



Review of Disability-inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction Policy and Practice across Europe and Central Asia

November 2021

Table of contents

Table of contents	2
Executive summary	3
Introduction	5
Background	5
Methodology	6
1.1. Approach.....	6
1.2. Issues and limitations	10
Findings	11
Key highlights	11
1.3. Policy.....	11
1.4. Practice.....	13
1.5. Summary of the key findings	13
Priority gaps	15
1. Lack of disability disaggregated data.....	16
2. Lack of representation, coordination and partnerships with 'representative' organizations of persons with disabilities.....	17
3. Lack of accessibility	18
4. Lack of expertise on disability-inclusive DRR	19
5. Lack of investments in disability-inclusive DRR	19
Recommendations.....	20
Annex 1. Good practice case studies.....	24
1. Armenia.....	24
1.1. Policy.....	24
1.2. Practice.....	24
2. Italy.....	26
2.1. Policy.....	26
2.2. Practice.....	27
3. Serbia	29
3.1. Policy.....	29
3.2. Practice.....	30
Annex 2. DiDRR online survey	32
Document credits	37

Executive summary

It is well documented that **persons with disabilities** are among those **most exposed to climate and disaster risk** and are rarely involved in emergency preparedness, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and related decision-making.

Europe and Central Asia are no exception, with COVID-19 as well as the July 2021 flooding and wildfires in Europe being one of the most recent examples of this.

In preparation for the 2021 European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (EFDRR), the European Disability Forum (EDF) has worked on the **first-ever [review of disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction \(DiDRR\) policy and practice](#)** across countries of the Europe and Central Asia region.¹

The aim of the DiDRR review was primarily to provide a baseline of information for this region on the current state of disability inclusion in DRR-related policies and practices and to support consistency of reporting on disability inclusion in DRR across the rest of the regions of the world. The review may help inform the upcoming Mid-Term Review of the implementation of the [Sendai Framework](#) for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and EDF alternative report for the second review of the EU by the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

The DiDRR review has identified several European countries with positive examples² of disability-inclusive policies as well as a few practices of engaging Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (DPOs) in DRR-related decision-making. Some of these relationships are informal, and at least two countries³ have DPO representatives engaged formally as part of the working groups at national level for disaster management. However, based on the results identified through this review, these good practice

¹ Based on this review, EDF has developed a [DiDRR policy paper](#) and a [policy brief](#), which can be found at the EDF website: <https://www.edf-fehp.org/> along with the [quick reference guide on DiDRR for practitioners in Europe and Central Asia](#).

² Given that the findings had to be based mainly on the desk research and responses from the DPO representatives due to the very limited response rate received from the governments, the review does not exclude the possibility that there may be more positive examples of disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction in the region which are not mentioned here.

³ Italy and Serbia

examples tend to be ad hoc, rather than common practice, and are often the result of a dedicated action of individuals, rather than being established in official systems and coordination mechanisms for DRR.

The following key findings from the review point to an urgent need to accelerate action to reduce disaster and climate related risks and their disproportionate impact on persons with disabilities:

- ❖ The DiDRR review has found **no example of systematic data disaggregation** by gender, age and disability in national information systems related to disaster risk reduction and recovery.
- ❖ Only **five⁴ out of 55** countries in Europe and Central Asia have demonstrated attempts in **developing disability-inclusive DRR policies** in line with the Sendai Framework.
- ❖ Only **six countries⁵** across the region have **prioritized protection and safety of persons with disabilities** in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies by having included reference to [Article 11](#) of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in national policies, strategies and action plans related to disability.
- ❖ Only **one country⁶** in the region commits to **allocation of state budget for disability inclusive civil protection** measures, which indicates to a major gap in national investments and efforts for inclusive DRR.
- ❖ The review has found practically **no reference to disability** in country-specific **policies and plans** related to **climate change adaptation**.
- ❖ **Rights-based approaches** are largely **missing** from policy and practice, and persons with disabilities continue to be seen as **'vulnerable groups'** rather than as key stakeholders and contributors to disaster risk reduction.

The following sections of the review highlight the major gaps and good practices that have been identified in relation to disability-inclusive DRR

⁴ Armenia, Georgia, Italy, Serbia and Tajikistan

⁵ Armenia, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Spain and UK

⁶ Croatia

policy and practice in 55 member states of the EFDRR and provide recommendations to support key stakeholders improve in this area.

Introduction

Background

Persons with disabilities make up at least 15% of the global population⁷, yet continue to be among those **most impacted by disasters**⁸ and **more likely to be excluded from** emergency preparedness, disaster risk reduction (**DRR**) and related **decision-making** processes.⁹

Research also shows that the **mortality rate** among persons with disabilities tends to be **two to four times higher** than that of the rest of the population, as demonstrated during the 2011 Japan earthquake and tsunami, and hurricane Katrina in the USA.¹⁰

This is true for Europe and Central Asia as well, as evidenced from the COVID-19 pandemic and recent disasters. For instance, UK statistics from early 2021 already show that **persons with disabilities accounted for six in 10 COVID-19 related deaths**¹¹, the fact strongly corroborated by evidence of discrimination from across the continent. Similar trends are observed in other crisis situations, including [flooding](#), [extreme weather related incidents and wildfires](#).

In humanitarian contexts, women and girls with disabilities are particularly at risk of exploitation and violence, including gender-based violence (GBV) and sexual abuse. They will also experience more barriers accessing support and services. In addition, women and girls with disabilities and their representative organizations are often not consulted during policy-making and management.

All **55 member states** of the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (EFDRR) have **agreed to the Sendai Framework**, which

⁷ [World Report on Disability](#). WHO and World Bank (2011)

⁸ [IASC Guidelines on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action](#) (2019)

⁹ Twigg, J. Kett, M. Lovell, E. [Disability inclusion and disaster risk reduction: Overcoming barriers to progress](#) (2018)

¹⁰ [Panel Discussion](#) on Disaster resilience and disability: ensuring equality and inclusion. ECOSOC Chamber, UN (2013) (accessed on 27 October 2021)

¹¹ [European Human Rights Report](#). Impact of COVID-19 on persons with disabilities. European Disability Forum (2021)

clearly emphasizes the **importance of inclusion** in disaster risk reduction, specifically highlighting the need for empowerment, leadership, and meaningful participation of persons with disabilities in DRR policy-making and practice as well as the importance of collecting disability disaggregated data. These countries have also formally agreed on the steps required for the Sendai Framework to be effective, which is reflected in implementation plans at various levels of governance across the region, and most recently, in the endorsement at the 2021 European Forum for DRR of the 2021-2030 EFDRR Roadmap for Europe and Central Asia.

Alongside the Sendai Framework, the [Sustainable Development Goals](#) (SDGs) are underpinned by the concept of 'leave no one behind', but perhaps most importantly, the majority¹² of the countries in the EFDRR zone have **ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities**. This means that they are **obliged to ensure** that all persons with disabilities are **fully included** and **meaningfully participate** through their representative organizations, in all activities that impact them. This is especially relevant for climate action and disaster risk reduction since persons with disabilities are repeatedly shown to be those most affected by natural hazards and climate change induced disasters.

Despite these developments, the EDF review of the DRR-related policies and strategic documents across the 55 countries of Europe and Central Asia has found a rather **limited progress** on the **implementation of the Sendai Framework at national level** from the disability inclusion lens, whereas there was **no data available pertinent to the local level** in this regard.

Methodology

1.1. Approach

The methodology of the review entailed a **three-phased approach** applying a combination of the **desk review** of DRR and disability related

¹² All 55 member states of the EFDRR have either signed and ratified the CRPD or accessed it except Liechtenstein (signed on 8 September 2020 but not ratified) and Tajikistan (signed on 22 March 2018 but not ratified). Source: https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-15&chapter=4&clang=en#4 (accessed on 8 November 2021)

laws, policies, strategies and action plans; an **online survey** and **key informant interviews**.

Phase 1: Desk review

The first phase involved a desk review of policy-level commitments to disability inclusion in DRR in 55 member states of the EFDRR across Europe and Central Asia. The objective of the desk review was to identify countries that make a reference to disability in their regulatory frameworks related to disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, civil protection and crisis management, and to analyze the approaches taken to disability inclusion.

The review looked specifically at the laws, policies, strategies and plans developed since 2005 taking the adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action as a cut-off point.

At the same time, disability related laws and strategic frameworks of the 55 countries were reviewed to understand the extent to which the countries consider the Article 11 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) related to “ensuring the protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk, including situations of armed conflict, humanitarian emergencies and the occurrence of natural disasters”.

In total the review looked at **over 650 documents** that were available in English and Russian languages by having consulted the following sources:

1. [Progress tracker](#) on inclusive DRR policies (Women’s resilience to disasters knowledge hub by UN Women)
2. Regional and national policies and plans on disaster risk, climate adaptation and resilience available at [PreventionWeb](#)
3. Most recent official statements made by the Government delegations at the [Global Platform 2019](#)
4. The [National Disaster Management Systems](#) of the Member States under the EU Civil Protection Mechanism
5. [CLIMATEWATCH](#) - data on countries’ climate progress

6. [Disability Strategies and Action Plans](#) by Country/Area (compilation by UN DESA)
7. Country-specific information related to the [reporting to the CRPD Committee](#)
8. EDF's [country factsheets](#) mapping disability inclusiveness of European Member States' development and humanitarian aid

In cases where limited to no information was found in the above sources, additional online search was conducted to identify specific country policies and strategic frameworks related to disability, DRR, CCA, civil protection and crisis management.

Phase 2: Online survey

Based on the desk review, the following 22 countries were identified for inclusion in the second phase of the review – an online survey.

- 1) First category – countries with multiple reference to disability in DRR, CCA, civil protection and/or crisis management related policies:

1. Armenia
2. Croatia
3. Czech Republic
4. Georgia
5. Italy
6. Serbia
7. Tajikistan
8. The European Commission (EU Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid)

- 2) Second category – countries with limited reference to disability i.e. not in line with the rights-based approaches in DRR, CCA, civil protection and/or crisis management related policies:

1. Bulgaria
2. Cyprus
3. Denmark
4. Greece
5. Ireland
6. Norway
7. Turkey

8. UK
9. Uzbekistan

The assessment of the rights-based approaches was made based on the following key inclusion criteria developed as per the Sendai Framework:

- **Disaggregated Data**
- **Accessibility** (Universal design and reasonable accommodation) of the physical environment, risk information, communication and services
- **Meaningful participation** of persons with disabilities through their representative organizations in disaster risk reduction policy and practice
- **Leadership** of persons with disabilities, including women with disabilities and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities
- **Investments** in disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction

3) Third category – countries with no reference to disability in DRR, CCA, civil protection and/or crisis management related policies. However, these countries have made commitments at global level and are funding disability-inclusive humanitarian action:

1. Finland
2. Germany
3. Montenegro
4. The Netherlands
5. Spain

The representatives of the government (National Sendai Focal Points) and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities from the above 22 countries were invited to participate in the online survey. These representatives were identified by the European Disability Forum among its members and networks in the region as well as by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR).

The objectives of the online survey were to understand the progress of the implementation of the national commitments to disability inclusion in line with the Sendai Framework, and to identify gaps and good practices in this regard.

For questions included in the online survey, refer to **Annex 2** at the end of the document.

Phase 3: Key informant interviews

The third phase of the review entailed remote key informant interviews with the stakeholders – government and DPO representatives – who responded positively to the online survey and the request to participate in the interviews.

In total nine responses were received:

1. Armenia (DPO representative)
2. Georgia (government representative)
3. Ireland (person with disability)
4. Montenegro (DPO representative)
5. The Netherlands (DPO representative)
6. Norway (government representative)
7. Serbia (DPO representative)
8. UK (DPO representative)
9. EC (EU Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid)

Following the interviews, additional resources were collected from the representatives of the countries with identified good practices in disability-inclusive DRR¹³ based on which country good practice case studies were developed. For the case studies refer to **Annex 1** at the end of this document.

1.2. Issues and limitations

During the review the following issues and limitations were encountered that should be kept in mind when considering the findings and recommendations.

- **Language** – due to the time and resource constraints, the desk review included only the documents available in English and Russian. Therefore, the review might have missed important information available in other languages.
- **Limited response rate** – due to the very limited response rate from the National Sendai Focal Points, the findings of the review are based primarily on the desk research as well as on the feedback received from the Organizations of Persons with Disabilities. Therefore, the review does not exclude the possibility that there

¹³ Armenia, Italy and Serbia

may be other positive examples of disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction in the region which are not included here.

- **Technical errors** – number of policies and plans related to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation were inaccessible due to the technical errors on the websites visited.
- **Standalone DRR strategies vs. DRR mainstreaming** – due to the time and resource limitations, the scope of the review could not include sectoral policies and strategies where DRR might have been mainstreamed (i.e. education, health and other sectoral policies, regional development plans, etc.). Instead, the review assumed that countries have either standalone DRR strategies or that DRR is part of the disaster management or civil protection related policy and regulatory frameworks.
- **Lack of available and/or reliable data** – the review was further limited due to the lack of openly available country-specific data related to the national progress reporting on the implementation of the Sendai Framework. There was also practically no data found related to the implementation of the Sendai Framework at local level. The data gaps in the Sendai Framework Monitor also made it difficult to assess how countries are addressing data disaggregation as part of their disaster management information systems.

Findings

Key highlights

1.3. Policy

The review of the national policies, strategies and plans related to disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, civil protection and crisis management across the 55 countries of Europe and Central Asia has found a rather limited progress on the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (specifically Target E) from the disability inclusion lens.

For instance, **only 5 out of the 55** countries in Europe and Central Asia have demonstrated attempts in aligning their policies with the Sendai

Framework in terms of disability inclusion by incorporating clear provisions on:

- **Participatory decision-making** and **active involvement** of persons with disabilities in **disaster risk management policy-making** and **implementation** (Armenia, Georgia);
- **Accessibility of measures** and activities **to reduce the risk** of disasters to persons with disabilities (Serbia);
- **Right to be informed** about disaster risks, including **provision of risk information in accessible** and easy to understand form and **formats** (Serbia);
- **Prioritizing evacuation** of persons with disabilities in emergencies (Italy, Serbia);
- Creation of **protocols** on different situations of **emergency response** for persons with disabilities (Serbia);
- Creation of database and inclusion of sex, age and disability **disaggregated data** in vulnerability and risk **assessments** (Tajikistan); and
- Empowering women and persons with disabilities to **publicly lead** and **promote** gender equality and **universally accessible response** (Serbia).

In addition, a group of seven countries has been identified that make a limited reference to disability by categorizing persons with disabilities as '**vulnerable groups**' (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Ireland, Norway, Turkey and UK).

The review has also attempted to analyze the status of the development of inclusive disaster risk reduction strategies at **local level**, however the information was practically unavailable in this regard, with only one country identified having adopted regional guidelines for effective inclusion of persons with disabilities in emergency planning at the municipal level (Italy).

At the same time, the review has looked at the **disability related policies** across the region and has found reference to the Article 11 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in **six countries** (Armenia, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Spain and UK) as well as at the European Commission level.

Particularly interesting is an example of Croatia, where the National Strategy for Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities

(2017 – 2020) includes an entire section on situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies with an action plan allocating the state budget as well as funds from local and regional government units for disability-inclusive civil protection measures.

The review has also come across several countries supporting disability inclusion as part of their humanitarian and development cooperation policies (Denmark, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Spain, UK as well as the European Commission), however, their focus seems to be limited to disability inclusive humanitarian action in comparison to inclusive preparedness and prevention.

1.4. Practice

During the review, several European countries have been identified with positive examples of disability-inclusive DRR. These include existence of inclusive policies and accessible crisis communication resulting from the successful lobbying campaigns of Organizations of Persons with Disabilities¹⁴ as well as a few practices of engaging ODPs in decision-making. Some of these relationships are informal, and at least two countries¹⁵ have DPO representatives engaged formally as part of the working groups at national level for disaster management. However, it is clear that these good practice examples tend to be ad hoc, rather than common practice, and are often the result of a dedicated action of individuals, rather than being established in official systems and coordination mechanisms for DRR.¹⁶ The review has also found cases, where DPOs have been particularly active in supporting and promoting disability inclusion in DRR through the development of specific tools and guidance for adoption by disaster management authorities.¹⁷ However, these attempts have not necessarily resulted in the positive uptake of the tools and guidance at the national level.

1.5. Summary of the key findings

The findings from the review of the DiDRR policy and practice in Europe and Central Asia point to an urgent need to accelerate action to reduce disaster and climate related risks and their disproportionate impact on persons with disabilities. This should be done through fast-tracked and

¹⁴ For example, in the Netherlands

¹⁵ Italy and Serbia

¹⁶ Due to the very limited response rate from the government representatives, the findings of the review had to be based primarily on the desk research as well as on the feedback from the DPOs.. Therefore, the review does not exclude the possibility that there may be other positive examples of disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction in the region which are not included here.

¹⁷ Montenegro

contextual implementation of the Sendai Framework, in adherence with its Guiding Principles and the roles and responsibilities of disability stakeholders specified, and in line with [Article 11](#) of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which obliges States to ensure the protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies.

Figure 1. Key findings from the DiDRR review in Europe and Central Asia

- The DiDRR review has found **no example of systematic data disaggregation** by gender, age and disability in national information systems related to disaster risk reduction and recovery. This is one of the main reasons for the disproportionate impact experienced by persons with disabilities in crisis situations, as without data, disaster risks cannot be fully understood and managed
- Only **five¹⁸ out of 55** countries in Europe and Central Asia have demonstrated attempts in **developing disability-inclusive DRR policies** in line with the Sendai Framework.
- Only **six countries¹⁹** across the region have **prioritized protection and safety of persons with disabilities** in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies by having included reference to the Article 11 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in national policies, strategies and action plans related to disability.
- Only **one country²⁰** in the region commits to **allocation of state budget for disability inclusive civil protection** measures, which indicates to a major gap in national investments and efforts for inclusive DRR.
- The review has found practically **no reference to disability** in country-specific **policies and plans** related to **climate change adaptation**.
- **Rights-based approaches** are largely **missing** from policy and practice, and persons with disabilities continue to be seen as **'vulnerable groups'** rather than as key stakeholders and contributors to disaster risk reduction.

¹⁸ Armenia, Georgia, Italy, Serbia and Tajikistan

¹⁹ Armenia, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Spain and UK

²⁰ Croatia

Priority gaps

The DiDRR review has identified the following **five priority gaps** resulting from the **lack of awareness** and **prioritization** of disability inclusion in disaster preparedness, response and recovery:

Figure 2. Priority gaps identified from the DiDRR review in Europe and Central Asia

1. Lack of disability disaggregated data
2. Lack of representation, coordination and partnerships with 'representative' organizations of persons with disabilities
3. Lack of accessibility of crisis communication, risk information, critical infrastructure and services
4. Lack of expertise on disability-inclusive DRR
5. Lack of investments in disability-inclusive DRR

Despite the evolution of the human rights-based approach to disability as part of the global legal and policy frameworks, persons with disabilities **continue to be seen as 'vulnerable'** in the face of disasters rather than as key stakeholders and contributors to climate action, disaster risk reduction and recovery. For instance, of the 12 countries²¹ in the region identified through this review as referring to disability in their DRR-related policies and strategic frameworks, seven²² of these categorize persons with disabilities as 'vulnerable groups' and as recipients rather than being contributing stakeholders in DRR.

Lack of awareness also leads to **disability inclusion** being **overlooked in policy and practice**. For example, the limited response rate with only three governments reacting to the online survey administered as part of the DiDRR review could also be an indication of the **lack of prioritization** of disability inclusion in DRR across the region. Moreover, the recent events, including COVID-19 and the July 2021 [flooding](#) in Europe, have revealed that persons with disabilities are often overlooked in preparedness and contingency planning and miss out on the humanitarian response. In [this 2021 example from Germany](#), persons with disabilities lost their lives as they were not evacuated on time following a heavy rainfall.

²¹ Armenia, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Georgia, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkey and UK

²² Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Ireland, Norway, Turkey and UK

There is also a **misconception** that disability is a **'technical' concern** and should be dealt with only by disability-specific organizations. This is one of the major obstacles in mainstreaming disability in disaster risk reduction.²³

The review has further identified the following priority gaps:

1. Lack of disability disaggregated data

The establishment of an evidence base to inform risk-sensitive decision making is a necessary pre-condition for understanding disaster risk. This directly relates to the implementation of the Sendai Framework Priority 1 and is also closely linked with the overarching principle of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – “leave no one behind” – which calls for more granular and disaggregated data than currently available in most countries, in order to inform the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) monitoring process. Without credible and comprehensive disability disaggregated data, disaster and climate risk cannot be fully understood by the decision-makers and practitioners.

Despite the global commitments to disability disaggregated data as set out by the Guiding Principle 19(g) of the Sendai Framework and the Article 31 of the CRPD, this does not necessarily translate into the regional or national-level commitments at policy and practice levels.

Neither the [EFDRR 2015-2020 Roadmap](#) for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework, **nor** the [European Action Plan](#) **explicitly mention that data should be disaggregated** by sex, age and disability as part of risk assessments and disaster loss databases. As for the [Central Asia and South Caucasus \(CASC\) Plan of Action](#), it states that "... by 2020 all eight countries in the CASC region should have established disaster loss databases and risk profiles, with sex, age and disability desegregated data, information and analysis." However, while there is an anecdotal evidence of disability disaggregated data being collected selectively in response to some crises, the DiDRR review has found **no example of systematic data disaggregation by gender, age and disability** in national information systems related to disaster risk reduction and recovery. Only one country²⁴ in the CASC region has committed to the

²³ Twigg, J. Kett, M. Lovell, E. [Disability inclusion and disaster risk reduction: Overcoming barriers to progress](#) (2018)

²⁴ Tajikistan

creation of a database on persons with disabilities and to the inclusion of Sex, Age and Disability Disaggregated Data (SADDD) as part of the vulnerability and risk assessments.

The review of the bilateral donor commitments to disability disaggregated data has identified only one donor committing to promote the routine, systematic collection and use of the disaggregated data using tested tools such as the [Washington Group](#) questions to understand the extent to which persons with disabilities are affected by specific crisis, and the key barriers to inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian response and risk reduction practices.

The **data gaps** in the [Sendai Framework Monitor](#) also makes it difficult to assess how countries are addressing data disaggregation as part of their disaster management information systems.

Furthermore, the review of the country profiles in the [INFORM Risk Index](#) has shown that the **methodology** for capturing the dimensions of risk (hazards and exposure, vulnerability and lack of coping capacities) **does not consider disability disaggregated data**. This is a concern, as the information gaps related to sex, age and disabilities prevent risk-informed decision-making, leading to exclusion of persons with disabilities from DRR interventions.

2. Lack of representation, coordination and partnerships with 'representative' organizations of persons with disabilities

During the DiDRR review, several²⁵ European countries have been identified with positive examples where Organizations of Persons with Disabilities are engaged in DRR-related decision-making. However, these **good practice examples are the exception**, rather than common practice, and are often the result of a dedicated action of individuals, take place as part of the specific projects or are triggered by disasters, rather than being established in the official systems and coordination mechanisms for DRR.

Moreover, while disability advocates and DPOs can play a significant role in disaster policy, planning and interventions, disaster management agencies usually tend to have **limited interaction or collaboration** with them. There is also **lack of documentation on how states promote**

²⁵ Armenia, Italy and Serbia

leadership of persons with disabilities, including women with disabilities in disaster risk reduction and recovery.

Limited representation of persons with disabilities and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities has also been observed **in National Platforms** for Disaster Risk Reduction, where only one²⁶ out of the 37 National Platforms across Europe and Central Asia has established a thematic working group for protection of persons with disabilities.²⁷ However, the mandate of this working group seems to be limited to the protection of persons with physical disabilities, and safety of institutions for persons with physical and psychosocial disabilities, portraying persons with disabilities as recipients rather than being contributing stakeholders.

Under the CRPD (article 4.3 and general comment 7) governments are obliged to "... give particular importance to the views of persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations, support the capacity and empowerment of such organizations and ensure that priority is given to ascertaining their views in decision-making processes." Therefore, the development and ongoing governance of these mechanisms for disaster and climate risk governance must always ensure participation of persons with disabilities, including women with disabilities.

3. Lack of accessibility

While some progress related to accessibility has been noted in the region, particularly with regards to the introduction of emergency call numbers²⁸ in several countries and developing accessible COVID-19 communication as a result of successful lobbying campaigns of DPOs²⁹, **more needs to be done** to ensure that **critical infrastructure** as well as **risk information and crisis communication is fully accessible**, covering the diversity of disability, and is available in local languages and in sign language.

For instance, the review has identified cases where investments were made for making the school infrastructure earthquake resistant, however, at the same time, physical accessibility aspects were not considered,

²⁶ Republic of North Macedonia

²⁷ [National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction](#). UNDRR (2020)

²⁸ In Norway, the Netherlands and Sweden there are options dedicated for deaf citizens to make emergency calls via Video Relay Service, messages and mobile smart applications, although the design of the respective options differs between the countries.

²⁹ The Netherlands

leaving students and adults with disabilities at higher risk as they would not be able to evacuate safely in case of a disaster. Furthermore, **lack of provision of reasonable accommodation** to respond to the specific access or functioning requirements of individuals with disabilities limits further their participation in disaster risk reduction and recovery on an equal basis with others.

4. Lack of expertise on disability-inclusive DRR

DRR actors often have **limited hands-on experience and expertise** in disability, and advocacy for and uptake of inclusive approaches rely on the influence of individuals with a personal interest in this area. The DiDRR review has found that formal **mechanisms for promoting disability inclusion** and coordination across sectors and institutions, **such as disability focal points** within state agencies responsible for disaster risk reduction and management, are rather limited and mostly **nonexistent**. Practitioners also **lack the training or tools** to respond appropriately to the specific requirements of persons with disabilities in emergencies or to ensure effective inclusion of persons with disabilities in disaster preparedness, response and recovery.³⁰

5. Lack of investments in disability-inclusive DRR

The DiDRR review has found **no specific provisions** at national and/or local levels **for funding disability-inclusive DRR** and recovery except for one country³¹ in the region that has made a commitment to allocation of state budget as well as funds from local and regional governments for disability-inclusive civil protection measures as part of its national strategy on equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities.

The review has also found that **specific DRR-related projects**, financed primarily by external donors, **occasionally address disability inclusion**, which was confirmed by the 11% of the respondents participating in the DiDRR survey. However, most of these initiatives **lack sustainability** or any tangible impact, as they discontinue as soon as the funding runs out.

³⁰ Twigg, J. Kett, M. Lovell, E. [Disability inclusion and disaster risk reduction: Overcoming barriers to progress](#) (2018)

³¹ Croatia

Absence of the requirement for budgeting for the potential **costs of disability inclusion**, including provision of reasonable accommodation, indicates to a **major gap in national investments** and efforts for inclusive disaster risk reduction. This hinders resilience building, as investments cannot be considered resilient if they do not prioritize inclusion of persons with disabilities and other at-risk groups in disaster risk reduction and recovery. It also results in increased costs in the long-term, as retrofitting for accessibility is always more expensive.

Recommendations

The findings from the review of the DiDRR policy and practice in Europe and Central Asia point to an urgent need to accelerate action to reduce disaster and climate change related risks and their disproportionate impact on persons with disabilities. This should be done through fast-tracked implementation of the Sendai Framework in adherence with its Guiding Principles, as well as the implementation of the [Article 11](#) of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Most importantly, persons with disabilities must be at the forefront of designing and evaluating climate action, disaster risk reduction, and humanitarian responses, and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities should be actively sought out and engaged across these different areas of policy and action.

Sendai Framework Priority 1: Understanding disaster risk

1. Prioritize disability, gender and age disaggregated data collection as part of disaster management systems (including climate and risk assessments, emergency needs assessments and disaster loss databases) at regional, national and local levels as well as national population censuses and surveys (art. 31 of the CRPD).
2. Integrate a disability, gender and age analysis in the development and implementation of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation (CCA) policies, strategies and programs to prevent the expansion of inequalities exacerbated by climate change.
3. Ensure methodological consistency in data collection using a functioning approach³² (for instance by adopting the Washington

³² A functioning approach to disability is less concerned with categorizations and instead focuses on what a person is able to do in their lived environment. Understanding disability from a functioning perspective is directly relevant to DRR as it enables the disproportionate risk that persons with

Group questions³³) together with appropriate tools, staff training and awareness raising on disability inclusion in climate action and disaster risk reduction.

4. Ensure local, national and regional level targets and indicators include disability disaggregated data in coherence with the Sendai Framework, the CRPD and the SDG monitoring and reporting.
5. Incorporate disability inclusion in the regular training schedules of staff of all stakeholders working on DRR and CCA, involving experts from DPOs as a 'cross learning' concept (art. 9, 19, 20, 21 and 29 of the CRPD).

Sendai Framework Priority 2: Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage disaster risk

1. Ensure representation and meaningful participation of persons with disabilities through their representative organizations in climate and disaster risk governance as well as related coordination mechanisms i.e. National Platforms for DRR, and the humanitarian Cluster system (art. 4.3 of the CRPD).
2. Ensure that DRR and CCA related policies, strategic frameworks and plans of action are disability-inclusive.
3. Ensure that all disability-related policies, strategies and action plans consider protection and safety of all persons with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian crises in line with the Article 11 of the CRPD.
4. Designate focal points for disability within the government units responsible for disaster risk reduction and climate action and invest in their capacity building in close collaboration with DPOs.
5. Ensure that all governance and decision-making bodies' measures towards protection and safety nets are fully inclusive of all persons with disabilities, including women with disabilities and that these are developed together, collaboratively between all stakeholders including DPOs (art. 11 and 4.3 of the CRPD).

Sendai Framework Priority 3: Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience

1. Include considerations for addressing specific requirements of persons with disabilities, including women with disabilities in leveraging investments for DRR and CCA, and ensure that all

disabilities face to be readily identified and directly acted upon (Robinson A., Kani S. Disability-inclusive DRR: Information, risk and practical action in Shaw R & Izumi (2014))

³³ Developed by the [Washington Group \(WG\) on Disability Statistics](#), formed by the United Nations Statistical Commission.

investment strategies and their end results are fully accessible to and participatory of all of society.

2. Invest in sustainable capacity building of DPOs in climate action and disaster risk reduction to foster more effective future participation that is based on a partnership of equals.
3. Ensure budgeting for reasonable accommodation, facilitating effective participation in climate action and DRR and recovery actions in individual situations where required.
4. Invest in critical infrastructure ensuring that it is fully accessible and is designed incorporating the principles of [Universal Design](#).
5. Identify and promote use of evidence linked with sustainability of disability inclusion in DRR and climate action as an investment rather than expenditure.
6. All DRR and climate action programs funded by the donor community should prioritize inclusion of persons with disabilities across the entire program cycle.

Sendai Framework Priority 4: Preparedness and resilient recovery

1. Ensure meaningful participation of persons with disabilities in the development of emergency preparedness and contingency plans at national and local levels to fully address the specific requirements of all persons with disabilities, including women with disabilities and other groups of persons with disabilities that are most excluded in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies (art. 11 and 4.3 of the CRPD).
2. Introduce specific measures to ensure gender-equity, promoting leadership of women with disabilities in all areas of disaster risk reduction and emergency preparedness, in line with the Sendai Framework.
3. Identify, collaborate with and build capacity of DPOs at all levels in all climate action, DRR and emergency preparedness measures.
4. Ensure that risk information, including early warning, alert systems, and crisis communication, are inclusive and provided in formats accessible for persons with diverse disabilities as well as is available in local languages and in sign language (art. 9, 11 and 21 of the CRPD). Consider guidance provided by the European Union of the Deaf for [accessibility of information and communication](#) for persons who are Deaf or hard of hearing.
5. Ensure that all newly built critical infrastructure including schools, hospitals and shelters are made safe and accessible following relevant national guidelines and the principles of Universal Design.

6. Support studies on the impact of COVID-19 on persons with disabilities and their families. Include the specific requirements of persons with disabilities in the contingency plans for pandemics (art. 11 and 32 of the CRPD).
7. Ensure that humanitarian response is inclusive considering specific requirements of all persons with disabilities, including persons with disabilities who are most excluded and face multiple forms of discrimination in line with the [Humanitarian Inclusion Standards](#) for Older People and Persons with Disabilities and the [IASC Guidelines](#) on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action.
8. Ensure that search, rescue and evacuations are inclusive. Build capacities of early responders on their understanding of disability, both for existing as well as for people who have acquired disabilities as a result of any disaster.

Annex 1. Good practice case studies

1. Armenia

1.1. Policy

The [National Disaster Risk Management Strategy and the Action Plan of the Republic of Armenia \(2017\)](#) makes several references to disability, highlighting the introduction of **participatory decision-making** with the **involvement of all main players** from the national to the local level, including **persons with disabilities** as one of the major achievements of the country (Chapter 8, Para. 57, p.19).

The Strategy calls for strengthening “social orientation in disaster risk management reforms; for this purpose, it is necessary to **support and promote active involvement** of educational institutions, **persons with disabilities**, socially vulnerable groups and other players **in disaster risk management policy making and implementation** processes.” It also underlines the importance of provision, safety and **accessibility of social protection and healthcare services** as part of humanitarian aid and disaster risk reduction (Chapter 3, Para.28.5, p.9).

At the same time, the Strategy highlights the importance of disaster risk assessment for **providing safety for all** representatives of the society, including **persons with disabilities on an equal basis** with others (Chapter 2, Para. 12, p. 3).

The newly passed [Law of the Republic of Armenia on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities \(2021\)](#) also resonates with the [Article 11 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities \(CRPD\)](#), underscoring that the “State shall take the necessary measures to ensure the **protection and security of persons with disabilities in emergency situations**. Special measures and conditions for their implementation shall be established by the authorized state body in the field of emergency situations” (Chapter 5, Art.15, Para 14).

1.2. Practice

Creating a favorable environment for **participatory decision-making** is one of the good examples of translating inclusive policies into practice in Armenia, where **organizations led by persons with disabilities** are **engaged in** various **consulting bodies**, including the Public Council under the Ministry of Emergency Situations (MES), and contribute to the

development of policies related to disaster risk reduction (DRR) and crisis management.

The Ministry has also created a long-term mechanism for **hiring persons with disabilities in its Crisis Management Centers** which are operating in the capital Yerevan, and several regions of Armenia. These centers are employing persons with disabilities who assist citizens on a day-to-day basis through the Emergency Call Centers.

The MES provides the **necessary conditions**, including flexibility in working hours and **transportation**, to ensure that employees with disabilities can access and move independently in the workplace. The buildings and premises, engineering infrastructures, and vehicles of the Ministry are also **adapted for the free movement and transportation** of persons with disabilities³⁴.

The [State Party's Report on the Implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities \(2020\)](#) provides several examples of inclusive DRR practices, including the development of **Disaster Risk Management Plans** for schools and preschool institutions considering the **age, gender and disability specific characteristics** of children, and **prioritizing evacuation** of persons with disabilities during simulation exercises for fires, earthquakes and other major hazards.

³⁴ [State Party's Report on the Implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#), Republic of Armenia, 2020, p.30 (accessed on 7 October 2021)

2. Italy

2.1. Policy

The adoption of the [Verona Charter on the Rescue of Persons with Disabilities in Case of Disasters \(2007\)](#) marks the beginning of Italy's efforts on policy level towards disability inclusion in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies.

Since then, Italy has made notable progress in developing policies for disability inclusive humanitarian action and crisis management, focusing particularly on elaboration of technical norms for inclusive fire safety and rescue and operative procedures for inclusive rescue

The [Italian Development Cooperation Disability Action Plan \(2013\)](#) has a dedicated chapter on inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian aid and emergency situations. It calls for **adoption of measures** to guarantee the **protection** and **safety/security** of **persons with disabilities** upon natural or man-made disasters and **setting up a working group** (including representatives of all relevant ministries, institutions, NGOs and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities) for identifying how **to improve technical** and **planning skills** to better define the needs and rights of persons with disabilities during disasters (Chapter 4, p.40-42). Italy has also endorsed the [Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action](#).

One of the key priorities of the three-year [Italian Development Aid Programming and Policy Planning Document \(2019-2021\)](#) is humanitarian aid focusing on inclusion of persons with disabilities, along with disaster prevention and risk reduction.

The Italian [Civil Protection Code \(2018\)](#) speaks about the effectiveness of the civil protection functions to be performed with particular regard to people in "conditions of social fragility and persons with disabilities" (Art.18.1.a).

The [Technical Fire Prevention Standards](#) refer to inclusive fire safety, specifically with regards to the fire safety design, evacuation and fire safety management (G.2.1.3.f, S.4.9, S.5.7.4 and S.5.7.5).

2.2. Practice

The development of the [Vademecum on Humanitarian Aid](#) in 2015 represents the result of the **joint initiative** between the **Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation** and the **Italian Network for Disability and Development** (RIDS) as part of the “Emergency” working group which was established in 2013 following the adoption of the [Italian Development Cooperation Disability Action Plan](#). This handbook is intended to provide a benchmark for aid workers – whether working in the field or at a strategic level – for the formulation and implementation of disaster prevention and response interventions. It also provides concrete examples for ensuring protection of the rights of persons with disabilities in humanitarian situations.³⁵

The **collaboration between** Organizations of Persons with Disabilities and the **National Fire and Rescue Service** (INFRS), which started from early 2000, represents one of the **exemplary practices** of disability-inclusive crisis management **at national level**.

In 2015 INFRS established a **working group** or “observatory” of experts, including a representative of the Italian Federation for Overcoming Handicap (FISH) and the Federation of National Associations of Persons with Disabilities (FAND), representing the associations of persons with disabilities operating in Italy, as a consultative body for supporting the **development of technical norms** and regulations **for inclusive fire safety and rescue**. INFRS has also been implementing a number of projects, including organizing **simulation exercises** involving people with multiple sclerosis in partnership with the Italian Multiple Sclerosis Society, and developing a [Vademecum for the Rescuer](#) for assisting persons with autism spectrum disorders in emergency situations in collaboration with the Children and Autism Foundation.

Currently, INFRS is working on the “**Guidelines for Inclusive Rescue**” and a mobile App “**Help for All**”, which contains specific sections with **safety tips** for persons with **different types of disabilities**. The development an SMS-based 112 emergency service is also in the pilot phase in collaboration with the Italian National Agency for the protection and assistance of the Deaf.

At the **regional level**, in 2015 the Department of Civil Protection of the Marche Region, in partnership with the Polytechnic University of Marche,

³⁵ [Humanitarian Aid and Disability Vademecum](#) (2015)

developed **guidelines for promoting the inclusion of persons with disabilities in municipal emergency planning**³⁶, which were officially adopted in 2019. The document considers the results of the survey conducted by the National Department of Civil Protection in 2011 aimed at understanding how Italian municipalities include disability issues in emergency planning activities.³⁷

Some of the key priorities highlighted in the [Regional Guidelines for Effective Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Emergency Planning Activities at the Municipal Level](#) relate to the **development** of the **database on persons with disabilities**; introduction of a **new role/support function within the municipal operation centers** on disability issues; development of an **accessible early warning and communication** system for persons with diverse disabilities; establishment of a local network of civil protection professionals, healthcare facilities, associations of persons with disabilities and voluntary organizations for effective assistance to persons with disabilities in an emergency; and ensuring **accessibility of emergency shelters** (p. 143-152).

In addition, Italy has carried out several initiatives (e.g. “Emergency and Fragility” and the project “Disability in Emergency”, following the 2016 Central Italy earthquake for developing Inclusive Emergency Family Plans) and research studies on persons with disabilities and emergencies (e.g. [People with disabilities and emergency: a survey in Friuli Venezia Giulia](#), 2016). Italy has also participated in the EU co-funded project [INDRIX](#) for developing an index of social resilience with a particular focus was on persons with disabilities and older people.

³⁶ [Major Hazards and People with Disabilities: A Toolkit for Good Practice](#), 2015. The Council of Europe and the EUR-OPA Agreement

³⁷ Gatto, B. (2014). [The Human Rights-Based Approach to Disability in Emergency Preparedness](#). Dissertation for the Doctoral Curriculum in Civil and Environmental Protection. Polytechnic University of Marche, Department of Life and Environmental Sciences (accessed on 9 October 2017)

3. Serbia

3.1. Policy

The [Law on Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Management \(2018\)](#) of the Republic of Serbia refers to disability several times emphasizing the importance of **accessibility of measures** and activities **to reduce the risk** of disasters **to persons with disabilities**, children, older people and other persons who are particularly at-risk (Art.7, p.4).

The Law makes it mandatory for everyone to participate in the execution of protection and rescue tasks. However, persons with disabilities, as well as persons caring for persons with disabilities are exempt from this rule (Art.36, p.21). Persons with disabilities are also given **priority during evacuation** in case of a disaster (Art.58, p.30).

At the same time, the Law mentions that citizens have the **right to be informed** about the risks of disasters and their potential consequences, as well as measures for disaster risk reduction, and necessary information for protection and rescue of populations in case of a disaster. "This **information** shall be provided in **accessible** and **easy to understand** form and formats, including sign language and Braille" (Art.36, p.20).

For **adequate assistance** and **protection** of persons with disabilities in situations of risk and disasters the [National Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction and Protection and Rescue in Emergencies \(2011\)](#) places an emphasis on the training of all participants in the integrated rescue and protection system (Strategic Area 3, p.8). On the other hand, the [Action Plan for the Implementation of the National Disaster Risk Management Program \(2017-2020\)](#) refers to the creation of "**protocols** on **different situations of emergency response** for people with disabilities – manuals in Braille, SMS apps and similar" (p.43). It also highlights the importance of "**Empowering women** and **persons with disabilities** to **publicly lead** and **promote** gender equality and **universally accessible** response, recovery rehabilitation and reconstruction approaches" (Component 4, p.7) which is closely aligned with the principles and approaches set out in the [Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030](#).

Serbia also makes **accessibility standards mandatory** for public buildings which is one of the important components for ensuring safe

evacuation of persons with disabilities and lowering exposure to risk in the event of a disaster.

3.2. Practice

Serbia represents one of the good examples of the countries in Europe of **partnership** between Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (DPOs) and **disaster management authorities**, where the **legislation and policies** related to disaster risk reduction have been developed in consultation with the DPOs **and** a number of **disability-inclusive DRR initiatives** are **designed** and **implemented jointly**.

For instance, Serbia made a **considerable progress in inclusive DRR policies** since 2017, when the Ministry of Interior invited the National Organization of Persons with Disabilities of Serbia (NOOIS) to **provide feedback to the draft Law** on Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Management.

It is noteworthy to mention that in 2016 the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities concluded that there was a lack of a general strategy and plan to protect and assist persons with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian emergencies in Serbia.³⁸ The Committee encouraged the State party to adopt a comprehensive emergency strategy, protocols and accessible informative services (e.g. hotlines, a text message-warning application, manuals in sign language and Braille) to address the specific requirements of persons with disabilities.³⁹

These recommendations were used by NOOIS as a starting point for the revision of the first draft of the Law on Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Management and introduction of the necessary amendments in the final draft.

The Sector for Disaster Risk Management under the Ministry of Interior has also been working closely with NOOIS on the initiatives supported by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) for disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction, response and recovery. For example, **special guidelines for persons with disabilities in situations of risk** were **developed in partnership with the DPOs**. The Family Guide for Emergency Preparedness and Response was printed in

³⁸ [Concluding Observations of the Initial Report of Serbia to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#), 2016, p.4 (accessed on 7 October 2021)

³⁹ Ibid.

Braille and an **audio version** of this Guide, a **brochure** and a **short video** with instructions on how to assist and protect persons with different types of disabilities during emergencies were also produced.

In 2019 a **conference** on “**People with Disabilities in Emergency Situations**” was held in Belgrade with the support of the OSCE Mission to Serbia and the Embassy of Sweden.⁴⁰ The event gathered over 50 participants from the civil society, authorities and the media, who discussed how to **improve early warning systems** for persons with disabilities. One of the main conclusions of the conference was that there is a need for introducing a national call center and mobile application for providing accessible early warning information in real-time in different formats (audio, video, and in sign language)⁴¹ – the work on which is now in progress.

With regard to the accessibility of risk information, following the advocacy efforts from the Association of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing for Serbia, **announcements** pertaining to the **COVID-19** pandemic on public broadcasting service are **simultaneously translated into Serbian sign language**. The Institute of Public Health of Serbia also introduced a COVID-19 **protocol for persons with autism** in collaboration with the Association for Assistance to Persons with Autism of Serbia.

⁴⁰ [Timely response saves lives: Strengthening emergency preparedness for people with disabilities](#), OSCE Mission to Serbia, 7 May 2020, (accessed on 7 October 2021)

⁴¹ Ibid.

Annex 2. DiDRR online survey

Disability-inclusive Disaster Risk Reduction in Europe and Central Asia

Short Online Survey

Introduction and Objectives of the Survey

Dear respondent,

Thank you for participating in this survey on the situation of disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction (DiDRR) in Europe and Central Asia, which is carried out within the framework of the consultancy commissioned by the European Disability Forum (EDF).

The objective of this survey is to understand the situation of policy and practice related to disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction, response and recovery in the European and Central Asian countries and to develop country thematic case studies/ factsheets based on the identified good practices.

The survey is administered among the Sendai Framework National Focal Points and representatives of Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (DPOs).

The findings of this review will be used for advocacy towards disability inclusion in the region and will also be shared during the upcoming European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction (EFDRR) taking place in Portugal on 24-26 November 2021.

The summary of findings and country factsheets will also be available on the EDF website.

The countries included in this survey have been shortlisted based on the desk review of national policies, strategies and plans related to disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, civil protection and/ or crisis management. The rapid screening has revealed that these countries make a reference to disability inclusion in their policies or are actively supporting disability inclusion in the humanitarian space.

We will be analyzing your responses over the coming couple of weeks and may be contacting you for an interview in case your country is selected as one of the potential good examples for the case studies. All responses will be treated anonymously.

This survey should take no longer than 15 minutes of your time.

The deadline for completion is 24 September 2021.

Please proceed further if you're still interested in supporting this important work.

Respondent Information

Name (optional, if you would like to be contacted in case your country is selected as a potential good practice):

E-mail (obligatory):

Country (obligatory):

Questionnaire

1) Is disability mainstreamed in your country's national laws, policies, strategies or plans related to disaster risk reduction, disaster response and recovery?

- A. Yes (please specify in which documents: _____)
- B. No
- C. I don't know

2) Are Organizations of Persons with Disabilities involved in decision-making related to disaster risk reduction, disaster response and recovery related policy processes?

- A. Always (please provide specific examples: _____)
- B. Usually (please provide specific examples: _____)
- C. Sometimes (please provide specific examples: _____)
- D. Never

E. I don't know

3) Are Organizations of Persons with Disabilities involved and closely consulted in practice related to disaster risk reduction, response and recovery, including in assessment of disaster risks and/ or coordination mechanisms (e.g. National Platforms for Disaster Risk Reduction and Cluster System)?

A. Always (please provide specific examples: _____)

B. Usually (please provide specific examples: _____)

C. Sometimes (please provide specific examples: _____)

D. Never

E. I don't know

4) Is leadership of persons with disabilities promoted in disaster risk reduction, response and recovery?

A. Always (please provide specific examples: _____)

B. Usually (please provide specific examples: _____)

C. Sometimes (please provide specific examples: _____)

D. Never

E. I don't know

5) Is leadership of women with disabilities promoted in disaster risk reduction, response and recovery?

A. Always (please provide specific examples: _____)

B. Usually (please provide specific examples: _____)

C. Sometimes (please provide specific examples: _____)

D. Never

E. I don't know

6) Are measures to improve access provided when required to respond to the access/ functioning needs of individuals with disabilities to ensure that they can participate in disaster risk reduction, response and recovery on an equal basis with others?

A. Always (please provide specific examples: _____)

B. Usually (please provide specific examples: _____)

C. Sometimes (please provide specific examples: _____)

D. Never

E. I don't know

7) Are agencies in your country collecting disability data for disaster risk reduction, response and recovery interventions (e.g. during risk assessments, damage and loss assessments, humanitarian needs assessments, monitoring disaster response, etc.)?

A. Yes (if collected, please provide specific examples and explain how the data is used: _____)

B. No

C. I don't know

8) Are specific measures put in place for ensuring that the critical infrastructure including roads, hospitals, schools and emergency shelters, as well as risk information and communication services (e.g. early warning systems, emergency call numbers) are accessible to persons with diverse disabilities?

A. Yes (please provide specific examples: _____)

B. No

C. I don't know

9) Are specific provisions made at national and/or local levels for funding disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction, response and recovery (e.g. is there a requirement on budgeting for the potential costs of disability inclusion)?

A. Yes (please provide specific examples: _____)

B. No

C. I don't know

10) Are there specific tools and guidance available for disaster risk reduction policy makers and practitioners in your country for disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction, response and recovery?

A. Yes (please provide specific examples: _____)

B. No

C. I don't know

11) Are there sufficient disaster risk reduction practitioners with relevant skills and experience for planning and implementing disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction, response and recovery activities (e.g. disability focal points at the national agency/ ministry responsible disaster management)?

- A. Yes (please provide specific examples: _____)
- B. No
- C. I don't know

Thank you for valuable time and participation in this survey.

For further information or if you would like to suggest any resource or including anyone else from your country in this survey, please contact: ninoqvetadze@gmail.com

Document credits

This document was commissioned by the European Disability Forum and developed by an independent consultant Nino Gvetadze with the support from Vera Tikhanovich for the desk review part of the research.



The European Disability Forum

The European Disability Forum is an independent NGO that represents the interests of 100 million Europeans with disabilities. EDF is a unique platform which brings together representative organization of persons with disabilities from across Europe. EDF is run by persons with disabilities and their families. We are a strong, united voice of persons with disabilities in Europe.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to all EDF members and experts who contributed to the development of the methodology and to the preparation of this document including Dr. Alex Robinson (the University of Melbourne, Nossal Institute for Global Health), Marcie Roth (World Institute on Disability), Stefanie Dannenman-Di Palma (UNDRR), Giampiero Griffo (Chairperson of the Italian Network on Disability and Development), Stefano Zanut (Italian National Fire and Rescue Service), Damjan Tatic (Legal expert on human rights of persons with disabilities, Serbia), Anđela Radovanović (Association of Youth with Disabilities of Montenegro), and Mushegh Hovsepian ("Disability Rights Agenda" NGO, Armenia).

Avenue des Arts 7-8
1210 Brussels Belgium

+32 2 329 0059

info@edf-feph.org
www.edf-feph.org