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**UNCRPD Inquiry (Summary of Findings & UK State Party Response)**

1. On 6 October the UNCRPD Committee published an inquiry report which addressed allegations of “serious and systematic” abuses of the human rights of disabled people in the UK in respect of Article 19 (Independent living and being included in the community), Article 28 (Adequate standard of living and social protection) and Article 28 (Employment).
2. This paper sets out a summary of the inquiry findings, and of the UK State Party’s subsequent response to those findings.

Background

1. This Inquiry was conducted by the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (‘Committee’) under the auspices of article 6 of the Optional Protocol to the UNCRPD, which is a course of action that may be taken by the Committee when it receives information ‘indicating grave or systematic violations by a State Party’ of rights contained in UNCRPD.[[1]](#footnote-1)
2. In the case of the UK, the Committee began to receive information in 2012 regarding the adverse impact of government policies and legislation on persons with disabilities.[[2]](#footnote-2) This was followed up with a formal request from a number of UK-based disability organisations in April 2013 followed by the official launching of an inquiry by the Committee in May 2014 and a country visit from 12-23 October 2015.
3. The substantive issues related to the Committee in this information engaged substantive rights, namely the right to live independently and to be included in the community (article 19), the right to an adequate standard of living and social protection (article 28) and the right to work and employment (article 27).

International human rights standards

1. Under article 19 on the right to live independently and be included in the community, the freedom to exercise control over their everyday lives and decisions, such as their place of residence, daily routine and living arrangements are ‘indispensable to ensure the full inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities in the community and to prevent their isolation and segregation’.[[3]](#footnote-3)
2. Thus, state party obligations amount to ensuring access of rights holders to support services, with any assessment of eligibility to be based upon the human rights approach rather than the medical approach.[[4]](#footnote-4)
3. States parties must also provide community services by disseminating information, providing counselling and doing so by coordinating efforts with health and social care providers.[[5]](#footnote-5)
4. Adequate resources must be allocated to fulfil this right, ensuring that persons with disabilities paying for services are not disproportionately impacted compared with other persons with disabilities and on an equal basis to persons without disabilities.[[6]](#footnote-6) Thus, ‘reductions in social and health-care budgets, a lack of alternative resources for some persons with disabilities, the unavailability of community-based services, the conditionality of support upon certain living arrangements, cuts in independent living support, stringent criteria for accessing support services and the delivery of more standardized services’ may infringe article 19 rights.[[7]](#footnote-7)
5. Article 27 recognises the right to work and employment on an equal basis with others. Accordingly, states parties must modify or abolish laws discriminating against persons with disabilities in work and prohibit discrimination, ensure equality of opportunity and treatment regarding access to employment, provide information and assistance to persons with disabilities who are seeking employment, legislate to ensure that public and private employers provide reasonable accommodation to employees with disabilities, legislate to take ‘affirmative action’ measures incentivising the employment of persons with disabilities, and provide access to technical and vocational training programmes.[[8]](#footnote-8) States parties must also protect persons with disabilities from forced or compulsory labour on an equal basis with others.
6. Article 28 provides the right of persons with disabilities to enjoy social protection without discrimination. This requires the state to provide measures ensuring access of persons with disabilities, particularly women, girls and older persons, to social protection and poverty reduction programmes, the goal of which is to ‘achiev[e] social inclusion and participation in the community.[[9]](#footnote-9) This is in light of the higher susceptibility of persons with disabilities to poverty, nationally and internationally.
7. Social protection systems should ensure the additional costs associated with disability are met, addressing the barriers to participation by persons with disabilities in society based on the human rights approach.[[10]](#footnote-10)
8. The state must ensure access to ‘quality, adequate, acceptable and adaptable’ programmes which are tailored to the individual needs of persons with disabilities.[[11]](#footnote-11) In providing such social protection, the state must guarantee ‘universal coverage, reasonable, proportionate and transparent eligibility criteria, affordability and physical accessibility to information’.[[12]](#footnote-12)
9. The Committee highlights that social security schemes are particularly important for persons with disabilities because they ensure individual autonomy and freedom of control and choice, ensuring they are not isolated or segregated from the community.[[13]](#footnote-13)
10. Measures to provide adequate income security and measures to support labour inclusion are complementary, not contradictory.[[14]](#footnote-14)
11. Furthermore, states parties have obligations relating to the UNCRPD more generally, including ensuring maximum availability of resources and under a duty of progressive realisation, which entails ‘a presumption against retrogressive measures in the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights’.[[15]](#footnote-15)
12. Where retrogressive measures have been introduced, there must have been careful consideration of the alternatives, genuine participation of the affected group, no direct or indirect discrimination and considerations as to whether such measures were retrogressive will include asking whether ‘an individual or group will be deprived of access to the minimum level of social security’.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Contextual considerations

1. The UK Government considered the UNCRPD, alongside the Equality Act 2010, to be the framework for protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. This is despite the fact that the 2010 Act has not be extended to Northern Ireland. This issue was not addressed by the Committee report.[[17]](#footnote-17) Indeed, the Committee noted that the UNCRPD has not been incorporated into domestic law and is therefore not directly justiciable.
2. The Committee noted that the national welfare system, encompassing the Welfare Reform Act 2012 and the Care Act 2014 ‘provide a solid base’ for protecting disability rights and providing them with ‘an acceptable level of autonomy’.[[18]](#footnote-18)
3. The WRA 2012 is deemed a ‘major reform of the welfare system’, repealing entitlements to Disability Living Allowance, introducing Personal Independence Payments, a one-year limit for receiving contributory Employment and Support Allowance, a “benefit cap”, Universal Credit for working-age claimants, limits on housing benefits (including the bedroom tax), changes to appeals procedures, tax credits system and council tax benefit.[[19]](#footnote-19)
4. The Care Act 2014, inter alia, shifts the duty of local authorities from ‘providing services’ to ‘meeting needs’.
5. The Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 reduces the benefit cap, freezes certain social security benefits and taxing credit amounts for four tax years, limiting Child Tax Credit, changing the child element of Universal Credit, amending the Child Poverty Act 2010, removing work-related activity component from ESA and regulating the limited capability for work element of Universal Credit and work-related requirements of Universal Credit.
6. Reform of the legal aid system under the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 have also been deemed by the Committee to affect claimants of the welfare system by narrowing the scope of civil legal aid in England and Wales and excluding legal aid for housing, debt and welfare benefit cases. This necessarily affects persons with disabilities.
7. The rationale for reform was justified on the basis of the ‘financial sustainability of the system and the need to make it more efficient’ which is consistent with an overall trend towards public spending cuts which will see the size of public expenditure reduced to its lowest in decades.[[20]](#footnote-20)
8. Concerns regarding discrimination were expressed at national and devolved levels, including in Northern Ireland via cumulative impact assessments.
9. The Committee noted from certain independent studies that there was likely to be impact from the reforms in relation to ‘financial income, provision of social care, inclusion in society, independence, quality of life, well-being, housing, work, mobility and mental health’ with specific impact on women, children and young persons with disabilities.[[21]](#footnote-21) For example, a 2013 independent source estimated that 26,000 people would no longer be entitled to disability allowances.
10. Public bodies related to the Committee the lack of a cumulative impact assessment considering the impacts of welfare reform on persons with disabilities.[[22]](#footnote-22)
11. The UK Parliament’s JHRC also warned about the potentially regressive impact of welfare reforms on persons with disabilities, particularly the PIPs and PIP eligibility, risk of discrimination regarding ESA and housing benefit, and destitution resulting from new conditionality and sanctions regimes.[[23]](#footnote-23)

General findings

1. The Committee made numerous findings of systematic violations based on the available reliable evidence.
2. Previous (2010-2015) and current UK Governments instituted a major policy reform to the welfare system, aimed at reducing the fiscal deficit by reducing welfare dependency which supporting those who are ‘most vulnerable’.[[24]](#footnote-24) Reforms affecting persons with disabilities included overhauling disability benefits, including means-tested benefits, income-maintenance benefits and those related to extra costs associated with disability.
3. Moreover, a large number of persons with disabilities have been required to undergo capability assessments, ‘with pre-implementation assumptions that a significant percentage would no longer rely on social allowances’.[[25]](#footnote-25)
4. Simultaneously with such policy implementation, persons with disabilities have accordingly been portrayed negatively as being ‘dependent or making a living out of benefits, committing fraud as benefit claimants, being lazy and putting a burden on taxpayers’, all of which have resulted in increased hostility and attacks. The Committee found that there was no evidence which substantiated the alleged benefit fraud by persons with disabilities.[[26]](#footnote-26)
5. The Committee noted that the WRA 2012 had not fully complied with the public sector equality duty to carry out impact assessments into the proposed legislative measures, as well as noting that closure of the Independent Living Fund did not comply with the domestic equality duty.
6. Persons with disabilities were also shown not to have been meaningfully consulted with in developing such legislation.[[27]](#footnote-27) Indeed, the Committee found that a cumulative impact assessment could have been completed on the basis of information available to the state party, rather than being ‘technically [in]feasible or practicable’ as alleged by the UK Government.[[28]](#footnote-28)
7. The Committee found that the new welfare legislative regime do not enforce international human rights concerning social protection and independent living because rights holders had not been properly considered and fails to recognise elements of autonomy and control and choice required for article 19, UNCRPD.[[29]](#footnote-29)
8. Regarding entitlement criteria, the medical approach was found to have been prevalent, resulting in failure to consider additional support required for persons with disabilities to perform a job. The human rights approach to disability was not adopted.[[30]](#footnote-30) Those involved in this system felt they had been processed rather than understood and that factors such as needs, views and personal history were not taken into account in such assessments.[[31]](#footnote-31) Much of the required information for such processes was also found to be limited, non-existent or often not in an accessible format or language.[[32]](#footnote-32) Such experiences were shown to cause ‘anxiety, psychological strain and financial hardship’ as well as deterioration in mental health.[[33]](#footnote-33)
9. Regarding legal aid, the Committee noted that provision had been severely restricted for challenges to benefits decisions and access to review by an independent tribunal had also been restricted. The impact of measures was not subjected to periodic monitoring and evaluation with representative organisations. The Committee ‘takes note’ of the mitigation plan agreed upon in Northern Ireland.

*Article 19*

1. Throughout the inquiry process, the Committee noted the disproportionate impact of welfare reforms on persons with disabilities, limiting their right to live independently and be included in the community.
2. The Committee is concerned, inter alia, that the right of persons with disabilities to choose their residence on an equal basis with others has been limited, that measures have caused financial hardship resulting in ‘arrears, debts, evictions and cuts to essentials such as housing and food’.[[34]](#footnote-34) These, coupled with high levels of stress and depression have also resulted in greater social isolation.
3. The ending of the Independent Living Fund in June 2015 has meant that costs of daily personal care are often insufficiently covered and whilst there have been mitigation measures in Northern Ireland, the Committee was ‘concerned about the lack of acceptance of new applicants to the fund in Northern Ireland’.[[35]](#footnote-35)
4. Measures introduced under the Care Act 2014 were deemed to increase financial hardship, reduce time with social care services adversely affecting older persons with disabilities and affecting their ability to take part in community life. Evidence showed that personal care packages were reduced and support was provided based on affordable service rather than on the specific needs of persons.[[36]](#footnote-36)

*Article 27*

1. The Committee identified multiple ‘flaws’ regarding ESA, particularly the focus on ‘functional evaluation of skills’ above personal need and complex barriers to work faced by persons with disabilities. Those involved in eligibility decisions often were lacking in awareness of disability issues and disability rights and a lack of reasonable accommodation and accessible information about the assessment process.[[37]](#footnote-37) Reconsideration periods were much too long and ESA payments are suspended during this time.
2. The growing number of sanctions between 2012 and 2014 indicates their disproportionate application as well as the modest hardship payments with strict requirements, resulting in reliance on relatives and food banks.[[38]](#footnote-38)
3. Both the Work Programme and Job Centre Plus showed no sign of having reduced unemployment among persons with disabilities and that ‘persons with substantial support needs were left aside’.[[39]](#footnote-39)
4. Deaths occurring after assessment were not monitored by the UK Government although information from official sources indicated that 33 deaths of claimants who died after being assessed were being examined although the Committee found no attempt by an independent body to conduct ‘objective, thorough, open and impartial investigations’ into such deaths.[[40]](#footnote-40)

*Article 28*

1. The Committee found evidence that changes to the welfare system had had ‘a more negative impact on households with persons with disabilities, especially on those living on low income’.[[41]](#footnote-41) The transition to PIPs from DLA was considered to create a 20 percent saving in expenditure by the authorities, thereby excluding many from this entitlement or causing delays in payment for those undergoing reassessment.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Systematic violations and Recommendations

1. The recommendations flowing from these findings of systematic violations are listed in summary form below:[[43]](#footnote-43)
2. The Committee recommends that the State party:
3. Conduct a rights-based and meaningfully participatory cumulative impact assessment of the measures adopted since 2010, referred to in the present report, on the rights to independent living and to be included in the community, social protection and employment of persons with disabilities;
4. Ensure that any intended measure of the welfare reform is rights-based, upholds the human rights model of disability and does not disproportionately and/or adversely affect the rights of persons with disabilities to independent living, an adequate standard of living and employment. To prevent adverse consequences, the States party should carry out human rights-based cumulative impact assessments of the whole range of intended measures that would have an impact on the rights of persons with disabilities;
5. Ensure that: any intended legislation and/or policy measure respects the core elements of the rights analysed in the present report; persons with disabilities retain their autonomy, choice and control over their place of residence and with whom they live; they receive appropriate and individualized support, including through personal assistance, and have access to community-based services on an equal basis with others; they have access to security social schemes that ensure income protection, including in relation to the extra cost of disability, that is compatible with an adequate standard of living and ensure their full inclusion and participation in society; and they have access and are supported in gaining employment in the open labour market on an equal basis with others;
6. Ensure that public budgets take into account the rights of persons with disabilities, that sufficient budget allocations are made available to cover extra costs associated with living with a disability and that appropriate mitigation measures, with appropriate budget allocations, are in place for persons with disabilities affected by austerity measures;
7. Introduce all adjustments necessary to make all information, communications, administrative and legal procedures in relation to social security entitlements, independent living schemes and employment/unemployment-related support services fully accessible to all persons with disabilities;
8. Ensure access to justice, by providing appropriate legal advice and support, including through reasonable and procedural accommodation for persons with disabilities seeking redress and reparation for the alleged violation of their rights, as covered in the present report;
9. Actively consult and engage with persons with disabilities through their representative organizations and give due consideration to their views in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of any legislation, policy or programme action related to the rights addressed in the present report;
10. Take appropriate measures to combat any negative and discriminatory stereotypes or prejudice against persons with disabilities in public and the media, including that dependency on benefits is in itself a disincentive of employment; implement broad mass media campaigns, in consultation with organizations representing persons with disabilities, particularly those affected by the welfare reform, to promote them as full rights holders, in accordance with the Convention; and adopt measures to address complaints of harassment and hate crime by persons with disabilities, promptly investigate those allegations, hold the perpetrators accountable and provide fair and appropriate compensation to victims;
11. Ensure that, in the implementation of legislation, policies and programmes, special attention is paid to persons with disabilities living with a low income or in poverty and persons with disabilities at higher risk of exclusion, such as persons with intellectual, psychosocial or multiple disabilities and women, children and older persons with disabilities. Those measures should be put in place within contributive and non-contributive regimes;
12. Set up a mechanism and a system of human rights-based indicators to permanently monitor the impact of the different policies and programmes relating to the access and enjoyment by persons with disabilities of the right to social protection and an adequate standard of living, the right to live independently and be included in the community and the right to work, in close consultation with persons with disabilities and their representative organizations in all regions and countries that constitute the State party;
13. Respond to the present report within the time limit prescribed under the Optional Protocol, widely disseminate the Committee’s findings and recommendations and provide appropriate follow-up to the recommendations of the present report, including during the consideration of the State party’s initial report before the Committee.

UK Government response to CRPD report

1. The UK Government were given the opportunity to respond to conclusions reached by the Committee and the main points made in this report are outlined below.
2. The UK Government ‘strongly disagree[d]’ with the Committee’s conclusions that grave and systematic rights violations have occurred as a result of welfare reforms.[[44]](#footnote-44)
3. The UK Government noted that the annual budget for benefits for ‘disabled people’ is ‘around £50bn’, comparably more than the budget in other OECD countries including Germany, France and the USA.[[45]](#footnote-45)
4. In Northern Ireland, the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 is still the main legislative instrument, being ‘recognised internationally as a model of effective anti-discrimination legislation’.[[46]](#footnote-46)
5. The UK Government bases its approach to persons with disabilities on ensuring they have the same opportunity as other people to find work, while supporting those who cannot work. Nevertheless, the UK Government notes that its welfare reforms are based on its desire to ‘champion work’.[[47]](#footnote-47)
6. The UK Government criticises the Committee report for having too narrow a scope, and that it should have considered circumstances outside the welfare system.[[48]](#footnote-48) The UK Government also notes that it ‘does not limit itself to upholding the rights of disabled people in the UK’, evincing the work of DFID in supporting other countries to do the same.[[49]](#footnote-49) The report seeks to correct an inaccuracy in the Committee report concerning the public sector equality duty which does not, in fact, require an equality impact assessment, but only that public authorities have ‘due regard’ to the need to, inter alia, eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations.[[50]](#footnote-50) Regarding legal aid, the UK Government notes that it ‘continues to provide access to justice, for those eligible, in the highest priority cases’.[[51]](#footnote-51)

*Article 19*

1. The UK response indicates that ‘significant steps have been taken to protect the choice of residence and access to a range of support to enable independent living, including the localisation of adult social care provision and additional funding made available via the 2015 Spending Review and other initiatives such as Disabled Facilities Grants and Care and Support Specialised Housing Fund.[[52]](#footnote-52) The state party is also addressing issues of housing standards, inclusive design and an accessibly environment.[[53]](#footnote-53) Community inclusion are also deemed to be enhanced through sports participation and transportation initiatives aimed at persons with disabilities.[[54]](#footnote-54)
2. The UK report also disagrees with the Committee’s findings that the Care Act 2014 fails to align with article 19 and that welfare reforms have restricted disabled people’s rights to choose their residence. They note that those with medical and welfare need, including disability are prioritised for the purposes of allocated social housing and the removal of the ‘bedroom tax’ ‘aimed to restore fairness’.[[55]](#footnote-55)
3. The UK response also notes that the ILF was closed to ‘integrate users with the mainstream social care system’, taking the duty to consult on the closure seriously.[[56]](#footnote-56) Unfortunately, no further information regarding the work of the NI Executive in this respect is provided in the UK response.

*Article 27*

1. The UK response notes that ‘disabled people should have equal opportunities to enjoy the benefit of work’ and an increase of 500,000 disabled people in employment is considered to ‘demonstrat[e] commitment to article 27’.[[57]](#footnote-57) A recently-published Green Paper consults on proposals to improve the work-related support available to persons with disabilities and those with health conditions more generally.
2. The UK Government points to the additional £130m for the Work and Health Programme due to provide support for persons with disabilities to find employment and recall the personalised response of Job Centre Plus ‘work coaches’.[[58]](#footnote-58)
3. Specialised support services also provide support to persons with disabilities and these include Access to Work, the Access to Work’s Mental Health Support Service, New Enterprise Allowance and Work Choice.
4. In Northern Ireland, the responsibilities of the Disability Employment Service are outlined and the NI Executive has prioritised those who are economically inactive over the next 10 to 15 years. Mention is also made of the NI Employment Strategy for People with Disabilities.
5. The UK report responds to criticisms of the work capability assessments for ESA by recognising the training and expertise of healthcare professionals and by improving delivery with reduced waiting times, reviewing design and providing disability awareness training.[[59]](#footnote-59)
6. The UK response also refutes the evidence showing sanctions disproportionately affected ESA recipients. The UK Government notes that there are processes underway to improve accessibility of information regarding entitlements as well as improving access to justice through a mandatory reconsideration procedure for eligibility considerations.
7. The UK report also noted that an independent inquiry had shown that reports of thousands of deaths following social security reassessments had proven inaccurate.[[60]](#footnote-60)

*Article 28*

1. The UK reports outlines the additional funding provided for social security claimants, particularly those on incapacity benefit, since 2010 as well as measures introduced in devolved administrations.
2. In Northern Ireland, a 12 month delay to welfare reforms was introduced so as to render the adjustment smoother for persons with disabilities.[[61]](#footnote-61) The NI Department for Communities also intends to introduce a four year scheme to provide additional support to low income households.
3. The UK Government states that ‘as a general rule, it is not right that households can receive more income from welfare benefits than from work’, thereby justifying a ‘welfare cap’. The cap does not apply to additional costs faced by disabled people.[[62]](#footnote-62)
4. It was noted that changes from DLA to PIP did not automatically raise the level of eligibility, and that many people who did not receive DLA are entitled to PIP.[[63]](#footnote-63) The UK report also references the success of the Motability scheme.[[64]](#footnote-64)

Recommendations

1. The UK report states that cumulative analyses have been published since 2010, and notes that the CRPD report’s focus on ‘welfare spending’ is overly narrow when support in relation to health, employment, investment and infrastructure also remove barriers to participation.[[65]](#footnote-65) The report outlines that ministers act in accordance with the equality impact duty regarding protected characteristics, including disability, and that the ODI’s Fulfilling Potential indicator framework also captures the impact of a range of policies.[[66]](#footnote-66)
2. The UK report confirms that the public sector equality duty is aligned with a rights-based approach and that such a duty was discharged in relation to social security reforms. Where impact was shown to be disproportionate in relation to persons with disabilities, mitigation or transitional arrangements were implemented ‘where feasible’.[[67]](#footnote-67)
3. The information provided to persons with disabilities about services they are entitled to is considered accessible and reasonable and reference the Government’s Digital Services work as evidence of its commitment to improving accessible communication.[[68]](#footnote-68)
4. The UK report considers that the measures in place to ensure access to justice for persons with disabilities is in place, with reference to the availability of legally-aided advice for discrimination matters.
5. The report also notes that the UK Government has taken steps to improve participation of persons with disabilities in their communities and takes seriously its responsibility to tackle disability hate crime and promote positive attitudes among the public.[[69]](#footnote-69)

**NIHRC**

**December 2016**

1. Article 6, Optional Protocol to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Inquiry concerning the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland carried out by the Committee under article 6 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention: Report of the Committee, 6 October 2016, CRPD/C/15/R.2/Rev.1, para. 1, <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRPD/Pages/InquiryProcedure.aspx> (‘Report’). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Report, paras 8-11. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Report, para. 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Report, para. 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Report, para. 14. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Report, para. 16. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Report, paras 17-24. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Report, para. 26. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Report, paras 30-32. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Report, para. 33. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Report, para. 37. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Report, para. 41. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Report, para. 42. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Report, paras 44 and 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Report, para. 46(e). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Report, para. 56. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Report, para. 64. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Report, para. 66. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Report, paras 70-71. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Report, para. 78. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Report, para. 75. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Report, para. 76. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Report, para. 83. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Report, para. 84. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Report, para. 85. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Report, para. 86. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Report, para. 87. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Report, para. 88. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Report, para. 89. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Report, para. 90. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Report, para. 91. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Report, para. 91. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Report, para. 97. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Report, para. 99. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Report, paras 99-100. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Report, paras 102-103. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Report, paras 106-107. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Report, para. 107. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Report, para. 109. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Report, para. 110. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Report, paras 111-112. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Report, para. 114(a)-(k). [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. United Kingdom Government Response to the Report by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities under article 6 of the Optional Protocol to the Convention, CRPD/C/R.3, para. 1, <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRPD/Pages/InquiryProcedure.aspx> (‘UK report’). [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. UK report, para. 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. UK report, para. 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. UK report, para. 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. UK report, para. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. UK report, para. 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. UK report, para. 15. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. UK report, para. 19. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. UK report, paras 23-26. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. UK report, paras 27-29. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. UK report, paras 30-31. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. UK report, para. 34. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. UK report, para. 39. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. UK report, para. 41. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. UK report, para. 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. UK report, para. 56. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. UK report, para. 67. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. UK report, para. 70. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. UK report, para. 74. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. UK report, para. 79. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. UK report, para. 80. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. UK report, para. 84. Although the report acknowledges that monitoring in relation to disability is not conducted in such analyses ‘due to significant modelling limitations to the robustness of such analysis’ (para. 85). [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. UK report, para. 87. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. UK report, para. 89. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. UK report, para. 94. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. UK report. Para. 100. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)