

Behinderung und internationale Entwicklung Disability and International Development

Behinderung und Forschung
Disability and Research



Inhalt

Participatory and Inclusive Research in
Development Cooperation
Rebecca Daniel 4

Herausforderungen gleichberechtigter Teilhabe für Forschende des
Globalen Südens am wissenschaftlichen Diskurs
Ilona Westphal 10

Making Development Processes Inclusive of Disability:
The Experiences of Rwanda and Malawi in Implementing
the SDGs and CRPD
Jorge Manhique 18

Kurzmeldungen/Announcements 26

Literatur 31

Impressum

Impressum | [Masthead](#)

Behinderung und internationale Entwicklung
[Disability and International Development](#)

Herausgeber | [Editor](#)

Behinderung und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit e.V.
[Disability and Development Cooperation](#)

Anschrift | [Address](#)

Altenessener Straße 394-398

45329 Essen

Tel.: +49 (0)201/17 89 123

Fax: +49 (0)201/17 89 026

E-Mail: info@inie-inid.org

Internet: www.zeitschrift.bezev.de

Für blinde und sehbehinderte Menschen ist die Zeitschrift im Internet erhältlich: www.zbdw.de

[For persons with visual impairment, an electronic version of the journal is available at www.zbdw.de](#)

Redaktionsgruppe | [Editorial Board](#)

Dr. Isabella Bertmann, Christine Bruker,

Dr. Thorsten Hinz, Jana Offergeld,

Prof. Dr. Sabine Schäper, Gabriele Weigt

Schriftleitung | [Editorship](#)

Gabriele Weigt

Redaktionsassistentin | [Editorial Assistance](#)

Katharina Silter

Gestaltung | [Layout](#)

Amund Schmidt

Druck | [Print](#)

Druckerei Nolte, Iserlohn

Bankverbindung | [Bank Details](#)

Bank für Sozialwirtschaft

BIC: BFSWDE33XXX

IBAN: DE08 370 205 000 008 040 706

Die Zeitschrift Behinderung und internationale Entwicklung ist eine Publikation des Instituts für inklusive Entwicklung. Das Institut wird getragen von Behinderung und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit e.V.

[The journal Disability and International Development is a publication of the Institute for Inclusive Development. The Institute is part of Disability and Development Cooperation.](#)

Hinweis: Für den Inhalt der Artikel sind die AutorInnen verantwortlich. Veröffentlichte Artikel stellen nicht unbedingt die Meinung der Redaktion dar. Die Veröffentlichung von Beiträgen aus der Zeitschrift in anderen Publikationen ist möglich, wenn dies unter vollständiger Quellenangabe geschieht und ein Belegexemplar übersandt wird. [Please note that the authors are responsible for the content of the articles. Published articles do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editorial board. Papers published in the journal Disability and International Development may be reprinted in other publications if correctly cited and if a copy is forwarded to the contact provided above.](#)

ISSN 2191-6888 (Print)

ISSN 2199-7306 (Internet)

Liebe Leserinnen und Leser,

Forschung im Kontext von Behinderung und Internationaler Entwicklung gewinnt vor dem Hintergrund der UN-Behindertenrechtskonvention und der Agenda 2030 zunehmend an Relevanz, nicht zuletzt, da die Umsetzung beider internationaler Abkommen einer fundierten Datengrundlage bedarf. In dieser Ausgabe möchten wir daher einen Blick auf die aktuelle Forschungslandschaft und ihre zentralen Themen werfen, aber auch ihre Rahmenbedingungen kritisch reflektieren.

Der einleitende Artikel behandelt die Fragen, wie Forschung zur Verbesserung der Lebensbedingungen von Menschen mit Behinderungen im Globalen Süden beitragen kann und welche Rolle partizipative Methoden aus den *Disability Studies* und der partizipativen Aktionsforschung bei der inklusiven Gestaltung von Entwicklungsprozessen spielen. Rebecca Daniel adressiert darüber hinaus wesentliche Herausforderungen der Datenerhebung.

Ilona Westphal setzt sich in ihrem Beitrag kritisch mit der bestehenden Machtasymmetrie zwischen Globalem Süden und Norden innerhalb des Wissenschaftssystems auseinander, die sich u.a. in einer einseitigen Priorisierung im Hinblick auf die Themenauswahl im Rahmen von Förderprogrammen ausdrückt. Die Offenlegung systembedingter Barrieren und Exklusionsmechanismen, so argumentiert die Autorin, sind wichtige Schritte hin zu einer genuin interkulturellen Forschungspraxis.

Der letzte Beitrag dieser Ausgabe zeigt ein Beispiel empirischer Forschung zur Situation von Selbstvertretungsorganisationen (sog. DPO) im Globalen Süden: Jorge Manique stellt Ergebnisse einer Analyse von Umsetzungsstrategien für die Agenda 2030 in Ruanda und Malawi vor. Eine Befragung nationaler DPO in beiden Ländern zeigt, dass die Agenda 2030 der Zivilgesellschaft neue Möglichkeiten bietet, sich im Sinne der UN BRK für die Rechte von Menschen mit Behinderungen einzusetzen.

Wir wünschen viel Vergnügen bei der Lektüre und freuen uns, Ihnen mit dieser Ausgabe unser neues Layout zu präsentieren. Vielen Dank an Christian Bauer für das tolle Design!

Ihr Redaktionsteam

Dear readers,

in the light of the UN CRPD and the 2030 Agenda, research in the context of disability and international development is gaining importance, as the implementation of both international agreements depends on sufficient data. This issue therefore addresses the current research landscape and its central topics, but also reflects critically on its foundations.

The introducing article focuses on the role research can play in the improvement of living conditions of people with disabilities in the Global South, and on participatory methods developed within disability studies and participatory action research and discusses, how participatory research may contribute to an inclusive design of development processes and strategies.

Ilona Westphal critically analyses existing power imbalances between the Global South and North within the scientific system, which i.a. manifests in a biased prioritisation of research topics in the scope of funding programmes. The author argues that the identification of systematic barriers and mechanisms of exclusion are important steps towards a genuinely intercultural research practice.

Our last article illustrates an example for empirical research on the situation of Disabled People Organisations (DPO) in the Global South: Jorge Manique presents results of a study on strategies regarding the SDG implementation in Rwanda and Malawi. Interviews with representatives from national DPOs in both countries indicate, that the 2030 Agenda provides new opportunities for civil society to forward the realisation of the rights of people with disabilities laid out in the UN CRPD.

We welcome the opportunity to present the new layout of our journal in this issue and thank Christian Bauer for the great design. We hope you enjoy the reading.

Your editorial board

Participatory and Inclusive Research in Development Cooperation

Rebecca Daniel

Persons with disabilities are still too often invisible within development cooperation - also due to a lack of consistent data. Existing theories and practices regarding disability often focus on rehabilitation, prevention and health - forgetting or undervaluing aspects of true and full participation also in the area of research on disability. This article suggests (1) which role participatory research can play for improving living conditions for persons with disabilities in the Global South, as well as (2) how participatory methods as applied in Disability Studies and Emancipatory Action Research can be used to make international development more inclusive.

Living Situation and Rights of Persons with Disabilities

More than 80 % of all persons with disabilities live in countries of the Global South (WHO 2011: 29; UN enable 2006b). Their living conditions are more likely to be characterised by exclusion, discrimination, violence and poverty (Deepak 2011: 5f.; UN enable 2006a: preamble e and v, and article 9; WHO 2014). According to estimates of the World Bank 20 % of the world's poorest people, living in absolute poverty, are persons with disabilities (UN enable 2006b). Furthermore, poverty and disability are directly linked to each other (WHO, 2011: 39). No matter if one looks at the needs for services regarding health, welfare, assistive devices, or education, at the need for counselling of persons with disabilities or their families, at the need for medical rehabilitation or for vocational training: the World Report on Disability shows that in the investigated countries the needs of persons with disabilities are not yet met sufficiently. It points out to what extent their need for health services is met so far, but the data

do not indicate categories such as participation and empowerment in general and in research in specific. These aspects are focused in this article (WHO 2011: 40ff.).

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) (UN enable 2006a), adopted in 2006 and entered into force in 2008 (UN enable 2006c), declares the rights of persons with disabilities and, therefore, complements further existing international declarations and treaties for human rights. With regard to inclusive and participatory research, especially Art. 32 of the UNCRPD should be stressed, for it points out the right of persons with disabilities to enjoy international cooperation and to have access to development programs which are responsive to their needs, without any barriers. This includes, amongst other things, (1) capacity-building in the sense of knowledge-exchange as well as (2) cooperation in research and (3) access to scientific and technical knowledge (UN enable 2006a: article 32).

Disability and Data Collection

With the adoption of the UNCRPD the international community has agreed on seeing disability as a human rights issue and as an „evolving concept [...] that results from the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers that hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with other“ (UN enable 2006a: preamble e.). Despite this international agreement on how to define impairment and disability, an internationally binding definition of disability has not yet been admitted fully into national policies and international cooperation (VENRO 2013: 1). Another challenge regarding the definition of - and, in consequence, data collection on - disability is that what is seen as *impaired*, *disabled* or *abled*, is very much determined by contextual factors. Perceptions of normality are relative, vague and shaped by situational factors (e.g. age, history, culture) (WHO 2011: 23). The human-rights based social model on disability, applied in the above outlined definition could, therefore, be complemented by rationale from cultural science. Applying a human-rights-based view on development and a social model of disability might conflict with cultural views of disability and calls for a critical reflection of possible cultural aspects. Nonetheless, there are controversial views on this issue being discussed within the scientific community, e.g. within Disability Studies (Waldschmidt 2005: 24f. and 26f.; Barton/ Oliver 1997; Hermes n.d.: 23), the studies about disability or „disability science“ (Waldschmidt 2003: 12; Degener 2003: 23).

Not only but also in consequence of the above outlined difficulties in defining disability, data on disability are not yet collected consistently worldwide. Different authors have stressed the importance to provide better quality and availability of disability data and statistics that are relevant in order to be able to meet the needs of persons with disabilities in development programs (Wolbring et al. 2013: 4154f. and 4178). Data collection is very important in order to measure and monitor the improvement of living conditions of persons with disabilities in the process of implementing the UNCRPD and of each Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) of the new developmental agenda Agenda 2030. Both, the CRPD and the Agenda 2030, stress the need to consider the topic disability, amongst other things, within their respective monitoring processes as well as within statistics and data collection on development (Secretariat/DSPD/DESA/ n.d.: 1). Participation and empowerment of persons with disabilities in the follow-up process and within reports on the implementation of the agenda and the CRPD should be

ensured (IDDC/IDA n.d. b.: 73).

A lack of consistent and reliable data has been a continuous challenge in the area of disability and development. In the year 2000, when the former developmental agenda, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), was introduced, data in countries of the Global South were still especially rare and often of insufficient quality. Internationally comparable measures for the identification of persons with disabilities had not yet been developed (Secretariat/DSPD/DESA/UN n.d.: 1). While the MDGs have been developed further to Sustainable Development Goals, first international measures have been taken. Examples are (1) the Short Set of Questions (WG-6) for census and research which has been developed by the Washington Group on Disability Statistics, (2) the Child Disability Question Set, which have been developed by UNICEF and the Washington Group, (3) the WHO Model Disability Survey, (4) as well as other standard researches being implemented in different countries. In some countries, furthermore, exist (5) standards and assessment instruments for accessibility which are also in the sense of the Agenda 2030 (Secretariat/DSPD/DESA/UN n.d.: 1).

Inclusive Development and Participatory Research

Several political strategies, existing for international development cooperation in general and especially to disability and development, have a great impact on development processes for persons with disabilities in countries of the Global South. It is necessary to implement these various international agreements in line with the CRPD and the Agenda 2030. In order to do so the implementation of short-, medium- and long-term development goals of these diverse strategies need to be undertaken in a measurable manner (see also Wolbring et al. 2013: 4154). For the monitoring of their achievement, again, data on disability, participation and development are needed.

In order to improve the marginalised living conditions of persons with disabilities in countries of the Global South, former colonialising and paternalising support structures regarding disability and development should be overcome. Paternalistic and individualising approaches have often caused feelings of powerlessness (Serrano-Garcia in Rappaport/Swift/Hess 1984: 175). According to Rappaport (1981), empowerment is, unlike prevention, not mainly concerned with welfare goals for certain persons or populations, but with the process of participation of these persons or populations in any intervention affecting their welfare (Swift in Rappaport/Swift/Hess 1984: xiv). This

Through participatory research persons with disabilities become subjects, doing research on their own welfare issues, instead of being object of research done on them by external "experts".

is also the case in research on disability and development. Therefore participatory research needs to be brought into discussion.

Participatory research is a research approach within social sciences, which implies involvement of groups of people in research on issues affecting their own life. It comprises a power shift away from the researcher to the people. Instead of investigating *on* people as objects, the researcher investigates together *with* the people themselves as subjects, i.e. as (co-)researchers (Ledwith 2014: 80f.). The need to include persons with disabilities in conducting research on needs, barriers, and health outcomes for themselves has also been seen by the WHO (2014). These data, therefore, should be collected through research based on a critical background and implemented in a participatory way. Thus it is possible to reach „theory in action and action from theoretical processes“ (Ledwith 2014: 79). According to Ledwith, theory is generated in action, and action, in turn, becomes more critical through (theoretical) analysis (ibid.: 3). The main focus of critical or radical development lies on the everyday lives of local people (ibid.: 2). Its aim is collective action for development respecting social and environmental justice.

Within critical theory there is a variety of different participatory research approaches and a controversial debate about definitions and principles of these approaches. It is not possible to give an overview over all of these terms, their meanings and the discussions about them within this article. Instead, in the following,

an insight will be given into the field by an exemplary outline of two major research approaches that seem of high relevance. These approaches are: Emancipatory Action Research and the Disability Studies.

Emancipatory Action Research

(EAR) derives from critical theory and is, originally, a research approach designed for Community development - without a specific focus on disability (Zuber-Skerritt 2001: 23; and Ledwith 2014). According to Ledwith (2014: 77ff.) with reference to Freire (1972), EAR is part of a symbiotic relation together with critical education and community action. Ledwith sees EAR as the glue that binds community development theory and practice as a unity of „praxis“, keeping it critical (Ledwith 2014: 78). The EAR view of the human kind and world view are value-based and founded on an ideology of equality (ibid.: 77). EAR has the aim to transform the present into a better future, with a central commitment to social justice (ibid.: 78f.), and is, therefore, in line with the aims of critical development processes. In EAR all involved actors and persons participate in a counter-hegemonic critical space where power relationships are deconstructed according to our analysis of power in order to reconstruct democratic relations with new possibilities for a world that is fair and just (ibid.: 78). It is methodologically working *with* the people, not *on* them (ibid.: 79). Inner reflection of attitudes and prejudices helps the critical practitioner to develop a self-critical deeper level of research and personal understanding. Outer processes of the research help to reach a more complex analytical level of research and to a collective understanding. This is done through creating critical spaces between the critical practitioner and other involved actors. Within this process non-controlling methods are used and there is a variety of ways extending conventional written research by further methods, e.g. dialogue, story, music, drama, poetry, drawings or photographs (ibid.: 79). Deriving from the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, basic principles of action research are identified. Two of them will be named here with reference to Zuber-Skerritt (2001: 11f.): (1) „Symmetrical communication“ implies the attitude that everyone participating is seen as equal contributor to the research process with equally important knowledge, skills, capabilities or talents. (2) „Becoming critical“ implies that the critical action researcher should not end with technical or practical modes of enquiry in the sense of co-option and co-operation, but continue to reach critical ones in the sense of collaboration. In EAR the

researcher does not have the role of an external expert or encourager any more, but the one of a moderator (Zuber-Skerritt 2001: 12f.)¹.

Disability Studies

It is, furthermore, recommended to base all research activities related to disability and/or development on the rationale of the Disability Studies. The disability studies challenge theoretical and, in consequence, practical approaches to disability, which are mainly focusing on rehabilitation, prevention and therapy (Waldschmidt 2005: 9; Gill 1998). Started mainly by scientists with disability in the USA and the UK, the disability studies are nowadays, amongst others, also present in countries of the Global South, e.g. in India or South Africa. In the sense of this article and critical theory, the aims of disability studies are (1) the analysis of societal conditions that lead to a negative image of persons with disabilities and (2) the change of social, political and cultural systems and practices that lead to exclusion and discrimination of persons with disability. The disability studies also have the aim (3) to make the group of persons with disabilities visible within society. Basis of this process is the critical analysis of such discriminating social processes (Hermes n.d.: 23). In disability studies persons with disabilities are active participants of the research process and their experiences and perspectives are centre of the analysis of problematic societal conditions and possible solutions (ibid.: 23). In the sense of this article, the disability studies offer at least two important aspects, i.e. (1) the focus on critical disability related research and (2) a cultural-sensitive critical perspective on the term of disability. Especially in the framework of development processes in countries of the Global South, it can be criticised to only apply a human rights based view on development and a social model of disability. As explained above, a cultural perspective can be important in international cooperation; moreover, the disability studies consider this perspective by (1) putting a focus on society from the perspective of the minority and on cultural representation of persons with disabilities in certain societies, as well as by (2) deriving implications not only for politics but also for real life and public and scientific discourses (Waldschmidt 2005: 24ff.).

It is not easy to find literature on examples of participatory research within the context of development and disability in the Global South, like one from Brazil mentioned by Deepak et. al. (2013: 11). The author of this article assumes from her own experience in Community Based Rehabilitation projects in Mongolia, India, Ghana and Nicaragua that there are aspects

of participatory research in different community development projects in countries of the Global South, which are not published for the public. This issue makes some of the existing research projects and approaches, existing worldwide, more visible.

Summary: Role of Participatory Research for Inclusive Development

As this article has shown, participatory research can play an important role for improving living conditions of persons with disabilities in the Global South. Development cooperation, again, can make a highly relevant contribution by supporting provision of better quality and availability of disability data and statistics. Important frameworks in favour of research and data collection within international cooperation are, as outlined, article 32 of the UNCRPD on international cooperation or in SDG 17 on global partnerships for sustainable development of the Agenda 2030. In line with these declarations short-, medium- and long-term sustainable development goals regarding disability should be formulated and their implementation needs to be measurable and monitored. For this monitoring, again, high-quality data on disability, participation and development are needed. As a consequence, all collected data, relevant for the field of international cooperation, need to be disaggregated by disability - and by different types of disabilities. Moreover, provision of respective funding and political strategies is a highly important aspect in order to allow collection of needed data, which can inform developmental processes.

If these data on disability and development are collected in a participatory way, former colonialising and paternalising support structures regarding disability and development can be broken up continuously. Persons with disabilities become visible within society as active participants of developmental cooperation measures as well as as active citizens, engaged equally within developmental processes themselves. Through this kind of participation, persons with disabilities become subjects, doing research on their *own* welfare issues, instead of being object of research done *on* them by external 'experts'. In consequence, this kind of research can contribute to increased empowerment of and social justice for persons with disabilities worldwide. Thereby, also social, political and cultural systems and practices that lead to exclusion and discrimination of persons with disability can change slowly over time.

Last but not least, participation of experts *on themselves* in research on their own regards can also lead to higher quality data, provided on their living conditions

and respective needs for change and, in consequence, to better quality measures implemented, e.g. in the field of development cooperation, based on these data.



NOTES

- 1 More on the process of EAR can e.g. be read in Ledwith (2014: 81ff.) or Ledwith/ Springett (2014: 93ff. and 199ff.).

REFERENCES

- BARTON, L./OLIVER, M. (1997): Disability Studies: Past, Present, Future. Leeds: The Disability Press.
- DEEPAK, DR. S. (2011): Making Development Inclusive. Community-based Rehabilitation (CBR). Guidelines and Promoting Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in International Development Cooperation. Working Paper. Article 32 of UN CRPD and CBR Guidelines. Bologna.
- DEEPAK, DR. S. et. al. (2013): Organisations of Persons with Disabilities and Community-based Rehabilitation. Disability CBR and Inclusive Development. 2013. Vol 24. Nr. 3. pp: 5-20. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- DEGENER, T. (2003): Behinderung neu denken. Disability Studies als wissenschaftliche Disziplin in Deutschland. In: HERMES, G./KÖBSELL (2003): Disability Studies in Deutschland. Behinderung neu denken. Dokumentation der Sommeruni 2003. Kassel, pp. 23-26.
- FREIRE, P. (1972): Pedagogy of the oppressed. Harmondsworth.
- GILL, C. (1998): Disability Studies. Looking at the FAQ's. In: Alert. Newsletter of the Institute on Disability Studies and Human Development. Volume 9. Issue 3. 1998. Chicago.
- HERMES, G. (n.d.): Der Wissenschaftsansatz Disability Studies - neue Erkenntnisgewinne über Behinderung? Available at: http://www.uni-klu.ac.at/gender/downloads/hermes_-_der_wissenschaftsansatz_disability_studies.pdf. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- IDDC/IDA (n.d.): The 2030 Agenda. The Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities. Comprehensive Guide.
- LEDWITH, M. (2014): Community Development. A critical approach. Second edition. Bristol.
- LEDWITH, M./SPRINGETT, J. (2014): Participatory practice. Community-based action for transformative change. Bristol.
- RAPPAPORT, J./SWIFT, C./HESS, R. (1984): Studies in Empowerment: Steps Toward Understanding and Action. New York.
- SECRETARIAT/DSPD/DESA/UN (n.d.): Operationalizing the 2030 Agenda. Ways forward to improve monitoring and evaluation of disability inclusion. Technical Note by the Secretariat.
- UN ENABLE (2006a): United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York: Available at: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?id=259>. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- UN ENABLE (2006b): Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Some facts about Persons with Disabilities. New York. Available at: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/facts.html>. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- UN ENABLE (2006c) United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York. Available at: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?id=150>. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- VENRO (2013): Statement for the High Level Meeting on Disability and Development. Available at: http://venro.org/publikationen/?no_cache=1&topic=2&cHash=107f9eb0ebd47ec2b97f76fb3393d0ea#. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- WALDSCHMIDT, A. (2003): Kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven der Disability Studies. Tagungsdokumentation. Kassel
- WALDSCHMIDT, A. (2005): Disability studies: Individuelles, soziales und/oder kulturelles Modell von Behinderung? P&G. 1/05. Pp. 9-31. Available at: http://commonweb.unifr.ch/artsdean/pub/gestens/f/as/files/4681/24335_184440.pdf. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- WHO (2011): World Report on Disability. Malta: Available at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2011/9789240685215_eng.pdf?ua=1. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- WHO (2014): Disability and health. Fact sheet N°352. 2015. Geneva. Available at: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs352/en/>. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- WOLBRING, G. et al. (2013): Disabled People and the Post-2015 Development Goal Agenda through a Disability Studies Lens. Open access. Sustainability, 2013, 5, pp. 4152-4182. Available at: http://r.search.yahoo.com/_ylt=A7x9UkoISWNVAAYAbw2z4IIQ;_ylu=X3oDMTByaDVva2FxBHNIYwNzcgRwb3MDMwRjb2xvA2lyMgR2dGlkAw--/RV=2/RE=1432598921/RO=10/RU=http%3a%2f%2fwww.mdpi.com%2f2071-1050%2f5%2f10%2f4152%2fpdf/RK=0/RS=j3tj3YyVGwAvAYD3LeQnKI5bDN0-. Visited on 26.10.2017.
- ZUBER-SKERRITT, O. (2001): Action Learning and Action Research: Paradigm, Praxis and Programs. In: SANKARA, S./DICK, B./PASSFIELD, R. (2001): Effective Change Management through Action Research and Action Learning: Concepts, Perspectives, Processes and Applications. Lismore. pp. 1-20.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Menschen mit Behinderungen sind in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit immer noch zu oft unsichtbar - auch aufgrund des Fehlens einheitlicher Daten. Bestehende Theorien und Praktiken zu Behinderung sind häufig auf Rehabilitation, Prävention und Gesundheit fokussiert - wobei Aspekte der vollen und gleichberechtigten Teilhabe, auch im Bereich der Forschung zu Behinderung, vergessen oder unterbewertet werden. Dieser Artikel weist darauf hin (1) welche Rolle partizipative Forschung für die Verbesserung der Lebensbedingungen für Menschen mit Behinderungen im Globalen Süden spielen kann, als auch (2) wie partizipative Methoden, wie sie die Disability Studies und der Emancipatory Action Research Ansatz verwenden, dazu genutzt werden können, internationale Entwicklungszusammenarbeit inklusiver zu gestalten.

RÉSUMÉ

Les personnes handicapées sont souvent invisible dans la coordination du développement international, aussi à cause d'un manque

des données cohérentes. Les théories et pratiques en regard de handicap approchent souvent la réadaptation, prévention et santé et oublient ou sous-évaluent les aspects d'une pleine et vraie participation aussi dans le terrain de la recherche du handicap. L'article propose (1) la rôle de la recherche participative pour améliorer la qualité de vie des personnes handicapées dans le sud et (2) comment les méthodologies participatives comme appliquer dans les Disability Studies et la Emancipatory Action Research peuvent rendre le développement international plus inclusive.

RESUMEN

Todavía las personas con discapacidad son invisibles dentro de la cooperación para el desarrollo, también debido a la falta de datos coherentes. Las teorías y prácticas existentes con respecto a la discapacidad a menudo se centran en la rehabilitación, la prevención y la salud, olvidando o subestimando los aspectos de verdadera y plena participación, también en el área de la investigación sobre la discapacidad. Este artículo sugiere (1) qué papel puede desempeñar la investigación participativa para mejorar las condiciones de vida de las personas con discapacidad en el sur global, y (2) cómo los métodos participativos aplicados en los Estudios de Discapacidad y la Investigación de Acción Emancipatoria pueden usarse para desarrollar el desarrollo internacional más inclusivo.

AUTHOR

Rebecca Daniel studied Special Education and Empowerment Studies in Münster and Düsseldorf, Germany. She works as a team leader and coordinator for inclusive voluntary commitment abroad at *Behinderung und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit e.V.* (bezev). Contact: rebecca.daniel@posteo.de .

Herausforderungen gleichberechtigter Teilhabe für Forschende des Globalen Südens am wissenschaftlichen Diskurs

Ilona Westphal

Internationale Abkommen fordern transnationale und interkulturelle Ansätze zur Bewältigung globaler Herausforderungen. Die bestehende Ungleichheit zwischen Globalem Norden und Globalem Süden hat jedoch Konsequenzen für die Teilhabe von Forschenden des Globalen Südens am wissenschaftlichen Diskurs und auch für internationale Forschungsk Kooperationen. Dieser Artikel weist auf die Relevanz kontinuierlicher, differenzierter Auseinandersetzung mit systembezogenen Hierarchien und Ungleichheiten hin und motiviert zur Synergieentwicklung.

„Weder Egalität noch Hierarchie, sondern Chancengleichheit ist für die interkulturelle Synergie entscheidend.“ (Tjitra/Thomas 2006: 256).

Vorbemerkung

Aktuelle internationale Bestrebungen wie die *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* der Vereinten Nationen (UN-CRPD) und die UN-Agenda 2030 fordern die globalen Herausforderungen gemeinsam, d.h. länder- und somit auch kulturübergreifend, zu lösen. Internationale (Forschungs-) Kooperationen unterstützen mit multikulturellen Teams, die als Vorbild für Werteumsetzung wie Gleichberechtigung dienen, die Umsetzung der UN-Paragrafen (vgl. Gaitanides 2010: 153). Länder und Kulturen sind aufgrund eines fehlenden linearkausalen Zusammenhangs begrifflich nicht gleichzusetzen (vgl. Klaus/Nauck 2007: 294), wodurch eine Kooperation bi- oder multikulturell und/oder bi- oder multinational strukturiert sein kann. Im Folgenden wird sowohl von internationaler Forschungsk Kooperation gesprochen (wie es im Hochschulkontext in diesem

Zusammenhang üblich ist), als auch von z.B. interkultureller Zusammenarbeit. Denn Intersektionalität zeigt sich hier zum einen in der Kategorie der Nationalität im Sinne von Staatsangehörigkeit, zum anderen in der Kultur, als Resultat der Enkulturation. Diese gilt es ebenso wie alle möglichen Kooperationsstrukturen mitzudenken.

Dahl (2006: 100; kursiv durch den Autor) konstatiert: „culture is not something that a person has, but something the person makes relevant in the meeting with others“. Er betrachtet Kulturen phänomenologisch und versteht sie nicht als geschlossene Entitäten, die auf geographische Bereiche bezogen vorkommen, sondern als fortwährende sozial konstruierte „arenas of contest“ (ebd.; kursiv durch den Autor), in denen unterschiedliche Konzepte, Diskurse und Praktiken aufeinander treffen, sich vergleichen und miteinander ringen (ebd.).

Kultur(-differenz) ist somit ein einflussreicher Faktor bezüglich des Gelingens und Misslingens jeglicher interpersoneller Kommunikation. Das Gelingen dieser ist wiederum ausschlaggebend für die Entwicklung und den Erfolg beispielsweise interkultureller Forschungsvorhaben. Zudem hat die bestehende Ungleichheit zwischen dem Globalen Norden und Globalen Süden Konsequenzen - nicht nur für internationale Forschungsk Kooperationen, sondern vor allem generell für die erfolgreiche Partizipation aller Forschenden am wissenschaftlichen Diskurs. Mögliche Schwierigkeiten und Lösungsansätze werden im Hinblick auf eine Annäherung an die Chancengleichheit der Beteiligten vorgestellt. Ziel des Artikels soll sein, die Reflexion der eigenen Anteile zur Unterstützung oder Überwindung bestehender exkludierender Strukturen auf Grundlage der beschriebenen Barrieren anzuregen.

UN-CRPD und Agenda 2030

Die Internationalisierung von Wissenschaft und Forschung ist inzwischen eine auf Regierungsebene international vereinbarte Zieldimension (vgl. Weidemann 2007: 667). Diese ist ganz im Sinne des ökonomischen Nachhaltigkeitsprinzips, birgt jedoch eine Reihe von Herausforderungen. Das Menschenrechtsübereinkommen United Nation Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN-CRPD) wurde 2006 verabschiedet und die Forderungen auf Völkerrechtsebene verankert. Die UN-CRPD gilt als übergeordneter Faktor zur Implementierung internationaler Standards. Inzwischen haben sich 175 Länder verpflichtet gleichberechtigte Teilhabe für alle zu ermöglichen (vgl. United Nations 2017). Der Artikel 32 *Internationale Zusammenarbeit* betont, dass die Agenda gemeinsam umgesetzt werden soll, und bildet somit eine rechtliche Basis für nachhaltige internationale (Forschungs-) Kooperationen (vgl. BMAS 2010: 51). Anknüpfend an die Millenniumsziele verabschiedet die UN-Generalversammlung 2015 die *Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung*. Ihre fünf Prinzipien sind die sogenannten *Five Ps*: Die Würde des Menschen steht im Mittelpunkt (People), Schutz des Planeten (Planet), Förderung des Wohlstands für alle (Prosperity), Förderung des Friedens (Peace), Aufbau globaler Partnerschaften (Partnership). Der Aktionsplan ist am 01.01.2016 in Kraft getreten und gilt ohne Einschränkung für alle Länder, wengleich keine verpflichtende Rechtsgrundlage zur Umsetzung der 169 Zielvorgaben besteht. Die Zielvorgaben, verstanden als Handlungsanweisungen, werden in 17 Nachhaltigkeitszielen (Sustainable Development Goals; Abk. SDGs) zusammengefasst. Menschen mit Behinderung wird kein alleiniges Ziel zugeteilt, sie

werden stattdessen in mehreren Zielen explizit und implizit berücksichtigt. Smith und Grand (2016) haben elf eindeutige Bezüge zu Menschen mit Behinderung in den SDGs herausgearbeitet. Die für die internationale bzw. bi- oder multikulturelle Zusammenarbeit im Kontext (inklusive) Bildung relevanten Nachhaltigkeitsziele sind die SDGs 4 und 10: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all (SDG 4); Reduce inequality within and among countries (SDG 10) (vgl. BMZ 2016). Bildung ist die Voraussetzung von Entwicklung, ihre Relevanz für die Reduktion von Ungerechtigkeiten wird durch die Unterziele des SDG 4 deutlich. Die Unterziele des SDG 10 konkretisieren dieses Anliegen (vgl. DUK 2017: 1f.). Es gilt sich auf hierarchiefreier Ebene international zu vernetzen, um Strategien zur Umsetzung der gemeinsamen Ziele durch Synergiebildung entwickeln zu können. Forschung kann im Zuge der Globalisierung ebenso wenig auf „einen Ort begrenzt“ sein wie die Menschen selbst (vgl. Schlehe 2007: 459).

Ungleiche Güterverteilung, Kultur- und Sprachdifferenzen als Barrieren

Materielle Ungleichheiten sind durch den Kolonialismus maßgeblich historisch bedingt und werden noch heute durch neokolonialistisches Handeln seitens des Globalen Nordens begünstigt, wodurch eine aktive Entwicklungsbehinderung des Globalen Südens stattfindet (vgl. Schneider/Toyka-Seid 2018; Mabe 2005). Der Ressourcenraub zeigt sich in der Forschung insbesondere im Datenraub. Gemeint sind hiermit die Erhebung von Daten sowie die Nutzung der hierzu benötigten Infrastruktur in Ländern des Globalen Südens durch Forschende des Globalen Nordens. Forschung auf die der Begriff Datenraub angewendet werden kann, findet nicht auf Augenhöhe mit den vermeintlichen Kooperationspartnern des Globalen Südens statt. Der Vorteil liegt auf der Seite des Globalen Nordens, dabei erfolgt weder eine wirkliche Berücksichtigung der Interessen der beteiligten Personen des Globalen Südens, noch eine angemessene Gegenleistung für Arbeitskraft und ähnliches. Ein Beispiel für sich in der Forschung abzeichnende Machthierarchien zeigt u.a. die Fallstudie *The way the country has been carved up by researchers: ethics and power in north-south public health research* von Walsh, Brugha und Byrne (2016). Aus forschungsethischer Perspektive muss gerade der Datenraub als neokolonialistische Handlung reflektiert und verhindert werden. In der Forschungskoope- ration selbst können unterschiedliche Faktoren wie divergierende kulturelle Normen, Kommunikationsstile,

Stereotypen und Vorurteile das Gelingen beeinflussen (vgl. Weidemann 2007: 670). Laut Gaitanides (2010: 154) kann sich dies in „Anzweifelung beruflicher Kompetenz, Reduktion auf Herkunftscompetenz, Unterstellung traditioneller Einstellungen und Verhaltensmuster“ gegenüber Forschenden des Globalen Südens äußern. Hinzu kommen Missverständnisse, die meist aufgrund mangelnden Wissens um „kulturelle Codes“ (Gaitanides 2010: 162) entstehen, die Konsequenz können Fehlattritionen und Stress für alle Beteiligten sein. Des Weiteren können sich fachspezifische Problemfelder auftun, z.B. bezüglich des Behinderungsbegriffs, wenn beispielsweise die Umweltfaktoren, die u.U. eine *Beeinträchtigung* erst zu einer *Behinderung* machen nur wenig oder kaum Berücksichtigung finden (vgl. DIMDI 2005: 21). Ein unterschiedliches Verständnis von Wissenschaftstheorien, divergierende Normvorstellungen akademischer Texte, Vorträge etc. sowie Erwartungen bezüglich der Arbeitsabläufe können ebenfalls in Kooperations-schwierigkeiten resultieren (vgl. Weidemann 2007: 670). Auch das Zeitverständnis, ob monochron oder polychron, und der damit zusammenhängende Umgang mit (vermeintlichen) Verbindlichkeiten spielen eine Rolle (vgl. Nicklas 2006: 129; Kumbruck/Derboven 2005: 15f.). Ein recht augenscheinliches Problem ist die Sprachbarriere. Konkret bedeutet das Level der jeweiligen Sprachkenntnisse und die Einigung auf eine Verkehrssprache, zu der meist eine frühere Kolonialsprache gewählt wird, einen verdeckten Machtgewinn der Dominanzkultur. Laut Auernheimer (2010: 39, 42) ist Kommunikation von Machtverhältnissen, Hierarchie, Status und Setting beeinflusst, wobei der jeweils Unterlegene quasi keinen Einfluss auf die Beziehungsgestaltung hat (ebd., 43). Machtasymmetrien werden auch in der Arbeitsteilung deutlich, denn meist wird die Kooperation durch die Beteiligten des Globalen Nordens koordiniert. Vorhandene Stereotype können dazu führen, dass Personen ihre Professionalität aufgrund unterschiedlicher Wertemuster abgesprochen wird. Zudem bestehen auch unterschiedliche Wege mit Konflikten umzugehen. Gaitanides (2010: 163) betont, dass das Konfliktverhalten nicht-westlicher Kulturen, vor allem dort, wo „rechtsstaatliche Konfliktregelung“ praktisch keine Bedeutung hat, oft von ausgeprägter „Unsicherheitsvermeidung“ gekennzeichnet ist. Konflikte werden hier eher nicht direkt, sondern gar nicht oder mittels einer dritten Person angesprochen. Häufige Ohnmachts- und Unterlegenheitserfahrungen können bei marginalisierten Personengruppen zu „Rückzugstendenzen bis hin zur ‚erlernten Hilflosigkeit‘ [...]“ führen (Auernheimer 2006: 154). Angehörige von

Minderheiten, bzw. diskriminierten Gruppen neigen in der Kommunikation dazu per se misstrauisch zu sein. Diese Rassismussensibilität ist als Schutzreaktion laut Auernheimer „nicht unvernünftig“ (2010: 50; Gaitanides 2010: 159), jedoch schafft sie ebenso wie die erstgenannten Barrieren Distanz, die für eine reibungslose Zusammenarbeit hinderlich sein kann.

Kulturbedingte divergierende Grundannahmen - Beispiele aus Ghana

Kooperationswillige Forschende können durch die Konfrontation mit kulturbedingten divergierenden Grundannahmen vor Herausforderungen gestellt werden. Da das Aufwachsen mit einer Kultur als Theoriensystem die erste Erfahrung ist, die ein Mensch im Zuge der Enkulturation macht, sind die entsprechenden Informationen tief in der Person verankert, wodurch im Zusammentreffen von Personen verschiedener kultureller Hintergründe Reibungspunkte entstehen können (vgl. Aydt 2015: 135). Anschaulich wird dies durch die traditionelle Sicht auf Behinderung am Beispiel Ghanas. Es wird v.a. die Entstehung von Behinderung traditionell unterschiedlich erklärt. Die Erklärungen sind nicht generalisierbar, sondern beziehen sich auf die jeweilige Ethnie der hier ausgewählten Beispiele: Die Dagomba (Northern Region) gehen traditionell davon aus, dass Geschlechtsverkehr zwischen 12 Uhr nachts und vier Uhr morgens zu kleinwüchsigen Kindern führt, da in dieser Zeit die Zwerge (Gestalten des Mythos, sie leben im *evil forest* - Anm. d. Autorin) unterwegs sind und sich in alle Geschehnisse einmischen. In Erklärungsannahmen der GA (Greater Accra) wird davon ausgegangen, dass für schwangere Frauen, die Schnecken essen, die Wahrscheinlichkeit steigt, ein Kind mit einem starken Speichelfluss zu bekommen. Die Hausa (Northern Region) sagen, dass eine Frau, die während ihrer Menstruation Geschlechtsverkehr hat und dann schwanger wird, ein Kind mit einer Beeinträchtigung zur Welt bringt. Schwangere Frauen der Asanti (Ashanti Region) sollen nicht in der Öffentlichkeit essen, da sie durch Hexen verzaubert werden könnten und das ungeborene Kind eine Behinderung bekommen könnte. Frisch geborene Kinder der Ewes (Volta Region) dürfen nur von den engsten Verwandten und Freunden gesehen werden. Zeigt man sie in der Öffentlichkeit, kann es passieren, dass ihnen mit dem bösen Blick Schaden zugefügt wird. Außerdem sollten Ewe-Frauen während der Schwangerschaft keinen Gefallen ausschlagen. Führen sie eine freundliche Geste (wie z. B. etwas Anreichen) nicht aus, kann es darin resultieren, dass sie ein Kind mit Behinderung zur Welt bringen (vgl.

Gadagbui 2013: 7f.). Eine Kenntnis dieser Annahmen ist für die Forschungsk Kooperation mit ghanaischen Kollegen und Kolleginnen im Kontext Behinderung hilfreich und für die Arbeit im Feld nahezu unabdingbar. Es wird deutlich, dass tiefer gehende kulturspezifische Informationen und Verständnis vonnöten sind, um Sichtweisen und Fundamente des Handelns nachvollziehen zu können.

Das Hochschul- und Wissenschaftssystem als Exklusionsfaktor

Allein das System, in dem Forschende arbeiten, kann ein Exklusionsfaktor sein. Auch wenn Wissenschaft „gemeinhin als kulturneutrales Phänomen wahrgenommen wird“ (Weidemann 2007: 668), ist dem nicht so:

„Das System ‚Wissenschaft‘ schließt international etablierte, rational begründete (wissenschaftliche) Standards und Prozeduren ein, die dazu dienen (sollen), den Wahrheitsanspruch wissenschaftlichen Wissens zu sichern. Im Umkehrschluss entscheidet die Einhaltung dieser Standards darüber, ob bestimmte Praktiken überhaupt als ‚wissenschaftlich‘ gelten können“ (ebd.: 668).

Das Gefälle zwischen dem Globalen Norden und Globalen Süden wird auch hier deutlich, da die Macht mit denen ist, die die Standards entwickelt haben, welche wiederum diejenigen mit einem ökonomischen Vorteil sind. Die Ungleichheit aufgrund der ungleichen Verteilung materieller Güter, wirkt sich direkt auf verfügbare Forschungsmittel aus und schafft dadurch „ungleiche Zugangsbedingungen, zum wissenschaftlichen Diskurs“ (Weidemann 2007: 669). Macht und Status von Wissenschaftler_innen der sogenannten westlichen Länder haben unmittelbare Auswirkungen auf tatsächliche Forschungsk Kooperationen. Die Förderprogramme bevorteilter Länder, die es in Ländern des Globalen Südens aufgrund mangelnder Ressourcen so nicht gibt, definieren die Forschungsfelder bzw. „thematische Prioritäten“ (ebd.), indem sie den konkreten Rahmen festlegen wie z.B. den Kreis der zugelassenen Antragssteller, das Antragsformat (z.B. englische Sprache als Standard). Auch die Bewilligung der anfallenden Kosten wie z.B. erhöhte Reisekosten und längere Projektphasen, die bei Kooperationen anfallen, wird durch Wissenschaftler_innen der ohnehin bevorteilten Länder vorgenommen (ebd.).

„Interkulturelle Beziehungen sind fast durchweg durch Machtasymmetrie - Status-, Rechtsungleichheit, Wohlstandsgefälle - gekennzeichnet“ (Auernheimer 2010: 47). Macht ist nach Auernheimer nicht mit Herrschaft gleichzusetzen, sondern „bezeichnet generell

die Überlegenheit hinsichtlich der Handlungsmöglichkeiten [...], der Chance, die Regeln zu setzen“ (ebd.). Diese Macht definiert sich durch den Zugang zu Ressourcen, insbesondere auf materieller Ebene, welche weitreichende Auswirkungen in dem jeweiligen System hat. Die Schwierigkeiten internationaler Forschungsk Kooperationen bezüglich Hierarchie beziehen sich auf die europäische bzw. westliche „Dominanzkultur“ (Gaitanides 2010: 154), die das „Deutungsmonopol“ (ebd.) innehat und somit bestimmte Gruppen auf der Basis eindimensionaler Kategorien systematisch marginalisiert. Die Forschung ist laut Henze (2007: 304) von US-amerikanischen und eurozentristischen Perspektiven dominiert, er fordert emische Ansätze zur Entwicklung kulturadäquater Konstrukte und Modelle.

Lingua Franca und Stilmormen - unterschätzter Einfluss

Im Forschungskontext können Sprachunsicherheiten weniger Wortmeldungen in Diskussionsrunden zur Folge haben. Es kann auch zu einer Unterschätzung der Fachkompetenz durch Dritte aufgrund mangelnder sprachlicher Differenziertheit kommen. Letztlich kann die betroffene Person ihre Expertise nicht ausleben, was eine „Infantilisierung“ (Auernheimer 2010: 48) zur Folge haben kann und zu einem Ausschluss

Wird zudem reflektiert, durch wen Wissenschaft bestimmt wird, kann der Ethnozentrismus kontrolliert und das Recht auf gleichberechtigte Teilhabe auch in der Forschung umgesetzt werden.

vom wissenschaftlichen Diskurs führt. Die auf die Sprachkenntnisse bezogenen Probleme gelten für alle nicht-englischen Muttersprachler und somit auch für deutsche WissenschaftlerInnen. Englische Muttersprachler_innen sind klar im Vorteil, da Übersetzungen bzw. „language editing“ (Weidemann 2007: 670; kursiv durch die Autorin) entfällt. Deutsche sind gern optimistisch bezüglich ihrer Sprachkenntnisse, sodass WissenschaftlerInnen, die sich selbst gute bzw. sehr gute Englischkenntnisse bescheinigen, von MuttersprachlerInnen oft weniger sprachqualifiziert eingeschätzt werden. Die daraus resultierende Problematik für z.B. Antragsverfahren auch innerhalb des Globalen Nordens, wird dabei meist nicht erkannt (ebd.). Hinsichtlich der Ungleichheit in der Forschung zeigt sich laut Henze (2007: 305f.) eine geringe Sichtbarkeit der Perspektiven aus dem Globalen Süden und Asien, infolge vergleichsweise weniger Zitationen. Nach Weidemann (2007: 675) zitieren britische und amerikanische AutorInnen zu 99% englischsprachige Quellen, deutsche zu 75% deutschsprachige und französische zu 66% französische Quellen. Hall verwendet den Ausdruck „einsprachiger Interkulturalismus“ (2006: 55): meist wird nur einsprachige Literatur verwendet, insbesondere in englischsprachigen Veröffentlichungen finden sich in der Regel nur englischsprachige Referenzen. Englisch (sprechen) steht im engen Zusammenhang mit der Position der Großmacht USA und wird daher „vielerorts als imperialistische Zumutung empfunden“ (Weidemann 2007: 671), dennoch passen sich viele internationale Journals dem Englischen als lingua franca an. Sogenannte objektive Maße wie der „Science Citation Index“ (SCI) oder „Social Science Citation Index“ beurteilen den Wirkungsgrad (impact factor) von Artikeln anhand der Quantität der Zitationen. Sie dienen als Grundlage von Evaluationen und Bewertungen, somit gelten die Indexe als Indikator für die Reputation eines Wissenschaftlers oder einer Wissenschaftlerin (vgl. Weidemann 2007: 676). In Artikeln dominieren trotz unterschiedlicher existierender Stile (nach Galtung 1983: teutonisch, sachsenisch, gallisch, nipponisch) die angelsächsischen Stilnormen. Texte, die von dieser Norm abweichen werden in peer review-Verfahren eher abgelehnt. Die meist nativ-englischsprachigen peers fungieren als „gatekeeper“ (Weidemann 2007: 675; kursiv durch die Autorin) und entscheiden somit über die Teilnahme am wissenschaftlichen Diskurs. Die so zustande gekommenen geringen Wirkungsgrade stellen eine Barriere in einem sich selbst erhaltendem System dar, die die „wissenschaftliche Produktivität“ (ebd.), insbesondere nicht-englischsprachiger Länder des Globalen Südens

unterschätzen lässt.

Herausforderungen internationaler Kooperation mit Synergie begeben

Um die Barrieren nach Anspruch der UN-CRPD zu überwinden und den Anliegen der Agenda 2030 entsprechen zu können, müssen Ressourcen gebündelt werden. Eine internationale Zusammenarbeit kann jedoch nur mit einem Fokus auf die Lösungen und weniger mit dem Blick auf die Hindernisse funktionieren. Synergiebildung bedarf der Entwicklung neuer, dritter Wege jenseits vom ewigen *entweder-oder*. Pluralität muss somit als Chance begriffen werden, wie es auch im Kontext Inklusion betont wird. In pädagogischen Ansätzen zur Interkulturalität werden Kulturen oft als geschlossene Systeme dargestellt, die eher mit einer Betonung der Differenzen betrachtet werden und als ein Risiko für inklusives Denken zu betrachten sind (vgl. Kiesel/ Volz 2010: 77). Zur Synergieentwicklung ist die Bewusstmachung der Unterschiede eingangs vonnöten, jedoch nur um aus dem Bewusstsein der Andersartigkeit die zu nutzenden Stärken abzuleiten. Neben der Anerkennung von Unterschieden ist primär die Vielfalt des Verbindenden zu suchen. Die möglicherweise bestehenden forschungsmethodischen Differenzen bzw. unterschiedlichen Herangehensweisen bergen Chancen, ebenso wie das Wissen um kulturbedingte Grundannahmen, wie am Beispiel Ghanas verdeutlicht, neue Sichtweisen zu erlauben. Hiermit kann sich zumindest kognitiv von einem eurozentristischen *Eine-Wahrheit-Denken* distanzieren werden. Gelungene interkulturelle Forschungspraxis zeichnet sich durch das Bewusstsein und die Anerkennung von Unterschieden und die aktive Nutzung der Vielfalt aus. Entscheidungen sollten von allen Beteiligten im Interesse aller getroffen werden. Eine Arbeitsatmosphäre, in der offen miteinander umgegangen wird und Probleme konstruktiv gelöst werden, sollte von allen Seiten gestützt werden. Eine Vereinbarung über den konkreten Umgang mit Schwierigkeiten im Miteinander und im Arbeitsprozess bietet sich an.

Nach Salo-Lee (2006: 86) ist die „[c]ultural synergy“ die erfolgreichste Art der interkulturellen Zusammenarbeit. Es werden hier kulturelle Differenzen und Gleichheiten ausgewogen zur Entwicklung eines synergetischen, eigenen Stils berücksichtigt. Somit finden die Stärken aller Kulturen Berücksichtigung und können entsprechend genutzt werden. Innovation und Kreativität sind die Chancen bi- oder multi-kultureller Kooperationen (vgl. Podsiadlowski 2007: 584). Synergiebildung ergibt sich aus dem „[...] Zusammenfügen

kulturell unterschiedlich ausgeprägter Elemente wie Orientierungsmuster, Werte, Normen, Verhaltensweisen usw. in einer Art und Weise, dass sich ein die Summation der Elemente übersteigendes qualitativ höherwertiges Gefüge ergibt. Das Gesamtergebnis ist dann qualitativ höherwertiger als jedes Einzelelement oder die Summe der Elemente.“ (Thomas 1993: 408 zit. n. Tjitra/ Thomas 2006: 254) Eine Grundvoraussetzung für eine möglichst reibungslose Synergiebildung ist nach Auernheimer der Dialog auf „Augenhöhe“ (2010: 58f.) und die Anerkennung anderer Wertsysteme. Gelingensbedingung hierfür ist die Ausbildung interkultureller Kompetenzen (vgl. Lüsebrink 2016: 8f.), da Wissen und das reflektierte Verständnis für die jeweils andere Kultur und das fremde System, in dem die Kooperationspartner sozialisiert wurden, Vorurteilen ebenso wie positiver Diskriminierung vorbeugt. Gaitanides (2010: 169) betont, dass „das Aushalten, Ausbalancieren und Fruchtbarmachen von Differenzen, Mehrdeutigkeiten und Widersprüchen (Ambiguitätstoleranz) [...] nicht nur ein herausragendes Ziel beim interkulturellen Kompetenzerwerb, sondern auch eine grundlegende sozialpädagogische Handlungskompetenz“ ist. Diese „Differenzsensibilität“ (Ricken/Balzer 2007: 67), muss der „eigenen [und fremden] Andersartigkeit“ (ebd.) gerecht werden, denn „um differente[n] Kulturmustern“ zu begegnen, ist „ein Bewusstsein der eigenen Kulturgebundenheit notwendig“ (Auernheimer 2010: 58).

Zur Schaffung von Synergien ist die Abschaffung von historisch und ökonomisch bedingten Hierarchien nötig. Dies heißt, dass nicht nur eine Seite beforscht wird (Datenraub), sondern das Nehmen von Informationen auf Gegenseitigkeit beruht, sodass die klassische Konstellation „weiße Forschende - lokale Informant/innen“ (Schlehe 2007: 459) überwunden werden kann. Dies kann nur gelingen, wenn ein Bewusstsein über die eigene Kultur und Fremdheit für den anderen, sowie die Fremdheit des Gegenübers besteht, ohne diese verändern zu wollen (vgl. Herzog/Makarova 2007: 269f. nach Mae 2003: 196).

Ausblick

Herzog und Makarova (2007: 269) fragen „Wie verhindern wir, dass aus Ungleichheit Ungerechtigkeit wird?“ Hierzu bedarf es zu allererst einer Selbstreflexion, um die Komplexität der Möglichkeiten zu erkennen, die über die vermeintlich einzige Wahrheit eines (rationalistischen) Weltbildes hinausgeht. „Dazu gehört [...] auch ein relativierendes, selbst-distanzierendes und selbstkritisches Verhältnis zur eigenen Lebensführungspraxis und zu manchen bewährten,

gewohnten und liebgewonnener Sichtweisen und Basisannahmen der Profession“ (Kiesel/Volz 2010: 79). Mehr Perspektiven verhelfen zu weiteren Lösungsansätzen für bestimmte Problemlagen und begünstigen die Entwicklung alternativer Handlungsoptionen, da es immer mehr als einen Weg zur Erreichung eines Zieles gibt (vgl. Tjitra/Thomas 2006: 254). Ein Gewinn lässt sich somit nicht nur auf fachlicher, sondern auch auf persönlicher Ebene verzeichnen: Laut Sehbrock (2013: 60) dient „Interkulturelle Begegnung als Steigerung der Lebensfülle!“. Wird zudem reflektiert, durch wen Wissenschaft bestimmt wird, kann der Ethnozentrismus kontrolliert und das Recht auf gleichberechtigte Teilhabe auch in der Forschung umgesetzt werden. Das „Offenlegen systematischer Zugangsbarrieren“ (Weidemann 2007: 668) wie sie für Frauen, ethnische Minderheiten sowie Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler aus dem Globalen Süden bestehen (ebd.), ist für die Entwicklung dieses Bewusstseins unabdingbar. ○

LITERATUR

- AUERNHEIMER, G. (2010): Interkulturelle Kommunikation, mehrdimensional betrachtet, mit Konsequenzen für das Verständnis von interkultureller Kompetenz. In: AUERNHEIMER, G. (Hrsg.): Interkulturelle Kompetenz und pädagogische Professionalität. Interkulturelle Studien, Band 13., 3. Aufl., Wiesbaden: VS. 35-68.
- AUERNHEIMER, G. (2006): Kulturwissen ist zu wenig: Plädoyer für ein erweitertes Verständnis von interkultureller Kompetenz. In: ANTOR H. (Hrsg.): Inter- und Transkulturelle Studien. Theoretische Grundlagen und interdisziplinäre Praxis. Heidelberg: Winter. 145-158.
- AYDT, S. (2015): An den Grenzen der interkulturellen Bildung. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Scheitern im Kontext von Fremdheit. Bielefeld: Transcript. 126-136.
- BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR WIRTSCHAFTLICHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT UND ENTWICKLUNG (BMZ) (2016): Die Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung. Online verfügbar unter: http://www.bmz.de/de/ministerium/ziele/2030_agenda/index.html. Aufgerufen am 11.11.2017.
- BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR ARBEIT UND SOZIALES (BMAS), REFERAT INFORMATION, PUBLIKATION, REDAKTION (2010): Übereinkommen über die Rechte von Menschen mit Behinderungen. Convention of the United Nations on rights of persons with disabilities. Convention relative des Nations Unies aux droit des personnes handicapées. Deutsch. Englisch. Französisch. Leichte Sprache. Bonn: BMAS.
- DAHL, Ø. (2006): Communication in a Globalized World. In: AALTO, N./REUTER, E. (Hrsg.): Aspects of Intercultural Dialogue. Theory. Research. Applications. Köln: Saxa. 95-107.
- DEUTSCHES INSTITUT FÜR MEDIZINISCHE DOKUMENTATION UND INFORMATION (DIMDI) (2005): Internationale Klassifikation der

- Funktionsfähigkeit, Behinderung und Gesundheit (ICF), -21.
Online verfügbar unter: <http://www.dimdi.de/static/de/klassi/icf/>.
Aufgerufen am 02.04.2018.
- DEUTSCHE UNESCO-KOMMISSION (DUK) (2017): Education 2030.
Bildungsagenda 2030. Aktionsrahmen für die Umsetzung von
Sustainable Development Goal 4. Inklusive, chancengerechte und
hochwertige Bildung sowie lebenslanges Lernen für alle. Kurzfas-
sung der Deutschen UNESCO-Kommission. 1f. Online verfügbar
unter: [https://www.unesco.de/fileadmin/medien/Dokumente/Bil-
dung/Bildungsagenda_2030_Aktionsrahmen_Kurzfassung_Deut-
scheVersion_FINAL.pdf](https://www.unesco.de/fileadmin/medien/Dokumente/Bildung/Bildungsagenda_2030_Aktionsrahmen_Kurzfassung_DeutscheVersion_FINAL.pdf). Aufgerufen am 02.04.2018.
- GADAGBUI, G. Y. (2013): Exceptionalities, Inclusive Education,
Personality Disorders & Gerontology -The Aged. Winneba: Bunni
Business. 6-9.
- GAITANIDES, S. (2010): Interkulturelle Teamentwicklung - Beobach-
tungen in der Praxis. In: AUERNHEIMER, G. (Hrsg.): Interkulturelle
Kompetenz und pädagogische Professionalität. Interkulturelle
Studien, Band 13., 3. Aufl., Wiesbaden: VS. 153-171.
- GALTUNG, J. (1983): Struktur, Kultur und intellektueller Stil: ein ver-
gleichender Essay über sachsenische, teutonische, gallische und
nipponische Wissenschaft. Leviathan, Jg. 11 (1983), H. 3, 303-338.
- HALL, C. (2006): Der Wissenschaftsanspruch der interkulturellen
Kommunikation. In: AALTO, N./REUTER, E. (2006): Aspects of
Intercultural Dialogue. Theory. Research. Applications. Köln:
Saxa. 47-61.
- HENZE, J. (2007): Interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kompetenz
- Nichtwestliche Perspektiven. In: STRAUB, J./WEIDEMANN, D./
WEIDEMANN, A. (Hrsg.): Handbuch interkulturelle Kommunikati-
on und Kompetenz. Grundbegriffe. Theorien. Anwendungsfelder.
Stuttgart: Metzler. 304-311.
- HERZOG, W./MAKAROVA, E. (2007): Interkulturelle Pädagogik. In:
STRAUB, J./WEIDEMANN, D./WEIDEMANN, A. (Hrsg.): Handbuch
interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kompetenz. Grundbegriffe.
Theorien. Anwendungsfelder. Stuttgart: Metzler. 261-272.
- KIESEL, D./VOLZ, F. R. (2010): Anerkennung und Intervention. Moral
und Ethik als komplementäre Dimensionen interkultureller Kom-
petenz. In: AUERNHEIMER, G. (Hrsg.): Interkulturelle Kompetenz
und pädagogische Professionalität. Interkulturelle Studien, Band
13., 3. Aufl., Wiesbaden: VS. 67-80.
- Klaus, D./Nauck, B. (2007): Vergleichende Länderstudien: Potenziale
und Grenzen. In: STRAUB, J./WEIDEMANN, D./WEIDEMANN, A.
(Hrsg.): Handbuch interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kom-
petenz. Grundbegriffe. Theorien. Anwendungsfelder. Stuttgart:
Metzler. 293-304.
- KUMBRUCK, C./DERBOVEN, W. (2005): Interkulturelles Training. Trai-
ningsmanual zur Förderung interkultureller Kompetenzen in der
Arbeit. Heidelberg: Springer.
- LÜSEBRINK, H.-J. (2016): Interkulturelle Kommunikation. Interaktion.
Fremdwahrnehmung, Kulturtransfer. 4. Aufl. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- MABE, J. E. (2005): Der Vorwurf von kultureller Dominanz und Neoko-
lonialismus. Dossier Afrika. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
Online verfügbar unter: [http://www.bpb.de/internationales/afri-
ka/afrika/59086/neokolonialismus](http://www.bpb.de/internationales/afri-
ka/afrika/59086/neokolonialismus). Aufgerufen am 02.04.2018.
- MAE, M. (2003): Transkulturalität und interkulturelle Kompetenz. In:
Erwägen Wissen Ethik 14, 194-196. Zit. n. HERZOG, W./MAKARO-
VA, E.: Interkulturelle Pädagogik. In: STRAUB, J./WEIDEMANN, D./
WEIDEMANN, A. (Hrsg.): Handbuch interkulturelle Kommunikati-
on und Kompetenz. Grundbegriffe. Theorien. Anwendungsfelder.
Stuttgart: Metzler. 261-272.
- NICKLAS, H. (2006): Interaktion und Kommunikation in plurikul-
turellen Gesellschaften. In: NICKLAS, H./MÜLLER, B./KORDES,
H. (Hrsg.): Interkulturell denken und handeln. Theoretische
Grundlagen und gesellschaftliche Praxis. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.
121-130.
- PODSIADLOWSKI, A. (2007): Multinationale Teams. In: STRAUB, J./
WEIDEMANN, D./WEIDEMANN, A. (Hrsg.): Handbuch interkultu-
relle Kommunikation und Kompetenz. Grundbegriffe. Theorien.
Anwendungsfelder. Stuttgart: Metzler. 576-586.
- RICKEN, N./BALZER, N. (2007): Differenz: Verschiedenheit - Anders-
heit - Fremdheit. In: STRAUB, J./WEIDEMANN, D./WEIDEMANN,
A. (Hrsg.): Handbuch interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kom-
petenz. Grundbegriffe. Theorien. Anwendungsfelder. Stuttgart:
Metzler. 56-69.
- SALO-LEE, L. (2006): Intercultural Competence in Research and
Practice. Challenges of Globalization for Intercultural Leader-
ship and Teamwork. In: AALTO, N./REUTER, E. (Hrsg.): Aspects
of Intercultural Dialogue. Theory. Research. Applications. Köln:
Saxa. 79-93.
- SCHLEHE, J. (2007): Kultureller Austausch und Globalisierung. In:
STRAUB, J./WEIDEMANN, D./WEIDEMANN, A. (Hrsg.): Handbuch
interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kompetenz. Grundbegriffe.
Theorien. Anwendungsfelder. Stuttgart: Metzler. 453-462.
- SCHNEIDER, G./TOYKA-SEID, C. (2018): Nord-Süd-Konflikt. Bonn:
Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Online verfügbar unter:
[http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/lexika/das-junge-politik-lexi-
kon/161455/nord-sued-konflikt](http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/lexika/das-junge-politik-lexi-
kon/161455/nord-sued-konflikt). Aufgerufen am 02.04.2018.
- SEHRBROCK, P. (2013): Gemeinschaft und Individuum in der
Schwarzafrikanischen Ethik nach Bénédet Bujo unter beson-
derer Berücksichtigung von Menschen mit Behinderung. In:
SEHRBROCK, P./ERDÉLYI, A./GAND, S. (Hrsg.): Internationale
und Vergleichende Heil- und Sonderpädagogik und Inklusion.
Individualität und Gemeinschaft als Prinzipien Internationaler
Heil- und Sonderpädagogik. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt. 48-60.
- SMITH, M./GRANT, J. (2016): The Inclusion and Participation of Per-
sons with Disabilities in the 2030 Agenda. In: Journal for Disabili-
ty and International Development 2/ 2016, 4-9. Online verfügbar
unter: [http://www.zbdw.de/userfiles/downloads/2016_2_BIE.
pdf](http://www.zbdw.de/userfiles/downloads/2016_2_BIE.
pdf). Aufgerufen am 11.11.2017.
- TJITRA, H./THOMAS, A. (2006): Interkulturelle Kompetenz und Syner-
gieentwicklung. In: NICKLAS, H./MÜLLER, B./KORDES, H. (Hrsg.):
Interkulturell denken und handeln. Theoretische Grundlagen
und gesellschaftliche Praxis. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus. 249-257.
- THOMAS, A. (1993): Psychologie interkulturellen Lernens und Han-
delns. In: THOMAS, A. (Hrsg.): Kulturvergleichende Psychologie:

eine Einführung. 377-424. Göttingen: Hogrefe. Zit. n. TJITRA, H./THOMAS, A. (2006): Interkulturelle Kompetenz und Synergieentwicklung. In: NICKLAS, H./MÜLLER, B./KORDES, H. (Hrsg.): Interkulturell denken und handeln. Theoretische Grundlagen und gesellschaftliche Praxis. Frankfurt a.M.: Campus. 249-257.

UNITED NATIONS (2017): Treaty Collection. Chapter IV. Human Rights. 15. Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Online verfügbar unter: https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-15&chapter=4&clang=_en. Aufgerufen am 09.11.2017.

WALSH, A./BRUGHA, R./BYRNE, E. (2016): „The way the country has been carved up by researchers“: ethics and power in north-south public health research. Online verfügbar unter: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5153695/>. Aufgerufen am 02.04.2018.

WEIDEMANN, D. (2007): Wissenschaft und Forschung. In: STRAUB, J./WEIDEMANN, D./WEIDEMANN, A. (Hrsg.): Handbuch interkulturelle Kommunikation und Kompetenz. Grundbegriffe. Theorien. Anwendungsfelder. Stuttgart: Metzler. 667-678.

SUMMARY

Current international agreements call for transnational and cross-cultural approaches to deal with global (educational) challenges. The existing inequality between the Global North and the Global South poses consequences for the participation of researchers from the Global South in the scientific discourse as well as for international research cooperation. The development of synergies within international cooperation requires a continuous differentiated discourse about system-related hierarchies and inequalities. This article emphasises the relevance of constant and differentiated examination of system related hierarchies and inequalities and promotes the development of synergies.

RÉSUMÉ

Les conventions internationales demandent des approches transversales et interculturelles pour surmonter les enjeux générales. Les inégalités existantes entre le nord et les sud ont cependant des impacts sur la participation des chercheurs du sud dans les discours scientifique et sur la coopération scientifique. L'article attire l'attention sur la pertinence d'une prise en compte continué et différenciés avec des hiérarchies ainsi qu'inégalités et invite la création des synergies.

RESUMEN

Los acuerdos internacionales requieren enfoques transnacionales e interculturales para solucionar los desafíos globales. Sin embargo, la desigualdad existente entre el Norte Global y el Sur Global tiene consecuencias para la participación de investigadores del Sur en el discurso científico y también para colaboraciones internacionales de investigación. Este artículo señala la relevancia de discusiones continuas y diferenciadas sobre las jerarquías sistémicas y las desigualdades, además él motiva para el desarrollo de sinergías.

AUTOR

Ilona Westphal M. Ed. ist Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Institut für Sonderpädagogik der Europa-Universität Flensburg in der Abteilung Pädagogik bei Beeinträchtigung der geistigen Entwicklung. Im Rahmen einer Hochschulkooperation mit der University of Education, Winneba verbringt sie seit 2011 etwa fünf Monate jährlich in Ghana.

Kontakt: Ilona Westphal M. Ed., Europa-Universität Flensburg, Auf dem Campus 1a, 24943 D-Flensburg; Tel.: +49 (0)461/ 805-2483; E-Mail: ilona.westphal@uni-flensburg.de.

Making Development Processes Inclusive of Disability: The Experiences of Rwanda and Malawi in Implementing the SDGs and CRPD

Jorge Manhique

The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are global tools that provide frameworks for the advancement of disability rights. This article examines the experiences of Rwanda and Malawi in implementing both the CRPD and the SDGs. The analysis is supported by qualitative data from semi-structured interviews with leaders of Disabled People's Organisation's (DPO's), and fieldwork documentation and reports drawn from projects implemented by DPOs, which are currently or were previously funded by Disability Rights Fund or Disability Rights Advocacy Fund.

Introduction

In developing countries, the eradication of poverty and to improve the living conditions of their citizens has for a long time been the priority of national governments. However, the battle against poverty is often done at the expense or with disregard of human rights¹. The newly approved 2030 Agenda for Development provides a useful basis to address traditional development problems by applying the human rights principles. The principle of "leaving no one behind" clearly reflects the commitment of perusing inclusive development and the idea of putting people at the centre of development (United Nations, 2015). In the disability rights field, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which entered into force in 2008, also resonates the idea of embracing the human rights approach to development, by making the development process accessible to persons with disabilities, and including them in all decision making processes that affect them from the onset (CRPD, Article

4 and 32). Previous studies have examined the relationship between the CRPD and the SDGs (Brolan, 2016; CBM, 2016). However, scholars are yet to fully understand how the SDGs implementation at country level supports the implementation of the CRPD. Rwanda and Malawi ratified the CRPD in 2008 and 2009 respectively, and both countries are committed to implementing the SDGs. This article examines the experience of Rwanda and Malawi in implementing both the CRPD and the SDGs. Specifically, this article examines whether, and to which extent the implementation of the SDGs in both countries are supporting the implementation of the CRPD.

This article starts with a theoretical framework on inclusive development, which is followed by a general background on SDGs and CRPD. The third section, presents an analysis of the responses gathered from DPOs in Malawi and Rwanda, and finally the conclusion presents the patterns on how the SDGs, in both countries, support the implementation of CRPD articles.

Theoretical Framework - Understanding Disability Inclusive Development

Inclusive Development can be defined as the process of including excluded and marginalised groups in all social, political and economic processes. It means to put people at the centre of the development process, and to set up mechanisms to ensure that those historically and traditionally excluded have the opportunities to participate in public life and influence decisions that affect their lives on an equal basis with others (Handicap International, 2012). Although the term inclusive development includes all excluded and marginalised groups, this article focuses on one of those groups only, persons with disabilities.

This study adopts the definition by the International Disability and Development Consortium (IDDC), which conceive a disability inclusive development as the process of “ensuring that all phases of the development cycle (design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) include a disability dimension and that persons with disabilities are meaningfully participating in development processes and policies” (IDDC, 2005). IDDC considers a rights-based approach to development, understood as the “framework for human development [...] a process firmly grounded in international human rights standards and focused on the promotion and protection of human rights” as an integral part of disability inclusive development” (IDDC, 2005). The above definition fits the purpose of this article because it considers persons with disabilities as agents of change, meaning that they have the rights to influence policies and programs that impact their lives, and to equally benefit from development outcomes. This view is central to international human rights frameworks, notably the CRPD.

The literature on disability and development points to three main guiding principles on disability inclusive development: Participation, non-discrimination and accessibility.

Participation is seen as essential for perusing the rights-based approach to inclusive development. It means to put people at the centre of development and as agents of change and can take two forms. First, as formal participation in the democratic process, which includes the right to vote and to be elected. On the other hand, it means the right to meaningfully participate in decision-making processes, law and policy design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation (Handicap International, 2012). Participation for persons with disabilities encompasses the need to take necessary measures to implement affirmative actions targeting persons with disabilities, and to provide reasonable

accommodation when needed by a specific person with disabilities. Reasonable accommodation is defined under the CRPD as “means necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms” (CRPD, Article 3). Affirmative action can be defined as an “active effort to improve social, economic and political opportunities for members of minority groups” (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2018).

Non-discrimination as a human rights principle is a key feature of inclusive planning. Non-discrimination is directly linked with the concept of equality, which is central to the CRPD. It means to provide chances to everyone and to consider human diversity, e.g. in regard to socio-economic status; disability, gender, race identities, among other categories. The CRPD Committee has expanded the understanding of the concept of equality embedded in the Convention, and termed it as Inclusive Equality. Inclusive equality, according to the Committee “embraces the substantive model of equality² and includes” i) a fair redistributive dimension to address socio-economic disadvantages; ii) a recognition dimension to combat stigma, stereotyping, prejudice and violence and to recognise the dignity of human beings and their intersectionality; iii) a participative dimension to reaffirm the social nature of people as members of social groups and the full recognition of humanity through inclusion in society; and iv) an accommodating dimension to make space for difference as a matter of human dignity” (General Comment Nr. 5, 2018). Non-discrimination in this context aims to ensure that development programs are not discriminating persons based on disability (Handicap International, 2012). Non-discrimination encompasses both direct and indirect discrimination. Direct discrimination refers to a “... situation [where] persons with disabilities are treated less favourably than other persons because of a different personal status in a similar situation” (General Comment Nr. 5, 2018). Indirect discrimination refers to “means that laws, policies or practices appear neutral at face value, but have a disproportionate negative impact on a person with a disability” (General Comment Nr. 5, 2018).

Accessibility: under the CRPD accessibility it is both a right and a principle. As a principle, it means that the implementation of all substantive rights provided in the CRPD must take accessibility into consideration. As a right, State parties have the obligation to take the necessary steps to remove barriers of various nature.

Critically, CRPD Article 9 acknowledges the need to consider and address accessibility measures at the earliest stage in planning, by implementing principles of universal design (Lord, 2010).

To implement disability inclusive development, scholars argue for the adoption of the so-called twin-track approach (CBM, 2012). On the one hand the twin-track approach requires governments to mainstream the disability and human rights perspective in all development programs. On the other hand, it requires States to support specific disability programs aiming to empower persons with disabilities - as a whole or specific impairment group - and enhance their inclusion in society. Both strategies combined will ultimately ensure equal rights and opportunities for all persons with disabilities (CBM, 2012).

Background: The Agenda 2030 and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

The SDGs were adopted in September 2015 and set out 17 goals and a framework for intervention: to end poverty everywhere, reduce inequalities, and achieve climate justice and prosperity for all. The SDGs are the first global agenda to include goals and indicators that explicitly mention persons with disabilities. There are seven explicit references to persons with disabilities in the SDG targets: Goal 4: education (two references), Goal 8: employment (one reference), Goal 10: reducing inequalities (one reference), Goal 11: sustainable and inclusive cities (two references), and Goal 17: means of implementation, data (one reference). Further, there are 11 global indicators explicitly referencing persons with disabilities. These include: the area of poverty eradication and education (two references), employment (two references), reducing inequalities, sustainable and inclusive cities (three references), and peaceful and inclusive societies (two references) (United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda, 2015). The participation of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), and particularly DPOs is paramount to implementing the SDGs nationally and internationally. At the national level, CSOs are called upon to be part of the SDGs implementation from the onset. However, in practice, DPOs are being turned away from national level consultation, “even when wider civil society is invited to participate, meetings and documents are not accessible for many persons with disabilities, thus excluding them from democratic processes” (International Disability Alliance and International Disability and Development Consortium, 2016).

At the global level, in 2013, in the course of the Rio Conference +20, persons with disabilities were recognised as a major group³, and joined already designated groups such as, children, women, indigenous, and youth, among others who were granted the right to participate and contribute to all processes related to the SDGs (SDG Knowledge Platform). In addition, persons with disabilities are represented in the High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development Goals (HLPF), a United Nations central platform for the follow-up and review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs (SDG Knowledge Platform).

The CRPD aims “to promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities, and to promote respect for their inherent dignity” (CRPD, Article 1). Similar to the SDGs, the UNCRPD requires that State Parties involve and closely consult with persons with disabilities and their representative organisations about all matters that impact their lives (CRPD, Article 4). The UNCRPD “recognises the link between disability and poverty, and articulates the substantive rights to provide opportunities that enable persons with disabilities to exercise their rights on an equal basis with others” (Manhique/Giannoumis, 2017). Further, CRPD Article 32 (a) calls upon state parties to ensure that “international cooperation, including international development programs, is inclusive of and accessible to persons with disabilities” and that international cooperation should promote the realisation of the convention, which include the obligation of closely consult with all persons with disabilities in all matters that affect them. As such, both the CRPD and the SDGs emphasise the active participation of persons with disabilities.

Methodology

This article is supported by qualitative data from questionnaires administered to leaders of disabled people’s Organisations (DPOs) both in Malawi and in Rwanda. A total of 18 organisations responded to the questionnaire (ten from Rwanda and eight from Malawi). The author of this article used the Disability Rights Fund’s (DRF) database to reach participant DPOs and mainstream civil society organisations (CSO) working to advance the rights of persons with disabilities. DRF started operating in Malawi in 2014 and in Rwanda in 2013. Although this article covers significant numbers of DPOs in both countries, it may not be fully representative of all DPOs in country, some of whom are not registered with the Umbrella Organisation. In its

grantmaking, DRF uses as guiding framework the SDGs and CRPD, and encourage applicants to address both or at least one of these international agreements. DPOs that responded to the questionnaire represent the diversity within the disability movement, including marginalised groups such as women with disabilities, organisations of refugees with disabilities, persons with albinism and little people. Umbrella organisations in both countries also responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed online, via email, using Google doc, alongside with an accessible version. A follow up by Skype, phone and WhatsApp was made with selected respondents to clarify and get a better understanding of responses provided. In addition, an extensive desk research was carried out, including analysis of fieldwork documentation and reports drawn from projects implemented by DPOs. These materials were used with the permission of DRF and within the boundaries of confidentiality.

Presentation of Results and Analysis **SDG's and CRPD Implementation in Malawi**

The Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development, is responsible for SDG implementation in Malawi. Action 2015/Malawi is a civil society mechanism for SDG implementation, and its secretariat is based in the Council for Non Governmental Organisations in Malawi (CONGOMA). The civil society task force was formed in February 2006, and has been implementing and monitoring the MDGs since then and played a crucial role in the discussion of the post-2015 framework in Malawi by convening debates around the country among other activities. FEDOMA is active in the platform. However, the participation of grass root DPOs is very limited.

The Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MDGS) III is the national plan which will operationalise the SDGs. The disability movement was consulted during the development of the strategy and written submission by DPOs were made to influence the process. The draft strategy is out, and the following priorities are outlined: Agriculture and Climate Change Management; Education and Skills Development; Energy, Industry and Tourism Development; Transport and ICT Infrastructure; Health and Population. There are also other development areas identified, namely: Financial Services; Vulnerability, Disaster Management and Social Support; Gender, Youth Development, Persons with Disability and Social Welfare; Human Settlement and Physical Planning; Environmental Sustainability; HIV and AIDS Management; and Peace and Security. Disability and/or vulnerable groups are

mentioned in almost all areas. Specific strategies defined under each priority also include disability.

To a great degree, the Government of Malawi is committed to disability rights. This is evident by a number of steps that the Government is taking to domesticate the CRPD. The willingness to review the Disability Act 2012, only after five years of enactment, is an indication of its commitments with disability rights⁴. This is also demonstrated by the presence of high level Government officials at disability-related events and forums. For instance, in 2016 on the International Day of Persons with Disabilities the Malawi President, Prof. Peter Mutarika, led the ceremonies (Malawi Voice, December 3rd 2016). But despite this political commitment, implementation of the existing laws and policies is weak because of inadequate budget, among other obstacles (US State Department, 2016).

The Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare is the Government entity in charge of disability affairs in Malawi through its Department of Disability. The Malawi Human Rights Commission (MHRC), established under the Constitution, is tasked to promote and protect human rights and investigate human rights violations. The MHRC is accredited under the Paris Principles, and has received an "A" status. But despite the independent leadership afforded to the MHRC, chronic resource shortages have limited the Commission's ability to adequately respond in a timely manner to human rights violations in the country. MHRC's competences on disability rights and its ability to monitor the implementation are generally weak, which is due, in part, to limited material and financial resources (US State Department, 2015).

The Government of Malawi submitted in May 2017 its initial State report on the implementation of the CRPD to the CRPD Committee. This will speed up the finalisation of the CRPD Alternative Report, which is currently being developed by a coalition lead by FEDOMA. Eight out of ten DPOs responded to the questionnaire in Malawi. From those, seven mentioned that they are implementing both the CRPD and SDGs. DPOs are working on different sets of SDGs, which include Goal 3 (Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages), Goal 4 (Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all), Goal 10 (Reduce inequality within and among countries), Goal 16 (Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels). The findings suggest that DPOs in Malawi are engaged in both SDGs and CRPD implementation. DPOs often use

The SDGs are the first global agenda to include goals and indicators that explicitly mention persons with disabilities.

the CRPD as a guiding document to inform development programs. A DPO leader has expressed the need to use the SDG to support CRPD implementation in the following way:

“Many service providers and government departments have embraced the SDGs though, their knowledge on individual goals is very limited. To influence change we need to partner with them (duty bearers) so that we could ensure their programs are inclusive and are advancing the implementation of the CRPD”

The analysis of the results further suggests that the SDGs contributed for DPOs to be more focused in their approach to CRPD implementation. Typically, DPOs adopted a relatively broad approach to implement the CRPD. For instance, DPOs typically engage in advocacy for “increased accessibility for persons with disabilities”. With the SDGs, DPOs start to be more specific on their approach. For instance, the Association of Persons with Physical Disabilities (APDM) is advocating for accessible Water and Sanitation (WASH) by combining CRPD article 9 (accessibility) and SDG 6 (Water and Sanitation).

The majority of DPOs which responded to the questionnaire, are engaged in awareness raising and advocacy (seven DPOs), but there is also service provision (one DPO). Further, while member organisations are focused on advancing specific SDGs goals and CRPD rights, FEDOMA adopts a broader approach, focusing on general SDGs and CRPD monitoring, as well as advocating for improving data collection on disability. The below description is an example of the work FEDOMA

is engaged in:

“... FEDOMA was engaged in several technical working committee meetings with the National Statistics office primarily focusing on the 2018 population and housing census disability related data. These meetings have yielded a positive outcome in terms of capturing disability data primarily focusing on Washington group methodology in the fourth coming Population and Housing Census in 2018. This is important because it will assist the country in coming up with reliable statistics on the prevalence of disability in the country. The past census done in 2008 had only captured limited disability data. As the result of FEDOMAs advocacy, more than eight types of disabilities will be captured in the 2018 census.”

Finally, the DPO’s engagement on SDGs implementation in Malawi enable them to build bridges with mainstream civil society organisations (CSO). While there is evidence of partnership between DPOs and mainstream civil society organisations before the adoption of the SDGs, it is also true that SDGs further increased the opportunities, - and actually resulted in concrete collaboration between the disability movement and mainstream CSOs. Examples of those partnerships include Centre for Girls Interaction (CEGI), a youth organisation who worked with youth with disabilities to ensure that they are part of SDGs implementation in the country.

SDG and CRPD Implementation in Rwanda

The government of Rwanda has committed to implementing the SDGs and has already outlined the country’s SDG priorities: “the total elimination of stunting of children under five, reduction of poverty, and ensuring more women are weaned off farming jobs” (The New Times, 2016). The government designated the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN) as the focal point for the SDG’s implementation. The Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS - II) which covers the period 2013 to 2018 is in its final phase, and consultations for the next comprehensive development strategy (the EDPRS III) have already begun. The EDPRS III, the Sector Strategic Plans and District Development Plans will operationalise the SDGs at national and local level respectively (Bizoza, 2016).

In collaboration with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the Ministry of Economic and Finance commissioned a gap analysis to identify the extent to which the SDGs are included in national development program. Consultations towards integrating the recommendations into various sector plans

are ongoing, and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning is leading the process (Institute of Policy Analysis and Research, 2017).

Rwanda is home to the Sustainable Development Goals Centre for Africa (SDGCA), officially established on April 1st, 2016. The purpose of the SDGCA is to provide “technical support, neutral advice and expertise to national governments, the private sector, civil society, and academic institutions across Africa to accelerate the implementation of the SDG agenda” (SDGs Centre for Africa).

The Rwanda Civil Society Platform (RCSP) is the civil society coalition monitoring the implementation of the SDGs. While the umbrella organisation National Union of Disability Organisation of Rwanda (NUDOR) is part of this coalition, the disability movement has been on the margins of SDG planning and implementation processes. However, NUDOR, in collaboration with the Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR), developed a specific study to assess the gaps in the local development programs as it relates to inclusion of disability, and proposes recommendations for disability inclusion using the SDGs and CRPD. This represents a significant step, as the result of the study provides a useful basis for inclusion of disability in the EDPRS III and local development plans.

Historically, the disability movement in Rwanda has been service-oriented with little focus and capacity on rights advocacy. This is due not only to traditional paradigms about disability, but also to the political climate in Rwanda, which is hostile to advocacy groups and criticism of government policies (Human Rights Watch, 2016). The domestication of the CRPD in Rwanda remains a top priority for the disability movement. Currently there are two key pieces of legislation on disability: Law relating to Protection of Disabled Former War Combatants, and Law relating to Protection of Disabled Persons in general. The law on ex-combatants gives special benefits to disabled former war combatants. For instance, they are entitled to housing provided by the State (Law N°02/2007, Article 16), priority in job opportunities (Law N°02/2007, Article 14) and an allowance provided by the State (Law N°02/2007, Article 17), among others. The law related to the protection of disabled persons in general does not afford the same benefits to persons with disabilities who are not former war combatants. Further, both pieces of legislations are strongly anchored on the medical model of disability.

The Government of Rwanda submitted its initial State Report on the implementation of the CRPD in April 2015 (Convention on the Rights of Persons with

Disabilities, Initial State Report, Rwanda, 2015). The disability movement is engaged in the development of an alternative report to the CRPD Committee, within which the need to enact a new disability law aligned with the CRPD, is outlined (Civil Society Alternative Report on the Implementation of UNCRPD, Rwanda).

Ten DPOs responded to the questionnaire in Rwanda. Nine of the organisations that responded to the questionnaire, mentioned that they engaged in advocacy, followed by awareness raising and lastly service provision. This represents a shift in DPO's focus. Traditionally Rwandan DPOs are oriented towards service provision and given the political climate and constraints associated to it, it has been difficult to engage in advocacy-oriented initiatives in the country. This shift is due, in part, to donors demand and an increase in advocacy capacity of DPOs. For instance, the Disability Rights Fund, since it started operations in Rwanda, has been investing heavily in developing advocacy capacity of DPO's. The results of the responses provided by leaders of the disability movement in Rwanda in our study suggest that DPOs working on SDGs goals are using the CRPD as a guiding document. From ten DPOs who responded to the questionnaire, nine of those organisation mentioned that their work targets both the SDGs and CRPD articles.

“Initiative of Refugees with Disabilities has been advocating and raising awareness for Inclusive education in line with SDG 4 that ensures (inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all). In doing so, IRD refer to the guidance provided in CRPD article 24 concerning (right to education), article 9 (accessibility)”.

DPOs are targeting diverse sets of goals, including: goal 1 (end poverty in all its forms everywhere), goal 3 (Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages); goal 4 (ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunity for all); goal 5 (Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls); goal 6 (Water and Sanitation); goal 8 (decent work and economic growth); and 16 (Peace and justice). On the other hand, the umbrella organisation, the National Union of Disability Organisation, is engaged in general advocacy for inclusion of disability into national development plans. DPOs are involved in local development plans, while the umbrella organisation is working at the national level.

DPOs in Rwanda reported to have diversified and expanded the government actors they use to engage with, as a result of their work on SDG's implementation. DPOs including the national umbrella

organisation National Union of Disability Organisation in Rwanda (NUDOR), are now engaging with the Ministry of Finance, (MINECOFIN), the National Statistic Office, including work with the national platform on social protection. Similar to the situation in Malawi, the work on SDGs implementation enables DPOs to build bridges with other rights groups, with which they traditionally have not worked together. Examples include partnerships between the organisation of women with Disabilities in Rwanda (UNABU), and Haguruka, a local women's Organisation that provides legal aid, and assistance to victims of exploitation and violence against women; and NUDOR's partnership with Collectif des Ligues et Associations de Défense des Droits de l'Homme au Rwanda (CLADHO) to engage on budgetary advocacy.

However, despite this openness to participation, these organisations and their forums remain inaccessible to persons with disabilities, as there is a lack of consideration of accessibility, including provision of reasonable accommodation. For instance, Rwanda National Union of Deaf Women's reported that:

"Despite several engagement with the National Platform on Social protection RNADW is still ignored due to misconception and stigma about disability. When we (RNADW) are invited, they usually do not provide sign language interpreter, making it difficult for us to meaningfully participate and raise our concerns".

This corroborates the findings of the study conducted by IDA and IDDC (mentioned above) which have revealed that the inaccessibility of those forums amount to barriers to participation of persons with disabilities. As in Malawi, DPOs in Rwanda focus their work on specific SDG goals and CRPD rights, while NUDOR, the umbrella organisation, adopts a more general approach, focusing on SDGs and CRPD monitoring.

Conclusion

In general, the SDGs opened up new opportunities for DPOs to participate in national development programs and to advance rights provided in the CRPD in three ways. First, mechanism of participation for DPOs expanded and diversified to include new stakeholders, including Governments, the United Nations and donors mechanisms and forums. Secondly, the DPO's work on SDGs enabled them to build bridges and engage with other rights groups and research institutions. Thirdly, DPO's work on SDGs enabled them to focus their approach more on specific rights and issues as opposed to a traditional broad approach on CRPD implementation. Despite these new channels, most of

the mechanisms of participation are still inaccessible for persons with disabilities, because of a lack of consideration to accessibility issues and of reasonable accommodation, essential elements to ensure true participation.

The results also suggest that umbrella organisations in both countries - given their capacity and reach - adopt a broad approach in relation to CRPD and SDGs monitoring and implementation, while DPOs are focused on advocating for specific rights and goals. Finally, the result also suggests that DPO's in Rwanda are increasingly moving from service-oriented activities to advocacy focus activities, despite structural constrain of adopting such approach. ○

NOTES

- 1 For instance, in contrast with its human rights record, Rwandan economy has performed well. Over the past years, the economy has been growing at 8% per year. World Bank, <http://data.worldbank.org/country/rwanda>.
- 2 For more information see <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/equal-opportunity/>. Visited on: 17.3.2018.
- 3 Major groups is the term used to designate 10 sectors of society recognised "as the main channels through which broad participation would be facilitated in UN activities related to sustainable development". Currently it includes, the following groups: Women, Children and Youth, Indigenous Peoples, Non-Governmental.
- 4 The current disability act was enacted in 2012. The 2012 disability act is in many ways considered progressive, as it adopts language of the CRPD, including the definition of disability and reasonable accommodation, among others.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Sarah Hofmayer for providing comments and editing previous versions of this article.

REFERENCES

- BIZOZA, A. (2016):SDGs series #1. Where Rwanda needs to focus on in the new course of Sustainable Development Goals by 2030? Available at: <http://www.chronicpovertynetwork.org/blog/2016/3/3/sdgs-series-1-where-rwanda-needs-to-focus-on-in-the-new-course-of-sustainable-development-goals-by-2030>. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- BROLAN, E. C. (2016): A Word of Caution: Human Rights, Disability, and Implementation of the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals.
- CBM (2012): Human Rights based Approach to Disability in Development. Available at: https://www.cbm.org/article/downloads/54741/A_human_rights-based_approach_to_disability_in_development.pdf. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (2012): Disability and Development.

- Available at: http://www.hiproweb.org/fileadmin/cdroms/Handicap_Developpement/www/en_page61.html. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH (2016): Rwanda Human Rights Report, Available at: <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2017/country-chapters/rwanda>. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- INTERNATIONAL DISABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM (IDDC) (2005): Inclusive Development and the Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities.
- INTERNATIONAL DISABILITY ALLIANCE (IDA)/INTERNATIONAL DISABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSORTIUM (IDDC) (2016). High Level Political Forum Report and participation of persons with disabilities.
- INSTITUTE OF POLICY ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH (Unpublished, 2017), Report on the Gap analysis of the level of inclusion of disability issues (as stated in the SDGs and CRPD) into national development programs.
- LORD, J. (2010): Accessibility and human rights fusion in the CRPD: Assessing the Scope and Content of the Accessibility Principle and Duty under the CRPD, Presentation for the General Day of Discussion on Accessibility CRPD Committee, UN - Geneva, October 7, 2010.
- Law N°02/2007 of 20/01/2007 Relating to Protection of Disabled Former war Combatants. Available at: www.ncpd.gov.rw/index.php?id=105. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- Law, N° 01/2007 OF 20/01/2007 Relating to Protection of Disabled Person in General. Available at: www.ncpd.gov.rw/index.php?id=105. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- MANHIQUE, J./GIANNOUMIS, G. A. (2017). Experiences of Disabled People in Using Information and Communication Technology in Mozambique. In: TSITSI, C. (Ed): The Routledge Handbook of Disability in Southern Africa. London: Routledge (forthcoming, Dec. 2017).
- MALAWI VOICE (2016): APM Statement At the Commemoration of the International Day for Persons with Disabilities, (3rd December, 2016). Available at: <http://www.malawivoice.com/apm-statement-at-the-commemoration-of-the-international-day-for-persons-with-disabilities/>. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- UNITED NATIONS (2018): Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities "General comment No. 6 (adopted on 9 March 2018). CRPD/C/GC/6.
- UNITED NATIONS (2015): Sustainable Development Agenda. Available at: <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda/>. Visited on 24.04.2018.
- UNITED NATIONS (2008): Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (adopted 13 December 2006, entered into force 3 May 2008) 2515 UNTS 3 (CRPD).
- UNITED NATIONS (2015): Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, First Initial State Report on Rwanda (October, 2015). CRPD/C/RWA/1.
- ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA (2018): Minority. Available at: [https://](https://www.britannica.com/topic/minority)

www.britannica.com/topic/minority. Visited on 05.03.2018.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Die Konvention über die Rechte von Menschen mit Behinderungen (BRK) und die Ziele der nachhaltigen Entwicklung (SDGs) sind globale Instrumente, die einen Rahmen zur Förderung der Rechte von Menschen mit Behinderungen bilden. Dieser Artikel analysiert die Erfahrungen in Ruanda und Malawi bei der Einführung sowohl der BRK als auch der SDGs. Die Untersuchung wird von qualitativen Daten aus halbstrukturierten Interviews mit Leitern von Behindertenverbänden und Dokumentationen aus der Feldforschung sowie von Projektberichten von Behindertenverbänden gestützt, die derzeit oder ehemals durch den Disability Rights Fund oder den Disability Rights Advocacy Fund gefördert wurden.

RÉSUMÉ

La Convention Relative aux Droits des Personnes Handicapées (CRDPH) et les Objectives du Développement Durable (ODD) créent un cadre général pour l'avancement des droits des personnes handicapées. L'article examine les expériences de Rwanda et Malawi en regard de la mise en œuvre de la CRDPH et des ODDs. L'analyse est complétée par des données qualitatives sur la base des interviews avec des leaders des Organisations des Personnes Handicapées (OPHs) et la documentation sur place et des rapports sur la base des projet qui sont mis en œuvre par les OPHs, qui sont actuellement financés par le Disability Rights Fund ou Disability Rights Advocacy Fund.

RESUMEN

La Convención sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad (CDPD) y los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible (ODS) son herramientas globales que brindan marcos para el avance de los derechos de las personas con discapacidad. Este artículo examina las experiencias de Ruanda y Malawi en la implementación tanto de la CDPD como de los ODS. El análisis está respaldado por datos cualitativos de entrevistas semiestructuradas con líderes de Organizaciones de Personas con Discapacidad (OPD) y documentaciones e informes de trabajo de campo, extraídos de proyectos implementados por OPD, que actualmente o anteriormente fueron financiados por diferentes fondos para los derechos de personas con discapacidad.

AUTHOR

Jorge Manhique - Is currently working as Program Officer for Africa (Malawi and Rwanda) at Disability Rights Fund and Disability Rights Advocacy Fund. Jorge has Master of Laws (LLM) degree in International and Comparative Disability Law and Policy from the National University of Ireland - Galway.
Contact: jorgemanhique@yahoo.com.br

CRPD Committee General Comment on Equality and Non-Discrimination

On 9. March 2018 the CRPD Committee adopted its 6th General Comments dealing with Art. 5 CRPD (Equality and Non-Discrimination) which prohibits discrimination against persons with disabilities. The General Comments published by the CRPD Committee are very useful instruments trying to interpret the CRPD and containing many practical and legal hints how to implement the human rights at national level. The General Comment on Art. 5 CRPD is of utmost importance as persons with intellectual disabilities and their families belong to the most vulnerable people in many countries. Many of them experience discrimination, neglect, disadvantage and segregation in daily life.

Information: <http://inclusion-international.org/crpd-committee-general-comment-equality-non-discrimination/>; <http://inclusion-international.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/General-Comment-002.docx>.

World Urban Forum 2018

From February 7th until the 13th, representatives of civil society, government (national, sub-national, and regional), private sector and academia from around the world met in Kuala Lumpur for the ninth session of the World Urban Forum (WUF9). The WUF9 mobilised these stakeholders in urban development to discuss their best practices, inputs on monitoring and evaluation, and facilitate strategic partnerships for the effective implementation of the New Urban

Agenda. Several events addressed the importance of inclusion and accessibility in urban development, technology, the arts and strategic partnerships towards the effective implementation and realisation of the New Urban Agenda and the 2030 Agenda. The outcome Declaration of the Forum explicitly includes the principles of accessibility and universal design as a core aspect of action plans for implementation of the New Urban Agenda.

Information: <http://wuf9.org/theme/>; <http://globalaccessibilitynews.com/2018/03/07/world-urban-forum-9-kuala-lumpur/>; <http://wuf9.org/kuala-lumpur-declaration/>.

Mainstreaming Disability in the Implementation of the Agenda 2030

The 56th session of the Commission for Social Development (CSocD56) held a High-level Panel Discussion on Towards Inclusive, Resilient and Sustainable Development: an Evidence-Based Approach to the Mainstreaming of Disability in the Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Agenda 2030 under sub-item 3(b) during its 56th session. Persons with disabilities still face multiple barriers to equal participation in the society and there is an urgent need to remove those barriers. Successful disability-inclusive development requires better and disaggregated data on disability. Yet, the lack of adequate data remains a major challenge. There is a need of validated methodologies to collect consistent and comparable data on disability. Establishing a forum on sustainable development of

persons with disabilities in CSocD could play a key role in enhancing international exchange and cooperation. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) constitute an unprecedented global agreement to build a future that is sustainable and inclusive for all. The inclusive nature of the 2030 Agenda provides a unique opportunity to develop policies that benefit persons with disabilities. Participants noted that poverty and inequality experienced by persons with disabilities are often due to barriers such as lack of accessibility of physical and virtual environments, discrimination, stigma and negative attitudes towards persons with disabilities. Women and girls with disabilities continue to face multiple discrimination which limits their participation in the society. To overcome these challenges, many countries integrated disability into national planning, strategies, and programmes to promote equal participation of persons with disabilities in the society particularly in the areas of education, health, and employment. A panelist emphasised the importance of including persons with disabilities in humanitarian situations as they are likely to become invisible in places such as refugee camps and detention settings. Across many cultures, there are many reasons individuals who do not volunteer to share about their disabilities, particularly women and children, who are vulnerable to violence. To include persons with disabilities in humanitarian situations, it is important to consider impairment or health condition as well as the

environmental barriers that create disability, such as the location of persons with disabilities relative to services that are available. In planning disaster risk reduction, it is crucial to understand where persons with disabilities live. The International Classification of Functioning Disability and Health (ICF) seeks to capture these elements. Many States shared their initiatives on disability-inclusive development. Inter-ministerial mechanisms on disability were established in Argentina and Guatemala. Indonesia adopted a law to ensure the rights of persons with disabilities, and established a national commission for promoting the participation of persons with disabilities in the society. National development plan of Indonesia includes improving accessibility; participation in political, social, and cultural aspects; promoting inclusive development in guideline in the national budget and planning; enhancing accessibility in public infrastructure and information; enable environment for private sector and enterprises to come up with initiatives for inclusion of persons with disabilities; equal access to education, healthcare services, and employment. Kenya, through its National Council of Disability set up a programme to support persons with disabilities including exemption of tax to maximise their income. Romania provides support to persons with disabilities and their family in accessing to healthcare services. Costa Rica promoted access to information and communication technology (ICT) and to health and rehabilitation services. Sudan considers prevention of disabilities is crucial and is building capacity of the Ministry of Health to set up a preventive initiative and to discover disability at the early stage. European Union enacted the

European Accessibility Act which aims to improve the functioning of the internal market for accessible products and services by removing barriers created by divergent legislation. The Sustainable Development Goals require States to collect data disaggregated by disability in order to monitor and evaluate the implementation. Similarly, Article 31 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) also calls for statistics and data collection on disability. Many participants addressed the lack of data and statistics on disability and echoed the importance of validated methodologies to collect consistent and comparable data. The United Nations Statistical Division (UNSD) clarified that the tools of both the Washington Group as well as those of WHO serve different but complementary roles in terms of data collected. Use of one or the other would be determined based on national needs for data. For example, while the Short Set of the Washington Group is widely acknowledged as an appropriate tool for data disaggregation by disability status, a brief version of the WHO Model Disability Survey can be used for the same purpose as well. There is diversity in national situations with countries being at different levels of statistical development and that this diversity needs to be taken into account in planning for national statistical capacity building. A number of States shared information about their efforts to advance disability-inclusive development through evidence-based approach. For example, in China, a series of survey was conducted to obtain more information on persons with disabilities and their specific needs, and currently building a big data system on the basis of the survey. Namibia has a Disability Council that coordinates on

disability and has statistics that pertains to persons with disability and how they benefit from the basic services. Costa Rica, Guatemala, Kenya, and Mexico conducted national surveys on the prevalence of persons with disabilities in their countries. Sudan set up a council for persons with disabilities chaired by the Prime Minister. South Africa currently pilots an equality index to identify disparity between persons with disabilities and persons without disability in employment, education, and political representations.

A panelist suggested the following for effective statistical monitoring for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda: (i) creating an assessment index system for sustainable development of persons with disabilities; (ii) establish a forum on sustainable development of persons with disabilities in CSocD to enhance international exchange and cooperation; and (iii) set up a World Disability Organisation for the voices of persons with disabilities to be heard. Some delegations emphasised the need to strengthening national capacity in data collection on disability. Sudan suggested setting up a specialised agency for persons with disabilities within the United Nations. Cuba called for more enhanced international cooperation for mobilisation of resources for persons with disabilities. The importance of including older persons and addressing inter-linkage between disability and ageing were also highlighted.

Information: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/news/dspd/disability-agenda2030.html>.

Access to Education for Children with Disabilities in Lebanon

Human Rights Watch has launched a new report and video on barriers to education for children with disabilities in Lebanon. The report talks about thousands of children with disabilities who are systematically excluded from the education system in Lebanon. Schools routinely deny admission to children with disabilities, discriminating against them and violating Lebanese and international law. For those who manage to enroll, most schools do not take reasonable steps to provide them with a quality education. Instead, several thousand children with disabilities attend institutions, which are not mandated to provide an education, so these children receive little if any education at all. Human Rights Watch are calling on the donors and the government to ensure that these investments reach all children, including children with disabilities. They are calling on the Lebanon government to strengthen teacher training, revise the curriculum, raise awareness about the right to education, improve data collection and move away from a segregated system of schools and institutions to an inclusive approach.

Information: <https://www.hrw.org/node/315703>; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gInqpOBqk-8&feature=youtu.be>

Landminenmonitor 2017: Erneut Anstieg der Opferzahlen

Der am 14.12.2017 von der ICBL in Genf vorgestellte Landminenmonitor 2017 zeigt im dritten Jahr in Folge einen dramatischen Anstieg der Opferzahlen durch Minen und explosive Kriegsreste. Mindestens 8.605 Menschen wurden durch diese Waffen im Jahr 2016 getötet oder

verletzt. 2013 waren es noch 3.450 Menschen. Der massive Anstieg seither ist vor allem auf die hohen Opferzahlen in den Konfliktgebieten in Afghanistan, dem Jemen, Libyen und der Ukraine zurückzuführen. Handicap International ruft die Staaten auf, das internationale humanitäre Recht durchzusetzen und Druck auf alle Konfliktparteien auszuüben, um dem Einsatz dieser barbarischen Waffen ein Ende zu setzen. Dies geschieht im Vorfeld des Treffens der Vertragsstaaten des Ottawa-Vertrags zum Verbot von Anti-Personen-Minen, das vom 18. bis zum 21. Dezember in Wien stattfand. Der Landminenmonitor 2017 analysiert die Umsetzung des Ottawa-Vertrags anhand von Daten, die bis Ende 2016 erhoben wurden (und in einzelnen Fällen bis heute). Dieser Vertrag verbietet Einsatz, Produktion, Transfer und Lagerung von Anti-Personen-Minen und fordert die Unterstützung betroffener Länder durch Räumung und Opferhilfe. Seit der Vertrag vor 20 Jahren geschlossen wurde, ging die Zahl der Opfer zurück – bis 2013. Für das Jahr 2017 verzeichnet der Monitor die höchste Anzahl an Opfern seit seiner ersten Veröffentlichung im Jahr 2000. Damals wurden für das Jahr 1999 9.228 Tote und Verletzte dokumentiert. Die meisten Unfälle ereigneten sich 2016 in Afghanistan, dem Jemen, Libyen, Syrien und der Ukraine. Mit 78 Prozent stammte die große Mehrheit der von Anti-Personen-Minen getöteten und verletzten Menschen aus der Zivilbevölkerung. Besonders erschreckend: 42 Prozent der zivilen Opfer waren Kinder. Noch nie forderten improvisierte Minen (von den Kampfparteien hergestellte Sprengsätze, die wie Anti-Personen-Minen funktionieren) so viele Opfer: 1.805 Menschen, darunter allein 1.180 in Afghanistan. Der Ottawa-Vertrag verbietet den

Einsatz von sogenannten „opferaktivierten“ Minen und gilt deshalb auch für „improvisierte Minen“, die genau wie Anti-Personen-Minen wirken. Der Landminenmonitor bestätigt neue Einsätze von Anti-Personen-Minen durch die Regierungstruppen Myanmars und Syriens zwischen Oktober 2016 und Oktober 2017. Ansonsten setzten nur noch nicht-staatliche Gruppen Anti-Personen-Minen ein, darunter auch improvisierte Varianten, in mindestens neun Ländern: Afghanistan, Indien, Irak, Jemen, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Syrien und Ukraine. Insgesamt 61 Staaten und Gebiete sind weltweit von Minen betroffen, davon sind 33 Mitgliedsstaaten des Ottawa-Vertrags. Sie sind verpflichtet, die bekannten Kontaminationen innerhalb von zehn Jahren zu räumen. Nur vier dieser Länder scheinen ihre Fristen einhalten zu können: Chile, die Demokratische Republik Kongo, Mauretanien und Peru. Im Jahr 2016 erhöhten 20 Geberländer ihre Unterstützung für Minenaktionen, also Aktivitäten wie Minenräumung und Opferhilfe, die die Folgen von Minen reduzieren. Zusammen mit nationalen Programmen betroffener Staaten in Höhe von rund 85 Millionen US Dollar wurden weltweit etwa 564,5 Millionen US Dollar für Minenaktionen ausgegeben. Dies entspricht einem Anstieg von ca. 40 Millionen im Vergleich zum Jahr 2015. Deutschland gehört neben den USA, der EU, Japan und Norwegen zu den größten Geldgebern für Minenaktion. Alleine die EU und Deutschland trugen 64 Prozent zum Anstieg der weltweiten Unterstützung für Minenaktion bei.

Information: <https://handicap-international.de/de/neuigkeiten/landminenmonitor-2017-erneut-anstieg-der-opferzahlen>; <http://themonitor.org/en-gb/reports/2017/landmine-monitor-2017.aspx>.

Mehr Unterstützung für Menschen mit Verletzungen und Behinderungen in Syrien

Die Weltgesundheitsorganisation (WHO) und Handicap International (HI) machen auf die Bedürfnisse der geschätzten drei Millionen Menschen aufmerksam, die in Syrien mit Verletzungen und Behinderungen leben. Sie fordern die internationale Gemeinschaft dazu auf, ihre Unterstützung für Reha-Maßnahmen und die Wiedereingliederung dieser Menschen in die Gesellschaft zu erhöhen. Jeden Monat werden Schätzungen zufolge 30.000 Menschen in Syrien verwundet; insgesamt wurden in dem seit über sechs Jahren andauernden Konflikt 1,5 Millionen Menschen verletzt. Weitere 1,5 Millionen Menschen leben mit einer bleibenden Behinderung, einschließlich der 86.000 Menschen, deren Verletzungen zu Amputationen geführt haben. Durch den intensiven Einsatz von explosiven Waffen in bewohnten Gebieten, besteht aufgrund der Kontamination mit Explosivwaffen im ganzen Land ein hohes Unfallrisiko. Immer mehr Menschen benötigen Reha-Versorgungsleistungen, die jedoch immer weniger vorhanden sind. In Syrien sind weniger als die Hälfte aller öffentlichen Krankenhäuser und Gesundheitseinrichtungen noch in Betrieb. Die meisten von ihnen sind zu schlecht ausgestattet, um Menschen mit Verletzungen zu behandeln und Menschen mit Behinderung weiter unterstützen zu können. Nur zwei Reha-Zentren für körperliche Rehabilitation, in Damaskus und Homs, bieten landesweit Prothesen an. Dieser stark eingeschränkte Zugang zur medizinischen Versorgung führt dazu, dass die Verletzungen vieler Menschen zu lebenslangen Beeinträchtigungen führen, die mit zeitnaher und angemessener Behandlung

vermieden werden könnten. Bis zu einem Drittel der Verwundungen haben ohne geeignete Reha-Versorgung langfristige oder lebenslange Behinderungen zur Folge. Die WHO und HI unterhalten eine für vier Jahre angelegte strategische und gut funktionierende Partnerschaft, durch die die Unterstützung für Verwundete oder Menschen mit Behinderung in Syrien ausgeweitet wird. Das Projekt wird den Zugang zu lebensrettenden Reha-Maßnahmen für Menschen mit Verletzungen verbessern und damit das Risiko senken, dass es zu Komplikationen kommt und bleibende Behinderungen entstehen. Weiterhin wird der Zugang zu Reha-Maßnahmen für alle in Syrien verbessert. Außerdem werden die Kapazitäten und die Belastbarkeit des lokalen Gesundheitssystems gestärkt.

Information: <https://handicap-international.de/de/neuigkeiten/who-und-hi-mehr-unterstuetzung-fur-menschen-mit-verletzungen-und-behinderungen-in-syrien>.

Bridging the Disability and Development Gap

Disabled people are losing ground and not sharing in the increased prosperity of many developing countries. Research across Kenya, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zambia has revealed wide gaps in vital opportunities and support. Increased access to healthcare, education, livelihoods and social protection for people with disabilities can be slower than for their non-disabled peers. The study reveals that despite poverty reduction from economic growth, disabled people are being left behind. Key findings from a survey of nearly 5,000 households in four countries included: In Uganda, 84% of all households surveyed with disabled members did not receive social protection benefits;

In Zambia, over 40% of surveyed adults with disabilities reported a lack of transport to access health-care facilities, compared to 13% of non-disabled adults - a higher percentage of survey respondents with disabilities than in any other country; In Kenya, 30% of surveyed disabled children in urban areas did not attend school compared to 5% of surveyed non-disabled children - a growing gap compared to rural areas in the same country, where only 13% of disabled children were not in school, compared to 4% of their non-disabled peers. Importantly, where development has yet to affect broader populations - in Sierra Leone for example - there is an opportunity to ensure that as development efforts increase, adults and children with disabilities are not left behind by designing inclusive policies and programmes from the outset. The Bridging the Gap research explores the extent to which the development and disability gap is widening as socioeconomic development takes place, as well as what can be done to alleviate the problem. As further data emerge from the research, it will help create a fuller picture of how the development and disability gap can be bridged effectively. The countries included in this study have ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and have disability related laws and policies in place, but many barriers to effective implementation of legislation remain. The study's findings highlight the urgent need for full inclusion of people with disabilities in all development efforts and targeted programmes to build their capacity to participate fully and equally in their communities. Better integration of mainstream and targeted programmes is required to ensure full inclusion over

time - if people with disabilities around the world are to genuinely benefit from international development efforts. The findings will support evidence-based advocacy for policymaking and programme development.

Information: <https://www.leonardcheshire.org/support-and-information/latest-news/press-releases/bridging-disability-and-development-gap>;
<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/iehc/research/epidemiology-public-health/research/leonard-cheshire-research>; https://www.leonardcheshire.org/sites/default/files/btg_research_summary_final_digital.pdf.

Über 630.000 Rohingya wurden gewaltsam vertrieben und sind auf Überlebenshilfe angewiesen.

RETTEN SIE LEBEN!

Spenden-Stichwort: **Nothilfe Rohingya**
 Bank für Sozialwirtschaft, IBAN: DE88 6602 0500 0202 0202 02

Bitte helfen Sie den Rohingya!

DZI Spenden-Siegel

www.caritas-international.de

caritas international
 DAS HILFSWERK DER DEUTSCHEN CARITAS

United Nations

The United Nations and Disability: 70 Years of the Work Towards a More Inclusive World

A new publication of the United Nations aims to provide an overview of the work of the United Nations, in particular the Secretariat, for persons with disabilities from the commencement of the organisation in 1945, to the present, highlighting the major meetings, human rights treaties and milestones that the UN has achieved in its promotion for the rights of persons with disabilities. Retracing how the CRPD came to be, it also showcases the UN's work towards a more inclusive world throughout the past 70 years and identifies the challenges and opportunities ahead.

Bezug: https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2018/01/History_Disability-in-the-UN_jan23.18-Clean.pdf; <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/news/dspd/un-and-disability.html>.

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

How Law Protects Persons with Disabilities in Armed Conflict

This paper identifies commonalities between international humanitarian law (IHL) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and emphasises certain specific contributions of IHL to the protection of persons with disabilities in armed conflict. It is hoped that this legal analysis will contribute to current

efforts by the ICRC and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, as well as other actors, to operationalise better inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities in carrying out humanitarian activities in armed conflict.

Bezug: <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/how-law-protects-persons-disabilities-armed-conflict>; https://www.icrc.org/en/download/file/62399/how_law_protects_persons_with_disabilities_in_war.pdf.

Chata Male/Quentin Wodon

Disability Gaps in Educational Attainment and Literacy - The Price of Exclusion: Disability and Education

This note provides an analysis of gaps in educational opportunities for children with disabilities. It also measures the impact at the margin of exclusion related to various types of disabilities on education outcomes for children. Four main outcomes are considered: whether children ever enroll in school, whether they complete their primary education, whether they complete their secondary education, and whether they are literate. The analysis is implemented using the most recent census data available for a total of 19 countries.

Bezug: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/396291511988894028/pdf/121762-replacement-PUBLIC-WorldBank-GapsInEdAttainmentLiteracy-Brief-v6.pdf>; <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/396291511988894028/Disability-gaps-in-educational-attainment-and-literacy>.

Plan International

Let Me Decide and Thrive - Global Discrimination and Exclusion of Girls and Young Women with Disabilities

Girls and young women with disabilities have the right to make decisions over their own bodies and live free from violence and fear. Yet, on a global level, they are the people least likely to enjoy their sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR). Compelled by this reality, Plan International and the Office of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities have joined forces to ensure young women and girls with disabilities can exercise choice and have control over their bodies. The Let Me Decide and Thrive initiative is supported by in-depth, critical field and desk research and aims to empower girls and young women with disabilities, raise awareness of their plight among stakeholders, and work to secure their sexual and reproductive health and rights. This research found that the barriers to SRHR confronted by girls and young women with disabilities are overwhelming: infantilisation and disempowerment; forced sterilisation, abortion, and contraception; disproportionate suffering from all forms of violence; substantial barriers in accessing justice; discriminatory attitudes, norms, and behaviours rendering them invisible; and a lack of accessible and appropriate SRHR information and services.

Bezug: <https://plan-international.org/publications/let-me-decide-thrive-srhr-disability>; <https://plan-international.org/file/22451/download?token=FHNH18B4>.

Alex Ghenis

New Earth Disability Newsletter - December 2017

New Earth Disability (NED) is a project looking at how climate change will affect people with disabilities. NED is now an initiative at the World Institute on Disability, a nonprofit focusing on disability research, education and partnerships.

Bezug: <https://mailchi.mp/wid/new-earth-disability-newsletter-december-2017?e=d32e075b99>.

Davide Olchini

Inclusive and Integrated Mother, Newborn and Child Health Programming: Beyond Mortality

This policy paper describes the operational terms of Handicap International's mandate and values as applied to Mother, Neonatal and Child Health (MNCH). Presenting the approaches and references underpinning Handicap International's actions, choices and commitments, its purpose is to ensure consistency across its practices while taking account of different contexts. Intended as a document to guide programme staff, the paper defines the topic, describes the target populations and sets out the methods of intervention (activities and expected results) and the indicators used to monitor and evaluate. It also aims to ensure that Handicap International programmes implement all projects in accordance with the presented methods of intervention. The SDGs focus on a broader scope of activities and are thus slowly but surely shifting from mortality to address in a more comprehensive manner the well-being and achievement of maximum potential for children and adolescents. With a robust component in sexual and

reproductive health, this represents a significant frame of reference for Handicap International's work in MNCH as it has paved the way for integrating MNCH-related impairments into existing health services. The framework of the SDGs provides a clear vision of the importance of multi-sectorial interventions, which encompass the limit of vertically-organised health systems centred on curative aspects, to offer a more integrated and preventive package of interventions that include chronic conditions, impairments and health for all.

Bezug: http://www.hiproweb.org/uploads/tx_hidrtdocs/InclusiveMNCHProgramming_PP14.pdf.

ILO

Promoting Diversity and Inclusion Through Workplace Adjustments. A Practical Guide

Equality of opportunity and treatment is a fundamental principle of social justice that has been at the core of the ILO's work since it was founded in 1919. Reasonable adjustments, often referred to as accommodations, are an essential component for promoting diversity and inclusion at the workplace and the right to equality in employment, vocational training and education. Reasonable accommodations allow workers and their employers to take advantage of their full professional potential and thereby contribute to business success. This guide aims to assist employers of all sizes and in all economic sectors, to provide reasonable accommodation at all stages of the employment relationship, including in designing and advertising a vacancy, the selection and recruitment phase, as well as during employment and in the context

of return to work.

Bezug: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_536630.pdf.

AfriNEAD

Disability and Inclusion in Africa: The Role of Assistive Technology - Conference Report

Ensuring universal access to essential and affordable assistive technology will be crucial in the attainment of the development agenda for the decades ahead. The report argues that overcoming impairments, eliminating barriers to enable persons with disabilities to actively participate and become productive members of society is one of the many issues government in Africa should be concerned if we are to realise SDGs.

Bezug: <http://afri-can.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/5th-AfriNEAD-Conference-Report.pdf>; <http://afri-can.org/2220-2/>.

Global Clubfoot Initiative

Impact Report 2017

The report highlights the initiatives and goals that have been achieved in 2017. It focuses on the RunFree 2030 global strategy to end preventable disability from clubfoot; the Africa Clubfoot Training materials and the World Health Organisation's Rehabilitation 2030 conference.

Bezug: <http://globalclubfoot.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/GCI-Impact-Report-final-2017.pdf>, <http://globalclubfoot.com/impact-report-2017/>.

*Global Partnership for Education
(GPE)*

Disability and Inclusive Education - A Stocktake of Education Sector Plans and GPE-Funded Grants

This report was commissioned by the Global Partnership for Education's Secretariat to take stock of how disability and inclusive education are included in education sector plans in 51 countries, including GPE-funded programs, such as education sector program implementation grants, program documents, implementation progress reports and education sector analysis, if applicable, and other relevant GPE program documents. This report documents progress and highlights the need to step up to support to GPE partner countries on disability and inclusive education, to improve consideration of issues around disability and inclusion in education sector analysis and sector planning processes to better promote the achievement of GPE 2020 strategic goal 2, and to fulfill the transformative vision of the Agenda 2030. This means ensuring that girls and boys with disabilities are not only able to access their right to a quality education in a nurturing environment, but also, through education, become empowered to participate fully in society, and enjoy full realisation of their rights and capabilities.

Bezug: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/download/file/fid/63832>; <https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/disability-and-inclusive-education-stocktake-education-sector-plans-and-gpe-funded-grants>.

30.05. - 01.06.2018

Inclusion International 17th World Congress: Learn - Inspire - Lead, Birmingham, UK.

Information: <http://inclusion-international.org/worldcongress2018/>.

Kontakt: Inclusion International, KD.2.03, 4 -6 University Way, London E16 2RD,
United Kingdom; Tel: +44 (0)208 223 7709; Fax: +44 (0) 208 223 6081;
E-Mail: info@inclusion-international.org.

12.06. - 14.06.2018

Conference of States Parties -

“Leaving no one behind through the full implementation of the CRPD”

Information: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/conference-of-states-parties-to-the-convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-2/cosp11.html>.

Kontakt: Secretariat for the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (SCRPD),
Division for Social Policy and Development (DSPD), Department of Economic and Social
Affairs (DESA), United Nations Secretariat (29th Floor), 405 E 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017,
United States of America; E-Mail: enable@un.org.

24. 07.2018

UK Global Disability Summit

Information: <http://www.internationaldisabilityalliance.org/summitation>

27.11. -28.11.2018

3rd World Disability & Rehabilitation Conference 2018 (WDRC 2018), Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Information: <https://disabilityconference.co>.

Kontakt: WDRC 2018 Conference Secretariat, #531/18, Kotte road, Pitakotte, Sri Lanka;
Tel: +94 113 132 828; Fax: +94 112 835 571; Hotline: +94 715 589 870;
E-Mail: info@disabilityconference.co.

Schwerpunkthemen kommender Ausgaben der Zeitschrift Focal Topics of Upcoming Issues

2/2018: Migration, Flucht und Behinderung I

[Migration, Flight and Disability I](#)

verantwortlich/[responsible](#): Dr. Thorsten Hinz/Jana Offergeld

3/2018: Migration, Flucht und Behinderung II

[Migration, Flight and Disability II](#)

verantwortlich/[responsible](#): Dr. Thorsten Hinz/Jana Offergeld

1/2019:

Inklusion der Katastrophenvorsorge

[Inclusion in Disaster Preparedness](#)

verantwortlich/[responsible](#): Gabriele Weigt

Interessierte Autorinnen und Autoren mögen sich für nähere Informationen und unseren *Leitfaden für AutorInnen* bitte an die oben genannten Verantwortlichen wenden.

Darüber hinaus sind Vorschläge für weitere Schwerpunkthemen willkommen unter info@inie-inid.org.

[If you are interested in contributing, please contact the respective member of the editorial board mentioned above for more information and our Guidelines for Submissions.](#)

[Moreover, we welcome ideas and suggestions for future focal topics which you can submit to our editorship at info@inie-inid.org.](#)

Redaktionsschluss für zukünftige Ausgaben

[Deadlines for the upcoming issues](#)

	2/2018	3/2018	1/2019
Hauptbeiträge/ Focal articles	15.07.2018	15.09.2018	15.01.2019
Kurzbeiträge/ Other contributions	15.07.2018	15.09.2018	15.01.2019

Liebe Leserinnen und Leser,

bitte informieren Sie uns unter info@inie-inid.org über eine Adressänderung bzw. wenn Sie die Zeitschrift nicht mehr beziehen möchten oder falls Ihnen die Zeitschrift nicht zugestellt worden ist.

[Dear Reader!](#)

[Please notify any changes of address, if you wish to end your subscription or have not received the print edition to info@inie-inid.org.](#)

**Behinderung und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit e.V.
Institut für inklusive Entwicklung**

Altenessener Strasse 394-398
45329 Essen
Germany
Tel.: +49-(0)201/17 89 123
Fax: +49-(0)201/17 89 026
info@inie-inid.org
www.inie-inid.org

Behinderung und internationale Entwicklung

Die Zeitschrift Behinderung und internationale Entwicklung erscheint seit 1990 dreimal jährlich mit Beiträgen sowohl in deutscher als auch englischer Sprache. Ihr Anspruch ist es, ein Medium für einen grenzüberschreitenden Informationsaustausch zur Thematik zu bieten sowie die fachliche Diskussion zu pädagogischen, sozial- und entwicklungspolitischen sowie interkulturellen Fragen im Zusammenhang mit Behinderung in Entwicklungsländern weiterzuentwickeln. Jede Ausgabe ist einem Schwerpunktthema gewidmet, das durch Einzelbeiträge und einen aktuellen Informationsteil ergänzt wird.

Bezugsmöglichkeiten:

KOSTENFREIER VERSAND DER AUSGABE IM PDF-FORMAT per E-Mail für die Aufnahme in den Verteiler: info@inie-inid.org
KOSTENPFLICHTIGER BEZUG DER PRINTAUSGABEN für 18 €/Jahr
3 Ausgaben, innerhalb Deutschlands und 27 € im europäischen Ausland: info@inie-inid.org
DARÜBER HINAUS kostenlos im Internet unter www.zeitschrift.bezev.de

Die Zeitschrift wird unterstützt durch | The journal is supported by:



bezev wird gefördert aus Mitteln des Kirchlichen Entwicklungsdienstes
Brot für die Welt – Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst

Disability and International Development

The journal Disability and International Development is published three times a year since 1990, featuring contributions in both English and German. Its objective is the scholarly and practice-oriented discourse on disability in low-income countries. The journal aims at providing a platform for a cross-border dialogue and promoting the professional discussion of related development policy, pedagogical/educational, socio-political and intercultural questions. Each issue is dedicated to a focal topic, complemented by single contributions on other subjects and up-to-date information.

Subscription:

FREE PDF VERSION via e-mail:

info@inie-inid.org for subscription

PRINT VERSION at a rate of 18 €/year, 3 issues, within Germany

and 27 € to other European countries:

info@inie-inid.org for subscription

IN ADDITION, a free online version is available at

www.zeitschrift.bezev.de