

Disability-inclusive approach to social accountability

A practical guide



Sightsavers

Contents

Introduction	3
The DASA process overview	8
Key structural elements	10
How to run a DASA	13
Phase 1: Desk review and policy mapping	15
Phase 2: The DASA indicator framework and scorecard	16
Phase 3: National consultation and follow-up	24
Kenya case study (summary)	26
Annexes	27



Josephine Conteh takes part in the Sightsavers citizenship and political participation workshop in Makeni.

Cover image: Portrait of Josephine Conteh, student and youth disability advocate, at Josephine's house in Karene District, Sierra Leone.

© Sightsavers/Hickmatu Leigh

Developed by: Sightsavers

Contributors: Nalini Vaz (Sightsavers, senior global advocacy adviser), Dr Sita Sekhar, Prarthana Rao, Dr. Andrew Griffiths (Sightsavers, head of advocacy).



Introduction

Why a disability-inclusive approach to social accountability (DASA)?

Globally, governments have made some progress in adopting national laws and policies aligned with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD). However, lack of policy coherence, weaknesses in regulation and lack of accountability mechanisms means people with disabilities, especially women and girls, continue to face multiple barriers to education, work, health, justice and participation. DASA offers a practical, organisation of people with disabilities (OPD)-led social accountability approach to influence policy development and implementation, monitor the effectiveness of governments in fulfilling their obligations and enhance collaboration between communities and authorities.

Social accountability encourages collaboration and dialogue between communities and the government, especially around effective policy development and implementation. This approach helps to build collective action and influence policymakers to design

and implement policies shaped by the lived experiences of communities most affected by the issues. It also creates opportunities for grassroots groups to work with the government to define problems and co-design solutions through cooperation, co-creation and shared decision-making. Some interesting examples are **World Visions' Citizen Voice in Action**¹, which has created impressive results in countries around the world, the **citizen report card**² (CRC) – a pioneering tool developed by the Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore, India and the **community score card**³ developed by CARE and implemented globally.

This is particularly important for Sightsavers because, while OPDs may be invited into policy spaces, they often need stronger and more targeted support to engage confidently and effectively. It is also closely aligned with the “localisation” agenda, which aims to ensure local ownership, participation, transparency and accountability in development processes at local and national levels.

-
1. live-advocacy.d2.worldvision.org/2020/09/16/citizen-voice-action-what-empowerment-looks-like/
 2. civicus.org/images/PGX_H_Citizen%20Report%20Cards.pdf
 3. www.care.org/our-work/health/strengthening-healthcare/community-score-card-csc/

What is DASA?

Disability-inclusive approach to social accountability (DASA) is basically human rights in action at the local and national level. It takes the core human rights principles contained in the UNCRPD, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and national constitutions and policies, and turns them into concrete standards communities can use to assess policy implementation and demand change. DASA applies a rights-based approach by positioning people with disabilities as rights-holders and state institutions as duty-bearers. It empowers communities to articulate priorities and enables OPDs to systematically monitor policy implementation

and participate in local development and planning processes. It also helps governments understand lived realities of the most marginalised communities. This strengthens accountability and transparency and supports inclusive governance and localisation. It can also be used to feed evidence into UNCRPD reporting and other national and international processes, for example, Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs).

The DASA indicator framework includes a set of key indicators to examine policy or programme implementation. This is further broken down into specific sub-indicators, depending on the domain (education, health, social protection, climate action, and so on).

Number	Indicator	What it measures
1	Awareness	Knowledge of rights, programmes, and entitlements under the specific policy or programme
2	Reach	Extent of service coverage and access
3	Usage	How people use the services and barriers faced
4	Adequacy	Sufficiency of support or services provided
5	Effectiveness	Quality, timeliness and grievance mechanisms
6	Attitude	Behaviour and empathy of officials and staff
7	Accessibility	Physical, communication and procedural access
8	Resources	Availability of human and financial resources for inclusion

Example: Disaster risk reduction (DRR) indicator framework for DASA which was part of the Hear Me See Me (HMSM) DRR project in Kenya at www.sightsavers.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/Hear-me-see-me-disaster-risk-reduction-in-Kenya-guide.pdf

The DASA score card and consultation processes translate commitments in the CRPD, SDGs, national laws and policies into practical indicators that communities can use to assess policy implementation, identify gaps and negotiate solutions. It is a participatory, OPD-led social accountability method that strengthens policy implementation, inclusion and oversight. It places lived experience at the centre of governance and supports CRPD compliance, particularly Article 6 on women and girls with disabilities.

Key features:



Evidence-based policy monitoring



Collective scoring and consensus building



Joint action planning between OPDs and government stakeholders



Participatory, inclusive and replicable

Portrait of Sadah Fofanah, youth disability advocate, at the Sightsavers citizenship and political participation workshop.



Core components of the DASA model

DASA provides an assessment of the robustness of policy implementation related to the relevant subject matter specific to people with disabilities. The process is developed to not only assess policy for inclusion, but also to involve OPDs and their members in the analysis process and jointly work with service providers to develop an action plan that leads to policies with better quality and implementation. People with disabilities are rights-holders, while government and service providers are duty-bearers.

DASA - Disability-inclusive approach to social accountability



Portrait of Mary Mamusa Koroma, teacher and youth disability advocate, at the Sightsavers citizenship and political participation workshop in Makeni.



The DASA process overview

The DASA model has three major phases, which, together, create a full cycle of accountability and evidence generation. This enables meaningful dialogue on policy solutions to the problems identified.

1

Desk review and policy mapping: A structured review to understand the existing policy environment, identify gaps and map how current laws and frameworks address disability inclusion. The policy score check tool is a simple instrument used for this analysis and is implemented by the core team, which includes OPD members and other relevant stakeholders (included in the annex).

Key questions under review:

- Is there a legal framework in place at national level to ensure the rights of people with disabilities, especially women and girls, are met?
- Are there policies in place? Do they directly mention people with disabilities?
- Are there programmes to implement the policies? How effective have these programmes been so far? Are there specific provisions for people with disabilities?
- Is there a budget allocated for programme implementation?
- Is there a scope for community (OPD) participation in design and implementation of programmes?
- Are monitoring and evaluation processes in place?



Josephine Conteh and Mohamed Mansaray, Entrepreneur, Father, and Youth Disability Advocate, at the Sightsavers citizenship and political participation workshop.

2

DASA indicator framework and scoring:

A participatory assessment process that uses agreed indicators to create a 'score card' to score policy implementation and generate collective insights and action points. Participants are divided into subgroups (women with disabilities, service providers, and so on). All the groups engage in a simultaneous scoring exercise (in the same room at the same time) followed by discussions based on comparing the scoring of the different groups. This culminates in a final consensus score for each indicator. The lowest three scores are selected to develop a joint action plan with government and other key stakeholders.

Key questions under review:

- Are the policies and programmes meeting the expectations of the targeted community?
- What are the opportunities that could emerge from the proper implementation or risks from ineffective implementation of these policies and programmes?
- What are the lowest scoring indicators on which to build a joint action plan along with service providers and local government?

3

National consultation and follow-up:

A platform to present findings, build consensus with relevant stakeholders and track commitments and actions through ongoing engagement.

Key questions under review:

- What are the key findings from desk review and score card exercises?
- What is the feedback and what are key suggestions from decision-makers and relevant stakeholders on strengthening the joint action plan?
- Final action plan and strategy paper.



Participants at the Sightsavers citizenship and political participation workshop in Makeni.

Key structural elements

A. Rights-based approach (RBA)

The human rights-based approach (HRBA) is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is based on international human rights standards and focused on promoting and protecting human rights. It seeks to understand inequalities that lie at the heart of development problems, address discriminatory practices and unjust distribution of power that slow down the progress of development and often result in groups of people being left behind.

Under the HRBA, the plans, policies and processes of development are anchored in a system of rights and corresponding obligations under international and national law, including all political and social rights, and the right to development.

How DASA uses a rights-based approach

1. Participation and inclusion

- DASA centres people with disabilities – especially women, girls and people with disabilities as partners in analysis and co-decision makers, not just “beneficiaries”.
- Tools (score cards, consultations, community meetings) are adapted (accessible formats, facilitation support, reasonable accommodation) so participation becomes meaningful, not tokenistic.

2. Equality and non-discrimination

- The process asks: “Who is not in the room? Who is not reached by this service?” and pushes for targeted actions (for example, outreach, accessible information, budget allocations and new services).

3. Accountability

- Duty-bearers (government, service providers) are in the room along with OPDs and people with disabilities; they hear evidence, and agree to specific, time-bound commitments.
- DASA creates a traceable chain from standards → scores → action plans → follow-up meetings → tracking progress.

- This shifts from “dialogue” to “accountability” – what will you change, by when, with what resources, and how will we monitor it?

4. Transparency and access to information

- Policies, budgets, plans and performance data are simplified and shared in accessible formats.
- The score card process makes complex systems legible to rights-holders (“What are you supposed to receive? What have you actually received?”).

5. Empowerment of rights-holders

- People with disabilities gain knowledge of their rights (CRPD, national laws, sector policies) and how systems work.
- The process builds confidence, collective voice and negotiation skills of OPDs, women’s groups, youths with disabilities.
- Over time, people with disabilities build robust dialogue with policymakers around collective claims grounded in law and policy.

6. Link to legal and policy frameworks

- DASA indicators and the policy score check tool are explicitly mapped to CRPD articles, SDG targets and national policies.
- This allows people with disabilities and OPDs to say with confidence that it isn’t just their opinion, but the gap violates specific obligations governments have already agreed to.

B. Accessibility and reasonable accommodation

Ensuring full accessibility and reasonable accommodation is central to the DASA process. Every stage, from planning to facilitation, should uphold the principles of inclusion, equality and dignity for people with disabilities.

1. Selection of facilitators

- Facilitators should be chosen from among OPD members to both empower them and ensure that participants are guided by people who understand their lived realities and communication needs.

2. Sensitising facilitators

- Before implementation, facilitators should undergo a briefing session to strengthen their understanding of accessibility, gender sensitivity and intersectionality. This ensures that the needs and priorities of all people with disabilities remain central throughout the process.

3. Accessible venues and logistics

- The venue for DASA meetings must be physically accessible, with barrier-free entry and movement for wheelchair users and people using walking aids. Materials should be provided in accessible formats (braille, large print, easy-to-read and digital). Sign language interpretation and assistive listening systems should be available, as needed.

4. Inclusive seating arrangements

- Seating should be arranged to allow all participants to see and hear each other easily, particularly for those who lip-read. Refreshments should be placed at accessible heights for everyone.

5. Time allocation and flexibility

- Additional time should be built into the schedule to account for participants who may require more time to move, communicate or process information. This ensures that no one feels rushed or excluded from discussions.

6. On-site assistance and guidance

- Facilitators should be trained to offer respectful and proactive assistance, including clarifying steps in the process, interpreting materials or providing physical guidance when requested. Continuous communication support, such as translation, sign language and simplified explanations, should be ensured.

7. Inclusion of support people

- Participants with intellectual, psychosocial or high-support needs should be facilitated to attend with support for people such as family members, caregivers or interpreters, who assist them in participating fully in the process.



Members of the Equal Bangladesh disability rights campaign participating in a workshop on the outskirts of Dhaka, Bangladesh in March 2024.

C. Gender sensitivity in DASA

The tool provides an opportunity to focus on the specific rights and needs of girls and women with disabilities into account. Also, DASA requires balanced gender considerations while implementing several steps of the tool, through:

- Verifying policy documents to check for clauses that ensure representation to women and girls with disabilities
- Organising dedicated focus group discussions among girls and women with disabilities, and selecting women OPD representatives to participate in all stages of the DASA
- Ensuring that women and girls with disabilities present the score card at the interface meeting
- Ensuring specific action and messaging around gender dimensions in the score card follow-up in the joint action plan and advocacy activities



Magdaleux Hawra Corgay, founder of organizations for women with disabilities, presenting at the Sightsavers citizenship and political participation workshop in Makeni.

How to run a DASA

Process pathway

DASA combines collective policy analysis, participatory indicator scoring and collaborative action planning.

Phase	1. Desk review and policy mapping
Purpose	Understand the legal and policy environment for women and girls with disabilities; identify gaps and opportunities
Key activities	<p>Desk review – policy score check tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check if legal frameworks protect the rights of women and girls with disabilities • Identify policies referencing people with disabilities, and specifically women with disabilities, and review wider policies to assess the extent of disability inclusion and intersectionality • Review programmes implementing these policies • Identify whether budgets exist for programme implementation • Assess whether OPDs are included in design and implementation • Check existence and quality of monitoring and evaluation processes
Key outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of key laws/policies • Disability inclusion gaps, and opportunities
Stakeholders	<p>Leading: Sightsavers country office team, along with core group OPD members, conduct the review using the policy score check tool</p> <p>Participating: Aligned disability-focused organisations, such as civil society organisations (CSOs)</p>
Phase	2. DASA score card process (indicator framework development)
Purpose	Assess policy implementation through participatory scoring and understand community expectations

Key activities	<p>DASA indicator framework development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine whether policies and programmes meet expectations of people with disabilities, especially women with disabilities • Identify strengths, weaknesses & opportunities, in policy implementation through the indicators associated with policy awareness, reach, usage, effectiveness & adequacy • Conduct sub-group scoring (government, service providers, OPDs, community, relevant others) • Build consensus scores for each DASA indicator (awareness, reach, usage, efficiency, effectiveness, adequacy) • Build a joint action plan based on the lowest scoring indicators
Key outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalised DASA score card with consensus indicator scores • Collective draft action plan
Stakeholders	<p>Leading: Core group OPD members, supported by Sightsavers</p> <p>Participating: Service providers, women with disabilities, community gatekeepers, wider community, people with disabilities & local government officials</p>

Phase	3. National level consultation and follow-up
Purpose	Present evidence, build consensus, validate results, and arrive at an improved action plan
Key activities	<p>National dialogue and endorsement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present findings from desk review and DASA score card • Obtain feedback and suggestions from decision-makers, OPDs, and relevant stakeholders • Endorse the joint action plan, recommendations, and commitments • Document follow-up mechanisms and accountability steps
Key outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorsed strategy/action plan • Consultation report • Follow-up roadmap
Stakeholders	<p>Leading: Sightsavers and the OPD core group members</p> <p>Participating: OPDs, disability-focused organisations/CSOs, service providers, national and local government officials, development partners</p>



Phase 1: Desk review and policy mapping

The legislative framework of every country is different and often very complex. The desk review aims to understand the overall legislative and policy environment. While the review is not expected to be comprehensive, it should be sufficient to identify the key protections for people with disabilities and specifically women with disabilities.

The policy mapping and analysis generated from the desk review help OPDs and other relevant stakeholders to understand:

- What frameworks in the selected domain (health, education, economic empowerment) exist for people with disabilities, especially women and girls with disabilities
- To what extent disability inclusion and intersectionality are reflected in these frameworks, and how they are implemented

For each of the key areas, the core team, including OPD members, would need to access secondary information from various sources, both governmental and non-governmental.

Steps

- Form a small core team that includes OPD representatives (especially women with disabilities), country office staff and other partners
- Jointly review relevant legislation, national policies and programmes using the policy score check tool
- Summarise findings to produce a brief report. This can also be done under key UNCRPD articles (such as education, health, participation, freedom from violence)
- Identify strengths, weaknesses and policy gaps

Output: A short **policy score check tool** report summarising each policy's inclusiveness, implementation and budget allocation (scored as high/medium/low or 1–5 scale).

Phase 2: The DASA indicator framework and score card

The score card exercise transforms policy analysis into participatory evidence. OPDs, women with disabilities, service providers, community leaders/gatekeepers and government representatives jointly score a series of indicators to assess how policies work in practice.

Step 1

Planning and preparation

Objective:

Identify the focus of the score card and prepare stakeholders.

Key activities:

- Identify the domains to be assessed (for example, disaster risk reduction, healthcare, education)
- Select target groups (for example, women with disabilities, local authorities, non-governmental organisations (NGOs))
- Form a facilitation team to guide the process
- Develop key indicators based on disability inclusion priorities
- Train the facilitation team on implementing DASA scoring events

Example of disaster risk reduction (DRR):

- Accessibility of early warning systems
- Inclusion of women with disabilities in DRR planning

Step 2

Conduct the DASA indicator scoring

Objective:

Gather perspectives of people with disabilities on service quality, as well as service providers' perspectives on their own performance.

Key activities:

- Develop a DASA indicator score card with performance indicators. Rate services using simple scoring (1-5 scale, symbols for accessibility)
- Collect qualitative feedback through storytelling, interviews, observation or photography
- Service providers assess their own service delivery and identify challenges and successes from their perspective
- Share findings with people with disabilities and include their perspective on disability inclusion

Example of DRR:

- Women with disabilities rate the accessibility of evacuation centres on a scale of 1 to 5, providing real-life experiences
- Disaster management officers evaluate their performance in inclusive emergency response efforts

Step 3

Interface meeting and dialogue

Objective:

Facilitate discussion between people with disabilities and service providers to compare perspectives and identify solutions.

Key activities:

- Present score card to people with disabilities and service providers
- Facilitate a structured dialogue to discuss gaps and possible improvements
- Promote mutual understanding and accountability

Example of DRR:

- People with disabilities might highlight barriers in emergency evacuation processes, while service providers discuss resource constraints

Step 4

Joint action planning and follow-up

Objective:

Develop solutions and ensure continuous improvement.

Key activities:

- Develop a joint action plan with commitments from both sides
- Assign responsibilities and set deadlines
- Establish a follow-up mechanism to track progress

Example of DRR:

- Action plans could include installing ramps in evacuation centres and training emergency responders on disability inclusion

A. Preparation

Stakeholder mapping: DASA is conducted at the national level. Hence, stakeholder mapping is key first step. Stakeholders include members of OPDs, women and adolescent girl members of the OPDs, youths with disabilities, community gatekeepers, such as informal leaders, religious figures and elders. They also include service providers and government representatives from local to national levels responsible for the design and implementation of policies and programmes related to the selected key area(s) for conducting DASA.

Formation of a core team, including OPD members, and implementing DASA training: As a preparatory step to conducting DASA, participating OPD members and other participating organisations must be trained on the DASA process, including the policy score check tool, the indicator framework and planning for the national level consultation.

Orientation of service providers and government representatives on DASA and their role: Service providers across all levels of the government responsible for design and implementation of policies and programmes related to the selected key areas, must be oriented on DASA, how it will be conducted and its potential benefits, as well as their specific role in the process. This will help to develop trust and promote joint efforts to improve the implementation of different programmes on the ground.

Selection of the facilitation team for the scoring event: Ideally, these should be OPD members who are part of the core team and familiar with the ground-level implementation of the various policies and programmes. They should also be aware of the needs and expectations of people with disabilities, especially women and girls with disabilities, in various communities within the country.

Selection of compilation team – a team of two to three people to help with the compilation of scores is also required.

Preparation and planning summary

- Pick and train core team
- Fix venue for group meetings
- Complete stakeholder mapping
- Orient all stakeholders – OPDs, people with disabilities, wider community and government officials on the DASA approach
- Invite stakeholders to participate in the scoring event
- Organise materials – such as flip charts, tapes, chart paper, laptop, marker pens, cameras and recorders
- Ensure accessible venues and communication support (sign language, braille, easy-read materials)
- Form a facilitation team (preferably OPD-led) and a compilation team to record results



Portrait of Abubakar Bangura, Youth Network Country Representative, at the Sightsavers citizenship and political participation workshop in Makeni.

B. Input tracking

Input tracking is an important step that builds the foundation for DASA. It helps in understanding the actual status of implementation of programmes and policies related to the key thematic area selected for conducting DASA. It also focuses on evidence gathering by the OPD core team to provide an on-the-ground reality check against norms, as per policy. Input tracking is done using three methods: examination and verification of relevant records, physical observation and key informant interactions.

1. Examination of results from the desk review

The policy score check sheet must be studied in detail by the participating OPD members and the facilitation team to understand the status of policy implementation in the key areas.

2. Physical observation

Since DASA will be implemented at the national level, the participants would bring their experiences and knowledge of the

ground-level situation based on the broad DASA indicators to the discussions. The indicators need to be documented as part of the input tracking exercise so that evidence can be collected against the indicators.

The evidence can include any audio, video documents, case studies or field notes from their interactions with people with disabilities, especially women and girls with disabilities, and any other documentation.

3. Interaction with key informants, where applicable

The participants would bring their experiences from their interactions with the community, as well as the relevant officials, to the discussions. Those need to be documented as a part of the input tracking exercise.

A checklist of key points to be covered can be prepared for documenting the experiences from the observation and interactions.

Example: Input Tracking Matrix for Greening City Programme - inputs from group 2 - women and girls with disabilities.

S no.	Input indicator	Entitlement	Actual	Remarks/observations
1	No. of sensitisation forums	4	4	The target was achieved, but, considering the following, there may be need to incorporate more programmes; - <ul style="list-style-type: none">the vastness of the geographical regionthe high populationthe effect of the floods in the 2024 long rain season
2	No. of resilience programmes initiated	5	5	
3	No. of air quality sampling kits procured	2	0	The target was not achieved. There is need to clearly indicate the reasons for this

Input tracking summary

- Examine results of desk review
- Collate information from policy score check tool
- Physical observation, where applicable, including photos and videos
- Interviews with key informants, wherever applicable

C. Group scoring

- Three or more groups are formed, for instance, OPD members, women with disabilities, and service providers, where each indicator is scored from 1 to 5
- Each group explains their reasoning, and scores are later compared
- The compilation team would take the score sheets and put them together. While the three columns for the three group scores would be filled, the last column in the format for the consensus score would be left blank at this point. It would be filled during the next step of DASA, which is the interface meeting

Example: Sample DASA framework indicator scoring by group 2 (women and girls with disabilities). Greening the City programme

S no.	Performance indicator	Score	Reason for score	Recommendation
1	Awareness about the programme	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information was not accessible to people with disabilities • There is more awareness among other entities, but not the government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication should be more accessible to accommodate all people with disabilities • There is need to disseminate the information in a better way
	Awareness of the existence of the programme	1		
	Awareness about the provisions/entitlements under the programme	1		
	Efforts from the government and other entities to build awareness	2		
	Availability and reach of appropriate information for people with disabilities	1		
	Average score for awareness	1.8		
2	Reach		Access to knowledge on how to plant trees, which builds ownership among people with disabilities	
	Reach of benefits to women and girls with disabilities	4		
	Average score for reach	4		

S no.	Performance indicator	Score	Reason for score	Recommendation
3	Usage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was knowledge on planting trees that can be used by the participants at an individual level to ensure more tree coverage Engagement of people with disabilities on climate change awareness programmes 	
	Usage of the programme benefits	3		
	Usage of the programme benefits	3		
	Average score for usage	3		
4	Adequacy		Provision of transport reimbursement to people with disabilities, including their care givers, tree seedlings provided and T-shirts for visibility	
	Adequacy of facilities provided, in terms of quantity (money or material)	3		
	Average score for adequacy	3		
5	Effectiveness		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Empowerment of women and girls with disabilities through discussions on climate change The fact that there were enough seedlings and facilitation to conduct the tree planting activity was evidence that corruption was minimal 	
	Quality of benefits	3		
	Timeliness of the benefits	3		
	Extent of corruption	4		
	Grievance redress mechanism			
	Average score for effectiveness	3.3		

S no.	Performance indicator	Score	Reason for score	Recommendation
6	Attitude of officials	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women with disabilities were treated with dignity, and empathy was expressed in situations where there was need for more support 	
	Behaviour towards women and girls with disabilities			
	Empathy			
	Average score for attitude of officials	3		
7	Infrastructure	3	People with disabilities were able to effectively participate and access the venue as there was reasonable accommodation	
	Availability of required infrastructure			
	Quality of the infrastructure			
	Adequacy of the infrastructure			
	Average score for infrastructure	3		
8	Availability of resources to make it inclusive	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sign language interpreters were provided • Guides for people with disabilities were facilitated to enable engagement 	
	Human resources			
	Financial resources			
	Average score for resource availability	3		

D. Consensus scoring and development of the joint action plan

All groups come together to:

- Compare and discuss scores
- Agree on consensus scores
- Identify three lowest scoring indicators
- Develop a joint action plan to improve these areas

An interface meeting is where all stakeholders come together. As a first step, the score sheets would be shared with the larger group. Following this, they would arrive at consensus scores for all the indicators through discussion and debate. The coordinator and facilitator for the interface meeting should ensure that the discussions happen collaboratively. Once the consensus scores have been finalised, the three lowest-scoring indicators should be selected for preparing detailed action

plans. The collective preparation of an action plan on low-scoring indicators for each key area is facilitated.

Interface meeting – Summary

- Apart from all stakeholders who participated, other key community leaders, political leaders and senior officials can be invited
- Begin with a presentation of the findings from the input tracking on the ground
- Share the scores given by different groups
- Hold discussions via facilitators to arrive at consensus scores
- Prepare an action plan with tasks being assigned to each category of stakeholder with clearly defined activities and deadlines

Example: Project – Interface meeting consensus scores – Greening the City programme

Indicator	Score by government representatives	Score by women and girls with disabilities	Consensus score
Awareness of the programme	1.25	3	2
Attitude of the officials	3	1	1
Usage	3	2.5	3

Action plan template

Indicator	Action	Responsible actor	Timeline	Resources needed	Follow-up

Phase 3: National consultation and follow-up

The final phase connects local evidence to national accountability processes.

As part of the preparation for the national level workshop, score sheets from the desk review for all the selected key areas for assessment, the input tracking matrices, the consensus DASA score card and related action plan should be compiled in an easy-to-read format. These must be presented at the workshop to solicit feedback and suggestions from the participants. Participants in this workshop should include decision-makers at the national level, including both administrators and political leaders, influencers such as OPD networks, the media and academics. After the presentation of the policy score check assessment and the DASA input tracking and scoring of indicators, the action plan is to be further discussed and endorsed by the participants, especially government. The national consultation would end with a revised and improved action plan developed jointly by all stakeholders who participated.



© Sightsavers

Participants reviewing their work during the last training workshop ahead of the Hear Me See Me exhibition.

National consultation summary

- Prepare a session plan for the consultation
- Prepare a short report on policy score check tool findings and DASA framework score card findings. Photos and videos can be used as well
- Share this report with participants, either prior to the consultation or during, using an appropriate presentation format
- Present DASA findings, photos and testimonies, as well as the joint action plan that emerged from the indicator scoring event
- Invite policy experts, ground level advocacy experts, OPD representatives, local and national government officials and development partners and media
- Hold focused discussions on the action plan prepared as the result of the DASA exercise and refine it to be more efficient and effective, and finalise it
- Promote government and key donor endorsement of the action plan for inclusion in the domain under review

© Sightsavers



Members of the Equal Bangladesh disability rights campaign participating in a workshop on the outskirts of Dhaka, Bangladesh in March 2024.

Follow-up

Follow-up activity needs to be carried out at the ground and national level. Follow-up activities should be undertaken based on the timeframes agreed upon in the action plan finalised at the national consultation. Ideally, it is best to start follow-up activities three to six months after the action plan is prepared and agreed upon by all stakeholders concerned. The follow-up exercise is to be carried out until the end of the timeframe agreed upon in the action plan, once every three to six months. It should comprise physical observation at the ground level, as well as interaction with key informants. Based on the output of the follow-up activities, status reports can be shared with the service providers. If there has been a delay or inaction, reasons for this must be noted clearly before being escalated to higher officials. After several follow-ups, if there is a need felt, modifications to the action plan should also be considered for the overall improvement of services available to people with disabilities, especially women and girls with disabilities.

Follow-up phase summary:

- After the national consultation, stakeholders are expected to implement the action plan
- Allow a few months, or the time indicated in the action plan, as a deadline and conduct the follow-up exercise
- The basic purpose of the follow-up is to revisit the action plan and cross check its status of implementation on the ground
- The follow-up exercise would provide a view into the impact of the DASA process
- Monitor agreed actions every three to six months
- Track progress, update status reports and escalate unresolved issues
- Share lessons across OPDs and with ministries



Photo from the Sightsavers women leadership training in August 2024.

Kenya case study (summary)

Context

Kenya faces frequent climate-related disasters. Women with disabilities are often excluded from DRR efforts. Sightsavers, Gifted Community Centre (GCC) and Lensational piloted the DASA tool in Nairobi to assess disability inclusion in DRR policies as part of the **Hear Me See Me (HMSM) project**⁴. The generic process described in the earlier chapters was customised to the context in Kenya. DASA emerged as a useful, impactful tool. It is adaptable and convenient to use in combination with other social accountability tools. It was complemented by the Lensational project, which used a photovoice approach where women with disabilities were trained on photography to share stories from the community on disaster risk and response. This also provided a strong lived experience evidence base as a context to the actual DASA scoring event.

What was done

- **Desk review and policy score check tool:** Analysed key policies, including the Persons with Disabilities Act (2025), National Disaster Risk Management Bill (2023), and Nairobi County DRR and disability policies
- DASA indicator framework scoring: OPDs, women with disabilities and service providers used the DASA score card to rate policy implementation
- National consultation: Results were shared with government officials, the Red Cross and the World Bank

Some key findings

- DRR frameworks referenced disability inclusion but lacked clear operational guidance
- Gaps in accessible early warning systems and inclusive evacuation centres
- Need for training of emergency responders on disability inclusion

Impact

- OPD capacity strengthened; participants reported greater confidence to engage officials
- A disability-inclusive DRR working group for Nairobi County was formed
- County governments are committed to allocating funds for disability-inclusive DRR
- The World Bank's Financing Locally Led Climate Action (FLLoCA) programme may consider DASA elements for its inclusion monitoring

Key takeaways

- DASA is scalable and adaptable to multiple policy areas (education, health, social protection, DRR)
- It empowers OPDs to collect evidence, negotiate change and co-create accountability with authorities
- For best results, integrate DASA findings into national monitoring of CRPD, SDGs and gender frameworks

4. www.sightsavers.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/Hear-me-see-me-disaster-risk-reduction-in-Kenya-guide.pdf

Annexes

Annex 1: Sample policy score check tool – add additional policies/programmes, as necessary

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
1	Legal framework	There is legislation relevant to the key area	1 point		
		The law is implicit for women (if this indicator is scored 1, the next one need not be scored)	1 point		
		The law is explicit for women (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		
		The law is implicit for people with disabilities (if this indicator is scored 1, the next one need not be scored)	1 point		
		The law is explicit for people with disabilities (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		
		There is a clear definition of what constitutes discrimination against women	1 point		
		There is a clear definition of what constitutes discrimination against people with disabilities	1 point		
Total score for legal framework and percentage of compliance (ideal score 7)					

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
2	Policies	There are national or sub-national level policies related to women in relation to the key areas	1 point		
		There are national or sub-national level policies related to people with disabilities in relation to the key areas	1 point		
	Policy 1	The policy is implicit for women (if this indicator is scored 1 the next one need not be scored)	1 point		
		The policy is explicit for women (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		
		The policy is implicit for people with disabilities (if this indicator is scored 1, the next one need not be scored)	1 point		
		The policy is explicit for people with disabilities (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		
		The policy has a roadmap for implementation (not all details are available) (if this indicator is scored 1 the next one need not be scored)	1 point		

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
		The policy has a roadmap for implementation (clear goals, budget allocations, human resource allocations, expected outcomes and timelines) (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		

Total score for policies and percentage of compliance (ideal score for three policies, 18, and for one policy, 6)

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
3	Programmes	There are national or sub-national level programmes related to the policies selected above	1 point		
	Programme 1	The programme is implicit for women (if this indicator is scored 1 the next one need not be scored)	1 point		
		The programme is explicit for women (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		
		The programme is implicit for people with disabilities (if this indicator is scored 1, the next one need not be scored)	1 point		
		The programme is explicit for people with disabilities (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
		The programme has a roadmap for implementation (not all details are available) (if this indicator is scored 1, the next one need not be scored)	1 point		
		The programme has a roadmap for implementation (clearly defined goals, efficient targeting, adequate funding, appropriate timelines, a trained team, and measurable outcomes) (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		
		All goals achieved fully (if this indicator is scored 1, the next two need not be scored)	2 points		
		All goals achieved partially (if this indicator is scored 1, the other two goal-related ones need not be scored)	1 point		
		Some goals partially achieved and some others fully (if this indicator is scored 1, the other two goal-related ones need not be scored)	1 point		
		All goals partially achieved (if this indicator is scored 1, the other two goal-related ones need not be scored)	1 point		

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
		Some goals partially achieved and some others fully (if this indicator is scored 1, the other two goal-related ones need not be scored)	1 point		

Total score for programmes and percentage of compliance (ideal score for three programmes, 24, for one programme, 8)

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
4	Budget allocations				
	Programme 1	Detailed budget allocation	1 point		
		100% utilisation as per plan (if this indicator is scored 3, the next three need not be scored)	3 points		
		50%-99% utilisation as per plan (if this indicator is scored 2, none of the other indicators related to utilisation need to be scored)	2 points		
		25%-49% utilisation as per plan (if this indicator is scored 1, none of the other indicators related to utilisation need to be scored)	1 point		
		No utilisation (this indicator is to be scored 0 if all the three indicators above are scored 0 or left blank)	0 points		

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
		Measurable outcomes defined in the programme	1 point		

Total score for budget allocations and percentage of compliance (ideal score 15 for three programmes, and 5 for one programme)

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
5	Community participation				
	Programme 1	There is scope for community participation	1 point		
		Roles for community participation clearly defined	1 point		
		Process for community participation clearly defined	1 point		
		Community participation integrated from the outset (if this indicator is scored 2, the next indicator need not be scored)	2 points		
		Community participation as post-implementation feedback (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	1 point		
		Grievance redressal system in place	1 point		

Total score for community participation and percentage of compliance (ideal score 18 for three programmes, 6 for one programme)

S no.	Indicators	Scoring criteria	Allocated score	Actual score based on desk review	Justification notes for actual score
6	Monitoring and evaluation				
	Programme 1	Inclusion of monitoring and evaluation as a requirement in the programme	1 point		
		Internal audit prescribed in the programme (if this indicator is scored 1, the next indicator need not be scored)	1 point		
		External (third party) audit prescribed in the programme (this indicator can be scored only if previous indicator is blank or scored 0)	2 points		
		Independent bodies, such as Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) or disability council, mandated	1 point		

Total score for monitoring and evaluation and percentage of compliance (ideal score 12 for three programmes and 4 for one programme)

Total score for key area and overall percentage of compliance (ideal score)

Annex 2: DASA score card template

Sl no.	Indicators	Score (1-5, 1 being lowest)	Reasons for scores
1	Awareness of the programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of the existence of the programme • Awareness of the provisions/entitlements under the programme • Efforts from the government and other entities to build awareness • Availability and reach of appropriate informational material for people with disabilities 		
2	Reach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach of benefits to people with disabilities especially women and girls with disabilities 		
3	Usage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usage of the programme benefits • Ease of processing like documentation, wait times, dependencies on caregivers or other organisations. 		
4	Adequacy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of facilities provided in terms of quantity (money or material) 		
5	Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of benefits • Timeliness of the benefits • Extent of corruption • Grievance redress mechanism 		
6	Attitude of officials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour towards people with disabilities especially women and girls with disabilities • Empathy 		
7	Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of required infrastructure • Quality of the infrastructure • Adequacy of the infrastructure 		
8	Availability of resources to make it inclusive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human resources • Financial resources 		

Annex 3: Action plan template

Sl no.	Indicator	Action plan	Who takes action	By when (deadline)	Resource requirement		Who will follow-up	Time frame (short/ medium/ long term)
					Human	Financial		
Indicator one								
Indicator two								
Indicator three								

We work with partners in low
and middle income countries
to eliminate avoidable blindness
and promote equal opportunities
for people with disabilities

www.sightsavers.org



@Sightsavers

Bumpers Way
Bumpers Farm
Chippenham
SN14 6NG
UK

+44 (0)1444 446 600

info@sightsavers.org

