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**Purpose:** This paper provides a brief overview of the purpose of a monitoring framework and how it could be developed.

Feedback from the Disability Data and Evidence Working Group on the issues and process identified in the paper, as well as an indication of how the Working Group would like to be involved will be sought at the meeting on 9 December 2015.

**What is the purpose of a monitoring framework?**

The monitoring framework should help us answer the following questions:

1. Are we achieving what we said we were going to do?
2. Are we doing the right things?

Answering these questions will ensure we are making the right decisions about priorities and resource allocation. Ultimately, a monitoring framework should enable continuous improvement and the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and relevance of what we do.

**What should the monitoring framework actually monitor?**

We would like the monitoring framework to tell us whether we are implementing the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), New Zealand Disability Strategy (NZDS) and the Disability Action Plan (DAP); i.e. are we achieving what we said we were going to do?

The revised NZDS is intended to articulate what gradual realisation of the CRPD looks like in the New Zealand context. While it is important that New Zealand works towards full realisation of the CRPD, this will take time. As such, it will be important that the monitoring framework identifies where we are doing well against the agreed areas of focus/priority (as stated in the NZDS). It should also identify when these may need to change, either because we have achieved an outcome and therefore have renewed capacity to look at new areas, or when emerging issues/trends indicate a need to reassess priorities.

The scope of the monitoring framework in covering all aspects of the CRPD, NZDS and DAP would need to be considered carefully during development. It will be important to ensure it covers the breadth of all three frameworks, without becoming so comprehensive it is not feasible to report against.

**What should the monitoring framework include?**

The monitoring framework needs to be aligned to the long-term (10 year) vision in the NZDS. As such, it should include indicators at three levels:

1. Goal – impact
2. Objectives – outcomes
3. Actions – outputs

There should be an interrelationship between the three levels, i.e. achievement of outputs will contribute towards the outcomes, which in turn contribute towards the impact. This will not be a simple linear process, as multiple outputs will contribute towards achievement of multiple outcomes (and multiple outcomes will contribute towards the impact).

Each indicator needs to specify the method of verification (i.e. where the information will be collected from, for example administrative data from a particular agency), frequency of collection and who is responsible. Consideration will need to be given to collection of both quantitative and qualitative information (i.e. drawing on the lived experience of disabled people and their families), including from non-government sources and through research.

There are several key issues that will need to be worked through carefully in developing the monitoring framework as follows:

* Feasibility
	+ In particular, whether information is actually available. If a robust information source is not available, consideration will need to be given to whether a proxy indicator is suitable and/or whether new information sources need to be developed.
* Attribution versus contribution
	+ Another issue is determining attribution and/or contribution; whether the reason for success can be isolated to particular outputs/outcomes (attribution), or whether there are likely to be other factors influencing success as well (contribution).

There should be alignment between the CRPD, NZDS and DAP and other important frameworks, such as the New Zealand Human Rights National Plan of Action and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, to enable streamlined monitoring across disability issues.

The monitoring framework will need to identify when reporting will occur. This may be different for the three levels, i.e. periodic reporting on impact given the longer time involved with achieving progress as this level. It will also need to identify when the framework will be refreshed (this should be aligned to any refresh of the NZDS insofar as possible). Capacity across all agencies/organisations involved will be a key consideration.

**Who should be involved in developing the monitoring framework?**

It is proposed that the Office for Disability Issues (ODI) facilitate the development of the monitoring framework through a co-design approach. This is consistent with ODI’s role under Article 33 of the CRPD. ODI has an existing mandate to support implementation and reporting on the CRPD, as well as the NZDS and DAP.

The Independent Monitoring Mechanism (IMM) should be a key partner in this process given it also has mandate from the Government regarding Article 33 as well. This mandate is outlined in the New Zealand Gazette Notice 13 October 2011 (refer Appendix 1).

The IMM has indicated an interest in being involved in the development of the monitoring framework and are keen to see a draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the process which includes identification of the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholder groups. This will assist the IMM determine the type of involvement, e.g. working in a co-design approach or providing input at selected points. In addition, the IMM will be working through:

* what indicators and information sources could IMM partners contribute towards the monitoring framework (i.e. from complaints and/or research)?
* How can the IMM maintain an independent voice by:
	+ providing alternative comment on reporting against the monitoring framework produced by government agencies (coordinated by ODI) if there is a different view of progress?
	+ drawing attention to emerging/persistent gaps in implementation of the CRPD that may not be identified in the NZDS
* how to ensure there are streamlined processes for requesting information from government agencies?

The Disability Data and Evidence Working Group (DDEWG) will be the primary mechanism for providing advice and input into the development of the monitoring framework (given its key role in providing advice on the kinds of data and evidence required in New Zealand).

The Disabled People’s Organisations (DPO) Group have also indicated an interest in being involved in a co-design approach in the development of the monitoring framework. This paper will be shared with the DPO Group in February 2016 with discussion to focus on what is the best way of the DPO Group to provide input that recognises the unique role of the group, vis-à-vis their representation on both the IMM and DDEWG. To date they have indicated they want provide streamlined and strategic input.

In summary, it is hoped that a co-design approach for the monitoring could include the IMM, DDEWG and DPO Group. It will also need to include wider stakeholder consultation and engagement to ensure it is relevant and appropriate.

Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in the development of the monitoring framework will be confirmed prior to work commencing (in the ToR). Throughout the design of the monitoring framework, stakeholders will have an opportunity to consider what role, if any, they want to play in the implementation of the monitoring framework (i.e. involvement in the development of it will not predetermine roles in implementation).

**How should the monitoring framework be developed?**

As the monitoring framework will focus on the revised NZDS, the timeframes and processes for developing them need to be aligned. While some work on the monitoring framework may need to be completed after the NZDS is revised, the majority of work should be done alongside.

A rough process outline is:

* January – March 2016 - develop a shared understanding of the purpose of a monitoring framework. In order to work in a co-design approach, and consult effectively with stakeholders, it will be important to ensure we all have a shared understanding of the purpose of a monitoring framework, in particular the language used (e.g. indictor, outcome). This will coincide with work the DDEWG will support regarding building as shared understanding of the CRPD understanding of disability and the World Health Organisation’s International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF).
* April – June 2016 – co-design monitoring framework based on direction of the NZDS
* July – September 2016 – final consultation, finalise monitoring framework for approval.

*Note: timeframes will need to be confirmed to align with those of the revision of the NZDS (which are currently being extended).*

**Appendix 1**

**Role of the Independent Monitoring Mechanism**

Note: this is taken from the New Zealand Gazette13 October 2011 (available from: <http://www.odi.govt.nz/what-we-do/un-convention/framework/new-zealand-gazette-notice-of-13-october-2011.html>).

*Notice of Designation of Independent Monitoring*

Whereas Article 33.2 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (“the Convention”) requires that States Parties shall, in accordance with their legal and administrative systems, maintain, strengthen, designate or establish within the State Party a framework, including one or more independent mechanisms, as appropriate, to promote, protect and monitor implementation of the Convention;

Now therefore I, The Honourable Tariana Turia, Minister for Disability Issues, give notice that the Government of New Zealand has designated an independent mechanism, comprising the following bodies and organisations, to monitor implementation of the Convention in New Zealand and to perform the additional functions stated in this notice:

1. The Human Rights Commission established under the Human Rights Act 1993 within the scope of its functions under section 5 of that Act;
2. the Ombudsmen established under the Ombudsmen Act 1975 within the scope of their functions under section 13 of that Act; and
3. the disabled peoples’ organisations who are at any particular time members of the Convention Coalition operating under a Memorandum of Understanding signed on or about 31 March 2010 by:
	1. Association of Blind Citizens of New Zealand Incorporated;
	2. Deaf Aotearoa New Zealand Incorporated;
	3. Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated;
	4. the committee representing mental health consumers known as Nga Hau E Wha;
	5. Ngati Kapo O Aotearoa Incorporated; and
	6. People First New Zealand Incorporated.

The additional functions of the independent mechanism are:

1. developing indicators in consultation with public and private sector agencies;
2. identifying priority areas drawing on their existing programmes of work;
3. measuring progress by analysing legislation, policy, and practice affecting disabled people; and
4. engaging with the government to establish a comprehensive reporting process in relation to the Convention that includes engagement with civil society, integration across public agencies, and clear accountability for publicising reports and following up recommendations.

Dated at Wellington this 4th day of October 2011.

HON TARIANA TURIA, Minister for Disability Issues.