

**Data sources for outcome indicators  
on Article 11:**

**Protection and  
safety in situation  
of risk, including  
situations of armed  
conflict, humanitarian  
emergencies & the  
occurrence of natural  
disaster**



**UNITED NATIONS  
HUMAN RIGHTS**  
OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER



ADVANCE VERSION

© 2020 United Nations

The *Data Sources Guidance* is a component of the [SDG-CRPD Resource Package](#) developed by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). This is an advance version of the SDG-CRPD Resource Package. A final version will be issued upon completion of OHCHR review processes.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this guidance do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a figure indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

The *Data Sources Guidance* was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of OHCHR and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.



## **11.23 Number of deaths, missing persons and persons affected by disaster per 100,000 people (SDG indicator 1.5.1), disaggregated by sex, age and disability.**

*Level 3: Indicator for which acquiring data is more complex or requires the development of data collection mechanisms which are currently not in place*

[Link to the metadata related to this SDG indicator](#)

Data provider at national level is appointed Sendai Framework Focal Points. In most countries disaster data are collected by line ministries and national disaster loss databases are established and managed by special purpose agencies including national disaster management agencies, civil protection agencies, and meteorological agencies. The Sendai Framework Focal Points in each country are responsible of data reporting through the Sendai Framework Monitoring System.

The Sendai monitoring system appears to capture the number of people affected by disasters, but not their individual characteristics. One way this could be collected is if the individual identities of everyone affected were known, as when there is a post-disaster assessment. This will especially be true in States that have emergency response procedures in place to address mass casualty events. Victims could then be linked to a national disability registry. However, in times of crises – especially large-scale crises where the number of deaths is estimated – this would be more difficult. Moreover, not all persons with disabilities will be included in a disability registry, for a variety of reasons, but this could generate an estimate of the indicator.

Another approach could be through government agencies that register deaths. Families will seek to register deaths for a range of reasons, including inheritance. Currently, disaggregated data may be an issue, but death certificates could be expanded to collect information on disability.

Finally, a post-disaster household survey could ask about persons with disabilities who died, or pre- and post-disaster surveys estimating the number of persons with disabilities could be used to estimate the number of persons with disabilities who have died. If this latter approach is taken, those estimates need to account for the people who became disabled as a result of the crisis, or the number of deaths would be underestimated.

## **11.24 Proportion of aid recipients with disabilities, compared to the proportion of persons with disabilities in the population, by sex, age and disability.**

*Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts*

Some Office of the Commission on Humanitarian Action (OCHA) Country-based Pooled Funds report their efforts to address persons with disabilities. For example, the [Humanitarian Fund Report of the Democratic Republic of Congo](#) reported that 6 per cent of their targeted population had a disability and 68 projects specifically addressed the concerns of persons with disabilities.

For purposes such as these, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee task force on the inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian action recommends the use of the WG short set of questions on disability in their needs assessments, as part of crisis response. A [tool for using these questions in humanitarian settings](#) was developed and tested by Humanity and Inclusion.

The OCHA and the Professionals in Humanitarian Action and Protection produce reports on tracking humanitarian funding. Although their most recent 2016 report was not disaggregated by disability, it could be expanded to do so.

Another potential source of information is the [OCHA financial tracking service](#). Again, while this does not currently report on the indicator, its reporting mechanisms could be expanded to include such reporting.

## **11.25 Proportion of persons with disabilities in refugee and internally displaced populations, compared to the proportion of persons with disabilities in the population, by sex, age and disability.**

*Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts*

This information should be incorporated into the ongoing data collection on refugees and internally displaced people by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), which are important sources of information on these populations. As an example, a report from Iraq can be consulted at <https://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/Iraq>.

[Humanity and Inclusion developed a toolkit for collecting data on disability](#) in humanitarian settings that draws upon the WG Short Set of Questions and that can be incorporated into

their tools. It was tested in Jordan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Philippines, and is to be used during the intake procedure in a humanitarian setting.

During the action research phase of the project, Humanity and Inclusion found that the rate of reporting of disability status increased from 1-3 per cent to 10-15 per cent in one project and from 3 per cent to 25 per cent in another. The document is available at [https://humanity-inclusion.org.uk/sn\\_uploads/document/2018-10-summary-review-wgq-development-humanitarian-actors.pdf](https://humanity-inclusion.org.uk/sn_uploads/document/2018-10-summary-review-wgq-development-humanitarian-actors.pdf) (pg.26).

Currently, such data is not typically collected. However the Humanity and Inclusion tool, or a variant, could be used both during an intake procedure for services or through a survey of refugees and internally displaced people, to get a handle on the flow of populations, or through a survey of refugees and internally displaced people for a stock measure. This could also be accomplished by having both disability questions and questions on refugee/displaced person status on standard household surveys.

[UNHCR's study, Age, Gender and Diversity Accountability Report 2017](#) has a section on how different countries are addressing persons with disabilities among refugee, asylum seeker and internally displaced populations.

The report states that, in response to the challenges identified by operations in the reporting process, UNHCR will consider investing further in data collection – broken down by age, sex and diverse characteristics. While improved data does not yet seem to be available, existing methods of data collection to disaggregate data continue to be strengthened including, but not limited to, biometric registration.

## **11.26 Proportion of persons with disabilities who had access to safe and dignified housing in response to a natural disaster or humanitarian emergency and proportion they represent of the total of beneficiaries, disaggregated by sex, age and disability, geographical location and nature of emergency.**

*Level 2: Indicator that could be produced with straightforward additions or modifications to existing data collection efforts*

In the U.S. Disaster Housing Assistance Program (DHAP-Katrina), as part of the case management process, case managers entered demographic information (including disability status, based on receipt of disability benefits) into an administrative database. In a [report on the program](#), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development reported that only 8 per cent of the 36,279 households who received help reported a disability.

It should be kept in mind, though, that recording disability status based on receipt of disability benefits, which in the United States of America is tied to the ability to work, undercounts persons with disabilities. A higher percentage would most likely have been recorded if the WG Questions were used. Functional questions on disability in the United States of America's statistics point to a 15 per cent disability rate, while only about 3 per cent of the population receives disability benefits. However, recording disability status as part of the intake or application procedure is a model for collecting these data.

[Half of all the post-disaster borrowing provided by the World Bank is earmarked for the reconstruction of housing.](#) However, no statistics were found on its accessibility to persons with disabilities or on the proportion of persons with disabilities in affected areas who had access.