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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>Population and Housing Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPD</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Demographic and Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIES</td>
<td>Household Income and Expenditure Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>Labour Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMS</td>
<td>Living Standards Measurement Survey (or equivalent e.g. Living Condition Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSO</td>
<td>National Statistics Office (or equivalent e.g. Bureau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPD</td>
<td>Organization of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCAP</td>
<td>United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART I: UNDERSTANDING DISABILITY DATA FOR INCHEON STRATEGY REPORTING

Introduction


Central to measuring progress towards implementing the Incheon Strategy is the need for reliable and comparable disability data. The purpose of this guide is to support governments in Asia and the Pacific in collecting and analysing disability data to report against the Incheon Strategy indicators. This guide is therefore of relevance to disability focal points, national statistical offices (NSOs), line ministries and related stakeholders.

Information in this guide is based on: lessons learned from 17 ESCAP member States (herein referred to as member States), as reported during in-country consultations between 2014 and 2018;\(^3\) findings from an ESCAP mid-point survey on Incheon Strategy progress conducted between October 2016 and April 2017;\(^4\) and feedback provided by member States in a consultative workshop hosted by ESCAP in Bangkok, 2018.

This guide is supplementary to the earlier ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy\(^5\), which provides detailed technical information on indicator measurement.

Scope of disability data

In this guide, disability data refer to all data that can be used to effectively measure efforts towards the inclusion of persons with disabilities in development policies, programmes and related initiatives. These include prevalence data; data on accessibility; and data on the removal of disabling barriers\(^6\) to inclusion and meaningful participation.

---

\(^2\) ESCAP, 2012(a). ST/ESCAP/2648.
\(^3\) Members hosting consultations: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam.
\(^4\) 35 ESCAP member States responded to the survey. In 2017, no government reported having full baseline data for all 62 indicators. While six member States reported having data for 20 or more indicators, 20 member States reported having data for less than half of the Incheon Strategy Indicators. The quality and comparability of different disability data varied greatly between countries. Findings from the survey contributed to the Midpoint Review of the Asian and Pacific Decade of Persons with Disabilities, 2013-2022 in Beijing, 2017 (ESCAP, 2017(c). E/ESCAP/APDDP(4)/1).
\(^5\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\(^6\) Disabling barriers identified in the World Report on Disability include: inadequate policies and standards; negative attitudes; lack of provision of services; problems with service delivery; inadequate funding; lack of
While discussions on disability data often focus on measuring disability prevalence, prevalence data alone are, however, insufficient for reporting against all Incheon Strategy indicators. Prevalence data often need to be combined with other data (for example, on poverty and employment to report against Incheon Strategy indicators 1.1 and 1.2); for some goals, rather than prevalence data, data on policies and accessibility are required (for example, data on the availability of accessible public documents under Incheon Strategy indicator 3.4).

**Box 1. Measuring disability prevalence data**

Having accurate and comparable disability prevalence data underpins the measurement of progress on disability-inclusive development. A key challenge to measuring progress towards the Incheon Strategy is the limited availability and variable quality of prevalence data. Globally, there is a lack of reliable data on the prevalence, or total number, of persons with disabilities, with data often not comparable between countries.

Disability prevalence as reported by ESCAP member States

Box 1. Measuring prevalence data (continued)

The chart shows a large variation in reported disability prevalence across Asia and the Pacific, ranging from 1.1 per cent in Brunei Darussalam to 24 per cent in New Zealand. Based on these reported figures, the average prevalence rate for Asia and the Pacific is 5 per cent, which is significantly below the World Health Organization’s estimate of a 15 per cent prevalence rate globally.

The lack of comparable prevalence data is due to differences in how disability is defined, measured and collected between and within countries. This lack of standardized approaches results in the underestimation of disability prevalence, which in turn negatively impacts resource allocation for, and the prioritization of, disability-inclusive development. Without accurate data on the number of persons with disabilities, decision makers face challenges in effectively planning for and delivering sustainable and inclusive development for all. Consequently, persons with disabilities remain largely invisible in development policy and practice at the national, regional and global levels.

Based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF), the Washington Group on Disability Statistics has developed tools for governments to use in censuses and surveys to collect standardized and comparable disability prevalence data.

The fundamental Washington Group question set is its Short Set on Functioning, comprising six questions. These six questions are designed to be culturally neutral; avoid reference to disability, which can result in underreporting; and are based on difficulties people may experience conducting familiar everyday activities.

The Washington Group Short Set on Functioning (WG-SS)

1. [Do/Does] [you/he/she] have difficulty seeing, even if wearing glasses?
2. [Do/Does] [you/he/she] have difficulty hearing, even if using a hearing aid(s)?
3. [Do/Does] [you/he/she] have difficulty walking or climbing steps?
4. [Do/Does] [you/he/she] have difficulty remembering or concentrating?
5. [Do/Does] [you/he/she] have difficulty with self-care, such as washing all over or dressing?
6. Using [your/his/her] usual language, [do/does] [you/he/she] have difficulty communicating, for example understanding or being understood?

Response categories to the above questions:

a. No difficulty
b. Some difficulty
c. A lot of difficulty
d. Cannot do at all

The Washington Group Short Set on Functioning is increasingly being used by member States to collect disability prevalence data. Accelerated adoption of the Washington Group questions by governments provides an opportunity to collect standardized disability prevalence data for Incheon Strategy reporting and to draw meaningful comparisons between countries.

Sources of disability data

a. Administrative data and management information systems

Administrative data are collected and used for the implementation, management and monitoring of a programme or service. For example, the Ministry of Labour may provide disability insurance and employment support services, the Ministry of Social Welfare may provide disability-related social assistance, the Ministry of Education may provide educational assistance to children with disabilities, and the Ministry of Health may provide medical rehabilitation and assistive technology to persons with disabilities.

Administrative data on persons with disabilities may be confined to a small subset of persons with disabilities who are beneficiaries or participants in specific government programmes or services. Often these individuals are identified by a clinical assessment of impairments; further eligibility criteria and fiscal considerations determine access to services and the ensuing inclusion in administrative data sets. The information recorded in databases is also often limited to basic demographic characteristics, such as sex and age, as well as disability type. Sometimes, the administrative data are frequently only available in aggregated form and may be stored in paper-based form.

Management information systems (MIS) are increasingly used to store and process administrative data to manage and monitor the delivery of government services effectively. MIS tend to be sector-specific, although efforts are currently being made to increase interoperability across sector-specific systems in many countries. Common examples of MIS include health and education management information systems. The extent to which data on persons with disabilities are included in MIS and allow for comparison with the wider population varies between and within countries, depending on the country’s political priorities, institutional capacities and technical infrastructure.

Box 2. Disability-inclusive EMIS of the Federated States of Micronesia

The Federated States of Micronesia has developed an EMIS to track progress towards disability-inclusive education. The EMIS includes data on children with and without disabilities. Benefits of this EMIS include:

- Inclusion of disability status of children allows disaggregation by disability status;
- Disability data for individual children allows disaggregation by characteristics, including age, sex and academic performance;
- Including data on children out of school reduces the risk of only having data on the disability status of children in school as children with disabilities are disproportionately out of school; and
- Digitally stored data allows efficient disaggregation of data for data analysis and evidence-informed policymaking.

Source: ESCAP member consultations.
b. Population-based surveys

In recent years, there have been concerted efforts to improve disability data collection in national population-based surveys. Tools include the Washington Group Short Set on Functioning, the UNICEF/Washington Group Module on Child Functioning and the World Health Organization’s Model Disability Survey. Increasingly, member States are incorporating the Washington Group Short Set into surveys, with some governments planning to use the questions in the 2020 census round (see Box 3). A couple of governments have already used the Washington Group questions in multiple national surveys.7

To improve disability data collection in national population-based surveys, the following approaches are encouraged:

- Collect disability data over two points in time to allow for the measurement of progress8;
- Include disability questions in multiple national population-based surveys as each survey collects data relevant to some, but not all, Incheon Strategy indicators; and
- Collaborate with organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) and persons with disabilities in data collection.

**Box 3. Integration of Washington Group questions into population surveys by governments in Asia and the Pacific**


Asia-Pacific countries planning to use the Washington Group questions in the 2020 Population and Housing Census include Kyrgyzstan and Sri Lanka.

---

7 For example, Myanmar and Bangladesh.
8 Timor-Leste used the Washington Group questions in two rounds of population and housing censuses (PHC). This is on a five-year PHC cycle when most countries have a 10-year PHC cycle. Myanmar used the Washington Group questions in its 2015 Labour Force Survey (LFS) and reported planning to use the questions in the LFS again.
Data analysis and usage

Data need to be analysed and applied to inform policymaking for disability-inclusive development. Yet while more countries now ask questions about disability in their censuses, the presentation of disability data has often been limited to tabulations showing the number of specific severe disabilities present in the population; crosstabulations with other characteristics are often rare. Comparisons with the population without disabilities are also not being made even though data are available. Where disability data has been collected over two points in time, no analysis of changes over time has been conducted. Further, to strengthen data analysis and application, there is a need for increased coordination and collaboration among disability focal entities, NSOs and line ministries and agencies.

Box 4. Disability data collection and analysis in Myanmar

Myanmar is one of the few Asia-Pacific governments that have collected disability data from multiple surveys. Myanmar has also taken steps to ensure more complex analysis of data collected. Some of the strengths and weaknesses of these initiatives are as follows:

First Myanmar National Disability Survey 2010

- Disability was defined “according to a Myanmar cultural construct of disability”. This definition resulted in data that cannot be compared to other survey findings;
- Data analysis only included persons with disabilities. Comparisons with population without disabilities were made against national level indicators;
- The study faced methodological limitations but showed potential to fill gaps in disability data; and
- Besides disability prevalence, educational attainment, housing, land and property ownership, employment, household income, awareness of disability services among the population with disabilities were analysed and reported.

Myanmar Population and Housing Census 2014

- The 2014 census used the first four questions of the Washington Group Short Set;
- Besides disability prevalence at different levels of difficulties, multiple disabilities, age and sex patterns of disability, and regional variation of disability were presented;
- Disaggregation and comparisons were made between populations with and without disabilities to identify gaps and unequal opportunities between the two populations in education, employment, poverty and access to infrastructures and services;
- Discussions of findings and policy implications were provided; and
- In-depth analysis and preparation of a thematic report on disability was facilitated through technical and financial support from the United Nations Population Fund.

---

Box 4. Disability data collection and analysis in Myanmar (continued)

Myanmar Labour Force Survey (MLFS) 2015

- The 2015 MLFS used all six questions of the Washington Group Short Set;
- Prevalence of disability was disaggregated by sex, rural and urban areas, and labour force status (employed, unemployed, in/outside labour force); and
- Further analysis of disability and comparisons of labour market indicators between populations with and without disabilities were not made. The Washington Group Short Set was not included in the 2016 round as there was limited reported use of the data collected in the 2015 round.

Situation Analysis of Children with Disabilities Survey (SACD) 2015

- The 2015 SACD used the UNICEF Washington Group Module on Child Functioning;
- In-depth analyses on the situation of children with disabilities was conducted with technical support from UNICEF and financial support from various donors; and
- Analyses included daily life of the child, caregiving and living environment, community and social life, right to education, right to health, right to protective environment, right to identity and privacy, children’s aspirations, and barriers faced by children with disabilities.


Frameworks, institutions and coordination mechanisms

a. Overarching legislative frameworks and anti-discrimination legislation

An overarching legislative framework and corresponding anti-discrimination measures is essential for the effective implementation of the Incheon Strategy.\(^\text{10}\) Robust legislative frameworks and associated measures facilitate the planning, coordination and budgeting for disability-inclusive development and put in place checks and balances required to hold stakeholders to account. Governments that have developed anti-discrimination legislation and measures note the benefits of broad stakeholder engagement, including the participation of OPDs, in implementing and reporting on the Incheon Strategy.

b. Whole of government approaches

Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination on disability data – along with the application of standardized approaches to disability measurement, data collection and

\(^{10}\) The criticality of establishing a robust legislative framework for disability inclusion is underscored in both in the context of implementing the CRPD, to which many Asia-Pacific governments are State Parties, as well as in implementing the Incheon Strategy. Goal 9 of the Incheon Strategy, in particular, calls upon member States to ratify and implement the CRPD, with Target 9.B specifying the enactment of national laws that include anti-discrimination provisions, technical standards and other measures.
management across all ministries and administrative levels – is essential to effective disability data management and Incheon Strategy reporting.

As work on disability inclusion covers a range of sectors and thematic areas, collaboration across government is required. Disability data cannot be approached as the responsibility of a single ministry or agency because no entity will have all the data necessary to inform policymaking on disability inclusion and to report against all Incheon Strategy indicators. For example, while NSOs lead the collection of national data, such as in censuses, other line ministries also collect data through surveys and administrative systems.

The following structures and roles were noted as being effective in facilitating intra-governmental coordination on disability data, during consultations with member States:

- A national disability coordination mechanism with multi-stakeholder participation, including cross-government representation and the participation of OPDs;
- An active national disability focal point with a corresponding focal point in each line ministry or equivalent agency;¹¹ and
- The NSO taking a coordinating role and providing cross-government support for the collection and disaggregation of disability data.¹²

¹¹ Having corresponding Focal Points in line ministries was noted as important, but few member States currently have this mechanism. It was also noted that the effectiveness of coordination usually depended on how committed and active the lead national Focal Point is.

¹² The importance of the NSO taking this role was not recognised in all consultations. Also, the importance of shared data collection efforts across ministries was noted. However, the ESCAP Member Survey showed only five member States doing so.
PART II: GUIDANCE ON GENERATING DISABILITY DATA BY INCHEON STRATEGY INDICATOR

General advice on Incheon Strategy reporting

The following steps can be used as a general guide to support the reporting of Incheon Strategy indicators:

Step 1: Identify and assess available disability data. This includes the assessment of data reliability and the appropriateness of data collection tools used. Note that disability data include both data on individuals with disabilities and data relating to barriers and accessibility.

Step 2: Identify which available data sets have usable data for each indicator. It is important to note the year in which the data were collected. If similar data for one Incheon Strategy indicator are available in multiple years, use the most recent data or the data closest to 2017 for baseline establishment.

Step 3: Identify missing data sources for each indicator. Explore alternative data sets that may be used to report against the indicator.

Step 4: Include the Washington Group Short Set on Functioning in surveys for end line reporting.

Step 5: Compare indicators over two points in time and analyse changes in differences between the population with and without disabilities.

GOAL 1: REDUCE POVERTY AND ENHANCE WORK AND EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTS

Indicator 1.1 Proportion of persons with disabilities living below the US$1.25 (PPP) per day international poverty line, as updated by the World Bank and compared to the overall population

Current situation

Persons with disabilities are disproportionately represented among the poor.\(^{13}\) Relatedly, the SDG objective of ending poverty in all forms everywhere will not be achieved without including persons with disabilities in poverty alleviation initiatives.

- **Data sources:** Various, including Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES), Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) and Population and Housing Census (PHC), assuming a disability module is included.

\(^{13}\) See: United Nations, 2011.
Observations and issues: The international poverty line was created in 1990 to compare poverty measures across countries. The World Bank updated the international poverty line to US$1.90 a day in October 2015 based on the purchasing power parity (PPP) calculations of the International Comparison Program 2011.\textsuperscript{14,15} Few countries have a disability module in their household income or expenditure surveys. Only seven member States and associate members (Georgia; Hong Kong, China; Indonesia; Macao, China; Mongolia; Republic of Korea; and Thailand) had poverty statistics by disability status as of 2017.\textsuperscript{16} For example, the Republic of Korea obtained estimates from the Survey of Household Finances and Living Conditions, 2015.\textsuperscript{17} Thailand used administrative data from the registration system maintained by the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities.\textsuperscript{18}

Way forward

Step 1: Where data do not currently exist, develop and implement a disability-inclusive income or consumption survey.

- Incorporate the Washington Group Short Set on Functioning in a national income or consumption survey (e.g. HIES or LSMS) or smaller-scale surveys if national surveys are not available.

Step 2: Analyse data collected to identify the population living below or above the international poverty line by disability status.

- This requires necessary training on poverty estimation; and
- In addition to using the available resources on the International Comparison Program, PPPs and PovcalNet, consider seeking technical support from the World Bank.\textsuperscript{19}

Further information:

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (pp. 19-20)\textsuperscript{20}; and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 13-15 and annex p. 60).\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{14} See: World Bank (a).
\textsuperscript{15} See: World Bank (c).
\textsuperscript{16} ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
\textsuperscript{19} The World Bank can assist NSOs in developing methodologies for and monitor indicators to measure progress on poverty eradication and run an online poverty data portal. Contact: Research@WorldBank.org. See: World Bank (b).
\textsuperscript{20} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{21} ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
Indicator 1.2 Ratio of persons with disabilities in employment to the general population in employment

Current situation

- **Data sources:** The most relevant data source is the Labour Force Survey (LFS). Employment data are also available through the Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES), Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS), and other population-based surveys, such as the Population and Housing Census (PHC) or Demographic and Health Survey (DHS).

- **Observations and issues:** Member States have multiple sources of data on employment that can be used to report the ratio of employment for the general population. However, data on the employment status of persons with disabilities are scarce.

Way forward

**Step 1:** Identify national population-based employment-related surveys that include suitable questions on disability. In situations where surveys do not include disability questions, develop and include a disability module.

**Step 2:** Select the best available data source for this indicator.

- Where multiple sources exist, consider selecting the data source that includes a large sample size for data precision and is collected on a frequent basis to enable assessment of progress over time.

**Step 3:** Estimate and report against the indicator.

- The ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators is brief and some users may not be familiar with the labour concepts used in the guide. For further information, refer to the International Labour Organization (ILO) Guide on Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM).²²

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (pp. 20-21)²³;
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 15-20 and annex p. 60)²⁴; and
- International Labour Organization, 2016. Key Indicators of the Labour Market.²⁵

---

Indicator 1.3 Proportion of persons with disabilities who participate in government-funded vocational training and other employment-support programmes as a proportion of all people trained

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Data for this indicator may be collected from administrative records.
- **Observations and issues:** Data from administrative records for this indicator may be held across ministries. For example, the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Social Welfare may all provide vocational training. Pakistan, for example, provides vocational training to people who are emigrating to work overseas and to youth under Youth Skills Development Programmes. Coordinating reporting across ministries may be challenging.

*Note:* It is possible to proximate this indicator using data on beneficiaries of vocational training and employment support programmes instead of service provider data. Information on these programmes may be collected via the Labour Force Survey (LFS), Education Survey, Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) or Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). However, these sources may not provide information on whether the training was government-funded or not.

Way forward

**Option 1:** Data from administrative records

**Step 1:** Identify existing government programmes on vocational training and employment support programmes. This may be completed by the disability focal point.

**Step 2:** Determine the availability of administrative data for these programmes and the availability of disability identification in the administrative dataset. Specifically, collect the following information:

- If the VTESP has administrative data, do the administrative data include information on disability status of the beneficiaries?
- If Yes:
  - How are persons with disabilities identified?
  - What is the total number of beneficiaries/participants?
  - What is the total number of beneficiaries/participants with disabilities?

*Note:* The total number of persons (as stated above) is required, not proportions of persons with disabilities. Proportions cannot be used for data merging in the next step.
Step 3: Merge data, estimate and report.

- Sum of the total number of beneficiaries across all programmes will be the denominator in the formula provided in the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators; and
- Sum of the total number of beneficiaries with disabilities across all programmes will be the numerator in the formula provided in the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators; and
- Sources of information, definitions of disability and their differences, and missing data should be noted when reporting this indicator.

Option 2: Data from surveys (if suitable administrative data are not available)

Step 1: Establish or identify population-based data that includes information on vocational training and employment support programmes.

- Possible data sources include the Labour Force Survey (LFS), Education Survey, Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) or Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) or specific disability survey; and
- Information on funding sources for vocational training, specifying whether they come from government or non-government organizations, should be included.

Step 2: Assess if a suitable disability module is included.

Step 3: If suitable disability data are available, analyse data and combine with the information on funding sources as far as possible.

Note: If this second option is used, it should be clearly stated in reporting, as it differs from the ESCAP Indicator Guide recommendations.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 21); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 20-21 and annex p. 60).

Indicator 1.4 Proportion of persons with disabilities living below the national poverty line

Note: As per indicator 1.1 without the requirement to consider PPP.

---

27 See ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators (p.21).
GOAL 2: PROMOTE PARTICIPATION IN POLITICAL PROCESSES AND IN DECISION-MAKING

Indicator 2.1 Proportion of seats held by persons with disabilities in the parliament or equivalent national legislative body

Current situation

- **Data sources**: Secretariat of the National Assembly or equivalent body. Personnel records of members of parliament. If personnel records are not available, a rapid survey can be conducted to acquire data for this indicator.
- **Observations and issues**: Most member States reported against this indicator from direct observation and memory. No survey of members of parliament was conducted. Direct observations may not adequately identify whether an individual has a disability. Information is also required from both upper and lower houses, as appropriate.

Way forward

**Option 1**: Where personnel records are available and accessible

**Step 1**: Assess if the following questions can be answered for each individual member:

- Two questions on disability in the Annex of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators:
  - Do you have a disability? Refer to p. 21 of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators.\(^{30}\)
  - If yes, can the degree of disability/functional difficulty be established? Refer to the table on p. 71 of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators.\(^{31}\)
- One question on the sex of the member of parliament.

**Step 2**: If the above questions cannot be answered from existing data, move to Option 2.

**Option 2**: Where personnel records are not available or not accessible

**Step 1**: Implement a rapid self-administered survey of all members of parliament via the secretariat of the National Assembly or equivalent body.

- The survey should use the questions as per Option 1 above.

**Step 2**: Analyse data to identify the proportion of seats held by persons with disabilities in the parliament or equivalent national legislative body.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (pp. 21-24)\(^{32}\), and

\(^{30}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

\(^{31}\) Ibid.

\(^{32}\) Ibid.
• ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 23 and annex p. 60). 33

**Indicator 2.2** Proportion of members of the national coordination mechanism on disability who represent diverse disability groups

**Current situation**

- **Data sources:** Membership records of the national coordination mechanism on disability or equivalent. If membership records are not available, a rapid survey can be conducted to acquire data for this indicator.
- **Observations and issues:** The midpoint review indicated a wide range of representation of persons with disabilities in the national coordination mechanism on disability from 0 per cent to 86 per cent. However, membership records were not available during consultations. It was also observed that the overall coordination body on disability might not include the representation of OPDs or persons with disabilities, while lower forums and committees might. It is assumed that different member States may have reported against different bodies.

*Note:* This indicator refers to the overall national coordination mechanism on disability and not to lower-level administrative forums or coordination bodies.

**Way forward**

**Option 1:** Where personnel records are available and accessible

**Step 1:** Assess if the following questions can be answered for each individual member:

- Two questions on disability in the Annex of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators:
  - Do you have a disability? Refer to p. 21 of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators. 34
  - If yes, can the degree of disability/functional difficulty be established? Refer to the table on p. 71 of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators. 35
- One question on the sex of the member of the national coordination mechanism on disability.

**Step 2:** If the above questions cannot be answered from existing data, move to Option 2.

**Option 2:** Where personnel records are not available or not accessible

**Step 1:** Implement a rapid self-administered survey of all members of the national coordination mechanism on disability via its secretariat.

- The survey should use the questions as per Option 1 above.

34 ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
35 Ibid.
Step 2: Analyse data to identify the proportion of seats held by persons with disabilities on the national coordination mechanism on disability.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 24)\(^{36}\); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 23 and annex p. 60).\(^{37}\)

| Indicator 2.3 Proportion of those represented in the national machinery for gender equality and women’s empowerment who are persons with disabilities |

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Currently, data are mainly obtained from administrative records (China; Georgia; Hong Kong, China; Macao, China; Republic of Korea; and Thailand). Data are also obtained from self-identification (Japan), medical screening data (Nauru), and a mix of interviews and observations (Federated States of Micronesia). Additionally, data may be obtained from personnel records or a rapid survey of members of the national machinery on gender.

- **Observations and issues:** Despite variations in how the national machinery for gender (or women) is organized between member States, collecting data for this indicator did not appear to present significant challenges. However, it was noted that, in a few cases, no national body for gender or equivalent existed. In addition, data on disability types or status may not exist.

Way forward

**Option 1:** Where personnel records are available and accessible

**Step 1:** Assess if the following questions can be answered for each individual member:

- Two questions on disability in the Annex of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators:
  - Do you have a disability? Refer to p. 21 of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators.\(^{38}\)
  - If yes, can the degree of disability/functional difficulty be established? Refer to the table on p. 71 of the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators.\(^{39}\)
- One question on the sex of the member of the national machinery on gender.

**Step 2:** If the above questions cannot be answered from existing data, move to Option 2.

---

\(^{36}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.


\(^{38}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

\(^{39}\) Ibid.
Option 2: Where personnel records are not available or not accessible

Step 1: Implement a rapid self-administered survey of members of the national machinery on gender via its secretariat.

- The survey should use the questions as per Option 1 above.

Step 2: Analyse data to identify the proportion of seats held by persons with disabilities on the national machinery on gender.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 25); and

Indicator 2.4 Proportion of polling stations in the national capital that are accessible with processes in place that ensure confidentiality of voters with disabilities

Current situation

- Data sources: A rapid survey of all polling stations in the national capital using an accessibility checklist.
- Observations and issues: Most countries reported having a National Electoral Commission with responsibility for, and oversight of, polling stations. Currently, how the accessibility of polling stations is assessed varies. While some member States have clear criteria for accessible polling stations, some reported that their criteria are outdated and require updating. Other member States have yet to develop criteria. Regardless of the availability of criteria for accessible polling stations, all countries reported taking measures to improve the accessibility of polling stations. However, it was noted that not all measures taken were appropriate. For instance, while ramps are provided in some locations, they may be too steep for proper usage; yet such ramps would be wrongly recorded as having improved the accessibility of polling stations.

Way forward

Step 1: The National Election Commission should update or develop an accessibility checklist for accessible polling stations.

- Physical accessibility standards are likely available from the Ministry of Public Works and should be referred to.
- Non-physical aspects of accessibility, including access to information and communication required for all individuals to vote, must be considered.

Note: Refer to ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific — Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.

---

Consultations with OPDs should be undertaken during the drafting and finalization of any accessibility checklist.

**Step 2:** The National Election Commission should ensure accessibility checklists are operational and distributed to all polling stations at each election.

- Polling stations self-report accessibility measures taken using the accessibility checklists.
- Sample surveys and spot-checks of polling stations to assess compliance.

**Further information**

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 25-26)\(^{43}\);
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 24-25 and annex p. 60)\(^{44}\); and
- ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific - Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.\(^{45}\)

**Box 5. Reported measures taken to improve voter access**

- Situating polling stations on the ground floor (Pakistan, Sri Lanka) and near roads (Sri Lanka);
- Providing sign language interpretation services in polling stations (planned, Sri Lanka);
- Including local OPD observers during the voting process and/or during accessibility audits of polling stations (Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan);
- Allowing persons with disabilities to vote by mail (Pakistan);
- Providing home-based voting via visiting electoral officials for those who cannot leave their homes (Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Micronesia with addition of a witness);
- Providing free shuttle services for persons with disabilities to commute to polling stations (Kyrgyzstan);
- Providing personal assistance for voters who need such services (Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Micronesia, Sri Lanka);
- Making Braille ballot papers available for voters who are blind (Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) and providing magnifying glasses for voters who have difficulty seeing (Kyrgyzstan);
- Providing mobile ramps for non-accessible polling stations (Azerbaijan);
- Recruiting persons with disabilities to work for the election commission (Kyrgyzstan, planned Pakistan);
- Providing short films or videos explaining the voting process with subtitles and including persons with disabilities in the film (Azerbaijan);
- Raising the awareness of the public and civil servants on the equal voting rights of persons with disabilities (Kyrgyzstan, Sri Lanka);
- Conducting accessibility audits of polling stations (Kyrgyzstan); and
- Making accessibility of all polling stations a legal requirement (Kyrgyzstan).

Source: ESCAP member State consultations.

\(^{42}\) ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
\(^{43}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\(^{44}\) ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
\(^{45}\) ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
GOAL 3: ENHANCE ACCESS TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION

Indicator 3.1 Proportion of accessible government buildings in the national capital

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Data may be sourced from a rapid survey using accessibility checklists.
- **Observations and issues:** “Accessible” buildings do not only refer to the accessibility of the built environment and facilities but also covers information, communication and services. Measures taken to improve the physical accessibility of buildings were reported in consultations. Sri Lanka reported making compulsory for public buildings and spaces to be accessible; Pakistan reported issuing instructions to all government departments to ensure accessibility; while the Federated States of Micronesia reported no national building code with accessibility considerations at present, representatives noted the importance of involving OPDs in accessibility planning and oversight. Efforts to ensure information and communication accessibility and the full utility of government buildings were generally seldom reported.

Way forward

**Step 1:** Develop or update comprehensive accessibility technical standards for government buildings.

- Review and update building codes alongside compliance and reporting mechanisms in consultation with OPDs.
- Accessibility considerations must include non-physical aspects of accessibility, including access to information and communication.  
  *Note:* Refer to ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific — Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.46
- The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 21542:2011 on Building Construction- Accessibility and Usability of the Built Environment may be used as a reference as it complies with the CRPD and international accessibility standards. It provides guidance on a large range of facilities and criteria in addition to ramps (which were the most frequently mentioned items in consultations), such as surfaces, steps, corridors, entryways, emergency exits, parking, as well as indoor and outdoor facilities including lighting, signage, alarm systems and toilets.
- Accessibility checklists should be developed based on existing accessibility standards or may be used in the interim as standards are being developed or updated.
- Include persons with disabilities and OPDs in the development or updating of accessibility standards and regulations.

---

Step 2: Audit government buildings in the national capital.

- The Ministry of Public Works should lead accessibility audits of government buildings in the national capital with OPDs. Accessibility audits should not be a one-off activity. Audits should be completed annually to ensure compliance and measure progress over time.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 28-29)\textsuperscript{47};
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 28-29 and annex p. 60)\textsuperscript{48}; and
- ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific - Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.\textsuperscript{49}

**Indicator 3.2 Proportion of accessible international airports**

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Administrative data from national Airport Authority or equivalent. Accessibility audit and compliance checks.
- **Observations and issues:** “Accessible” airports do not only refer to the accessibility of the built environment and facilities in the airport but also covers information, communication and services. All member States reported no significant issues in obtaining data for this indicator. However, it should be noted that member States often cited international airports as being accessible due to the provision of elevators. However, having elevators is not in itself an indicator of accessibility. No accessibility standards or accessibility checklists were available during consultations.

Way forward

**Step 1:** The Airport Authority or equivalent should lead a review and update comprehensive accessibility standards and compliance and reporting mechanisms (as Indicator 3.1).

- Accessibility considerations must include non-physical aspects of accessibility, including access to information and communication.
  
  *Note:* Refer to ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific — Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{48} ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
\textsuperscript{49} ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
\textsuperscript{50} ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
• International standard ISO 21542:2011 on Building Construction- Accessibility and Usability of the Built Environment\textsuperscript{51} may be used as a reference as it complies with the CRPD and international accessibility standards. It provides guidance on a large range of facilities and criteria in addition to ramps (which were the most frequently mentioned items in consultations), such as surfaces, steps, corridors, entryways, emergency exits, parking, as well as indoor and outdoor facilities including lighting, signage, alarm systems and toilets.
• Accessibility checklists should be developed based on existing accessibility standards or may be used in the interim as standards are being developed or updated.
• Include persons with disabilities and OPDs in the development or updating of accessibility standards and regulations.

**Step 2: Audit international airports.**

• The Ministry of Public Works should lead accessibility audits of international airports with OPDs. Accessibility audits should not be a one-off activity. Audits should be completed periodically to ensure compliance and measure progress over time.

**Further information**

• ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 29-30)\textsuperscript{52};
• ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 28-29 and annex p. 60)\textsuperscript{53}; and
• Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific - Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.\textsuperscript{54}

**Indicator 3.3 Proportion of daily captioning and sign-language interpretation of public television news programmes**

**Current situation**

• **Data sources:** Administrative data from the Ministry of Communication or equivalent body. Accessibility audit of public broadcasters.
• **Observations and issues:** During member State consultations, ESCAP was unable to meet with responsible ministries and, as such, data for this indicator were not available. However, in the member State survey, a few countries reported regular captioning and sign-language interpretation on public television news programmes. Where such services are available, they are often provided for short news bulletins. No member State reported being aware of global initiatives to improve access to information and communication technologies for persons with disabilities, such as the G3ict initiative.

\textsuperscript{51} International Organization for Standardization (a).
\textsuperscript{52} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{53} ESCAP, 2017(a).
\textsuperscript{54} ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
Way forward

**Step 1:** The Ministry of Communication or equivalent should develop or update national standards and guidelines on captioning and sign-language interpretation.

- It is essential to include OPDs and persons with disabilities in the development or updating of these standards and guidelines.

**Step 2:** Audit public television news programmes based on the above guidelines or interim accessibility checklists if required. Ensure monitoring over time.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 30)\(^55\);
- Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific - Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development\(^56\); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 29-30 and annex p. 60)\(^57\);

*Note:* The link to the international standards and the G3ict initiative in the ESCAP indicator Guide has been replaced. At the time of writing, the following link could be used: [http://www.e-accessibilitytoolkit.org/toolkit/technology_areas/television](http://www.e-accessibilitytoolkit.org/toolkit/technology_areas/television).

### Indicator 3.4 Proportion of accessible and usable public documents and websites that meet internationally recognized accessibility standards

**Current situation**

- **Data sources:** Administrative data from the Ministry of Communication or equivalent body. Sample surveys of public documents and websites.
- **Observations and issues:** While the increasing availability of public documents via government websites was noted, few efforts to make documents and websites accessible were reported. Although the ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators refers to international standards (ISO/IEC 40500:2012), no participants reported being aware of these standards. Relatedly, the UN e-Government Survey 2018 indicated improved targeted e-service delivery to persons with disabilities globally but noted that further improvement was needed due to the strong correlation between digital exclusion and social exclusion.\(^58\)

\(^{55}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

\(^{56}\) ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.

\(^{57}\) ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.

\(^{58}\) DESA, 2018. ST/ESA/PAD/SER.E/205.
Way forward

**Step 1:** The Ministry of Communication or equivalent should lead a review of public documents and develop and update national accessibility standards for public documents and websites.

- Refer to international standards, such as the ISO/IEC 40500:2012, in the development or revision of standards.
- It is essential to include OPDs and persons with disabilities in the development or updating of these standards.

**Step 2:** The Ministry of Communication should lead a review of a sample of public documents and websites in collaboration with OPDs.

- Audit a sample of all public documents published in a specific year. The most recent year is recommended.
- For websites, a sample of currently available websites is needed for the audit.
- Existing accessibility auditing tools, such as the website http://wave.webaim.org/, can be used to check website accessibility.

**Further information**

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 31);
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 29-30 and annex p. 60);
- ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific — Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development; and

**Indicator 3.5** Proportion of persons with disabilities who need assistive devices or products and have them

**Current situation**

- **Data sources:** The data source recommended in the ESCAP Indicator Guide is a national disability survey. Data for this indicator were collected via disability-specific or socioeconomic surveys in Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and Thailand. Administrative data from the Ministry of Health were also used.

---

60 ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
62 International Organization for Standardization (b).
• Observations and issues: During consultations, it was noted that assistive devices or products were frequently provided by multiple agencies without coordination across agencies. How data on assistive products and their needs were collected and recorded also varied across ministries. Overall, data for this indicator from service providers were either limited or not available. Similarly, data from users were not available as questions on assistive products had yet to be incorporated into national surveys. At the time of writing, the World Health Organization (WHO) is in the process of developing a priority assistive product list that potentially may be incorporated into surveys.63

Way forward

Step 1: The NSO should identify population-based surveys that can be used to estimate this indicator, including disability status, needs and ownership of assistive products.

• If data are available and suitable, the NSO should select the best available data (if multiple sources exist) and proceed to report.
• If data are not available or not suitable, for example, having data on ownership but missing data on the needs for assistive products, proceed to Step 2.
• While national data are preferred, sub-national data with a clear note of scope and limitations may be used for reporting.

Step 2: The NSO should incorporate questions on the needs and ownership of assistive products in upcoming population-based survey(s) alongside questions on disability status (Washington Group questions).

• The WHO’s list of priority assistive products provides a reference on essential assistive products.64

Further information

• ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 32)65;
• ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 30 and annex p. 60)66;
• WHO priority assistive products list (under development)67; and
• WHO Global Cooperation on Assistive Technology (GATE) Programme.68

64 WHO, 2016.
68 WHO.
GOAL 4: STRENGTHEN SOCIAL PROTECTION

Indicator 4.1: Proportion of persons with disabilities who use government-supported healthcare programmes, as compared to the general population

Current situation

- **Data sources**: National surveys that track health-care use. For example, Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS), Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) and other national health surveys. The survey is required to include a disability module.

- **Observations and issues**: Member States reported having administrative data on the beneficiaries of government-supported health programmes from the national health management information system (HMIS). However, HMIS data can be problematic for this indicator due to the following factors: administrative data do not cover the total population; disability status is not recorded; or disability status is recorded but may not be reliable, for example, data obtained via a direct self-reported question on disability. Population-based surveys also do not have sufficient information for this indicator. For example, they currently do not include questions on the use of government-supported healthcare programmes; the survey does not include disability status; or disability status is recorded using a direct question and may be unreliable.

Way forward

**Step 1**: The NSO should identify national population-based surveys that include questions on the use of government-supported healthcare programmes and reliable disability questions.

- If data are available, analyse and report.
- If data are not available or not suitable, move to Step 2.

**Step 2**: The NSO should develop and include questions on the use of government-supported healthcare programmes and disability status, using Washington Group questions, in upcoming population-based survey(s).

*Note*: An alternative option would involve modification of reporting requirements and their corresponding forms within the HMIS.

- Where feasible, the Ministry of Health should consider including all residents in their database (instead of patients only), and integrate the Washington Group/UNICEF Module on Child Functioning in HMIS.
- Including all residents in the HMIS would be challenging, but possible if the HMIS is linked to universal health programmes that target everyone. This may not be feasible for all member States at this point, however, should be considered in the context of strengthening data systems towards the achievement of universal health coverage (UHC) and increasing use of digital health records.
Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 37); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 33-34 and annex p. 60).

| Indicator 4.2 Coverage of persons with disabilities within social protection programmes, including social insurance and social assistance programmes |

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Population-based surveys, including Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) or disability surveys that include information on recipients of disability benefits. Administrative data from social protection programmes.
- **Observations and issues:** Data for this indicator were reported as available in some countries but were not analysed or available during member State consultations. Disability measurement was not consistent across countries. Direct questions on disability, chronic illness, or types of impairment were used and thus affected the reliability and comparability of information. Administrative data were reported as available; however, administrative data often did not include disability status or combined different measures of disability status resulting in incomparable data. Difficulties in combining social protection records to report against this indicator were reported by member States. For example, Kyrgyzstan noted some social protection programmes kept digital records; however, other programmes still had paper-based records. Further, not all records included disability status. On balance, population-based surveys are therefore likely to be a better source of data for this indicator currently.

Way forward

**Option 1:** Use population-based survey data to report against this indicator

**Step 1:** The NSO should identify national population-based surveys that include both questions on the receipt of social protection programmes and suitable disability questions.

- If data are available, analyse and report.
- If data are not available or not suitable, move to Step 2.
- If data are not available at the national level, use sub-national level data with a clear note on scope and limitations.

**Step 2:** The NSO should develop and include questions on the receipt of social protection programmes and disability status, using Washington Group questions, in upcoming population-based survey(s).

---

70 ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
Option 2: Combine the use of administrative data and survey data to report against this indicator

Step 1: The Ministry of Social Welfare should lead a review of administrative data of all social protection programmes administrative data.

- List all social protection programmes.
- Review and, if necessary, develop and add a disability module using the Washington Group questions to the data collection forms and systems.

Step 2: The NSO should harmonize the use of disability questions in population-based survey tools and administrative data systems.

- Include the same disability module in census or national population surveys to get the total population with disabilities using the Washington Group questions.
- Combining analysis of data from both steps will provide the information required to report against this indicator.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 38)\(^{71}\); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 33-34 and annex p. 60).\(^{72}\)

### Indicator 4.3 Availability of government-funded services and programmes, including for personal assistance and peer counselling, that enable persons with disabilities to live independently in the community

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Administrative data from service providers and reports from the Ministry of Social Welfare and the Ministry of Health.
- **Observations and issues:** In member State consultations, initiatives to support independent living were reported; however, most were limited in scale. In Central Asia, Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan reported programmes to support independent living in the community for persons with disabilities and older persons who live alone; these programmes may be government-funded or delivered via private sector partnerships. Smaller-scale initiatives and pilots were reported in South and Southeast Asia.

**Way forward**

Step 1: The Ministry of Social Welfare should lead the assessment of current initiatives to support independent living.

---

\(^{71}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

\(^{72}\) ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
• List and quantify the number of government and non-government initiatives to support independent living. Also, record the location and type of services provided.
• Review programme level administrative data to further assess the coverage and number of beneficiaries.

Further information

• ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (pages 38-39)\textsuperscript{73}; and
• ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (page 34 and annex page 60).\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{73} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{74} ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
GOAL 5: EXPAND EARLY INTERVENTION AND EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Indicator 5.1 Number of children with disabilities receiving early childhood interventions

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Administrative data from the Ministries of Education, Health and Social Affairs. Non-governmental organization reports and beneficiary records.
- **Observations and issues:** Most member States reported having one or more Early Childhood Intervention (ECI) programme with related administrative data. These programmes were usually under the Ministries of Education or Health. Non-government organizations were reported as providing ECI programmes; however, these were usually localized and of limited scale. Some member States noted that it was challenging to coordinate data and reporting from non-government actors.

Way forward

**Step 1:** Compile a list of all current ECI programmes and interventions.

- The disability focal point may coordinate requests for information to the Ministry of Social Welfare, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, and related Ministries.
- The disability focal point may also seek support from the Ministry of Home Affairs (or equivalent agency) to coordinate requests for information to non-government organizations.
- Support may also be required under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to obtain information from international non-government organizations, UN agencies, and other development cooperation programmes, to cross-check data reported by the relevant line ministries and local NGOs.

**Step 2:** Compile and analyze administrative data and beneficiary lists to estimate the number of children with disabilities receiving ECI.

*Note:* Member States should consider making it a requirement for government and non-government ECI programmes to use a standard and comparable reporting format, including the disability status of children.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 43)[75];
  *Note:* This indicator is aimed at children with disabilities specifically. The wording in the ESCAP Indicator Guide should not be read as implying all children for this indicator; and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 36 and annex p. 60).[76]

**Indicator 5.2 Primary education enrolment rate of children with disabilities**

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Administrative data from the Ministry of Education. Population-based surveys, including census.
- **Observations and issues:** Member States reported using administrative and survey data to report against this indicator and the number of children with disabilities in school. Administrative data from the Education Management Information System (EMIS) may provide this information. However, during consultations, it was reported that EMIS data may not be available or may not be complete. In such cases, population-based survey data, including self-reported school attendance data, may be used. Questions on school attendance are frequently included in population-based surveys, including the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS), Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), Labour Force Survey (LFS), Population and Housing Census (PHC) and UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS).

Way forward

**Option 1: Use administrative data to report against this indicator**

**Step 1:** The Ministry of Education should assess the comprehensiveness and appropriateness of EMIS data for reporting against this indicator.

- If data are appropriate, analyse and report.
- If data are not appropriate, progress to Step 2.

*Note:* EMIS data may miss administrative records from private schools, special schools, or home-based schools. Also, EMIS data may miss information on disability status.

**Step 2:** The Ministry of Education should review and update EMIS.

- To measure progress towards universal primary education, it is important that EMIS is fit for purpose. This requires including information on children with disabilities and disability status.

**Option 2: Use national population-based survey data to report against this indicator**

- NSO should estimate self-reported school attendance rates using data from population-based surveys that include appropriate disability data, such as PHC, MICS, LSMS, DHS, or LFS.
Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 44)\textsuperscript{77}; and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 36-38 and annex p. 60).\textsuperscript{78}

**Indicator 5.3 Secondary education enrolment rate of children with disabilities**

- As per Indicator 5.2, with a focus on children of secondary school age.

\textsuperscript{77} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{78} ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
GOAL 6: ENSURE GENDER EQUALITY AND WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT

| Indicator 6.1 | Number of countries that include the promotion of the participation of women and girls with disabilities in their national action plans on gender equality and empowerment of women |

Current situation

- **Data source:** National action plan documents.
- **Observations and issues:** The majority of member States have ratified the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). During consultations, most member States reported having national action plans and/or a strategy on gender equality and/or women’s empowerment. Disability was included in several action plans reviewed, though the reference to disability was often cursory. Where disability had not yet been included, member States noted plans to include relevant considerations in the next round of revisions of the national action plans or strategies.

Way forward

**Step 1:** The Ministry of Women’s Affairs should lead a content review of national action plans on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

- References to disability and specifically to women and girls with disabilities should be noted.
- Measures to specifically promote accessibility for, and the empowerment of, women and girls with disabilities should be noted.

**Step 2:** The Ministry of Women’s Affairs should update national action plans on gender equality and women’s empowerment, based on outcomes of the review in Step 1.

- In collaboration with OPDs and women with disabilities, revise and update national action plans for the next round of revisions.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 49); and

---

81 ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
**Indicator 6.2** Proportion of seats held by women with disabilities in the parliament or equivalent national legislative body

Current situation

- **Data source:** Secretariat of the National Assembly or equivalent body. Personnel records of members of parliament. If personnel records are not available, a quick survey can be conducted to acquire data for this indicator.
- **Observations and issues:** During consultations, and as for indicator 2.1, not all member States had information on this indicator.

Way forward

- The process of data collection for this indicator is the same as that for indicator 2.1.
- Data for this indicator should be collected at the same time and via the same process as data collection for indicator 2.1.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 50)\(^{82}\); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 40 and annex p. 60).\(^{83}\)

**Indicator 6.3** Proportion of girls and women with disabilities who access sexual and reproductive health services of government and civil society, compared to women and girls without disabilities

Current situation

- **Data source:** Population and health surveys, such as the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) with inclusion of a disability module. Also, administrative data. Indonesia reported using the 2015 Interconsel Population Survey data; and the Republic of Korea reported using administrative records.
- **Observation and issues:** Most member States reported not collecting data to report against this indicator. While some member States reported conducting sexual and reproductive health (SRH) surveys or population-based surveys with an SRH module, data had not been analyzed and were not available at the time of consultations. SRH data may also be available in administrative data in several countries; however, this data frequently do not include information on disability.

\(^{82}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\(^{83}\) ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
Way forward

**Option 1:** Use population-based survey data to report against this indicator

**Step 1:** The NSO should identify national population-based surveys that include appropriate SRH and disability questions.
- If data are appropriate, analyse and report.
- If data are not appropriate, progress to Step 2.

**Step 2:** The NSO should develop and include questions on access to SRH services and disability, using the Washington Group question sets, in upcoming population-based survey(s).

**Option 2:** Use administrative data to report against this indicator

**Step 1:** The Ministry of Health should lead a review of administrative data.
- If data are appropriate, analyse and report.
- If data are not appropriate, review and update questions to ensure data collected are appropriate for reporting against this indicator, including disability status using the Washington Group questions.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (pp. 50-51); and

---

**Indicator 6.4** Number of programmes initiated by government and relevant agencies aimed at eliminating violence, including sexual abuse and exploitation, perpetrated against girls and women with disabilities

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Programme reports and related documentation, including registration lists of programmes where available.
- **Observations and issues:** While member States reported related laws or policies (see Indicator 6.1), no specific programmes relating to this indicator were identified in member State consultations. However, there were a few examples, such as the Federated States of Micronesia, where women and girls with disabilities are prioritized in broader programmes for the elimination of violence against women and girls.

---

84 ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
Way forward

**Step 1:** The Ministry of Women’s Affairs, or equivalent, should lead a review of programmes at the national and sub-national levels on the elimination of violence against girls and women

- Identify programmes and review programme objectives and target beneficiaries for references to disability inclusion and women and girls with disabilities.
- If data are available, compile, document and report.
- If data are not available, progress to Step 2.

**Step 2:** The Ministry of Women’s Affairs should lead the development of questions on the inclusion of women and girls with disabilities in programme reporting, in collaboration with the national disability focal point.

- Use the Washington Group question sets.
- Include OPDs and women with disabilities in this process.
- Require standardized reporting for all related programmes and initiatives.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 51); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 41-42 and annex p. 60).

**Indicator 6.5** Number of programmes initiated by government and relevant agencies that provide care and support, including rehabilitation, for women and girls with disabilities who are victims of any form of violence and abuse

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Programme reports and related documentation, including registration lists of programmes where available.
- **Observation and issues:** No specific programmes under this indicator were reported by member States. While member States reported providing general care and support services, including rehabilitation, for women and girls with disabilities, these programmes did not specifically target women and girls who are victims of violence and abuse or their particular needs and requirements

Way forward

- As per the way forward under Indicator 6.4, but focussing on programmes providing care and support, including rehabilitation, for women and girls with disabilities who are victims of any form of violence and abuse.

---

87 ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 52)\textsuperscript{88}; and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 41-42 and annex p. 60).\textsuperscript{89}

\textsuperscript{88} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{89} ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
GOAL 7: ENSURE DISABILITY-INCLUSIVE DISASTER RISK REDUCTION AND MANAGEMENT

Indicator 7.1 Availability of disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction plans

Current situation

- **Data sources:** National and sub-national disaster risk reduction plans.
- **Observation and issues:** All member States reported having disaster management or response plans. These plans tended to include persons with disabilities under the umbrella of vulnerable groups. Disaster risk reduction (DRR) plans with a preventive focus and including specific references to persons with disabilities, in line with this indicator, were generally not available or under development. However, examples exist among member States, including Bangladesh\(^{90}\) and Pakistan\(^{91}\).

Way forward

**Step 1:** The National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) should collate and lead a content review of national and sub-national DRR plans.
- References to disability, disability inclusion and persons with disabilities should be noted.
- Measures to specifically promote accessibility and the reduction of risk for persons with disabilities should be noted.

**Step 2:** The NDMO should lead and coordinate the review and updating of DRR plans.
- In collaboration with OPDs and persons with disabilities.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 53)\(^{92}\);
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 44 and annex p. 60)\(^{93}\);
- ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific — Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development\(^{94}\); and
- Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.\(^{95}\)

\(^{91}\) See: Pakistan National Disaster Management Authority: National disaster response plan 2019.
\(^{92}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\(^{93}\) ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
\(^{94}\) ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
**Indicator 7.2 Availability of disability-inclusive training for all relevant service personnel**

Current situation

- **Data sources:** Administrative data, including personnel records and training records. Training programme completion lists and certification records.
- **Observations and issues:** No member State reported having all relevant personnel trained on disability inclusion at this time. However, there are examples of good practices. These include collaborations between the NDMO and OPDs in the delivery of training in Indonesia\(^{96}\) and Pakistan.

Way forward

**Step 1:** The NDMO should lead a review of training programmes and certifications at the national and sub-national levels.

- Identify training programmes and review modules and syllabus for content on disability inclusion.
- If data are available, compile, document and report.
- If data are not available, progress to Step 2.

**Step 2:** The NDMO should lead the development of a training module and/or curriculum in collaboration with OPDs and persons with disabilities.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 54)\(^{97}\); and
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 44 and annex p. 60).\(^{98}\)

---

**Indicator 7.3 Proportion of accessible emergency shelters and disaster relief sites**

Current situation

- **Data sources:** NDMO and/or Shelter Cluster data and reports or equivalent. Rapid accessibility audit of shelters and relief sites.
- **Observations and issues:** Member States reported the lack of standards as a concern. Accessibility standards for emergency shelters should comply with general accessibility standards for buildings available from the Ministry of Public Works or equivalent. Further, shelters should ensure the dignity of both women and men with disabilities with dedicated spaces for toileting, washing and changing clothes. Relief sites should be

\(^{96}\) See: Prevention Web: Indonesia’s Disaster Risk Management Baseline Country Status Report 2015 (p.28).

\(^{97}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

\(^{98}\) ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
located in accessible locations. Alternative methods for the distribution of relief and essential items should be used as needed, such as the direct distribution to homes. Full consideration for equitable access and communication is required in an emergency situation. See examples in Box 5 under Goal 2 for possible measures that may be taken or adapted. While member States did not report comprehensive accessibility measures, it was noted that the use of new government buildings or schools as shelters implied a degree of physical accessibility. 99 Myanmar reported providing assistive devices at shelters and relief sites.

Way forward

Step 1: The NDMO should lead a review of current and proposed permanent shelters and temporary relief sites in advance of an emergency.

- Use existing accessibility standards available from the Ministry of Public Works or/ and the Ministry of Disaster Management or its equivalent. Consider non-physical accessibility and essential service provision.

  *Note*: Refer to ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific — Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.100

- Include OPDs and persons with disabilities in the review.

- Further, with OPDs and persons with disabilities, develop an accessibility checklist for use in audits in Step 2. This should be completed in advance of an emergency.

Step 2: The NDMO should lead accessibility audits with OPDs and persons with disabilities during emergency responses.

- Review available data, including locations of temporary shelters and relief sites, from the Shelter Cluster lead or equivalent.

- Using the accessibility checklist developed under Step 1, conduct accessibility audits of all shelters and relief sites with OPDs and persons with disabilities.

- Share findings with the Shelter Cluster or equivalent for action.

- Repeat accessibility audits of all (including newly established) shelters and relief sites with OPDs and persons with disabilities to check compliance.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 55)101;

- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (pp. 44-45 and annex p. 60)102; and

- ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific - Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.103

99 If schools are used as emergency shelters, alternative measures to ensure the continuity of teaching and learning during emergencies need to be taken.

100 ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.


GOAL 8: IMPROVE THE RELIABILITY AND COMPARABILITY OF DISABILITY DATA

Indicator 8.1 Disability prevalence based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) by age, sex, race and socioeconomic status

Current situation

- **Data sources**: National population-based surveys, including census data that include the Washington Group questions.
- **Observations and issues**: There is a significant variation in disability prevalence reported amongst member States due to differences in disability measurement and data collection approaches. However, more member States are incorporating the Washington Group questions in population-based surveys and censuses. The Washington Group questions are based on the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) and provide suitable disability data for reporting under this and other Incheon Strategy indicators. Data on age, race, sex and socioeconomic status are collected in population-based surveys and censuses.

Way forward

**Step 1**: The NSO should review disability questions in existing population-based surveys.

- The preferred disability data collection tools based on the ICF are the Washington Group question sets.
- If appropriate disability data are available or will be available, proceed to Step 2.
- If appropriate disability data are not available, proceed to Step 3.

**Step 2**: The NSO should analyse data to obtain disability prevalence by age, sex, race and socioeconomic status.

- Refer to the UN Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Census Revision 3\(^{104}\) to report disability prevalence based on the ICF for the population aged five or older.
- Disaggregate disability prevalence by age, sex, race (or ethnicity if applicable), and socioeconomic status using the UN Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Census Revision 3\(^{105}\). It is recommended to use tabulations 8.1-A, 8.2-A, 8.3-A. Further tabulations may be necessary depending on the country context or requests from line ministries.

**Step 3**: If no disability data are available, include an appropriate disability module in upcoming national population-based surveys or census.

- Include the Washington Group Short Set or Extended Set, and the UNICEF/WG Module on Child Functioning and Disability in upcoming surveys.

---

\(^{103}\) ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.


\(^{105}\) Ibid.
Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (pp. 58-59)\textsuperscript{106};
- Note: The ESCAP Indicator Guide recommends a cut-off point of 10 years old for data analysis. This may need to be revised to five years old in line with the UN Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Census Revision 3\textsuperscript{107};
- ESCAP publication: Building Disability-Inclusive Societies in Asia and the Pacific: Assessing Progress of the Incheon Strategy (p. 48 and annex p. 60)\textsuperscript{108}; and
- Washington Group website\textsuperscript{109}
  Note: The NSO may consider contacting the Washington Group secretariat directly for any technical question relating to the use of Washington Group question sets.\textsuperscript{110}

| Indicator 8.2 | Number of Governments in the Asia-Pacific region that have established, by 2017, baseline data for tracking progress towards achievement of the Incheon goals and targets |

Current situation

- Data sources: Mid-term review reports submitted by member States to ESCAP.
- Observations and issues: No member State has full baseline data for all indicators, and the availability of baseline data varies greatly between countries.

Way forward

Step 1: Establish a National Action Plan

- Under the direction of the national disability focal point, a National Action Plan for Operationalizing the Incheon Strategy Indicators should be developed with cross-ministerial collaboration.
- Using this guidebook as a general guide, a review of available data for each indicator should be completed. Then follow-up actions to fill gaps in data should be agreed with a designated lead agency for each indicator.
- A proposed structure for the National Action Plan is provided as Appendix 2.

Step 2: The disability focal point should monitor progress regularly and report to ESCAP in accordance with agreed schedules for Incheon Strategy reporting.

- It is recommended that annual reviews are conducted with all stakeholders, including persons with disabilities and OPDs, along with the submission of annual progress reports to the disability focal point.

\textsuperscript{106} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{107} DESA, 2017. ST/ESA/STAT/SER.M/67/Rev.3.
\textsuperscript{108} ESCAP, 2017(a). ST/ESCAP/2800.
\textsuperscript{109} Washington Group on Disability Statistics, 2016.
\textsuperscript{110} Contact: WG_Secretariat@cdc.gov or use the online contact at http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/contact/
Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 59).\(^{111}\)

| Indicator 8.3 | Availability of disaggregated data on women and girls with disabilities in mainstream development programmes and government services, including health, and sexual and reproductive health, programmes |

Current situation

- Data sources: Programme reports. Administrative data.
- Observations and issues: No ESCAP member State reported the availability of comprehensive data for this indicator. While records of sex and age are normally kept in programme records and administrative data, the challenge is the availability of disability data.

Way forward

**Step 1:** The Ministry of Home Affairs or the Ministry of Development or equivalent should lead a review of government programmes for the availability of disaggregated disability data by sex and age, in close collaboration with the Ministry of Women’s Affairs or equivalent.

- Given the potentially large number of programmes, review a sample of programmes and services delivered by government across ministries.
- From the sample, review administrative data and programme reports to identify if data are collected on disability alongside sex and age.
- Check for comparability of disability data and the use of appropriate disability measures, such as the Washington Group questions.
- If data are available and appropriate, analyse and report.
- Provide feedback and recommendations to the line ministries surveyed.
- If data are unavailable, progress to Step 2.

*Note:* Data collected under Goal 6 can contribute to reporting under this Indicator.

**Step 2:** The lead ministry should develop standardized minimum reporting requirements for all government programmes and services.

- Minimum data collection and reporting requirements should include sex, age and disability.
- Use the Washington Group question sets to establish disability status.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 60).\(^{112}\)

\(^{111}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

\(^{112}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

### Indicator 9.1 Number of Governments that have ratified or acceded to the Convention

**Current situation**

- **Data sources:** The UNENABLE website provides updated records of ratifications and accessions by UN Member States.\(^{113}\)
- **Observations and issues:** The majority of ESCAP member States have ratified the CRPD. Among the few member States that have not ratified the Convention, there was a concern, expressed during consultations, that ratification might result in increased budget implications.

**Way forward**

- It is suggested that the remaining member States who have not ratified the CRPD consult with OPDs and UN agencies on the benefits and challenges of ratification.

**Further information**

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 61)\(^{114}\); and
- ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific - Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.\(^{115}\)

### Indicator 9.2 Availability of national anti-discrimination legislation to uphold and protect the rights of persons with disabilities

**Current situation**

- **Data sources:** UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities reports. Member States mid-term review reports to ESCAP.
- **Observations and issues:** There is significant variation in the progress of member States under this indicator. It should also be noted that there exists a range of examples from member States that, with adaptation, can be used to guide the development of anti-discrimination legislation.

---


\(^{114}\) ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.

\(^{115}\) ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
Way forward

- It is suggested that under the lead of the Ministry of Justice, or equivalent, member States conduct a review of existing legislation and, where needed, develop anti-discrimination legislation as a priority.
- It is important that the process of developing anti-discrimination legislation includes the participation of OPDs and persons with disabilities.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 62).\textsuperscript{116}
- ESCAP publication: Disability at a Glance 2019: Investing in Accessibility in Asia and the Pacific - Strategic Approaches to Achieving Disability-Inclusive Sustainable Development.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{116} ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
\textsuperscript{117} ESCAP, 2019. ST/ESCAP/2873.
GOAL 10: ADVANCE SUBREGIONAL, REGIONAL AND INTERREGIONAL COOPERATION

**Indicator 10.9** Number of statisticians in the Asia-Pacific region trained in disability statistics, in particular on the ICF approach, by ESCAP and other relevant agencies

Current situation

- **Data source:** NSO training logs and reports.
- **Observations and issues:** No major issues in reporting against this indicator were reported. There is clear demand among member States for the further training of statisticians in disability statistics.

Way forward

- This indicator does not present major issues for reporting. The disability focal point can obtain the necessary data from the NSO and report to ESCAP.

Further information

- ESCAP Guide on Disability Indicators for the Incheon Strategy (p. 70).[^118]

[^118]: ESCAP, 2014. ST/ESCAP/2708.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: ESCAP member States participating in national stakeholder consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESCAP member State</th>
<th>Venue and dates</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Baku, 23-26 April 2018</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population; State Committee for Family, Women and Children Affairs; National Statistics Service; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Transport, Communications and High Technologies; Central Election Commission; Ministry of Emergency Situations; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dhaka, 16-19 September 2014</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Welfare; Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics; Ministry of Labour and Employment; Ministry of Public Administration; Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs; Ministry of Finance; Ministry of Women and Children Affairs; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Primary and Mass Education; Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief; Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism; Ministry of Posts, Telecommunications and Information Technology; Ministry of Information; National Election Commission; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Thimphu, 26-28 October 2016</td>
<td>Gross National Happiness Commission; Ministry of Health; National Statistics Bureau; Ministry of Home and Cultural Affairs; Ministry of Labour and Human Resources; Ministry of Works and Human Settlement; Ministry of Information and Communications; Ministry of Education; Election Commission; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAP member State</td>
<td>Venue and dates</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Phnom Penh, 15-17 December 2015</td>
<td>Disability Action Council; National Institute of Statistics; Ministry of Social Affairs and Veterans; Cambodian National Council for Women; Ministry of Women’s Affairs; Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training; Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction; Ministry of Public Works and Transport; Ministry of Justice; Ministry of Information; Ministry of Interior; Ministry of Civil Service; Persons with Disabilities Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Tbilisi, 17-19 January 2017</td>
<td>Human Rights Secretariat of the Administration; Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs; National Statistics Office; Ministry of Education and Science; Ministry of Internal Affairs; Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure; Central Election Commission; Public Defender's Office; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>New Delhi, 15-17 March 2017</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment; Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation; National Institution for Transforming India; Ministry of Labour and Employment; Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs; Election Commission; Ministry of Rural Development; Ministry of Urban Development; Ministry of Information and Broadcasting; Ministry of Electronica and Information Technology; Airport Authority of India; Ministry of Health and Family Affair; Women Commission; Ministry of Women and Child Development; Ministry of Home Affairs; Ministry of Human Resource Development; National Disaster Response Force; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Jakarta, 14-16 November 2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs; National Statistics Agency; Ministry of National Development Planning; National Board for Disaster Management; Ministry of Manpower; Ministry of Home Affairs; Ministry of Public Housing; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Communication and Information; Ministry of Transportation; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Public Works; National Election Commission; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAP member State</td>
<td>Venue and dates</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Bishkek, 2-4 May 2018</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Development; National Statistics Committee; Ministry of Emergency Situations; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Culture, Information and Tourism; Committee of Information Technologies and Communications; Ministry of Transport and Roads; Ministry of Science and Education; Central Election Commission; Civil Aviation Agency; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>Majuro, 15-17 February 2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs; Economic Policy, Planning and Statistics Office; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Transportation and Communications; National Election Commission and National Parliament (the Nitijela and the Council of Iroij); Ministry of Health; OPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia (Federated States of)</td>
<td>Pohnpei, 3-5 April 2018</td>
<td>Department of Health and Social Affairs; FSM Statistics Division; Social Security Administration; Department of Education; Department of Justice; Department of Transportation, Communications and Infrastructure; Telecommunications Corporation; National Electoral Office; Department of Environment, Climate Change and Emergency Management; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Ulaanbaatar, 21-23 April 2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Population Development and Social Protection; National Rehabilitation and Development Center; National Statistical Office; Ministry of Education, Culture and Science; National Human Rights Commission; General Election Committee; Ministry of Construction and Urban Development; Governor's Office of Ulaanbaatar City; National Emergency Management Agency; Ministry of Labour; Telecommunications Regulatory Commission; Information Technology, Post and Telecommunications Authority; OPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Naypyidaw, 27-29 June 2017</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement; Central Statistical Organization; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Home Affairs; Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population; Ministry of Health; Ministry of Information; Ministry of Transport and Communications; Ministry of Construction; Union Election Commission; OPDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAP member State</td>
<td>Venue and dates</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Islamabad, 27 February-1 March 2018</td>
<td>Ministry of Human Rights; Pakistan Bureau of Statistics; Ministry of National Health Services, Regulations and Coordination; Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training; Ministry of Overseas Pakistanis and Human Resources Development; Ministry of Information Technology and Telecommunication; Ministry of Communications; Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs; Election Commission of Pakistan; National Disaster Management Authority; SDG Support Unit of the Ministry of Planning, Development and Reform; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (the)</td>
<td>Manila, 27-30 April 2015</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare and Development; National Council on Disability Affairs; Philippine Statistical Authority; Department of Education; Department of Health; National Economic and Development Authority; Department of Public Works and Highways; Philippine Health Insurance Corporation; Employees Compensation Commission; National Center for Mental Health; Department of Justice; House of Representatives’ Committee on Social Services; Bureau of Internal Revenue; Department of Labour and Employment; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Colombo, 22-24 May 2018</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Empowerment, Welfare and Kandyan Heritage; Department of Census and Statistics; Ministry of Health, Nutrition and Indigenous Medicine; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Women and Child Affairs; Ministry of Telecommunication, Digital Infrastructure and Foreign Employment; Ministry of Housing and Construction; Ministry of Disaster Management; Ministry of Labour, Trade Union Relations and Sabaragamu Development; Election Commission; Secretariat of Parliament; OPDs; UNCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCAP member State</td>
<td>Venue and dates</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Bangkok, 25-30 June 2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Development and Human Security; Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities; Department of Women’s Affairs and Family Development; National Commission on Social Welfare Promotion; Ministry of Labour; National Statistical Office; Ministry of Interior; Ministry of Justice; Parliament Secretariat; National Human Rights Commission; Election Commission; Ministry of Public Health; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Transport; Ministry of Information and Communication Technology; Ministry of Tourism and Sports; Bangkok Metropolitan Administration; National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>Hanoi, 9-11 June 2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs; National Coordinating Council on Disability; Department of Gender Equality; Ministry of Education and Training; General Statistical Office; Ministry of Construction; Committee of Social Affairs under the National Assembly; Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development; Department for Dyke Management, Flood and Storm Control; Ministry of Health; Viet Nam Federation on Disability; UNCT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Annotated outline of National Action Plan

Cover page:

Title: Action Plan for Operationalizing Incheon Strategy Indicators in Support of Disability-Inclusive Development

For the Government of [Country Name]

1. Background [1 and 1/2 page]
This section provides information on the Incheon Strategy and its linkages to the 2030 Agenda; the midpoint review survey in 2017 to establish a baseline and survey findings of the country; and how the action plan was developed.

2. Objective [1/2 page]
This section elaborates on the objectives of the action plan, including what it will be used for.

3. Analysis of Disability Information and Gaps [4 pages]
This section summarizes the availability of legal and policy measures; the collection of disability data and its shortcomings; and how effectively the national coordination mechanism on disability is functioning.

   3.1. Legal and policy measures
   This sub-section lists effective legal and policy-related measures or actions to promote and uphold the rights of persons with disabilities.

   3.2. International standards for disability measurement with population-based surveys
   This sub-section describes international standards for disability measurement, including the Washington Group Short Set on Functioning, the cut-off for disability identification and the UNICEF/Washington Group Module on Child Functioning.

   3.3. Disability measurement and data collection at national level
   This sub-section describes disability data collections in the country through population and household censuses, surveys and/or administrative sources, and shortcomings in terms of comparability.

4. The National Coordination Mechanism on Disability [1/2 page]
This section describes the existing national coordination mechanism on disability, its effectiveness in data collection, and how its function can be strengthened.

5. Action Plan to Collect Disability Data for the Incheon Strategy Indicators [1 page]

   5.1. Focal point of this Action Plan
   This sub-section identifies a ministry or agency with the overall lead responsibility for implementing this action plan and coordinating data collection.
5.2. Forging multi-ministerial partnerships

This section lists the partnerships between government offices for effective implementation and monitoring of the action plan.

5.3. Reporting to ESCAP

This section specifies the reporting mandate of the government in mid-2021, for the final review of the Asian and Pacific Decade of Persons with Disabilities

Annex I: Action Plan Matrix

Incheon Strategy Goal [number]: [full description of goal]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator [number]: [full description of goal]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Describe any shortcoming of the present tool and how this can be overcome in the next collection.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link to SDGs: [description]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency name(s)</th>
<th>Baseline: [Describe the existing baseline for the indicator.]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next collection: [Describe the next data collection on the indicator.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

…

…

[Add as required]

Annex II: Agencies responsible for Incheon Strategy indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency name</td>
<td>[List all indicators that fall under the agency’s responsibility]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Add as required]