theme of deepening the understanding of poverty gained in the first PPA and gathering people's experiences with government policies (MFPED 2002).

The revision of the PEAP in 2000 drew on the progress made since 1997, including:

- the development of sector-wide approaches
- the participatory research carried out by the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment project
- the constraints identified in the Poverty Status Report
- the development of costing and verifiable indicators in many sectors
- the consultations which have been held for the 2000 PEAP itself.

The revision process also placed greater emphasis than the 1997 document on the actions that promote private sector development and therefore contribute indirectly to poverty reduction. The preparation of the 2000 PEAP was highly participatory, with wide circulation of drafts supervised by a steering committee, strong involvement from civil society, general consultative workshops, the receipt of written comments, and regional and political consultations.

An initiative called the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP) was implemented. This was an initiative of the Government of Uganda that sought to bring the perspectives of poor Ugandans, through consultations, into the formulation and implementation of policies and planning for poverty reduction, both at district and at national levels.

UPPAP was a three-year process designed to:

- strengthen and complement quantitative data utilised in poverty monitoring
- review the national priorities of the PEAP, based on the priorities of the communities consulted
- facilitate the capacity development of district planning processes to be participatory, consultative and thereby to focus on the poor.

The project was a partnership, initiated by the Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development (MFPED), between the Government of Uganda, selected district authorities, Ugandan NGOs, academic institutions, donors, and Oxfam as the implementing partner.

Civil society organisations lobbied successfully to be included in the drafting committee of the PEAP. They gathered inputs from their constituents, the analysis of which they presented to the technical committee of the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development that was responsible for developing the PEAP.

4. Participation of disabled people in the PRSP/PEAP process

The rights of people with disabilities are stipulated in Article 35 of the Constitution 1995 (see Annex B):

“Persons with disabilities have a right to respect and human dignity and the State and society shall take appropriate measures to ensure that they realise their full mental and physical potential.”

Today, disability concerns in Uganda have reached a level where they are part and parcel of the country’s general concerns, which have to be addressed in national policies and programmes. A number of legal provisions, such as the Parliamentary Elections Statute 1996, the Children Statute 1996, the Local Government Act 1997, the Land Act 1998, the Uganda Communication Act 1997, the Traffic and Road safety Act 1998, the UNISE Act 1998 and the Movement Act 1998, attempt to address the needs of disabled people. Each of these pieces of legislation mainstreams disability and provides regulations aimed at improving access of services to disabled people.

It was not until the most recent PEAP process that the disability movement made a co-ordinated effort to ensure that people with disabilities were included in mainstream poverty eradication programmes.

In the recent process, NUDIPU was successful in organising key disabled people’s organisations to participate in the process. Not all disabled people’s organisations participated, due lack of resources and capacity.

According to NUDIPU, the history of the disability movement in Uganda can be divided into the following four phases:

Phase 1	1945–1970	Emphasis on institutions and medically-oriented approach
Phase 2	1970–1986	Political uprising and upheavals
Phase 3	1986–1995	Start of the social and human rights model
Phase 4	1995–2000	Political self representation in public entities

It is clear from the testimony of disabled people interviewed that Phase 4 is presently continuing with the next task: implementing policies.

The National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU)

The National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda (NUDIPU) was formed in 1987, by 17 groups of people with disabilities as an umbrella organisation to provide a united voice for the disability movement. Before that time, disabled people were not involved in the planning and implementation of programmes meant to benefit them. By establishing NUDIPU, a unified voice of disabled people was activated, to challenge the inconsistencies in policy making and planning for disabled people (Nayiga 2000). NUDIPU brings together all categories of disabilities, including physical, sensory and mental impairments (NUDIPU 2005).

The aim of the organisation is to fight negative attitudes and discrimination, to improve the welfare of people with disabilities, and to advocate for equalisation of opportunities, involvement and participation in policy planning and implementation of disability programmes, in close co-operation with government, NGOs, and the

general public. The main purpose is to influence the provision of services in favour of people with disabilities.

After its formation, NUDIPU became a member of Disabled Peoples International (DPI), and later played a leading role in creating the regional DPI structure – the East African Federation of Organisations of the Disabled (EAFOD).

NUDIPU is comprised of ‘district unions’ of people with disabilities, established in each 56 of Uganda’s districts. The organisation does not deal directly with individual disabled people, but can provide information and guidance to individuals regarding appropriate groups or associations to join. It also advises on the formation of new groups, and can assist such groups to grow into fully fledged associations.

NUDIPU’s membership comprises uni-disability organisations, such as Uganda National Association of the Deaf (UNAD), Uganda National Association of the Blind (UNAB), Mental Health Uganda (MHU), Uganda Parents Association of Children with Learning Disabilities (UPACLED), National Union of Women with Disabilities of Uganda, and Disabled Women’s Network and Resource Organization (DWNRO). Through NUDIPU, all these national advocacy organisations were involved in the PRSP/PEAP process.

NUDIPU’s structure is made up of a general assembly, a board of directors and a secretariat.

NUDIPU’s leadership

Reflecting on the role of leadership in the PRSP/PEAP process, respondents pointed out that their leaders successfully lobbied and advocated for the inclusion of disability components in the PEAP. The challenges facing NUDIPU leadership at the time where there was a need to:

- provide guidance to the overall process
- generate and co-ordinate the views of different components of the disability movement
- lobby for financial support to NUDIPU’s participation and concept paper.

After preparing the concept paper, NUDIPU worked with the NGO Forum to gather support for the inclusion of disability components. Despite this effort, the first draft of the PEAP excluded disability inputs in key areas. Disability was mentioned in the section dealing with ‘other issues’, within a range of cross-cutting themes.

NUDIPU’s organisational strategy was not confined to the national NGO network and uni-disability groups: the organisation also works at district and sub-county levels.

After the PRSP and Budget Conference, the MFPED showed interest in issues of ‘vulnerable groups’, and NUDIPU was now ready to submit recommendations for action through the concept paper.

NUDIPU’s strategy for participation included the following elements:

- close interaction with the centre of government
- active mobilisation of district and sub-counties
- setting up disability indicators for the PEAP – particularly, but not limited to, universal primary education (UPE), HIV/AIDS, and agriculture
- emphasising the need for assistive devices and other facilities needed to enable disabled people to be productive

- continuously working with the NGO network and stakeholders to ensure unity of purpose.

Participation in the PEAP process was voluntary. This required commitment and sacrifice from those involved.

The role of NUDIPU staff

Senior staff in NUDIPU played a useful role in the PEAP process. The staff handled technical work in terms of pulling together the views of the various disabled people's organisations that participated in the process. NUDIPU personnel also attended and provided inputs into the stakeholder and sectoral meetings and consultations around the PEAP process.

In addition, NUDIPU staff:

- provided feedback to leadership on the PEAP process
- worked with employees of other organisations in the disability movement
- followed up with government departments on inputs from the disability movement to ensure that disability components were captured
- shared and disseminated information on the PRSP/ PEAP processes
- garnered support from other PEAP stakeholders to impress upon the NGO Forum the need to include disability components in consultative group presentations.

DPO participation in the PEAP process

During the process of revising the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (MFPED 2002b), the Government of Uganda invited various stakeholders, including DPOs, to participate in the process.

DPOs feel that this process was very important in shaping future government policy interventions, and therefore wanted to take advantage of the opportunity. As a group with key concerns and partners in the development process of the country, they want to ensure that the government hears these concerns and takes them into consideration. This is especially the case given that DPOs were not consulted in the drafting of the initial PEAP and its first revision process in 2000. Disabled people were only involved in its third revision, in 2002.

Some respondents recalled that the major difficulty was that the lack of clarity on the needs of disabled people that should be addressed in the PEAP. Although the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) was interested in accommodating the needs of disabled people, it was not aware of what to include.

With support from the Danish Council of Organisations of Disabled People (DSI) and Action on Disability and Development (ADD), NUDIPU was able to organise a meeting of stakeholders in December 2004, and department-focused task teams were established to investigate the extent to which disability was, or could be, included in the departmental action plans that would form part of the PEAP. The meeting was attended by NUDIPU members, the Ministry of Education, NGO Forum, Uganda Society for Disabled Children (USDC), ADD, the Ministry of Gender, COMBRA and the Ministry of Health, among others.

By then, NUDIPU had developed its own concept paper entitled *Participation of Organizations and Partners for Persons with Disabilities in the PEAP 2003 Revision* (Ddamulira 2003), with funding from DSI. NUDIPU, in partnership with USDC and ADD, had earlier commissioned a process of documenting proposals for the PEAP

revision 2003, which guided policy makers and all other stakeholders to put in place practical public policy interventions to reduce the level of poverty of disabled people, and that most importantly recognise the need to integrate disabled people into all Uganda's development processes (Ddamulira 2003).

Disabled people's organisations pointed out that they possessed certain capacities, such as knowledge base, level of awareness and information, intellectual and analytical skills, human resource skills and material resources. These were complemented by particular qualities, including commitment, creativity and inventiveness, and willingness to share information.

There are a number of principles that underpinned DPOs' participation in the PEAP process (African Forum and Network on Debt and Development 2002), including:

- the need to participate in a 'country-driven and ownership process
- participation
- commitment to transparency
- accessibility of information
- accountability .

These principles are described below.

The need to participate in a 'country driven and ownership' process

According to the World Bank and IMF, PRSPs should be country driven – in other words, with processes led by governments and broad-based participation in the adoption and monitoring of the resulting strategy. That the process should be 'country driven' implies ownership by states or governments. That it should also encompass 'participation' implies that there should be ownership by civil society as well. Ownership by states and governments is determined by their relations with the Bretton Woods Institutions, and the extent to which they trust government to define and implement their own processes. Attempts to impose models of civil society participation can bypass or undermine governments' roles as leaders in national decision making and determination of appropriate policy.

Participation

As noted above, 'participation' is linked to, and determines, ownership of processes by civil society within a state. It is dependent not just on the willingness of states to allow space for civil society voices, but also on the amount of information to which they have access on a continuing basis. In Uganda, DPOs were involved at every stage during the most recent PEAP process. Their involvement was complemented by a parallel civil society process, set up by (mainly international) NGOs. Disabled people are, however, anxious to see whether their participation was meaningful by checking whether their inputs and recommendations were incorporated into the final PEAP/PRSP report.

Commitment to transparency

In Uganda, where there was some considerable satisfaction with the amount of civil society's participation in the formulation of the PRSP, government has also made a commitment to make known all relevant information about public policies, budgetary policies and public expenditure. The Uganda Debt Network has already become involved in monitoring the Poverty Action Fund – a government mechanism for mobilising the savings from debt relief in priority areas, for poverty alleviation.

Accessibility of information

Representatives of DPOs also mentioned that use of the media had assisted disabled people in obtaining information about the PRSP/ PEAP. The Civil Society Task Force organised a media campaign through radio and television phone-in programmes, in which government officials were invited to respond to queries from the public and to explain the PRSP process. Use of a 'phone-in' format allowed for flow of information and issues both ways within a single programme. The task force also used the print media to publicise the process, and invited contributions from the public.

Accountability

The need for accountability meant that DPOs had an obligation to ensure that the process of drawing up the PRSP explicitly reflected the needs and priorities of people with disabilities along with the needs of other vulnerable groups. In addition, accountability ensured that realistic mechanisms were put in place to hold government and service providers answerable for the delivery of policies and goods, and for the spending of public funds. This process also ensured that DPOs were prepared for involvement in monitoring how PRSP strategies are implemented, and whether anti-poverty commitments are being fulfilled for the benefit of people with disabilities.

Level of involvement and participation

The level of involvement of DPOs and other civil society organisations in the formulation of PRSP/PEAP in Uganda seemed to have been a function of:

- the experience and preparedness of local DPOs, NGOs, CSOs and individual members of civil society
- the willingness of the government to consult and take civil society views into account.

The proactive approach of the DPOs has earned them the right to participate in the annual consultative group meetings held in Uganda. They were thus well prepared to take the opportunity for participation in the PRSP/PEAP. DPOs in Uganda participated both within the government framework for formulation of the PRSP and also, where they felt it necessary, outside this process.

Participation in the formal process was as the government-initiated Civil Society Task Force composed of international and national NGOs operating in Uganda, with the Uganda Debt Network becoming the lead agency for civil society participation.

The task force became engaged in the reformulation of the PEAP into the PRSP. This task force also formed part of the steering committee that drove the whole process. Specific activities of the task force included:

- carrying out consultations with grassroots groups as a complementary initiative to a series of workshops with local government officials run by the government
- running media campaign to disseminate information on the PRSP process and collect views from a wide cross-section of society
- holding consultations with special interest groups, such as DPOs and those involved in conflict resolution and environmental issues, and other CSOs, such as the National Union of Trade Unions.

The consultations indicated that DPOs and other civil society viewed employment creation as a priority concern, along with mechanisms for civil society participation in monitoring of the programme. The results were presented to the technical (drafting) committee, which incorporated them into the PEAP/PRSP, notably including a whole

section on participation and monitoring written by civil society. Further civil society initiatives took place outside the activities of the task force and drew in contributions from more than 200 other NGOs and community-based organisations.

The Ugandan government's commitment to consultations with civil society in its country was an essential factor. The government:

- facilitated a consultation process in which civil society was meaningfully involved
- provided CSOs with necessary information, including the draft PEAP/PRSP
- ensured that a substantial amount of the output of the consultation process was included in the final document;
- made CSOs full members of the national task force, so that they were able to attend all meetings
- facilitated constant contact between the civil society task force and the technical team that drafted the PRSP
- allowed CSOs to determine the agenda and methodology of the consultations with communities.

i. Alliances created

In addition to establishing a unified movement and building consensus among DPOs, NUDIPU created alliances with the NGO Forum, COMBRA, USDC, Uganda National Institute of Special Education, and government departments, particularly the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), and the ministries of Education and Health. NUDIPU also created a working relationship with USAID and World Vision.

Despite the emphasis on civil society participation, the PRSP is a government-led process. Hence, the first step for most countries was to set up, within existing government structures, some sort of steering or co-ordinating committee.

5 NUDIPU proposals for the PEAP

The process of developing the position paper *Participation of Organizations and Partners for Persons with Disabilities in the PEAP 2003 Revision* (Ddamulira 2003) included reviewing wider literature on disability and poverty in Uganda, carrying out interviews with several representatives of DPOs and partners, and deliberating in all stakeholders' meetings on the different proposals and options that outlined input proposals.

Due to limited capacity, NUDIPU faced the challenge of timely delivery of inputs, critical analysis of draft documents, comprehensive consultations with all stakeholders and the production of materials that would be acceptable to the government technical team.

The position paper argued that the PEAP treated issues about disabilities under the general headings of 'vulnerable groups', 'marginalised groups of society', or 'disadvantaged groups', but that this kind of grouping, had in most cases, failed to give explicit strategies and relevant policy interventions for the intended target groups. Determinants or dimensions of poverty were relatively wide as identified in the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP), even within the 'vulnerable' or 'marginalised groups', so it was essential for specific groups and sub-groups to have explicit strategies with concrete specificity to be addressed by PEAP.

Focused interventions

In addition to general concerns and issues raised in its position paper (see Annex A), NUDIPU proposed focused interventions (Ddamulira 2003) that needed to be incorporated in the revised PEAP. These included the following extracts from the position paper:

Pillar I: Creating a framework for economic growth and transformation

- a. Public expenditure allocations – medium term and annual – should indicate a specific amount to finance policy interventions for disability. This could be included within the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) as a separate expenditure line or as a conditional percentage on various sectoral allocations.
- b. DPOs should be consulted and involved in all planning, design, and implementation processes of the PEAP.
- c. Formal and informal employment for people with disabilities should be supported by elimination of any unnecessary constraints to access of such opportunities.
- d. The monitoring tools for PEAP should reflect statistics on disability, including disaggregated data on poverty, social and economic situations of people with disabilities.

Pillar II: Good governance and security

- a. PEAP should set targets (indicators) to reduce factors that increase the incidence of disability – this could be part of monitoring process, especially on disability caused by insecurity.
- b. Legal systems should recognise the rights of people with disabilities in terms of protecting their social, economic, political and civil rights. Particularly in a bid to administer justice in courts of law, some court staff should be trained in ways of communicating with key categories of disabled people in order to increase their opportunity to receive fair justice.
- c. There is a need for capacity building of the representatives (councillors) of people with disabilities in order to improve their capacity to effectively influence

processes mainly in favour of people with disabilities. It is also important to sensitise other decision makers so that they can have an understanding of disability concerns and incorporate them in their day-to-day planning and implementation activities.

- d. Participation and representation of people with disabilities in decision making should be extended to tender boards, service commissions and so on, to give them equal opportunities and reduce the level of discrimination.

Pillar III: Actions which directly increase the ability of the poor to ease their incomes

- a. PEAP should recognise that people with disabilities need special support such as skills, appropriate technology, access to information, and so on, in order for them to actively participate in agriculture as an income-generating occupation but also to have food security at household levels.
- b. Land is a critical aspect in agriculture and it is therefore important that people with disabilities access land, through redistribution of communally owned land, for instance.
- c. Government should provide guarantees (especially where people with disabilities lack collateral) for low-cost development finances (medium and long term) to be accessed by people with disabilities for investments geared towards alleviating poverty and as a way of creating employment.
- d. People with disabilities should be provided with key agricultural technologies (including technical advice in processing, storage, preservation) from government to boost their productivity.
- e. PEAP should specifically come up with mechanisms to link and guarantee markets for products produced by people with disabilities

Pillar IV: Actions that directly enhance the quality of life

- a. PEAP needs to provide avenues that enhance accessibility and utilisation of universal primary education (UPE) facilities by children with disabilities.
- b. Besides UPE, it is also important to address education concerns at secondary and other higher institution level.
- c. Currently there are a few teachers trained in special needs education but they are not employed because of the ban on recruitment by government. This ban should be lifted immediately since there is a high need for these skills on the ground.
- d. It is important to sensitise parents of children with disabilities to the positive elements of rehabilitation process and education.

NUDIPU also called for DPOs and government to devise key indicators that could be used to measure progress in poverty reduction among people with disabilities. PEAP therefore needed to recognise the involvement of people with disabilities and DPOs in implementation and monitoring effective progress on poverty reduction in the country.

The extent to which NUDIPU's proposals were included in the final PEAP document could not be ascertained as this document is not yet publicly available.

However, the 2000 PEAP document included the following outputs under monitoring indicators for 'empowering vulnerable groups':

- access of disabled people to necessary equipment
- economic activity of disabled people to earn a living. (See Annex Table 1: Goals, targets and indicators in the PEAP 2000.)

Constraints

The constraints fell into the following categories:

- capacity
- time
- stakeholders' access to information
- ability to influence.

These are described below.

Capacity

By definition, the countries undertaking PRSPs are both 'heavily indebted' and 'poor'. It is therefore inevitable that they will be severely constrained in their capacity to carry out a comprehensive, participatory consultation exercise with all the requirements in terms of personnel/expertise, transport, communications, documentation and so on that this entails. Although civil society can add to government efforts if called on to do so, it is also true that (at least national) CSOs and NGOs in a poor country are unlikely to be very well resourced.

The Ugandan experience shows that deliberate efforts are needed to first build the capacity of DPOs, especially the national organisations, if they are to have greater impact on policy planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Capacity building includes the recruitment of high-calibre, skilled and well-trained staff to implement some of the strategic programmes. Counterparts in government are well trained and knowledgeable in their fields of competence, and have little patience for a slow pace on the part of DPOs. At the local level, DPOs need to build the capacity of grassroots people to monitor policy implementation. For its part, local government must develop transparent and accountable systems that enable grassroots communities to have access to the information they need to conduct effective monitoring (Gariyo 2002).

In Uganda, DPOs and CSOs were able to complement the efforts of government, with government approval, through the operation of the Civil Society Task Force. Their efforts led to the production of a much richer PRSP, and a perception among Ugandans that the process had been satisfactorily participatory. Aided by the level of government tolerance, DPOs, CSOs, and NGOs were also able to organise their own consultative initiatives where they saw the need, and the results of these were considered in the drafting of the PRSP/PEAP.

DPOs in Uganda acknowledged that they had their own capacity constraints, including insufficient staff, at either national or local level, qualified to engage donors and policy makers in dialogue on macro-economic policy issues. However, they felt that they had much to gain by taking the opportunity offered to participate in the PRSP/PEAP.

Time

Debt relief is, of course, a very attractive prospect to a country that is heavily indebted and trying, within that context, to overcome problems of poverty. The desire to get the PRSP completed so that debt relief can be applied inevitably creates time pressures that are likely to undermine the quality of the process itself.

As noted above, the PRSPs are already developed in conditions marked by financial, infrastructural and other capacity constraints. The imposition of sometimes severe

time constraints on this situation can only make matters worse. Participatory approaches are, by their very nature, long winded as well as expensive.

In the case of Uganda, the pressure was on for the PRSP to be completed as quickly as possible. There was great internal urgency to qualify for debt relief, but this was compounded by external pressure from donors who needed a successful example of a country benefiting from the enhanced HIPC initiative to show off at the spring meetings of the Bretton Woods Institutions in 2000. As a result, the PEAP process, in which civil society had been meaningfully involved, became constricted into a six-month PRSP process from which they found themselves, to some extent, squeezed out (African Forum and Network on Debt and Development 2002).

The few meetings that took place between the IMF/World Bank missions and CSOs were almost like verification meetings to find out the level of civil society participation and the quality of inputs. The subtext to this is that if the CSOs had indicated that their level of participation had not been satisfactory, they would have jeopardised their country's qualification for much-needed debt relief.

The DPOs also had to deal with time pressures, and had to distribute their concept paper at every opportunity in order to ensure buy-in. In addition, the task teams that were set up to engage government departments had to operate at a very fast pace in order to keep up with developments and progress in the PRSP/PEAP process.

Stakeholders' access to information

Given the diversity of the DPOs needing access to information, the means by which information is transmitted are highly relevant. Explanatory publications accessible to the general public multiply the impact of available information. The media plays a key role in disseminating development information, and unbiased reporting can enhance transparency and increase the accountability of all stakeholders.

In Uganda, as in many other countries, illiteracy and language differences present barriers to disseminating information to disabled people. Even for people who can read, print publications may be expensive and difficult to disseminate widely, while internet access is still quite narrowly confined. Television or radio typically reach more people, but are not accessible to the majority of people with disabilities (World Bank 1998).

Ability to influence

Another challenge is to use the influence and achievements of disabled people's organisations (DPOs). DPO inputs need to be mainstreamed into policy planning. Some government officials still regard DPO and CSO participation merely as an exercise to legitimise the PRSP process in Uganda's government agenda, and still view criticism from CSOs with suspicion. Furthermore, DPOs need to fully understand and analyse the donor agenda. Donors retain a strong influence over budgetary and other policy plans in Africa (and in other developing countries) because they contribute a large portion of the government budget. For instance, in the financial year 2000/01, 53 per cent of Uganda's budget was dependent on donors (including loans and grants), while the government contribution was only 47 per cent (Gariyo 2002).

Best practice and lessons learned

The task force established seven thematic working groups, which were tasked with analysing thematic areas and prioritising the key elements within each area. In addition to government representatives from the respective sectoral ministries, several civil society representatives and all bilateral and multilateral donors were

invited to join. This strategy enhanced the PRSP/PEAP process. DPOs could, if resources permitted, not only have actively participated in the thematic working groups, but also established parallel working groups to provide dedicated input into mainstream sessions.

A small drafting team consisting of local and international consultants and DPO representatives should have been recruited at the start of the process. This team would have also been responsible for managing information flows, both to and from different stakeholders.

Had there been adequate resources, the DPO movement in Uganda would have launched its PRSP process with an awareness campaign, so that disabled people were made aware that the PRSP existed and knew what it was all about and would, therefore, have been prepared to participate in its formulation. The only lesson that can be drawn from the involvement of DPOs in the 2002 PEAP revision is that with persistence, advocacy and lobbying, governments can involve disability issues in their policies and decision-making processes.

It is clear that the disability movement in Uganda had insufficient capacity to engage in the PRSP/PEAP process. However, funding from DSI and support from organisations such as ADD played a key role in enabling the movement to develop a coherent proposal on the needs of disabled people with the PEAP process. Resource constraints meant that the movement could not involve local research institutions, which would have significantly enriched DPOs' engagement with the process.

NUDIPU set up parallel consultation processes to those being conducted by their government and civil society organisations. It should be noted that the success of these processes depended to a large degree on the amount of (at least moral and political) support they received from other NGOs and the government.

The Ugandan government considered DPOs as serious stakeholders in the PRSP/PEAP process and deliberately encouraged their participation. It backed up this belief by facilitating their participation through the inclusion of the Civil Society Task Force in the steering committee for the PRSP process. In addition, it ensured that DPOs had access to necessary documentation and information.

Uganda, more noticeably than other countries, has an active policy of disseminating information about progress on its poverty reduction strategy, through monthly press conferences of leading government officials, regular publications, radio in multiple dialects, special explanatory publications, and indicators to end users, even at the programme level, in educational and health facilities. The policy allows end users of the programmes to understand what is going on and gauge the success or failure of the programmes.

Although there is no direct highlight on the involvement of disabled people in the drafting of the final Poverty Eradication Action Plan, the achievements made by NUDIPU illustrates that government considers and values the participation and contribution of disabled people in planning programmes and developing policies for the country.

Some disability inputs are eagerly expected in the new PEAP, which is yet to be released. If disability components are included, this will further strengthen the strategy itself and will satisfy members of the disability movement of their ownership of the document.

6 Conclusion and recommendations

Whether the disability movement continues to play a significant role in future donor–government policy planning processes remains to be seen. What is clear is that for DPOs to effectively influence policies, in Uganda and elsewhere in Africa, there must be a policy environment that is conducive to their doing so. Disabled people's participation in the formulation of the PRSP increases democratic ownership of the process – and increased ownership enhances policy implementation, so that intended outcomes can be better realised.

Specific conclusions

The following specific conclusions were made:

PRSPs and the government–donor–DPO relationship

Sceptics have suggested that the PRSP process might not yield anything new, merely reproducing previous perspectives along the economic growth model espoused by the IMF and the World Bank. This remains contentious, since under structural adjustment programmes, the main focus is macro-economic stability, control over inflation and liberalisation of the economy (Gariyo 2002).

However, in the Ugandan context the difference is that economic growth and macro-economic stability are now targeted towards poverty reduction. Thus, while the economic growth model is not completely discarded, the poverty perspective that has become a major focus of macro policy formulation clearly demonstrates a paradigm shift on the part of the Bretton Woods Institutions (Gariyo 2002).

The PRSP/PEAP may, perhaps, have potential for transforming relationships between the government and the Ugandan people.

The PRSP/PEAP as a poverty reduction tool for disabled people

The demand was made that civil society should be involved in the formulation of PRSPs/PEAP, and the Government of Uganda did successfully attempt to do so. Given the links between the PRSP/PEAP and the national poverty reduction initiatives of Uganda, this led to greater involvement of DPOs and other civil society organisations in the PEAP. However, for this to approach be really effective, both donors and governments have to be genuine in their stated desire for the participation of DPOs and civil society.

The PRSP/PEAP have some potential to transform the relationship between DPOs and donors. However, to drag DPOs into a participatory process because that is the particular requirement of the programme might not be very sustainable when the government and the rest of the civil society live amid a plethora of other international arrangements and contractual agreements from which they are totally excluded in terms of final decision making. Apart from the credibility of the consultative process, analysis shows that the PRSP and other related programmes exclude serious consideration of the potential impact of ongoing World Bank loan programmes to Uganda (Nyamugasira and Rowden 2002).

The effectiveness of the PRSP/PEAP for disabled people in Uganda should be extensive, with a very high quality of DPO participation at all levels, but neither the donors themselves nor Ugandan government have shown a consistent commitment to this principle – particularly in terms of taking into account all the issues raised by

the disability movement and allocating adequate fiscal resources to back planned activities.

In this regard, then, there was little verifiable evidence to show that the PRSP/PEAP in Uganda offer any better solutions or means of reducing poverty among disabled people, in real terms, than Uganda's previous national poverty reduction initiatives.

Benefits of developing a long-term vision

Uganda is among the 16 countries of the 48 reviewed that have a well-developed long-term vision, and that are further linking the long-term vision to strategy and developing long-term goals. To be actionable, a long-term vision needs to be embodied in a medium-term strategy that defines goals, with associated roles for the private sector, civil society, local governments, and external partners – and to be adequately budgeted. As a result of the introduction of the PRSP process, Uganda is among the countries that have developed medium-term development strategies.

Uganda has achieved some success in aligning its sectoral frameworks with its overall Medium Term Expenditure Framework, but a key challenge is to ensure the mainstreaming of disability components on the lines proposed by NUDIPU.

Recommendations

- Although the disability movement participated in the PRSP/PEAP process, it faces a challenge in sustaining this policy involvement. DPOs lack adequate capacity to engage in quality dialogues with stakeholders such as the donors, and even the government itself. A lot has to be done to enhance the capacity of CSOs in the decision-making process. The future of civil society participation in the preparation of not only the PRSPs but also other development papers depends on initiatives to increase their capacity in the decision-making process. It is therefore recommended that the capacity of DPOs be enhanced substantially, in order to sustain their participation and involvement in the development process.
- NUDIPU supports the design and use of participatory appraisal and evaluation of PEAP implementation processes. It is recommended that monitoring of PEAP alleviation strategies for people with disabilities should be based on both qualitative and quantitative approaches, with qualitative studies involving DPO research and study groups, research institutions and other civil society organisations.
- It is recommended that a process of formulating disability indicators and performance benchmarks that cut across key sectors of government, donors, and civil society organisations be implemented.
- The implementation of existing and new pieces of legislation that could benefit disabled people in Uganda is moving at a very slow pace. It is recommended that NUDIPU's advocacy for the implementation of legislation and pro-disability poverty alleviation strategies within the PEAP be supported and accelerated with the active involvement of representative organisations that represent different categories of disability.
- While NUDIPU presented a comprehensive proposal on disability components within the PEAP, there is no guarantee that all the recommendations will be included in the final document. Ongoing advocacy and lobbying is recommended alongside efforts to mainstream disability in all the pillars of the PEAP.

- The problems and priorities generated in the focus-group discussions with disabled people during district and sub-county participation processes varied according to differences in age, gender and type of disability. Overall, and among other needs, food and housing stood out as cross-cutting priority concerns. It is recommended that the Government of Uganda develops appropriate strategies that can address the different needs of different types of disability.
- There is a need to improve information flows to disabled people on their rights. The disability movement should advocate for accessible information dissemination strategies on the implementation of government legislation and the PEAP.
- It is recommended the disability movement should continue to lobby for a share of resources flowing from the development co-operation and debt relief. NUDIPU should advocate for budgeting for disability programme components and actual funding allocations to poverty-focused projects that benefit disabled people.
- NUDIPU should develop capacity to influence development co-operation – particularly in relation to disability funding policies of agencies that operate in Uganda, such as USAID, DANIDA, and NORAD, among others.

Annex A: NUDIPU PEAP position paper

This report, entitled *Participation of Organizations and Partners for Persons with Disabilities in the PEAP 2003 Revision*, was commissioned by NUDIPU, USDC and ADD. It was compiled by Davis Ddamulira in July 2003

Background

The Government of Uganda is in the process of revising the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2002c) and has invited various stakeholders, including disabled people's organisations (DPOs), to participate in the process. As DPOs, we feel this process is very important in shaping future government policy interventions, and therefore that taking advantage of this opportunity is key. We need to ensure that the government hears our concerns and takes them into consideration given that we were not consulted in the drafting of the initial PEAP and its first revision process in 2000 as a group, with key concerns and partners in the development process of this country.

On behalf of DPOs and our stakeholders, NUDIPU in partnership with USDC and ADD has commissioned a process of documenting proposals for the PEAP revision 2003, which we think will guide policy makers and all other stakeholders to put in place practical public policy interventions to reduce poverty of people with disabilities (PWDs) but most importantly recognise the need to integrate them in all Uganda's development processes.

The process of developing this position has included reviewing wider literature on disability and poverty in Uganda, carrying out interviews with several representatives from DPOs and our partners, and deliberations in all stakeholders' meeting on the different proposals and options that we would like to see the government put in place. This document will be continuously revised to incorporate more information and strategies needed, to ensure that disability issues are given due consideration both in the current revision process and in other subsequent similar processes, such as budget allocation and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) progress.

Introduction

Understanding disability and its link to poverty in Uganda

According to The United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities, the concept of 'disability' in relation to policy intervention is defined to an acceptable level as "the functional limitations occurring to any population in different forms of physical, intellectual or sensory impairment, medical conditions or mental illness". Such impairments, conditions or illness may be permanent or transitory in nature. The same rules define the term 'handicap' to mean the loss or limitation of opportunities to take part in the life of the community on an equal level with others. Therefore, for the sake of simplicity, this paper refers to disability as defined within the above concept, including situations of being handicap in order to guide the relevant policy interventions and for political action.

Most studies have revealed that the relationship between poverty and disability is very strong. Poor people are more vulnerable to risky situations such as occupational hazards, less or no access to good health facilities and poor feeding and nutrition, which expose them to disabling conditions. Disability is a cause and consequence of poverty. It is stuck in a vicious circle that leads from the appearance of a disability to poverty, which increases the incidence of disability. This in turn increases poverty.

The Government of Uganda therefore has the obligation to break this circle, by giving disability issues a prominent position in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP – a national framework for poverty eradication).

The current PEAP treats issues about disabilities under the general categories of “vulnerable groups”, “marginalised groups of society”, or as “disadvantaged groups”. However, this kind of grouping has in most cases failed to give explicit strategies and relevant policy interventions for the intended target group(s). Determinants or dimensions of poverty are quite wide, as identified in the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP), even within the “vulnerable or marginalized groups”, and therefore it is essential for specific groups and sub-groups to have explicit strategies with concrete specificity to be addressed by PEAP.

Who are the people with disability in Uganda?

It is estimated that persons with disability are about 10.4 per cent (approximately 2.6 million people) of Uganda’s population (NUDIPU 2003); although exact statistics will be available in the final Uganda’s 2002 Population Census Report (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2002). However, a report on chronic poverty and disability (Development Research and Training, Uganda, 2003) puts this figure at approximately 2.4 million people with disability. In actual sense, lack of proper statistical information about poverty situations of people with disabilities from key government sources is itself a symptom of their marginalisation.

The latest Poverty Status Report, 2002) estimates overall poverty level in Uganda at 35 per cent (approximately 8.6 million people) of the total population (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2002). The DRT study (DRT 2003) further suggested that approximately 80 per cent of people with disabilities live in conditions of long-term poverty. If this figure is taken as an indicator of poverty level among the PWDs, then according to the current population estimate, there are 2.1 million poor people with disability. This estimation therefore shows that among the poor, 24 per cent (2.1 of 8.6 million) have disabilities. In simple terms, one in four poor people in Uganda has a disability.

The above number of poor PWDs as a total of people who live in abject poverty is considerably significant for government to ignore the key poverty concerns of PWDs and their contribution to the general development process in the country. It is therefore very important for government to take into consideration strategies to reduce poverty among PWDs, not solely with a social protection approach but by ‘unlocking their income potential’ under the PEAP and public expenditure processes. For example, in many cases, PWDs get less or no education and skills due to social exclusion and lack of facilities, thus limiting their ability to get a better source of livelihood in terms of good employment or ability to be economically active.

Furthermore, disability is not only an individual destiny, but also the outcome of situations and decisions for which the disabled person is no more responsible than any other citizen, such as bad sanitary and health conditions or war. But the disabled person carries the consequences of collective situations and decisions. The government, therefore, has a responsibility through key interventions to eliminate the exclusions that turn impairment into a disability.

How PEAP 2002 addresses disability and poverty

Pillar I: Creating an enabling environment for rapid and sustainable economic growth and structural transformation

Pillar 1 tends to be the most important goal of the PEAP, and is normally given more importance and attention by government and development partners. This pillar mainly focuses on national indicators, especially in economic sectors. However, there is very little linkage between this pillar and other key pillars – for example, how are macro indicators related to, or reflected at, the micro or local levels?

For instance, how does the 10 per cent by 2017 national poverty indicator target specific categories of the current poor, and more so, PWDs? Are we likely to see this 10 per cent mainly composed of people with disabilities by 2017, since they are normally in a position that does not allow them to take full advantage of poverty reduction programmes, unlike the poor that do not have disabilities?

It is also important to note that Pillar I is mainly responsible for medium-term financial allocations to different sectors and local governments. However, it does not specifically indicate any expenditure flows and trends required to finance public interventions for poverty and disability, even in poverty expenditures such as the Poverty Action Fund (PAF).

Lastly, this pillar also focuses much on revenue collection through taxes and non-tax sources. It goes further to focus on specific tax incentives for particular categories of groups in the taxable base. However, PWDs are given little specific attention in the overall approaches on tax incentives, such as exemptions on their investment (profit and non-profit) enterprises, graduated personal tax or income tax. Likewise, there is no consideration to boosting investments in small and medium enterprises (SMEs) by people with disabilities, either directly or indirectly, yet such investments are normally above average, due to the high overhead costs in facilities and operational costs incurred by PWDs, especially in start-up process.

Pillar II: Good governance and security

As a prerequisite for economic development, this pillar recognises increased accessibility to public information as being central to good governance. It is through this that actions to empower specific disadvantaged groups require attention. For instance, the specific needs of the disabled require a community-based approach, which deserves priority. Not only is physical security recognised to cause income vulnerability, but it also directly affects welfare, both by causing injury and deaths, and by generating a climate of fear. The cause of disability is partly a legacy of the history of internal conflict.

In this case, PWDs would expect key information on disability, such as current national and disaggregated statistics from censuses and other sources like household survey on economic and social situations of PWDs. This would also be put in a format that would make it more useful to those who needed it, especially for different categories of PWDs.

This pillar also considers issues of disability to be crosscutting in all sectors. Although it is much appreciated that issues of disability are crosscutting and need a holistic approach, the way this has been handled in the PEAP has actually not given these issues the much-needed attention as regards to coming up with specific public interventions on disability.

This pillar also recognises issues of disability to be stressed from a community-based rehabilitations perspective, as far as policy intervention is concerned. As much as this is a positive development, the PEAP needs to go further in policy interventions, both in addressing factors leading to increasing incidence of disability, and in other interventions specifically addressing prevailing concerns, such as increase in public expenditure for facilities and services to PWDs, and support mechanisms targeting to uplift poor PWDs from the marginalised state and inter-generational poverty trends. In addition, government should be concerned with the increasing number of PWDs as a result of war in the country. For example, there is less attention to victims of war like the Kichwamba and Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) scenarios. Rehabilitation is left either to NGOs or to development agencies, yet this should be the responsibility of the state, which is failing to protect its citizens.

Under this pillar, there has been great development in political representation, which is embedded in Uganda's Constitution (1995) and the local government act (1997) with enshrined specific provisions on disability, such as affirmative action. This has led to 46,218 councillors being elected in the whole country at LC1–LC5 levels. However, despite this progress, many existing laws are still impotent with respect to people with disability (Ntale 2003). This political empowerment has also not transformed into economic benefits for PWDs, which needs to be addressed in the current PEAP. It is therefore important to note that integrating the concerns of people with disabilities in the policy formulation is a challenge in which civil society can help government.

The Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD)'s community-based rehabilitation programme focuses on providing appliances and small capital goods such as sewing machines for PWDs, and training them, their families and community leaders. Disability issues need to be looked at beyond small activities within the PEAP. Support and public intervention need to focus on having good disability-focused legislation, fair treatment, and increased opportunities to PWDs for their property or assets to be protected in courts of law.

Under this pillar, it was further recognised that more information would be obtained from the next round of UPPAP to address disability and poverty.

Pillar III: Actions which directly increase the ability of the poor to raise their income

In general, this pillar stresses the need for programmes to support the livelihoods of groups that cannot support themselves – especially families headed by disabled people. This support can be offered through the improvement of agriculture as the central component of economic growth.

The PEAP further recognises that while the able-bodied poor, with abundant labour, will be able to take advantage of these opportunities, there are some people who cannot take full advantage of them, either because they are disabled or they are heavily burdened by social responsibilities.

Apart from recognising this concern, this pillar does not clearly indicate what policy interventions will target PWDs in the agricultural sector. It does not recognise the specific needs of PWDs to participate on equal terms in this sector, either as individuals or collectively. Some of these needs include having innovative advisory services under NAADS, whether demanded or not, in order to explore and boost the PWDs potential to actively and profitably participate in the agricultural sector. PWDs might also need special technologies and technical skills in addition to accessing other productive resources like credit, leased land and restocking, which guarantee

returns from such investments to be supported by government. However, this should not be interpreted as meaning that PWDs have to be labour providers under such schemes, but as meaning that boosting their entrepreneurship as managers is also possible and should be of priority.

It is therefore important to initiate actions within the PEAP and PMA specifically to increase the incomes of people with disabilities, such as access to productive assets. This has to be embedded with the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) to target PWDs if they are to be recognised as key players in the agriculture sector.

Pillar IV: Actions which directly improve the quality of life of the poor

Although under this pillar disability issues are recognised as a general concern for immediate policy action, several challenges in policy and implementation for the disabled still exist. For example, there is lack of adequate provision of facilities and equipment for the disabled in the design of public buildings. Because of these, administrative developments are not tailored for disability and tend to ignore these concerns.

This is partly due to lack of sensitisation on disability among local administrators and, in some cases, to ignoring of concerns of PWDs in the general planning and implementation of development programmes. It is important to recognise the rights of PWDs in planning processes since they constitute more than 10 per cent of the total population and about 25 per cent of the poor. In partnership with DPOs and representatives of PWDs where these exist, government should come up with ways of looking at problems of PWDs, both in planning and budget allocation processes.

The partnership is very relevant because public policy actions tend to vary from one group to another. Different groups of PWDs need specific attention in order to improve their quality of life and this is where relevant data is most needed in order to have appropriate interventions. For example, the provision of services range from psycho-socio support, stigmatisation, disorientation and more, each of which needs to be covered differently, while at the same time, provision of specific equipment may also vary from one group to another.

As mentioned above, government emphasises universal primary education (UPE) but does not come up with specific ways to cater for children with disabilities (CWDs), including special sub-groups, such as deaf and blind children, and those who are physically handicapped. The groups need specific attention, facilities and skills that are relevant to their special learning needs.

The pillar does not also address education for CWDs beyond UPE – a situation that has tremendously reduced their opportunities in areas of higher learning. This eventually led some of them to poorer employment or to working in a less skilled labour market, limiting their chances to earn a better source of livelihood.

Key policy recommendations for PEAP 2003 revision

In addition to general concerns and issues raised above, below are some more focused interventions that need to be incorporated in the revised PEAP. Although some could be best expanded under different sector plans, it is important to incorporate their general recommendations in the PEAP so that sector-specific policy actions can be followed up later where they do not already exist.

Major areas for revision and policy intervention

Pillar I: Creating a framework for economic growth and transformation

- i. Public expenditure allocations – medium-term and annual – should indicate specific amount to finance policy interventions for disability. This could be included within the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) as a separate expenditure line or as a conditional percentage on various Sectoral allocations.
- ii. DPOs should be consulted and involved in all planning, design, and implementation processes of the PEAP.
- iii. Given that PWDs are more than 10 per cent of the total population and about 25 per cent of the poor, public funds allocated for poverty and disability to all sectors and levels should also be included in the Poverty Action Fund so that they are ring-fenced. DPOs further propose the amount allocate to disability under PAF should be at least not less than 25 per cent of the total PAF expenditure.
- iv. All conditional grants to local governments should be subjected to participation of PWDs and incorporation of plans on disability and poverty eradication. In addition, to ensuring this is effective, plans, budgets and accountability reports (financial and output) should be endorsed by PWDs' representatives or DPOs in the areas before more funds are released to local governments.
- v. Government programmes such as Schools Facilities Grants, Second Local Government Development Program and National Agricultural Advisory Services should always take into consideration the concerns of people with disabilities during allocation and utilisation of funds. This should not only be seen during the planning process, but as a requirement during implementation.
- vi. The PEAP should recognise that PWDs have a small or non-existent asset base and therefore specific tax exemptions should be extended to individual incomes; enterprises owned by DPOs that produce or import gadgets such as calipers, wheelchairs and artificial limbs; and those that directly create employment for PWDs. Government can also provide support to these firms and projects that are run by DPOs or other stakeholders.
- vii. Formal and informal employment for PWDs should be supported by elimination of any unnecessary constraints to access of such opportunities.
- viii. The monitoring tools for PEAP should reflect statistics on disability, including disaggregated data on poverty, social and economic situations of PWDs. This data could be generated from national census and surveys and local administrative structures. It should also cover details on various health, education and economic activities and public services to PWDs.
- ix. In order to ensure effective participation of PWDs in the mainstream economic activities for their sustainable income generation, the government, as the largest consumer of goods and services, should target purchasing products produced by enterprises or organisations of PWDs. Practically, this could be pursued as tender requirement without jeopardising seriously the required quality standards during procurement.
- x. Other tax-related incentives should target exemptions of income tax of PWDs since their cost while in employment is above normal levels – for example, PWDs hire extra labour while in the line of employment and pay more for their equipment just to level off their efficiencies at work – while organisations or companies that employ PWDs, should receive more incentives, such as

exempting part their corporate taxes to encourage and boost employment opportunities for PWDs.

- xi. The PEAP should clearly indicate the inter-linkages of this pillar with other pillars, in order to balance macro-economic concerns of the country and human development requirements, especially on expenditure, policy prioritisation and sequencing.

Pillar II: Good governance and security

- i. PEAP should set targets (indicators) to reduce factors that increase the incidence on disability. This could be part of monitoring process – especially on disability caused by insecurity. Part of the process for this is to have conflict resolution, by adopting peaceful mechanisms and providing effective support to conflict-affected areas and PWDs due to acts of war.
- ii. There is need for PEAP to recognise and put in place mechanisms of having a disability policy with major emphasis on poverty reduction and participation of PWDs in development and poverty policy process.
- iii. Legal systems should recognise the rights of PWDs in terms of protecting their social, economic, political and civil rights. Moreover, in a bid to administer justice in courts of law, some court staff should be trained in ways of communicating with key categories of PWDs in order to increase their opportunity to receive fair justice.
- iv. There should be transparency in public expenditure (allocation and utilisation) for disability public interventions, both at national and local levels. Information on this should be in formats that make it relevant for understanding by different categories of PWDs.
- v. The law currently governing Micro Finance Institutions is not favourable to PWDs' needs and thus needs to be revised or have supplementary provisions to ensure that it does not limit opportunities to access of credit and protection of their assets.
- vi. There is a need for capacity building of the representatives (councillors) of PWDs in order to improve their capacity to effectively influence processes mainly in favour of PWDs. It is also important to sensitise other decision makers so that they can have an understanding of disability concerns and incorporate them in their day-to-day planning and implementation activities.
- vii. Participation and representation of PWDs in decision making should be extended to actors such as tender boards and service commissions, to give them equal opportunities and reduce on the level of discrimination.

Pillar III: Actions which directly increase the ability of the poor to ease their incomes

- i. Since this pillar is based on the Plans for Modernisation of Agriculture, PEAP should recognise that PWDs need special support, such as skills, appropriate technology and access to information in order to actively participate in agriculture as an income-generating occupation, but also to be food-secure at household levels. Information provided should be relevant and packaged appropriately for different sub-groups of PWDs, such as the deaf and blind.

- ii. Land is a critical aspect in agriculture, and it is therefore important that PWDs access land – for instance, through redistribution of communally owned land. In other processes, such as the restocking programme, where land is always a prerequisite before benefits emerge, PWDs who may be interested but do not have land should always be exempted from these conditions or requirement as a way to boost their asset base.
- iii. The government should provide guarantees (especially where PWDs lack collateral) for low-cost development finances (medium and long-term) to be accessed by PWDs for investments geared towards alleviating poverty, and as a way of creating employment.
- iv. NAADS needs to incorporate disability-tailored extensions to agricultural services, including advice on initiatives and opportunities, provision of relevant information and other agricultural vocational skills that PWDs could take advantage of. Furthermore, it is important to ensure that the intended beneficiaries access these services.
- v. There is need for PWDs to attain vocational skills training in entrepreneurship, management, carpentry, shoe making. However, this should not be an overall objective for CWDs, and therefore opportunities for further education in tertiary institutions should be provided.
- vi. PWDs should be availed with key agricultural technologies (including technical advice in processing, storage and preservation) from the government to boost their productivity.
- vii. PEAP should specifically initiate mechanisms to link and guarantee markets for products produced by PWDs in order to make activities in this sector relevant for individual investment, especially by small-scale farmers. This could be linked to the proposal of an 'affirmative action' in the government procurement procedures to give priority to these products.
- viii. In most cases, PWDs have no access to reproductive assets, and therefore need special support to kickstart their investment venture. PEAP should also recognise that PWDs are faced with high overhead costs in their investment and therefore special support is needed. These include access to credit or long-term development finance, risk insurance guarantees and others that are tailored specifically to the needs of PWDs and their investments.

Pillar IV: Actions which directly enhance the quality of life

- i. As much as there has been dramatic increase in Universal Primary Education, this has not been so with children with disabilities (CWDs). PEAP needs to provide avenues that enhance accessibility and utilisation of UPE facilities by CWDs.
- ii. Besides UPE, it is also Important to address education concerns at secondary and other higher institutions. The affirmative action of the University and Other Tertiary institutions Act should be implemented, especially in private institutions. In addition, a performance criteria regarding implementation of this provision should be put in place, and where institutions do not observe this, they should be fined. This money could be sent to a specific education fund to promote education for PWDs.

- iii. There is need for PEAP to make provision for improving the quality of education for CWDs, which can be specifically handled under the education policy/programme. This could include provision for key facilities, such as constructing CWD resource rooms, training more teachers in special needs education, providing or transcribing education material in Braille, or putting up annexes in selected districts for CWDs who cannot walk long distances.
- iv. Currently there are some teachers trained in special needs education who are not deployed because of the ban on recruitment by government. This ban should be lifted immediately, since there is a high need for these skills on the ground.
- v. The government needs to find out why most CWDs drop out of school. For example, in Mbale, of the 1,407 who enrolled in 1997 only 570 were still in school by 2003.
- vi. The government should also partner with NGOs that have been involved in the provision of assistance to PWDs.
- vii. It is important to sensitise parents of CWDs on the positive elements of rehabilitation process and education. This aims at changing attitudes of these parents to regard their CWDs as equals in the family, in order for them to seek medical assistance for them, as well as taking them to school.
- viii. There is a need for increased public expenditure to go to the Mulago Orthopaedic workshop and the [Uganda National Institute of Special Education](#), to make more mobility appliances. In addition, the government should put in place other orthopaedic workshops – at least in each region – that are fully equipped, in order to reduce congestion in Mulago and the high cost of accessing these services for those patients travelling long distances. To the poor, this is a serious obstacle that determines their access to rehabilitation services.
- ix. The government should invest and promote early childhood rehabilitation and help by providing assistive devices to CWDs or supporting those who produce them. This will boost early intervention/correction of disabilities, thus reducing public and personal expenditure in the lifetime of a PWD.
- x. There is need to have more hospitals with the right infrastructure that are easily accessible by PWDs. These hospital should have trained staff – for example, in orthopaedic technology or sign language – to handle different categories of disability.
- xi. The government needs to increase stocks of relevant drugs and appliances in most hospitals – especially psychiatric drugs. Much focus should be placed on hospitals and health centres in rural areas, which is where the majority of community members seek medical care. This can be part of the essential health package for people with mental problems and epilepsy.
- xii. Reproductive health and HIV/AIDS services need to be accessible (user friendly to different categories) to PWDs, especially for women with disabilities, for instance, access and utilisation of drugs, knowledge and information.
- xiii. Medical personnel should be trained in sign language and other special skills that will enable them to handle PWDs.

- xiv. There is need to ensure good sanitation in public places and schools. They should be accessible and clean enough to cater for PWDs with visual and mobility impairment.
- xv. Procurement committees both at national and local level should at least have representatives of PWDs.
- xvi. Given that water is not easily accessible to PWDs, either because they cannot pay for it, or because they cannot move long distances to water sources, privatisation of water will not only limit access further, but will contribute to a lack of a basic necessity for poverty eradication and sanitation. Moreover, the distance to the boreholes and other water sources needs to be reduced. DPOs therefore strongly urge government not to privatise water because of the likely negative consequences to PWDs and CWD, who are likely to bear the brunt of privatisation.

Monitoring and evaluation of PEAP

- i. As identified in UPPAP, poverty among disabled people is of different dimensions from that among other members of society, and indicators for PWDs might also be quite different from the average. DPOs and government should therefore work out key indicators that can be used to measure progress in poverty reduction among PWDs.
- ii. Once key public interventions on disability are incorporated in the PEAP in a clear manner, DPOs are willing to join government to monitor progress on these issues both at national and local levels. PEAP therefore needs to recognise the involvement of PWDs and DPOs in implementing and monitoring effective progress on poverty reduction in the country.

Annex B: The 1995 Constitution and Disability (Specific Provisions on Disability)

National Objectives and Directive Principles of State policy

General

- i. The following objectives and principles shall guide all organs and agencies of the State, all citizens, organisations and other bodies and persons in applying or interpreting the Constitution or any other law and in taking and implementing any policy decision for the establishment and promotion of a just, free and democratic society.
- ii. The President shall report to Parliament and the Nation at least once a year, all steps taken to ensure the realisation of these policy objectives and principles.

Protection and promotion of Fundamental and other Human Rights and Freedoms

- vi. **Gender balance and fair representation of marginalised groups.**
The state shall ensure gender balance and fair representation of marginalised groups on all constitutional and other bodies.

Social and Economic Objectives

- xvi. **Recognition of the dignity of persons with disabilities.**
Society and the State shall recognise the right of persons with disabilities to respect human dignity.

Cultural Objectives

xxiv. Cultural Objectives

Cultural and customary values which are consistent and with the constitution may be developed and incorporated in the aspects of Uganda life.

The State shall:

- (a) Promote and preserve those cultural values and practices, which enhance the dignity and well being of Ugandans;
- (b) Encourage the development, preservation and enrichment of all Ugandan languages;
- (c) Promote the development of a sign language for the deaf and;
- (d) Encourage the development of a national language or languages.

Under the rest of the constitution the following provisions which are enforceable in the courts of law have been secured.

Protection and promotion of fundamental and other Human Rights and Freedoms

General

Article 21

1. All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life in every other aspect and shall enjoy equal rights.

2. Without prejudice to clause (1) of this article, a person shall not be discriminated against on the ground of sex, race, colour, ethnic origin, creed or religion, or social economic standing, political opinion or disability.
3. For the purpose of this article, “discriminate” means to give different treatment to different persons attributable only or mainly to their respective descriptions by sex, race, colour, ethnic origin, tribe, birth, creed or religion, or social economic standing, political opinion or disability.
4. Nothing in this article shall prevent Parliament from enacting laws that are necessary for;
 - (a) implementing policies and programmes aimed at redressing social, economic or educational or other imbalance in society; or
 - (b) making such provision as is required or authorised to be made under this Constitution; or
 - (c) providing for any matter acceptable and demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.
5. Nothing shall be taken to be inconsistent with this article which is allowed to be done under any provision of this Constitution.

Article 32

1. Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the State shall take affirmative action in favour of groups marginalised on the basis of gender, age, disability or any other reason created by history, tradition or custom, for the purpose of redressing imbalances which exist against them.
2. Parliament shall make relevant laws, including laws for the establishment of an equal opportunities commission, for the purpose of giving full effect to clause (1) of this article.

Article 35

1. Persons with disabilities have a right to respect and human dignity and the State and society shall take appropriate measures to ensure that they realise their full mental and physical potential.
2. Parliament shall enact laws appropriate for the protection of persons with disabilities.

Representation of the People

Right to vote

Article 59

1. Every citizen of Uganda of eighteen years of age or above, has a right to vote.
2. It is the duty of every citizen of Uganda of eighteen years of age or above, to register as voter for public elections and referenda.
3. The State shall take all necessary steps to ensure that all citizens are qualified to vote, register and exercise their right to vote.
4. Parliament shall make laws to provide for the facilitation of citizens with disabilities to register and vote.

The Legislature

Establishment, Composition and Functions of Parliament

Article 78

1. Parliament shall consist of;
 - (a) members directly elected to represent constituencies;
 - (b) One woman representative for every district;
 - (c) such numbers of representatives of the army, youth, workers, persons with disabilities and other groups as Parliament may determine; and
 - (d) the Vice-President and Ministers, who, if not already elected members of Parliament, shall be ex-officio members of Parliament without the right to vote on any issue requiring a vote in Parliament.
2. Upon the expiration of a period of ten years after the commencement of this Constitution and thereafter, every five years, Parliament shall review the representation under paragraphs (b) and (c) of clause (1) of this article for the purposes of retaining increasing, or abolishing any such representation and any other matter incidental to it.
3. The representatives referred to in paragraph (a) of clause (1) of this article shall be elected on the basis of universal adult suffrage and by secret ballot.
4. Parliament shall by law, prescribe the procedure for elections of representatives referred to in paragraph (b) and (c) of clause (1) of this article.

Article 84

1. Subject to the provisions of this article, the electorate of any constituency and of any interest group referred to in article 78 of this Constitution have the right to recall their member of Parliament before the expiry of the term of Parliament.
2. A member of Parliament may be recalled from that office on any of the following grounds;
 - (a) physical or mental incapacity rendering that member incapable of performing the functions of the office; or
 - (b) misconduct or misbehaviour likely to bring hatred, ridicule, contempt or disrepute to the office; or
 - (c) persistent deserting of the electorate without reasonable cause.
3. The recall of a member of Parliament shall be initiated by a petition in writing setting out the grounds relied on and signed by at least two-thirds of the registered voters of the constituency or of the interest group referred to in clause (1) of this article, and shall be delivered to the Speaker.
4. On receipt of the petition referred to in clause (3) of this article, the Speaker shall, within seven days require the Electoral Commission to conduct a public inquiry into the matters alleged in the petition and the Electoral Commission shall expeditiously conduct the necessary inquiry and report its findings to the Speaker.

5. The Speaker shall;
 - (a) declare the seat vacant, if the Electoral Commission reports that it is satisfied from the inquiry, with the genuineness of the petition; or
 - (b) declare immediately that the petition was unjustified, if the Commissions reports that it is not satisfied with the genuineness of the petition.
6. Subject to the provisions of clauses (2), (3), (4) and (5) of this article, Parliament shall, by law prescribe the procedure to be followed for the recall of a member of the Parliament.

Local Government

Principles and Structures of Local Government

Article 180

1. A local government shall be based on a council which shall be the highest political authority within its area of jurisdiction and which shall have legislative and executive powers to be exercised in accordance with this Constitution.
2. Parliament shall by law prescribe the composition, qualifications, functions and electoral procedures in respect of local government councils, except that:
 - (a) the person elected as District Chairperson of a local government shall be a member of the council;
 - (b) one third of the membership of each local government council shall be reserved for women; and
 - (c) any law enacted by virtue of this article shall provide for affirmative action for all marginalised groups referred to in article 32 of this Constitution.
 - (d) Parliament shall exercise similar powers of review as stipulated in clause (2) of article 78 of this Constitution, in relation to paragraphs (b) and (c) of this clause.
3. A person shall not be a member of a local government council unless that person is a citizen of Uganda.

Articles 107, 84, 144 and 185, for the removal of the President, Ministers, Members of Parliament, Judicial Officers, District Chairperson and Speaker respectively and so many other important personalities is covered in this Constitution.

One of the grounds for which they could be removed from office is inability to perform the functions of that particular office.

Originally, the grounds had limited to physical and mental incapacity, which would disfavour persons with disabilities or cause interpretation wrangles.

As already spelt out in a number of provisions above, parliament is expected to enact detailed laws to protect and promote rights of citizens with disabilities.

The Local Government Act, 1997: (Provisions on Disability) – Section 11: Composition of District Councils

11. District Councils shall consist of:

- (a) The District Chairperson ; elected under part X of this Act;
- (b) One Councillor directly elected to represent an electoral area of a District
- (c) Two Councillors, one of whom shall be a female youth representing the youths in the District;
- (d) Two Councillors, with disabilities one of whom shall be a female, representing persons with disabilities; and

Women Councillors forming one third of the council such that the Councillors elected under paragraph (b), (c) and (d) shall form two thirds of the Council.

Section 24: Lower Local Government Councils

(1) A Sub-county Council shall consist of:

- (a) A Chairperson, elected under Part X of this Act;
- (b) One Councillor, representing each parish or part thereof in the Sub-county;
- (c) Two Youth Councillors representing the youth in the Sub-county, one of whom shall be a female youth;
- (d) Two Councillors with disabilities, one of whom shall be a female, representing persons with disabilities in the Sub-county; and
- (e) Women councillors forming one third of the Council.

(2) A City Division Council shall consist of:

- (a) A Chairperson, elected under Part X;
- (b) One Councillor, representing each Parish or part thereof in the Division;
- (c) Two Councillors with disabilities, one of whom shall be a female, representing persons with disabilities in the City Division;
- (d) Two Youth Councillors representing the youth in a City Division, one of whom shall be a female youth; and
- (e) Women Councillors forming one third of the Council.

(3) A Municipal Council shall consist of:

- (a) A Chairperson, elected under Part X and carrying title of Mayor,
- (b) One Councillor, representing each Parish or part thereof in the Municipality;
- (c) Two Councillors with disabilities representing persons with disabilities in the Municipality;
- (d) Two Youth Councillors representing the youth in the Municipality, one of whom shall be a female youth; and
- (e) Women Councillors forming one third of the Council.

(4) A Municipal Division Council shall consist of:

- (a) A Chairperson, elected under Part X;
- (b) One Councillor directly elected to represent each Parish or part thereof in the Municipal Division;
- (c) Two Councillors with disabilities representing persons with disabilities in the Municipal Division;
- (d) Two Youth Councillors representing the youth in the Municipal Division, one of whom shall be a female youth; and
- (e) Women Councillors forming one third of the Council.

(5) A Town Council shall consist of:

- (a) A Chairperson, elected under Part X;
- (b) One Councillor, directly elected to represent each ward or part thereof in the Town;
- (c) Two Councillors with disabilities representing persons with disabilities in the town;
- (d) Two Youth Councillors representing the youth in the town one of whom shall be a female youth; and
- (e) Women Councillors forming one third of the Council.

Section 46: Administrative Units

46. (1) There shall be Administrative Units based:

- (a) in rural areas, on:
 - (i) County
 - (ii) Parish; and
 - (iii) Village;
- (b) in urban areas, on:
 - (i) Parish or Ward; and
 - (ii) Village

(2) There shall be a Council at each level of the Administrative Units.

Parliamentary Elections Statute 1996 (Provisions on Disability)

Section 12

- 2. (g) To promote, through appropriate means, civic education of the citizens of Uganda on the purpose, and voting procedures, of any election, including where practicable, the use of sign language.

Section 37

- 2. (d) For persons with disabilities, there shall be five representatives at least one of whom shall be a woman.
- 3. (e) The representatives of persons with disabilities shall be elected by an electoral college of representatives of such persons from each district in a manner prescribed by regulations made by the Minister under section 123.

Section 58

- 1. Every polling station shall, as far as possible, be located in an open ground, or where there is no open ground, in large premises of convenient access, having an outside door for the admittance of voters, and, if possible, another door through which voters may leave after voting and the polling station shall, as far as possible be such as to facilitate access by persons with disabilities and the aged.

Section 59 (Polling procedures)

6. (a) The voter has no thumb on the right hand, the process specified in that paragraph shall be applied to the finger nearest to the position of the thumb on the voters' right hand; or
- (b) The voter has no right hand the process shall be applied to the left hand; or
- (c) A voter has no fingers on the left or right hand, the voter may dip the tip of any hand into indelible ink; or
- (d) The voter has no hands, the process shall be applied to any other conspicuous part of the voter's body as a polling assistant may determine.

Section 62

2. The presiding officer may allow expectant mothers, old or sickly voters or voters with disabilities and persons required for essential duties to vote without waiting in line with the other voters.

Section 66

1. Where a voter is by reason of blindness, illiteracy, old age or any other disability unable to fix the authorised mark of choice on the ballot paper, that voter may report at the polling station accompanied by a person of his or her choice to assist the voter to fix the authorised mark of choice on the ballot paper if necessary, on the voter's behalf or the voter may subject to sub-section (3) of this section, request another person present at the polling station to assist such voter in that behalf.
2. It shall be lawful for any member of a voter's family to assist a voter under subsection (1) notwithstanding the fact that the former is below the age of eighteen years.
3. An election officer, a candidates agent, an observer or monitor, at any polling station, is not permitted to assist any voter with a disability under subsection (1).
4. No person is authorised to assist any voter to mark the ballot paper under subsection (1) unless the voter has voluntarily requested such assistance.
5. A person commits an offence who;
 - (a) Pretends to have a disability for the purposes of subsection (1) when he or she does not;
 - (b) Contravenes subsection (4) of this section.

Section 123

1. The Minister may with the approval of the Legislature and on the recommendation of the Commission, by statutory instrument make regulations prescribing any matter which by this statute is required or authorised to be prescribed or which for carrying out or giving effect to the provisions of this Statute other than matters to be prescribed by rules of court.

NB: The above provisions were enacted because of two constitutional provisions i.e. article 78 and 59 (4) of the Constitution of Uganda.

References

- African Forum and Network on Debt and Development (2002). *Civil Society Participation in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Process*, African Forum and Network on Debt and Development.
- Danish Council of Organizations of Disabled People (2001). *Country Strategy Uganda 2001*.
- Ddamulira D (2003). *Participation of Organizations and Partners for Persons with Disabilities in the PEAP 2003 Revision*. NUDIPU/USDC/ADD.
- Gariyo [initial?] (2002). *Participatory Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs): The PRSP process in Uganda*. Uganda Debt Network.
- International Labour Organization (2002). *Disability and Poverty Reduction Strategies*. [Geneva: International Labour Organization].
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2002a). *Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process – UPPAP*. MFPED.
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2002b). *Second Participatory Poverty Assessment Report: Deepening the understanding of poverty*. MFPED.
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2002c). *Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP)*. [MFPED].
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2000).
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (1998). *Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP)*. MFPED.
- Nayiga F-S (2000). *The Political Process that Led to the Inclusion of Disability in the Constitution of Uganda*.
- Ntale CL (2003). *Chronic Poverty and Disability in Uganda*. Chronic Poverty Research Centre.
- NUDIPU (2005). NUDIPU website, available at: <http://international.egmont-hs.dk/nudipu>
- NUDIPU (2003). MDG-PEAP submission for the consultative group meeting NUDIPU.
- Nyamugasira, Rowden (2002). *New Strategies, Old Loan Conditions: Do the new IMF and World Bank loans support countries' poverty reduction strategies? The Case of Uganda*.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics (2002). *2002 Provisional Census*. Uganda Bureau of Statistics.
- United Nations (1993). *The Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities*. Geneva: United Nations.

World Bank (2003). *Getting Serious about Meeting the MDGs*. Comprehensive Development Framework Report. Geneva: World Bank.