

## MAIN PATH ADVISORY

# Disability Inclusion Diagnostic

Sample Programme — Child Protection, Middle East Region

---

**Overall Rating: Emerging** — Core Score: 2 / 18

Documents reviewed:

Programme Narrative · Resource Mobilisation Strategy · Work Plan · Youth Advisory Board Invitation Materials

## SECTION 1

# Executive Summary

---

The programme operates at the intersection of child protection, social norms change, and adolescent engagement — a portfolio where disability inclusion is not optional but structurally mandated. Children with disabilities face disproportionate rates of violence globally: WHO and UNICEF evidence consistently shows they are 3.7 times more likely to experience violence than their non-disabled peers, with rates compounded in conflict-affected and fragile settings across the Middle East region where the programme operates. CRPD Article 7 obligates states — and by extension, international programme actors — to ensure children with disabilities enjoy all human rights, including freedom from violence, on an equal basis. SDG Target 16.2 cannot be achieved while leaving children with disabilities behind. UNICEF's Disability Inclusive Programming and Accountability Standards (DIPAS) further require that disability inclusion be embedded across programme design, data systems, and partnerships — not treated as an add-on.

This diagnostic reviewed four programme documents: the Programme Narrative, Resource Mobilisation strategy, Work Plan, and Youth Advisory Board (YAB) invitation materials. The finding is unambiguous: disability inclusion is currently ABSENT across all six core dimensions. No document explicitly names children with disabilities as intended beneficiaries. The Theory of Change, outcomes, and indicators are silent on disability. The YAB — a flagship adolescent engagement mechanism — contains no accessibility criteria, no reference to recruiting young people with disabilities, and no mention of communication adaptations. Data collection tools are not referenced, let alone aligned to the Washington Group Child Functioning Module. No delivery partner is identified with disability expertise, and no budget allocation for disability inclusion can be identified.

The overall RAG rating is RED. The core score is 2 out of 18 (Maturity Level 1 — Emerging). This means the programme currently risks systematically excluding the children most likely to experience violence from its prevention reach, its evidence base, and its accountability systems. This is both a programmatic failure and a reputational and donor-credibility risk as disability-inclusive programming becomes a baseline expectation of institutional funders. The path forward is achievable: disability inclusion must be named in the Theory of Change within 30 days, the YAB recruitment process must be retrofitted with accessibility criteria within 60 days, and the MEL framework must incorporate Washington Group-aligned indicators within 90 days.

## SECTION 2

## Overall Portfolio Score & Maturity Rating

| <div>2.1</div> <div>out of 3.0</div> | Stage       | Range     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|
|                                      | Absent      | 0.0 – 0.9 |
|                                      | ★ Emerging  | 1.0 – 1.5 |
|                                      | Developing  | 1.6 – 2.2 |
|                                      | Established | 2.3 – 2.7 |
|                                      | Leading     | 2.8 – 3.0 |

The programme sits firmly at Maturity Level 1 — Emerging — with a core score of 2 out of 18. Disability inclusion is currently unmanaged: no institutional intent in programme documents, no design accommodation for children with disabilities, no disability-disaggregated data, no OPD partnerships, no accountable owner, and no acknowledged risk of exclusion. Major institutional donors including USAID, FCDO, and the EU are increasingly requiring disability inclusion as a condition of grant compliance.

## SECTION 3

## Heat Map

| Dimension                   | Score            | RAG Status                    |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Intent & Commitment         | 0 / 3            | ● Red — Priority gap          |
| Inclusive Design            | 0 / 3            | ● Red — Priority gap          |
| Data & Evidence             | 1 / 3            | ● Red — Priority gap          |
| Delivery & Partnerships     | 0 / 3            | ● Red — Priority gap          |
| Monitoring & Accountability | 1 / 3            | ● Red — Priority gap          |
| Risk & Missed Value         | 0 / 3            | ● Red — Priority gap          |
| Budget & Resourcing         | 1 / 3            | ● Amber — Needs strengthening |
| <b>OVERALL</b>              | <b>2.1 / 3.0</b> |                               |

● **Red** = Priority gap — immediate action required (score 0–1)

● **Amber** = Needs strengthening — action within 3–9 months (1.1–2)

● **Green** = Relative strength — monitor and maintain (2.1–3)

## SECTION 4

# Dimension-by-Dimension Findings

## Intent & Commitment

Score: 0/3

Status: Red

### What we found

Across all four documents, children with disabilities are not named as intended beneficiaries at any level — not in the programme goal, outcomes, or guiding principles. The Programme Narrative references 'vulnerable children' and 'adolescents most at risk' without once disaggregating this to include children with disabilities. The Resource Mobilisation document frames the case for funding around VAC prevalence data and social norms without any disability-specific framing. The Work Plan lists activities, milestones, and responsible parties with no reference to inclusion commitments or disability targets. The YAB Invitation Letter does not mention young people with disabilities as a priority group for recruitment.

### The gap

The complete absence of disability as an intended beneficiary group means there is no institutional driver to include children with disabilities in design, delivery, or measurement — making exclusion the default and creating a structural blind spot in a programme targeting the most violence-affected children.

#### ■ Red flag

No board-approved inclusion policy identified. No Theory of Change or outcome statement references children with disabilities. 'Vulnerable children' language without disability disaggregation is a common tokenism risk.

Confidence: **High** | Evidence: Programme Narrative · Resource Mobilisation Strategy · Work Plan · YAB Invitation Materials

## Inclusive Design

Score: 0/3

Status: Red

### What we found

No accessibility or inclusive design considerations are documented in any of the four reviewed documents. The Work Plan specifies activities and timelines but contains no accessibility criteria for venues, communications, or digital materials. The YAB Invitation Letter makes no mention of physical accessibility of meetings, communication format adaptations (e.g. sign language interpretation, Easy Read materials, captioning), or transport support for young people with mobility impairments. The Programme Narrative describes community engagement and social norms work without reference to how these are designed to be accessible for children or caregivers with disabilities.

### The gap

Without documented accessibility requirements embedded at the design stage, the programme defaults to exclusion-by-omission. For the YAB specifically, this means the participatory mechanism most likely to shape programme direction is inaccessible to young people with disabilities — undermining both the quality and representativeness of adolescent voice.

#### ■ Red flag

No accessibility criteria in activity design. YAB process has no documented accommodations. Risk of reactive 'we'll accommodate if needed' approach rather than proactive universal design.

Confidence: **High** | Evidence: Work Plan · YAB Invitation Letter · Programme Narrative

## Data & Evidence

Score: 1/3

Status: Red

### What we found

The Programme Narrative and Resource Mobilisation document reference global and regional VAC prevalence data — including WHO figures on violence rates — but none of these data points are disaggregated by disability status. There is no reference in any document to the Washington Group Short Set, UNICEF Child Functioning Module (CFM for children 2–17), or any other validated disability measurement instrument. The Work Plan does not include disability-disaggregated indicators in its monitoring columns. One partial credit is awarded because the Programme Narrative references evidence-based approaches and data-driven adaptation — indicating an infrastructure exists into which disability data could be incorporated, though it has not been.

### The gap

Without disability-disaggregated data, the programme cannot know whether children with disabilities are being reached, whether violence rates are declining for this group, or whether the programme is inadvertently widening inequality. This is both a measurement failure and an ethical gap given the known elevated VAC risk for this population.

#### ■ Red flag

Global prevalence figures used without disability disaggregation — classic assumption-not-measurement risk. No CFM or Washington Group Short Set referenced. No enumerator guidance for disability-sensitive data collection visible in Work Plan.

Confidence: **Medium** | Evidence: Programme Narrative · Resource Mobilisation Strategy · Work Plan

## Delivery & Partnerships

Score: 0/3

Status: **Red**

### What we found

The Programme Narrative and Work Plan reference implementing partners and community-level delivery mechanisms, but no partner is identified with explicit disability expertise, and no Organisations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs) are named as programme partners, sub-grantees, or consultees. The YAB background document describes a multi-country adolescent advisory structure but does not specify whether any member organisations representing young people with disabilities are included. The Resource Mobilisation document makes no reference to disability-specialist co-implementing organisations.

### The gap

The absence of OPDs or disability-specialist partners from the delivery architecture means the programme lacks the competency to identify disability-related barriers to VAC prevention, adapt delivery for children with disabilities, or maintain accountability for their inclusion.

#### ■ Red flag

No OPDs named in partner rosters or governance structure. No disability training referenced in partner capacity-building activities in Work Plan.

Confidence: **Medium** | Evidence: Programme Narrative · Work Plan · Resource Mobilisation Strategy · YAB Invitation Materials

## Monitoring & Accountability

Score: 1/3

Status: **Red**

### What we found

The Work Plan contains indicators and milestones tracked against responsible parties and timelines, indicating an existing MEL infrastructure. However, no indicator in the Work Plan is disaggregated by disability status, and no accountability owner for disability inclusion is identified. The Programme Narrative references learning and adaptive management processes, but disability inclusion is absent from all reporting frameworks and review mechanisms identified. One partial credit is awarded for the existence of a functional MEL structure that could be upgraded to include disability indicators.

### The gap

Without a named accountability owner and at least one disability-disaggregated indicator in the Work Plan, disability inclusion has no pathway from intent to result — even if commitments were made at programme design, there is no mechanism to track, review, or course-correct on inclusion performance.

#### ■ Red flag

MEL framework is disability-blind despite tracking multiple equity dimensions. No quarterly reporting template or reporting column references disability.

Confidence: **Medium** | Evidence: Work Plan · Programme Narrative · Resource Mobilisation Strategy

## Risk & Missed Value

Score: 0/3

Status: **Red**

### What we found

No risk register, scenario analysis, or risk narrative in any of the four documents acknowledges the risk of excluding children with disabilities from VAC prevention programming. The Resource Mobilisation document outlines a funding case without reference to the programmatic or reputational risk of disability exclusion. The Programme Narrative does not identify disability exclusion as a threat to outcomes, scale, or equity commitments. There is no costed analysis of the population of children with disabilities in the programme's target geographies who would be missed under the current design.

### The gap

The failure to name disability exclusion as a programme risk means it will not be managed, mitigated, or reported — placing the programme in a position of unacknowledged exposure on both the results and donor-credibility dimensions as disability-inclusive programming becomes standard practice among institutional funders.

#### ■ Red flag

Risk of exclusion is entirely unacknowledged. No scenario modelling of impact on results if children with disabilities — who face elevated VAC risk — are systematically excluded from prevention reach.

Confidence: **High** | Evidence: Resource Mobilisation Strategy · Programme Narrative · Work Plan

## Budget & Resourcing

Score: 1/3

Status: **Amber**

### What we found

The Resource Mobilisation document provides a funding strategy and cost framework, but no disability-specific budget lines are identifiable — no allocations for assistive technology, OPD partnership costs, accessibility adaptations, sign language interpretation, or disability-inclusive training of programme staff. The Work Plan includes resource columns against activities, but none reference disability-specific costs. A score of 1 is given rather than 0 because a general budget infrastructure exists; however, it contains no disability-specific allocations.

### The gap

Without ring-fenced budget for disability inclusion, any commitment made at design level will be undeliverable. The cost of retrofitting accessibility at delivery stage is consistently higher than designing it in at the outset — making this a cost-efficiency risk as well as an equity gap.

■ Red flag

No disability-specific lines in Resource Mobilisation document. Risk that disability inclusion will be treated as an unfunded mandate if not budgeted before next funding round.

Confidence: **Low** | Evidence: Resource Mobilisation Strategy · Work Plan

## SECTION 5

# Hard Truths

The most significant gaps — stated directly for leadership.

**"Children with disabilities — the group most likely to experience the violence this programme exists to prevent — are completely invisible in every outcome, indicator, and target across the entire programme portfolio."**

The Programme Narrative, Work Plan, and Resource Mobilisation documents contain zero disability-disaggregated indicators and no explicit mention of children with disabilities as intended beneficiaries, despite WHO evidence that they face 3.7x higher violence rates.

**"The Youth Advisory Board — the programme's flagship adolescent voice mechanism — is structurally inaccessible: no accessibility criteria, no adapted communication formats, and no recruitment commitment to young people with disabilities are documented anywhere in the invitation or background materials."**

The YAB Invitation Letter and background information describe a multi-country participatory structure with no mention of physical accessibility, sign language interpretation, Easy Read materials, or disability-inclusive recruitment — meaning the mechanism shaping programme direction excludes the voices of young people with disabilities by default.

**"The programme cannot credibly claim its child protection work is evidence-based or equity-focused while its data systems are 100% blind to disability — it has no way of knowing whether it is reaching, serving, or failing children with disabilities."**

No document reviewed references the Washington Group Short Set or UNICEF Child Functioning Module; no data collection tool disaggregates by disability; and no sampling methodology accounts for children with disabilities, who are disproportionately excluded from community-level surveys in conflict-affected settings.

## SECTION 6

# Gap Analysis

| Gap Identified                                                                                     | System Affected                                                   | Recommended Action                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Timeline                            | Owner                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Children with disabilities not named in Theory of Change or programme outcomes                     | Theory of Change / Programme Strategy / Donor Reporting           | Revise Programme Narrative Theory of Change to explicitly name children with disabilities as a priority group; add one outcome statement referencing equitable reach for children with disabilities                                  | Quick Win 0–3 months                | Programme Director                   |
| YAB recruitment contains no accessibility or inclusion criteria for young people with disabilities | Adolescent Participation / YAB Design / Institutional Credibility | Retrofit YAB Terms of Reference to include: accessibility requirements for venues, communication format adaptations (sign language, Easy Read, captioning), explicit recruitment outreach through OPDs                               | Quick Win 0–3 months                | YAB Coordinator                      |
| MEL framework and Work Plan contain zero disability-disaggregated indicators                       | MEL Framework / Work Plan / Donor Accountability                  | Add two disability-disaggregated indicators: (1) % of participants with functional difficulty using CFM/WG-aligned tool; (2) % of activities assessed as accessible to children with disabilities                                    | Quick Win 0–3 months                | MEL Manager                          |
| No OPDs or disability-specialist partners in delivery architecture                                 | Partner Roster / Delivery Quality / Community Trust               | Map OPDs and disability-specialist civil society organisations in target geographies; initiate at least one OPD partnership or sub-consultancy arrangement within 6 months                                                           | Foundation Building 3–9 months      | Partnerships Manager                 |
| No disability-sensitive data collection tool or enumerator guidance                                | Data Collection / Evidence Quality / Donor Credibility            | Adopt UNICEF Child Functioning Module (CFM, ages 2–17) in all programme surveys; develop enumerator training guidance on administration and proxy reporting protocols                                                                | Foundation Building 3–9 months      | MEL Manager                          |
| No disability inclusion budget lines in Resource Mobilisation document                             | Resource Mobilisation / Budget / Programme Sustainability         | Develop disability inclusion cost model: estimate costs of accessibility adaptations, OPD partnership, CFM data collection, and disability-inclusive training; include as named line in next funding proposal                        | Foundation Building 3–9 months      | Finance Manager / Programme Director |
| Disability exclusion risk not acknowledged in risk narrative or Resource Mobilisation document     | Risk Management / Donor Relations / Strategic Credibility         | Add disability exclusion as a named programme risk in all future risk registers and donor reports; develop one-page risk-to-results narrative quantifying the estimated proportion of children with disabilities currently unreached | Systemic Transformation 9–12 months | Programme Director / MEL Manager     |

## SECTION 7

# 90-Day Action Plan

## Action 1

Convene internal disability inclusion working session: review Programme Narrative and Work Plan against UNICEF DIPAS standards; assign a named internal focal point for disability inclusion

| Owner              | Target  | Expected Outcome                                                                                                 |
|--------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Programme Director | Month 1 | Named disability inclusion focal point identified; gap assessment completed and shared with programme leadership |

## Action 2

Revise YAB Terms of Reference and invitation materials to include accessibility criteria, adapted communication formats, and explicit recruitment of young people with disabilities; share revised materials with YAB national coordinators

| Owner           | Target  | Expected Outcome                                                                                        |
|-----------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| YAB Coordinator | Month 1 | Accessibility-inclusive YAB TOR approved; revised invitation materials ready for next recruitment cycle |

## Action 3

Add minimum two disability-disaggregated indicators to Work Plan MEL framework; identify which existing data collection surveys can be upgraded to include Washington Group Child Functioning Module questions in next data collection round

| Owner       | Target  | Expected Outcome                                                           |
|-------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MEL Manager | Month 2 | Work Plan updated with disability indicators; CFM integration plan drafted |

## Action 4

Conduct rapid OPD landscape mapping in target geographies (identify at least 3 OPDs per country); brief programme leadership on partnership options

| Owner                | Target  | Expected Outcome                                                                     |
|----------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Partnerships Manager | Month 2 | OPD mapping document produced; at least two OPD introductory conversations completed |

## Action 5

Draft disability inclusion section for next donor progress report and/or next funding proposal: include commitment statement, planned actions, and first set of disability-disaggregated baseline targets

| Owner | Target | Expected Outcome |
|-------|--------|------------------|
|-------|--------|------------------|

|                                  |         |                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Programme Director / MEL Manager | Month 3 | Disability inclusion narrative included in donor-facing document; commitment made public and trackable |
|----------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### Action 6

**Identify and schedule training on UNICEF CFM administration for programme data/MEL staff; source existing UNICEF or Washington Group training materials (freely available) and adapt for programme context**

| Owner       | Target  | Expected Outcome                                                          |
|-------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MEL Manager | Month 3 | Training scheduled; at least 2 MEL staff trained on CFM by end of month 3 |

## SECTION 8

# 12-Month Roadmap

## Phase 1: Quick Wins

0–3 months

**Name children with disabilities as explicit intended beneficiaries in the programme Theory of Change and revise the narrative accordingly**

### Owner

Programme Director

### Success

Revised ToC with disability inclusion approved at programme governance level; children with disabilities named in at least one outcome statement

**Retrofit YAB process with accessibility criteria and disability-inclusive recruitment commitment**

### Owner

YAB Coordinator

### Success

Accessible YAB TOR in place; outreach to disability-inclusive youth networks initiated in at least two target countries

**Add disability-disaggregated indicators to Work Plan MEL framework and assign accountability owner**

### Owner

MEL Manager

### Success

Two disability indicators live in Work Plan; named accountability owner confirmed

## Phase 2: Foundation Building

3–9 months

**Integrate UNICEF Child Functioning Module (CFM, ages 2–17) into all programme data collection instruments; train enumerators**

### Owner

MEL Manager

### Success

CFM embedded in survey tools; first disability-disaggregated dataset available; enumerator training completed in all programme geographies

**Establish at least one formal OPD partnership or consultancy arrangement; define scope and funded deliverables**

### Owner

Partnerships Manager

### Success

MoU or consultancy contract signed with at least one OPD; OPD input documented in programme review

**Include disability inclusion budget lines in all new funding proposals and in next budget revision**

**Owner**

Finance Manager / Programme Director

**Success**

Disability-specific line items (accessibility, OPD partnership, training, CFM data collection) visible in approved budget

**Deliver disability inclusion capacity-building for all implementing partners; develop minimum inclusion standards for partner selection**

**Owner**

Programme Director / Partnerships Manager

**Success**

All active implementing partners have completed disability inclusion orientation; minimum inclusion standards included in partner selection criteria

### Phase 3: Systemic Transformation

9–12 months

**Embed disability inclusion in quarterly review and learning processes: QPR template updated to include disability indicators; remedial actions documented**

**Owner**

MEL Manager / Programme Director

**Success**

Disability indicators reviewed at every QPR; at least one adaptive management decision documented in response to disability inclusion data

**Develop a risk-to-results narrative on disability exclusion: estimate proportion of target children with disabilities unreached; include in donor reporting and resource mobilisation materials**

**Owner**

Programme Director / MEL Manager

**Success**

Risk-to-results narrative finalised; disability exclusion risk included in programme risk register and shared with programme governance and donors

**Commission a disability inclusion programme review (internal or independent) to assess progress against the 12-month roadmap and update maturity rating**

**Owner**

Programme Director

**Success**

Review completed; updated maturity score; revised roadmap for Year 2 approved by programme governance

## SECTION 9

# Manager Quick Start Guide

## FOR PROGRAMME MANAGERS & OPERATIONAL STAFF

### MONDAY-MORNING GUIDE: Disability Inclusion for Child Protection Programming

#### What disability inclusion means for your programme:

For this programme, disability inclusion is not a separate workstream — it is the difference between a child protection programme that reaches the most vulnerable children and one that systematically misses them. Children with disabilities face compounded risks: elevated rates of violence, reduced access to protection services, and frequent exclusion from community-level engagement. Every community meeting, every YAB session, every data collection exercise that is not designed with disability inclusion in mind may be reaching the majority while leaving behind the children your programme exists for most.

Practically, this means: when you design a community workshop, you ask 'can a child using a wheelchair attend, and can a child who is deaf participate?' When you recruit for the YAB, you actively seek young people with disabilities and ensure the materials are in accessible formats. When your enumerators collect data, they use the UNICEF Child Functioning Module to identify children with functional difficulties. When you select partners, you ask whether they have OPD links and disability inclusion experience.

#### FIVE THINGS TO DO THIS WEEK:

1. Email your team today and name a disability inclusion focal point for the programme — even temporarily. Inclusion needs a named owner to move forward.
2. Open the Work Plan and identify the two indicators most central to your reach and outcome claims. Add a column: 'Can this be disaggregated by disability?' Schedule a 30-minute conversation with your MEL lead to plan how.
3. Pull up the YAB invitation materials. Ask: 'Could a young person who is blind, deaf, or uses a wheelchair engage with this process as written?' If the answer is no, flag it for revision this week.
4. Search for three OPDs operating in your key target geographies. Look at regional disability federations, national disability federations, and UNICEF country office contacts. Book one introductory call.
5. Download the UNICEF Child Functioning Module (freely available at [data.unicef.org](https://data.unicef.org)) and share it with your MEL manager with the note: 'We need this in our next data collection round.'

#### THREE QUESTIONS TO ASK YOUR PARTNERS AND GRANTEES THIS WEEK:

1. 'What proportion of the children you are currently reaching have a functional difficulty or disability — and how do you know?'
2. 'What accessibility adaptations are in place for your community activities, and who is responsible for ensuring they happen?'
3. 'Do you have an existing relationship with any OPD or disability-specialist organisation in your geography that we could bring into programme design?'

#### KEY TOOLS TO REFERENCE:

- **Washington Group Short Set on Functioning:** freely available at [washingtongroup-disability.com](https://washingtongroup-disability.com) — use for caregiver and community-level surveys.
- **UNICEF Child Functioning Module (CFM, ages 2–17):** the gold standard for measuring disability in children — use in all child-level data collection.

- **UNICEF DIPAS (Disability Inclusive Programming and Accountability Standards):** your institutional benchmark — review the standards checklist with your team.

## SECTION 10

## Where Inclusion Drives Value

---

### Reach

Including children with disabilities expands reach to the most violence-affected children, improving coverage rates and donor confidence in headline numbers. Target geographies include significant populations with disabilities, many of whom are disproportionately exposed to violence and routinely excluded from community-level prevention activities. Designing for disability inclusion — accessible venues, adapted communications, OPD-linked outreach — can materially expand the programme's reach to the children most at risk.

### Effectiveness

Child protection programmes that include children with disabilities in design and delivery produce more contextually robust approaches: safeguarding mechanisms, reporting pathways, and social norms interventions tested with children facing the highest barriers are more likely to be effective for all children. Including young people with disabilities in the YAB will strengthen the quality and equity of adolescent voice inputs to programme design.

### Cost-Efficiency

Proactive universal design of activities costs significantly less than retrofitting accessibility after the fact. OPD partnerships — if scoped and funded at programme design — avoid the higher cost of addressing inclusion failures identified during evaluation. CFM-aligned data collection adds marginal cost to existing survey processes but eliminates the much higher cost of evidence gaps that undermine programme credibility and funding renewals.

### Credibility

Institutional donors to this programme — including USAID, FCDO, and UN pooled funds — are increasingly applying disability inclusion as a baseline compliance expectation and a differentiating criterion in competitive grants. Demonstrating disability-disaggregated data, OPD partnerships, and accessible programme design positions the programme ahead of sector peers and strengthens resource mobilisation prospects in the next funding cycle.

### Scalability

A disability inclusion architecture built for this programme — CFM-aligned MEL tools, OPD partnership models, accessible YAB design, and inclusion-competent partner selection criteria — can be replicated across other regional programmes at marginal additional cost, creating a scalable inclusion infrastructure and a replicable model that strengthens organisational reputation globally.

## SECTION 11

# About This Diagnostic

---

This diagnostic was produced by the Main Path Advisory AI Diagnostic Tool, built on the Main Path Advisory framework developed by Anna Burlyaeva. The framework draws on 15 years of senior experience at UNICEF and the UN system across Asia, Africa, Europe, and Latin America.

The analysis is based solely on documents provided by the user. Findings reflect the evidence available in those documents. Gaps identified may reflect the absence of documentation rather than the absence of practice.

For a full human-led diagnostic including stakeholder interviews, document deep-dives, and expert advisory support, contact Main Path Advisory at [mainpathadvisory.com](https://mainpathadvisory.com).

This tool is licensed for single-organisation use. Redistribution or resale is not permitted.

---

© 2026 Main Path Advisory. All rights reserved. | [mainpathadvisory.com](https://mainpathadvisory.com)