## Fact sheet: Disability inclusiveness of development and humanitarian aid in **NORWAY**

|  |
| --- |
| [**The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation**](https://www.norad.no/en/front/) **has played an important role in bringing disability inclusion into the international spotlight, and it has taken some initial steps to strengthen drivers of inclusion in its own programmes. It should now build on this momentum by working in partnership with organisations of persons with disabilities (DPOs) to develop ambitious internal strategies and measurable commitments that ensure all Norwegian Official Development Assistance is inclusive of, and accessible to, persons with disabilities.** |

**Methods used:** review of documents in the public domain (in English) ; review of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Creditor Reporting System database ; exchange with the Norwegian Federation of Organisations of Disabled People. The review took place between July and September 2020.

For important context on the scope of the work, please refer to the [methodology document](https://www.edf-feph.org/content/uploads/2020/11/Mapping-inclusivenss_methodology_final.docx)

### **Key facts**

### **STRATEGY AND LEADERSHIP**

Clear commitments in strategy documents and leaders’ statements have a key role to play in driving the department-wide changes needed for disability inclusion.

* **Ministry in charge of international development and humanitarian action**: [Ministry of Foreign Affairs](https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/id833/), which includes the [Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation](https://norad.no/en/front/) (NORAD). Spending through the Ministry and NORAD amounted to around 95% of Norway’s total allocable Official Development Assistance (ODA) spending in 2018.[[1]](#footnote-1)
* **National strategy/policy on disability**: The Norwegian Government has a [strategy](https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/bc8396c163f148dc8d4dc8707482e2be/a-society-for-all_web.pdf) for the equality of persons with disabilities for the period 2020-2030. The strategy includes a very brief section on ‘international cooperation’ (section 4.3.4): this contains broad objectives on international engagement, but nothing explicit on Norway’s own ODA spending.
* **Law on ODA:** There is no separate law on ODA. The Norwegian Parliament rules on ODA spending every year through its annual budget.[[2]](#footnote-2)
* **Overall strategy/policy on international cooperation and humanitarian action**: The four most relevant strategy documents are: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ [White Paper](https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/217f38f99edf45c498befc04b7ef1f7e/en-gb/pdfs/stm201620170024000engpdfs.pdf) on the SDGs (2017), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ [humanitarian strategy](https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/departementene/ud/dokumenter/hum/hum_strategy.pdf) (2018), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ [White Paper](https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/5673dadc917448148b491635289ac690/en-gb/pdfs/stm201820190027000engpdfs.pdf) on multilateral cooperation (2019), and NORAD’s [strategy](https://norad.no/globalassets/publikasjoner/publikasjoner-2016/knowledge-for-development.pdf) (2016). The first three of the documents contain brief references to disability. These cover: the need to ensure educational opportunities for children with disabilities;[[3]](#footnote-3) to include persons with disabilities (among other ‘vulnerable groups’) in planning and implementing humanitarian action;[[4]](#footnote-4) and to pay particular attention to the civil and political rights of persons with disabilities (among other ‘vulnerable groups’).[[5]](#footnote-5) However, none of the documents contain measurable commitments on disability.
* **Strategy/policy on disability in international cooperation and humanitarian action:** The Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ most recent policy document on ‘[Norway’s international efforts to promote the rights of persons with disabilities](https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/ud/vedlegg/hum/efforts_disabilities.pdf)’ dates from 2013, before the current government came to power. The policy covers education, gender, health, humanitarian action, and some cross-cutting areas such as support to organisations of persons with disabilities (DPOs) and research. In the document, Norway focuses its commitments primarily on influencing multilateral, civil society and government actors, and on making some new funding allocations. The commitments are not explicitly linked to a full theory of change for upholding Norway’s obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and in general the commitments are not measurable.[[6]](#footnote-6) Disability is also covered in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ [White Paper on human rights](https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/261f255d028b42cab91ad099ee3f99fc/en-gb/pdfs/stm201420150010000engpdfs.pdf) (2015), which includes both a stand-alone section on disability, and references to disability in other prioritised sectors (particularly education and humanitarian action). The document is relatively brief, and again the commitments are generally not measureable.
* **Charter on inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian action:** Norway has endorsed the [charter](http://humanitariandisabilitycharter.org/).
* **Evidence of senior commitment to disability inclusion in international cooperation and humanitarian action:** The Minister of International Development, Dag-Inge Ulstein, announced 100 million kroner (US$ 11.6 million) additional funding for disability-related work in March 2019 and said, “we must give this area priority. The Government will pursue an even more inclusive development policy, with a particular focus on education, global health and support for civil society.”[[7]](#footnote-7) In July 2020, Mr Ulstein took part in a high-level round table to highlight the importance of including persons with disabilities in COVID-19 response and recovery.[[8]](#footnote-8)
* **Engagement in the** [**Global Action on Disability (GLAD) Network**](https://gladnetwork.net/): Norway is one of the Co-Chairs of the GLAD Network.
* **Other engagement on disability inclusion with international actors in the fields of development cooperation and humanitarian action**: Norway has championed disability inclusion in a range of international forums, particularly in the education sector.[[9]](#footnote-9) In 2018, Norway co-founded the Inclusive Education Initiative, which supports disability-inclusive education through coordination, knowledge sharing, finance, and data collection.[[10]](#footnote-10) Norway will host the next Global Disability Summit, in 2022.[[11]](#footnote-11)

### **ENGAGEMENT WITH DPOs**

High-quality engagement with DPOs is fundamental. Not only does it make development cooperation and humanitarian action legally compliant and technically stronger in the short term. By strengthening the disability movement and making space for real participation – as the “subject of action”, not the “object of intervention”,[[12]](#footnote-12) it also contributes to the redistribution of power that is a pre-requisite for sustainable disability-inclusive development in the long-term.[[13]](#footnote-13)

* **DPO engagement in Norway’s ODA**: In 2019 the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities said it was concerned about the lack of information on effective involvement of DPOs as partners in Norway’s development cooperation.[[14]](#footnote-14) Apart from some training activities (noted below), and a broad recognition that persons with disabilities should be consulted in the planning of humanitarian response (noted above), the documents reviewed for this fact sheet did not give specific evidence of DPO participation in the design, implementation and monitoring of mainstream policies and programmes. At the level of disability-targeted interventions, Norway channels some of its disability-targeted funding through the Atlas Alliance (an alliance of Norwegian DPOs, and non-governmental organisations engaged in disability-targeted ODA), but the level of such funding has been in decline, while co-funding requirements may deter smaller Norwegian DPOs from applying for other Norwegian civil society funding opportunities.[[15]](#footnote-15) Based on data from 2018, it appears that disability-targeted ODA did not flow directly to DPOs in the Global South,[[16]](#footnote-16) though such DPOs take part in partnerships with Norwegian DPOs as sub-grantees.[[17]](#footnote-17)

### **INTERNAL CAPACITY**

Successfully implementing disability-inclusive development cooperation and humanitarian action requires sufficient staff with relevant skills and experience.

* **Human resources for work on disability**: Detailed data on this indicator was not available.
* **Tools and guidance for work on disability:** The Atlas Alliance has a partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to develop training for staff in the ministry and in civil society.[[18]](#footnote-18) NORAD has set up an internal network on disability to help strengthen capacity (although it appears the network’s reach does not yet extend to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or to country missions).[[19]](#footnote-19)
* **Recognition for staff work on disability:** This review did not find any evidence of specific performance incentives for staff work on disability.

### **MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING**

It is essential for management and reporting processes to create positive incentives that foster disability inclusion, and avoid perverse incentives that lead to exclusion.

* **Budgeting for disability inclusion:** No explicit allowance has been made for the costs of ensuring disability inclusion. An emphasis on “cost effectiveness” in NORAD’s stratgegy[[20]](#footnote-20) could create a perverse incentive to focus on groups who are cheaper to reach, if interpreted narrowly.
* **Programme management:** This review did not find any evidence of check-points for disability inclusion in the programme management process.
* **Grant management:** NORAD’s grant application process requires grantees to say how they plan to include persons with disabilities.[[21]](#footnote-21) Only limited information is available online, so it was beyond the scope of this review to assess which grantees must follow this process (multilateral as well as civil society?) or what the consequences are if they do not comply. In 2017 Norway also carried out a review of disability-inclusion within Norwegian-supported programmes implemented by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE),[[22]](#footnote-22) but it is not clear whether this led to any changes in GPE practice. (Please note that this review focused on incentives to include persons with disabilities in the work of civil society and multilateral partners. It was beyond its scope to examine incentives through other channels, e.g. ODA investments in private sector companies, but this would be an important area for future research).
* **Procurement:** Based on Norway’s procurement documents reviewed online, there is not enough evidence to conclude whether procurement processes create incentives for suppliers to provide accessible products and to uphold the rights of persons with disabilities.
* **Disaggregated data and other reporting:** Full data on reporting processes is not available. However, for geographically specific community-level projects in the education sector (bilateral or multilateral), where Norway is the sole of major donor, reporting on disability inclusion is mandatory, though only “if data is available”.[[23]](#footnote-23) (Please see ‘spending’ section below for reporting using the ‘DAC marker’).
* **Checks to detect and prevent ODA spending on activities that contravene the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) - e.g. forced psychiatric treatment:[[24]](#footnote-24)** Based on the evidence analysed for this review, it was not possible to conclude what controls are in place to mitigate the risk of Norwegian ODA funding projects that contravene the CRPD.

### **SPENDING**

Spending data shows the scale of an ODA provider’s investment in international cooperation and humanitarian action. Subject to some limitations, it also gives a snapshot of how much that ODA provider’s spending aimed to be inclusive of persons with disabilities.

* **Norway’s total Official Development Assistance (ODA) spending**: US $4.3 billion (36.6 billion krone) in 2019. This was 1.02% of Gross National Income.[[25]](#footnote-25)
* **Percentage of allocable ODA spending screened using the disability ‘DAC marker’ in 2018:[[26]](#footnote-26)** 100%.[[27]](#footnote-27)
* **Percentage of allocable ODA spending with disability inclusion as at least one objective in 2018**: 1%.[[28]](#footnote-28) (In interpreting this result, please note that reporting is based on self-assessment and there is no ex-post process to check different ODA providers’ reported results for methodological consistency). [Please refer to this link for listings of the individual projects](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Yttfs9gpWw3f8sElPs6FJXoymjXhUEfKnR3De31_6fc/edit?usp=sharing) that had disability inclusion as at least one objective [please note the link contains two separate sheets].[[29]](#footnote-29)

### **Annex A: Key questions for future analysis and advocacy[[30]](#footnote-30)**

1. Our understanding is that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ most recent published policy[[31]](#footnote-31) on disability dates from 2013. As Co-Chair of the Global Action on Disability Network, what plans does the Government of Norway have to update this document with a new and more ambitious strategy on disability inclusion in Norwegian ODA?
2. What steps is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs taking to ensure that organisations of persons with disabilities systematically participate in the planning, implementation and monitoring of Norwegian development cooperation and humanitarian action – not only disability-specific programmes, but also mainstream ones?
3. How many staff at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs / NORAD have responsibility for disability inclusion in development cooperation and humanitarian action (full-time, part-time)?
4. NORAD requires grant applicants to say how they plan to include persons with disabilities. How does NORAD respond if grantees’ plans for disability inclusion are not strong enough? More broadly, taking into account all the different channels for Norwegian ODA spending, does the Ministry of Foreign Affairs take any steps to check that all spending proposals are disability inclusive, before spending is approved?
5. For geographically specific community-level projects in the education sector where Norway is the sole of major donor, reporting on disability inclusion is mandatory “if data is available”.[[32]](#footnote-32) Does the Ministry of Foreign Affairs monitor and report disability-disaggregated data in other areas of intervention? If not, does it have plans to do so in future?
6. According to the OECD Creditor Reporting System database, in 2018, just 1% of allocable Norwegian ODA spending had disability inclusion among its objectives. This is extremely low – is it accurate? If yes, does the Ministry of Foreign Affairs agree that urgent measures are needed to increase disability inclusion in Norwegian ODA in future? If no, how will the Ministry of Foreign Affairs improve the reliability of its reporting in future years?
7. NORAD’s strategy says it will “give priority to … partners that … are cost-effective.“[[33]](#footnote-33) How does NORAD ensure partners do not interpret this to mean that they should minimise the cost per person reached, even if this means leaving out harder-to-reach groups, such as persons with disabilities? Has the Ministry of Foreign Affairs considered making an explicit statement on the need for Norwegian-funded programmes to budget for disability inclusion?[[34]](#footnote-34)

### **Annex B: Norway’s priority countries**

Priority countries for long-term development cooperation: Colombia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Malawi, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Tanzania and Uganda. Priority countries for « stabilisation and conflict prevention » : Afghanistan, Mali, Niger, Palestine, Somalia and South Sudan.[[35]](#footnote-35)

### **Annex C: key DPO and other contacts**

### Key DPO and DPO-civil society alliances: Norwegian Federation of Organisations of Disabled People (FFO); [Atlas Alliance](https://atlas-alliansen.no/en/)

* To ensure coordination with wider civil society messaging on the quantity and quality of Norwegian ODA, advocates may also want to consider contacting the [Norwegian Forum for Development and Environment](http://www.forumfor.no/en/) (ForUM)
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