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Executive Summary

In December 2022, UNDRR launched the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities – Annex for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities under the MCR2030 initiative, with the aim of assisting local governments in disability inclusive disaster risk reduction (DRR). The Annex, which is aligned with the UN Strategy for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities and the Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient, assesses local capacities across 19 indicators distributed among the Ten Essentials. In 2023, it was utilized by 21 cities, majority of which received technical support from UNDRR and financial backing from the Governments of Finland and the Republic of Korea. The Annex employs a scoring system to identify strengths and weaknesses, thereby facilitating the development of context-specific action plans.

This report analyses findings and draws recommendations from the pilot implementation of this Disability Inclusion Scorecard Annex. It finds that, despite demonstrating some progress in certain indicators associated with the Ten Essentials, cities grapple with persistent challenges, and the collective trajectory towards comprehensive disability inclusion remains limited. A closer look at individual achievements across these indicators reveals a nuanced landscape, emphasizing the need for sustained efforts to amplify and consolidate advancements in disability inclusive DRR practices across urban settings.

The analysis identifies four overarching challenges pivotal to advancing urban DRR:

- **The absence of disaggregated data** on persons with disabilities;
- **Limited knowledge of DRR and persons with disabilities** among policy makers, along with a lack of DRR knowledge among persons with disabilities and Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs);
- **Lack of participation** from persons with disabilities and OPDs in DRR processes
- **Absence of designated focal points** for disability inclusion within local government departments.

These challenges collectively impede effective planning and resource allocation, hinder preparedness measures, limit representation, and obstruct the coordination of disability-inclusive practices across cities.

Based on the analysis, several key recommendations are suggested for cities to enhance disability inclusion in DRR. Cities are advised to:

- **Recognize and prioritize the inclusion of persons with disabilities** as a central policy objective, explicitly acknowledging their fundamental rights in plans and policies;
- **Establish a comprehensive system for collecting disaggregated data** on persons with disabilities, integrating it into risk assessments for targeted and inclusive DRR strategies;
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- **Develop local awareness campaigns and capacity-building initiatives** tailored to the varied needs of persons with disabilities in collaboration with all key stakeholders;
- **Ensure the active and meaningful participation** of persons with disabilities and OPDs in DRR planning for inclusive decision-making at every stage;
- **Designate empowered focal points** with disability inclusion expertise to facilitate coordination between DRR offices, stakeholders, and OPDs;
- **Embed specific budget allocations** for disability-inclusive measures within the local resilience strategy. Enhance collaboration with external actors to secure additional support for disability-inclusive resilience initiatives in resource-poor contexts;
- **Implement comprehensive local building codes** prioritizing universal design and accessibility with strong local enforcement mechanisms;
- **Engage OPDs and stakeholders in developing contingency plans** for post-disaster living and meeting spaces, ensuring protection for persons with disabilities, and regularly reviewing and updating plans;
- **Equip local government systems** for effective and inclusive forecasting, monitoring, and communication tailored to diverse needs of persons with disabilities;
- **Ensure post-disaster reconstruction actively aims for inclusivity** through meaningful engagement with OPDs, learning from failures, and incorporating lessons into reconstruction projects.

The implementation of these recommendations will contribute to a more inclusive, resilient, and prepared urban environment, safeguarding the meaningful participation and protection of persons with disabilities in all DRR phases.

This report findings aligns with the broader findings of the UNDRR Global Survey on Persons with Disabilities and Disasters 2023, indicating limited progress in disability inclusion over the past decade with no significant regional differences. Within this context, the Disability Inclusion Scorecard Annex emerges as a valuable tool for city learning, shedding light on gaps in practices and activities, and aiding in the formulation of recommendations and design of action plans.
1. Introduction

In December 2022, the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR) launched the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities - Annex for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities¹ as part of the Making Cities Resilient 2030 (MCR2030) initiative². The Scorecard aims to assist local governments in developing and implementing inclusive disaster risk reduction (DRR) strategies.

The Annex complements the original Scorecard³, specifically focusing on assessing local government capacities to incorporate persons with disabilities into DRR policies. Aligned with the UN Strategy for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities⁴ and the Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient⁵, the Annex addresses key considerations in disaster risk governance, urban development, design, infrastructure resilience, and recovery. The goal is to strengthen risk governance in cities, promote inclusivity, and enhance resilience, aligning with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development's commitment to leaving no one behind. Several cities and sub-national authorities have begun utilizing the Scorecard Annex to identify gaps and improve the inclusion of persons with disabilities in their disaster risk reduction efforts.

Figure 1: The Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient

This Scorecard Annex is recommended for use in a half to a full-day multi-stakeholder workshop. It can be combined with a training on urban resilience, DRR and disability inclusion which may encompass two to three days. The Annex comprises a total of 19 indicators

2. https://mcr2030.undrr.org/
specifically addressing the inclusion of persons with disabilities. These indicators are distributed across the existing Ten Essentials, except for Essential 5, which lacks designated indicators.

Stakeholders can assign a score of 0-3 for each indicator, where 3 represents the maximum achievable score. Consequently, cities implementing the Annex can attain a maximum total score of 57 points.

The completion of the Scorecard facilitates cities in recognizing strengths and weaknesses in their current practices concerning the inclusion of persons with disabilities in DRR efforts. By evaluating each indicator, cities can identify contextually specific approaches to address gaps or fortify existing strengths. These identified actions subsequently form the city's action plan.

In 2023, a total of 21 cities across 10 countries have utilized the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities – Annex for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities, majority of which were implemented through the technical support of UNDRR with financial support from the Government of Finland and the Government of the Republic of Korea. The objective of this report is to analyse the findings and draw recommendations from the results provided by these cities to improve the inclusion of persons with disabilities in DRR efforts overall.

---

*Bhutan (Gelephu Thromde*, Phuentsholing Thromde*, Samdrup Jongkhar Thromde*, Thimphu Thromde*), Brazil (Barcarena*, Rio de Janeiro*), Chile (Pudahuel), Colombia (Cali*, Pereira*), Costa Rica (Santa Ana), El Salvador (Santa Tecla), Kazakhstan (Astana*), Philippines (Baguio City, Quezon City*), Uganda (Kampala*), and Uruguay (Bella Union, Minas de Corrales, Ciudad del Plata, Vichadero, Villa Constitución, Young). Note: * are cities that undertook the Scorecard Assessment under the pilot project financially supported by the Government of Finland and the Government of the Republic of Korea.*
2. Methodology

This report presents the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the results obtained from Disability Inclusion Scorecard assessments, workshop reports, and action plans conducted and developed by 21 participating cities in 2023. The data from the cities was consolidated to allow a deeper understanding of patterns and trends in including persons with disabilities in DRR.

The methodology involved a comprehensive review of city data derived from scoring per city and per indicator, complemented by an examination of narrative information extracted from the means of verification and assessment summaries provided by cities and training reports prepared by UNDRR following on from the completion of the scorecard activity. This approach aimed to gain insights into the strength areas as well as identifying gaps and challenges faced by cities, along with the reasons behind them. This data, together with an analysis of the city action plans and their identified top-up actions aimed at enhancing performance in specific indicators allowed for the formulation of targeted recommendations to support and propel cities forward in their inclusion initiatives.

Overarching trends were also analysed alongside the findings of the 2023 UNDRR Global Survey on Persons with Disabilities and Disaster7. The survey was designed to assess the advancements in disability inclusion within DRR. It served as a follow-up to the 2013 Global Survey, aiming to better understand the progress made and challenges faced in integrating persons with disabilities into DRR initiatives. This dual analysis provides a global perspective, revealing the broader challenges faced by persons with disabilities during disasters. Throughout the report, alignment or divergence in the findings with those of the Global Survey is indicated wherever relevant, offering a nuanced comparison and enriching the contextual understanding of the local assessments.

3. Limitations

The report relies solely on secondary data and sources. While many cities generally provided robust and well-validated data, there were instances where the depth of justification or explanation for assigned scores varied or where the specific activities that they implement lack details to help generate case study examples. This variability poses a challenge in fully grasping the rationale behind the scoring in such instances. The report hence attempts to draw as much analysis as possible based on the available data. More detailed data documentation and follow-up interviews may help add more depth to the analysis and showcase the full range of practices of the participating cities in a way that can facilitate even more cross city learning.

City data was provided in diverse languages. Any data that was provided in English or Spanish could be analysed directly by the author who is fluent in those languages. For data in languages other than these, translation software was used to aid data analysis. This approach aimed to ensure a thorough understanding of city practices, even in instances where language differences might have posed a barrier. It is important to acknowledge that while machine translation offered valuable insights, there may still be nuances and limitations in the interpretation of qualitative data obtained in this manner.
4. Overall progress of local governments in disability inclusion in local disaster risk reduction

The trends in disability inclusion in DRR across participating cities presented in this section are based on an analysis of the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities – Annex for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in 21 cities across 10 countries. The overall scores vary across cities ranging from a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 39 out of 57, and with an average score of 15.9 out of 57, cities have demonstrated a low to moderate level of overall achievement in advancing disability inclusion on local disaster risk reduction.

The overall performance across the cities per Essential is shown in Figure 2 (Scale of 0-3) and per Indicator is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 2: Overall progress of local governments in advancing disability inclusion in local DRR (all cities per Essential)

Overall, ‘Essential 4: Pursue resilient urban development’ is the area of highest progress (1.23), followed by ‘Essential 1: Organise for Disaster Resilience’ (0.95), ‘Essential 2: Identify, Understand and Use Current and Future Risk Scenarios (0.81), ‘Essential 9: Ensure Effective Disaster Response’ (0.76), ‘Essential 6: Strengthen Institutional Capacity for Resilience’ (0.71) and ‘Essential 10: Expedite Recovery and Build Back Better’ (0.64). ‘Essential 3: Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience’, ‘Essential 7: Understand and Strengthen Societal Capacity for Resilience’ and ‘Essential 8, Protection from Violence’ (0.62) are the areas requiring most improvement.
Figure 3: Overall progress of local governments in advancing disability inclusion in local DRR (all cities per Indicator)

When looking in greater detail, ‘Indicator 4.2: Building Codes and Standards’ is the area demonstrates the highest progress overall (2.05) whereas the least progress has been made in relation to ‘Indicator 6.2: Accessible Language’ (0.52).
5. Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient

This section presents a breakdown of progress per indicator of the Ten Essentials.

Essential 1: Organize for Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Leave No One Behind</strong> - Does the master plan (or relevant local plan/strategy) identify and include persons with disabilities as an integral part of risk management, as promoted by the Sendai Framework and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities?</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Organisation, Coordination and Participation</strong> - Is there a designated focal point at the local government level with decision-making capacity and adequate resources to coordinate and address disability inclusion in disaster risk reduction?</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall City Achievement for Essential 1

The overall city achievement for Essential 1 is 0.95 out of 3, making it the second highest scoring of the Essentials. However, this achievement is not evenly distributed across the two indicators that constitute Essential 1 with achievement in Indicator 1.1 (1.24) being greater than that of Indicator 1.2 (0.67). This indicates that when it comes to “Organising for Resilience”, cities have advanced more in identifying and including persons with disabilities as an integral part of risk management than they have in ensuring the presence of a designated focal point at the local government level to address disability inclusion in DRR. See Figure 4.

Figure 4: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 1 Organizing for Resilience
Strength Areas

Several cities demonstrate strengths areas in incorporating persons with disabilities into their local plans and strategies, aligning with the principles outlined in the Sendai Framework and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (e.g., Thimphu, Quezon City, Baguio City, Astana, Santa Tecla and Pudahuel). These medium and high scoring cities demonstrate the integration of persons with disabilities across risk management frameworks and note the existence of mechanisms for being able to identify them. Common practices include systems for gathering and collating data about persons with disabilities and the development of comprehensive city-wide plans that involve consultation with persons with disabilities, ensuring their integral inclusion. These inclusive efforts often extend to disaster risk management strategies, local area plans, and transportation plans, among others. Additionally, some cities (Astana, Baguio City and Quezon City) stand out in this area and showcase institutionalized support through designated focal points supported by human and economic resources (i.e., the establishment of the Persons with Disabilities Affairs Offices in the Philippines) and participation in relevant committees.

Gaps and Weaknesses

Cities describe facing notable gaps and weaknesses in their approaches to Essential 1: Organize for Resilience. In some instances, city DRR planning is still in its incipient stages and/or what currently exists lacks comprehensive inclusion strategies and experience remains limited to certain types of disabilities. There is also a significant lack of local plans, or the existence of ones that do not account for persons with disabilities in their measures, actions, projects, and initiatives.

In relation to designated sectoral/multi-sectoral mechanisms or municipal focal points with adequate resources to influence the definition of inclusive preparedness and response tasks, participating cities note that in cases where there are focal points, resource constraints hinder effective coordination for inclusion. One city acknowledges having a focal point to coordinate and address the challenges of including persons with disabilities in DRR. However, financial constraints, limit their ability and impact to improve the situation for persons with disabilities prompting the recognition of the need to expand and strengthen financial resources for the focal point at the local level.

The trend relating to the lack of designated focal points, also reflects findings in the UNDRR Global Survey which shows that just 16 percent of their respondents knew of there being a designated role in government for disability inclusion. However, the report also highlights a significant consideration for cities aiming to address gaps in institutional leadership roles for disability inclusion and that is that even when designated roles exist, individuals with disability expertise are frequently not appointed to these positions, emphasising the significance of ensuring that appointed focal points possess the necessary disability-specific knowledge for effective inclusion strategies.
Cities participating in the Scorecard exercise also note that challenges persist in including persons with disabilities in the design of DRR plans and activities and disseminating information relating to DRR plans to the community, coordinating with Organizations for Persons with Disabilities (OPDs), and addressing specific needs, showcasing the need for cities to enhance their community engagement and coordination strategies.

The UNDRR Global Survey results reinforce these challenges showcasing that 86 percent surveyed persons with disabilities reporting no participation in community-level DRR decision-making and planning and that awareness of DRR plans remains remarkably low among persons with disabilities, with only 11 percent reporting awareness of national level DRR plans and 14 percent at the subnational level. Moreover, a mere 8 percent indicated that local DRR plans adequately addressed the specific needs of persons with disabilities. These findings underscore a critical need for cities to not only improve their DRR planning inclusivity but also to enhance communication strategies, ensuring that awareness and understanding permeate the entire community, especially among persons with disabilities.

**Recommendations**

- Develop, review and enhance local DRR policies, to ensure inclusivity for persons with disabilities. Incorporate inclusive language explicitly and deliberate interventions to protect persons with disabilities from disasters in alignment with international standards. Allocate sufficient funding for the implementation and enforcement of these interventions.
- Conduct comprehensive accessibility audits to identify barriers, engaging persons with disabilities in the process. Use the findings to inform strategies addressing accessibility, communication, evacuation, and participation, ensuring the plans consider and accommodate diverse needs.
- Designate empowered (with human and financial resources) focal points with specific disability expertise within municipal departments with decision making authority to lead coordination efforts, allocate resources, and prioritize disability inclusion in DRR strategies.
Essential 2: Identify, Understand and Use Current and Future Risk Scenarios

**Indicators**

2.1 **Design of Disability-Inclusive Risk Analyses and Risk Scenarios** - *Has the local government developed a comprehensive and multi-hazard risk assessment that takes into account the differentiated needs of persons with disabilities? Are risk scenarios developed in accessible formats and shared with persons with disabilities in a meaningful way?*

2.2 **Cascading Effects** - *Does the local plan contain information on the population of persons with disabilities and does it include measures to mitigate the negative impact that a disaster could have on them, including impacts resulting from possible cascading failures?*

**Overall City Achievement for Essential 2**

The overall city achievement for Essential 2 is 0.81 out of 3 with equal levels of achievement across indicator 2.1 (0.81) and indicator 2.2 (0.81). See Figure 5.

**Figure 5: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 2 Risk Scenarios**

![Score Chart](image-url)

- **Score**: 0.81
- **Essential 2**: 2.1
- **Score**: 0.81
- **Essential 2**: 2.2

**Strength Areas**

Some cities indicate the existence of multi-hazard risk assessments and local plans and within that group, several (e.g., Baguio City, Quezon City, Bella Union, Pudahuel) indicate the involvement, consideration, and consultation of persons with disabilities in their development and review to varying degrees.
Gaps and Weaknesses

Nonetheless significant gaps and weaknesses remain across all cities. The analysis reveals that, overall, risk scenarios and awareness campaigns when they do exist, tend to lack any significant consideration and collaboration with persons with disabilities and communities, highlighting a critical weakness in inclusive disaster planning. Consequently, one city notes that their risk scenarios do not reflect the real needs and concerns of people with disabilities.

Five cities scored zero on both indicators, revealing a significant gap in considering the distinct needs of persons with disabilities in the design and delivery of multi-hazard risk assessments and an overall lack of consideration of measures to mitigate the negative impact that a disaster could have on them, including impacts resulting from possible cascading failures.

In terms of common challenges, cities continue to mention the negative impact that the lack of comprehensive and disaggregated data and information on persons with disabilities has on the creation of thorough multi-hazard risk assessments tailored to the specific needs of persons with disabilities. The lack of detailed information hampers the formulation of local plans, hindering the implementation of measures to mitigate the negative impact of disasters, including considerations for possible cascading failures. Access to such information is vital for understanding the specific needs and vulnerabilities of the disabled population, ensuring that risk reduction strategies are tailored to address their unique circumstances.

Other cities note however that even when information on the number of people with disabilities features in plans, it is not accompanied by measures to mitigate the effects of risks on them. Their observation highlights a significant gap in the translation of knowledge into actionable policies and practices and shows that information alone is insufficient. There is a critical need for proactive planning and implementation of strategies tailored to the unique challenges and vulnerabilities faced by individuals with disabilities in the face of disasters and authorities must demonstrate a heightened level of prioritisation for persons with disabilities and recognise the importance of integrating them into DRR efforts.

Recommendations

- Cities should enhance data and information accessibility. There is a need to conduct comprehensive and disaggregated data collection on persons with disabilities and work with this group to inform the design and delivery of multi-hazard risk assessments, enabling a more tailored and inclusive approach.
- Promote awareness and knowledge on persons with disabilities and disasters. Implement targeted awareness campaigns focusing on enhancing the knowledge and understanding of policymakers regarding the specific risks faced by persons with disabilities.
- Prioritize the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the design and review of risk scenarios, ensuring their meaningful involvement. Embed persons with disabilities as a fundamental part of the process for creating, reviewing, and updating risk scenarios ensuring that the risk scenarios are consistently developed in accessible formats.
Essential 3: Strengthen Financial Capacity for Resilience

Indicators

3.1 Inclusive Financial Mechanisms - *Are financial mechanisms in place, be it internally or externally, to ensure the sustainability of resilience initiatives that incorporate persons with disabilities in their design, implementation, and evaluation?*

Overall City Achievement for Essential 3

The overall achievement of Essential 03 stands at just 0.62 out of 3, making it the lowest scoring of all of the Essentials. Given that there is only one indicator under this Essential, and the achievement of ‘Indicator 3.1: Inclusive Financial Mechanisms’ mirrors this overall score. See Figure 6.

At the city level, the data reveals a low level of achievement in Indicator 3.1, with as many as 13 of the participating of cities recording a zero score, indicating an absence of financial mechanisms addressing the needs of persons with disabilities in the design, implementation, and evaluation of resilience initiatives.

Figure 6: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 3 Financing for Resilience

Strength Areas

Despite its low performance overall, there are some notable city practices with some indicating a more comprehensive approach to integrating persons with disabilities into their financial mechanisms (e.g., Baguio City, Bella Union and Pudahuel). In Baguio City, for example, the budget appropriation for persons with disabilities programs, projects, and
activities is set at 1% of the annual National Tax Allocation, and this allocation is implemented by all local departments. This ensures a designated portion of the budget specifically earmarked for initiatives aimed at supporting and benefiting persons with disabilities across various local government departments. As an additional measure the city will aim to allocate 1% of the Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Fund (LDRRMF) specifically for programs, projects, and activities related to Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) for persons with disabilities. This ensures a dedicated portion of the fund to address the unique needs and vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities in disaster resilience initiatives.

Gaps and Weaknesses

The prevailing gaps and challenges identified by cities include a scarcity of financial resources and budget allocations in general and dedicated to disaster resilience initiatives in particular. In some cities, what exists is exclusively tailored for public without any specificity for persons with disabilities, and there is a significant lack of financial support mechanisms specifically designed to address the unique needs of persons with disabilities in the face of disasters. A lack of integration between the existing financial mechanisms within each municipal department has been described as exacerbating the struggle to establish comprehensive and inclusive financial strategies for resilience initiatives. These challenges collectively impede the development of robust and inclusive financial mechanisms essential for the sustainable resilience of persons with disabilities in the event of disasters.

Recommendations

- Embed specific budget allocations for disability-inclusive measures, actions, and projects within the local resilience strategy or plan, safeguarding the earmarked budget for these initiatives.
- Enhance partnerships and collaboration with external actors, including donors, international organizations, and NGOs, particularly in resource-poor contexts. Prioritize partnerships aligned with inclusive principles to seek additional support for disability-inclusive resilience initiatives, emphasizing the importance of sustained financial commitment from external entities.
- Institutionalize monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to oversee the implementation of programs for persons with disabilities and assess the effectiveness of financial support in disability-inclusive resilience initiatives.
- Regularly review and adapt programs and financial strategies based on the evolving needs of persons with disabilities, ensuring that sustained support remains responsive to changing circumstances and emerging challenges.
Essential 4: Pursue Resilient Urban Development

Indicators

4.1 Inclusive Resilient Urban Design - *Are persons with disabilities meaningfully involved in development of local urban design, to make it accessible, resilient and inclusive?*

4.2 Building Codes and Standards - *Are there national or municipal building codes or standards that address infrastructure accessibility for persons with disabilities?*

4.3 Building Codes and Standards - *Are building codes and regulations that promote infrastructure accessibility for persons with disabilities widely implemented and adequately enforced?*

4.4 Removal of Environmental Barriers - *Does the Local Plan consider universal design, such as the removal of environmental (physical, communication and information) barriers, as promoted by the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030?*

Overall City Achievement for Essential 4

Essential 4 is the highest performing area of work, standing at 1.23 out of 3. Within this, ‘Indicator 4.2: Building Codes and Standards’ shows a relatively higher level of progress (2.05), indicating that more cities have national or municipal building codes or standards in place that address infrastructure accessibility for persons with disabilities. See Figure 7.

Figure 7: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 4 Resilient Urban Development

![Graph showing progress scores for Essential 4](image-url)
However, performance in one indicator does not translate to equal success in the remaining indicators. While the existence of building codes is a positive sign, the existence of regulations does not necessarily guarantee their effective application on the ground with enforcement of accessibility standards (Indicator 4.3) showing a lower score of 1.14. Lower scores still were recorded in relation to Indicator 4.4 which relates to considerations of universal design principles in DRR (1.00) and Indicator 4.1 which relates to overall inclusivity of urban design (0.71).

**Strength Areas**

City progress in inclusive urban design varies, with cities like Quezon City, Baguio City, and Gelephu showcasing considerations for persons with disabilities through institutionalized approaches like executive orders mandating accessibility audits.

Additionally, some cities suggest involvement of OPD representatives in specific urban planning elements, such as in the design and development of transportation initiatives and city bus plans (e.g., Thimphu). Notably, a strength area across cities is the presence of national or municipal building codes and standards addressing infrastructure accessibility for persons with disabilities, as indicated by cities like Barcarena, Baguio City, Quezon City, and Pudahuel.

Regarding the implementation of building codes prioritizing infrastructure accessibility for persons with disabilities, Quezon City stands out for its rigorous enforcement of national codes and its active efforts to strengthen commitment through the development of additional ordinances. In terms of promoting universal design principles and addressing environmental barriers, cities such as Baguio City and Quezon City demonstrate a sustained commitment through executive orders, annual assessments, and evaluations. Similarly, in Barcarena, all new developments in the city follow the municipal building codes and associated accessibility measures. The local government's commitment to these standards, particularly in relation to new projects like the municipal market, has earned commendation from OPDs for having adhered to the highest accessibility standards. This proactive approach reflects a systematic effort by local governments to identify and eliminate environmental barriers across physical, communication, and information domains.

**Gaps and Weaknesses**

The varied success across indicators suggests that some cities may be addressing individual components of resilience and inclusivity rather than adopting a holistic approach. Fragmented initiatives may not effectively address the complex interplay of factors influencing inclusive and resilient urban development.

Inclusive urban design faces challenges in cities with many cities participating in this pilot noting that persons with disabilities are not considered in urban design processes at all. Others note that while persons with disabilities may be involved in creating new designs, they
often see diminished participation in final decision-making, causing accessibility issues further down the line. Outdated designs contribute to infrastructure inaccessibility, and there are notable challenges relating to the difficulties associated with retrofitting older facilities and neighbourhoods within cities. Limited involvement of OPDs further restrict inclusive representation in urban design.

Despite the existence of legal building codes that support inclusion in several contexts, compliance remains a challenge. Even well performing cities noted issues of low compliance of buildings with national accessibility laws that establish essential standards to ensure the accessibility of buildings for persons with disabilities, particularly among private and commercial buildings. This non-compliance, a challenge across all cities, impedes the effective implementation of building codes and standards designed to enhance infrastructure accessibility for persons with disabilities. It underscores a broader issue of legal requirements not being met, leading to physical barriers that limit the mobility and participation of persons with disabilities. The challenge not only obstructs the realization of inclusive urban design goals but also calls for concerted efforts in enforcement, awareness-raising, and collaboration among city authorities, business proprietors, and advocacy groups to ensure adherence to accessibility standards and foster a more inclusive urban landscape.

**Recommendations**

- Cities should enhance meaningful engagement of persons with disabilities and OPDs in urban design through their consistent involvement in all phases of creating, reviewing and updating urban plans.
- Establish comprehensive local building codes explicitly addressing universal design and accessibility, ensuring consistent implementation. Where these exist bridge the gap between their existence and local implementation by adapting and incorporating standards into municipal regulations. Initiate retrofitting efforts for existing facilities and old neighbourhoods, ensuring they meet updated accessibility standards and universal design principles.
- Cities should strengthen building code enforcement at the local level. In instances where no enforcement efforts exist, cities should establish focused initiatives to initiate and enforce building codes. In other contexts, the continuous improvement and reinforcement of existing enforcement measures should be pursued, with the goal of achieving universal compliance.

**Essential 5: Safeguard Natural Buffers to Enhance the Protective Functions Offered by Natural Ecosystems**

| No Indicators |
Essential 6: Strengthen Institutional Capacity for Resilience

Indicators

6.1 **Capacity Building and Inclusion for Resilience** - *Are there training processes in place that cover key aspects of disability inclusive disaster risk reduction that are accessible to persons with disabilities and to all sectors of the city, such as local government, private businesses, NGOs and communities? Are these processes and activities designed and imparted with the active participation of persons with disabilities and OPDs?*

6.2 **Accessible Language** - *Are communication materials and information on risk and resilience available in accessible and easily understandable formats to ensure the inclusion of persons with disabilities?*

Overall City Achievement for Essential 6

The overall city achievement for Essential 6 stands at 0.71 out of 3, suggesting a significant overall deficiency in institutional capacity dedicated to promoting urban resilience in disability inclusive DRR.

There is a notable disparity between the two indicators with Indicator 6.1 scoring 0.90 compared to Indicator 6.2, which with a score of just 0.52 is the lowest-scoring indicator in the entire assessment framework. See Figure 8.

**Figure 8: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 6 Institutional Capacity**
This shows that when it comes to strengthening institutional capacity for resilience, cities are making relatively greater progress in ensuring that there are training processes in place to all sectors of the city that cover disability inclusive DRR than they are in ensuring that communication materials and information are available in accessible and easily understandable formats. Nonetheless, with eight of the participating cities recording a zero score across both indicators, and no city achieving the maximum 3 points, widespread challenges in this Essential appear evident.

**Strength Areas**

Some cities are implementing actions to address institutional capacity including efforts to conduct training sessions dedicated to enhancing preparedness for persons with disabilities, with a particular focus on schools and involving children and parents.

Cities are looking to additional measures that they can undertake which include activities such as specialized training for emergency responders on disability awareness, inclusion practices, and effective communication strategies to ensure that responders are equipped to assist persons with disabilities during all stages of disaster response. This is complemented by the development and implementation of early warning systems that are inclusive and accessible to persons with disabilities.

**Gaps and Weaknesses**

Nonetheless, significant challenges persist. One city notes that their existing training programmes and DRR activities do not address the needs of persons with disabilities while others describe a complete absence of training on disability inclusion in DRR across diverse stakeholder groups, encompassing persons with disabilities, local government, private businesses, NGOs, and communities. Many cities report that disability inclusion has not been a subject they have received training on or engaged with until now through the support of UNDRR, the Government of Finland and the Government of the Republic of Korea.

Some cities note that in cases where capacity-building training is provided to local governments, there has been limited involvement from NGOs and OPDs in the development and delivery of the trainings. Without their input, training may overlook the unique needs of persons with disabilities, resulting in a less inclusive and relevant program.

Cities also highlight issues related to information, education, and communication materials. Existing materials, where available, are often not tailored to the specific needs of persons with disabilities and there is limited knowledge among service providers in creating content in accessible languages, exacerbating the challenge. The absence of accessible materials compounds the difficulties faced by persons with disabilities in disaster situations. This reflects the findings of the UNDRR Global Survey which shows that 56% of respondents reported not being aware of or not having access to disaster risk information in accessible formats in their communities.
Recommendations

- There is a need for city-wide capacity-building programs focused on disability-inclusive DRR. Ensure that all stakeholders, including local government officials, private businesses, NGOs, and communities including persons with disabilities and OPDs receive training to enhance their understanding of disability inclusion in resilience efforts.
- Actively involve OPDs and NGOs in the planning, development, and delivery of capacity-building training. Leverage their expertise to ensure that the unique needs of persons with disabilities are adequately addressed in all training initiatives. Include persons with disabilities in the design and evaluation of training sessions. Their lived experiences provide invaluable insights that can contribute to the development of more effective and relevant capacity-building programs.
- Develop and disseminate accessible information, education, and communication materials that cater specifically to the needs of persons with disabilities. Ensure the use of plain language, sign language interpretation, and alternative formats including the Braille, to guarantee widespread understanding and inclusivity. Ensure persons with disabilities and OPDs are actively involved throughout the process of developing and disseminating the materials.

Essential 7: Understand and Strengthen Societal Capacity for Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Active Participation of Organisations of Persons with Disabilities - Are organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) actively involved in planning for a potential disaster event in any area of the city and for responding to such events?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Capacity Building by and for Organisations of Persons with Disabilities - Are there disaster risk reduction training programmes designed by and for organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall City Achievement for Essential 7

With a total score of just 0.62 out of 3 for Essential 7, cities show notably low performance in understanding and strengthening societal capacity for resilience. There is only a slight disparity between the two indicators that constitute the essential, with Indicator 7.1 focusing on the active participation of OPDs and Indicator 7.2 focusing on capacity building by and for OPDs scoring 0.57 and 0.67 respectively. See Figure 9.
Figure 9: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 7 Societal Capacity

Nine cities recorded zero scores across both indicators, and no city achieved the maximum 3 points in either indicator, underscoring the urgent need for substantial improvements in promoting the involvement of OPDs and enhancing capacity-building efforts specifically designed for and by this group.

Strength Areas

In terms of strength areas, a handful of efforts and practices are evident. In relation to Indicator 7.1, Quezon City acknowledges the existence of disaster planning efforts including information dissemination, trainings, and awareness-raising activities in some of the city communities. The city recognises the need for them to increase their coverage across the city as well as the need for greater levels of inclusion of OPDs in them. In relation to Indicator 7.2, Pudahuel, describes the existence and implementation of training programs specifically designed for OPDs and recognises the need to increase the frequency at which these are carried out as well as the importance of amending existing training programmes that the municipality has to offer, to ensure a focus on disability inclusion. Notably, in Rio de Janeiro, a wealth of OPDs and a vibrant civil society actively contribute to advancing disability inclusion and DRR efforts, offering a significant opportunity for the city to harness this existing strength.

Gaps and Weaknesses

Nonetheless, challenges persist across cities. A city notes the complete absence of OPDs in the city. Given the non-existence of these entities, it logically follows that tailored training initiatives designed by and for them are also non-existent. They note the need to establish OPDs or similar entities at the city level. This step will be crucial for fostering collaboration and ensuring representation in disaster planning. Another city notes that despite the existence of OPDs and civil society actors actively working on disability inclusion and DRR, the city government faces the challenge of effectively mapping these actors, understanding
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their activities, building dialogue, and fostering synergies with public action. The recognition of the vibrant landscape of OPDs and civil society engagement highlights the need for the city government to enhance its coordination efforts. Establishing mechanisms to map these actors and their initiatives becomes crucial for facilitating collaboration and ensuring their meaningful integration into inclusive DRR efforts.

In other cities, despite some DRR training being carried out in communities, OPDs have not yet been included in them, signalling a need for more inclusive practices. One city highlights challenge related to the limited dissemination and communication about the preparation of DRR plans which limits the opportunities for OPD engagement and acknowledge that while there are training programmes designed by and for OPDs, they are carried out infrequently.

**Recommendations**

- Promote meaningful collaboration and coordination between OPDs and the local government. Engage persons with disabilities or through OPDs in the development and review of contingency plans, ensuring a unified approach that incorporates varied perspectives and protection needs of persons with disabilities.
- Strengthen inclusion by actively engaging with organizations representing persons with disabilities to understand their unique needs and perspectives in relation to DRR. Collaborate closely with these organizations to develop inclusive DRR plans. In the absence of existing OPDs, initiate efforts to establish local organizations or explore collaboration with regional/national or if necessary global disability advocacy groups to address this gap.
- Cities should develop and implement regular and continuous training programs for OPDs on DRR and focal persons within OPDs for DRR should be established and provided with specialized training to enhance their DRR capabilities.

**Essential 8: Increase Infrastructure Resilience**

**Indicators**

8.1 Protection from Violence - Are contingency plans being developed in meaningful consultation with OPDs to protect persons with disabilities and other groups from violent situations and for meeting their needs in post-disaster living and meeting spaces?

**Overall City Achievement for Essential 8**

The overall achievement of Essential 8 stands at 0.62 out of 3, signalling low levels of achievement in relation to ensuring protection from violence for persons with disabilities in
post-disaster living and meeting spaces. With only one indicator under this essential, and the achievement of Indicator 8.1 mirrors this overall percentage. See Figure 10.

**Figure 10: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 8 Protection from Violence**

![Graph showing overall progress of local governments in Essential 8 Protection from Violence with a score of 0.62 for Indicator 8.1](image)

**Strength Areas**

Limited good practices are evidenced for meaningful consultation with OPDs in contingency planning for the protection of persons with disabilities and other groups during violent situations and post-disaster scenarios. Baguio City’s establishment of persons with disabilities desks in all barangays (lowest administrative unit), managed collaboratively with OPDs and Social Service Departments under the Camp Coordination and Management sector, stands out. Although little detail is provided, these desks, can act as local hubs and facilitate the development of contingency plans with direct input from persons with disabilities and OPDs. The continuous engagement ensures consideration of specific needs, addressing vulnerabilities and formulating effective strategies for protection during emergencies. In post-disaster situations, these desks become crucial spaces for coordinating and implementing plans, potentially contributing to inclusive design addressing protection concerns in living and meeting spaces. This collaborative approach ensures that the voices and concerns of persons with disabilities are integrated, fostering a more responsive and effective post-disaster environment.

**Gaps and Weaknesses**

While cities largely express having developed contingency plans, they acknowledge a lack of targeting contingency planning and protection measures specifically for persons with disabilities during emergencies and disasters. As many as 11 of the 21 participating cities marked a zero score in this indicator acknowledging that their contingency plans lack protective provisions tailored for persons with disabilities.
Cities point to a lack of consideration of protection concerns relating to the physical cohabitation spaces, but also to a lack of knowledge and awareness among first responders and emergency response teams about the specific protection needs of persons with disabilities in such settings. This suggests a need for increased training and awareness raising on these issues drawing on the experiences of persons with disabilities and OPDs as well as the extensive existing materials including those from a range of sources, including the humanitarian shelter sector that have been developed with these groups to address protection concerns of persons with disabilities in post-disaster living spaces.

One city notes that civil society OPDs carry out activities relating to contingency planning with the inclusion of protective measures for persons with disabilities during emergencies and disasters, but they take place independently of local government, highlighting a lack of coordination. Another city highlights the impact of the lack of trust in public institutions to report cases of violence, with NGOs and community organizations being perceived as more reliable emphasising the importance of building transparent and accountable mechanisms to address cases of violence. These cases highlight the need for enhanced cooperation between civil society and public authorities to effectively address and prevent violence. The lack of integration or joint planning may lead to missed opportunities for a more comprehensive and inclusive approach to addressing the protection needs of persons with disabilities in disaster preparedness and response efforts highlighting the importance of bridging the gap between civil society organizations and the local government for a more unified and effective approach to DRR, particularly for persons with disabilities.

In response to these challenges, cities universally emphasize the importance of reviewing their contingency plans in collaboration with OPDs to enhance preparedness and response efforts.

**Recommendations**

- Engage in meaningful consultation with OPDs during contingency plan development. Ensure thorough consideration of the varied perspectives and protection needs of persons with disabilities. Regularly review existing contingency plans to identify gaps and shortcomings, especially in terms of protection measures for persons with disabilities ensuring the active involvement of OPDs in the process.
- Provide training developed in collaboration with OPDs to emergency response teams and relevant personnel on the specific protection needs of persons with disabilities. Include guidance on violence prevention in various emergency and disaster situations, addressing the nuanced requirements of persons with disabilities.
- Establish mechanisms for coordination, collaboration and joint planning between civil society organizations and local government to create a unified and effective approach to DRR with a specific focus on persons with disabilities.

---

8 See for example: [https://sheltercluster.org/resource/all-under-one-roof](https://sheltercluster.org/resource/all-under-one-roof)
Essential 9: Ensure Effective Disaster Response

**Indicators**

9.1 **Inclusive Detection, Monitoring and Early Warnings** - Does the local government have forecasting and monitoring equipment, multi-hazard early warning systems and/or any related communication systems that work effectively for persons with disabilities, taking into account the full diversity of disability?

9.2 **Drills** - Does the local government conduct annual drills or simulation events that include the population of persons with disabilities and their organisations?

9.3 **Awareness Campaigns and Multi-scenario Drills** - Does the local government carry out awareness-raising campaigns and/or multi-hazard drills that contribute to enhancing visibility of the differentiated needs of persons with disabilities in emergency situations that require evacuation, search and rescue, shelter management?

**Overall City Achievement for Essential 9**

The overall achievement of Essential 9 is 0.76 out of 3, and the degree of achievement is equally distributed across Indicators 9.2 and 9.3 (0.81) but slightly lower in Indicator 9.1 (0.67) indicating slightly greater progress in relation to drills as well as awareness campaigns and multi-scenario drills than in relation to inclusive detection, monitoring and early warnings. See Figure 11.

**Figure 11: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 9 Disaster Response**

![Score Chart](image-url)
**Strength Areas**

Several cities report implementing various forecasting and monitoring systems, as well as multi-hazard early warning mechanisms and communication systems. For example, the city of Astana states that they have a warning system that works effectively for most persons with disabilities (approximately 50-75%). Santa Tecla acknowledges the presence of monitoring and early warning systems at both the local government and community levels. The city conducts biannual drills, mandated by legislative decree, with the active obligation for institutions, encompassing all sectors, including OPDs, to participate in these exercises. In Rio de Janeiro, firefighters and NGOs have organized drills focusing on disability inclusion. Furthermore, the city boasts an award-winning app, designed for risk monitoring, warnings, and risk communication. While the current version includes some accessibility features, there are plans for further enhancements in the upcoming version.

Similarly, cities including Astana, Pudahuel, Baguio City, Kampala, and Santa Tecla, note regular drills and simulation events, involving OPDs and persons with disabilities in various settings such as educational institutions and health centers. Cities confirm that they have, in some instances, undertaken campaigns and multi-hazard drills but the extent to which it can be said that they contribute to enhancing visibility of the differentiated needs of persons with disabilities in emergency situations that require evacuation, search and rescue, shelter management is not consistent. Santa Tecla, however, notes the existence of several national level initiatives and confirm the active participation of persons with disabilities in them. The city maintains a comprehensive directory of individuals with disabilities and notes that the Red Cross and firefighters play a crucial role in supporting efforts to ensure the inclusion of people with disabilities in these campaigns and drills.

**Gaps and Weaknesses**

One notes the complete absence of forecasting and monitoring systems as well as early morning mechanisms and communication systems, while others note that the systems that do exist, do not consider the varied needs of persons with disabilities. Notably, there are specific limitations, in relation to some of the systems and approaches to early warning mechanisms that do exist, such as the oversight of the needs of persons with sensory impairments, indicating a pressing need for enhancements to ensure inclusivity across the entire spectrum of disabilities. One city notes the profound impact of the absence of early warning system alarms that the deaf community experienced in past disasters. The city emphasizes the critical need for comprehensive training for all individuals with disabilities, highlighting the unique diversity each person brings.

The deficiencies in forecasting and monitoring systems, early morning mechanisms and communication systems poses a significant challenge when considering that as results from the UNDRR Global Survey on Persons with Disabilities and Disasters show that even with adequate early warning persons with disabilities often face difficulties evacuating and in some cases are unable to evacuate independently at all.
In terms of preparedness through drills and simulation events, some cities note a lack of active participation of OPDs in exercises explicitly tailored to address the unique challenges faced by persons with disabilities. Instead, their involvement has been limited to general drills, signalling a potential oversight in the specificity required to meet the varied needs of persons with disabilities.

When it comes to awareness raising initiatives, some cities note that local governments do not regularly conduct campaigns and awareness-raising activities to deal with various hazards, which help to improve awareness of the different needs of people with disabilities in emergency situations. Others, accept that while they have been carried out, they do not achieve full coverage across the entire population and the differentiated needs of persons with disabilities remain inadequately visible within these awareness-raising activities. Simulations, even when they do exist, lack regularity and fail to specifically address the nuanced requirements of persons with disabilities. This suggests a need for more comprehensive and inclusive strategies to ensure that the local government's preparedness measures effectively account for and address the unique challenges faced by persons with disabilities.

The ability to monitor and communicate risk to the communities of persons with disabilities is fundamental for informed decision making in DRR planning. Yet findings from the Global Survey, reveal that 84 percent of persons with disabilities reported not having a personal preparedness plan for disasters. This statistic underscores the urgency of bridging the gap in inclusive disaster planning, emphasizing that tailored measures and targeted awareness campaigns are imperative to empower persons with disabilities to make informed choices in preparing for and responding to disasters.

**Recommendations**

- Develop or enhance existing forecasting and monitoring equipment to accommodate the differentiated needs of persons with disabilities by incorporating features that address various forms of disabilities. Ensure that the early warning system and communication systems are fully inclusive and accessible by providing information in multiple formats, such as text, audio, and visual content. Regularly engage with persons with disabilities and OPDs to gather feedback and insights for ongoing improvements to enhance inclusivity in forecasting, monitoring, and communication systems.

- Establish a regular schedule for conducting highly realistic drills that consider the specific and differentiated needs of persons with disabilities. Collaborate with persons with disabilities and OPDs to gather feedback and insights for ongoing improvements to enhance inclusivity in forecasting, monitoring, and communication systems.

- Develop and implement awareness-raising campaigns that specifically focus on the differentiated needs of persons with disabilities in emergency situations. Conduct multi-hazard drills that contribute to enhancing the visibility of these needs during evacuation, search and rescue, and shelter management. Ensure the active participation of persons with disabilities and OPDs in the planning and execution of these campaigns and drills.
Essential 10: Expedite Recovery and Build Back Better

**Indicators**

10.1 Inclusive Reconstruction and Rehabilitation - Does post-disaster reconstruction and rehabilitation aim to build a more accessible and inclusive society, through the meaningful engagement of organisations of persons with disabilities?

10.2 Compilation of Lessons Learned - Are clear processes in place to learn from failures following a disaster event, particularly regarding the participation/impact on persons with disabilities with consideration for other factors such as sex, age, income and geographic distribution? Are there clear and effective mechanisms/processes for incorporating these lessons into the design and implementation of reconstruction projects?

**Overall City Achievement for Essential 10**

The overall achievement of Essential 10 is 0.64 out of 3. The degree of achievement across the two indicators differs slightly with Indicator 10.1 focusing on inclusive reconstruction and rehabilitation scoring 0.57 and Indicator 10.2 focusing on lessons learned scoring slightly higher at 0.71. See Figure 12.

Overall, city responses suggest a mix of strengths and gaps. While some areas demonstrate an incipient commitment to inclusivity and community engagement in post-disaster contexts, others struggle with fragmented processes, inadequate planning, and limited involvement of OPDs in critical aspects of post-disaster management.

**Figure 12: Overall progress of local governments in Essential 10 Expedite Recovery**
Strength areas:

Cities note a handful of strength areas in relation to Essential 10. Phuentsholing, for example benefits from an active civil society formed OPDs and NGOs despite the absence of major incidents requiring reconstruction. This suggests that the city has a foundation of engaged and proactive entities that could potentially contribute significantly to post-disaster reconstruction and rehabilitation efforts. This is positive for the city's potential in inclusive recovery efforts for future disasters.

Pudahuel benefits from accessibility regulations for persons with disabilities in reconstruction efforts showing that the city has taken proactive steps to incorporate accessibility measures and suggesting a positive effort toward building a more accessible and inclusive society through post-disaster reconstruction. Quezon city also stands out with its established Program Partner Agreements (PPAs) on Rehabilitation and Recovery in the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Plan, and structured initiatives for skills training and startup capital for persons with disabilities being delivered by NGOs.

Santa Tecla has proactively conducted multiple technical studies on soils and other factors to identify measures aimed at reducing risks, even in the absence of recent disasters. The city relies on standards, laws, and ordinances governing construction and rehabilitation activities. Additionally, Santa Tecla notes the presence of a comprehensive urban master plan that integrates inclusion considerations throughout its framework. Insights gained from previous disasters are described as having played a pivotal role in shaping the city's approach to risk management. These lessons have not only inspired the creation of family evacuation tools but have also driven the ongoing enhancement of the city's emergency plans.

Gaps and Weaknesses

Despite the strength areas cities also note facing challenges in relation to inclusive recovery, reconstruction and rehabilitation as well as in overall learning from disasters. Cities reveal fragmented processes across departments engaged in post disaster recovery and rehabilitation and describe practices such as the implementation of overly generalised impact assessment without specific consideration for persons with disabilities. Together these factors can hinder the development of comprehensive, consistent and integrated strategies for building a more accessible and inclusive society in post disaster contexts.

Cities also indicate that it is not yet a common practice for OPDs and other bodies providing social services to actively participate in post-disaster recovery and reconstruction processes. This is due to a combination of factors including local authority oversight, inadequate consultation processes and a lack of experience in working collaboratively with such groups.

When it comes to learning from disasters, one city notes that they currently have no processes in place to facilitate learning and that when this takes place, it is dependent upon the time and initiative of individuals rather than part of a broader institutional approach. Other
cities state that while processes and assessments exist, the perspectives and impacts of disasters on persons with disabilities are not routinely captured in them.

Recommendations

- Actively engage OPDs and actors providing social protection services in all phases of post disaster planning processes even institutionalising where possible such engagement through resolutions or other mechanisms. Foster collaboration and partnerships within and between local government agencies, NGOs and OPDs to ensure a coordinated, holistic and inclusive approach in post disaster contexts.
- Create guidelines and standard operating practices that explicitly emphasize the incorporation of differentiated and intersectional needs into post-disaster reconstruction projects. Reinforce these through capacity building initiatives that ensure decision-makers, planners, and implementers understand the importance of addressing the specific requirements of persons with disabilities.
- Develop clear and comprehensive post-disaster assessment mechanisms that specifically consider the participation and impact on persons with disabilities. Institutionalize the process of learning from disasters by developing mechanisms for incorporating lessons into policies and guidelines for post-disaster reconstruction ensuring the participation of persons with disabilities and OPDs in such processes.
6. Concluding Remarks

The findings of the pilot implementation of the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities – Annex for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities reveal a notable disparity in the collective achievement of cities across the Ten Essentials for the inclusion of persons with disabilities in sub-national DRR policies and practices. Nonetheless, overall, the results indicate that progress in disability inclusion efforts is limited across cities.

It is clear from the scoring that there are areas for urgent enhancement and optimization in disability inclusion efforts in every city context. This trend aligns with the broader findings of the UNDRR Global Survey 2023, indicating limited progress in disability inclusion over the past decade with no significant regional differences.

Within this context, the Disability Inclusion Scorecard exercise emerges as a valuable tool for city learning, shedding light on gaps in practices and activities, and aiding in the formulation of recommendations and design of action plans. In this sense, low scores present opportunities to enhance strategies and practices, ensuring that cities continuously progress toward comprehensive disability inclusion in their DRR efforts.

Key Challenges

While some achievements are evident, significant challenges persist. While the analysis has shown the many contextually specific challenges across cities affecting their progress in ensuring the inclusion of persons with disabilities in local DRR processes, the analysis reveals four primary challenges that while sometimes linked to specific essentials, are crosscutting, interlinked, foundational to advancing DRR across the board.

The first challenge is the lack of data and knowledge on persons with disabilities. The absence of specific data on persons with disabilities and OPDs hinders effective planning and resource allocation for disability inclusion in DRR. To address this, cities are recommended to establish centralised registries designed for persons with disabilities, providing detailed and disaggregated information for more inclusive disaster risk management. However, as the analysis showed, the presence of data alone does not result in the development of inclusive strategies for DRR. Rather it takes individuals with the requisite knowledge and capacity to proactively convert such information into effective and actionable initiatives that genuinely prioritise the meaningful inclusion of persons with disabilities across all facets of DRR.

The second challenge involves a dual deficit: limited knowledge and understanding of DRR and persons with disabilities among policymakers, and a corresponding lack of DRR knowledge among persons with disabilities and OPDs. In many cities, policymakers lack knowledge and understanding of the intersection of disasters and disabilities hindering effective planning for the risks faced by persons with disabilities. However, it is also the case that there is often a lack of knowledge and understanding of DRR among persons with
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disabilities and OPDs leading to a lack of awareness regarding potential risks and the corresponding lack of development of personal preparedness measures. Furthermore, this knowledge gap may contribute to their already limited participation in planning processes, and the create barriers to the development of inclusive strategies.

Cities commonly note a lack of participation of persons with disabilities and OPDs in DRR processes. This exclusion leads to limited representation of the unique and diverse perspectives and needs of persons with disabilities, resulting in the oversight of crucial considerations across the DRR spectrum. The absence of their direct input hampers the development of effective and inclusive disaster management strategies, potentially leading to ineffective responses during disasters. Overall, it highlights the need for mechanisms to actively involve them in all stages of DRR planning to foster inclusivity and resilience.

The fourth challenge relates to the absence of designated and empowered focal points for persons with disabilities within local government departments. This widespread challenge highlights a systemic barrier that obstructs effective coordination and the implementation of disability-inclusive practices across participating cities. The lack of focal points compromises the ability of the cities to integrate persons with disabilities into DRR efforts, thereby undermining the organizational structure essential for inclusive planning and response.

A key consequence of these issues across the Essentials is continuous lack of equity between people with and without disabilities in DRR considerations. In many cases, as the analysis showed existing plans and policies, when present, inadequately address or completely neglect considerations of the needs of persons with disabilities.

Yet, it is imperative to note that none of these issues are insurmountable. With a dedicated commitment to persons with disabilities, and an increased recognition among city policy makers of the fundamental rights of persons with disabilities to be meaningfully included in all aspects of disaster management, cities have the potential to overcome these challenges, making significant strides in advancing inclusivity and resilience across the DRR spectrum.

**Key Recommendations for Cities**

Based on these findings, the following key recommendations are suggested for cities.

**Recognize and prioritize the inclusion of persons with disabilities as a central and urgent policy objective for DRR policy and practice**. Demonstrate dedicated commitment by explicitly recognizing and prioritizing the fundamental rights of persons with disabilities in policies and plans.

---

Establish a comprehensive system for collecting and maintaining disaggregated data on persons with disabilities, including details on their demographics, types of disabilities, and geographic locations, etc. Integrate this information into risk assessments and policy development processes to ensure targeted and inclusive DRR strategies.

Develop and implement DRR awareness campaigns and capacity-building initiatives with and for persons with disabilities, OPDs and policymakers. Design and conduct education programs, inclusive planning processes and awareness campaigns in collaboration with OPDs to enhance understanding of the impact of disasters on persons with disabilities among policy makers. Simultaneously, offer DRR capacity-building programs and communication materials specifically tailored to the varied needs of persons with disabilities and OPDs.

Ensure the active and meaningful participation of persons with disabilities and OPDs in DRR planning and implementation processes. Consider the diverse needs of various groups of persons with disabilities when planning for DRR. Foster inclusive decision-making processes that involve persons with disabilities and OPDs at every stage.

Designate empowered focal points with specific disability inclusion expertise for DRR policy and practice. Establish clear and empowered focal points who can facilitate coordination between the DRR offices, other municipal stakeholders and OPDs. These focal points should play a pivotal role in steering coordination, allocating resources, and ensuring disability inclusion remains central.

Embed specific budget allocations for disability-inclusive measures, actions, and projects within the local resilience strategy or plan. Enhance partnerships and collaboration with external actors, including donors, international organizations and NGOs, particularly in resource-poor contexts to seek additional support for disability-inclusive resilience initiatives.

Implement comprehensive local building codes that explicitly prioritize universal design and accessibility and ensure strong mechanisms for local enforcement.

Engage OPDs and other key stakeholders in developing contingency plans for post-disaster living and meeting spaces, ensuring protection from violence for persons with disabilities. Regularly review and update contingency plans.

Equip local government systems for effective forecasting, monitoring, and communication tailored to diverse needs. Conduct inclusive drills and awareness campaigns addressing the unique needs of persons with disabilities in emergencies.

Ensure post-disaster reconstruction actively aims for inclusivity through meaningful engagement with OPDs and persons with disabilities. Establish processes for learning from failures and develop mechanisms to incorporate these lessons into reconstruction projects.
By implementing these recommendations, cities can progress towards a more inclusive, resilient, and prepared urban environment, ensuring the meaningful participation and protection of persons with disabilities in all phases of disaster management.