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Introduction

1. This submission has been produced by the United Kingdom Independent Mechanism (UKIM). In 2009 the UK Government designated the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (ECNI), the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (NIHRC) and the Scottish Human Rights Commission (SHRC) as UKIM under Article 33 of the Convention on the Right of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). They are tasked with promoting, protecting and monitoring implementation of the CRPD.

How to read this document

1. This submission provides information on the implementation in the UK of the CRPD. It gives an update on UKIM’s earlier submissions to the CRPD Committee in February 2017, which are all available on the [EHRC’s website](https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-human-rights-work/monitoring-and-promoting-un-treaties/un-convention-rights-persons-disabilities):

* UKIM (2017), ‘Disability Rights in the UK’
* EHRC (2017), ‘Disability Rights in England’
* EHRC (2017), ‘Disability Rights in Wales’
* EHRC and SHRC (2017), ‘Disability Rights in Scotland’
* NIHRC and ECNI (2017), ‘Disability Rights in Northern Ireland’

1. The submission also responds to the CRPD Committee’s List of Issues for the UK[[1]](#footnote-1) in light of the State Party’s reply to the List of Issues.[[2]](#footnote-2) The CRPD Articles and List of Issues questions that each section relates to are indicated in the headings and sub-headings.
2. Following the approach of UKIM’s earlier submissions, we have identified problems under 14 thematic areas that we consider to be especially pressing for disabled people. We refer to evidence in our February 2017 submissions where relevant, and present new evidence on recent developments, and in answer to some List of Issues questions. This submission is therefore best read alongside UKIM’s February 2017 submissions.
3. UKIM has developed recommendations, included after the executive summary, which the CRPD Committee may wish to consider when formulating its Concluding Observations for the UK and devolved governments. Some of these recommendations have been informed by our discussions with disabled people and their representative organisations.[[3]](#footnote-3)
4. The EHRC and the SHRC in Scotland funded a civil society coalition to produce an independent report for the CRPD Committee pre-sessional working group in March 2017.[[4]](#footnote-4) The EHRC is also funding some disabled people’s organisations (DPOs) from England, Wales and Scotland to attend the CRPD Committee session in Geneva in August 2017.

Terminology

1. In this report, we use the term ‘disabled people’ rather than ‘persons with disabilities’. The term ‘disabled people’ is recognised by the disability rights movement in the UK to align with the social and human rights model of disability, as it is considered to acknowledge the fact that people with an impairment are disabled by barriers in the environment and society.

UK constitutional arrangements

1. The UK comprises four countries – England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The UK Parliament has devolved various powers to the Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Ireland Assembly, and it maintains responsibility for matters that have not been devolved (‘reserved’ matters) and for England. Responsibility for implementing the CRPD therefore lies with the UK and devolved governments.
2. In addition, there are three separate legal systems in the UK – England and Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. The Supreme Court is the UK’s highest court of law. It is the final court of appeal for all UK civil cases. It also decides ‘devolution issues’ about whether the devolved authorities in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have acted or propose to act within their powers.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Key developments

1. Important developments since UKIM’s February 2017 submissions include:

* A UK General Election took place on 8 June resulting in a minority Conservative government. The UK Government held an engagement event with civil society organisations in May 2017 about the CRPD Committee’s List of Issues for the UK. However, due to restrictions during the pre-election period,[[6]](#footnote-6) officials were unable to discuss any substantive policy issues.
* The European Union (Withdrawal) Bill was introduced in the UK Parliament on 13 July 2017. The White Paper on the Bill states that: ‘all the protections covered in the Equality Act 2006, the Equality Act 2010 and equivalent legislation in Northern Ireland will continue to apply once the UK has left the EU’.[[7]](#footnote-7) However, if the Bill is passed in its current form, the EU Charter on Fundamental Rights will be removed from UK law, and there are protections relevant to disabled people – such as the right to non-discrimination (Article 21) and the right to preventative health care (Article 35) – that do not have equivalent protections in UK law and may be lost.
* EU law more generally is an important vehicle through which CRPD rights are given effect in member states’ legal systems. Since December 2010[[8]](#footnote-8) the EU has itself been a signatory to the CRPD. As a result, it is explicitly committed to the full realisation of disabled people’s rights as set out in the CRPD in areas that are within the EU’s competence. One aspect of this is that the CRPD shapes new EU laws, policies and programmes. Another is that the CRPD influences interpretation of existing EU law by the Court of Justice for the EU (CJEU). The decisions of the CJEU have a direct impact on the domestic law of member states.[[9]](#footnote-9) In the absence of anything equivalent to EU law as a whole, the UK’s withdrawal from the EU constitutes the loss of a very significant way in which CRPD rights are applied and realised in practice. To ensure there is no regression on current levels of protection, and to benefit from progress driven by the CRPD, the UK Government will need to take additional steps to those currently proposed to ensure these protections are clearly and explicitly incorporated into UK law, for example by giving enhanced status to equivalent rights in UN human rights treaties, including the CRPD.
* The potential impact of the loss of EU funding on protected groups is being assessed by a number of organisations. Early findings suggest that disabled people will be disproportionately affected because, for example, the European Social Fund’s priority groups include disability, mental health, older people and carers.[[10]](#footnote-10)
* The Conservative Party 2017 pre-election manifesto committed to introducing a Shared Prosperity Fund to ‘use the structural fund money that comes back to the UK to reduce inequalities between communities across our four nations’.[[11]](#footnote-11) The manifesto explains the design of the Fund will be consulted on, ‘including with the devolved administrations, local authorities, businesses and public bodies’. However, to ensure the funds are used to reduce inequalities, including for disabled people, the UK Government will need to conduct a rigorous equality and human rights impact assessment, and it will be important that potential beneficiaries of the fund, such as disabled people, are consulted in a meaningful way.
* The Queen’s Speech on 21 June highlighted some proposed areas of law reform in England and Wales that have potential implications for CRPD rights, including a review of the mental health legislative landscape; a commitment to bringing forward proposals on social care reform for consultation; proposed legislation to modernise the courts system; and a draft Domestic Violence and Abuse Bill.[[12]](#footnote-12)
* The Scottish Government has announced reviews of law and practice that may significantly affect disabled people: a fundamental review of hate crime legislation, an independent review of legal aid[[13]](#footnote-13) and a proposal for further consultation and possible reform of the Adults with Incapacity (Scotland) Act 2000. In July, the Government published a consultation paper on the socio-economic duty, which it plans to introduce later in 2017.[[14]](#footnote-14) The Social Security (Scotland) Bill was introduced into the Scottish Parliament in June 2017.
* The Welsh Government has announced it is to update its Framework for Action on Independent living,[[15]](#footnote-15) which sets out its vision for implementing the CRPD in Wales.

Executive summary

In UKIM’s view, the UK and devolved governments have not taken all the appropriate steps to progress the implementation of CRPD and have introduced some retrogressive measures that have had a significant negative effect on disabled people. Below, we set out a summary of the key concerns in this report. See section two for a list of UKIM’s recommendations.

1. Enhancing the status of the CRPD in domestic law and policy (Articles 3, 4) – List of Issues questions 1 and 27

The CRPD is not directly incorporated into domestic law, and continued uncertainty about the future of human rights legislation, as well as the UK’s planned withdrawal from the European Union, pose risks to disabled people’s rights. Clear action plans are needed by the UK and devolved governments to meet CRPD requirements.

2. Equality and non-discrimination (Article 5) – List of Issues question 2

There are significant gaps in the legal framework providing protection from disability discrimination that need to be addressed in GB and in Northern Ireland, where there is a lower level of protection than the rest of the UK.

3. Awareness-raising (Article 8) – List of Issues question 5

Negative attitudes persist towards disabled people despite some measures in place.

4. Accessibility (Articles 9, 21, 30) – List of Issues questions 6, 17 and 25

Despite some improvements, disabled people continue to face difficulties in accessing appropriate housing, the built environment, transport, information and insurance. There is no comprehensive UK-wide accessibility plan(s).

5. Independent and adequate standard of living and social protection (Articles 19, 20, 26, 28) – List of Issues questions 4, 14, 16, 22, 23 and 30

Disabled people are more likely to live in poverty and material deprivation than people who are not disabled, and continue to be disproportionately affected by a range of social security reforms. Further retrogressive measures have been brought in since the CRPD Committee’s Inquiry concluded in 2016.

Increasing demand along with reduced funding for adult social care may be leading to a regression in disabled people’s Article 19 rights to live independently in the community.

6. Employment (Article 27) – List of Issues questions 20 and 21

Disabled people are much less likely to be in employment than non-disabled people. They experience barriers to finding and staying in work, and are on average paid less.

7. Access to justice (Articles 13, 12) – List of Issues question 8

Disabled people may be prevented from accessing justice on an equal basis with others because of: changes to legal aid in England and Wales; significant increases to court fees in Scotland; the inability of education tribunals to award financial compensation for disability discrimination or harassment and the lack of a formal system of support in Scotland for people with learning disabilities in court.

8. Education (Articles 24, 7) – List of Issues question 18

Further efforts are needed to achieve an inclusive education system across the UK, and there are higher exclusion rates and lower attainment rates for disabled pupils. Disabled young people face barriers to transitioning from school to further education or employment.

9. Health and life (Articles 25, 10) – List of Issues questions 1(f) and 19

Disabled people experience health inequalities and barriers to accessing services. People with learning disabilities or autism can be placed in inpatient care inappropriately or stay longer in hospital than other patients. Disabled women experience barriers to equal enjoyment of their reproductive rights.

Mental health services require improvement. Further action is needed to protect the right to life of people using mental health or learning disability services, and to address non-natural deaths in prisons, police custody (and after release) and psychiatric hospitals.

10. Freedom from exploitation, violence and abuse (Articles 16, 6) – List of issues questions 3(b), 4(b) and 11

Action is needed to address: disability hate crime, and high levels of under-reporting; the additional barriers experienced by disabled women seeking support because of violence and abuse; the lack of information collected about disability-motivated bullying in schools and the abuse of disabled people in institutional settings and home care.

11. Autonomy and integrity (Articles 12, 14, 15, 17) – List of Issues questions 9 and 10

There are widespread concerns about the extent of physical, mechanical and chemical restraint across a range of settings and the use of long-term segregation. Immigration detention needs to be changed to align with CRPD requirements. Action is needed to significantly improve access to supported decision-making and to introduce effective safeguards against deprivation of liberty.

12. Participation in political and public life (Article 29) – List of issues question 24

There are barriers to exercising the right to vote that should be removed, and disabled people continue to be under-represented in political office and public appointments.

13. Statistics and data collection (Article 31) – List of Issues question 26

There are significant gaps in the collection of disability statistics and limited availability of disaggregated data, which inhibits effective monitoring and reporting of CRPD compliance.

14. National implementation and monitoring (Article 33) – List of issues question 29

There is insufficient funding provided to the UK Independent Mechanism to allow it to effectively carry out the full range of functions envisaged by CRPD.

Recommendations

1. Enhancing the status of the CRPD in domestic law and policy (Articles 3, 4) – List of Issues questions 1 and 27

1.1 The CRPD in domestic law and policy

**UK-wide**

1. The UK and devolved governments should incorporate the CRPD into domestic law so individuals can effectively challenge rights violations to secure compliance with CRPD duties using the domestic legal system. This should include:

* Access to a domestic remedy for alleged breaches of CRPD rights
* A domestic mechanism to scrutinise policy and legislation to ensure CRPD compliance, and
* Robust domestic mechanisms to hold decision-makers to account for breaches of the CRPD.

1. The UK and devolved governments should ensure effective and adequately resourced mechanisms are in place for the active ongoing involvement of disabled people, including children, in the development and review of law, policy and practice.

1.2 Human Rights Act

**UK-wide**

1. In light of proposals for changes to the human rights legal framework, the UK and devolved governments should ensure there is no regression in the protection of disabled people’s rights, and their access to redress.

**1.3 Brexit**

1. The UK Government should ensure there is no regression in the protection of disabled people’s rights as a result of the changes introduced following Brexit.

**1.4 Action plans**

1. The UK and devolved governments should ensure their disability action plans or strategies:

* Explicitly identify and address gaps in CRPD implementation
* Include actions to address all recommendations of the CRPD Committee and relevant recommendations of other UN bodies, and
* Contain clear targets and outcomes as part of adequately resourced delivery plans.

2. Equality and non-discrimination (Article 5) – List of Issues question 2

2.1 Gaps in equality legislation

**UK-wide**

1. The UK Government, and Scottish Government where relevant, should reinstate all original and commence any outstanding provisions of the Equality Act 2010, and introduce new measures to address gaps in protection.

**England**

1. As part of its review of the Public Sector Equality Duty, the UK Government should review the specific duties in England and include measures to ensure the involvement of disabled people in decisions that could affect them.

**Scotland and Wales**

1. The Scottish and Welsh Governments should use the new equal opportunities powers to identify changes to promote and protect disabled people’s CRPD rights.

**Northern Ireland**

1. The Northern Ireland Executive should accept and act on the proposals of the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland to reform disability equality legislation to address legislative gaps in protection, noting that these proposals better reflect CRPD rights than the Equality Act 2010.

3. Awareness-raising (Article 8) – List of Issues question 5

3.1 Prejudice and negative attitudes

UK-wide

1. The UK and devolved governments should:

* Resource long-term positive awareness-raising campaigns, training and education to address prejudice and negative attitudes towards all disabled people, including those with mental health conditions and those claiming social security benefits.
* Ensure that government communications do not fuel prejudicial views, particularly with regard to the rights of disabled people claiming social security benefits.
* Ensure that there is awareness of the CRPD among disabled people, public service providers, and throughout society.

4. Accessibility (Articles 9, 21, 30) – List of Issues questions 6, 17 and 25

4.1 Overall framework

UK-wide

1. The UK and devolved governments should adopt action plans that identify barriers to accessibility for disabled people; set time frames with specific accountable deadlines; and provide both human and material resources to fully implement these plans in line with CRPD General Comment 2.
2. In light of plans to exit the EU, the UK Government should pass parallel legislation on accessibility, setting standards in goods and services, in accordance with Article 9 and drawing on EU models.

4.2 Housing, the built environment and planning

**UK-wide**

1. The UK and devolved governments should:

* Introduce national targets to ensure that new housing is increasingly accessible or adaptable for disabled people, and
* Ensure the built environment is accessible and allows disabled people to live independently, reviewing and revising the planning framework where necessary.

**England**

1. The UK Government should:

* Review the current planning framework in England to ascertain whether it facilitates compliance with the CRPD obligation to ensure accessibility in relation to housing, particularly in older housing stock.
* Encourage local authorities in England to follow the example of London and use optional Building Regulations to increase the provision of accessible and adaptable housing.

**Wales**

1. The Welsh Government should:

* Monitor the implementation of Part 4 of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 and the Renting Homes (Wales) Act 2016 to ascertain whether they succeed in increasing the supply of, and reducing waiting times for, accessible housing.
* Monitor the impact of housing standards in providing appropriate, accessible housing for disabled people.
* Promote and improve the use of Accessible Housing Registers (AHRs) to match disabled people with accessible or adapted properties more quickly.

**Scotland**

1. The Scottish Government should implement the recommendations made by the Independent Housing Adaptations Working Group.

**Northern Ireland**

1. The Northern Ireland Executive should implement in full the recommendations of the Inter-Departmental Review of Housing Adaptations Services Final Report and Action Plan 2016.

4.3 Transport

**UK-wide**

1. The UK Government should set a target date by which all rail stations in the network should be accessible, focusing on the accessibility of journeys, not just of stations.
2. The UK and devolved governments should ensure that all transport and transport infrastructure is accessible to disabled people, and that accessibility is built into planning processes.
3. The UK and devolved governments should ensure that personnel of all public transport providers are equipped with the skills and knowledge to assist disabled passengers.
4. The UK and devolved governments should ensure that all new buses and trains provide accessible real-time travel information.

**Northern Ireland**

1. The Northern Ireland Executive should commit to resource and fully implement the Accessible Transport Strategy 2025.

4.4 Information and communication

**UK-wide**

1. The UK and devolved governments should ensure that all communications (including online forms) of public authorities or those of their contracted providers are accessible to disabled people.
2. The UK and devolved governments should take all appropriate steps to ensure barriers to accessing the internet for disabled people are removed.
3. The UK and devolved governments should take appropriate steps to remove barriers to communication between D/deaf and D/deafblind people and their families, carers, education and healthcare staff, and public service providers. This could include support to undertake courses for D/deafblind communication skills.

**Northern Ireland**

1. The Northern Ireland Executive should implement the commitment to develop a Northern Ireland standard for accessible communications and a disability information hub.
2. The Northern Ireland Executive should adopt and implement the Sign Language Framework.

**4.5 Insurance**

**UK-wide**

1. The UK Government should take steps to ensure disabled people have improved access to affordable insurance.

5. Independent and adequate standard of living and social protection (Articles 19, 20, 26, 28) – List of Issues questions 4, 14, 16, 22, 23 and 30

5.1 Poverty, material deprivation and food insecurity

**UK-wide**

29. The UK and devolved governments should examine the factors behind the higher levels of poverty among disabled adults and children and develop strategies to address these factors.

30. The UK and devolved governments should ensure the rights of disabled people including disabled children are prioritised within anti-poverty strategies.

31. The UK Government should act on the findings of the July 2017 Trussell Trust report on food bank use, in particular the conclusion that an inquiry into the support and sufficiency of benefit allowances for disabled people is needed, especially in light of new reforms which may have a further negative impact.

**Wales**

32. The Welsh Government should capture data relating to poverty and differences between disabled and non-disabled people in the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation.

5.2 Impact of social security reforms

**UK-wide**

33. The UK Government should monitor and publish the impact of welfare reforms on disabled people. This should include assessments of the cumulative impact of tax and social security changes and public spending reductions on disabled people.

34. In relation to existing social security entitlement and any future reforms, the UK Government should address the UN criteria for non-retrogression to determine whether potentially regressive measures are temporary, necessary, proportionate and non-discriminatory, and that they do not undercut a core minimum level of protection, putting in place any mitigating measures required to safeguard disabled people’s rights.

35. The UK Government should revoke the Social Security (Personal Independence Payment) (Amendment) Regulations 2017 to safeguard and promote the rights of people with psychosocial impairments in line with the CRPD.

5.3 Independent living funding

36. The UK Government should act upon the recommendation of the Work and Pensions Select Committee to set out a clear plan for identifying where new Employment and Support Allowance Work Related Activity Group claimants have additional, unavoidable living costs relating to their condition, and ensure a financial support package is in place to adequately support all new claimants looking for and moving into work.

37. The UK Government should take swift action to reform the work capability assessment to offer a more flexible, personalised approach to providing support to unemployed disabled people, including those with greatest needs and fluctuating conditions. The focus should be on identifying work potential and the types of adjustments and support that could remove barriers to individuals accessing and staying in work. This should be separate from any financial assessment. Financial support for people unable to work or where there are inadequate adjustments or personalised support in place should not be conditional on actions linked to job-seeking or subject to benefit sanctions.

Scotland

38. The Scottish Government should ensure that Scotland’s new social security system:

* Delivers progressive realisation of CRPD rights
* Takes a participatory approach to the development, implementation and monitoring of social security legislation and policy, and
* Is underpinned by the standards and principles of the CRPD.

Northern Ireland

39. The Northern Ireland Executive should consider extending and or/developing the current time-limited package of measures to mitigate any adverse impacts of social security reform.

**England**

40. The UK Government must take steps to ensure compliance with CRPD Article 19 where it has delegated responsibility for independent living funding to local authorities in England. These steps should include:

* Providing sufficient funding to each local authority to meet the independent living needs of disabled people in their area through mechanisms (such as ring-fencing) that ensure the funding is used for that purpose.
* Providing guidance to local authorities to clarify what they must do to meet the requirements of Article 19, including examples of best practice.
* Putting in place a monitoring mechanism so that each local authority reports on independent living funding and activities, and service-user experience, so the UK Government can assure itself that it is complying with Article 19.

**Wales**

41. The Welsh Government should ensure that Welsh Independent Living Grant recipients and disabled people with complex care needs receive the care and support they require to live independent lives.

**Northern Ireland**

42. The Northern Ireland Executive should consider:

* Undertaking research into the extent to which disabled people with substantial needs, who are not existing ILF users, are having their needs met through Self Directed Support and Direct Payments provisions.
* Re-opening the Independent Living Fund to new entrants.

**5.4 Re-institutionalisation concerns**

**England**

43. The UK Government should closely monitor the impact of local authority budget reductions on supported living arrangements to ensure there is no regression on disabled people’s right to live independently within the community.

44. The UK Government should monitor the impact of NHS-funded Continuing Care policies and ensure there is no regression on disabled people’s rights to live independently in the community.

5.5 Adult social care and support

**UK-wide**

45. The UK and devolved governments should monitor the impact of any reductions in the availability of adult social care on the rights of disabled people under CRPD and take immediate steps to address any adverse impacts identified.

46. The UK and devolved governments should review the impact of charging for adult social care and eligibility thresholds, and improve the system to meet the requirements of CRPD Article 19, read in light of the CRPD Committee’s General Comment on this Article.

**England**

47. The UK Government should monitor the impact of reductions in the availability of local authority-funded adult social care support on disabled people’s ability to choose how and where their support is delivered as required by the ‘wellbeing principle’ in the Care Act 2014. It should take immediate steps to address any adverse impacts identified.

48. The UK Government should monitor the impact of reductions of local services that enable disabled people to stay socially connected within their communities and take steps to address adverse impacts identified.

**Wales**

49. The Welsh Government should monitor the impact of the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 and ensure it is implemented in a way that progresses CRPD rights.

**Scotland**

50. The Scottish Government should:

* Incorporate the requirements of Article 19, in line with the CRPD Committee’s General Comment on this Article, into all aspects of its proposed reform of adult social care and ensure new models protect and promote disabled people’s rights under Article 19.
* Identify whether the introduction of Self-Directed Support (SDS) is resulting in a better quality of life for people, including evidence of the impact on SDS on different groups of disabled people.
* Address issues with SDS funding and service delivery to ensure real choice and support for independent living.

**Northern Ireland**

51. The Northern Ireland Executive should ensure care in the community arrangements guarantee quality of care, are consistent with the requirements of CRPD Article 19 and take account of CRPD Committee’s General Comment on this Article.

**5.6 Support for carers**

**UK-wide**

52. The UK and devolved governments should put in place systems to ensure adequate support, including respite care, is available to:

* Disabled parents
* Disabled carers
* Parents with a disabled child
* Carers for a disabled person, and
* Young, sibling and peer carers

6. Employment (Article 27) – List of Issues questions 20 and 21

6.1 Employment gap and barriers

UK-wide

53. The UK and devolved governments should evaluate how well employment support programmes help disabled people find and stay in work, and take steps to improve their effectiveness. As a first step, the UK Government should act upon the recommendation of the Work and Pensions Committee to publish a Disability Employment Strategy that is seen as a shared, long-term objective and priority across all relevant government departments.

54. The UK Government should:

* Introduce interim targets and a statutory reporting requirement on its commitment to halving the disability employment gap, and

Report regularly on progress including by impairment group and identify steps if progress is insufficient.

55. The UK Government should ensure that changes to the Access to Work programme comply with Article 27 by:

* Widening support for mental health and complex health or medical conditions.
* Monitoring any adverse impact on employment opportunities, for disabled people generally and for people with sensory impairments specifically.
* Introducing mitigations such as additional funding flexibilities, extending transition arrangements and reviewing the cap level.

Putting in place a publicity programme for the Access to Work scheme among employers to increase awareness.

56. To help remove barriers to recruitment and retention of disabled people, the UK Government should build training on disability law and providing reasonable adjustments into new models of support resulting from the Green Paper ‘Improving Lives: Work, Health and Disability’.

**Wales**

57. The Welsh Government should ensure that supporting disabled people into employment is a target within employment and skills programmes.

**Scotland**

58. The Scottish Government should support local authorities and integrated health and social care boards to meet their obligation to provide employment support services under sections 26 and 27 of the Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003.

**Northern Ireland**

59. The Northern Ireland Executive should commit to allocating the necessary resources to ensure the full implementation of ‘Supporting Equality through Inclusive Employment – An Employment Strategy for People with Disabilities’, including mainstream funding for supported employment.

6.2 Pay gap

**UK-wide**

60. The UK and, where relevant, the devolved governments should:

* Monitor the effectiveness of mandatory gender pay gap reporting on closing pay gaps
* Publish statistical information on the scale and trends in disability (in addition to gender) pay gaps for full and part-time workers
* Consult with employers and relevant organisations on extending the statutory requirements to report on gender pay gaps to disability, to encourage employers to consider the scale and causes of all their pay gaps.

Put in place an action plan for closing the disability pay gap and report regularly on progress.

7. Access to justice (Articles 13, 12) – List of Issues question 8

7.1 Legal aid and advice

**England and Wales**

61. The UK Government should:

* Publish the planned post-legislative memorandum on the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 without delay
* Conduct a full review of the impact of legal aid reforms on access to justice for disabled people in England and Wales by March 2018, including analysis of what people with legal problems do when they cannot access legal aid. Those responsible for the review should seek input from disabled people, wider civil society and the EHRC.
* Take concrete steps to mitigate any adverse impacts identified from legal aid changes, including any indirectly discriminatory effects on disabled people.
* Review the impact of budget reductions and legal aid reforms on the availability of legal advice from non-government organisations in England and Wales, and take action to address the problem of ‘advice deserts’.

62. The UK Government should further review the operation of the telephone gateway service (Civil Legal Advice) in England and Wales with regard to its accessibility and effectiveness, particularly for disabled people and parents of children with special educational needs (SEN), and mitigate any adverse impacts.

**Scotland**

63. The Scottish Government, in deciding how to respond to the findings and recommendations from the independent review of legal aid, must recognise:

* Its obligations under the CRPD and take steps to ensure legal aid policy and practice takes the views of disabled people fully into account and ensures access to appropriate and suitable legal advice and assistance.
* The requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty and demonstrate that it has had due regard to the need to remove or minimise disadvantage experienced by disabled people in access to justice.

7.2 Court and employment tribunal fees

England and Wales

64. In light of the Supreme Court judgment on employment tribunal fees and the fundamental rights underpinning the Court’s reasoning, the UK Government should not introduce any new barriers to accessing employment tribunals, and should reaffirm its commitment to ensuring equal access to justice for all.

**Scotland**

65. The Scottish Government should assess and publish the impact of the court fee increases on disabled people and include in this process an up-to-date assessment of disabled people’s access to civil legal aid. The assessments should involve disabled people and take into account their views and experiences. If any negative or disproportionate impact is identified, the Scottish Government should take mitigating action to ensure disabled people are not prevented from access to justice.

7.3 Awareness of the CRPD and reasonable accommodations

**UK-wide**

66. The UK and devolved governments should take steps to develop capacity-building programmes for the judiciary on:

* The CRPD, including its principles and the jurisprudence of the CRPD Committee, and
* Reasonable adjustments to ensure access to justice for disabled people, through initiatives such as the Equal Treatment Benchbook.

7.4 Disability discrimination in schools

67. The UK should allow education tribunals to award financial compensation for disability discrimination or harassment in schools.

7.5 Support and protection in the criminal justice system in Scotland

68. The Scottish Government should:

* Ensure members of the Crown Office Procurator Fiscal Service have knowledge and experience of learning disability, and develop and promote good practice guidance for staff involved in the assessment of adults’ capacity to be competent reliable witnesses.
* Monitor and report on when special measures are used to support disabled people, or not used, and identify the outcomes for disabled people.
* Adopt an agreed police custody model to identify learning disability and make training on learning disability mandatory for police officers and staff working in police custody settings.
* Introduce formal support for the accused and witnesses with learning disabilities during the court process.

8. Education (Articles 24, 7) – List of Issues question 18

8.1 Inclusive education

**UK-wide**

69. The UK, and where relevant devolved, governments should:

* Remove the reservation and interpretive declaration on Article 24, and take concrete steps to progressively realise disabled children’s right to inclusive education.
* Renew the commitment to developing ‘an inclusive system where parents of disabled children have increasing access to mainstream schools and staff, which have the capacity to meet the needs of disabled children’.
* Ensure teachers are equipped to teach disabled pupils. Any current education system reforms should be used as an opportunity to put key changes in place.

**England**

70. The UK Government should conduct a review of England’s SEND Code of Practice within five years of it coming into effect to evaluate whether improvements for disabled pupils are secured in practice.

71. The UK Government should issue guidance to local councils to ensure that the £215 million funding boost for provision for children with SEND is used in a way that is CRPD-compliant and supports the progressive realisation of inclusive education in mainstream schools under CRPD Article 24.

72. In its response to the Lenehan Review into the experiences and outcomes in residential special schools and colleges, the UK Government should place central importance on its obligation to progressively achieve an inclusive education system under CRPD Article 24.

**Wales**

73. The Welsh Government should:

* Ensure that the implementation of the new system that follows the passing of theAdditional Leaning Needs Bill is adequately resourced to contribute to closing the educational attainment gaps for disabled pupils.
* Monitor the impact of the measures in the Additional Learning Needs Bill, once enacted, on outcomes for disabled children in light of CRPD standards.

**Scotland**

74. The Scottish Government should proactively monitor compliance with the statutory accessibility requirements to ensure disabled pupils have access to school buildings, facilities and the curriculum.

**Northern Ireland**

75. The Department for Education and the Education Authority should ensure that SEN provision effectively meets the needs of children and young people.

8.2 School exclusions

**UK-wide**

76. The UK and devolved governments should ensure that strategies to reduce the exclusion of disabled pupils, including those who display challenging behaviour arising from a disability, are in place and promoted in all areas.

77. The UK Government should review Regulation 4(1) of the Equality Act 2010 (Disability) Regulations 2010, which currently excludes ‘a tendency to physical abuse of other persons’ from the definition of ‘disability’.

**England**

78. The UK Government should ensure head teachers comply with their statutory duties in relation to pupils with SEN: seek early interventions to address underlying causes of disruptive behaviour; assess the suitability of existing provision; and avoid, as far as possible, permanently excluding pupils.

8.3 Transition from school

**UK-wide**

79. The UK and devolved governments should take steps to improve the process of transition for disabled children and young people from school to further education and employment.

**Wales**

80. The Welsh Government should consider ways to improve the participation and progression rates of disabled people in apprenticeships.

8.4 Access to higher education

**England**

81. The UK Government should monitor the impact of changes to Disabled Students’ Allowance for disabled students, publish the results, and mitigate any identified negative impacts on disabled students’ access, participation and attainment at university.

**Wales**

82. The Welsh Government should implement the recommendations of the Diamond Review of higher education funding with regard to disabled students, in order to remove barriers to education and improve attainment levels.

8.5 Additional support for learning (ASL) – children’s right to appeal in Scotland

83. The Scottish Government should apply the presumption of legal capacity from age 12 to ASL, recognise and take action to prevent education authorities from being placed in a conflict of interest situation and ensure disabled children have the necessary support to allow them to exercise their legal capacity.

8.6 Educational attainment

**UK-wide**

84. The UK and devolved governments should continue to monitor educational attainment rates for disabled pupils, focusing on the impacts of legislation and policy on improving attainment rates, and take action to improve the educational attainment of disabled pupils.

9. Health and life (Articles 25, 10) – List of Issues questions 1(f) and 19

9.1 Health inequalities

UK

85. The UK and devolved governments should take concrete steps to address health inequalities experienced by disabled people, including inequality in life expectancy and end-of-life care. Progress should be monitored and published, and further steps taken where progress is insufficient.

England

86. The UK Government should ensure that NHS England undertakes a comprehensive mental health mortality review to identify the reasons why people with mental health conditions often die prematurely. It should also identify improvements in clinical practice and wider support that will protect the health and lives of people with mental health conditions.

**Scotland**

87. The Scottish Government should implement the Mental Welfare Commission recommendation to ensure that mental health services facilitate patients having physical health checks at least every 15 months and access to relevant screening programmes.

**Wales**

88. The Welsh Government should:

* Ensure access to health services for learning disabled people and the uptake of annual health checks continue to be monitored and evaluated, including geographic variations across Wales.

Establish programmes to improve accessible information and health literacy for people with learning disabilities.

9.2 Access to and quality of mental healthcare services Recommendations

UK-wide

89. The UK and devolved governments should ensure there are sufficiently funded, appropriate and high quality mental health services to meet demand.

90. The UK and devolved governments should respond to the 2016 Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child by putting in place systems to regularly collect comprehensive data on child mental health; rigorously investing in child and adolescent mental health services; and developing strategies with clear time frames, targets, measurable indicators, effective monitoring mechanisms and sufficient human, technical and financial resources.

England

91. The UK Government should implement the recommendations of the Independent Mental Health Taskforce in full.

**Scotland**

92. The Scottish Government should:

* Establish a root and branch review of the support offered to people with mental health conditions, to be carried out by an independent Commission of enquiry, underpinned by CRPD standards.
* Investigate and publish the reasons why mental health waiting time targets are not being met and take action to ensure there is timely access to psychological therapies close to home across all Health Boards.
* Ensure psychiatric facilities provide an appropriate therapeutic environment.
* Carry out an audit of specialist services for individuals with highly complex needs to ensure their needs are appropriately met.

**Northern Ireland**

93. The Northern Ireland Executive should expedite the production and publication of ‘Protect Life 2’ and ensure the strategy is appropriately resourced to ensure individuals experiencing mental health conditions can access appropriate treatments and services to ensure their rehabilitation.

**9.3 Sexual and reproductive health**

**UK-wide**

94. The UK and devolved governments should take steps to ensure that disabled women can access mainstream sexual and reproductive healthcare and maternity services on an equal basis with others. This should include ensuring that all staff providing sexual health services receive disability rights and awareness training, and ascertaining the need for specialist services.

9.4 Inappropriate or long-term placement of children and adults with learning disabilities and/or autism

UK-wide

95. The UK and devolved governments should ensure that people with learning disabilities and/or autism:

* Can access community-based services to avoid involuntary placement in psychiatric hospitals, assessment and treatment units, or general acute wards. This includes ensuring that sufficient community-based provision is in place.
* Remain in inpatient care (for the purpose of assessment and treatment) for the shortest possible time, and do not stay in a short-term facility on a long-term basis.
* Are provided with appropriate services for their needs, and are not placed in the psychiatric estate unless they have a mental health need.

Are protected by effective safeguards, including access to advocacy, peer support and supported decision-making.

9.5 Inappropriate use of ‘Do Not Resuscitate’ orders

UK-wide

96. The UK and devolved governments should monitor the use of ‘Do Not Resuscitate’ Orders in relation to disabled people to ensure that:

* Guidance on the use of orders is accessible to patients and/or their representatives.
* Healthcare professionals are consulting with patients when making a clinical decision as to whether cardio-pulmonary resuscitation is withheld and recording reasons where consultation has not taken place.
* Where there is evidence of inappropriate use of notices, immediate steps are taken to prevent orders being placed inappropriately on disabled people.

Healthcare professionals are sufficiently skilled in understanding the communication needs of disabled people with a broad range of impairments and an awareness of the full spectrum of quality of life for disabled patients.

**9.6 Investigating deaths in learning disability or mental health services**

England

97. The UK Government should provide a comprehensive update on actions taken in response to the CQC’s report into the way NHS Trusts review and investigate the deaths of patients in England, including an update in relation to people with learning disabilities and mental health conditions. The update should set out how progress is being monitored, and what steps will be taken where progress is insufficient.

**Scotland**

98. The Scottish Government should ensure that all deaths in mental health settings are investigated and implement any recommendations resulting from these investigations.

9.7 Non-natural deaths in detention and post-custody in England and Wales

England and Wales

99. The UK Government should implement all outstanding recommendations from the EHRC’s inquiry into non-natural deaths of people with mental health conditions in detention in England and Wales, and its report on deaths upon release from police custody. In particular, action is needed to:

* Address the root causes leading to the high levels of non-natural deaths in prisons, including greater access to specialist mental healthcare.
* Ensure that independent investigations and learning from the non-natural deaths of patients in psychiatric hospitals are in fact taking place so that practice improves throughout the system.

10. Freedom from exploitation, violence and abuse (Articles 16, 6) – List of issues questions 3(b), 4(b) and 11

10.1 Disability-motivated hate crime, hostility and harassment

UK-wide

100. To address under-reporting of disability-motivated hate crime, the UK and devolved governments should ensure that the police and other statutory agencies evaluate their reporting and recording processes, in consultation with disabled people, and take steps to simplify them.

101. The UK and devolved governments should employ consistent data collection methods across countries, the criminal justice system and within individual agencies to allow comparative and chronological analysis.

**England and Wales**

102. The UK Government should:

* Undertake a full-scale review of aggravated offences and sentencing provision in England and Wales without delay, and monitor the use of sentencing guidelines to assess sentencing consistency.
* Conduct a review of the provision of third-party reporting of hate crime in England and Wales; evaluate the impact and sustainability of provision; highlight geographical and thematic gaps; and ensure third party and police recording systems are consistent.
* Ensure the police, Crown Prosecution Service and probation services adopt and publish a single, clear definition of a disability hate crime and communicate it effectively to the public and staff.

**Scotland**

103. The Scottish Government should implement the recommendations of the Independent Advisory Group on Hate Crime, Prejudice and Community Cohesion.

10.3 Bullying in schools

UK-wide

104. The UK and devolved governments should ensure that all schools collect qualitative and quantitative data on bullying of disabled children in schools, and use the data to develop strategies to protect disabled pupils.

10.4 Violence against disabled women

105. With reference to CRPD General Comment No. 3 on Article 6, the UK and devolved governments should take all necessary steps to ensure initiatives to address domestic and sexual violence and forced marriage effectively assist disabled victims, including adequately funded support services and sufficient legal protection

106. The UK and devolved governments should make the necessary law, policy and practice changes to be able to ratify the Istanbul Convention and, once it is ratified, dedicate sufficient resources to central, devolved and local authorities to ensure its effective implementation.

10.5 Abuse in institutional settings and home care

**UK-wide**

107. The UK and devolved governments should strengthen measures to prevent abuse in institutional settings and home care, including sexual and financial abuse, of disabled people, in particular disabled children, people with learning disabilities, and disabled older people. This should include ensuring that care costs are assessed with service users’ human rights in mind, including their CRPD rights, and that the findings of the most recent investigations and inspections are acted on without delay.

**Northern Ireland**

108. The Northern Ireland Executive should ensure the criminal law framework is sufficiently robust to address circumstances in which an individual, in particular a carer, mistreats or wilfully neglects a disabled person.

11. Autonomy and integrity (Articles 12, 14, 15, 17) – List of Issues questions 9 and 10

11.1 The use of restraint

**UK-wide**

109. The UK and devolved governments should ensure evidence on the extent of the use of physical, mechanical and chemical restraint, and segregation and seclusion, is routinely published in relation to: prisons; the youth justice system; health and care settings; and education settings.

110. The UK and devolved governments should take steps towards eradicating the use of physical and chemical restraint for reasons related to disability, including mental health-related disability, in all settings. Steps could include:

* A commitment to achieving a shared understanding and consistent human rights approach across all government regulators, inspectorates and ombudsmen.
* Reviewing national and international best practice on methods of de-escalation and other practices which avoid resort to the use of restraint.
* Requesting technical assistance from the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
* Ensuring all relevant professionals and staff have appropriate training and knowledge of best practice.

In any steps taken, the UK and devolved governments should ensure that reduction in the use of force or chemical restraint does not lead to increases in other restrictive practices which threaten human rights, such as segregation and isolation.

**England and Wales**

111. The UK Government should act upon all outstanding recommendations in relation to restraint from the EHRC’s inquiry into the non-natural deaths of adults with mental health conditions in state detention and the 2016 progress review, including:

* The Ministry of Justice should routinely publish data on the use of restraint in prisons to aid transparency and accountability.
* Segregation should not be used for prisoners with mental health conditions, unless there is an exceptional circumstance, which is clearly defined and understood by prison staff.
* Ensuring that the Independent Advisory Panel’s principles for safer restraint are fully acknowledged in the three settings and beyond, with a focus on the youth justice secure estate.

112. The UK Government should evaluate the extent to which its new guidance on restraint is followed in practice, including ‘Positive and Proactive Care’ and the NHS England guidance on chemical restraint.

113. The UK Government should ensure that good practice on reducing the use of restraint identified by the CQC in mental health services is communicated to and used consistently across all units, and that lessons are shared in all settings where disabled people are detained.

11.2 Immigration detention

**UK-wide**

114. The UK Government should:

* Use immigration detention only as a last resort, cease the detention of vulnerable people, and set a statutory time limit of 28 days for immigration detention.

Ensure that, where it detains people who may require support to exercise their legal capacity, independent support is provided to allow them to assert their legal right to challenge their immigration detention.

**11.3 Supported/substitute decision-making frameworks**

**UK-wide**

115. The UK and devolved governments should take immediate steps to introduce and strengthen provision for supported decision-making, and ensure compliance of mental capacity/incapacity legislation with Article 12 CRPD.

**England and Wales**

116. The UK Government should increase the scope of supported decision-making in England and Wales, and put in place safeguards to enable the removal of a supporter if they are not acting in accordance with a disabled person’s will and preferences. As initial steps, the UK Government should respond to the Law Commission’s draft Bill on reform of the Mental Capacity Act 2005, setting out how it intends to give consideration to CRPD Articles 12 and 14, and in its proposed mental health law reform.

**Scotland**

117. The Scottish Government should:

* Address gaps in advocacy provision.
* Ensure patients are routinely involved in decision-making about their treatment and care planning.
* Urgently carry out a comprehensive review of legislation governing non-consensual care and treatment and ensure the new provisions reflect a supported decision-making framework.

**Northern Ireland**

118. The Northern Ireland Executive should ensure the positive provisions of the Mental Capacity (NI) Act 2016 requiring provision of support to disabled people who may require assistance to take decisions themselves are effectively implemented and that substitute decision making is limited.

11.4 Deprivation of liberty

**UK-wide**

119. The UK and devolved governments should provide effective legislative safeguards against deprivation of liberty for disabled people and ensure that these safeguards are based on the principle of supported decision-making.

**Scotland**

120. The Scottish Government should implement the recommendations from the scoping study about the review of the inclusion of learning disability and autism in the Mental Health (Scotland) Act 2003.

12. Participation in political and public life (Article 29) – List of issues question 24

12.1 Voting

**UK-wide**

121. The UK Government should publish clear and comprehensive proposals setting out how registration and voting will be made fully accessible to disabled people.

2.2 Elected representatives

**UK-wide**

122. The UK Government should publish the evaluation of the Access to Elected Office Fund, and, based on the evidence, provide the most effective solution to ensure disabled people have equal prospects of gaining and remaining in elected office. This could include developing a collaborative approach with political parties.

**GB**

123. The UK Government should commence section 106 of the EA 2010 so that political parties are required to publish diversity data about their candidates. The UK and devolved governments should also encourage political parties to identify and remove the barriers to selection faced by disabled people.

**Wales**

124. The Welsh Government should build on current initiatives to remove barriers and build confidence amongst disabled people interested in standing for elected office and to support newly elected councillors in their first term of office.

12.3 Public appointments

**UK-wide**

125. The UK and devolved governments should take steps to promote representation of disabled people on boards of public bodies, for example through mentoring, coaching and training measures, and to monitor and report on progress.

13. Statistics and data collection (Article 31) – List of Issues question 26

13.1 Data gaps and lack of disaggregated data

**UK-wide**

126. The UK and devolved governments should regularly collect data in all nations to meet the requirements of Article 31, disaggregating by disability and all other protected characteristic groups, and by impairment type.

127. The UK Government should include questions on long-term health conditions or disabilities, including type of impairment, in the 2021 censuses.

128. The UK and devolved governments should ensure the development of disability equality indicators that are in line with the CRPD and the Sustainable Development Goals.

**Northern Ireland**

129. The Northern Ireland Executive should implement the commitment to a data development agenda in the draft Delivery Plan for Programme for Government Indicator 42, ‘Average life satisfaction score of people with disabilities’, in accordance with the requirements of Article 31 of the CRPD.

14. National implementation and monitoring (Article 33) – List of Issues question 29

**14.1 Independent Mechanism**

**UK-wide**

130. Taking into account the CRPD Committee guidance on Independent Mechanisms, the UK and devolved governments, should review the allocation of resources to ensure:

* Sufficient funding for the UK Independent Monitoring Mechanism to meet its functions, including effective involvement of disabled people.
* The effective involvement of disabled people in the monitoring and reporting of the implementation of the Convention.

Disability rights in the UK: UK Independent Mechanism updated submission to the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities ahead of the public examination of the UK’s implementation of the UN CRPD

1. Enhancing the status of the CRPD in domestic law and policy (Articles 3, 4) – List of Issues questions 1 and 27

1.1 The CRPD in domestic law and policy

1. The UK and devolved governments have not directly incorporated the CRPD into domestic law. There is no explicit requirement for Ministers to consider their international obligations under the CRPD when developing new policy and law, or any domestic mechanism to hold them to account for failing to do so.[[16]](#footnote-16)
2. UK Government policy is to ‘consider the full range of people affected by proposed policies and ensure that disabled people can access any consultation’.[[17]](#footnote-17) However, this approach does not guarantee that disabled people will be involved in decision-making.

1.2 Human Rights Act

1. UKIM continues to be concerned about the UK Government’s commitment to bring forward proposals on a British Bill of Rights to replace the Human Rights Act (HRA).[[18]](#footnote-18)
2. The UK Government has stated that it will ‘consider the human rights legal framework’ once the UK has exited the European Union.[[19]](#footnote-19) Election promises to change human rights laws, which the Government claims prevent it from tackling terrorism,[[20]](#footnote-20) also create uncertainty for the future of human rights legislation.
3. UKIM maintains its position that the HRA provides essential protection to everyone in the UK, including some important protections for disabled people’s CRPD rights.[[21]](#footnote-21) Changing it would have significant social and constitutional consequences, and should only be considered as part of a broad and participative process that advances human rights protections.[[22]](#footnote-22)

**1.3 Brexit**

1. The risk that the UK’s planned withdrawal from the European Union may remove or restrict the rights of disabled people continues to be of serious concern to UKIM.[[23]](#footnote-23)

**1.4 Action plans**

1. While there are some government strategies and action plans for disabled people **across the UK**, UKIM is not aware that the UK or devolved governments have given adequate consideration of where current law, policy and practice falls short of CRPD compliance, and where progress is needed.[[24]](#footnote-24) There are concerns in Northern Ireland that the Executive’s disability strategy has failed to deliver.[[25]](#footnote-25)
2. Since February 2017:

* There has been no update on the future of the UK Government’s ‘Fulfilling Potential’ strategy and action plan, primarily relevant to **England**, since an annual progress report published in November 2015.[[26]](#footnote-26)
* The Welsh Government’s Framework for Action on Independent Living,[[27]](#footnote-27) which sets out its vision for implementing the CRPD in **Wales**, is currently being ‘refreshed’. The EHRC welcomes the refresh exercise and efforts to engage disabled people and their organisations in the process.[[28]](#footnote-28)
* The **Northern Ireland** Executive Disability Strategy lapsed on 31 March 2017.[[29]](#footnote-29) Work is underway to develop a series of actions under the draft delivery plan for Programme for Government.[[30]](#footnote-30) The Independent Mechanism for Northern Ireland (IMNI) is concerned that the CRPD and relevant Concluding Observations of other treaty bodies are not specifically mentioned, and that the plan lacks significant detail and is described as a ‘broad commitment to improvement’ with the pace of delivery ‘determined by the resource available’.[[31]](#footnote-31)

1. The UK and devolved governments have not set out plans for implementing the 2016 Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, many of which are relevant to disabled people.[[32]](#footnote-32)

2. Equality and non-discrimination (Article 5) – List of Issues question 2

2.1 Gaps in equality legislation

1. The Equality Act 2010 (EA 2010) provides protection across **Great Britain** from various forms of disability discrimination in areas such as work, the provision of goods and services, education and premises. However:

* Some EA 2010 provisions are not in force, including the socio-economic duty (sections 1-3), dual discrimination (section 14) and the duty to make reasonable adjustments to the common parts of residential properties (sections 36-37)[[33]](#footnote-33)
* There are a number of significant gaps in protection.[[34]](#footnote-34)

1. On 6 April 2017, sections 165 and 167 of the EA 2010 were implemented with the effect that taxi and private hire vehicle drivers in **England, Wales and Scotland** are now obliged by law to: transport wheelchair users in their wheelchair; provide passengers in wheelchairs with appropriate assistance; and charge wheelchair users the same as non-wheelchair users.[[35]](#footnote-35) While this is a welcome development, without implementation of the other EA 2010 taxi provisions it may not make a difference in practice for many disabled people.[[36]](#footnote-36)
2. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)[[37]](#footnote-37) specific duties in **England** are far less extensive than those in Wales and Scotland.[[38]](#footnote-38) In particular, they do not include a duty to involve disabled people in decisions that could affect them.[[39]](#footnote-39) This is especially relevant in light of a planned review of the PSED by the UK Government, the timeline for which is yet to be confirmed.
3. The power to introduce the EA 2010 socio-economic duty has been devolved to the National Assembly for Wales[[40]](#footnote-40) and the Scottish Parliament. The Scottish Government intends to be the first country in the UK to introduce the duty, towards the end of 2017.[[41]](#footnote-41) In both Scotland and Wales further powers have also been devolved that provide both the devolved parliaments with an opportunity to introduce protections, including for disabled people, that supplement but do not modify the existing provisions of the EA 2010 in relation to devolved public authorities and the devolved functions of cross-border authorities.[[42]](#footnote-42) These new legislative powers offer further opportunities to promote equality and tackle poverty in Scotland and Wales.
4. There is a greater level of protection for disabled people in GB than in **Northern Ireland**, where the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 still applies, and the EA 2010 does not.[[43]](#footnote-43)
5. The IMNI[[44]](#footnote-44) has called on the Northern Ireland Executive to make changes[[45]](#footnote-45) to disability equality legislation in **Northern Ireland** so as to, at minimum, keep pace with positive legislative changes in GB,[[46]](#footnote-46) and provide for redress against multiple discrimination.[[47]](#footnote-47) There is no evidence in the public domain that progress is being made to realise the commitment to consider limited legislative reform by September 2017, as committed to by the Northern Ireland Executive.[[48]](#footnote-48)

3. Awareness-raising (Article 8) – List of Issues question 5

3.1 Prejudice and negative attitudes

1. There is evidence of persisting negative attitudes towards disabled people, particularly those claiming social security benefits,[[49]](#footnote-49) despite some commitments and measures in place.[[50]](#footnote-50)

4. Accessibility (Articles 9, 21, 30) – List of Issues questions 6, 17 and 25

4.1 Overall framework

1. There is no comprehensive **UK-wide** accessibility plan(s) as required by the CRPD General Comment on Accessibility,[[51]](#footnote-51) and Brexit may mean that the proposed European Accessibility Act[[52]](#footnote-52) will not be implemented into UK law.[[53]](#footnote-53)

4.2 Housing, the built environment and planning

1. There is a shortage of accessible and adaptable housing for disabled people across **GB,** [[54]](#footnote-54) as well as barriers to accessing the built environment, including leisure and sporting facilities.[[55]](#footnote-55)
2. There are gaps in the legal and policy framework for accessible housing**,** including the fact that the EA 2010 duty to make reasonable adjustments to the physical features of the common parts of buildings is not yet in force across **GB**.[[56]](#footnote-56) [[57]](#footnote-57)
3. A UK parliamentary inquiry report published in April 2017[[58]](#footnote-58) confirmed and underlined the concerns raised in UKIM’s February 2017 submission about the serious lack of accessible homes and increasingly inaccessible public spaces.[[59]](#footnote-59)
4. In relation to **England,** the EHRC has recommended local authorities adopt the good practice approach of the altered London Plan.[[60]](#footnote-60)
5. If implemented and promoted effectively, there are a number of initiatives that could improve housing for disabled people in **Wales**, including:

* Measures in Part 4 of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 and Renting Homes (Wales) Act 2016, as well as the Welsh Housing Quality Standard
* Accessible Housing Registers to match people to accessible homes.[[61]](#footnote-61)

1. Disabled people in **Scotland** often find it difficult to get adaptations made to their homes, and the Scottish Government has not implemented the recommendations made by the Independent Housing Adaptations Working Group.[[62]](#footnote-62)
2. A 2017 ECNI statement reported that many disabled people in **Northern Ireland** live in homes that are inadequate for their disability-related needs.[[63]](#footnote-63) It is therefore imperative that the Inter-Departmental Review of Housing Adaptations Services Final Report and Action Plan 2016is fully resourced and implemented.[[64]](#footnote-64)
3. A 2016 survey of provision[[65]](#footnote-65) at entertainment venues in **Northern Ireland** for people with mobility, hearing and vision impairments found widespread evidence of barriers to access.[[66]](#footnote-66)

4.3 Transport

1. Despite some progress[[67]](#footnote-67) on accessibility of transport, UKIM is concerned about the continuing barriers to accessing rail, bus and taxi services **across the UK**.[[68]](#footnote-68)
2. There is a lack of real-time information available to people with sensory impairments on trains and buses.[[69]](#footnote-69) An amendment to the Bus Services Bill, which became the Bus Services Act in April 2017, adds a regulation-making power under the EA 2010 to require accessible information on buses. While this is a step in the right direction, it does not directly require accessible information to be provided. [[70]](#footnote-70)
3. There are a number of accessibility problems in **Northern Ireland.** A 2015 survey found that 30 per cent of disabled people stated that difficulties getting on or off vehicles prevented them from using public transport, compared with four per cent of non-disabled people.[[71]](#footnote-71)
4. In **Northern Ireland,** the Executive has committed to[[72]](#footnote-72) supporting the delivery of the Accessible Transport strategy 2025.[[73]](#footnote-73)

4.4 Information and communication

1. Disabled people continue to experience barriers in accessing information and are more likely to have never used the internet.[[74]](#footnote-74) There are also issues with digital accessibility and the inaccessibility of some government websites.
2. The EHRC has welcomed the NHS England mandatory ‘Accessible Information Standard’ adopted in 2016 in **England**.[[75]](#footnote-75) We also welcome the recent publication of a post-implementation review of the Standard in July 2017.[[76]](#footnote-76) This review highlighted widespread support for the Standard and evidence of its benefits to date, but also pointed to some weaknesses including variable compliance, lack of awareness and lack of staff time, which will need to inform revisions to the Specification and Implementation Guidance for the Standard.
3. Evidence indicates that further work is needed to ensure that the All Wales Standards for communication and information for people with sensory loss**,** applicable to all health services in Wales, are effectively implemented.[[77]](#footnote-77)
4. The **Northern Ireland** Executive has committed to developing a standard for accessible communications and a disability information hub that will be a central point for information access.[[78]](#footnote-78)
5. D/deaf and D/deafblind communities are often unable to access both public and private services because of a lack of good quality sign language interpreters, and there is a failure to translate information into sign language or subtitles, as well a lack of sign language courses **across the UK**.[[79]](#footnote-79)
6. In 2016, the Department for Cultural Arts and Leisure in **Northern Ireland** issued a consultation on a draft Sign Language Framework[[80]](#footnote-80) that included proposals for draft legislation to safeguard Irish Sign Language/British Sign Language users’ rights.[[81]](#footnote-81) However, the current draft Programme for Government does not include any commitments to advance the proposed Framework.[[82]](#footnote-82)

4.5 Insurance

1. At least half a million disabled people have been turned down for insurance, and there is a lack of affordable insurance for disabled people. [[83]](#footnote-83) Insurers are exempt from the disability provisions of the EA 2010, provided they are reasonably relying on relevant actuarial data.[[84]](#footnote-84)

5. Independent and adequate standard of living and social protection (Articles 19, 20, 26, 28) – List of Issues questions 4, 14, 16, 22, 23 and 30

* 1. Poverty, material deprivation and food insecurity

1. UKIM is concerned that disabled people **across the UK** are more likely to live in poverty than people who are not disabled.[[85]](#footnote-85) The latest statistics confirm that on both relative[[86]](#footnote-86) and absolute[[87]](#footnote-87) low income measures, those living in a family with a disabled member are more likely to be in low income than non-disabled families.[[88]](#footnote-88) [[89]](#footnote-89)
2. UKIM is also concerned that disabled people across the UK are also more likely to live in material deprivation than people who are not disabled.[[90]](#footnote-90) In **GB**, intersectional analysis shows that for disabled people in 2014/15, ethnic minority disabled people experienced a poorer standard of living; Black/African/Caribbean, Mixed and Pakistani disabled people being the most materially deprived.[[91]](#footnote-91)
3. There is growing concern about the rapid rise in people using food banks in Britain since 2010.[[92]](#footnote-92) [[93]](#footnote-93) A study covering **GB**[[94]](#footnote-94) published in June 2017 profiled the characteristics of food bank users. It found that half of the people surveyed were disabled and unable to work. Furthermore, 78 per cent of households in the study ‘were cutting back on food intake, experiencing hunger, and/or going whole days without eating because they lacked enough money for food’ over the past 12 months.[[95]](#footnote-95) [[96]](#footnote-96) This research also found that ‘the people using food banks are groups who have been most affected by recent social security reforms, including disabled people’.[[97]](#footnote-97)
4. In **Wales**there is no information about the number of disabled people in poverty within the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. Comparisons between disabled and non-disabled people at a local authority level would provide more useful data.[[98]](#footnote-98)

**5.2 Impact of social security reforms**

1. UKIM remains concerned that social security reforms introduced by successive UK Governments since 2010 are having a particularly negative, disproportionate and cumulative impact on the rights to independent living and an adequate standard of living for disabled people.[[99]](#footnote-99) [[100]](#footnote-100)
2. There are ongoing concerns about the impact of reforms on particular groups of disabled people:

* The UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women expressed its concern about the impact of austerity measures on the rights of disabled women in its July 2013 Concluding Observations.[[101]](#footnote-101)
* Families with disabled children face additional financial challenges to those faced by families without a disabled child, and are likely to be at greater risk of poverty.[[102]](#footnote-102) [[103]](#footnote-103)
* The benefits process was seen as particularly insensitive to the complex nature of many impairments, particularly where the invisibility of certain conditions means needs are not recognised (such as mental health conditions).[[104]](#footnote-104)

1. The impact of social security reforms is likely to be particularly pronounced in **Wales** due to the proportion of disabled adults in the population. The EHRC has welcomed the Welsh Government’s commitment to putting in place mitigating measures, where possible.[[105]](#footnote-105)
2. Responsibility for around a third of non-pension social security benefits is being transferred to the **Scottish** Parliament, including disability related benefits such as Carer’s Allowance, DLA and PIP.[[106]](#footnote-106) The Social Security (Scotland) Bill was introduced into the Scottish Parliament in June. The EHRC and SHRC welcome the Scottish Government’s commitment to design and develop the new social security system in adherence with seven principles, which include the principle that ‘social security is a human right, essential to the realisation of other human rights,’ and to explore with the EHRC whether there is sufficient data to conduct a Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) on the new system.[[107]](#footnote-107)
3. The **Northern Ireland** Executive committed to financially protect disabled people impacted by changes to social security benefits for a temporary period to afford them time to ‘adjust’ to the reforms.[[108]](#footnote-108)
4. UKIM also remains deeply concerned that the UK Government has not provided an adequate response to, or taken action to address the recommendations of, the CRPD Committee’s Inquiry.[[109]](#footnote-109) Instead, new policies have been introduced which may further the negative effect on disabled people, including:

* The Social Security (Personal Independence Payment) (Amendment) Regulations 2017,[[110]](#footnote-110) [[111]](#footnote-111) were introduced in **GB** in response to two Upper Tribunal Judgments, which challenged the Department for Work and Pension (DWP)’s interpretation of particular daily living and mobility descriptions that are part of the PIP assessment.[[112]](#footnote-112) Equivalent Regulations have also been passed in **Northern Ireland**.[[113]](#footnote-113)UKIM is concerned that the changes brought in by the Regulations will place people with mental health conditions at a serious disadvantage in meeting the costs they face relating to their condition; are contrary to the UK Government’s CRPD obligations to support disabled people to participate fully in society; and contradict the social model of disability by treating psychosocial impairments differently to other impairments.[[114]](#footnote-114)
* From April 2017 new claimants **across the UK** placed in the Work-Related Activity Group of the Employment and Support Allowance receive the same weekly payment as those on Jobseeker’s Allowance.[[115]](#footnote-115) This equates to an annual loss of about £1,500 a year for a disabled person.[[116]](#footnote-116) The EHRC opposed this change and raised concerns about the lack of appropriate impact assessment.[[117]](#footnote-117) The EHRC’s offer to assist with an impact assessment of the change was refused.[[118]](#footnote-118) Other stakeholders have voiced serious concerns that the change may put disabled people at a significant disadvantage where they have unavoidably higher living costs.[[119]](#footnote-119) It is essential that a personal support package, which includes both financial and employment support, is in place to support the capacity of individuals to look for and move into work.[[120]](#footnote-120)

1. There are also ongoing issues related to ESA which are continuing to have a negative impact on disabled people:

* Work Capability Assessments (WCAs)[[121]](#footnote-121) remain a significant concern, with claimants with serious health conditions or impairments found ‘fit for work’, and evidence showing that assessments, reassessments and poor decisions are adversely impacting on the physical and mental health of claimants, and links made to some suicides.[[122]](#footnote-122) A 2017 EHRC report laid out a large body of evidence of the negative impact of WCAs on disabled people,[[123]](#footnote-123) and evidence continues to emerge.[[124]](#footnote-124) A recent parliamentary report called for swift reform of the WCA, noting that it is ‘fundamentally flawed’.[[125]](#footnote-125)
* ESA conditionality and sanctions are having a detrimental impact, particularly on those with mental health conditions.[[126]](#footnote-126) An 2017 survey found that 90 per cent of respondents who had received out-of-work benefits and been sanctions reported said this experience had negatively affected their mental health.[[127]](#footnote-127)

1. UKIM remains seriously concerned about the continued failure of the UK Government to conduct an assessment of the cumulative impact of multiple policy and law reforms on disabled people, and to assess and justify retrogressive measures against the established UN criteria, namely to determine whether they are temporary, necessary, proportionate and non-discriminatory, and that they do not undercut a core minimum level of protection.[[128]](#footnote-128) An EHRC-commissioned study has shown that CIAs are both feasible and practicable.[[129]](#footnote-129) [[130]](#footnote-130)

5.3 Independent living funding

1. UKIM has significant concerns about the closure of the Independent Living Fund (ILF) on 30 June 2015, with continued support of ILF users transferred to local authorities in England and the devolved administrations.[[131]](#footnote-131)
2. In **England**, without ring-fencing of the funds or adequate mechanisms to monitor spending, there are significant concerns and emerging evidence of a postcode lottery of support across different local authority areas.[[132]](#footnote-132) Evidence shows that this is resulting in a regression in disabled people’s Article 19 rights.[[133]](#footnote-133)
3. In **Wales**, the Welsh Independent Living Grant was set up by the Welsh Government in order to provide continued support to former ILF recipients.[[134]](#footnote-134) By April 2019 all former ILF recipients will have their care and support needs met through normal social care provision under the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014.[[135]](#footnote-135)
4. UKIMis concerned that the ILF in **Northern Ireland** is restricted to existing users, leading to its de facto closure with future arrangements unclear.[[136]](#footnote-136) There is also an absence of quantitative information on the extent to which disabled people with substantial needs, who are not existing ILF users, are having their needs met through the Self-directed Support and Direct Payments provisions.
5. Furthermore, key stakeholders in **Northern Ireland** have pointed out that Direct Payments do not fund many of the activities that were funded by the ILF, and that disabled people using this scheme therefore have less choice and control than was possible through support from the ILF.[[137]](#footnote-137)

**5.4 Re-institutionalisation concerns**

1. The EHRC[[138]](#footnote-138)is concerned that local authority budget cuts in **England** are leading to a reduction in independence and autonomy for disabled people in their home lives.
2. Evidence continues to emerge, showing that many Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)[[139]](#footnote-139) across **England** may be forcing patients with ongoing care needs to accept residential care home placements due to restrictions to NHS Continuing Healthcare funding.[[140]](#footnote-140) According to the responses to a Freedom of Information request,[[141]](#footnote-141) at least 37 CCGs have a policy that if a person’s NHS Continuing Care costs are above the cost of residential care by a certain percentage, the CCG will not pay the additional cost of support for someone in their home, effectively forcing them into residential care. The EHRC is concerned that this may be a potentially serious breach of disabled people’s Article 19 right to live independently within the community, and could result in disabled people being re-institutionalised.[[142]](#footnote-142)
3. In light of the above concerns, it should be noted that:

* The right to live independently in the community is not currently recognised as a statutory right in the **UK**.
* Disabled people cannot claim protection of this right in the **UK** courts.
* Statutory guidance for the Care Act 2014 in **England**, and the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 in **Wales**, explains that the over-riding duty to promote ‘well-being’ includes giving effect to Article 19 of the CRPD. However, the EHRC is concerned that local authorities do not understand the full implications of this when reaching decisions about care support, so is intervening in the case of *Davey v Oxfordshire County Council* in the Court of Appeal.[[143]](#footnote-143)

5.5 Adult social care and support

1. There is increasing demand but reduced funding for social care **across the UK** leading to difficulties in delivering support, and long-standing concerns about the severity of need required for someone to be eligible for state-funded social care.[[144]](#footnote-144)
2. While the UK Government has made some recent funding commitments in relation to adult social care in **England**, these are unlikely to adequately address the needs of disabled people of all ages.[[145]](#footnote-145) Furthermore, any additional funding for adult social care must be considered and assessed against a backdrop of overall reductions in central government funding for local authorities.[[146]](#footnote-146)
3. In 2016/17 the EHRC intervened in the first instance case of *Davey v Oxfordshire County Council*,[[147]](#footnote-147) where Mr Davey challenged the Council’s decision to reduce his 24-hour care package because of the adverse impact this decision had on his ability to make choices about when and who supported him to live independently. The EHRC’s intervention guided the Court on how the CRPD should be applied by public authorities in **England** when they are making decisions about levels of care and support for disabled people. The case was lost at first instance and his appeal is due to be heard on 17 August 2017. The EHRC is applying to intervene at his appeal hearing to reiterate its submissions and correct elements of the first instance judgment that failed to recognise that the Care Act 2014 intended to apply CRPD Article 19, and should be interpreted accordingly.
4. The Scottish Government has committed to reform adult social care in **Scotland**, including the commissioning of residential care and the role of new models of care and support in home care.[[148]](#footnote-148) The EHRC and SHRC consider that any reform should take place within the framework of the CRPD and Article 19 requirements in particular.
5. The introduction of Self-Directed Support (SDS) in Scotland, which allows disabled people to make informed choices about social care and how it is delivered, has been supported by disabled people and their organisations. However, concerns have been raised about its implementation.[[149]](#footnote-149) Recent research found low uptake of SDS, waiting times of up to a year for SDS packages to be put in place after people have been assessed, and that many consider their SDS packages insufficient for their needs.[[150]](#footnote-150)
6. While welcoming the emphasis of the Social Services and Well-Being (Wales) Act 2014 on ensuring that people have voice, choice and control over their social care in **Wales**, the EHRC has expressed concern that the duty of due regard on the face of the Act in relation to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the UN Principles for Older Persons does not apply to the CRPD.[[151]](#footnote-151)
7. In **Northern Ireland** the Commissioner for Older People has commented that: ‘There is no cohesive approach at regional level to the delivery of key support services for those …people who are assessed as needing non-critical levels of domiciliary care[[152]](#footnote-152) but who would greatly be assisted by social care services’.[[153]](#footnote-153) The Commissioner also stated that good quality domiciliary care was a ‘postcode lottery’[[154]](#footnote-154) and noted increasing concern that domiciliary care visits are being reduced from thirty to fifteen minutes in some areas.[[155]](#footnote-155)

5.6 Support for carers

1. Families of disabled people **across the UK** often provide significant care, and experience difficulties in paying bills, maintaining good health and participating in work and educational opportunities.[[156]](#footnote-156)

6. Employment (Article 27) – List of Issues questions 20 and 21

6.1 Employment gap and barriers

Disabled people **across the UK** are less likely to be in employment than non-disabled people.[[157]](#footnote-157) In the UK 49 per cent of disabled people aged 16-64 were in employment in January-March 2017 compared with 80 per cent of non-disabled people.[[158]](#footnote-158) [[159]](#footnote-159) There are concerns that government initiatives intended to address the disability employment gap will fail to achieve positive change.[[160]](#footnote-160)

1. In **Scotland,** despite the obligation on local authorities under the Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003 with respect to supporting people on Community-based Compulsory Treatment Orders (CCTOs) to secure and sustain employment, little progress had been made to give effect to this duty.[[161]](#footnote-161)
2. There are concerns that the Employment Strategy for disabled people in **Northern Ireland** will not be sufficiently resourced.[[162]](#footnote-162) Furthermore, little progress has been made with respect to providing transition support for young people over 19 years,[[163]](#footnote-163) especially those with complex needs.[[164]](#footnote-164)
3. Since February 2017:

* The UK Parliament Work and Pensions Committee released a report[[165]](#footnote-165) that welcomed the UK Government’s commitment to halve the disability employment gap and some efforts to achieve it. However, it commented that the UK Government would struggle to achieve its target if it could not bring employers on board and enhance in-work support, and recommended publication of a Disability Employment Strategy.[[166]](#footnote-166)
* In **Northern Ireland**, the draft delivery plan for Indicator 42 of the Programme for Government, ‘Average life satisfaction score of persons with disabilities’, commits to implementation of the Employment Strategy for disabled people[[167]](#footnote-167) to create a pathway that will help more young adults move into work. The plan also includes a commitment to ‘ensure that disabled people who are economically inactive are, where possible, helped back into the labour market’.[[168]](#footnote-168)

6.2 Pay gap

1. Disabled people in the **UK** are paid less on average than non-disabled people.[[169]](#footnote-169) In **GB** in 2016 the disability pay gap stood at 13.6 per cent.[[170]](#footnote-170)
2. Research from the EHRC[[171]](#footnote-171) explores the disability pay gap.[[172]](#footnote-172) Key findings include:

* The causes of the disability pay gap are complex. However, there is evidence that disabled people face barriers and discrimination in employment. There are also differences in the personal characteristics of disabled people and non-disabled people that have an impact on the pay gap. For example, lower levels of education or reduced ability to work continuously on a full-time basis can have a negative impact on pay.
* The size of the pay gap varies depending on the exact nature of the disability. The pay gaps for those with neurological disorders, mental health conditions, learning difficulties or disabilities[[173]](#footnote-173) tend to be large.[[174]](#footnote-174)
* The pay gaps for those with physical impairments are substantial. Men with physical impairments generally experience pay gaps in the range of 15 to 28 per cent, depending on the nature of the disability. The difference between non-disabled women's pay and that of women with physical impairments ranges from eight to 18 per cent.
* An EHRC pay gaps strategy[[175]](#footnote-175) notes that the UK, Scottish and Welsh Governments have already taken some steps in the right direction to reduce pay gaps:
  + All three governments are taking some action to support disabled people at work.[[176]](#footnote-176)
  + The Welsh Government has set clear equality objectives to identify and reduce the causes of employment, skills and pay inequalities.[[177]](#footnote-177)

1. The Employment Act (Northern Ireland) 2016[[178]](#footnote-178) requires employers in **Northern Ireland** to publish information relating to employee pay for the purpose of showing whether there are differences in the pay of male and female employees. This information must also include statistics on workers within each pay band in relation to ethnicity and disability.[[179]](#footnote-179)
2. From April 2017, gender pay gap reporting requirements under the EA 2010 will be extended in England, Scotland and Wales to all private and voluntary organisations with 250 or more employees, and in England to public bodies with 250 or more employees.[[180]](#footnote-180) [[181]](#footnote-181) However, **across the UK** there remains no requirement on public or private employers to publish disability pay gaps.

7. Access to justice (Articles 13, 12) – List of Issues question 8

7.1 Legal aid and advice

1. Changes introduced by the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders (LASPO) Act 2012 mean that civil legal aid is no longer available in **England and Wales** for certain types of cases.[[182]](#footnote-182)
2. Evidence shows that these changes:

* are having a seriously detrimental impact on disabled people’s access to justice, with disabled people often disproportionately affected by those areas where legal aid funding has been cut[[183]](#footnote-183)
* have left so-called ‘advice deserts’ in some areas.[[184]](#footnote-184) The EHRC and others have noted that lack of access to early advice means that matters may escalate and become more costly to resolve, as well as having a greater impact on the individual(s) concerned.[[185]](#footnote-185) A report from June 2017 underlines these concerns.[[186]](#footnote-186)

1. While Exceptional Case Funding (ECF) is available in some instances[[187]](#footnote-187) and has seen a small rise according to the latest statistics in June 2017,[[188]](#footnote-188) significant concerns about the inadequacy of ECF and the negative impact of legal aid changes on access to justice remain.[[189]](#footnote-189)
2. The EHRC remains concerned about the accessibility of the telephone gateway service, Civil Legal Advice, for disabled people.[[190]](#footnote-190)
3. In January 2017, the previous UK Government announced that it would undertake a review of the LASPO Act.[[191]](#footnote-191) [[192]](#footnote-192) The post-legislative memorandum had not been published at the time of writing.
4. An independent review of legal aid in Scotland was announced at the start of 2017 and the review group has identified an indicative set of issues it considers are likely to arise. These include the effectiveness of legal aid processes and the role of legal aid in promoting equality and fairness. The review is likely to report by February 2018.[[193]](#footnote-193)

7.2 Court and employment tribunal fees

1. The number of applications to employment tribunals, including disability discrimination claims, dropped significantly following the introduction of fees in **GB**, and the complexity of the fee remission system can be a barrier to accessing it.[[194]](#footnote-194) There is also a lack of awareness about the availability of partial fee remission.[[195]](#footnote-195)
2. The Supreme Court ruled on 26 July 2017 that the current scheme for employment tribunal fees is unlawful because it has the effect of preventing access to justice.[[196]](#footnote-196) The court quashed the legislation which introduced the fees; fees will therefore no longer be charged and will be refunded to those who already paid.
3. The EHRC’s January 2017 submission to the post-implementation review stressed that the fees regime in **GB** seriously undermines the right to access justice, and the UK Government has failed to show that fees are a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.[[197]](#footnote-197)
4. As part of the devolution of employment tribunals, the Scottish Government has stated that there will be no tribunal fees.[[198]](#footnote-198) However, court fees have been significantly increased, despite concerns being raised about the impact that this may have on access to justice for many and in particular disabled people.[[199]](#footnote-199) The Scottish Government does not expect that the increases will have a discriminatory impact, including in relation to disability, because the fee increases affect all court users and those who earn less than average can secure assistance from legal aid and other available exemptions.[[200]](#footnote-200) The EHRC and SHRC are concerned that this response does not take into account the disproportionate impact of such high court fees on disabled people, the disability pay gap and the barriers to getting legal aid, for example legal aid is not available for all civil cases.

7.3 Awareness of the CRPD and reasonable accommodations

1. There does not appear to be compulsory training for members of the judiciary on the CRPD or reasonable adjustments to ensure equal access to justice.[[201]](#footnote-201)
2. The Northern Ireland Court of Appeal has recognised a need for lower courts to understand the challenges faced by disabled people seeking to access justice. The Court identified a need to develop awareness of the Equal Treatment Bench Book which, inter alia, sets out adjustments to court or trial procedures that may be required to accommodate the needs of disabled people.[[202]](#footnote-202)

7.4 Disability discrimination in schools

1. Education tribunals in the **UK** are not able to award financial compensation for disability discrimination or harassment. The civil courts are however able to award financial compensation for other forms of discrimination, such as race or sex discrimination, in the provision of school education.[[203]](#footnote-203)

7.5 Support and protection in the criminal justice system in Scotland

1. Many disabled people experience difficulties with the criminal justice system and they are more likely to report a lack of confidence in the system providing equal access for all.[[204]](#footnote-204)
2. Too often the criminal justice system does not provide enough support and protection to suspects, victims and witnesses who have learning disabilities. The Appropriate Adult scheme is under-resourced and inconsistent, and there is no formal system to provide support during the court process.[[205]](#footnote-205)

8. Education (Articles 24, 7) – List of Issues question 18

8.1 Inclusive education

1. UKIM’s view is that the UK Government’s interpretative declaration and reservation to CRPD Article 24 are unnecessary and contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.[[206]](#footnote-206)
2. In **England**, the trend towards inclusion in mainstream schoolshas stalled,[[207]](#footnote-207) and there are concerns about the UK Government’s reform to provision in education for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).[[208]](#footnote-208) Early findings reported in January 2017 from inspections into implementation of the reforms indicate some good progress, but identify weaknesses such as a lack of urgency in implementation.[[209]](#footnote-209)
3. The most up-to-date statistics for **England** from May 2017 confirm that the percentage of children with a statement or Education, Health and Care (EHC) plan[[210]](#footnote-210) attending state-funded special schools has gradually increased each year.[[211]](#footnote-211) This appears to be a regression on the aim of inclusion of children with SEND in mainstream schooling.
4. Further key facts about children with SEND in **England** include:

* In 2016, 42.9% of school pupils with a statement or EHC plan were in state-funded primary schools while the rest were in state or independent schools.[[212]](#footnote-212)
* Overall, the most common primary type of need is Moderate Learning Difficulty;[[213]](#footnote-213) SEND is more prevalent among boys than girls, at all ages.
* Pupils with SEND are more likely to be eligible for free school meals than those without.
* SEND is most prevalent in Travellers of Irish Heritage, Gypsy/Roma and Black Caribbean pupils.[[214]](#footnote-214)

1. Since February 2017, other developments with implications for inclusive education in **England** include:

* A £215 million funding boost for improved provision for children with SEND, announced on 4 March 2017[[215]](#footnote-215) can be used by local councils for ‘special units’ and ‘special schools’, as well as for improving inclusion within mainstream schools.[[216]](#footnote-216) While additional funding is welcome, it is concerning that no reference has been made to the duty to progressively realise inclusive education, and it appears that no guidance on CRPD requirements has been issued to local councils.
* An independent review into experiences and outcomes in residential special schools and colleges was launched in January 2017.[[217]](#footnote-217) It is welcome that the review puts a spotlight on the experiences of children with SEND. However, the review fails to make reference to the Article 24 obligation to move progressively towards an inclusive education system.[[218]](#footnote-218)

1. In relation to teacher training, we welcome the UK Government’s acceptance of the recommendations of the independent expert group on developing a framework of core content for initial teacher training (ITT) in **England**.[[219]](#footnote-219)
2. The Welsh Government is transforming the additional learning needs system in **Wales** through the Additional Learning Needs and Educational Tribunal (Wales) Bill.[[220]](#footnote-220) The Bill is continuing to progress through the legislative process,[[221]](#footnote-221) and a consultation on implementation concluded in early June.[[222]](#footnote-222) The Minister for Lifelong Learning and Welsh Language announced a £20 million package of support for the implementation of the Bill.[[223]](#footnote-223) Calls have been made for the CRPD to be more central to the Bill than it is currently.[[224]](#footnote-224)
3. In relation to **Scotland**, despite the requirement for local authority, independent and grant-aided schools to produce an accessibility strategy, only 13 of 61 local authorities could provide a current strategy.[[225]](#footnote-225)
4. The number of disabled children in ‘special’ education in **Scotland** remains relatively static, with no notable trend towards inclusion.[[226]](#footnote-226)
5. On 29 June 2017, the Northern Ireland Audit Office published a report on SEN provision within mainstream education in **Northern Ireland**.[[227]](#footnote-227) The report was critical of the level of support currently provided to more than 75,000 children with SEN[[228]](#footnote-228) and concluded that neither the Department of Education nor the Education Authority can currently demonstrate value for money in terms of economy, efficiency or effectiveness in the provision of support to children with SEN in mainstream schools.[[229]](#footnote-229)

8.2 School exclusions

1. There are concerns across **GB** that:

* Despite guidance in place, permanent and/or temporary exclusion rates from school were far higher for pupils with SEN/additional support needs (ASN) than for other children across GB, although the gap is narrowing very slightly.[[230]](#footnote-230)
* The Upper Tribunal[[231]](#footnote-231) has confirmed that ‘the tendency to physically abuse others’[[232]](#footnote-232) is excluded from the definition of disability even if it arises as a result of a disability (such as autism) and regardless of whether it applies to an adult or child.[[233]](#footnote-233) Therefore, certain disabled children are not protected by the EA 2010 in relation to school exclusions.

1. In **England,** guidance from the Department for Education advises that: ‘The head teacher should, as far as possible, avoid permanently excluding any pupil with an Education, Health and Care plan…’[[234]](#footnote-234)

8.3 Transition from school

1. Disabled young people **across the UK** face significant barriers to transitioning from school to further education or employment, and are more likely not to be in education, employment or training.[[235]](#footnote-235)
2. A June 2017 report from the Welsh education inspection body concluded that further education colleges in **Wales** must do more to support young people with learning disabilities to develop their communication and work skills, and made recommendations for improvements.[[236]](#footnote-236)
3. In **Wales** in 2014/15 only 1.3 per cent of apprenticeships were started by disabled learners.[[237]](#footnote-237) A number of barriers that prevent disabled learners from engaging in apprenticeship programmes has been identified.[[238]](#footnote-238)

8.4 Access to higher education

1. In relation to **England**, reductions to Disabled Students’ Allowance (DSA) will disproportionately affect disabled students from low income households.[[239]](#footnote-239)
2. The Diamond Review found that disabled students experience significant barriers to accessing higher education in **Wales**.[[240]](#footnote-240) The Welsh Government has accepted the recommendation to consider what further assistance can be offered to disabled students.[[241]](#footnote-241) A consultation is to be carried out during 2016/17 to seek views on proposed changes to support for disabled students in higher education from 2018/19.

8.5 Additional support for learning (ASL) – children’s right to appeal in Scotland

1. The EHRC and SHRC continue to have serious concerns about the capacity and well-being assessments that will take effect in **Scotland** from January 2018, which are required if a child wants to appeal the level of ASL provided by their local authority. In the relevant draft revised Code of Practice, the Scottish Government explains that these assessments will be carried out by the education authority the child is seeking to exercise their right of appeal against. An appeal will only be allowed if the education authority is satisfied the child has sufficient maturity and understanding to exercise the particular right and that in exercising the right there will be no adverse impact to the child’s well-being. [[242]](#footnote-242)
2. In our view the assessments will disproportionally affect disabled children and will have the effect of reversing the presumption of legal capacity from age 12 in Scots law. The Scottish Government is also failing to address concerns that the education authority will have a conflict of interest when carrying out both assessments.

8.6 Educational attainment

1. **Across the UK**, fewer children with SEN/ASN achieve good results in Key Stage 4 or on leaving school than those pupils without SEN/ASN.[[243]](#footnote-243) The latest available statistics confirm the continued educational attainment gap.[[244]](#footnote-244)

9. Health and life (Articles 25, 10) – List of Issues questions 1(f) and 19

9.1 Health inequalities

1. Disabled people in the **UK**, particularly those with learning difficulties, are more likely to experience health inequalities than non-disabled people.[[245]](#footnote-245) Concerns include:

* People with mental health conditions and learning disabilities die younger than non-disabled people;[[246]](#footnote-246)
* People with learning disabilities are one the groups least likely to access palliative care.[[247]](#footnote-247)

1. Evidence in **Scotland** also highlighted concerns that people on community-based Compulsory Treatment Orders (CTOs) are not receiving regular physical health reviews.[[248]](#footnote-248)
2. Research in **Wales** also showed geographic differences in the uptake of health checks among people with learning disabilities, and the need for accessible health advice and information about health checks.[[249]](#footnote-249)
3. The EHRC has welcomed NHS England’s ongoing learning disability mortality review in **England**, which aims to identify the reasons why people with learning disabilities often die prematurely.[[250]](#footnote-250)
4. The Welsh Government’s end of live care delivery plan published in March 2017 provides a welcome acknowledgment of the barriers faced by disabled people in accessing end-of-life care in **Wales**, and the need for improvements to be made.[[251]](#footnote-251) The impact of the action plan is yet to be seen.

9.2 Access to and quality of mental healthcare services

1. UKIM is concerned that mental health services across the UK have experienced underfunding; many people experience long waits for treatment, have unmet needs or have to travel very far from home for treatment.[[252]](#footnote-252) [[253]](#footnote-253) Concerns have been raised by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child about mental health services for children.[[254]](#footnote-254) In addition, there are a lack of hospital beds, and reliance on emergency services.[[255]](#footnote-255)
2. The EHRC has called on the UK Government to implement the recommendations of the independent Mental Health Taskforce, which set out a five-year national strategy for mental health in England.[[256]](#footnote-256)
3. In England, evidence shows:

* despite funding commitments for adult and child and adolescent mental health services, the funding is often being used for other purposes.[[257]](#footnote-257) [[258]](#footnote-258) [[259]](#footnote-259)
* ongoing concerns about the tendency, primarily in the independent sector, for people with severe mental health conditions to remain in hospital for very long time periods.[[260]](#footnote-260)
* concerns about the state of child and adolescent mental health inpatient services in England, including evidence in a recent report that young people are staying in hospital much longer than necessary due to a lack of services in the community.[[261]](#footnote-261)

1. UKIM welcomes statements from the Queen’s Speech in June 2017 in relation to England, which indicate a commitment to making mental health a priority in the NHS; continued investment in mental health services; and promise the publication of a Green Paper on Children and Young People’s Mental Health.[[262]](#footnote-262)
2. In relation to **England,** the 2016 Care Quality Commission (CQC) report into the application of the Mental Health Act (MHA) states that ‘good care is not consistent across the country’. CQC points to several areas where practice needs to improve, including the provision of information about the right to an independent mental health advocate; provision of information in accessible formats; greater patient involvement in care planning; and facilitation of access to health check-ups and care.[[263]](#footnote-263)
3. Improving access to mental health services and support is a key equality and human rights challenge in **Wales**, and there has been a significant increase in demand for CAMHS in the last four years with insufficient capacity to meet it.[[264]](#footnote-264)
4. In July 2017, the National Assembly for Wales’s Children, Young People and Education Committee launched an inquiry into the ‘Emotional and Mental Health of Children and Young People’.[[265]](#footnote-265) The inquiry will consider whether the review of CAMHS – the ‘Together for Children and Young People Programme’ - is on track to deliver the changes in CAMHS services that are needed. This inquiry will provide welcome scrutiny of relevant legislation and policy. The Welsh Government should consider the recommendations that result.
5. In **Scotland**, since 2014, the majority of Scottish health boards have continually failed to meet the waiting time target of 90 per cent of patients to be referred to psychological therapy within 18 weeks.[[266]](#footnote-266) A review of Intensive Psychiatric Care Units found a range of unmet needs, including a lack of activities, rehabilitation or a therapeutic environment.[[267]](#footnote-267) People with complex needs, including people with autism or a dual diagnosis such as learning disability plus mental health condition, or women and young people needing secure care have been found to be receiving worse mental health services than others and have poorer outcomes.[[268]](#footnote-268) Overall, concerns in Scotland about mental health care and support have been growing and this has led to calls for a root and branch review, including a focus on moving towards supported decision-making, to be carried out by an independent Commission of enquiry.[[269]](#footnote-269)
6. Around one in five adults in **Northern Ireland** shows signs of a mental health condition.[[270]](#footnote-270) One factor, broadly accepted to have contributed to the prevalence of mental health conditions among the general population, is the history of violent conflict.[[271]](#footnote-271) Research shows that individuals who experienced a conflict-related traumatic event relating to the ‘Troubles’ are more likely to have a mental health condition at some point in their lives.[[272]](#footnote-272)
7. Evidence suggests that mental health services in Northern Ireland have been funded more poorly than elsewhere in the UK for some time, both with respect to Northern Ireland’s share of the overall health budget and on a per capita basis.[[273]](#footnote-273) Research carried out in 2011 found that actual spending per capita on mental health services in Northern Ireland was 10-30 per cent lower than in England, even though it necessitated almost 44 per cent higher per capita funding.[[274]](#footnote-274)
8. The suicide rate in **Northern Ireland** is significantly higher than elsewhere in the UK.[[275]](#footnote-275) The most recent Suicide Prevention Strategy ran from 2012 to 2014. IMNI is aware that the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety has consulted on a revised Strategy, ‘Protect Life 2’*,* which will work in tandem with the Regional Mental Health Care Pathway.[[276]](#footnote-276) IMNI considers that an integrated, wide-ranging strategy, tackling the factors influencing the high rate of suicide and mental health conditions, including the conflict-related matters, should be developed for Northern Ireland.

**9.3 Sexual and reproductive health**

1. A number of research studies across the UK indicated that disabled women experience a number of barriers to accessing sexual and reproductive health and information services. For example:

* Few services or support groups offer support and information about sex and relationships for people with a learning disability, and sex education is often insufficient.[[277]](#footnote-277)
* Small-scale qualitative research in England [[278]](#footnote-278) and a 2016 small-scale UK-based survey[[279]](#footnote-279) provide evidence that most women with learning disabilities did not make their own decisions about the use of contraception, or had their choices constrained by various factors including fear of losing services.
* Reproductive and maternity rights were strong themes that emerged during forums to discuss disabled women’s equality in **Scotland** in 2013-15. Many reported experiences of negative comments from health professionals with regards to pregnancy and maternity and assumptions about their fertility, capacity and desire to parent. Some also reported feeling pressured to terminate pregnancies and to take steps to avoid becoming pregnant.[[280]](#footnote-280) A small-scale study[[281]](#footnote-281) also found that unlike non-disabled women, disabled women’s pregnancies were perceived as ‘abnormal’, and the women reported incidents where their choices were denied.[[282]](#footnote-282)
* Research in Northern Ireland[[283]](#footnote-283) recommended that consideration should be given to the specific needs of disabled women with respect to maternity services, and that awareness training for health service staff is needed in respect of the sexual health and well-being of disabled women.

9.4 Inappropriate or long-term placement of children and adults with learning disabilities and/or autism

1. Many people with a learning disability or autism across the UK are placed in psychiatric hospitals inappropriately, or are likely to have longer stays in hospital than other mental health patients.[[284]](#footnote-284) [[285]](#footnote-285)
2. The Lenehan Review (January 2017) found that poor community provision, no single point of accountability for care, and the lack of early intervention for children and their families means that children with significant needs are often ‘stuck’ in Assessment and Treatment Units (ATUs), long distances from home.[[286]](#footnote-286) It is currently unclear what steps Government is taking to implement the review’s recommendations.
3. Research published this year reveals concerns about how a person who has been in an ATU for five years will generate a substantial profit for an independent sector organisation.[[287]](#footnote-287) This is particularly concerning as independent sector inpatient services charge more; are, on average, poorer quality in terms of being compliant with CQC standards, and their use of restraint; and people experience longer stays.[[288]](#footnote-288)

9.5 Inappropriate use of ‘Do Not Resuscitate’ orders

1. There is evidence of ‘Do Not Resuscitate’ (DNR) orders being inappropriately applied to disabled people by medical professionals across the UK.[[289]](#footnote-289)
2. Guidance for **England and Wales** on DNR orders includes a decision-making framework underpinned by the principle of non-discrimination and the Human Rights Act.[[290]](#footnote-290) The guidelines explicitly state that ‘decision-makers must not be influenced by their own personal views about living with a particular condition or disability’.[[291]](#footnote-291)
3. The Scottish Government has produced revised guidance for healthcare professionals on DNR orders including a decision-making framework which highlights human rights standards and CRPD in particular.[[292]](#footnote-292)

**9.6 Investigating deaths in learning disability or mental health services**

1. The EHRC welcomes the publication of a review by the CQC, which examined how NHS Trusts in **England** investigate and learn from deaths of people using learning disability or mental health services.[[293]](#footnote-293) The UK Government’s statement accepting the recommendations, which made a number of commitments for taking them forward,[[294]](#footnote-294) is also welcome.
2. The EHRC endorses the recommendations of this review, and welcomes the first edition of the National Guidance on Learning from Deaths[[295]](#footnote-295) published in March 2017. The guidance proposes for all deaths to be reviewed by ‘independent medical examiners’ from April 2018 and for deaths of people with learning disabilities that meet certain criteria[[296]](#footnote-296) to be reviewed by an ‘independent, trained reviewer’ who will decide whether a multi-agency review is required. It states that ‘reviewers would be expected to conduct reviews independent of the Trust in which they work’.
3. The Chief Coroner[[297]](#footnote-297) raised concerns about the independence and quality of medical examiners. We share these concerns and we also consider them relevant to ‘trained reviewers’ who will review the deaths of people with learning disabilities.
4. There is a gap in **Scotland** in the arrangements for investigating deaths in mental health settings.[[298]](#footnote-298)

9.7 Non-natural deaths in detention and post-custody in England and Wales

1. In England and Wales:

* There are outstanding recommendations from an EHRC inquiry, which documented a number of non-natural deaths of adults with mental health conditions in prisons, police custody or psychiatric hospitals between 2010 and 2013.[[299]](#footnote-299)
* There are significant concerns about the number of deaths within a month of release from state custody, with mental health as a key factor.[[300]](#footnote-300)

10. Freedom from exploitation, violence and abuse (Articles 16, 6) – List of issues questions 3(b), 4(b) and 11

10.1 Disability-motivated hate crime, hostility and harassment

1. Disability hate crime persists **throughout the UK** and there are high levels of under-reporting, despite some initiatives in place.[[301]](#footnote-301)
2. In **England and Wales:**

* Recent new approaches to reporting hate crime may prove useful for individuals experiencing disability-related harassment.[[302]](#footnote-302)
* A Criminal Justice Joint Inspection Review of how the police, Crown Prosecution Service and probation trusts[[303]](#footnote-303) dealt with disability hate crime made a priority recommendation that they should all adopt and publish a single, clear and uncomplicated definition of a disability hate crime that is communicated effectively to the public and staff.[[304]](#footnote-304) A follow up report in 2015 found that little to no progress had been made against the recommendations.[[305]](#footnote-305)

1. According to the latest statistics in **Scotland**, released in June 2017, 2016-17 is the first year the number of charges reported has fallen since 2010.[[306]](#footnote-306) However, there is broad consensus that this type of crime continues to be under-reported compared with other forms of hate crime.[[307]](#footnote-307)
2. The EHRC’s final report from its inquiry into disability-related harassment[[308]](#footnote-308) outlines some progress **across GB**.[[309]](#footnote-309) However, under-reporting of disability-related hate crime and harassment remains prevalent,[[310]](#footnote-310) and further action is needed to improve law and policy, data and evaluation and victim support.[[311]](#footnote-311)
3. In July 2017, the EHRC wrote to the Secretary of State for Justice to seek an update on plans to respond to recommendations by the Law Commission in 2014 to address inequalities in legal provisions for sentencing different types of hate crime in **England and Wales**.[[312]](#footnote-312) We remain concerned that no response to the recommendations has been received to date.

10.2 Bullying in schools

1. Disabled children and young people experience disproportionate levels of bullying in schools,[[313]](#footnote-313) and no government department collects regular data.[[314]](#footnote-314) [[315]](#footnote-315)

10.3 Violence against disabled women

1. Disabled women experience disproportionate levels of all forms of violence and abuse, and face additional barriers to accessing appropriate support.[[316]](#footnote-316) Insufficient funding remains a major barrier.[[317]](#footnote-317)
2. The UK Government is yet to ratify the Istanbul Convention.[[318]](#footnote-318) The Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence (Ratification of Convention) Act 2017*,* which received Royal Assent on 27 April 2017,[[319]](#footnote-319) puts pressure on the UK Government to ratify the Convention.[[320]](#footnote-320)
3. The EHRC welcomes plans included in the 2017 Queen’s Speech for a Draft Domestic Violence and Abuse Bill for **England and Wales** to strengthen access to justice and protection measures for victims.[[321]](#footnote-321)

10.4 Abuse in institutional settings and home care

1. There is evidence of abuse and neglect in institutional settings and home care, particularly of older disabled people and people with learning disabilities.[[322]](#footnote-322)
2. As a result of shocking levels of abuse at a specialist unit in **England,** the UK Government introduced Transforming Care in 2012 to transfer more people with learning disabilities from institutional mental health settings into community settings. The UK Government say that there was a 12 per cent fall in the numbers of people with learning disabilities in specialist units and hospitals between March 2015 and February 2017, leaving 2,530 people with learning disabilities in mental health institutions as at March 2017.[[323]](#footnote-323)
3. An EHRC inquiry found evidence in **GB** of poor treatment, including lack of food and water, unsanitary conditions and financial abuse and control of disabled people by carers.[[324]](#footnote-324) While local authorities have taken action to improve their decision-making procedures in this area, there are concerns about the capping of prices for commissioned care costs, stating its potential to lead to future human rights violations.[[325]](#footnote-325)
4. In 2013 concerns were raised regarding the issue of child sexual abuse in **Northern Ireland**.[[326]](#footnote-326) The Northern Ireland Executive instituted a thematic review with the aim of identifying key learning points and opportunities for improvement.[[327]](#footnote-327) An independent expert-led inquiry report, published in 2014,[[328]](#footnote-328) identified a need for greater appreciation among key personnel of the links between disability and child sexual exploitation, emphasizing that staff in disability teams have the awareness and training to recognise vulnerability to sexual exploitation and other emerging child protection issues, and to respond appropriately by involving staff with more specialist child protection expertise.[[329]](#footnote-329) It also highlighted the need to ensure greater awareness among disabled children of the risk of sexual exploitation.
5. In **Northern Ireland**, although the Mental Capacity (NI) Act 2016 introduces new offences of ill treatment or wilful neglect of a person who lacks capacity, the requirement to prove that a victim lacks capacity restricts the effectiveness of these offences to protect victims against abuse. There is a free-standing offence to address situations where a care worker ill-treats or neglects a person they care for in both Scotland, and England and Wales.[[330]](#footnote-330) In April 2017 allegations of abuse at a number of care homes led to arrests by the police, underscoring the need for a robust legal framework to ensure the effective prosecution of abusers.[[331]](#footnote-331)

11. Autonomy and integrity (Articles 12, 14, 15, 17) – List of Issues questions 9 and 10

11.1 The use of restraint

1. UKIM is concerned about the use of physical and/or chemical restraint in detention, healthcare and some education settings.[[332]](#footnote-332)
2. While there are some welcome initiatives,[[333]](#footnote-333) there are substantial issues with implementation. For example, in England and Wales:

* Notwithstanding the ‘Minimising and Managing Physical Restraint’ (MMPR) policy,[[334]](#footnote-334) an inspection of its implementation in the youth offending estate has revealed serious concerns.[[335]](#footnote-335)
* There are continuing criticisms about the widespread over-use of segregation in adult male prisons, including for people with pre-existing mental health conditions, and its detrimental impact.[[336]](#footnote-336)
* Unlike the MMPR policy, there has been no similar review of the overall effectiveness of ‘Positive and Proactive Care’,[[337]](#footnote-337) applicable in **England**. However, in its latest annual review of the Mental Health Act 1983, the CQC found that: ‘mechanical restraints are sometimes being used as a blanket measure when transporting patients off-site.’[[338]](#footnote-338)
* The CQC expressed concerns about physical restraint, seclusion and over medication. Although there was good practice leading to a reduction of restraint and restrictive practices in some units, in others there was poor practice and inconsistent recording of physical restraint and seclusion. Between January 2015 and January 2016, face down restraint actually increased in high secure settings for people with learning disabilities.[[339]](#footnote-339)

1. Recommendations related to restraint[[340]](#footnote-340) from an EHRC inquiry, which found that physical restraint and segregation could be a direct or indirect cause of some non-natural deaths of adults with mental health conditions in prisons, police cells and hospitals, in **England and Wales**, have not been acted on.[[341]](#footnote-341)

Further, half of prisons in England and Wales continue to locate prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm in segregation units.[[342]](#footnote-342) In his latest annual report, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons has expressed frustration at the widespread continuation of this practice despite recommendations from his inspectorate.[[343]](#footnote-343) He has also cited 'major concerns about the governance and oversight of use of force and segregation’.[[344]](#footnote-344)

1. The use of force to restrain people in police custody in England and Wales remains inconsistently recorded by frontline staff and is not systematically monitored by senior police managers, ‘despite repeated recommendations over the years from HMIC/HMIP inspections.’ In some cases, there were findings that police custody staff members do not perceive their intervention as a use of force.[[345]](#footnote-345)
2. The Council of Europe’s Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) recently identified a range of concerns about forced treatment, the use of force on patients and the use of long-term segregation and night-time confinement in high secure hospitals in England. The CPT found that some patients had been held in long-term segregation for a period of years.[[346]](#footnote-346)
3. A study of the Children’s Commissioner revealed that disabled children in the youth justice secure estate in England are more likely to have experienced isolation than non-disabled children.[[347]](#footnote-347)
4. In **Northern Ireland**, the Mental Capacity (NI) Act 2016, which is yet to be commenced, makes provision for a statutory definition of restraint. However, this only applies in circumstances in which an individual is deemed to lack capacity.

11.2 Immigration detention

1. UKIM is concerned by:[[348]](#footnote-348)

* Indications that immigration detention facilities are inadequately equipped for detainees with serious mental health conditions.
* There is no Home Office policy or procedure to ensure that immigration detainees who lack mental capacity are provided with independent support to assert their legal rights.
* The UK Government introduced new guidance and policies in September 2016[[349]](#footnote-349) which recognise that some disabilities[[350]](#footnote-350) indicate that detention may cause harm and lead to a presumption that detention is not appropriate. However, disabled people whose immigration risk factors and/or public protection concerns are deemed to outweigh the harm they may suffer can still be detained under the new policies, even if is there is a risk of significant harm occurring.[[351]](#footnote-351) [[352]](#footnote-352)

11.3 Supported/substitute decision-making frameworks

1. Legislation **across the UK** continues to provide for substitute decision-making.[[353]](#footnote-353) The Essex Autonomy Project has made recommendations to reform legislation across England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland to achieve CRPD compliance.[[354]](#footnote-354)
2. **Northern Ireland** has introduced a single legislative framework for mental capacity and mental health which separates incapacity from identified disability.[[355]](#footnote-355)
3. A review in England and Wales by the Law Commission published in March 2017 identified significant concern that the Mental Capacity Act 2005 (MCA) does not comply with the CRPD and recommended that the UK Government establish supported decision-making schemes.[[356]](#footnote-356) It also proposed a draft Bill[[357]](#footnote-357) to amend the MCA to establish duties to: ascertain, so far as reasonably practicable, the person’s wishes and feelings, beliefs and values; and give particular weight to any wishes and feelings ascertained.[[358]](#footnote-358) The UK Government has yet to respond to the proposal.
4. In **Scotland**, there are common issues in hospitals, care homes and prisons relating to failures to properly adhere to the requirements of mental health and incapacity legislation. There is also an ongoing shortage of Mental Health Officers, who provide an essential safeguard.[[359]](#footnote-359)
5. A recent report sets out the case for reform of Scotland’s mental health and capacity law to achieve compliance with the CRPD.[[360]](#footnote-360) The Scottish Government has committed to review the Adults with Incapacity (Scotland) Act 2000. However, as yet no proposals for reform have been published [[361]](#footnote-361)
6. In Northern Ireland, when the Mental Capacity (NI) Act 2016 is commenced, it is important to ensure that provisions for supported decision-making contained within the Act are effective and accessible.[[362]](#footnote-362)

11.4 Deprivation of liberty

1. The EHRC is seriously concerned that the number of detentions under the Mental Health Act 1983 are continuing to increase in **England and Wales**.[[363]](#footnote-363)
2. The UK Government has committed itself to reforming mental health law in **England and Wales**.[[364]](#footnote-364) Before the 2017 General Election, the Prime Minister was widely reported identifying ‘unnecessary detention’ as a problem.[[365]](#footnote-365) It is not clear whether the proposed reform will include proposals to align mental health law with CRPD Articles 12 and 14.
3. In the **UK**, there is a lack of effective safeguards to prevent people in hospitals or other care settings who are deemed incapable of consent, but are compliant with their admission and/or treatment, from being deprived of their liberty.[[366]](#footnote-366) [[367]](#footnote-367)
4. The Law Commission identified ‘a compelling case’ for replacing the deprivation of liberty safeguards (DoLS) within the Mental Capacity Act 2005 that apply in **England and Wales**. [[368]](#footnote-368) The Law Commission has proposed a draft Bill to introduce a new DoLS scheme that places deprivation of liberty within the overall context of care and treatment arrangements, and increases the weight accorded to a person’s ‘wishes and feelings’. As yet there has been no response to the draft bill from the UK Government.
5. In **Scotland** there are concerns[[369]](#footnote-369) that people deprived of their liberty are ‘unable effectively to assert their rights’.[[370]](#footnote-370) The Scottish Government has committed to addressing issues around deprivation of liberty as part of the reform of the incapacity law framework.[[371]](#footnote-371)
6. The legal framework in **Scotland** for people with mental health conditions who require compulsory detention and treatment applies only to people who have a ‘mental disorder,’ and the definition includes learning disability. There has been, and still is, considerable debate about whether learning disability and autism should be included in mental health law and there have been calls for review.[[372]](#footnote-372) The Scottish Government committed to this review, and the findings of a scoping study were published in January 2017.[[373]](#footnote-373) However, no further announcements have been made about scope and timetable.
7. In its earlier submission UKIM raised concerns regarding the non-consensual use of electroconvulsive therapy in **Northern Ireland.**

12. Participation in political and public life (Article 29) – List of issues question 24

12.1 Voting

1. Disabled people experience barriers to exercising their right to vote.[[374]](#footnote-374)
2. A 2017 report found that the participation of disabled people in the voting system is ‘seen through the prism of compliance rather than inclusion’ and identified ‘barriers not just in the physical act of voting, but in joining the electoral register and accessing information about elections, candidates, and party policies’.[[375]](#footnote-375)

12.2 Elected representatives

1. Disabled people are under-represented in political life **across the UK**, and the collection of information about candidates and elected officials’ protected characteristics needs to be improved.[[376]](#footnote-376)
2. Following the General Election on 8 June 2017, media reports stated that less than one per cent of Members of Parliament have declared that they have a disability.[[377]](#footnote-377) Disabled people are similarly under-represented in the devolved Parliaments/ Assemblies.[[378]](#footnote-378)
3. A significant obstacle to disabled people standing for election is additional disability-related costs they can incur. The Access to Elected Office Fund[[379]](#footnote-379) set up in 2012 for elections to the UK Parliament (General Election) and local elections in England was closed in 2015.[[380]](#footnote-380) In the absence of the Fund,[[381]](#footnote-381) many disabled candidates in the June 2017 General Election were unable to meet additional disability-related costs.[[382]](#footnote-382) An Early Day Motion (EDM)[[383]](#footnote-383) tabled in June 2017 reiterates key concerns. The Scottish Government set up a comparable fund for the Scottish Local Government election in 2016, and due to its success has extended it to cover the Scottish Parliament election in 2021.

12.3 Public appointments

1. Disabled people continue to be under-represented on public boards across the UK,[[384]](#footnote-384) despite some progress on appointing disabled candidates in **England and Wales** according to the latest figures.[[385]](#footnote-385)

13. Statistics and data collection (Article 31) – List of issues question 26

13.1 Data gaps and lack of disaggregated data

1. There are significant disability data gaps **across the UK**, and limited availability of data disaggregated by impairment type. This inhibits effective monitoring and reporting of CRPD compliance.[[386]](#footnote-386)
2. There are a number of data gaps across **GB** in relation to education; work; standard of living; health and care; justice and detention; and participation and identity.[[387]](#footnote-387) More needs to be done to improve the evidence base about issues facing disabled people, including the experiences and outcomes of disabled people with specific or multiple impairments, and to disabled people of different ethnic groups, ages or sexual orientations’.[[388]](#footnote-388)
3. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has stated that it will not be including questions seeking data on impairment type in the 2021 Census.[[389]](#footnote-389) However, the White Paper with proposals for the Census will not go before Parliament until spring 2018.
4. In **Northern Ireland,** the draft Delivery Plan for Programme for Government commits the NI Executive to a data development agenda.[[390]](#footnote-390)

14. National implementation and monitoring (Article 33) – List of issues question 29

**14.1 Independent Mechanism**

1. With the exception of a one-off grant in Northern Ireland,[[391]](#footnote-391) the members of UKIM have not received funding to carry out their additional mandate to promote, protect and monitor the implementation of the Convention.[[392]](#footnote-392) Further, the Commissions[[393]](#footnote-393) have all had to manage significant budget reductions since being designated as the Independent Mechanism.
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