

**INTERNATIONAL STUDY  
ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF  
THE UN CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS  
OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

# **ZERO PROJECT REPORT 2012**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- State of the implementation of the UN Convention in 36 countries and in nine Austrian federal provinces - based on 21 social indicators
- 27 Good Practice Examples from 15 countries - nominated, selected and reviewed by an international network of disability experts
- Eight Good Policy Examples from seven countries - nominated by disability policy experts from all around the world, researched by the World Future Council and selected by an international Scientific Advisory Board

**Authors:**

Michael Fembek, Tom Butcher, Ingrid Heindorf  
and Caroline Wallner-Mikl

In cooperation with more than 100 activists from the disability rights movement, academics and experts from NGOs, foundations and international organizations, as well as persons with disabilities.

# Executive Summary

For many years, the Essl family, owners of the bauMax Group, have been involved in social activities both as a business, as well as privately. In 2007, Martin and Gerda Essl established the Essl Foundation which has two goals: promoting social innovation, and helping persons with disadvantages, especially disabilities. Since 2008, the Essl Social Prize, endowed with annual prize money of EUR 1 million, has been awarded each year to outstanding social entrepreneurs, to develop and implement an innovative project, as a role model that can be scaled up and copied in order to create a maximum of social impact.

## The Zero Project

The Zero Project ([www.zeroproject.org](http://www.zeroproject.org)) is the Essl Foundation's project which advocates, with a new and innovative approach, the rights of persons with disabilities internationally. **The mission is: working for a world with zero barriers.**

The Zero Project is based on the "Essl Social Index Pilot Study" which was published in 2010. The results of, and the experiences gained developing, the pilot study have led to expansion into other fields. The Zero Project creates platforms for sharing and developing models that clearly improve the daily lives, and legal rights, of persons with disabilities. The Zero Project-Report is the written summary of the project's research and findings. It will, in future, be published on a regular basis.

## Zero Project: Social Indicators, Good Practice and Good Policy

At this time the Zero Project has identified three areas of work that clearly help to improve the daily lives and the legal rights of persons with disabilities.

**1. Zero Project Social Indicators** that compare and measure the implementation of the CRPD (in addition to the excellent work done by ANED, by national Focal Points and shadow reports). The Zero Project Social Indicators will contribute material for discussion, supporting those who work to implement the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD) nationally, or even regionally. For this report, 21 indicators have been reviewed based on a questionnaire

that was sent to NGOs and experts in 36 countries, two states in the USA and nine Austria federal provinces. The questionnaire was completed by around 50 experts from NGOs, foundations and from academic fields.

**2. Zero Project Good Practice:** Good Practice Examples were a kind of by-product of the pilot study in 2010. It turned out that those included in the study were highly thought of, since they provided proven solutions to a number of the problems that were identified by the social indicators. In other words: moving from the "what to..." to the "how to..." At the core of the Zero Project is a platform for Good Practice that will be continuously developed and expanded. For this report an initial 27 Good Practices have been included, having been nominated by an expert committee and selected carefully in a two-step process.

**3. Zero Project Good Policy.** For the first time in this report eight Good Policy Examples have been included. Of either a regional or national nature, they have been in existence long enough to deliver identifiable improvements to advance disabled persons human rights. To research Good Policies, the Zero Project has teamed up with the World Future Council (WFC), a foundation informing policy-makers about future just solutions. The WFC applied its Future Just Lawmaking Methodology to the policies nominated by an international expert network and presented its evaluation to a Scientific Advisory Board, which selected the policies to be included in this report.

## Zero Project: Report, Website and Conference

The Zero Project establishes three communications channels to promote its key fields of activity:

1. The present **Zero Project Report**, being published on the occasion of the International Day of Persons with Disabilities, 3 December 2011. It will be published either annually or bi-annually in the future, and will summarise all current results of the Zero Project. It will be available in print and also for free download from the Zero Project Website.
2. The **Zero Project Website** ([www.zeroproject.org](http://www.zeroproject.org)): It will be officially launched in January 2012. Its design is based on social media and will act as an interactive platform for everyone who is interested in

Social Indicators, Good Practice and Good Policy Examples in the field of disability. Participation will be possible in various ways, but with the overarching aim of highlighting the best solutions for creating change for the better. Thus, at this stage, it will focus on Good Practice and Good Policy.

3. The **Zero Project Conference**. The "International Conference on Good Policies for Disabled People" being organised in partnership with the World Future Council will take place in Vienna on 22 and 23 January 2012 and concentrate on Good Policies. In a carefully designed research and evaluation process adopted by the World Future Council, eight Good Policies have been selected by the Scientific Advisory Board to be presented and discussed with 200 international decision-makers in the field of disability policy. For the first time ever, parliamentarians, representatives of NGOs and foundations, from the European Union and the UN, academics and disability rights activists will come together to discuss inspiring policies from all around the world and to find ways to spread them to other countries. We are also very grateful to Bank Austria, which is hosting this event and supporting it generously.

### Zero Project - Social Indicators: Results

For this year's Zero Project Report, 21 social indicators were established and reviewed. To enhance clarity and comparability, all of the results have been summarised in traffic light colours, with GREEN representing a good solution, ORANGE a partial solution, and RED an unsatisfactory solution.

In terms of content, the social indicators are oriented exclusively toward implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, since countries that have ratified the UN Convention have also incorporated it into their legal systems.

Based on concrete examples, the social indicators throw light on the extent to which the UN Convention has been incorporated into the legal system and lived experience of persons with disabilities in the various countries. Differences between the countries (and, in Austria, between the nine federal provinces, as a number of rules and structures exist at the provincial level) can, thus, be seen. Various articles, specifically Articles 8 - 33, of the UN Convention serve to underpin the questions asked. The social indicators are based on those used in the

Essl Social Index Pilot Study. Out of an original 44 indicators, 21 have been used (with only minor alterations) in the Zero Project Report. The selection was based on issues of validity and reliability, as well as representativeness and transparency.

The survey took place between May and September 2011. More than 50 persons representing organisations in 36 different countries took part.

Due to a lack of internationally comparable data, there remain issues of representativeness, validity, etc., that are connected with questioning expert panels. The lack of internationally recognised definitions of "disability" and consequently of international statistics is one of the biggest obstacles to overcome in this regard.

No simple count of traffic lights has, therefore, been done, since this number would be misleading as an indicator about how successfully a country implements the UN Convention. On the other hand, a simple count of "red", "orange" and "green" traffic lights, totalled by question, is less biased and more acceptable.

### Count and ranking of traffic lights per question

No	In Brief	Green	Orange	Red
1	Accessibility of new buildings	27	8	0
10	Right to primary mainstream education	22	12	1
6	Sign language in court	22	11	2
5	Partial guardianship	20	9	5
19	Official statistics about education and employment	19	15	8
14	Accommodations in the workplace	19	13	3
9	Right to marry, have and raise children	16	17	2
20	State sponsorship of umbrella organisation	16	12	7
11	Alternative testing methods for students	14	18	3
13	Accessibility of medical practices	14	17	4
8	Safeguards in institutions	12	15	7
17	Right to receive necessary support to vote	11	23	1
21	Designation of "Focal Points" within government	10	15	8
2	Legal time frame for accessibility	8	16	11
7	Financial support for inclusion in the community	7	21	7
16	Number of employees with disabilities	6	7	21
18	Statistics on disabled persons living in institutions	5	23	7
15	State employment of persons with disabilities	5	20	10
3	Accessibility of public buses	3	30	2
12	Statistics on university graduates	3	17	15
4	Early warning system for national emergencies	3	11	19

The largest number of "green" lights was given to Question 1, regarding regulations for the accessibility of new buildings: The respondents from 27 countries

confirm that such regulations are fully in place, and there are no “red” lights at all. Also Question 10 (mainstream education), Question 6 (sign language in court) and Question 5 (partial guardianship) each got 20 or more “green” lights.

At the bottom of ranking were questions 4 (early warning system), 12 (statistics on university graduates) and 3 (accessibility of public buses).

### The most important results

#### **Question 17: RIGHT TO RECEIVE NECESSARY SUPPORT TO VOTE**

In 23 out of 35 countries (or two thirds of the countries surveyed), persons with disabilities do not receive all the necessary support to vote in secret, according to the respondents of the questionnaire. Whilst some of the countries may be countries with relatively young democracies (yet all of them are democracies on paper), a majority of them have had democratic systems for a very long time, and the right to vote secretly for everyone should be deeply rooted.

Since the implementation of this right has, since 1950, been included in the European Convention on Human Rights, and its implementation does not involve huge costs, this is a quite surprising result.

#### **Question 4: EARLY WARNING SYSTEM FOR NATIONAL EMERGENCIES**

In only three countries – Denmark, the Netherlands and the UK – are the states’ early warning systems universally accessible to all those with disabilities. In 19 others, the early warning system has not even been designed to be universally accessible to all those with disabilities. Since these three countries have already blazed a trail, it should be up to all the others to learn from their examples.

With the effects that climate change seems to be having on once accepted weather patterns, in this area alone, national emergency early warning systems are becoming increasingly important.

#### **Question 3: ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC BUSES**

Only three countries – Israel, the Netherlands and the UK - (together with California) answered with a “green” light and, interestingly, three of these four (Israel, the Netherlands and the USA/California) have not even ratified the CRPD. So, in each of the other 32

countries, and in New York state, the capital’s bus system fell short in one way or another. With buses constituting the vital transportation mode for persons with disabilities, this has very far-reaching consequences for employment (getting to a job), education (getting to school), leisure activities, etc.

#### **Question 15: STATE EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

Figures on state employment of persons with disabilities are published annually by only five countries. The fact that more than 20 countries are either not publishing them, or there are no official figures, or they are not annual, is another issue that could be tackled easily. And it is not financially burdensome.

There may be another reason why these figures are not published in many countries: to hide the fact that they do not actually employ persons with disabilities. The figures that have already been published tend to indicate this.

#### **Question 12: STATISTICS ON UNIVERSITY GRADUATES**

Another hardly believable fact: 15 “red” lights and 17 “orange”! Taking into account that arguably all universities (at least in Europe) receive state funding, it is hard to understand why this support is not linked to transparent figures about the inclusiveness of the education they provide. Self-identification (of being a person with a disability) is, of course, an issue, but it is not a general excuse for absent data.

#### **Question 1: ACCESSIBILITY TO NEW BUILDINGS**

Some good news: 27 out of 35 countries have legislation in place that covers both all newly constructed buildings to which there is public access and covers all disabilities. No “red” lights have been given. This means that states are, at least, taking accessibility, in its most basic sense, seriously.

The coverage of all disabilities will always be an issue. But here is an area where lessons learned internationally, and shared, can help prevent the re-invention of the wheel.

#### **Question 5: PARTIAL GUARDIANSHIP**

It is enormously comforting to see that partial guardianship covering a wide range of different circumstances is

available in well over half (20) of the countries surveyed, and in at least a number of circumstances in nine further countries. In view of the paradigm shift from “substituted decision-making” to “supported decision-making” required by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD), this number of respondents answering in the full or partial affirmative is very encouraging. Ireland stands out as a particular anomaly, with only plenary guardianship possible in the country. And that covered by the unfortunately named Lunacy Act of 1871.

#### **Question 10: RIGHT TO PRIMARY MAINSTREAM EDUCATION**

With inclusion from the earliest possible age so important, to see that in 22 of 35 countries every child with a disability has at least the right to receive free and compulsory primary education within the mainstream educational system is encouraging. It is sad to note that in the Argentina, the right to inclusion in the mainstream educational system remains unrecognised.

#### **Question 18: STATISTICS ON DISABLED PERSONS LIVING IN INSTITUTIONS**

How can states hope to fulfil their responsibilities of care for persons with disabilities in institutions if they don't know how many such persons are in institutions? And if they do know, why are such figures not published? These have to be two questions uppermost in one's mind when looking at the answers to this question. In only five countries are these figures published annually and officially. So, why are no such figures officially published in seven states and only either partial and/or stale figures in some 23 others? De-institutionalisation should never be regarded as a secondary issue. Both Italy and Sweden show the way as to how to implement the CRPD in this respect.

#### **Question 16: NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES**

In nearly two thirds (21 of 34) of all the countries responding to this question, the figure either decreased or no figures were available. Whichever is the case, and perhaps both are, the situation is bad. If the figure in each of these countries has decreased, the immediate question is why? And if no figures are actually available, how does a state expect effectively to address these issues?

#### **Question 14: ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE WORKPLACE**

It is encouraging to note that the state obliges employers to make all the necessary accommodations in so many countries, 19 in total. And that actions, albeit limited, are legally required in a further 13. It is to be hoped that this last figure will decrease soon, as such limitations should not exist. The number of countries with no such obligations is gratifyingly low: three.

#### **Question 19: OFFICIAL STATISTICS ABOUT EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT**

Publication every 10 years could be seen as being exceptionally over-generous. However, on the basis that eight states have never undertaken any such study, and that the studies undertaken by 15 others have either not encompassed both education and employment, or are older than 10 years, over-generosity is, perhaps, not the issue. For the success of any policies focusing on persons with disabilities to be measured, figures need not only to be published regularly, but also to be complete. The plethora of unsatisfactory responses to this question can only raise, not least, concerns of either a lack of will to action, or systemic problems in evaluating the success of policy.

#### **Question 6: SIGN LANGUAGE IN COURT**

With equal access to justice such an important aspect of the Convention, and despite the intolerable situation for persons who are either deaf or hearing impaired in both Albania and Ireland, in over 60% of the countries surveyed, sign language is both an official language of the courts and persons with a hearing impairment have the right to a translator paid for by the state.

#### **Question 8: SAFEGUARDS IN INSTITUTIONS**

The question is predicated on the persons in question actually already having the choice of whether to stay or to leave, i.e. the question is about their ability to exercise an option they already have, not their requesting that option. Therefore, to find that in 15 out of the 34 countries surveyed, i.e., just under half, either safeguards do not exist or persons with disabilities are not informed of their freedom to choice, is awful. Perhaps even more awful is the fact that, in seven countries, this freedom of choice, already rightfully theirs, is denied them.

### Differences between Austrian provinces

NGOs in nine federal provinces within Austria were also asked 13 out of these 21 questions. Since Austria is a federal state and many regulations concerning persons with disabilities are on a provincial level, these 13 questions were also asked to discover differences within Austria.

#### Notable results:

- Vienna is the only province where a focal point is already in place.
- There are significant differences in the accessibility of buildings. Both Carinthia and Upper Austria are at the top of the list.
- According to NGOs in Carinthia and Vorarlberg, these are the only two provinces in which there safeguards in place that ensure that no person has to stay longer than necessary in an institution (Question 8).
- There are also big differences between the provinces regarding the accessibility of medical practices (Question 13).
- Only respondents in Upper Austria and Tyrol report that official statistics about employment and education are available.

### ZERO PROJECT - GOOD PRACTICE: RESULTS

The Essl Foundation has created an international network of more than 100 persons with disabilities, NGOs, social entrepreneurs, foundations, networks, media, companies (e.g. infrastructure providers), academics, administration staff, politicians etc. Based on this network, a three-stage process was developed to select the most outstanding Good Practices. The final selection comprised 27 nominations. These Good Practice Examples are described in detail in this report, and are the core selection for the Zero Project Website.

#### 1. Assistance

- A support model for families to have "time off"
- a service to address sexual facilitation
- cooperatively organised personal assistance
- an interdisciplinary commission to protect the rights of persons with disabilities
- a "baby simulator" to support decision-making for parenthood
- the ENIL-Initiative to live independently

#### 2. Job Support and Job Creation

- An internet job platform that encourages companies to employ persons with disabilities
- a job creation initiative for persons with psychosocial disabilities in Asia
- an employment model for persons with Autism
- a training programme for blind women to screen other women for breast cancer
- an entertainment facility that creates jobs for blind persons and creates mutual understanding between the blind and the non-blind
- a consulting firm for staffing companies with persons with disabilities

#### 3. Hardware/Software/Technical support

- Software that makes email- and web-texts more accessible for persons with disabilities
- A system for live transcription and subtitling of conferences and discussions
- An online map of wheelchair accessible and inaccessible places
- A standardised key for all toilet facilities in Europe

#### 4. Awareness Raising, Policy Implementation

- A toolkit for practitioners to help refugees with disabilities
- Capacity building seminars and planning models for implementing the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD) enter this category
- A model for how to plan the implementation of local/regional disability policy plans

#### 5. Media/TV/Accessibility

- Subtitling TV news broadcasts in South America,
- Web TV specially targeted at the deaf/hard of hearing
- Evaluation tool for the accessibility of websites and other digital media.

#### 6. Coaching/Education/Training

- A training centre for persons with disabilities to become peer coaches for others with disabilities, and
- A campaign programme for young persons that enables them to raise awareness of the CRPD

#### 7. International and Development Cooperation

- High-level guidance for development aid pro-

grammers on how to shape programmes in order to include persons with disabilities

- A monitoring system for the implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD) in developing countries

## 8. Data/Statistics

- A global online database on ongoing government projects that include persons with disabilities in mainstream programmes in the field of education, livelihoods and health

## ZERO PROJECT - GOOD POLICY: RESULTS

For nominations of Good Policies, the Essl Foundation and the World Future Council, together, reached out to disability policy experts from all around the world, including all members of the UN CRPD Committee, the European Disability Forum and the International Disability Alliance. This network of experts provided 18 nominations of laws or regulations from a country, state or province. The policies nominated were researched and evaluated by the World Future Council, which applied its Future Just Lawmaking Methodology. As a third step, eight good policies were finally selected by the Scientific Advisory Board. They were chosen for the Zero Project Report and at the same time constitute the core of the Zero Project Conference in January 2012.

The 8 Good Policies can be divided into two categories:

### 1. Anti-discrimination and Equality Laws

In many countries there are laws that serve as the basis for all measures that are to be taken to prevent discrimination in society. These laws vary highly in terms of comprehensiveness (some deal only with special types of disability, some, on the other hand, are targeted at any kind of discrimination, including race, religion, minority, gender, etc.) and in many other respects. Most importantly, these laws are crucial for improving the living conditions of persons with disabilities in a broad range of areas, foremost in education, employment, health, transport, access to information and many more. The final selection includes the anti-discriminatory and equality laws of Austria, of Spain and of the UK. All of them have their strengths and weaknesses, but – according to the experts – they are the laws to look at now.

### 2. Special Policies

In arguably every country of the world there are special laws and regulations with the focus to protect persons with disabilities, to support them by funding programmes, tax incentives, minimum requirements, by removing barriers, by awareness raising, by promoting training and education, or by the creation of transparency. However, these policies rarely take all human rights of persons with disabilities fully into account, as laid out in the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which entered into force in May 2008. Amongst all the nominations, the Scientific Advisory Board finally selected five as outstanding examples of Good Policy. They all have delivered identifiable improvements and can be hereby recommended for transfer to other countries.

#### These five Good Policy Examples are:

- The Swedish Ombudsman System to enable supported, instead of substituted, decision-making, which assists persons with severe mental and psychosocial disabilities in their decision-making, reducing guardianships, suicide, isolation (and costs as well).
- The "Representation Agreements" from British Columbia (Canada) that strengthen the right of persons with disabilities to make their own choices, to obtain support in decision-making and to prevent them being forced into guardianship.
- The Swedish right to live independently, which is one of the few policies in the world where persons with extensive disabilities can, themselves, choose the support that best suits their needs. They, and not the service providers, receive directly the financial support for directing personal assistance services, thus allowing them the maximum control and freedom of choice.
- The obligation of all nurseries, schools and universities in Italy to accept any child, pupil or student regardless of their disabilities, including the most severe, which has led to the fact that 99.6% of all pupils with disabilities are now included in mainstream schools
- The system of universal access to justice in Israel, where every person with a mental, intellectual or communication disability has the right to be accommodated during investigative and judicial procedures.





SVK	SLO	ESP	SWE	UK	ALB	BIH	RKS	MKD	MNE	SRB	SUI	TUR	ARG	AUS	CAN	ISR	MEX	RSA	US CA	US NY STATE		
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 30
ART.9: ACCESSIBILITY																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 32
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 34
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 36
ART.11: SITUATIONS OF RISK AND HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCIES																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 38
ART.12: EQUAL RECOGNITION BEFORE THE LAW & ART 13: ACCESS TO JUSTICE																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 40
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 42
ART.19: LIVING INDEPENDENTLY AND BEING INCLUDED IN THE COMMUNITY																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 44
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 46
ART.23: RESPECT FOR HOME AND THE FAMILY																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 48
ART.24: EDUCATION																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 50
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 52
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 54
ART.25: HEALTH & ART.26: HABILITATION AND REHABILITATION																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 56
ART.27: WORK AND EMPLOYMENT																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 58
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 60
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 62
ART.29: PARTICIPATION IN POLITICAL AND PUBLIC LIFE																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 64
ART.31: STATISTICS AND DATA COLLECTION																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 66
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 68
ART.32: INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 70
ART.33: MONITORING																						
●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	Pg. 72

**KEY TO LOCATIONS**

















- EUROPE EU
- EUROPE EX-EU
- OUTSIDE EUROPE

**KEY TO TRAFFIC LIGHT COLOURS**

- YES
- YES, WITH QUALIFICATIONS
- NO
- Not applicable/ No data available

**KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS**

AUSTRIA (AUT)	PORTUGAL (POR)	SERBIA (SRB)
BELGIUM WALLONIA (BEL)	ROMANIA (ROM)	SWITZERLAND (SUI)
BULGARIA (BUL)	SLOVAKIA (SVK)	TURKEY (TUR)
CROATIA (CRO)	SLOVENIA (SLO)	
CZECH REPUBLIC (CZE)	SPAIN (ESP)	ARGENTINA (ARG)
DENMARK (DNK)	SWEDEN (SWE)	AUSTRALIA (AUS)
ESTONIA (EST)	UNITED KINGDOM (UK)	CANADA (CAN)
FINLAND (FIN)		ISRAEL (ISR)
FRANCE (FRA)	ALBANIA (ALB)	MEXICO (MEX)
GERMANY (GER)	BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA (BIH)	SOUTH AFRICA (RSA)
HUNGARY (HUN)	KOSOVO (RKS)	UNITED STATES - CALIFORNIA (USA CA)
IRELAND (IRL)	MACEDONIA (MKD)	UNITED STATES - NEW YORK (USA NY STATE)
ITALY (ITA)	MONTENEGRO (MNE)	
THE NETHERLANDS (NLD)		

Usefulness/ Applicability/ Of Interest	For all forms of disability/multiple disabilities				For mental or psychosocial disability	
Selected* in 20 countries or more	<p>Leonard Cheshire Disability</p> <p><b>Bringing the UN CRPD to life through youth advocacy</b></p> <p>Art. 8, 24</p> <p>21 countries</p> 	<p>Leonard Cheshire Disability</p> <p><b>Global disability database</b></p> <p>Art. 31</p> <p>Africa und Asia</p>	<p>Bizlink</p> <p><b>Support in finding employment</b></p> <p>Art. 8, 27</p>  <p>Singapore</p>		<p>New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association</p> <p><b>Jobs for people with psychosocial disabilities</b></p> <p>Art. 27</p>  <p>Hong Kong</p>	
Selected* in 16 to 20 countries	<p>Caritas Austria</p> <p><b>Support for families with handicapped children</b></p> <p>Art. 26</p>  <p>Austria</p>	<p>WAG</p> <p><b>Cooperatively organised personal assistance for persons with disabilities</b></p> <p>Art. 19</p>  <p>Austria</p>	<p>The Swedish Disability Federation</p> <p><b>Implementation of the UN standard disability plans</b></p> <p>Art. 33</p>  <p>Sweden</p>	<p>Empowerment Center of Initiative for Independent Living</p> <p><b>Peer-counseling and education</b></p> <p>Art. 27</p>  <p>Austria</p>	<p>European Network of Independent Living</p> <p><b>Assistance for people with intellectual disabilities</b></p> <p>Art. 19, 29, 30</p>  <p>Sweden</p>	<p>Lipida Sexualbegleitung</p> <p><b>Sexual facilitation</b></p> <p>Art. 5, 22</p>  <p>Austria</p>
Selected* in 11 to 15 countries	<p>Light for the world</p> <p><b>Implementing the UN CRPD in developing countries</b></p> <p>Art. 31, 32, 33</p>  <p>Burkina Faso</p>	<p>Career Moves</p> <p><b>Internet job platform for persons with and without disabilities</b></p> <p>Art. 21, 27</p>  <p>Austria</p>		<p>Interdisciplinary Commission Chile</p> <p><b>Protecting the rights of persons with mental disabilities</b></p> <p>Art. 15, 16, 33</p>  <p>Chile</p>	<p>Association to Help People with Intellectual Disabilities</p> <p><b>Training seminars on UN CRPD</b></p> <p>Art. 8, 12</p>  <p>Slovakia</p>	
Selected* in 3 to 6 countries	<p>Bartiméus Accessibility Foundation</p> <p><b>Promotion of inclusive accessibility of the internet</b></p> <p>Art. 9, 19, 21</p>  <p>The Netherlands</p>	<p>Women's Refugee Commission</p> <p><b>Helping disabled refugees</b></p> <p>Art. 11, 17, 28</p> <p>Five countries</p>		<p>Specialist People Foundation</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities for people with autism</b></p> <p>Art. 27</p>  <p>Denmark</p>	<p>AWO</p> <p><b>Decision support for disabled people who desire a baby</b></p> <p>Art. 19, 23</p>  <p>Germany</p>	

\* Respondents of the questionnaire could select up to 10 (of 27) Good Practice Examples which they personally consider the most useful/interesting/applicable in their countries.

For visual impairment, blindness

For hearing impairment, Deafness

For physical disability

**KEY TO THE MAP**

The 27 selected Good Practice Examples have been arranged according to


- Importance (Usefulness, Applicability/Of Interest) in the rows: Higher positions mean that more experts on national level considered the Good Practices to be very important in their own country.
- Type of disability in the columns.
- Colours indicate the topic of the Good Practice (see explanation below)
- The name of the project is to be found at the top of every entry
- The Articles refer to the Articles on the UN Convention where this Good Practice Example is applicable and would mean a step towards better implementation of the UN CRPD
- The country refers to the country of origin, or the countries where the Good Practice Example has been established so far
- Detailed information on the selection process can be found on page 24, detailed information on every Good Practice Example on page 96 ff.

**KEY TO COLOURS: TOPICS**


- Hardware/Software/ Technical Support
- Coaching/ Education/Training
- Jobs/ Job Creation
- Awareness raising/ Policy implementation
- Assistance
- International Cooperation/ Development Cooperation
- Data/ Statistics
- Media/ TV Accessibility

Wheelmap.org  
**Accessibility information for wheelchair users**  
 Art. 9, 21  
  
 Germany

Dialogue in the Dark  
**Empowering disabled people**  
 Art.8, 27  
  
 Germany

discovering hands@  
**Visually impaired women detect breast cancer**  
 Art. 6, 25, 27  
  
 Germany

RoboBraille Consortium  
**Electronic texts for the visually impaired**  
 Art. 9, 21  
  
 Denmark




VerbaVoice  
**Transcription for hearing impaired people**  
 Art. 9, 21, 27  
  
 Germany

Deaf and Hard of Hearing Clubs Association of Slovenia  
**Web TV for the deaf/hard of hearing**  
 Art. 9, 21  
  
 Slovenia


Deaf Real Citizenship Corporation of Chile  
**Sign language on TV news**  
 Art. 21  
  
 Chile

Eurokey  
**Guaranteed access to public facilities**  
 Art. 9, 20  
  
 Switzerland

## ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AND EQUALITY LAWS

	DESCRIPTION	RESULTS
<p><b>Participation in All Areas of Life</b></p> <p>2006</p>  <p>Austria</p>	<p>The focus on accessibility in the public and private sector combined with a mandatory low-threshold conciliation procedure, which is promoted as Good Practice by disability organisations, are what distinguish the Austrian Federal Disability Equality Act. In particular, the law puts forth a highly interesting approach with regard to the achievement of an accessible built environment, which, in its original version, is favoured by the European Disability Forum as a model for the European Accessibility Act (announced for 2012).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2010, the Disability Ombud answered over 1,200 requests.</li> <li>• In the same year, EUR 3.4 million was granted by the Federal Social Welfare Board to almost 200 undertakings for accessibility works.</li> <li>• From 2006 to 2010, there were 732 mandatory conciliation cases, of which approximately 60 percent could be solved out of court.</li> <li>• In addition, several ministries have published action plans with the objective of achieving accessibility.</li> <li>• The publication of a 10-year plan is expected soon.</li> <li>• The publication of a 10-year action plan is expected in 2012.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The Right to Equal Opportunities</b></p> <p>2003</p>  <p>Spain</p>	<p>The <i>Law of Equal Opportunities, Non-Discrimination and Universal Access for People with Disabilities</i> marked an unambiguous shift in Spanish disability policy toward a human rights perspective based on the social model of disability. Foremost, its provisions aim to guarantee the right to equal opportunities of disabled people by defining measures against discrimination and a series of affirmative actions. Crucial for achieving its objectives is the crosscutting goal of universal accessibility.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within six months of the law's enactment, the National Action Plan on Accessibility 2004-2012 was launched.</li> <li>• In 2007, a series of further regulations were promulgated.</li> <li>• Reports have highlighted that improvements in quality of life have been made, foremost in accessibility of transport and of communication. Public and private attitudes have started to change.</li> <li>• In 2011, the enactment of Act no 26 has incorporated the definition of a person with disability of UN CRPD Article 1.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The Right to Equality</b></p> <p>2010</p>  <p>United Kingdom</p>	<p>116 separate pieces of legislation were consolidated and updated with the introduction of the single <i>Equality Act</i>, perhaps the most comprehensive and detailed anti-discrimination legislation in Europe. Its comprehensiveness derives not only from the range of the protected groups, but also from the areas covered by the Act, which include nearly all the functions of public authorities and the private sector. Particularly in the non-employment context, two promising tools for tackling discrimination can be found: the public sector equality duties, and the anticipatory reasonable adjustment duty.</p>	<p>In 2010, the Equality and Human Rights Commission took 50,000 calls to its helpline (unfortunately threatened by spending cuts).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the general public sector equality duty, there is an increasing number of successful cases and about 100-200 settlements per year.</li> <li>• The anticipatory reasonable adjustment duty appears to have inspired the European Commission to include a similar anticipatory duty in its draft of the Goods and Services Directive.</li> </ul>

## SPECIAL LAWS

	DESCRIPTION	RESULTS
<p><b>Advancing Supported Decision-Making</b></p> <p>1999</p>  <p>British Columbia</p>	<p>With its <i>Representation Agreement Act RSBC c.405</i>, British Columbia has led the way in the recognition of the right to support in personal decision-making. The law's flexible definition of capability is one of its main strengths, since it recognises trust as one of the defining features of support relationships and shifts the burden of proof of incapability to others. The legislation allows for the creation of personal planning tools known as representation agreements, which, unlike most personal planning tools, permit the appointment of an individual(s) to help an adult make decisions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representation Agreements are praised by the disability community as highly successful in providing legal recognition of supported decision-making.</li> <li>• The non-profit organisation Nidus provides a centre for excellence in Best Practice with personal planning and supported decision-making, and operates a centralised registry with some 5,000 records.</li> <li>• Representation Agreements significantly prevent guardianship and are the reason why the number of private guardianships has remained fairly stable during the last years</li> </ul>

<p><b>Universal Access to Justice</b></p> <p>2005</p>  <p>Israel</p>	<p>Many justice systems around the world are not accessible to people with mental, intellectual or communication disabilities, as investigative and judicial procedures are not adapted to meet their needs. As established by the <i>Investigation and Testimony Procedures Law</i>, in Israel, a Special Investigator is now assisting police interrogations. In addition, the law provides for important adaptations to the testimony given in court, including the exemption from cross-examination as a witness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 2007 to 2010, there were 2,400 requests for special investigations. Almost 1,780 persons with intellectual disabilities were interrogated.</li> <li>• The majority of the cases recorded – 78 percent - constituted victims of crime.</li> <li>• Cases were brought to court which beforehand would have been dismissed.</li> <li>• Parallel to its enactment, the law and its mechanisms enlightened the debate about the content and language of UN CRPD Article 13 on access to justice.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The Right to Inclusive Education</b></p> <p>1992</p>  <p>Italy</p>	<p>Italy abolished almost all segregated educational settings and, with its <i>Framework Law for the Assistance, Social Integration and the Rights of Disabled Persons No 104</i>, enshrined the entitlement of all students with special needs to experience a good quality of inclusive education. All day nurseries, schools, universities and any other education provider, including private institutions, have the obligation to accept pupils with disabilities, also those severely disabled. All disabled children have the right to be supported in learning by a professional. Of particular importance to the law's objectives is the combination of clinical diagnosis, dynamic profile and tailored education plan to determine the personal potential of the pupil, and the broad cross-sectoral participation and cooperation of all stakeholders in working groups at different levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Italy is, so far, the only European country in which almost all (99.6%) disabled pupils, out of a total of 170,000 (in 2007-2008), were included in mainstream schools.</li> <li>• Inclusive education is achieved with the help of over 90,000 specialised teachers for learning support and an additional 25,000 educators employed by the schools.</li> <li>• Physical barriers in access to schools have been almost eliminated.</li> <li>• An amendment of 1999 concerned inclusive university settings and, as a result, an impressive 12,400 disabled students were enrolled in Italian universities in 2006, tripling within only six years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Safeguarding human dignity</b></p> <p>2005</p>  <p>Sweden</p>	<p>The <i>Swedish Government Decision No 16</i> established a nationwide system of Personal Ombudsmen (POs) that provides support in decision-making for persons with severe mental or psychosocial disabilities. POs are highly skilled persons who do outreach work and establish, first and foremost, trusting relationships with individuals in need of support. They assist individuals in taking control of their own situation, identify care needs and ensure that they receive the necessary help.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support by a Personal Ombudsman shows highly positive response rates and reduces guardianship, isolation, drug addiction, homelessness, suicide and violence amongst the individuals addressed.</li> <li>• Calculations have shown that PO operations reduce costs by approximately €80,000 per assisted person over a five year period.</li> <li>• In 2010, 325 POs employed in over 100 businesses provided support to more than 6,000 individuals throughout the country.</li> <li>• Recently, a personal support system was started by Oslo and one currently operates in Helsinki. Cities such as San Francisco, Vancouver, Sydney, Budapest, Riga and Prague have similar plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The Right to Living Independently</b></p> <p>1993</p>  <p>Sweden</p>	<p>Sweden legally entitles persons with extensive disabilities to cash payments for the purchase of self-directed personal assistance services. The <i>Act concerning Support and Service to Persons with Certain Functional Impairments</i> sets out the right for persons with considerable and permanent functional impairments to "good" as opposed to basic living conditions through the provision of ten measures for special support. One of the measures constitutes the right to personal assistance as regulated by the Assistance Benefit Act, setting the foundation for a demand-driven and competitive personal assistance market.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009, over 60,200 people received special support.</li> <li>• The system of cash payments created a competitive market consisting of about 15,900 assistance users, 230 local governments and over 1,100 private entities, these last employing a total of 60,000 (full-time equivalent) personal assistants.</li> <li>• It enables assistance users and their family members to return to work and provides jobs to people who often would otherwise live on unemployment insurance.</li> <li>• It has been estimated that taxpayers have saved a minimum of SEK29 billion since 1994, compared to the costs of local governments' services.</li> </ul>