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Executive Summary

Reducing vulnerability, maximizing inclusion

While natural hazards – including extreme weather events driven by climate change – can pose threats to the life, health, and well-being of all population groups, some groups find themselves disproportionately impacted by their immediate and long-term effects. This is especially true for the world’s one billion persons with disabilities. Reasons for this type of disparate impact include disability-related considerations, as well as factors reflective of the interplay between disability and other risk factors for enhanced vulnerability during situations of emergency, such as poverty. Disability-based discrimination has the effect of marginalizing persons with disabilities in society during periods of non-emergency, and in many cases forces them into lives of dependency. Situations of natural disaster exacerbate such conditions, further enhancing the disparities between persons with disabilities and other members of society, and increasing the likelihood that persons with disabilities will be disproportionately negatively affected both during and after such a period of emergency.

Persons with disabilities are not a homogenous group, and include people with a wide range of disabilities, including but not limited to people with physical disabilities, vision disabilities, hearing and speech disabilities, cognitive disabilities, and psychosocial disabilities. People with seemingly similar disabilities may experience common barriers in different ways, and some barriers may equally affect people with seemingly very different disabilities. Barriers that should be pro-actively addressed through active consultation with persons with disabilities at all phases of the disaster risk management (DRM) process include: physical; information and communication; legislative/regulatory; policy; and attitudinal barriers. The experience of barriers and societal discrimination is also dynamic, and affected by the intersection of disability with other identities and bases of discrimination, including age, gender, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, indigeneity, or other status. Part 1 offers a fuller discussion of the importance of disability-inclusive DRM.

Disproportionate negative outcomes for persons with disabilities need not be inevitable, and the benefits of being disability-inclusive extend to all members of society. For example, the application of accessibility standards and universal design to early warning systems increases the ability of such systems to effectively warn people with and without disabilities. In turn, more people are reached by early warning systems, and more people can maximize the time pre-disaster to effect evacuation or shelter-in-place plans, or protect essential assets. In addition, bolstering the resiliency of persons with disabilities to withstand and recover from natural disasters bolsters the resiliency of communities and societies as a whole, benefitting everyone. Perhaps most importantly, achieving disability-inclusive DRM can empower persons with disabilities to take their rightful place as agents of change, and as active contributors to the development and effective implementation of DRM policies, plans and standards.
The global mandate for disability-inclusive DRM

There are numerous international policy frameworks available to help guide effective implementation of disability-inclusive DRM. This includes the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the World Humanitarian Summit, Paris Climate Change Agreement, and Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda. Policy frameworks of particular relevance to disability-inclusive DRM include the following, which are discussed in greater detail in Part 1 of the report.

Of greatest relevance in this context is the **Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030** adopted by UN Member States in 2015. The Sendai Framework sets forth four priorities for action to guide the development and implementation of policies on disaster risk reduction from 2015-2030. The relevance of these priorities to disability-inclusive DRM, the status of implementation with respect to persons with disabilities, and examples of promising practices, are discussed in greater detail in Part 2 of the report:

Within the World Bank, several regulatory frameworks are relevant to this issue including the Environmental and Social Framework, Rapid Response to Emergencies and Crises operations policy (OP/BP 8.00), and International Development Association (IDA) crisis financing mechanisms (including the Immediate Response Mechanism and the Crisis Response Window).

How DRM processes have fallen short of disability inclusion

To date, although promising practices do exist, much more remains to be done to ensure that persons with disabilities are empowered to be active participants in all phases of DRM, and that proactive measures are taken to: incorporate disability into disaster risk analyses; facilitate the meaningful participation of persons with disabilities at all levels of disaster risk governance; build the resilience of persons with disabilities; and recover and “build back better” in a way that gives effect to the full scope of the concept for persons with disabilities. For example, many risk analyses fail to account for the existing social exclusion that persons with disabilities often face – exclusion that can become exacerbated during times of emergency, leading to diminished resilience and disproportionately negative outcomes for persons with disabilities. Many emergency preparedness plans also do not yet reliably include the perspectives and inputs of persons with disabilities, meaning that persons with disabilities are unable to effectively evacuate or avail themselves of shelters or other response initiatives. First responders frequently lack the training and tools to respond appropriately to the specific needs of persons with disabilities. Recovery interventions that do not address, e.g. the accessibility of housing, or inclusion of persons with disabilities in financial protection systems, can leave persons with disabilities excluded from the benefits of such initiatives, and disadvantaged with respect to other members of society.
Developing a robust action plan for disability inclusion across DRM

Both the GFDRR and the World Bank are uniquely positioned to assist countries and the international disability community by incorporating disability into their DRM-related development portfolios, leveraging their convening ability to bring together relevant stakeholders and experts, and providing technical and analytical assistance. The following summarized recommendations (discussed in more detail in Part 3 of the report), address specific lines of effort that could be undertaken to improve the inclusion of persons with disabilities in GFDRR’s and the World Bank’s DRM investments, and their relationship to the Sendai priorities.

A. Entry points in GFDRR thematic areas of engagement

The GFDRR thematic areas of engagement identified in the GFDRR Strategy 2018-2021 offer several entry points for disability inclusion:

Promoting open access to risk information. In assisting communities to map their exposure to disasters, GFDRR mapping activities should:

- **Disaggregate data by disability** – GFDRR’s research, mapping, and other data collection activities offer a crucial opportunity to gather necessary information on persons with disabilities. Existing data collection tools, or future tools yet to be developed, could be utilized to identify disability data-related needs in the risk information context. Collaboration with groups such as the Washington Group on Disability Statistics¹ and incorporation of disability assessment questions can help to narrow the data gap.

- **Empower and include persons with disabilities and DPOs in mapping activities** – drawing on the unique knowledge and perspective of persons with disabilities will facilitate a better identification of risks that may have unique or disproportionate impacts on persons with disabilities and their families.

- **Ensure that all tools and methods for collecting analyzing and disseminating risk information are accessible** – such accessibility will be essential if persons with disabilities are to be able to effectively participate in information mapping, or to utilize disaster risk information that is available.

*Sendai priority impacted – 1*

Promoting resilient infrastructure. In providing technical assistance to governments to improve the design, operations and maintenance, and contingency planning of new and rehabilitated infrastructure, GFDRR should:

¹ [https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/washington_group/index.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/washington_group/index.htm)
• **Assist countries in the adoption and effective implementation of accessibility standards** – so that housing, transportation, schools, health care, drinking water, sanitation, telecommunications, etc. are accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. Such accessibility should entail not only physical accessibility, but also information and communication accessibility. Working collaboratively with international organizations and NGOs with expertise on accessibility standards will enhance GFDRR and government capacity to effectively implement these standards.

• **Engage DPOs in identifying critical infrastructure** – where existing infrastructure needs to be retrofitted, persons with disabilities and DPOs should be actively consulted in assessments to determine which infrastructure is of critical relevance for the disability community and accessibility challenges, so that investments will be maximally beneficial to the disability community.

• **Include disability in the “making school infrastructure safe” initiative** – it is essential that accessibility be considered, and that students with disabilities (in inclusive and/or segregated schools) have access to resilient school infrastructure as well.

*Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 3, 4*

**Scaling up the resilience of cities.** Urban resilience and urban development practices have to adapt to reduce risk for all, including persons with disabilities. It will be important for GFDRR to:

• **Engage DPOs** – in the piloting, monitoring, and evaluation of resilient cities projects. Where possible, disability disaggregated data and accessibility audits should be taken into account in decision-making processes to determine what urban resilience investments and policy changes should be made.

• **Include accessibility in resilient city construction and/or policy reforms** – urban resilience should encompass aspects of physical and information/communication accessibility, for the benefit of persons with a wide variety of disabilities and others.

*Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 3, 4*

**Strengthening hydromet services and early warning systems.** When offering technical expertise and capacity building to governments to benefit people – especially people in low income and small island states – GFDRR should:

• **Encourage and promote the use of accessible early warning and weather forecast systems** – for investments in hydro-meteorological and early warning systems to be maximally effective, they should aim to ensure provision of essential information to as large a number of people as possible, including persons with disabilities. This in turn should enhance the numbers of lives and assets saved in the advent of a natural hazard event.

*Sendai priority impacted – 4*
Deepening financial protection. In its work with governments to develop comprehensive financial protection strategies, including direct and indirect insurance programs, GFDRR should:

- **Offer technical assistance in making financial protection schemes disability-inclusive** – including through: identification of relevant qualifying criteria; identifying access barriers to in information, registration, and distribution mechanisms; improving access to social protection/poverty alleviation programs; and ensuring that government contingency funds for the scaling up of social protection schemes in times of emergency can include or target persons with disabilities as necessary.

- **Engage DPOs and employers** – in identifying activities in which persons with disabilities could participate as part of cash for work programs. Although some programs will exempt qualifying beneficiaries from the work requirement, many persons with disabilities would nevertheless like to be able to contribute by working.

- **Facilitate research** – on the (often hidden) costs of exclusion, to identify return on investment for social protection systems, risk financing, and contingency funds, to enhance understanding of the importance of including persons with disabilities in such mechanisms.

*Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4*

Deepening engagements in resilience to climate change. GFDRR’s activities in this area would be strengthened by:

- **Ensuring that persons with disabilities and DPOs are included as contributing stakeholders** – persons with disabilities and DPOs have relevant knowledge to contribute to assessments of the climate change resilience of investments.

- **Ensuring that small island initiatives are disability-inclusive** – the specific risk(s) of climate change to persons with disabilities, as well as the potential impacts of responsive measures to persons with disabilities, should be taken into account, to ensure that such measures at a minimum do no harm to persons with disabilities, and at best ensure benefits on an equal basis with others.

*Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 3, 4*

Building resilience at community level. Working through its Inclusive Community Resilience (ICR) Initiative, GFDRR has the opportunity to:

- **Ensure that lessons learned documentation includes disability-inclusive scalable DRM models** – identifying key components that could be incorporated, replicated, and scaled-up in community resilience programs. Where disability-inclusive DRR elements do not exist in particular practices, assessments should address what disability-inclusive components
could have been undertaken, so that opportunities for disability inclusion in similar projects are not missed in the future.

- **Engage DPOs and DRM actors** – facilitating cross-sector learning, training, and capacity-building, will assist persons with disabilities in being able to better identify risks, barriers, and solutions, and DRM actors in working collaboratively with community members with disabilities to achieve disability-inclusive DRM solutions.

*Sendai priority impacted* – 3

**Enabling resilient recovery.** In its activities to help train government officials on post-disaster needs assessment and recovery planning, as well as strengthening its own response capacity to help coordinate and support post-disaster assistance, it will be important for GFDRR to:

- **Ensure that damage and impact assessments encompass disability equities** – it will be important to actively engage persons with disabilities and DPOs to ensure that disability-related issues (e.g. access to assistive devices, rehabilitation services, accessible shelter and housing, accessible life sustaining supplies such as food and water, etc.) are addressed as part of the damage and impact assessments. It will also be important to gather (and promote the collection of) disability disaggregated data as part of these assessments.

- **Ensure that recovery plans are inclusive of persons with disabilities** – the recovery process offers an important opportunity to engage the input of persons with disabilities through consultation and dissemination of accessible information materials related to recovery planning. It also offers a critical opportunity to promote the long-term recovery and resilience of persons with disabilities, including through giving full effect to what it can mean to “build back better.” By addressing the full scope of “build back better,” measures need not be exclusive to physical infrastructure, but could also be expanded to encompass other community based supports, such as access to rehabilitation services, mental health supports, supported decision-making, independent living, and myriad other supports that promote the ability of persons with disabilities to assume/resume their place as fully included and actively contributing members of society.

*Sendai priorities impacted* – 3, 4

**B. Entry points in World Bank processes**

The following summary recommendations relate to different components of the World Bank’s development work with client countries.

**Country Strategies.** The World Bank’s Country Partnership Framework (CPF), which is informed by the thorough analysis and stakeholder consultations reflected in the Systematic Country Diagnostic
(SCD), guides the World Bank’s support to a member country. In order to ensure that the CPFs are disability-inclusive, the SCDs should be developed by:

- Engaging the disability community, including DPOs, in meaningful, accessible consultations.
- Building-in disability expertise into staff review processes.
- Countering data gaps.

**Financing.** A variety of financing instruments are available to contribute to World Bank activities that promote disability-inclusive DRM, including:

- *Investment Project Financing (IPF)* – disability-focused projects, as well as incorporation of disability into larger projects through subproject-level interventions, can have positive impacts on the ability of persons with disabilities to be resilient to, and recover from, natural hazards. The existing Safeguards and the Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) should facilitate the inclusion of disability as part of the social assessment, so that persons with disabilities are meaningfully consulted, and are protected from negative impacts and included in mitigation plans and actions. Examples of IPF projects that provide avenues for disability-inclusive DRM include but are not limited to:

  - **Community driven development** – projects that support participatory decision-making and community empowerment have the potential to support the active engagement and inclusion of persons with disabilities at the national and local levels.
    - Sendai priority impacted – 2
  - **Financing new construction, rehabilitation, and/or reconstruction** – projects financing construction in anticipation of, or in the aftermath of, a natural hazard event, offer the opportunity to ensure that accessibility standards are addressed.
    - Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4
  - **Financing development of accessible communications systems** – telecommunications infrastructure that is not only resilient to natural hazards but also accessible to persons with disabilities can be utilized as part of hazard warning systems to reach a larger number of people.
    - Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4
  - **Disability inclusive and resilient social safety net mechanisms** – projects that assist in promoting the establishment of social safety net mechanisms that are accessible to and inclusive of persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others, can improve the resiliency of persons with disabilities, and also provide a ready mechanism for deployment of financial assistance in the aftermath of a natural hazard emergency.
    - Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4
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- **Development Policy Financing (DPF)** – this can provide a mechanism through which to fund, for example, the strengthening of client country DRM policy through strengthening the institutional/legal framework for DRM, and/or integrating DRM into development planning and decision-making. In the formulation and implementation of such projects, task teams have the opportunity to promote and facilitate the inclusion of persons with disabilities and DPOs in related stakeholder consultations.
  - Sendai priorities impacted – 2, 3

- **Program-for-Results Financing (PforR)** – PforR financing offers the opportunity to engage in a wide variety of DRM-related activities, e.g. scaling up capacity to engage in DRR activities, improving disaster risk financing and insurance for targeted populations, etc. In order to ensure that such projects are disability-inclusive, the projects could include persons with disabilities as targeted beneficiaries in the program results; and also ensure that the needs, challenges, and impacts on persons with disabilities are taken into account in the social and environmental assessments, as well as technical assessments.
  - Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4

**Advisory Services and Analytics.** Broadly illustrative examples of disability-inclusive DRM-related activities that could be undertaken by the World Bank include, for example:

- Utilizing the convening role of the World Bank to bring together persons with disabilities and DPOs with other DRM experts at conferences, seminars, and in accessible online discussions for knowledge-sharing and networking.

- Capacity-building activities with disability-inclusive DRM stakeholders, such as persons with disabilities and DPOs, government officials, DRM practitioners, and development practitioners.

- Advising countries on developing or adapting accessibility and universal design standards for e.g. hazard warning systems, accessible resilient housing, accessible transportation.

- Analytical work, such as desk reviews of country DRM policies and practices to assess degree of disability inclusion.

- Primary data collection, to determine, e.g. persons with disabilities being served by social safety net programs, and/or those unable to participate due to qualification, registration, or dissemination-related barriers.

- Connecting clients to information resources and international experts in the field of disability-inclusive DRM.

  *Sendai priorities impacted* – 1, 2, 3, 4
C. General Recommendations to enhance GFDRR and World Bank capacity on disability inclusion

These recommendations address enhancing the World Bank’s and GFDRR’s internal capacity to execute disability-inclusive DRM across their respective portfolios, so that staff are better equipped to conceptualize disability-inclusive projects, engage with stakeholders— including the disability community, measure progress, and share promising practices.

Monitor and report on disability aspects across the DRM portfolio. At present there is no way to readily identify DRM projects that are disability-inclusive. Consequently, there is no way to benchmark the degree to which projects are disability-inclusive, nor measure the Bank’s and GFDRR’s progress over time. GFDRR’s new system for screening gender as a cross-cutting theme offers a model for how disability could be tracked. Designating projects as being “disability informed,” and/or including “disability actions,” would help identify the degree to which disability inclusion manifests across the GFDRR portfolio. Indicators in results and monitoring and evaluation frameworks, should specifically assess disability inclusion or be disability disaggregated where possible.

Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4

Enhance staff expertise. In addition to consultations with the World Bank’s Global Disability Advisor as appropriate, and ensuring that there is a corps of staff available for internal ‘just in time’ consultation (including staff with disabilities), guidance notes and other training, information, and professional development tools should be made available to guide staff in ensuring that DRM-related projects incorporate disability from the earliest phases onwards.

Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4

Communicating engagement on disability-inclusive DRM – enhancing the World Bank’s and GFDRR’s public-facing information (including websites, policy statements, and publications) to more comprehensively discuss disability inclusion would greatly assist in educating client countries, other stakeholders (including the disability community), and the public at large about the Bank’s commitment to disability-inclusive DRM, and would also help to catalyze consultations and create synergies for information exchange and engagement with persons with disabilities and other stakeholders.

Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4
Introduction

Natural hazards pose a significant threat to all people, but particularly to poor and marginalized people. Economic development, population growth, and rapid urbanization are driving increases in disaster losses, and it is estimated that climate change threatens to push an additional 100 million people into extreme poverty by 2030. Such threats pose an especially great hazard for the world’s one billion persons with disabilities, who are already more likely to experience adverse socioeconomic outcomes than their non-disabled peers, and who have historically been disproportionately affected by natural hazards.

Mainstreaming climate and disaster risk management (DRM) into development has the potential to reverse current trends of rising disaster losses. Consistent with its mandate to alleviate poverty, the World Bank is committed to climate and disaster risk management as part of its development portfolio. One mechanism which supports the Bank’s work in this area is the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR); a grant-funding mechanism, managed by the World Bank, that supports DRM projects worldwide. A global partnership, GFDRR helps developing countries better understand and reduce their vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change. GFDRR also contributes to the effective implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction by helping countries integrate DRM and climate change adaptation into development strategies and investment programs, and recover from the impacts of hazard events quickly and effectively.

Although some strides have been made in addressing the specific needs of persons with disabilities in DRM and promoting resilience to natural hazards, fewer efforts are aimed at incorporating lessons learned into long-term disaster and climate risk management at a systemic and/or policy level. This is particularly evident in the gaps on disability inclusion in large scale planning and interventions for risk identification, risk reduction, preparedness and resilient recovery and reconstruction. Such approaches are necessary, not only to ensure that persons with disabilities are not disproportionately impacted by natural hazards, but because disability-inclusive DRM interventions have the potential to benefit all members of society.

This paper provides information to assist World Bank and GFDRR staff in effecting disability-inclusive DRM. It is based upon desk reviews of existing practice, as well as consultations with experts in the field of disability-inclusive DRM. The paper:

- Illustrates promising practices related to disability-inclusive DRM;
- Identifies key gaps in knowledge and practices; and

---
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- Identifies value-added areas for GFDRR and the World Bank, including specific actions they can take to advance the disability and social inclusion agenda in DRM.

In addition to explanatory sections that examine the importance of disability-inclusive DRM; synergies between disability, poverty, and natural disasters; and barriers faced by persons with disabilities in the DRM context; the paper also includes:

- Relevant guiding international policy frameworks;
- Disability inclusion in the priorities of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction;
- Illustrations of promising practices in disability-inclusive DRM; and
- Recommendations of specific lines of effort that could be undertaken to improve the inclusion of persons with disabilities in World Bank and GFDRR DRM investments.

- An annex of resources related to disability and DRM.

Although the paper is intended to help Bank staff incorporate persons with disabilities and a disability perspective in their ongoing DRM work, it is hoped that the information contained within will also be of interest to other development actors and stakeholders working in the DRM space.
Part 1 – Disability Inclusion in Disaster Risk Management

1.1. The importance of disability inclusion in disaster risk management

Natural hazards, by their nature, pose threats to the life, health, and well-being of all population groups. However, some groups find themselves disproportionately impacted by the immediate and long-term effects of natural disasters, and this is especially true for the world’s one billion persons with disabilities. For example, following the 2011 earthquake and tsunami in Japan, of persons with disabilities registered with the government, the fatality rate was double that of the general population. Reasons for this type of disparate impact include disability-related considerations, as well as factors reflective of the interplay between disability and other risk factors for enhanced vulnerability during situations of emergency.

For example, societal discrimination and stigma on the basis of disability results in persons with disabilities experiencing systemic and sustained diminished or non-existent access to education, health-care, employment, transportation and infrastructure, housing, political and public life, justice, and other aspects of life necessary for persons with disabilities to live independently and be included in the community. Societal barriers to enjoyment of human rights by persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others include physical, information and communication, legislative/regulatory, policy, and attitudinal barriers. Specific examples of barriers experienced by persons with disabilities in the context of DRM are discussed more fully below, but the net effect of all such disability-based discrimination is to marginalize persons with disabilities in society during periods of non-emergency, and in many cases force them into lives of dependency. Situations of natural disaster exacerbate such conditions, further enhancing the disparities between persons with disabilities and other members of society, and increasing the likelihood that persons with disabilities will be disproportionately negatively affected both during and after such a period of emergency.

Of course, persons with disabilities do not constitute a homogenous group, and anyone can be born with or acquire a disability. The intersectionality of disability with age, race, ethnicity, sex, gender, religion, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, and myriad other bases can further impact the types and degrees of stigma, discrimination, and disadvantage that persons with disabilities experience. Particularly powerful is the synergy and inter-relationship between disability and poverty. It is now widely accepted that disability is a risk factor for poverty, and poverty is a risk factor for disability, as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

This relationship is especially important, because as noted in *Unbreakable*, poor people suffer disproportionate negative impacts to their well-being from natural hazards due to:

- **Overexposure** to natural hazards in many countries, e.g. from floods, drought, and high temperatures, including overexposure to frequent, low-intensity events that may attract little public attention but can have significant cumulative impacts.

- **Higher vulnerability** to loss of wealth, including rates of loss of share of wealth “two to three times that of the non-poor, largely because of the nature and vulnerability of their assets and livelihoods.”

- **Less ability to cope and recover** due to diminished access to supports such as social protection.

- **Permanent impacts on education and health** due to the choices poor households have to make in the aftermath of disasters, such as whether or not to send a child to school, or whether to cut health care expenses. Such decisions can have effects and consequences that span generations, and in so doing “reinforce the intergenerational transmission of poverty.”

---

• **Effects of risk on saving and investment behavior**, which can lead to poor people engaging in risk averse behaviors (such as planting low-return, low-risk crops, or avoiding investment in equipment that could be destroyed by natural disasters). These behaviors, which are driven by the experience or prospect of natural disasters, can in turn contribute to people remaining in poverty.

The report also notes the tendency to underestimate the degree of impact of natural disasters on the poor. Traditional estimates of the effects of natural disasters tend to focus on asset losses, of which poor people experience only a relatively small share. However, if well-being is taken into account, poor people experience magnified losses in well-being. Arguably, the historic lack of disability disaggregated data collection makes it likely that even assessments of the well-being of persons with disabilities following natural disasters underestimate the deleterious effects of such emergencies.

The synergies and intersectionality of disability and poverty have significant implications for the importance of disability in DRM, as well as the role that the larger development agenda can play in building the resilience of persons with disabilities, mitigating the negative effects of natural disasters, and promoting robust recovery that benefits all people – including persons with disabilities. Development interventions that help to move persons with disabilities out of poverty, will help to reduce the impact of natural disasters on persons with disabilities who might otherwise be at increased risk because of such poverty. Disability-inclusive DRM engagements will also help to ensure that persons with disabilities are more resilient to natural disasters, in turn reducing the likelihood that such emergencies will create or exacerbate situations of poverty for persons with disabilities. By ensuring that recovery efforts are inclusive of persons with disabilities, those leading such efforts can better ensure that “building back better” (both physically and with respect to provision of services and community supports) has tangible benefits for persons with disabilities and their families, and does not merely reinforce or sustain societal inequalities, but contributes to and builds their resilience.

1.1.1. **Intersectionality and multiple sources of marginalization**

With respect to other forms of intersectionality, the Bank’s work on social inclusion, as articulated in the report “Inclusion Matters,” is instructive. The report notes that the exclusion of certain groups in society – people who are “branded by stigmas, stereotypes, and superstitions’ – leads to certain people consistently failing to benefit from a nation’s progress, and thus development investments producing unequal benefits. Such exclusion does not mean that the individuals in question will necessarily experience poverty, as it is possible to be affluent and also experience exclusion. However, there are social, political, and economic costs to society as a whole when entire groups of people are excluded. The membership of individuals in different groups at once, and the simultaneous intersectionality of

---

https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/16195  
6 Id. at p. 1.  
7 Id. at p. 2.
their various identities can produce multiple advantages or disadvantages in different contexts. Thus, the experience of a young white man without a disability will be different than that of an elderly indigenous woman with a disability, who may experience increased exclusion and discrimination due to the cumulative exclusion on the bases of age and indigeneity. Although social transitions can increase the societal tensions and exclusion experienced by some groups, they also offer opportunities for social inclusion to be planned and achieved. The report highlights climate change and climate-related stress as the causes of “one of the most profound spatial transitions of this century,” but also notes that natural catastrophes can provide the opportunity of a “blank slate” for reconstruction and transformation of societies to be more inclusive. Proactively planning for disability-inclusive DRR in response to natural hazards provides just such an opportunity to promote the social inclusion of persons with disabilities, to the benefit of society as a whole.

Box 1.1: Older persons and disaster risk reduction: Ibasho Café, Japan

Older persons often face similar barriers to persons with disabilities with respect to inclusion and participation in society. Ageing is often viewed negatively, and as a consequence many elders experience social and physical marginalization and isolation, often in institutional settings. Many populations around the world are rapidly ageing, with the World Health Organization estimating that 22% of the global population will be aged 60 and over by 2050. In contrast to many popular beliefs, older persons still aspire to well-being, and their accumulated years of knowledge and experience are invaluable assets for their communities and especially for disaster risk management (DRM). Older persons are often disproportionally affected by natural hazard events due to factors analogous to those experienced by persons with disabilities, including: poverty and limited access to social protection systems; inaccessible or age-inappropriate environments; lack of global or national policies and legal frameworks related to ageing; poor housing; limited family or community support leading to isolation; and physical or mental conditions that may require specific attention and/or responses adapted to their needs.

In the context of disaster risk management, not including older persons is a missed opportunity. Their life experiences and accumulated knowledge can be crucial elements in building community resilience. For example, older persons may be able to recall details about previous local disasters (and previous response efforts), bringing localized understanding of the risk environment and highlighting what could be improved. They can also reflect on climate variability and climate change over time, and how the community has adapted. Experience shows that with the right kind of support, older persons

---

8 Id. at p. 6-7.
9 Social inclusion is defined throughout “Inclusion Matters” as both: “the process of improving the terms for individuals and groups to take part in society;” and more specifically as “the process of improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of people, disadvantaged on the basis of their identity, to take part in society.”
10 Id. at p. 135-137.
can contribute to the strengthening of key DRR and preparedness measures, using their knowledge to complement scientific and technological developments.

Being inclusive of older persons in disaster recovery also benefits communities as a whole. For example, following the 2011 earthquake and tsunami in Japan, elders led the community of Ofunato in the design and development of the “Ibasho café,” an informal, inter-generational gathering place for the community in which elders are actively engaged in the operation of the café. The Ibasho approach recognizes elders as valuable assets to their community, empowering them to be active participants, and changing the harmful outcomes created by society’s negative perceptions and expectations—social isolation, a loss of dignity and respect, and a sense of uselessness and irrelevance. This approach improves the community’s ability to withstand shocks caused by natural hazards, by creating a strong informal support system in which elders are the catalyst to strengthen social capital among community members of all ages. Stronger social networks across all age groups support stronger community resilience by enhancing the capacities of the different groups, promoting understanding of vulnerabilities, and leading to the development of better coping strategies. The Ibasho experience in Japan has garnered interest from communities recovering from natural disasters in Nepal and the Philippines, and GFDRR is providing support to replicate the Ibasho model, including bringing together elders from Japan, Nepal, and the Philippines in peer support contexts.

It should be noted that a commitment to disability inclusion in both DRM and the larger development agenda (consistent with the vision of the Sustainable Development Goals for development that leaves no-one behind) will garner tangible benefits for people already disabled and affected by natural disasters, as well as the thousands of people who acquire disabilities as a consequence of such events. According to the UN, approximately 200,000 people are expected to live with long-term disabilities as a result of injuries sustained in the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti. As long as natural disasters have the potential to disable people through injury and trauma, disability inclusion in DRM and development more broadly will be essential to ensuring that such individuals have the opportunity to rehabilitate, adapt to their acquired disabilities, and regain their place as contributing members of society.

More broadly, disability-inclusive interventions have the potential to benefit everyone. For example, the application of accessibility standards and universal design to early warning systems increases the ability of such systems to effectively warn people with and without disabilities, people with low literacy, people who speak other languages, children, and many others. In turn, the more people are reached

---

11 Building resilience of older people, Global Age Watch, Brief 6, Helpage International: http://www.helpage.org/download/5494603e06f53
by early warning systems, the more people have the opportunity to maximize the time pre-disaster (which could be a matter of mere minutes) to effect evacuation or shelter-in-place plans, thus increasing their chances for survival, and potentially giving them time to also protect assets such as homes, livestock, transportation, etc.

Thus, despite the challenges, disproportionate negative outcomes for persons with disabilities as a result of natural disasters need not inevitable, and the benefits of being disability-inclusive have the potential to extend to all members of society. Furthermore, it is also a particularly salient time to seize upon the opportunities for disability-inclusive DRM and development. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change\textsuperscript{14}, climate change is likely to lead to changes in the magnitude and frequency of extreme weather events, and in so doing have major impacts on human health. For the negative impacts of climate change to be ameliorated to the maximum extent possible, it will be essential for stakeholders at all levels to take into account the needs and contributions of persons with disabilities in developing DRM and development interventions. As will be discussed further below, such work also has the potential to be greatly assisted by the comprehensive policy and regulatory frameworks that now exist to guide those committed to effective inclusion of persons with disabilities in DRM and development.

1.2. Barriers faced by persons with disabilities in DRM

"Because I can’t hear sirens, when there is severe weather, I have to stay awake to watch storms until all gone."

Quote from a respondent to the 2013 UNISDR global survey of persons with disabilities\textsuperscript{15}

Persons with disabilities include people with a wide range of disabilities, including but not limited to people with physical disabilities, vision disabilities, hearing and speech disabilities, cognitive disabilities, and psychosocial disabilities. People with seemingly similar disabilities may experience common barriers in different ways, and some barriers may equally affect people with seemingly very different disabilities. When considering how best to avoid or mitigate various barriers, it is therefore important to consider the diversity of the disability community, and ensure that DRM consultations reflect the inputs of a wide range of persons with disabilities and their representative organizations. It should also be remembered that persons with disabilities who would typically be able to lead quite independent lives during non-emergency situations, may experience emergency-related barriers (e.g. separation from social support networks, support staff, mobility devices, medication, and physical isolation, etc.) that may increase their reliance on others during and in the aftermath of natural disasters.

Societal barriers experienced by persons with disabilities on a daily basis can become magnified and potentially life threatening in the context of a natural disaster, and have the potential to negatively


\textsuperscript{15} http://www.unisdr.org/archive/35032
affect people with different disabilities at all stages of the DRM cycle. At the same time, these barriers can inhibit the ability of persons with disabilities to take their rightful place as agents of change, and as active contributors to the development and effective implementation of DRM policies, plans and standards. In some cases, barriers may result in people with only certain types of disabilities being able to participate, meaning that consultations may lack the diversity of disability experience and perspectives. As noted in Priority 4 of the Sendai Framework, “empowering women and persons with disabilities to publicly lead and promote gender equitable and universally accessible response, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction approaches is key.”

The following reflect examples of some of the types of barriers experienced by persons with disabilities, but by no means reflect the totality of barriers that should be pro-actively addressed through active consultation with persons with disabilities at all phases of the DRM process. It should also be emphasized that all development interventions that promote the equality and inclusion of persons with disabilities in society on an equal basis with others, have the capacity to bolster the resilience of persons with disabilities and their families to withstand natural disasters and their aftermath.

1.2.1. Physical barriers

Public consultation processes to develop community disaster preparedness plans that are held in inaccessible locations, will not benefit from the contributions of persons with disabilities who require such access in order to effectively participate. Prevention and mitigation measures that are identified as priorities to protect life and assets, are often not accessible. For example, water collection points in rural communities facing seasonal floods may be built on higher locations, or the water pumps and tubewells raised above the level of potential floods. Those measures often impact the ability of persons with disabilities to collect clean water, increasing their exposure and risk to contract water-borne diseases.

Public transportation systems and road systems that are inaccessible to wheelchair users or people with other mobility disabilities will have limited capacity to assist in evacuating such people, potentially leaving persons with disabilities (and their families) stranded in hazardous locations. The presence of physical barriers, such as debris, in the aftermath of an emergency can also impact mobility of persons with disabilities. To the extent that shelters are available at all, shelters that are physically inaccessible, or that place critical services (e.g. medical care, food, bathrooms) in inaccessible locations within the shelter complex, may leave evacuees with disabilities and their families unable to utilize such shelters and without viable alternative shelter options. Quiet spaces in shelter settings are often unavailable for people, including people with autism, to be able to decompress and avoid sensory overload. Relatedly, persons with disabilities may experience difficulty in accessing settings in which they can maintain their privacy and dignity.
Emergency housing that is itself inaccessible, and/or that is located away from accessible transportation options, can leave persons with disabilities without temporary housing, or reliant on housing that segregates them from social networks, support services (e.g. personal assistants, psychosocial supports), schools, workplaces, medical care, or other essential aspects of community living. In some cases, housing built during the recovery phase may utilize building methods intended to promote community resilience to future hazards, but which create barriers for people with mobility disabilities, e.g. raising the ground floor living space above anticipated flood waters can render housing inaccessible to wheelchair users. When inaccessible temporary housing provided during the recovery phase becomes de facto long-term housing, these kinds of barriers can have long-lasting and detrimental impacts on persons with disabilities.

1.2.2. Information and communication barriers

Community consultations to develop disaster preparedness plans will not benefit from the contributions of persons with disabilities if the discussions and associated materials are inaccessible to e.g. people with hearing or vision disabilities due to lack of captioning, sign language interpretation, Braille, or large print; or to people with cognitive disabilities due to failure to utilize plain language. Persons with disabilities who are themselves serving as members of DRM teams at local, regional, or national levels, may also require reasonable accommodations to facilitate their communications in order to fulfill their duties in that role.

Early warning systems that rely solely on audible methods (e.g. sirens, radios, loudspeakers, some mobile phone alerts, etc.) are typically inaccessible to people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing, meaning that they may be unaware of impending emergencies, or become aware with little or no time to meaningfully respond. Similarly, awareness campaigns, education programs informing the general public about existing risks, and prevention/preparedness measures or relief activities, often rely on oral communications. Crucial information may therefore be inaccessible to persons with disabilities, in turn impacting their capacity to understand risks and prepare adequately.

Reliance on televisions as a medium for communication may be of limited value if sign language interpretation and captioning are not provided for people who are deaf or hard-of-hearing, and/or audio description is not provided to ensure that people with vision disabilities can access visual information, such as maps and check-lists. Critical information (such as guidance and way-finding information, emergency numbers, evacuation instructions, instructions on how to claim emergency financial supports, etc.) that is not communicated in plain language is likely to be inaccessible for people with cognitive or other disabilities that impact their ability to process and respond to information, who in turn may be left confused as to how they should proceed. Communications with first responders (either in person or via telephone, text, etc.) will not be effective if they are inaccessible to persons with hearing, speech, or cognitive disabilities.
1.2.3. Legislative/regulatory barriers

Legislative and regulatory barriers to the employment of persons with disabilities by government entities can reduce the numbers of government employees with disabilities, and in so doing contribute to a lack of internal awareness and responsiveness of public entities to the DRM-related needs of the disability community. For example, where employment criteria needlessly restrict the ability of persons with certain types of disabilities from being considered qualified, where mandatory civil service tests are inaccessible to applicants with disabilities, and/or where workplace reasonable accommodations are inappropriately capped at arbitrary funding amounts, persons with disabilities may find themselves unable to gain or retain government employment.

Pervasive legal restrictions on the ability of persons with disabilities to exercise legal capacity, own land, own their own home, etc. can negatively impact the resilience of persons with disabilities to withstand natural disasters. Even if a jurisdiction has strong non-discrimination legislation, or accessibility standards, failure to effectively enforce and implement those requirements can significantly negate the efficacy of those laws and regulations. For example, failure to implement accessibility requirements for schools and other public buildings can render those facilities unable to accommodate persons with disabilities when those facilities are used as shelters during times of emergency, or when they are used as facilities for food distribution programs.

Ineffective or lax zoning restrictions may result in housing or other critical infrastructure being built in areas at-risk of natural hazards, such as flooding, forest fires, landslides, etc. Without affordable or accessible alternatives, persons with disabilities may have little option but to live in these higher risk areas.

Financial protection systems and insurance schemes may be inaccessible to persons with disabilities (e.g. due to legal restrictions on the ability of persons with disabilities to contract for insurance services, hold a bank account etc.), or they may operate in ways that perpetuate societal barriers. For example, insurance policies may be legally allowed to require damaged assets to be repaired or replaced exactly as they were before the natural disaster, thus limiting the opportunities for recovery efforts to “build back better” through more accessible construction. Persons with disabilities may already be unable to benefit from social protection schemes under normal conditions (due to inaccessibility of financial systems, deprivation of legal capacity, lack of access to ID cards or other necessary documents, etc.), limiting the ability of such systems to serve as distribution mechanisms to get financial assistance directly to persons with disabilities after a disaster.

1.2.4. Policy barriers

Segregated approaches to disability, where policies promote separate facilities or services for persons with disabilities, can result in persons with disabilities being unable to utilize mainstream systems of emergency response. For example, the establishment of evacuation centers exclusively for persons
with disabilities may result in their being turned away from general shelters, or being separated from family. In other instances, persons with disabilities may engage in self-segregation if they feel that general shelters are unaccommodating, or if they wish to avoid potential competition for limited resources with other community members.

Policies that prohibit evacuation or housing of animals in shelters may discourage persons with disabilities who rely on support animals (e.g. guide dogs, emotional support animals) from choosing to evacuate in order to stay with their animals. Alternatively, they may be limited in which shelters will accept them together with their support animals, or they may become separated, leaving them without an important support and means of being independent. In communities where persons with disabilities rely on livestock as a means of income or self-sufficiency, they may choose to remain with their animals to try to protect those assets.

Policies that over-medicalize support to persons with disabilities can have a chilling effect on the willingness or ability of volunteers who are not medical professionals to assist persons with disabilities. This can in turn leave persons with disabilities without adequate or timely support to assist them in eating, getting dressed, going to the bathroom, or other activities of daily living. In addition, policies that medicalize disability can tend to assume that all health needs are disability-related, forcing persons with disabilities towards disability-centric supports as a default, rather than mainstream supports that may be more timely and effective. For example, a disabled child with diarrhea caused by the same virus that is affecting other evacuees, will be better served by immediately seeing a doctor or nurse, rather than being sent to a rehabilitation clinic.

Policies regarding documentation requirements can interfere with the ability of persons with disabilities to resume their lives and access needed services after a disaster. For example, students with disabilities may have had to evacuate without documentation certifying their qualification for certain reasonable accommodations in school. Insistence by education authorities on production of such documents when students enroll in new or temporary schools, can leave students with disabilities without the supports they need to effectively resume their education. In other instances, policies may prohibit students with disabilities from attending mainstream schools at all, or deny them opportunities to utilize reasonable accommodations to facilitate their effective learning. Given that DRM information is often part of the school curricula in countries at high risk of natural disasters, students with disabilities may find themselves lacking this essential information because they are not in school to receive it, or because the information is inaccessible to them.

1.2.5. Attitudinal barriers

The attitudes of others can often constitute the most significant barriers faced by persons with disabilities. The stereotyping and stigmatizing of persons with disabilities can lead to both overt and more subtle forms of discrimination, which in turn can permeate the policies and practices associated with DRM and create or perpetuate physical, information, communication, and other barriers. For
example, disparaging societal views of persons with disabilities, or even beliefs that they will bring bad luck, may lead to them being turned away from shelters or relief centers by aid workers or other survivors.

Disability stereotypes can often lead to persons with disabilities being viewed as passive beneficiaries of the interventions of others. This can be especially true for persons with cognitive and psychosocial disabilities, though it is a challenge experienced across the disability community. Although sometimes well-intentioned, such approaches risk violating people’s autonomy, and lead to substituted decision-making that ignores or violates persons with disabilities’ stated wishes. Such patronizing approaches also limit the opportunities for persons with disabilities to be – and be respected as – active and empowered contributors to all phases of DRM.

A related concern is the tendency for policy makers, first responders, volunteers and others involved in DRM to communicate with family and support staff of persons with disabilities, instead of communicating directly with persons with disabilities themselves. This further marginalizes and disempowers persons with disabilities, and can lead to inaccurate or incomplete information collection, which in turn can have negative consequences for persons with disabilities. Even when people do wish to communicate directly with persons with disabilities, if societal stigma and shame has caused families to hide their family members with disabilities, those involved in DRM may be unable to readily find, count, assess, or communicate with persons with disabilities. If DRM personnel do not see any persons with disabilities, it can also lead to the assumption that ‘there are no persons with disabilities,’ or that ‘all persons with disabilities must have died,’ in turn excluding persons with disabilities from DRM activities, including relief and recovery efforts.

Triage is an often-used methodology for prioritizing needs during situations of emergency, so that limited resources can be maximally utilized. However, due to pervasive beliefs that there is limited potential for persons with disabilities to benefit from such interventions, the needs of non-disabled people are often addressed first. Alternatively, aid workers may believe that only specialized organizations can assist persons with disabilities, even with respect to basic needs such as food, water, etc. This can leave persons with disabilities without timely access to needed resources, and undermine their resiliency and well-being during and after natural disasters. In worst case scenarios, such denials of access to resources can be needlessly life threatening.

Although natural disasters are, by their nature, situations of often great risk that can pose unique challenges for persons with disabilities, the types of barriers discussed above should not be considered unavoidable. As will be discussed in Part 2 of the report, ensuring that DRM is disability-inclusive – including through the active participation of persons with disabilities and their representative organizations – is the key to avoiding and mitigating barriers, and ensuring that persons with disabilities are not disproportionately impacted during and after situations of emergency.
“We have water and food stored outside, clothing, portable shower/toilet, etc. I am a member of our triage team for our retirement community”

Quote from a respondent to the 2013 UNISDR global survey of persons with disabilities

1.3. Relevant guiding international policy frameworks

When considering what international policy frameworks are available to guide effective implementation of disability-inclusive DRM, the last several years have seen the adoption, and in some instances updating, of numerous relevant frameworks. The disability-inclusive nature of these frameworks is reflective of the robust engagement of persons with disabilities and disabled people’s organizations (DPOs) during the negotiation of these instruments. These various policy frameworks should not be thought of as operating in isolation, but rather as being interconnected and sometimes explicitly so. For example, some of the documents discussed below include express cross-references to each other. At a minimum, these policies can be thought of as complementing each other, such that successful implementation of one has the potential to promote or mutually reinforce effective implementation of others. Indeed, one of the most innovative aspects of the frameworks is that in many cases they seek to reduce the divide between development, DRM, and humanitarian policies, strategies, and programs. The interrelation between the frameworks offers opportunities to avoid ‘siloing’ of topics, instead promoting collaboration and mutual learning, whilst also facilitating mutually reinforcing monitoring efforts.

It should also be noted that in parallel to the development of a number of these policy frameworks, several conferences and events were held to discuss aspects of financing of these issues, for example, the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, July 2015), and the Grand Bargain discussions of the World Humanitarian Summit (Istanbul, Turkey, May 2016). One of the goals of discussions such as these has been to try to simplify funding mechanisms and improve efficiency and efficacy of response. Facilitating financing, as well as creating environments where issues can be addressed across the various policy frameworks, will be important as countries face increasing types, numbers, and durations of crises, so that negative impacts of disasters can be minimized, existing development gains can be safeguarded, and the economic and social well-being of people – including persons with disabilities – can be supported.

16 http://www.unisdr.org/2013/iddr/#assets_resources
17 For example, at the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, which led to the adoption of the Sendai Framework, there was robust advocacy space for disability inclusion organizations, led by the Disability Stakeholder Group. This group brought together hundreds of persons with disabilities, and representative disability organizations worldwide. For more on the work of the Disability Stakeholder Group, see: http://www.preventionweb.net/organizations/17064/profile
18 For an illustration of this kind of complementarity, see e.g. UNISDR’s examination of how the Sendai Framework contributes to realization of the Sustainable Development Goals and vice-versa: http://www.unisdr.org/files/50438_implementingthesendaiframeworktoeach.pdf
1.3.1. Sustainable Development Goals

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)\(^{19}\) – also known as the Global Goals – represent the internationally agreed upon development agenda through 2030. The SDGs build upon the prior Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which established measurable, universally-agreed objectives for the international development agenda from 2000-2015. Adopted by the UN General Assembly in September 2015,\(^ {20}\) the SDGs consist of 17 goals and 169 targets, and not only affirm the international community’s commitment to end poverty, but do so in a way that is sustainable, and that leaves no one behind – including persons with disabilities. All of the development goals are interrelated and interconnected, such that success in achieving one can impact the successful achievement of others. In this manner, achievement of any of the 17 goals has the potential to improve the resiliency of persons with disabilities to withstand natural disasters.

However, two goals are of particular relevance to those engaged in disability-inclusive DRM:

- **Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable** – in addition to promoting safe, affordable, inclusive, accessible, and sustainable housing and basic services (including transport systems), Goal 11.5 and 11b explicitly reference the need to reduce losses and improve resilience to disasters, consistent with the Sendai Framework. Goal 11 also expressly references a number of at-risk populations, including women, children, older persons, and persons with disabilities.

- **Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts** – addressing a topic not previously included in the MDGs, SDGs Goal 13 discusses the need to strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries. It also addresses issues of education, awareness-raising, mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction, and early warning, as well as implementing the commitments undertaken by developed-country parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Importantly, it also promotes raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management that includes women, youth, and local and marginalized communities – all groups that would encompass persons with disabilities.

1.3.2. Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

The Sendai Framework\(^ {21}\) was adopted by UN Member States in March 2015 at the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai City, Japan. Building upon the prior Hyogo Framework for Action, the Sendai Framework’s objective is “the substantial reduction of disaster risk


\(^{21}\) [http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/sendai-framework](http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/sendai-framework)
and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries.” A fifteen year, voluntary, non-binding agreement, the Sendai Framework sets forth four priorities for action to guide the development and implementation of policies on disaster risk reduction from 2015-2030. These priorities are informed by seven global targets (with indicators) and thirteen guiding principles. The priorities and their relevance to disability-inclusive DRM are discussed in greater detail in Part 2 of the report:

- Priority 1 – Understanding disaster risk
- Priority 2 – Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk
- Priority 3 – Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience
- Priority 4 – Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction

1.3.3. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

 Adopted by UN Member States in December 2006, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) entered into force in May 2008, and has now been ratified by over 170 parties, including the European Union. The CRPD represents the first core international human rights treaty to comprehensively address the full array of civil and political, economic, social, and cultural rights in the context of disability. Legally binding upon states parties, the CRPD does not seek to create new rights for persons with disabilities, but rather elaborates and clarifies existing obligations for parties within the disability context.

**CRPD Article 11 (Situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies)** is of particular relevance for disability-inclusive DRM. It is notable that the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami occurred during the CRPD negotiations, and impacted the understanding of delegates that natural disasters could, but ideally should not, disproportionately impact the lives and well-being of persons with disabilities. Article 11 thus calls on States Parties to take all necessary measures to ensure the protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk, including the occurrence of natural disasters. Although effective implementation of the CRPD in its totality has the potential to build the resilience of persons with disabilities to withstand natural disasters, beyond Article 11, several articles in particular have the potential to be especially relevant for those engaged in disability-inclusive DRM:

---


• **Article 3 General principles** – explicitly sets forth the principles of the CRPD, which are not only relevant to the interpretation and implementation of the CRPD, but offer helpful guidance in any policy context where effective disability inclusion is sought.

• **Article 4 General obligations** – Article 4(3) encapsulates the international disability community’s rallying cry of “nothing about us without us,” by requiring that in decision-making processes concerning issues relating to persons with disabilities, there shall be close consultation with, and active involvement of persons with disabilities (including children with disabilities), through their representative organizations.

• **Article 9 Accessibility** – in order to ensure that persons with disabilities can live independently and participate fully in all aspects of life, Article 9 includes broad coverage of issues of accessibility, not only of the built environment, but also of information, communications and other services, including electronic services and emergency services.

• **Article 31 Statistics and data collection** – responding to the historic dearth of disability data, Article 31 highlights the need to undertake collection of appropriate information, including statistical and research data, to enable the formulation and implementation of policies to give effect to the CRPD. Such activities should not only include disaggregation and accessibility of the data, but also ensure confidentiality and respect for the privacy of persons with disabilities.

• **Article 32 International cooperation** – reflecting a twenty-first century appreciation for the interrelationship between human rights and international development, Article 32 promotes international cooperation, including international development programs that are inclusive of, and accessible to, persons with disabilities.

---

24 Article 3 states that “The principles of the present Convention shall be:

(a) Respect for inherent dignity, individual autonomy including the freedom to make one’s own choices, and independence of persons;

(b) Non-discrimination;

(c) Full and effective participation and inclusion in society;

(d) Respect for difference and acceptance of persons with disabilities as part of human diversity and humanity;

(e) Equality of opportunity;

(f) Accessibility;

(g) Equality between men and women;

(h) Respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities and respect for the right of children with disabilities to preserve their identities.”
1.3.4. Dhaka Declaration

The Dhaka Declaration on Disability and Disaster Risk Management\(^{25}\) was adopted at the Dhaka Conference on Disability and Disaster Risk Management, which included participants from 18 countries, including representatives of governments, UNISDR, regional and international NGOs, academics, DPOs, bi-lateral and multi-lateral development agencies, and other development sector representatives. The Declaration notes with concern the relatively higher rates of mortality experienced by persons with disabilities as compared with other community members. Highlighting the importance of the active contribution of persons with disabilities and DPOs, and the need to implement and recognize the linkages between the CRPD, Sendai Framework, and the SDGs, the Declaration calls on all governments and other stakeholders to:

- Ensure a people centered approach;
- Strengthen governance, partnership and cooperation;
- Integrate gender, age and disability disaggregated data;
- Promote empowerment and protection; and
- Act at local to national to global levels

For each of the five issues highlighted, the Declaration also includes concrete, action-oriented indicators against which to measure progress. The Declaration was endorsed during the 2017 Global Platform on DRR, and included as part of the conference’s outcomes.\(^{26}\)

1.3.5. World Humanitarian Summit

Convened in Istanbul in May 2016, the Summit\(^{27}\) brought together 9,000 participants, including governments, civil society, academia, and the private sector, to address the needs of people caught up in humanitarian crises and support a “new Agenda for Humanity.” The Platform for Action, Commitments and Transformation\(^{28}\) was launched as a hub to track progress towards implementation of the more than 3,500 commitments to action launched at the Summit. One of the initiatives launched at the Summit was the “Charter for Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action.”\(^{29}\)

A non-binding document, the Charter seeks not only to ensure that persons with disabilities can fully benefit from humanitarian aid during emergencies, but that they are participants in the development,

\(^{25}\) Dhaka Declaration on Disability and Disaster Risk Management, adopted at the Dhaka Conference on Disability and Disaster Risk Management, December 2015: http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/policies/v.php?id=47093

\(^{26}\) http://www.preventionweb.net/publications/view/53989

\(^{27}\) http://agendaforhumanity.org/summit

\(^{28}\) http://agendaforhumanity.org

\(^{29}\) Information about the Charter in the context of the World Humanitarian Summit is available here: http://agendaforhumanity.org/initiatives/3827
planning, and implementation of humanitarian programs. To date, the Charter has been endorsed by more than 150 stakeholders, including governments, UN agencies, other international organizations, and NGOs. Charter signatories commit to ensuring that their future humanitarian actions will be inclusive of persons with disabilities based on five principles:

- Non-discrimination and recognition of the diversity of persons with disabilities;
- Involvement of persons with disabilities in developing humanitarian programs;
- Ensuring that services and humanitarian assistance are equally available for, and accessible to, all persons with disabilities;
- Implementation of inclusive global policies; and
- Cooperation and coordination among humanitarian actors to improve inclusion of persons with disabilities.

1.3.6. Paris Climate Change Agreement

In 1992, the international community adopted the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which seeks to limit global temperature increases and related climate change, as well as cope with the impacts of the inevitable effects of climate change to date. Since that time, countries have sought to build upon and strengthen the UN climate change regime, and the Paris Climate Change Agreement, adopted in December 2015, represents the latest effort to address climate change on a global level. In addition to seeking to limit global temperature rise this century to below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels (and hopefully down to 1.5 degrees Celsius above), the Paris Agreement also aims to strengthen the ability of countries to address the impacts of climate change. Of particular relevance in this context, is the acknowledgement in the preamble that climate change is a “concern of humankind,” and that in taking action on climate change, parties should also consider their obligations with respect to the human rights of a variety of people in vulnerable situations, including persons with disabilities. In addition, Article 8 addresses a range of areas of cooperation and facilitation, including across a number of DRM-related activities, such as: early warning systems; emergency preparedness; comprehensive risk assessment and management; risk insurance facilities, climate risk pooling and other insurance solutions; and resilience of communities, livelihoods, and ecosystems.

1.3.7. Habitat III and the New Urban Agenda

The United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development – known better as “Habitat III” – builds upon previous international conferences to address sustainable human

---

30 Further information about the Charter, including a list of endorsing stakeholders, is available here: 
http://humanitariandisabilitycharter.org
31 http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php
32 http://habitat3.org
settlements and urbanization, starting in 1976 with Habitat I, and then in 1996 with Habitat II. Following an extensive series of more recent regional and thematic dialogues, Habitat III culminated in the October 2016 adoption of the Quito Declaration on Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements for All, otherwise known as the “New Urban Agenda,” which was formally adopted by the UN General Assembly in December 2016. In setting forth its vision for livable, accessible, inclusive and sustainable communities, the New Urban Agenda includes numerous references to intersecting populations, including persons with disabilities. In addition to promoting equitable and affordable access to sustainable physical and social infrastructure, the Agenda also references the need to empower and ensure the contributions of all relevant stakeholders, including persons with disabilities. Improving resilience and promoting all phases of disaster risk reduction and management, including with respect to climate change, natural disasters, and the need to “build back better,” are themes that run throughout the Agenda.

1.3.8. World Bank regulatory frameworks

It is beyond the scope of this report to provide an in-depth examination of the totality of the World Bank’s internal regulatory frameworks, including the myriad financing mechanisms and Operational and Bank policies. However, the following represent policy frameworks that are relevant to some, if not all, DRM-related activities:

Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies and the new Environmental and Social Framework. For the last 20 years, the World Bank has utilized the Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies to ensure that people and the environment are protected from potentially adverse impacts arising from projects funded by Investment Project Financing (IPF). The 11 operational policies require borrowing governments to address certain environmental and social risks in order to receive World Bank support for investment projects. Within the Safeguards, OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment), OP. 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples), OP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement), and OP 4.20 (Gender and Development) have provided opportunities for inclusion of disability into Bank activities with client countries, even though disability is not expressly referenced in the Safeguards.

In 2016, The World Bank’s Board of Executive Directors approved a new Environmental and Social Framework (ESF), which will go into effect in early 2018 and operate in parallel with the existing Safeguards for approximately seven years, ultimately replacing the Safeguard Policies. The new ESF moves beyond the prior approach of trying to ensure that IPF projects ‘do no harm,’ to promoting inclusion that empowers all people to participate in, and benefit from, the development process.

35 These are projects to which Bank Policy “Investment Project Financing” applies. (Note: these projects were previously governed by OP/BP10.00 “Investment Project Financing,” which was updated by the most recent policy in August, 2017.)
including disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups. Under the new ESF, which includes obligations for both the Bank and borrowers, persons with disabilities are explicitly referenced in: the “Vision for Sustainable Development” as one of the groups for whom barriers to the development process should be removed; Environmental and Social Standard (ESS) 2 (Labor and Working Conditions); ESS10 (Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure); and in the Bank Directive “Addressing Risks and Impacts on Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups,” in which persons with disabilities are included in the definition of those individuals or groups who are “disadvantaged or vulnerable.”

In the “Vision for Sustainable Development,” climate change and DRM activities are referenced as examples of the Bank’s global engagement in which the Bank is committed to environmental and social sustainability. For any DRM and climate change activities funded by investment project financing, the new ESF arguably lays a strong foundation for robust, accessible, and inclusive engagement of the disability stakeholder community, so that persons with disabilities are equal and active contributors to, and beneficiaries of, the Bank’s engagement.

Although not policy frameworks per se, it is worth noting that there are also two World Bank financing mechanisms that can assist in streamlining World Bank financing in the context of emergencies:

**Rapid Response to Emergencies and Crises, OP/BP 8.00.** Adopted in March 2007, and updated in July 2014, OP/BP 8.00 is intended to enhance the speed, flexibility, and effectiveness of the Bank’s crisis and emergency response policies and procedures. Consistent with four guiding principles, OP/BP 8.00 allows emergency operations to be processed under faster and more simplified procedures, which also streamline requirements that would typically be necessary in fiduciary and

---

36 Bank Directive “Addressing Risks and Impacts on Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups” Section II(1) defines “disadvantaged or vulnerable” as: “those individuals or groups who, by virtue of, for example, their age, gender, ethnicity, religion, physical, mental or other disability, social, civic or health status, sexual orientation, gender identity, economic disadvantages or indigenous status, and/or dependence on unique natural resources, may be more likely to be adversely affected by the project impacts and/or more limited than others in their ability to take advantage of a project’s benefits. Such an individual/group is also more likely to be excluded from/unable to participate fully in the mainstream consultation process and as such may require specific measures and/or assistance to do so. This will take into account considerations relating to age, including the elderly and minors, and including in circumstances where they may be separated from their family, the community or other individuals upon whom they depend.”

37 The four principles guiding the Bank’s policy on rapid response to crises and emergencies are: application of the rapid response policy to address major adverse economic and/or social impacts resulting from an actual or imminent natural or man-made crisis or disaster; continued focus of the Bank’s direct assistance on its core development and economic competencies and always in line with its mandate, including in all situations where the Bank supports peace-building objectives and relief to recovery transitions; close coordination and establishment of appropriate partnership arrangements with other development partners, including the United Nations (UN), in line with the comparative advantage and core competencies of each such partner; and appropriate oversight arrangements, including corporate governance and fiduciary oversight, to ensure appropriate scope, design, speed, and monitoring and supervision of emergency operations.
safeguards (in future, ESF) areas. The rapid response is triggered by a member country’s request for urgent assistance “in respect of an event that has caused, or is likely to imminently cause, a major adverse economic and/or social impact associated with natural or man-made crises or disasters.”

Assistance may be in the form of immediate support or restructuring of existing, or provision of new, investment project financing. For example, rapid response may be in support of various objectives, including such DRM-related activities as: rebuilding and restoring physical assets; preserving or restoring essential services; establishing and/or preserving human, institutional, and/or social capital, including economic reintegration of vulnerable groups; longer-term reconstruction, disaster management, and risk reduction; and supporting measures to mitigate or avert potential effects of imminent or future emergencies or crises in countries at high risk. The policy highlights the need for collaboration and coordination with other development partners, including recognizing the lead role of the UN or other international institutions regarding activities that may fall outside the Bank’s core competencies, e.g. relief, security, and specialized peace-building.

**International Development Association (IDA) crisis financing mechanisms.**

For countries assisted by loans/credits and grants from the World Bank’s International Development Association, two crisis financing mechanisms were created in 2011 to assist countries affected by natural disasters and other crises:

- **Immediate Response Mechanism** – this mechanism allows IDA countries to rapidly access up to 5% of their undisbursed IDA investment project balances following a crisis. In the case of small states, or countries with small undisbursed balances, they are able to access up to $5 million. Accessing funds in this manner following a natural disaster could facilitate, for example, the scaling up of social safety nets to mitigate the impact on vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities, or the repair or restoration of basic physical assets.

- **Crisis Response Window (CRW)** – intended to be accessed as a last resort, and linked to country-specific circumstances, this mechanism provides IDA countries with additional resources to respond to crises and return to their long-term development paths. With respect to natural disasters, CRW financing would only be available for events that are “exceptionally severe.” Additional financing in such circumstances would complement other efforts (e.g. by the UN) to provide emergency relief, for example through supporting social safety nets for affected populations, or restoring basic physical assets.

---

Part 2 – Disability inclusion in the Sendai Framework
priorities

2.1. Introduction to the priorities

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction was developed via a broad consultative process that built on the prior Hyogo Framework for Action. Taking stock of the progress made in implementing the Hyogo Framework, and identifying gaps, challenges and lessons learned with respect to Hyogo, Sendai defines 4 priorities that will guide the development and implementation of policies on Disaster Risk Reduction from 2015-2030:

- **Priority 1: Understanding risk factors**, addresses the imperative to assess risks in all their dimensions, from hazards to social, economic, and environmental risks, and to do so at all levels, from local (individual) to national and regional levels. It also recognizes the need for further global and regional cooperation, as disasters by their nature do not respect jurisdictional borders.

- **Priority 2: Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk**, addresses the need to build up political commitments, leadership, and coherence in managing disaster risk, with a multi-sectoral approach that will strengthen stakeholder coordination mechanisms.

- **Priority 3: Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience**, implicates the strong interrelation between the Sendai Framework and the Sustainable Development Goals, and also highlights that disaster risk reduction investments can themselves be drivers of innovation, growth and job creation, bolstering community resilience beyond the immediate DRM gains.

- **Priority 4: Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction**. In the past 10 years, a large number of major disasters (e.g. the 2004 Asia Tsunami, Haiti and Japan earthquakes, major cyclones in the Pacific and record-breaking Atlantic hurricanes) have demonstrated that we still need to strengthen preparedness and response capacities that then will contribute to easier and more efficient responses and recovery. This priority addresses the need to include Disaster Risk Reduction in preparedness, response and recovery programs, to ensure sound and effective investments and further save lives and assets. Priority 4 also explicitly references the critical role persons with disabilities and women should play in this work.

These priorities are also informed by a set of guiding principles that sets the broader conditions for implementation of the Sendai Framework. The 4 priorities should accordingly be implemented consistent with the guiding principles, as well as taking into account the preamble and other relevant elements of the Framework.
Of the thirteen guiding principles in the Sendai Framework, two make explicit reference to persons with disabilities:

- **Guiding principles Para. (19)(d):** Disaster risk reduction requires an all-of-society engagement and partnership. It also requires empowerment and inclusive, accessible and non-discriminatory participation, paying special attention to people disproportionately affected by disasters, especially the poorest. A gender, age, disability and cultural perspective should be integrated in all policies and practices, and women and youth leadership should be promoted. In this context, special attention should be paid to the improvement of organized voluntary work of citizens;

- **Guiding Principles, Para.(19)(g):** Disaster risk reduction requires a multi-hazard approach and inclusive risk-informed decision-making based on the open exchange and dissemination of disaggregated data, including by sex, age and disability, as well as on easily accessible, up-to-date, comprehensible, science-based, non-sensitive risk information, complemented by traditional knowledge;

These principles respond to one of the lessons learned from implementation of Hyogo, namely that “Governments should engage with relevant stakeholders, including women, children and youth, persons with disabilities, poor people, migrants, indigenous peoples, volunteers, the community of practitioners and older persons in the design and implementation of policies, plans and standards.” (Sendai Framework Section I(7))

### 2.2. Priority 1 – Understanding disaster risk factors

The first priority of the Sendai Framework is defined in Section IV(23):

> Policies and practices for disaster risk management should be based on an understanding of disaster risk in all its dimensions of vulnerability, capacity, exposure of persons and assets, hazard characteristics and the environment. Such knowledge can be leveraged for the purpose of pre-disaster risk assessment, for prevention and mitigation and for the development and implementation of appropriate preparedness and effective response to disasters.

Understanding risk factors is the first step of disaster risk reduction programs. Thinking about risk factors in this context is often limited to identification of hazards, be they natural or man-made, which have the potential for negative impacts, especially large loss of life and/or considerable loss of assets. Though this is important, risk identification should be broader and consider high frequency and low intensity hazards, such as fire or heavy rain, which can have highly destructive impacts on the poor – amongst whom persons with disabilities are disproportionately represented – who may be less able to recover from such repeated shocks. Beyond natural hazards, underlying risk factors such as poverty,
poor quality housing, limited family income earning capacity, etc. pose additional risks to individuals, families and communities, as such factors increase their potential losses and decrease their capacity to recover even from small shocks. For persons with disabilities who may experience marginalization even within the community, and/or discrimination on multiple bases (e.g. persons with cognitive, developmental, and psychosocial disabilities, or women and girls with disabilities who face discrimination on the basis of disability and gender), such discrimination and resulting marginalization should be considered as part of underlying risk factors. Beyond broadening its scope, risk identification as an exercise should be conducted not only at the national level, but also at sub-national levels, and especially at the local community level where it should be complemented by a vulnerability and capacity assessment.

Community perceptions of disasters and risks – and individuals’ role with respect to them – should also be taken into consideration. The disempowering effects of disability stigma and discrimination may affect persons with disabilities’ concept of disasters and risks, causing them to incorrectly assume that such events and their aftermath are inevitable, and that as persons with disabilities they have no societal role to play in mitigating their effects or reducing the chances of occurrence. Although women have an important role to play in mitigating disaster risks, women with disabilities are rarely considered as having the necessary skills and resources to contribute, and therefore often will not be invited – or worse not be permitted – to join education or community meetings on DRR.

Combatting disability-based discrimination and the compounding effects of poverty, can also empower persons with disabilities and their families to employ strategies that improve their resilience to disasters. For example, ensuring access to inclusive education can facilitate children with disabilities being sent to school, which in turn improves the income-earning potential of the family and their ability to withstand economic shocks caused by disasters. Similarly, ensuring access of persons with disabilities to agricultural training programs can increase their awareness and ability to invest in climate resistant crops, both as a source of food and also as a means of income generation. Part of the heightened risk faced by persons with disabilities can be related to their functional capacities. Thus, access to rehabilitation services, assistive devices, and information adapted to their needs can facilitate their being more self-sufficient, in turn enabling them to contribute to DRR, and also enabling family members and their social support networks to dedicate more time to mitigating risks.

Although Priority 1 does not specifically mention persons with disabilities, it does include references to disability-related concepts, including accessible information and communication. In Paragraph 24(m), it highlights the importance of taking into account specific audiences and their needs in sharing knowledge and information on disaster risk reduction. Dissemination of risk information, and information about national policies, strategies, and programs, is another area where adaptations can tangibly benefit persons with disabilities. Such information is often shared with communities via formal and informal education channels, such as community meetings, women’s groups, youth clubs, etc. Historically, such fora have not typically been inclusive of, or accessible to, persons with disabilities. Ensuring that such groups, and the information disseminated by them, are fully accessible
to persons with disabilities, will help to ensure that persons with disabilities and their families have access to the information on an equal basis with other members of the community.

Generation of that risk information should also be inclusive of persons with disabilities. Not only should persons with disabilities be a part of the groups working together to identify risks, but participants with disabilities should be empowered to meaningfully contribute to such risk or vulnerability and capacity assessments, such that their knowledge, opinions, and voices are valued by others. Including persons with disabilities (taking into consideration gender and cross-disability representation) in assessment teams can also help to facilitate the participation in and contribution to DRM-related activities of persons with disabilities in the wider community.

Ideally, data collected for risk, vulnerability, and capacity assessments should be disaggregated by sex, age, and disability, or at least ensure that existing disability data (such as from social protection registers, national census, service provision data, etc.) is used and integrated in the key elements of assessments. A variety of techniques may be used to develop community based risk, vulnerability, and capacity assessments, such as community mapping, transect walks, and seasonal calendars, and such approaches should ideally include gender and cross-disability perspectives. For example, community mapping that indicates where persons with disabilities live, can facilitate not only a better preparedness plan, but can also inform decisions on measures that have the potential to reduce risks and save lives and assets for the overall community.

Box 2.1: Bangladesh – Community based disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction (CBDIDRR)

The Centre for Disability in Development (CDD), together with its partner Gana Unayan Kendra (GUK), implement CBDIDRR projects in Gaibandha district. Gaibandha is prone to many disasters, but in particular the district faces significant annual floods from the Brahmaputra River, powered by both monsoon rain and Himalayan snow melt. In order to support communities to reduce the impacts of such floods, a participative process for risk, vulnerability, and capacity assessment (VCA) was developed. The first step consisted of organizing meetings with community members including persons with disabilities, and with local authorities, to capture their knowledge about the different hazards faced, challenges in coping, and their demands. Training was then organized with self-help groups of persons with disabilities, community members, and local authorities, focused on understanding DRR, learning about the risk assessment and VCA techniques, and understanding disability issues. One of the techniques used was community mapping, where participants drew their village map, clearly indicating critical infrastructure, evacuation routes, water points, as well as the location of persons with disabilities, elderly persons, livestock, and assets. Once the map was completed, it was then leveraged to develop strategies and plans to minimize the impacts of the floods. For example, evacuation shelters and roads were identified based on previous flood levels; evacuation priorities were defined; the roles and responsibilities of different community members were decided;
and plans were made to shelter livestock and ensure the safe conservation of foods, seeds, and related community assets. In this way, persons with disabilities were able to substantively and meaningfully participate in the protection of the community as a whole.

The negotiations of the Sendai Framework clearly highlighted the lack of data and information related to disability in the context of DRR. In 2013, the Disability Stakeholders Group, together with UNISDR, launched an online survey to begin to address the dearth of information. The stark results of the survey were a key contributor to the successful inclusion of disability in the Framework. For example, only 17% of the respondents were aware of a disaster management plan for their area, which also highlighted the degree to which persons with disabilities were not involved in the risk assessment. Despite the compelling results of the survey, the inclusion of disability in the Framework, and negotiation of targets and indicators, inclusion of disability in DRR, especially with respect to data collection, has not materialized to the extent needed.

The pervasive failure to disaggregate data by sex, age, and disability, means that most reports on losses related to disasters still do not include information on the numbers and manner in which persons with disabilities are affected by disasters. That said, some countries, including the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Bangladesh, Indonesia, and Ecuador, have begun to take steps to more effectively work with persons with disabilities to promote disability-inclusive DRM. Recognizing that persons with disabilities are an integral part of their societies, and that they need to better understand the situation of persons with disabilities, these countries are taking measures to identify and mitigate risks and build community resilience, including by reviewing policies, developing guidelines, amending handbooks, and related interventions. However, these remain isolated examples, and much more needs to be done in more countries to strengthen evidence-based interventions, and to facilitate information exchange between stakeholders regarding practical approaches to ensuring disability-inclusive DRM.

Box 2.2: New Zealand – Symposium on disability

A year after the 2011 earthquake in Christchurch, New Zealand, the Office for Disability Issues, Civil Defence and CBM organized a symposium on persons with disabilities and emergency preparedness, bringing together persons with disabilities, their families, local service providers, and international guests. The objective of the symposium was to enable cross-sector learning regarding the Christchurch earthquake response between persons with disabilities and responders. As a result, the New Zealand Civil Defence and Emergency Management (CDEM) Department developed partnerships with persons with disabilities, and published an information note on “including persons with disabilities.”11 In the foreword to the document, Mr. Hamilton, director of Civil Defence Emergency Management wrote:

---

40 http://www.unisdr.org/2013/iddr/#assets_resources
“The message from people with disabilities in Canterbury is very clear: “Nothing about us without us.” This means full participation in all aspects of CDEM, not just consultation. There is a strong willingness among people with disabilities to work with local authorities to ensure that CDEM is delivered in disability-inclusive ways. By partnering with people with disabilities and their wider networks, CDEM organizations can gain not only an understanding of the requirements of these members of the community, but also their strengths.”

**Box 2.3: Ecuador – High level regional meeting on inclusive disaster risk management – including persons with disabilities in the responses to emergencies and disasters (2016).**

Following the adoption of the Sendai Framework, a regional plan for Latin America was developed to comply with the Framework. The government of Ecuador, under the leadership of the prime minister, organized a high-level meeting to identify actions that should be included in the regional plan to include persons with disabilities. The meeting brought together DPOs from the region, international experts, and representatives of several Latin American countries. As one outcome from the meeting, the participants agreed on a declaration about the importance of regional integration for the management of risk, and expressing openness to creating a network of experts for inclusive management of risks, focusing on the approach and empowerment of persons with disabilities as the key component of the work.42

### 2.3. Priority 2 – Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk

The second priority of the Sendai framework is defined in Section IV(26):

Disaster risk governance at the national, regional and global levels is of great importance for an effective and efficient management of disaster risk. Clear vision, plans, competence, guidance and coordination within and across sectors, as well as participation of relevant stakeholders, are needed. Strengthening disaster risk governance for prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery and rehabilitation is therefore necessary and fosters collaboration and partnership across mechanisms and institutions for the implementation of instruments relevant to disaster risk reduction and sustainable development.

As with Priority 1, Priority 2 also does not specifically mention persons with disabilities, nor does it expressly reference elements related to accessibility, universal design or inclusion. However, Priority 2 calls for decentralization and empowerment of community representatives, and encourages them to organize public consultations. Priority 2 also establishes roles and responsibilities for the development, implementation, and monitoring of the disaster risk reduction policies, regulations, strategies and plans. This Priority should therefore be read in light of Section V(36)(iii), which identifies persons with disabilities as one of the stakeholders that should be involved and empowered to participate in

all actions related to Priority 2. As with the other Priorities, implementation should occur consistent with the Guiding Principles, which do reference persons with disabilities.

Implementation of Priority 2 for persons with disabilities requires that all development sectors work together in mainstreaming both DRR and disability in their policies, strategies, plans and programs. This ‘twin mainstreaming’ should ideally happen in a coordinated manner involving all stakeholders, with the implementation of a risk informed development agenda that creates linkages between sectors. Although the integration of both DRR and disability in the SDGs is an encouraging development, effective implementation remains a challenge. Global initiatives such as safe schools, safe hospitals, and making cities resilient, are contributing to the mainstreaming of DRR in all sectors. However, disability is not being systematically included. Nevertheless, in some countries, governments or other stakeholders have taken the lead in implementing pilot programs within these larger campaigns that include disability. For example, the Global Risk Award 2014, was given to a project that includes disability in a resilient city initiative. “Peñaflor town inclusive safe community: Resilience for all,” aimed to remove barriers, in turn enabling community members to better utilize services available, and also contributing to saving lives and assets during disasters. Such initiatives remain quite isolated though, and are typically not yet well documented or developed enough to be used as models or considered a “standard.”

Arguably, the most effective progress to date in the realm of strengthening risk governance has been with respect to decentralization of disaster risk management and engagement of communities. Across the world a number of pilot programs involving local authorities, civil society organizations, NGOs, and communities have been implemented using a community based approach. The advantage of community based approaches in the context of DRM is by now widely accepted. However, too few efforts have been made to ensure the inclusion and empowerment of marginalized groups to participate, including persons with disabilities. The persistent perception of persons with disabilities as passive recipients of assistance, rather than as agents of change with valuable contributions to make, arguably has a chilling effect on the willingness of many local authorities and others to make their meetings and services accessible to persons with disabilities. To ensure successful, inclusive risk governance, much greater awareness about DRM is needed within the disability community, and much greater awareness of disability is needed amongst governments and other stakeholders. To the extent that there are community based DRM projects that have benefited the whole community, such programs need to be documented, shared, and scaled up as models for national and regional replication.
Box 2.4: Indonesia – Arbeiter Samariter Bund (ASB) as part of the Technical Assistance and Training Teams consortium (TATTs)\

Strengthening partnership between Disabled People’s Organizations (DPOs) and Provincial Local Disaster Management Office (LDMO) to realize and sustain DiDRR practices.

The program aims to sustainably enhance the skills and technical capacity of Local Disaster Management Offices (LDMOs) in 8 provinces in Indonesia, so that they are able to provide technical and operational support before, during, and after disasters occur, as well as promote best practices among their respective districts. In the process of providing technical assistance and training to LDMOs at province level, the TATTs program will promote more proactive, inclusive, and effective policy and planning processes at national, provincial, and district levels. Local Disabled People's Organizations (DPOs) are involved with this process, to ensure local resources on disability-inclusive DRR (DiDRR) are available, and that strengthened DPOs are able to be potential partners for LDMOs to sustain its capacity in DiDRR planning and delivery. Through the TATT program, DPOs benefit from technical training on DRR, and have greater opportunities to partner with government and other DRR actors. As a result, DPOs are participating in national and local DRR fora, and can then better influence DRR policy and planning, share good practices, and learn from other stakeholders. Furthermore, the program promotes DPO leadership in DRR, especially in contributing to training of LDMO staff. DPOs are involved in developing national DRR training curricula, module review, and trials, ensuring that the DRR training content is inclusive of disability issues, but also that the training methodology is disability inclusive, thus enabling persons with disabilities to fully participate.

Building on the mutual understanding that has developed between the LDMO and DPOs, the program has facilitated the setting up of a Disability Inclusion Service Unit for Disaster Management within LDMO in, e.g. Central Java. The unit personnel are representatives of LDMO officials, DPOs, and non-government DRR actors. The function of the unit includes monitoring and evaluation, and disaggregated data management to support DiDRR realization and scaling-up, including replication of existing good practices at district level.

---

41 Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund (ASB), Yayasan Mercy Corps Indonesia, Perkumpulan Lingkar, and Indonesia University Forum for DRR and CARDNO, funded by The United States Agency for International Development (USAID).
Box 2.5: United States – Feeling Safe Being Safe accessible emergency preparedness materials developed by and for persons with developmental disabilities

In 1992, the Director of the California Department of Developmental Services (DDS) created the Consumer Advisory Committee (CAC), to give consumers (ie. people with developmental disabilities receiving services from DDS) a voice in the work of DDS. Made up entirely of persons with developmental disabilities, the CAC articulates priorities of concern to the developmental disabilities community in California, and also provides information to assist consumers, including resources to promote independent living and community inclusion.

Responding to prior natural disasters, such as hurricane Katrina, and mindful of the wide array of natural hazards to which California is prone, the CAC sought to develop resource materials for consumers that would increase personal safety and community connections, and assist them in creating their own individualized emergency preparedness plans and kits. In addition, the CAC wanted to counter the stereotype of persons with developmental disabilities as being incapable of contributing to DRR activities or having to rely on staff, and instead empower consumers to help themselves and others in their communities.

With funding from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the CAC worked collaboratively with DRR experts and consultants to create accessible, plain language, emergency preparedness materials designed by and for persons with developmental disabilities. CAC members stressed that the materials should: be easy to understand; use bright color and large fonts; and express a positive approach using everyday language with simple illustrations. The materials were extensively tested with end users at community meetings and conferences, with 2400 persons from the developmental disabilities community providing evaluations. The materials were then revised in response to the feedback received. For example, the title “Feeling Safe, Being Safe” was chosen because consumers related that it made them feel empowered about the topic, rather than fearful or panicked.

To promote sustainability, additional grant funding was obtained to facilitate the development of train-the-trainer courses. Through such training, persons with developmental disabilities could become certified as Feeling Safe Being Safe trainers by the DDS. Some trainers used their certification to engage in income generating activities, whereby they would be paid to deliver community trainings using the Feeling Safe Being Safe materials. The materials have also come to be used by other jurisdictions. For example, Hawaii and Minnesota both adapted the materials for the cultural and climate contexts. To date, 15 other U.S. states have used versions of the materials to promote emergency preparedness by people with and without developmental disabilities.

44 Feeling Safe Being Safe materials are available here: http://www.dds.ca.gov/ConsumerCorner/EmergencyPreparedness.cfm  For more information about the process used to develop the materials, see: http://brcenter.org/lib/lib_pdf/SP_IN_FSBS_Story.pdf
Information and evidence sharing is also critical to improving disability-inclusive disaster risk governance. For example, every two years, governments meet during the “Global Platform” and report on progress in implementing the Sendai Framework. In 2017, the Chair’s Summary (paragraph 59) promoted the inclusion of the 2015 Dhaka Declaration on Disability and Disaster Risk Management as an implementing guidance and monitoring tool:

The Global Platform recognized the importance of the Dhaka Declaration on Disability and Disaster Risk Management as practical guidance for inclusive implementation of the Sendai Framework. Countries were urged to implement the Declaration and report progress on its implementation when reporting progress of the Sendai Framework in 2019.

Using national, regional and global fora to report on successful inclusion of disabilities should promote replication. It should also empower DPOs and others to continue to advocate for disability-inclusive implementation of Sendai with their governments, by taking existing promising practices and plans and adapting them to their own country contexts. Regional and global DRR platforms could also be used as a venue for governments to demonstrate innovative disability-inclusive DRR programs. Some governments have made tremendous efforts to include persons with disabilities in their DRR programs, but unless shared with others such experiences cannot be readily used as models or adapted and replicated in other countries.

Lastly, one of the most significant gaps regarding disability, is its invisibility in coordination mechanisms across DRR. Although in some countries, DPOs are invited and involved in coordination mechanisms, there are few government bodies responsible to ensure inclusion across all DRR programs. Thus, the responsibility to ensure contribution of persons with disabilities is often forgotten. In many countries, disability as a policy issue is situated within ministries of social welfare, which are often not adequately included in DRR discussions. An alternative approach would be to nominate a focal point for disability-inclusive DRR within the DRR management and coordination body, to ensure responsibility and accountability for disability inclusion.

Box 2.6: UNISDR – an important ally in disability-inclusive DRR

The UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) has been a key ally in raising the voices of persons with disabilities in the DRR context, including in the process to negotiate and adopt the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. During the negotiation process, UNISDR utilized a commonly employed UN practice of soliciting input from “Major Groups.” Given the lack of space

45 The Dhaka Declaration on Disability and Disaster Risk Management was adopted at the Dhaka Conference on Disability and Disaster Risk Management, which included participants from 18 countries, including representatives of governments, UNISDR, regional and international NGOs, academics, DPOs, bi-lateral and multi-lateral development agencies, and other development sector representatives.

http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/policies/v.php?id=47093

Draft for Discussion

available for persons with disabilities to advocate, and conscious of the necessity of offering equal opportunities to disability stakeholders, UNISDR set up the “Disability Stakeholders Group,” and worked with it alongside the other Major Groups. UNISDR invited the Disability Stakeholders Group to all meetings, providing opportunities to make statements and comment on all drafted documents. UNISDR also organized the first online survey to ask persons with disabilities about DRR and their coping capacity in the face of a disaster event. The survey results were released for International Day for Disaster Risk Reduction in 2013, the theme of which was “Living with Disability and Disasters.”

With the support of the Nippon Foundation, UNISDR also committed making the World Conference on DRR in Sendai, Japan, accessible to participants with disabilities, in order to enable their full participation. Consequently, Sendai was seen as one of the most accessible such international events to date. Drawing on that experience, UNISDR worked hard to make its Regional Platform meetings and also the 2017 Global Platform in Cancun even more accessible. One of the most notable features of Cancun was the facilitation of remote participation via a web-based conference system and telepresence robots, with the technical support of the Institute on Disability and Public Policy at American University. Persons with disabilities from 4 regions were able to log into the telepresence robot and attend sessions, ask questions, or otherwise interact with other participants.

As a result of involving persons with disabilities more systematically, outcome documents for Regional and Global Platform include strong references on inclusiveness. Furthermore, regional strategies on implementing the Sendai Framework make strong reference in involving persons with disabilities and indicated relevant actions.

UNISDR will continue to promote inclusion of persons with disabilities by mainstreaming disability concerns across the organization, and including disability in the development of guidelines, training, and in discussions with governments. UNISDR has nominated 2 focal persons who will continue to work with the Disability Stakeholders Group, including facilitating access for persons with disabilities to participate. Currently, UNISDR is working with partners to develop disaggregated data for the national loss accounting databases; an important tool that will provide more accurate information on the impact of disasters on persons with disabilities.

2.4. **Priority 3 – Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience**

The third priority of the Sendai framework is defined in Section IV(29):

> Public and private investment in disaster risk prevention and reduction through structural and non-structural measures are essential to enhance the economic, social, health and cultural resilience of persons, communities, countries and their assets, as well as the environment.
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These can be drivers of innovation, growth and job creation. Such measures are cost-effective and instrumental to save lives, prevent and reduce losses and ensure effective recovery and rehabilitation.

While Priority 3 does not explicitly mention persons with disabilities, many persons with disabilities will be captured by Paragraph 30(k)’s reference to people with life-threatening or chronic diseases. In this context, and consistent with the Sendai Framework’s Guiding Principles, persons with disabilities should have the opportunity to contribute to both risk assessment and risk reduction activities. Priority 3 is also of particular relevance to persons with disabilities in its focus on finances, and social safety nets in particular. Social safety nets, to the extent that they are available, are often the only source of income for persons with disabilities, and are thus a critical resource for many in the disability community. While enhancing financial protection and reduction of financial losses, Priority 3 should of course be implemented consistent with the Guiding Principles (Section III(19)), and the role of stakeholders. (Section V(36)(iii))

Persons with disabilities are frequently amongst the poorest in society. The World Bank estimates that 80% of the world’s one billion persons with disabilities are among the world’s poorest. Persons with disabilities often have very limited incomes, in part because their livelihoods are frequently in the informal employment economy or rely on social protection mechanisms. This means that a large portion of the population is unable to contribute to investment for resilience. At household and community levels, persons with disabilities are more likely to be identified as a ‘financial burden’ than as a ‘financial assets.’ With Priority 3 calling for investment in resilience building at all levels, ensuring access to more diversified and sustainable livelihoods for persons with disabilities offers the opportunity for a high return in investment in the form of enhanced resilience for persons with disabilities and their families. Removing barriers to formal employment, and ensuring access to financial mechanisms by persons with disabilities, such as saving accounts, and loan and credit mechanisms, should similarly be thought of as innovative and sustainable mechanisms through which to build the resilience of society as a whole.

**Box 2.7: Niger – CBM/Karkara investments in ‘survival yards’**

Niger is one of the poorest countries in the world, and is facing climate-related disasters in the form of severe droughts alternating with heavy rainfall, which hat strongly affect people’s livelihoods, health and access to food. Conflict in northern Nigeria, and an influx of refugees constitute additional stressors on Niger’s capacity to cope. Inflation of food prices and loss of value of livestock can have dramatic consequences for poor people, including persons with disabilities, who rely on agriculture and livestock.

---

48 Paragraph 30(k) recognizes the heightened impacts of disasters on people with life-threatening and chronic diseases, promoting their participation in their specific risk assessments, and design of policies and plans that will mitigate them.
CBM, with its partner Karkara, are implementing a comprehensive project targeting poor communities, that includes the establishment of gardens with diversified and climate resistant crops, health, water and sanitation, and wood efficient cooking stoves, among other components. Persons with disabilities are given lands by the community to establish vegetable and fruit gardens that are drought resistant. These gardens provide the direct benefit of good and varied nutrition, as well as a financial benefit derived from selling surplus crops on the market. The land is chosen carefully, so that sufficient water is available without compromising the other water consumption needs of the community. An accessible water well is built up that can be used by the entire community.

A cart and a donkey is given as loan to the garden owner to transport extra produce to the local market. The cart is also a great asset to the community, and is often used to support a diversity of community transportation needs. Of particular note is that the cart has improved community access to health centers, which in turn has garnered positive health outcomes. The project also demonstrates that financial empowerment can lead to greater recognition of persons with disabilities in their communities as active contributors. Furthermore, it increases local production of food that can improve the community’s capacity to cope, as vegetable and fruits are chosen carefully to ensure production of food across the seasons. Lastly, the garden waste is used to feed small animals. Investing in developing such ‘survival yards’ not only helps the community to cope with climate induced hazards, but has improved the overall living conditions of the community.

Social protection, where available, can constitute another source of income for persons with disabilities. However, requirements to access social protection / safety mechanisms are often such that these options are inaccessible to persons with disabilities. For example, persons with disabilities frequently do not possess identification cards, or they will not be aware that they are entitled to receive a disability benefit card or perhaps understand how to obtain it. As a consequence, they may experience barriers to qualification and/or successful registration to access poverty schemes, social benefits, etc. Such barriers can be particularly acute for women with disabilities (who often face gender as well as disability discrimination), and persons with psychosocial or cognitive disabilities (who may lack access to accessible information materials about the programs, and/or access to supported decision-making to help them navigate those systems).

Even if persons with disabilities are qualified and successfully registered for social protection or other safety net mechanisms, the means to access the funds are often not directly accessible to them (e.g. bank accounts, mobile transfers, receiving cash, or in-kind, etc.) in turn creating dependency on others. For example, the use of mobile phones for funds transfers is common in many countries, but is often not accessible to persons with vision disabilities absent availability of adapted mobile phone technologies. Similarly, receiving in-kind food assistance may create transportation expenses for people with physical disabilities, in turn creating abuse risks, or generating inequalities in the amounts actually received. For women with disabilities, being entitled to cash that they cannot directly access or otherwise use independently, can create a high risk of abuse and gender based violence.
Box 2.8: Ethiopia – World Bank Group Productive Safety Net program integrating disaster and climate risk management

Ethiopia’s Productive Safety Net Program is a large national social safety net program that responds not only to chronic food insecurity among Ethiopia’s poor, but also to shorter-term shocks, mainly droughts. The program finances labor-intensive public works (such as building terraced fields on hill slopes to reduce soil erosion and increase water retention), and social services infrastructure. Cash is paid for up to five days of work a month per household member, for six months a year, until the recipient households graduate from the program by accumulating an asset and income level that enables them to meet 12 months of food needs and to withstand modest shocks. In addition, about 20 percent of the participating households with members unable to work receive unconditional cash or food transfers. The program’s Risk Financing Mechanism and contingency budget helps to protect the income and assets built up by program beneficiaries from being eroded by recurring shocks, particularly droughts. Chronically food-insecure households that cannot provide labor to public works, are given an unconditional cash or food transfer of equivalent value to that received by labor-contributing households. The Direct Support beneficiaries have included (but are not limited to) orphans, pregnant and nursing women, people with disabilities, the elderly, chronically ill individuals, and female-headed households that are labor poor (i.e., lack time, mobility, or members to work on project sites). A 2011 impact evaluation found that households receiving Direct Support had considerably lower average income and asset values, and owned and cultivated less land than households participating in the Public Works component, highlighting the need to develop innovative mechanisms to ensure that such program benefits accrue equally to all members of the community.

There are very few examples where specific effort has been made to enroll persons with disabilities in investment programs that build resilience, despite instances where the intention is to include them. For example, cash for work programs may plan for provision of unconditional cash for people who are unable to physically perform the work. However, lack of disability data and no plan to otherwise identify persons with disabilities can prevent them from benefiting from such programs.

In addition, the assumption that persons with disabilities cannot work, or do not want to, is often inaccurate. When asked, many persons with disabilities will say that although unconditional cash is a great initiative supporting them, they would nevertheless still like to contribute to the resilience building of their communities. Cash transfer programs should also ensure that persons with disabilities who are the most marginalized, such as women with disabilities, persons with psychosocial or cognitive disabilities and others, are identified and included in such programs. It is also important to make provisions for mothers of children with disabilities, as their family obligations may not leave them with sufficient free time to access cash for work programs.
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Another key element of Priority 3 of relevance to persons with disabilities, is the resilience of strategic infrastructures and sectors via the enforcement of building codes, or investment ensuring continuity of services. There are very few building codes that comprehensively integrate both safety and accessibility issues. This can lead to basic accessibility standards not being incorporated when building or rebuilding critical infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, health centers, public buildings, etc. This creates a clear barrier to inclusion of disability issues in DRR and resilience building, as it prevents persons with disabilities from building their resilience, either leaving them to maintain the status quo, or worsening the capacities of persons with disabilities to cope with disasters and contribute to their individual, family, community and country resilience. At present, there is a clear gap in investment for resilience strategies and programs that are inclusive of persons with disabilities and benefit all equally, both in building critical infrastructure and services resilience, as well as building individual, households and community resilience.

Box 2.9: Haiti earthquake – State Secretary for inclusion of persons with disabilities

Following the 2010 deadly earthquake in Haiti, and the massive reconstruction needed, the State Secretary for inclusion of persons with disabilities in partnership with local disabled people's organizations and international organizations, has worked to establish standards for making all reconstruction accessible. A number of resource documents have been published, and training on universal design to engineers and university students has been implemented. The State secretary, in conjunction with other governments bodies, developed an accessibility law to ensure that all Haitian buildings (both new and rebuilt) are made accessible. On June 30th 2017, this law was approved by the Council of Ministers, and ratified in August by the Senate. The objective of the law is to build an inclusive society, and also ensure that persons with disabilities have better capacity to cope with disasters, escape from public buildings, or access shelters in time of disasters. If the law is successfully implemented, it will greatly improve the overall resilience of Haitian society.

2.5. Priority 4 – Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction

The fourth priority of the Sendai framework is defined in Section IV(32):

The steady growth of disaster risk, including the increase of people and assets exposure, combined with the lessons learned from past disasters, indicates the need to further strengthen disaster preparedness for response, take action in anticipation of events, integrate disaster risk reduction in response preparedness and ensure that capacities are in place for effective response and recovery at all levels. Empowering women and persons with disabilities to publicly lead and promote gender equitable and universally accessible response, recovery,
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rehabilitation and reconstruction approaches is key. Disasters have demonstrated that the recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction phase, which needs to be prepared ahead of a disaster, is a critical opportunity to “Build Back Better,” including through integrating disaster risk reduction into development measures, making nations and communities resilient to disasters.

Priority 4, by its people-centered approach across preparedness, response, recovery and reconstruction, is of great importance to ensuring the contribution and protection of persons with disabilities. Perhaps most importantly, it explicitly calls for the empowerment of persons with disabilities to contribute to all aspects of disaster risk reduction. It also emphasizes the need to prepare for the recovery and reconstruction phases, while “building back better.” Read in light of Priority 2, the approach to “build back better” should include universal design as part of the regulatory framework, to ensure increased resilience of community, assets, and infrastructures.

The clear call of Priority 4 to empower persons with disabilities to take leadership in DRM has yet to be fully realized. Although there is increasing evidence of governments and other stakeholders consulting with DPOs at all levels of emergency preparedness, response, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction, most current efforts fall short of the kind of leadership and empowerment envisioned by the Sendai Framework. This is especially true for women with disabilities, who remain excluded from many of these initiatives, despite Priority 4’s call for women and persons with disabilities to play a leadership role. Persons with disabilities often have not had access to education or professional opportunities on an equal basis with other members of society, which can make it difficult for them to confidently take up leadership roles, and participate fully in planning and coordination mechanisms. This is generally true in non-emergency settings, and can be even more pronounced in times of disaster, when information may be even less likely to be shared in accessible formats, or meeting locations may not be accessible.

Box 2.10: Cambodia – Thailand – Philippines– University of Sydney’s Disability and Disasters project

Taking a holistic approach, this project examines the challenges that persons with disabilities face in responding to disasters and risk in South East Asia, and identifies resilience-building solutions for mainstreaming disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction planning and action (DiDRR). To achieve this, the project works through 3 main axes: increasing knowledge and skills of persons with disabilities and DRR stakeholders on risk and DiDRR; changing attitudes and beliefs about persons with disabilities and demonstrating their value to the DRR process; and facilitating inclusive governance processes by providing tools and mechanisms that demonstrate best practice. Main activities and outputs designed to foster greater inclusion include:
- The creation of an empirical knowledge-base on what support persons with disabilities need and how DRR actors can best work with persons with disabilities to ensure this support; and
- The development of the DiDRR Toolkit that guides users on how to do DiDRR on the ground. The Toolkit was developed in collaboration with main stakeholders (i.e. persons with disabilities, DPOs, government, and emergency responders) to ensure relevance, and comprises of i) Risk awareness and preparedness training modules for persons with disabilities; ii) Train the Trainer manuals that train persons with disabilities how to lead DiDRR training sessions for DRR actors; iii) Inclusive Emergency Response training for emergency responders; iv) the Inclusive Resilience Scorecard that enables persons with disabilities, women’s groups, other minority groups (such as the LGBTQI community), DPOs, and government, to identify opportunities for inclusion within their cities; and v) the Inclusion Road Map – a step-by-step guide on how to support stakeholders in designing more inclusive practices.

Box 2.1: Bangladesh – CBM Inclusion Matters: Making Differences
Shared Leadership Established in DRR Program at Horipur, Gaibandha, Bangladesh

On August 29 2017, at around 11:00 am, hundreds of flood-affected people, mostly women and older men, were gathering around a village home yard, just on the bank of the river Tista. Another hundred were seen on their way there. They were gathering to collect referral tokens and complete biometric registration for emergency relief support from an INGO. Surprisingly, the gathering place in question was not the residence of any influential local politician. Instead, people gathered in front of the house of Badsha Miah’s, who is jointly coordinating the emergency response with local Union Parishad Member. Badsha Miah is a wheelchair user, and leader of a Self Help Group (SHG) and their local network body.

During the August 2017 flooding across Horipur, SHG members were highly visible and proactive. They volunteered in early warning, rescue operation, and beneficiary selection for emergency response. In recent years, persons with disabilities have begun to be seen not only as beneficiaries, but as key stakeholders, actors, and contributors in DRR and emergency responses program. SHG leaders have been demonstrating exactly this kind of leadership, management capacity, and knowledge-based decision making, in addressing issues related to the pre, mid, and post-flood situation. SHG is making changes, showcasing the benefits of inclusion, and contributing to societal transformation. Their vibrant presence and organized efforts in emergency have earned recognition at local level, and the SHG members are highly praised for their contribution in building resilience.

The involvement of persons with disabilities in emergency preparedness will hopefully assist in eroding barriers to their contribution in emergency response. Several countries have developed clear preparedness plans that are reviewed and drilled regularly. This is an area where great progress has been made in including persons with disabilities, as it is more widely recognized that it helps emergency services personnel to understand and plan for the needs of persons with disabilities if they are involved in such drills. However, too often persons with disabilities are invited to role-play disaster victims, rather than being included as part of the coordination cells to support inclusion not only in search and rescue, but also in all the humanitarian response cycle.
Box 2.12: Thailand\textsuperscript{52} - Thailand-Cambodia Joint and Combined Exercise on Humanitarian Assistance

Following CBM’s campaign to make disaster management exercises inclusive of persons with disabilities, the Royal Thai Armed Forces invited government bodies, the private sector, and civil society organizations including the Council of Persons with Disabilities Thailand, to join the Thailand-Cambodia Joint and Combined Exercise on Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief in 2012. The purpose of the exercise was to identify areas for improvement, enhance coordination between several stakeholders in Thailand, and strengthen the relationship between Thailand and Cambodia.

The Council of Persons with Disabilities participated in this exercise for the first time, and nine representatives with disabilities inspired the training participants to move their practices to inclusive disaster management. One representative worked as a liaison officer to support the Commanding Post Unit; the others were acting with other civilians as disaster victims in storm surges, tsunamis, landslides, and collapsed buildings.

For those who have committed to disability inclusion, one challenge can be ensuring representation of a cross-disability perspective, and avoiding limiting disability inclusion to only those with the most visible disabilities. Some sectors have developed guidance on including persons with disabilities in emergency preparedness, response and reconstruction.\textsuperscript{53} However, even these efforts must also consider dissemination strategies, and face the challenge of competing agendas between crosscutting issues (e.g. gender, ethnic minorities, older persons, etc.) which need to be addressed simultaneously.

In some cases, inclusion may not always be the default option that persons with disabilities will necessarily choose. For example, in Haiti after the earthquake, some persons with hearing disabilities pushed for segregated camps as the only solution to ensure information flow, secure access to relief goods, and provision of an environment in which they could mentally recover from such a traumatic event. Similarly, in Nepal following the earthquake, a camp for persons with disabilities was set up by the independent living center. The goal of this initiative was to create an accessible camp, and one where especially women with disabilities in particular felt safe and protected from abuses, and could access facilities and goods with dignity.

Those two examples demonstrate how emergency settlements that are not accessible (either with respect to physical, social, information, or communication accessibility, etc.) can lead persons with disabilities to exclude themselves from mainstream relief. It is not difficult or costly to have accessible latrines and bath areas in a camp that are safe for everyone, and not fulfilling that need poses important

\textsuperscript{52}https://www.cbm.org/article/downloads/54741/Disability_Inclusive_Disaster_Risk_Management.pdf
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risks of abuse, including gender based violence for women and girls with disabilities. Often, distribution of relief goods is organized via a central location where people must register and potentially queue for extended periods of time, only to have to then carry back heavy bags of goods. Especially in the initial stages of an emergency, response mechanisms are not typically in place to facilitate organized distribution. In such ‘first come, first served’ scenarios, persons with disabilities, older persons, and others are frequently left behind and unable to access critical supplies. When all disaster-affected people are struggling to fulfil their basic needs, and relief workers are challenged to respond, existing negative societal attitudes towards persons with disabilities can be manifested in both conscious and unconscious bias, resulting in discrimination and exclusion. Addressing these types of issues through disability inclusion in emergency preparedness and response, will help ensure not only greater resilience, but also greater efficacy of the overall response.

Mindful of Priorities 2 and 3, and the need to develop and strengthen resilient communities, reconstruction plans should ideally include accessibility. However, initiatives in this respect remain isolated, as universal design and accessibility are not typically included as criteria for approval/clearance of reconstruction plan and designs. Often, reconstruction designs and plans are developed post-disaster with great urgency, and usually with very little consultation with community members, and certainly not with persons with disabilities. Even where specific attention is given to a household with a disabled person, in order to adjust the design to the household’s needs, such focused interventions are rare. Moreover, such an approach only encompasses accessibility of the house, and not the wider societal context in which the person lives, including consideration of access to education, health, livelihoods, rehabilitation or other disability-related support services, friends, family, and wider social support networks, etc. Although an admirable start, such restrictive approaches fall short of achieving the vision of “building back better.”

**Box 2.13: Denmark – Safe and accessible to all building**

Disabled People’s Organizations Denmark have taken the challenge to construct a building that included accessible and universal design perspectives right from the start. The building was built in alliance with leading experts in construction and user-centered design. In this building everyone can actively participate in work and social life, regardless of type of disability.

The overall objective was to create an office building without barriers for people with disabilities, so that everyone can feel welcome. The vision therefore demanded an inclusive approach to all types of disability. Before even laying the first brick, it was important to have a thorough user involvement process, so that all demands and wishes could be balanced in the actual building process. The core accessibility challenges were addressed early in the process, partly because to do so was more cost-effective, but also because the quality of the solutions are higher when they are a part of the design strategy from the beginning. This building aims to show that it is possible to make universal solutions that are both beautiful and practical.
Aspects like lights, venting, navigation, lifts, handles, toilets, meeting rooms, emergency evacuation - and many more, have been thoroughly examined in order to be fully accessible and inclusive. The fire evacuation strategy takes into consideration needs for safe evacuation of everyone. It includes 3 fire resistant safe zones, and the possibility to use lifts, even in case of fire, which is particularly important for the safety of people using wheelchairs or with mobility limitations.

Today the office building is home to approximately 20 different organizations of persons with disabilities, as well as the umbrella organization of Disabled People’s Organization Denmark. It should be noted that the building is not only fully accessible and inclusive, but it is also safe and resilient.

Disasters often create more barriers to inclusion of persons with disabilities, making them even more invisible in society. With appropriate preparation though, emergency preparedness and response can contribute to making even the most marginalized group visible. For example, contingency plans and stockpiling of goods can readily include specific disability-related actions or items. For instance, persons with disabilities are often separated from their assistive devices, are unable to access important medicines, or require power to charge their assistive device(s) such as wheelchairs, ventilators, or augmented communication devices. A disability-inclusive contingency plan would include power provision for persons with disabilities, and stockpiling initiatives could include assistive devices that could then be distributed as relief items. Furthermore, the recovery and reconstruction phase should ensure the restoration of disability-specific services at a minimum, and ideally also ensure the improvement of access to such services. For example, improvements could include better physical accessibility of services, better transportation infrastructure to reach services, or developing community-based services that promote inclusion in all sectors, including rehabilitation, psychosocial and mental health, education, health, livelihoods, etc.

Box 2.14: Ethiopia - Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative

Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative is an Ethiopian indigenous development organization active in Teltele in Borana district. Together with Intermon Oxfam, they worked on inclusive food security and early recovery during the drought crisis. Key components of this work were to: improve access to drinking water through rehabilitating ponds or digging new ponds; improve the livestock for the poorest and more vulnerable households; and provide drought resistant seeds for farmers.

It proved less difficult than expected to include persons with disabilities during the targeting process with the community. Village leaders and local authorities agreed on including persons with disabilities as a priority group for cash-for-work activities, as well as for receiving livestock. Throughout the project, persons with disabilities participated side-by-side with their neighbors in digging ponds and rehabilitating roads, and many of them could re-stock with goats. The people that could not physically carry out these rather heavy jobs could complete other tasks, or one of their family members could work instead.
These activities have contributed to improving the communities’ resilience to drought and food insecurity. Recovery mechanisms are in place, and persons with disabilities are now not only more visible, but are also active members of community water management committees, and are looking for possibilities to set up cooperatives.
Part 3 – Recommendations

The following recommendations address specific lines of effort that could be undertaken to improve the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the World Bank and GFDRR’s DRM investments. The recommendations respond to the prevailing international policy frameworks, particularly the Sendai Framework priorities, and are informed by current gaps in practice, as well as challenges experienced by persons with disabilities and countries seeking to implement disability-inclusive DRM. In many cases, the recommendations reflect ‘force multipliers,’ which have the potential to expand the positive impacts of existing lines of effort, ensuring that persons with disabilities can benefit from DRM interventions on an equal basis with others.\(^{54}\) Where recommendations implicate new lines of effort, positive systemic outcomes from those interventions have the potential to not only benefit persons with disabilities, but also the wider communities in which they live. For each recommendation and where relevant, an indication is provided regarding which of the Sendai Framework priorities would be particularly impacted by implementation of the recommendation. It is notable that a number of the recommendations have the potential to meaningfully bolster effective implementation across multiple Sendai priorities at once.

The recommendations are divided into three sections:

- Recommendations regarding entry points in GFDRR thematic areas of engagement
- Recommendations regarding entry points in World Bank processes
- Recommendations for how the internal capacity of the World Bank and GFDRR could be enhanced to facilitate more robust and effective engagement in disability-inclusive DRM

3.1. Entry points in GFDRR thematic areas of engagement

The following recommendations relate to the GFDRR in its capacity as a mechanism that provides knowledge, funding, and technical assistance, to support DRM projects worldwide. The recommendations are organized around, and are intended to be responsive to, the thematic areas of engagement identified in the GFDRR Strategy 2018-2021.\(^{55}\)

3.1.1. Promoting open access to risk information

In assisting communities to map their exposure to disasters, GFDRR mapping activities should:

---


• **Empower and include persons with disabilities and DPOs in mapping activities** – drawing on the unique knowledge and perspective of persons with disabilities should facilitate a greater awareness of risks that may have unique or disproportionate impacts on persons with disabilities and their families, including risk factors such as: inaccessible housing, inaccessible transportation, limited evacuation options, lack of access to community based rehabilitation services, lack of access to mobility or other assistive devices, etc. Participants with disabilities may benefit from capacity-building in order to facilitate their participation in such activities on an equal basis with other stakeholders.

• **Ensure that all tools and methods for collecting analyzing and disseminating risk information are accessible** – such accessibility will be essential if persons with disabilities are to be able to effectively participate in information mapping, or to fully utilize disaster risk information that has been made available.

• **Consider collaboration with the Washington Group on Disability Statistics**[^56] – could offer the possibility of a strategic partnership through which existing data collection tools (such as the Group’s short set of questions), or future tools yet to be developed, could be utilized to address disability data-related needs in the risk information context.

  ○ Sendai priority impacted – 1

3.1.2. **Promoting resilient infrastructure**

In providing technical assistance to governments to improve the design, operations and maintenance, and contingency planning of new and rehabilitated infrastructure, the GFDRR should:

• **Assist countries in the adoption and effective implementation of accessibility standards** – in addition to promoting infrastructure that is resilient to relevant natural hazards, GFDRR should assist countries in adopting and effectively implementing accessibility standards, so that housing, transportation, schools, health care, drinking water, sanitation, telecommunications, etc. are also accessible to persons with disabilities, and increase their and their community’s resilience. Such accessibility should entail not only physical accessibility, but also information and communication accessibility, and should address the accessibility needs of persons with a range of different types of disabilities.

• **Engage DPOs in identifying critical infrastructure** – especially in contexts where existing infrastructure is old and in need of retrofitting in order to ensure accessibility, it may be necessary to identify which infrastructure is of critical relevance for the disability community. Persons with disabilities and DPOs should be actively consulted in such assessments, so that investments will be maximally beneficial to the disability community.

• **Include disability in the “making school infrastructure safe” initiative** – as the GFDRR works to ensure that schools and classrooms are built safer, not only should accessibility

[^56]: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/washington_group/index.htm
standards be integrated into such activities, but consideration should also be given to both inclusive and disability-focused schools. Although the CRPD has catalyzed an international shift towards inclusive education, segregated and sometimes residential schools for students with disabilities still remain, and it is essential that these students have access to resilient school infrastructure as well.

- **Consider strategic partnerships to address accessibility standards** – a number of international organizations and NGOs exist that have deep expertise on the subject of accessibility standards, and in some cases promulgate such standards. Working collaboratively with institutions such as the International Organization for Standardization, the International Telecommunication Union, the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), the Global Alliance on Accessible Technologies & Environments, the Global Initiative for Inclusive ICTs (G3ict), and those with expertise in accessible architecture and construction, could facilitate knowledge sharing and enhanced capacity of countries to effectively implement accessibility standards.

  - Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 3, 4

3.1.3. **Scaling up the resilience of cities**

Including persons with disabilities and disability concepts (such as accessibility) in the program on urban resilience will be essential if urban development practices are to change in a way that enhances resilience and reduces risk for all, including persons with disabilities. In this respect, it will be important for GFDRR to:

- **Engage DPOs** – in the piloting, monitoring, and evaluation of resilient cities projects. Where possible, disability disaggregated data and accessibility audits should be taken into account in decision-making processes to determine what urban resilience investments and policy changes should be made.

- **Consider accessibility in resilient city construction and/or policy reforms** – as referenced above with respect to resilient infrastructure, urban resilience should encompass aspects of physical and information/communication accessibility, for the benefit of persons with a wide variety of disabilities and others.

  - Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 3, 4

3.1.4. **Strengthening hydromet services and early warning systems**

In offering technical expertise and capacity building to governments to benefit people – especially people in low income and small island states – GFDRR should:

- **Encourage and promote the use of accessible early warning and weather forecast systems** – for investments in hydro-meteorological and early warning systems to be maximally effective, they should aim to ensure provision of essential information to as large a number of people as possible, including persons with disabilities. Working with DPOs and accessibility experts to build accessibility into such systems should ensure that they are effective for persons
both with and without disabilities. This in turn should enhance the numbers of lives and assets saved in the advent of a natural hazard event. Where necessary, research should be undertaken to investigate new and innovative warning systems that can benefit all users.

○ Sendai priority impacted – 4

3.1.5. Deepening financial protection

In its work with governments to develop comprehensive financial protection strategies, including direct and indirect insurance programs, the GFDRR should:

• **Address the inclusion of persons with disabilities in financial protection schemes** – through collaboration with governments and DPOs, GFDRR could facilitate the enhanced inclusion of persons with disabilities in financial protection schemes, including through: identification of relevant qualifying criteria; promoting opportunities for persons with disabilities to contribute to social protection/poverty alleviation programs; and ensuring that government contingency funds for the scaling up of social protection schemes in times of emergency can include or target persons with disabilities as necessary.

• **Address the implementation of financial protection schemes to ensure access and inclusion of persons with disabilities** – beyond qualifying for such schemes, persons with disabilities often experience barriers in the form of inaccessible information about the schemes, inaccessible registration procedures, and/or inaccessible distribution mechanisms. GFDRR is well positioned to work with governments to address such barriers, so that persons with disabilities can benefit from financial protection programs on an equal basis with others.

• **Engage DPOs and employers** – in identifying activities in which persons with disabilities could participate as part of cash for work programs. Although some programs will exempt qualifying beneficiaries from the work requirement, many persons with disabilities would nevertheless like to be able to contribute by working. By working with DPOs and potential employers, income generating activities may be better identified, along with possible reasonable accommodations that would facilitate the participation of persons with disabilities.

• **Facilitate research** – on the (often hidden) costs of exclusion, to identify return on investment for social protection systems, risk financing, and contingency funds, to enhance understanding of the importance of including persons with disabilities in such mechanisms.

○ Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4

3.1.6. Deepening engagements in resilience to climate change

In supporting integration of resilience to climate change in its program, GFDRR’s activities in this area would be strengthened by:

• **Ensuring that persons with disabilities and DPOs are included as contributing stakeholders** – persons with disabilities and DPOs have relevant knowledge to contribute to
assessments of the climate change resilience of investments. Efforts should therefore be undertaken to ensure that the disability community is aware of such activities and consulted to facilitate their inputs.

- **Ensuring that small island initiatives are disability-inclusive** – the greater exposure of small island nations to hydro-meteorological events and sea level rise, means that small island initiatives are necessarily an important component of GFDRR’s engagement on this theme. The specific risk(s) of climate change to persons with disabilities, as well as the potential impacts of responsive measures to persons with disabilities, should be taken into account, to ensure that such measures at a minimum do no harm to persons with disabilities, and at best ensure benefits on an equal basis with others.
  - Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 3, 4

### 3.1.7. Building resilience at community level

Working through its Inclusive Community Resilience (ICR) Initiative, GFDRR has the opportunity to:

- **Ensure that lessons learned documentation includes disability-inclusive scalable DRM models** – existing promising practices should be assessed for disability-inclusive DRM elements, identifying key components that could be incorporated, replicated, and scaled-up in community resilience programs. Where disability-inclusive DRM elements do not exist in particular practices, assessments should address what disability-inclusive components could have been undertaken, so that opportunities for disability inclusion in similar projects are not missed in the future.

- **Engage DPOs and DRM actors** – facilitating cross-sector learning, training, and capacity-building, will assist persons with disabilities in being able to better identify risks, barriers, and solutions, and DRR actors in working collaboratively with community members with disabilities to achieve disability-inclusive DRM solutions.
  - Sendai priority impacted – 3

### 3.1.8. Enabling resilient recovery

GFDRR will be drawing on its extensive experience in post-disaster recovery to help train government officials on post-disaster needs assessment and recovery planning, as well as strengthening its own standby response capacity to help coordinate and support post-disaster assistance. In these activities, it will be important for GFDRR to:

- **Ensure that damage and impact assessments encompass disability equities** – it will be important to actively engage persons with disabilities and DPOs to ensure that disability-related issues (e.g. access to assistive devices, rehabilitation services, accessible shelter and housing, accessible life sustaining supplies such as food and water, etc.) are addressed as part of the damage and impact assessments. To the extent that it is available, it will also be
important to gather (and promote the collection of) disability disaggregated data as part of these assessments.

- **Ensure that recovery plans are inclusive of persons with disabilities** – the recovery process offers an important opportunity to engage the input of persons with disabilities through consultation and dissemination of accessible information materials related to recovery planning. It also offers a critical opportunity to promote the long-term recovery and resilience of persons with disabilities, including through giving full effect to what it can mean to “build back better.” Issues of accessibility and universal design could readily be included alongside more traditional issues of seismic, flood, fire, and other construction safety considerations. In addition, the concept of “building back better” encompasses not only the restoration of physical infrastructure, but also incorporation of DRR measures into societal systems, and the revitalization of livelihoods, economies and the environment, with the intention of increasing the resilience of nations and communities. By addressing the full scope of “build back better,” measures need not be exclusive to physical infrastructure, but could also be expanded to encompass other community based supports, such as access to rehabilitation services, mental health supports, supported decision-making, independent living, and myriad other supports that promote the ability of persons with disabilities to assume/resume their place as fully included and actively contributing members of society.

  ○ Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4

### 3.2. Entry points in World Bank processes

The following recommendations relate to different components of the World Bank’s development work with client countries. Whilst implementation of these recommendations would be particularly important in enhancing the Bank’s work on disability-inclusive DRM, it should be noted that bolstering overall disability inclusion across a variety of thematic portfolios should assist in building the capacity and resilience of the disability community to withstand the impacts of natural hazards by raising them out of poverty.

#### 3.2.1. Country Strategy

The World Bank’s Country Partnership Framework (CPF), which is informed by the thorough analysis and stakeholder consultations reflected in the Systematic Country Diagnostic (SCD), guides the World Bank’s support to a member country. An analysis of current CPFs reveals none that reference disability in the context of DRR, and many reference persons with disabilities only sparingly if at all. This correlates with the relative lack of profile that persons with disabilities enjoy in the SCDs. Of SCDs completed in FY17, most have limited, if any, references to persons with disabilities, with many focusing only on disability within the social protection framework of a country. Other references tend to be rather medicalized, referencing people “suffering” from disabilities, and in some cases focusing on the societal “burden” of disability. Only the SCDs for Kosovo and Vietnam included more
developed information about the situation and context of persons with disabilities, including the type of marginalization and discrimination experienced. In order to ensure that the CPFs are disability-inclusive, the SCDs should be developed by:

- **Engaging the disability community, including DPOs, in meaningful, consultations that comply with accessibility guidelines.** Where public consultations will be held (either in-person or online), specific outreach should be made to persons with disabilities and their representative organizations, to ensure that they are aware of the opportunity to participate, as they may not have familiarity or prior experience with such World Bank activities.

- **Building in disability expertise into staff review processes.** Including staff with disability and social inclusion expertise (including staff with disabilities) into review processes, affords additional opportunities to enhance disability inclusion in the SCDs.

- **Countering data gaps.** Disability disaggregated data and statistics can be difficult to obtain, but this should not mean that disability cannot be meaningfully included in the SCDs. In addition to encouraging governments to collect such data, additional analytical work can be jointly developed through strategic partnerships with government entities, DPOs, academics, and others. Furthermore, some information need not be dependent upon the availability of statistics. For example, the Vietnam SCD addresses current government legal and policy initiatives to address the situation of persons with disabilities, as well as the conditions faced by disability advocacy groups that impacts their advocacy efficacy. Such information can help to provide a more nuanced framing of the situation and context of persons with disabilities in a country.

### 3.2.2. Financing

A variety of financing instruments are available to contribute to World Bank activities that promote disability-inclusive DRM, including:

**Investment Project Financing (IPF).** Disability-focused projects, as well as incorporation of disability into larger projects through subproject-level interventions, can have positive impacts on the ability of persons with disabilities to be resilient to, and recover from, natural hazards. As noted in Part 1 of the report, the existing Safeguards and the new Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) should facilitate the inclusion of disability as part of the social assessment, so that persons with disabilities are meaningfully consulted, and are protected from negative impacts and included in mitigation plans and actions. Where necessary, policies such as OP/BP 8.00 (discussed in Part 1) that may be utilized in the event of a natural hazard emergency, should be engaged in a way that creates or restructures IPF to be inclusive of the needs of persons with disabilities affected by that crisis or emergency. Examples of IPF projects that provide avenues for disability-inclusive DRM include but are not limited to:

- **Community empowerment and institutional development** – projects that support participatory decision-making and community empowerment have the potential to support
the active engagement and inclusion of persons with disabilities at the national, local, and village levels.

- Sendai priority impacted – 2

**Financing new construction, rehabilitation, and/or reconstruction** – projects financing construction in anticipation of, or in the aftermath of, a natural hazard event, offer the opportunity to ensure that accessibility standards are addressed. For example, construction of housing, medical facilities, municipal buildings, transportation infrastructure, schools and other assets relied upon before and after natural hazard events, offer opportunities to ensure the building of structures that are not only environmentally sustainable and resilient to natural hazards, but that are accessible to persons with disabilities. At present, some climate-resilient approaches (e.g. raising housing above potential flood waters) do not promote access for persons with disabilities, despite the two objectives not being mutually exclusive.

- Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4

**Financing development of accessible communications systems** – telecommunications infrastructure that is not only resilient to natural hazards but also accessible to persons with disabilities, can be utilized as part of hazard warning systems that can reach a larger number of people. Such systems can also be used to communicate with people as part of recovery efforts, in turn increasing the efficiency and efficacy of those efforts, including for persons with disabilities.

- Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4

**Disability inclusive and resilient social safety net mechanisms** – projects that assist in promoting the establishment of social safety net mechanisms that are accessible to and inclusive of persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others, can improve the resiliency of persons with disabilities, and also provide a ready mechanism for deployment of financial assistance in the aftermath of a natural hazard emergency. Such systems should take into account qualification, registration, and disbursement, so that all phases are accessible to persons with a variety of different disabilities.

- Sendai priorities impacted – 3, 4

**Development Policy Financing (DPF).** This can provide a mechanism through which to fund, for example, the strengthening of client country DRM policy through strengthening the institutional/legal framework for DRM, and/or integrating DRR into development planning and decision-making. In the formulation and implementation of such projects, task teams have the opportunity to promote and facilitate the inclusion of persons with disabilities and DPOs in related stakeholder consultations. Such consultations have the potential to ensure that the design of reforms, implementation processes, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are appropriately disability-inclusive.

- Sendai priorities impacted – 2, 3
**Program-for-Results Financing (PforR).** As the name suggests, PforR financing entails the tying of disbursement of aid to achievement of pre-agreed results. A relatively newer financial instrument (approved in 2012), it has not yet been widely used in the DRM context. However, it offers the opportunity to engage in a wide variety of DRM-related activities, e.g. scaling up capacity to engage in DRR activities, improving disaster risk financing and insurance for targeted populations, etc. In order to ensure that such projects are disability-inclusive, the projects could include persons with disabilities as targeted beneficiaries in the program results; and also ensure that the needs, challenges, and impacts on persons with disabilities are taken into account in the social and environmental assessments, as well as technical assessments.

- Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4

**Advisory Services and Analytics.** These can include technical assistance, reimbursable advisory services, and economic and sector work. Examples specific to GFDRR and its 2018-21 Strategy will be discussed below, but broadly illustrative examples of disability-inclusive DRM-related activities that could be undertaken by the World Bank include, for example:

- Utilizing the convening role of the World Bank to bring together persons with disabilities and DPOs with other DRM experts at conferences, seminars, and in accessible online discussions for knowledge-sharing and networking.

- Capacity-building activities with disability-inclusive DRM stakeholders, such as persons with disabilities and DPOs, government officials, DRM practitioners, and development practitioners.

- Advising countries on developing or adapting accessibility and universal design standards for e.g. hazard warning systems, accessible resilient housing, accessible transportation.

- Analytical work, such as desk reviews of country DRM policies and practices to assess degree of disability inclusion.

- Primary data collection, to determine, e.g. persons with disabilities being served by social safety net programs, and/or those unable to participate due to qualification, registration, or dissemination-related barriers.

- Connecting clients to information resources and international experts in the field of disability-inclusive DRM.

  - Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4

**3.3. Enhancing internal capacity**

The following recommendations relate to enhancing the World Bank’s and GFDRR’s internal capacity to address disability-inclusive DRM across their respective portfolios, so that staff are better equipped
to conceptualize disability-inclusive projects, engage with stakeholders, including the disability community, measure progress, and develop knowledge and share promising practices.

- **Enhancing Bank staff expertise** – although the development of a project is necessarily an iterative process involving multiple consultations with client country and other stakeholders (which should include persons with disabilities and DPOs), the earliest phases of project conception are typically internal to the Bank. As decisions made at these early phases will shape the parameters and scope of onwards project discussions, it is important that GFDRR and other Bank staff have the knowledge and awareness needed to address disability-inclusive DRM concepts right from the start. In addition to consultations with the World Bank’s Global Disability Advisor as appropriate, and ensuring that there is a corps of staff available for internal ‘just in time’ consultation (including staff with disabilities), guidance notes and other training, information, and professional development tools should be made available to guide staff in ensuring that DRM-related projects incorporate disability from the earliest phases onwards.
  - Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4

- **Monitoring and reporting on disability aspects across the DRM portfolio** – at present there is no way to readily identify DRM projects that are disability-inclusive, without undertaking an individualized analysis of each project or activity. Even where projects do have a tangible benefit for the disability community, failure to expressly reflect that in project documents may give the impression that persons with disabilities have not benefitted from project-related activities. Consequently, there is no way to benchmark the degree to which projects are disability-inclusive, nor measure the Bank’s and GFDRR’s progress over time in promoting disability-inclusive DRM, nor fully develop knowledge on this topic and promote information sharing of promising practices. In addition, for staff and stakeholders interested in learning from the experiences of prior projects to inform disability inclusion in current and future projects, there is no ready mechanism for them to identify and track relevant projects. GFDRR’s new system for screening gender as a cross-cutting theme in GFDRR funded projects offers a potential model for how disability could be similarly tracked, and goes beyond simply ‘tagging’ projects with a marker. Designating projects as being “disability informed,”

---

57 Under the existing Safeguards, assurance that a project ‘does no harm’ to a particular group or community may be sufficient, but under the new Environmental and Social Framework and its “Vision for Sustainable Development,” it will be important to show (at least for projects funded through Investment Project Financing) that the Bank’s “Vision for Sustainable Development” has been achieved, namely ensuring inclusion so that all people are empowered to participate in, and benefit from, the development process.

58 Consistent with the existing gender monitoring framework, operations would be considered “disability informed” if a disability analysis or disability impact was either taken into consideration during project design, or mentioned as an expected outcome.
and/or including “disability actions,”\textsuperscript{59} would greatly assist in identifying the degree to which disability inclusion is manifesting across the GFDRR portfolio. It is notable that international instruments, like the Dhaka Declaration,\textsuperscript{60} include concrete, action-oriented indicators against which to measure progress. The adoption of indicators to monitor and report on disability outcomes, to be embedded in GFDRR’s program logic and its monitoring and evaluation framework, would similarly assist in assessing progress, and identifying gaps where disability inclusion could be improved. Indicators could include, for example, targeted numbers of projects that are “disability informed” and/or include “disability actions.”

- **Communicating engagement on disability-inclusive DRM** – enhancing the World Bank’s and GFDRR’s public-facing information (including websites, policy statements, and publications) to more comprehensively discuss disability inclusion would greatly assist in educating client countries, other stakeholders (including the disability community), and the public at large about the Bank’s commitment to disability-inclusive DRM and how disability relates across GFDRR’s portfolio – including how disability intersects and interrelates with other historically marginalized groups and with GFDRR’s overall social inclusion agenda. Not only would this assist in reflecting the World Bank and GFDRR’s leadership on this issue, but it would also help to catalyze consultations and create synergies for information exchange and engagement with persons with disabilities and other stakeholders.

\begin{itemize}
\item Sendai priorities impacted – 1, 2, 3, 4
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{59} Consistent with the existing gender monitoring framework, operations would be considered to have “disability actions” when analyzed as being “disability informed” whilst additionally having specific components/activities that seek to minimized mentioned disability gaps relevant to the project’s development objective(s).

\textsuperscript{60} Dhaka Declaration on Disability and Disaster Risk Management, adopted at the Dhaka Conference on Disability and Disaster Risk Management, December 2015: http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/policies/v.php?id=47093
Annex 1 – Glossary

**Barrier.** Those aspects of society that intentionally or unintentionally exclude persons with disabilities from full participation and inclusion in society. Barriers can be physical, informational, legal, institutional, environmental, attitudinal, etc.

**Build back better.** The use of the recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction phases after a disaster to increase the resilience of nations and communities through integrating disaster risk reduction measures into the restoration of physical infrastructure and societal systems, and into the revitalization of livelihoods, economies and the environment.

**Built Environment.** That which is commissioned, designed, constructed and managed for use by people and which includes external and internal environments and any component, facility or product that is a fixed part of them.

**Capacity.** The combination of all the strengths, attributes and resources available within an organization, community or society to manage and reduce disaster risks and strengthen resilience. Capacity may include infrastructure, institutions, human knowledge and skills, and collective attributes such as social relationships, leadership and management.

**Disability.** An evolving concept, disability results from the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers that hinders their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.61 (This definition is consistent with the “social/cultural model” of disability, as distinct from the “medical/charity model” of disability.)

**Disabled People’s Organization (DPO).** A non-governmental organization managed and led by people with disabilities.

**Discrimination on the basis of disability.** Any distinction, exclusion or restriction on the basis of disability which has the purpose or effect of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal basis with others, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field. It includes all forms of discrimination, including denial of reasonable accommodation.

---

61 This glossary definition is drawn from the concepts addressed in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) preambular paragraph (e). Note though, that the CRPD itself does not include a definition of disability per se, respecting both the evolving nature of the concept, and the need for different definitions in different contexts.
**Disaster.** A serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society at and scale due to hazardous events interacting with conditions of exposure, vulnerability and capacity, leading to one or more of the following: human, material, economic and environmental losses and impacts.

**Disaster management.** The organization, planning and application of measures preparing for, responding to and recovering from disasters.

**Disaster risk.** The potential loss of life, injury, or destroyed or damaged assets which could occur to a system, society or a community in a specific period of time, determined probabilistically as a function of hazard, exposure, vulnerability and capacity.

**Disaster risk assessment.** A qualitative or quantitative approach to determine the nature and extent of disaster risk by analyzing potential hazards and evaluating existing conditions of exposure and vulnerability that together could harm people, property, services, livelihoods and the environment on which they depend.

**Disaster risk governance.** The system of institutions, mechanisms, policy and legal frameworks and other arrangements to guide, coordinate and oversee disaster risk reduction and related areas of policy.

**Disaster risk information.** Comprehensive information on all dimensions of disaster risk, including hazards, exposure, vulnerability and capacity, related to persons, communities, organizations and countries and their assets.

**Disaster Risk Management.** The application of disaster risk reduction policies and strategies to prevent new disaster risk, reduce existing disaster risk and manage residual risk, contributing to the strengthening of resilience and reduction of disaster losses.

**Disaster Risk Reduction.** Disaster risk reduction is aimed at preventing new and reducing existing disaster risk and managing residual risk, all of which contribute to strengthening resilience and therefore to the achievement of sustainable development.

**Early warning system.** An integrated system of hazard monitoring, forecasting and prediction, disaster risk assessment, communication and preparedness activities systems and processes that enables individuals, communities, governments, businesses and others to take timely action to reduce disaster risks in advance of hazardous events.

**Evacuation.** Moving people and assets temporarily to safer places before, during or after the occurrence of a hazardous event in order to protect them.

**Exposure.** The situation of people, infrastructure, housing, production capacities and other tangible assets located in hazard-prone areas.
**Hazard.** A process, phenomenon or human activity that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation. Hazards include (as mentioned in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, and listed in alphabetical order) biological, environmental, geological, hydrometeorological and technological processes and phenomena.

**Hazardous event.** The manifestation of a hazard in a particular place during a particular period of time.

**Impairment.** A concept that encompasses the full and diverse range of functional impairments, including physical, sensory, neurological, psychiatric and intellectual—all of which may be permanent, intermittent, temporary or perceived as impairment by society, but not necessarily by individuals.

**Investment Project Financing.** The provision of loans, credits, grants, or guarantees by the Bank from its resources or from trust funds financed by other donors and administered by the Bank, or a combination of these.

**Medical/charity model of disability.** Now considered outdated and disempowering, this conceptual framework for disability emphasizes the impairment and functioning of the person as the central issue and focuses on treatment, cure and charitable assistance as methodologies for improving the lives persons with disabilities.

**Mitigation.** The lessening or minimizing of the adverse impacts of a hazardous event.

**Multi-hazard.** Means (1) the selection of multiple major hazards that the country faces, and (2) the specific contexts where hazardous events may occur simultaneously, cascadingly or cumulatively over time, and taking into account the potential interrelated effects.

**National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction.** A generic term for national mechanisms for coordination and policy guidance on disaster risk reduction that are multisectoral and interdisciplinary in nature, with public, private and civil society participation involving all concerned entities within a country.

**Physical Accessibility.** A characteristic of the built environment, the quality of which is dependent on usability. That is, the means of access to, in and within the environment, which can be determined by measurement or other agreed means.

**Preparedness.** The knowledge and capacities developed by governments, response and recovery organizations, communities and individuals to effectively anticipate, respond to and recover from the impacts of likely, imminent or current disasters.
**Preparedness plan.** Establishes arrangements in advance to enable timely, effective and appropriate responses to specific potential hazardous events or emerging disaster situations that might threaten society or the environment.

**Prevention.** Activities and measures to avoid existing and new disaster risks.

**Reasonable Accommodation.** Necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

**Reconstruction.** The medium- and long-term rebuilding and sustainable restoration of resilient critical infrastructures, services, housing, facilities and livelihoods required for the full functioning of a community or a society affected by a disaster, aligning with the principles of sustainable development and “build back better,” to avoid or reduce future disaster risk.

**Recovery.** The restoring or improving of livelihoods and health, as well as economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets, systems and activities, of a disaster-affected community or society, aligning with the principles of sustainable development and “build back better,” to avoid or reduce future disaster risk.

**Rehabilitation.** (In the disaster recovery context.) The restoration of basic services and facilities for the functioning of a community or a society affected by a disaster.

**Rehabilitation.** (In the disability context.) Refers to the regaining of skills, abilities, or knowledge that may have been lost or compromised as a result of acquiring a disability or due to a change in one’s disability or circumstances. Rehabilitation can enable persons with disabilities to attain and maintain maximum independence, full physical, mental, social, and vocational ability, and full inclusion and participation in all aspects of life.

**Residual risk.** The disaster risk that remains in unmanaged form, even when effective disaster risk reduction measures are in place, and for which emergency response and recovery capacities must be maintained.

**Resilience.** The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management.
Response. Actions taken directly before, during or immediately after a disaster in order to save lives, reduce health impacts, ensure public safety and meet the basic subsistence needs of the people affected.

Risk. The combination of the probability of an event and its negative consequences.

Social/cultural model of disability. A rights-based approach to disability that understands disability as a social construct, not an inherent quality. In other words, "disability" is not something that people possess, nor is it inherent in a person or group; rather, it is the inability of society to recognize differences and remove barriers that inhibits the full inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities. The social model emphasizes the removal of societal barriers that exclude persons with disabilities, including environmental, institutional and attitudinal barriers.

Structural and non-structural measures. Structural measures are any physical construction to reduce or avoid possible impacts of hazards, or the application of engineering techniques or technology to achieve hazard resistance and resilience in structures or systems. Non-structural measures are measures not involving physical construction which use knowledge, practice or agreement to reduce disaster risks and impacts, in particular through policies and laws, public awareness raising, training and education.

Underlying disaster risk drivers. Processes or conditions, often development-related, that influence the level of disaster risk by increasing levels of exposure and vulnerability or reducing capacity.

Universal Design. The design of products, environments, programs and services to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.

Vulnerability. The conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes which increase the susceptibility of an individual, a community, assets or systems to the impacts of hazards.
Annex 2 – Additional Resources

Promising practices


Policy documents

Global


Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Statements: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRPD/Pages/CRPDStatements.aspx

Statement on Disability inclusion in the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction and beyond (September 2014)

Statement of the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on disability inclusion for the World Humanitarian Summit (Adopted at the CRPD 14th Session (17 August-4 September 2015)

Statement by the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities-FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE-Securing inclusion of persons with disabilities in the New Urban Agenda-Habitat III-Third United Nations conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development


Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, 2015-2030, endorsed by the UN General Assembly following the 2015 Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, Sendai- Japan: http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/sendai-framework


Regional

Regional Platform and DRR strategies list and statements : http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/regional/platform/

National
National platforms for Disaster Risk reduction : http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/national-platforms


Other
Inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction; Policy Paper, Handicap International. (2017). Technical Cell : can be obtained at: publications@handicap-international.org


Research/Articles


Disability and Disaster Risk Reduction: Data collection using Washington Group Questions. Research finding infographic. ASB: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6uqTsGZbocFUFFySU1laFc3UzA/view

Natural Hazards, Human Vulnerability and Disabling Societies: A Disaster for Disabled People?


Reports/Publications


Implementing the Sendai framework to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. (2016). UNISDR: https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/50438


“Shock Waves: Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty,” (2016); “Hallogeatte, Stephane; Bangalore, Mook; Bonzangio, Laura; Kay, Marianne; Kane, Tamaro; Narloch, Ulf; Rozenberg, Julie; Treguer, David; Vogt-Schilb, Adrien, Climate change and development, Washington D.C; World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/22787


Standards and guidelines
Checklist for inclusive DRR plans. ASB / FECONORI (member of RIADIS) / CORDES (member of HelpAge) / ONG Inclusiva: https://goo.gl/Gkqcpz.


GIF for inclusive language. ASB / FECONORI (member of RIADIS) / CORDES: https://goo.gl/PvyUk6


Guide to raise awareness and train communities on inclusion of persons with disabilities in DRR (Spanish ASB, Disability Cabinet of Nicaragua and FECONORI (Federation of Associations of Persons with Disabilities in Nicaragua)): http://bit.ly/2y26XqK


Draft for Discussion


Training /tools


Inclusive DRR toolkit and training. Inclusive Community Resilience for Sustainable Disaster Risk Management (incrisd): www.incrisd.org


Video
The video showcase barriers faced by persons with disabilities in times of disasters
Earthquake evacuation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1GKEhVcAIIE
Fire evacuation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jWOAheL3LGw

Testimony showing positive and meaningful participation and contribution of persons with disabilities in DRR:
My story: Kazol : https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4XKFrRlYd_e
**Relevant Websites**

Disaster Risk Reduction’s Disability Stakeholder Group: http://www.preventionweb.net/organizations/17064/profile


Feeling Safe Being Safe: http://www.dds.ca.gov/ConsumerCorner/EmergencyPreparedness.cfm (For more information about the process used to develop the materials, see: http://brecenter.org/lib/lib_pdf/SP_IN_FSBS_Story.pdf)

Habitat III: http://habitat3.org/

Sustainable Development Goals: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300

The Center for Universal Design website at: http://www.design.ncsu.edu/cud/newweb/about_ud/udprinciples.htm


World Humanitarian Summit: http://agendaforhumanity.org/