**Disability Inclusion in Shelter & Settlements Programming – GSC Meeting session 20 October 2020**

**Questions and Answers**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Answer** |
| Does anyone know of any nice links or leads to research which explores the intersection between disability inclusion and gender, age, caste etc? | TW: Not much exists at the moment. This was identified as a gap by ELRHA technical working group on persons with disabilities and older people and there may be one or two projects exploring this in the current challenge. The working group will link with ELRHA once they had identified successful proposals that will be funded to see if one of them addresses this gap. |
| MH in several cultural or countries is not something to bring up openly. In my case during responses in central Sulawesi the challenge has been to know where they are. Any recommendation what approach can use into the community? | LM: Good question. The Baseline Mapping report from last year mentioned that one of the biggest barriers to persons with disabilities accessing shelter and settlement activities is the attitudes of family members and communities (particularly for women with disabilities and persons with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities), so it is something that we often have to address. This speaks to our role as advocates within this space around broader inclusion and the importance of  KT: Should always be looking to undertake humanitarian action that can restore of dignity and safety with the population and looking to strengthen social cohesion through community support. Awareness raising and sensitisations can challenge negative assumptions, but always look to identify cultural/ social barriers and address them in a culturally appropriate way. |
| I notice that WGSQ or long questions are not included in the assessment methodology, wonder if it is used or is considered to be used? | LM: Yes, this is something that is used in some shelter and settlements assessments, but this is not consistent. We saw from the Baseline Mapping report that many actors indicated limited experience in using them, but also that there are also questions around the usefulness of the WGSQ to inform shelter programming. One of the research projects that the working group has been looking into is around understanding what data might be useful to support more inclusive shelter programming and also how to adapt existing methods such as the WGSQ or other approaches to collect that data.  DD: The field study will hopefully help to shed more light on how relevant questions are included in assessments |
| How did you (IOM) select and form the PWD committee, noting a common perception of PWD as physical disabilities and the difficulty of discussing disabilities with many communities? | IOM: The structure was a community-formed mutual support and advocacy group called “Committee for War Wounded” when the IDP site first spontaneously settled. It began initially as a community-run group with members and focus almost entirely on physical disabilities. As we became aware of the committee, CCCM worked with them to make it more inclusive and widen the scope to all types of disabilities, focusing on ensuring membership of women, those with developmental challenges, and caretakers. It was renamed “Community Disabled Committee.” The committee was overall welcoming of this wider membership and representation. They were also given a permanent place on the Camp Leadership Committee, which was welcomed by other members. |
| Would be interesting to know what additional cost is added when you do inclusive shelter response? this would help other actors to advocate for and budget additional costs for inclusive response | TW: General suggestion is – to meet the physical accessibility requirements of persons with disabilities (for example, when constructing buildings or WASH facilities), it is estimated that between 0.5 per cent and 1 per cent should be added to budgets. To provide specialized non-food items (NFIs) and mobility equipment to persons with disabilities, estimates suggest a further 3-4 per cent, and up to 7 per cent, should be added. See Help Age, CBM, Handicap International, Humanitarian inclusion standards for older people and people with disabilities.  IOM: Our CCCM project structure and mandate includes Site Care and Maintenance, which caters for common infrastructure in the site such as roads, drainage, drainage crossings, community meeting spaces and camp offices. As such, for CCCM, we did not need to raise a separate project or budget for these infrastructure upgrades, but included into our ongoing maintenance and site development project.  For any new projects or sites, what we called accessibility “upgrades” should really be standard features. For our case of Wau IDP site, the emergency phase did not include a focus on accessibility because we were not really fully aware of their importance, so it came later.  I would say the choice of standalone element/project or mainstreaming is really a choice of donor advocacy, resource mobilization and visibility. If you can include in the standard package for site development, it’s really much better to build in the cost. I say build accessible from day one and put in mind of Cluster and partners that it’s an essential feature. For persons with disabilities, having accessible facilities should be our first approach, not something we do later if we have some money left. But, if you are in a situation where you need resource mobilization talking points or you are in an existing site, the choice to include as a standalone project element or high-visibility activity is really one of donor advocacy and visibility. |
| Were there any members of the community support group, that had other disabilities that were not physical or visible disabilities? Did you include or consider any programming that targeted these groups? | IOM: yes, the focus of the committee changed throughout the project period and CCCM worked to ensure it was more inclusive (widening the scope to all types of disabilities, focusing on ensuring membership of women, those with developmental challenges, and caretakers etc). Those additional considerations were taken into account as the project progressed.  TW: We (CBM) are working on a practical guidance around this with our OPD partners and will be happy to share that with this group when it is ready |
| How to ensure these initiatives are also closely linked to the IASC Guidelines roll out? | The working group is working to ensure that our ongoing activities support and reinforce the IASC guidelines roll out. One of the ways that we are doing this is through engagement in the Disability Reference Group workstream that is working on the roll out. We will ensure that we provide support to test the tools available and continue to understand what further support is required to make these resources useful to shelter practitioners and contribute to more inclusive shelter and settlement programming. |