

Key Results from Review of Disability Inclusion in 2025 Humanitarian Needs and Response Plans



A woman with a disability is being informed by a focal point from the NGO GOAL about the procedure to follow to collect the food voucher in Carrefour. Port-au-Prince, Ouest, Haiti. Photo: GOAL/Johnson Sabin¹

Background

Since 2018, focused interagency efforts have been underway by the Disability Advisory Group² to strengthen disability inclusion in Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs), carried out up to 2022 as part of the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office

¹ Haiti Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan 2025, p. 12. Available at: <https://humanitarianaction.info/plan/1257>

² The Disability Advisory Group is an interagency group led by UNICEF and focused on strengthening disability inclusion in HNO/HRP development processes and HNO/HRP documents. As of July 2024 the group has active participation by FCDO, Global Education Cluster, Global Protection Cluster, Humanity & Inclusion, Impact Initiatives, IOM, OCHA, Trinity College Dublin, UNHCR, and WFP.

(FCDO) Humanitarian Single Business Case 2017-21³. These efforts have involved the development of Guidance on Strengthening Disability Inclusion in HRPs⁴ and accompanying resources (including tip sheets), as well as support to countries, both through global webinars and more targeted bilateral support. To track progress and inform these efforts going forward, reviews of disability inclusion in HNOs/ HRPs were conducted in 2018, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024. In 2025, DAG piloted use of AI to automate the review against pre-defined disability inclusion review criteria.⁵ This document presents key results from the 2025 review; the lessons learned from using AI for the review are presented in a separate document.⁶

This report is intended for humanitarian and disability inclusion actors at global, regional and country level who have an interest in how information on persons with disabilities is being integrated in HNRPs. This report can be used as a basis to develop guidance and training and to inform efforts to further strengthen disability inclusion in HNRPs.

Analysis and Recommendations

In 2025, countries are better at identifying disability specific barriers and risks but struggling more with reflecting this in response planning. While reflection of disability inclusion in risk analysis declined modestly, description of targeted programming declined significantly. There is also decreased cross-sectoral attention and lack of improvement in the number of disability-specific indicators included in monitoring frameworks. Declines in targeted programming may reflect funding and capacity constraints but might also be a consequence of new consolidated HNRP formats affecting space to elaborate on disability inclusive action.

Recommendations:

1. Prioritize countries with very low scores for capacity building on disability inclusion.
2. Prioritize sectoral guidance and training for clusters to implement sector specific disability inclusive interventions with disability specific indicators to track progress.
3. Establish peer learning mechanisms between high and low performers (e.g. document and share successful approaches from top performing countries).
4. Provide guidance and training on OPD engagement.

³ The UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) - UN Single Business Case was a multi-year, multi-agency programme built around a single Results Framework shared by six UN agencies (UNICEF, WFP, UNHCR, OCHA, IOM). It aimed to support the implementation of reform commitments made by UN agencies under the Grand Bargain and the World Humanitarian Summit and to promote a greater focus by the UN humanitarian system on protecting vulnerable persons in humanitarian situations, particularly persons with disabilities. The disability results area was led by UNICEF.

⁴ Guidance on Strengthening Disability Inclusion in HRPs: This guidance provides support to strengthen inclusion of disability in Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) and includes the Humanitarian Needs Overview development process in recognition of the importance of the HNO as the basis for the Humanitarian Response Plan. See

<https://reliefweb.int/report/world/guidance-strengthening-disability-inclusion-humanitarian-response-plans>

⁵ The criteria were developed by the DAG, based on the below guidance and adapted progressively based on broader HNRP guidance.

Guidance on strengthening disability inclusion in Humanitarian Response Plans, 2019. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/documents/guidance-strengthening-disability-inclusion-humanitarian-response-plans>

⁶ Due to most countries using a new HNRP format and DAG using automation for the review for the first time, the comparability of results from 2024 to 2025 is slightly limited.

At-a-Glance Findings (2025 vs 2024)

- Strongest gains:
 - Indicator 7 – Accessible feedback & complaints mechanisms: 74 % of countries partially/fully meet the standard in 2025 (vs 33.0 % in 2024). Only 4.5 % fully meet, showing quality gaps despite broad uptake.
 - Indicator 3 – Diversity & intersectionality: 95.0 % partially/fully meet (vs 57.0 % in 2024). Intersectional risks (gender, age, displacement status) are now widely recognized.
- Largest declines:
 - Indicator 4 – Cross-sectoral coverage (response chapters): 67 % partially/fully meet (vs 84.5 % in 2024). Breadth of sector coverage fell, although the share fully meeting rose to 48 % (vs 32 % in 2024).
- Mixed / modest shifts:
 - Indicator 6 – Comprehensive response (twin-track approach): 74 % partially/fully meet (vs 66 % in 2024). Reflection of a twin-track approach persists but is described less consistently.
 - Indicator 2 – Risk & barrier analysis: 62 % partially/fully meet (vs 48.5 % in 2024). Recognition of concrete barriers dipped.
 - Indicator 1 – Data & methodology: 76 % partially/fully meet (vs 59.5 % in 2024). No country fully meets this in 2025; global estimates are widely used but often without source citation or plans to strengthen data.

High Performers (≥75% performance)

Countries whose HNOs/HRPs/HNRPs disability inclusion ‘score’ average 75 % and above across the eight indicators.⁷

1. Afghanistan (HNRP): 94 %
2. Somalia (HNRP): 87.5 %
3. Mozambique (HNRP): 87.5 %
4. Cameroon (HRP): 87.5 %
5. Yemen (HNRP): 87.5 %
6. Myanmar (HNRP): 87.5 %
7. Ukraine (HNRP): 75.0 %
8. Nigeria (HNRP): 75.0 %

Performance Summary with Good Practice Examples

Indicator 1: Disaggregated Data

- Not meeting: No reliable disability data; or PIN disaggregated but implausible (e.g., <10% or >30%) without justification.
- Partially: Some reliable data, but inconsistent across sections/sectors.

⁷ “High performers” are countries whose HNO/HRP/HNRP average ≥75% across the eight DAG indicators, scored as Fully = 1, Partially = 0.5, Not = 0 and averaged only over indicators that were actually assessed (i.e., “Not analyzed” are excluded). This list is used to spotlight replicable practices and to guide peer-learning between strong and lower performers.

- Fully: PIN disaggregated using WGOs or reliable secondary data aligned with global estimates, with a note to strengthen data if using global estimates.

Results

2025: 0 % fully meeting, 76 % partially meeting, 24 % not meeting

2024: 33.5 % fully meeting, 57 % partially meeting, 9.5 % not meeting.

Pattern: Most rely on the global estimate of 15% of the population having a disability, without clear source or plans to strengthen disability data systems.

Good practice example: Mozambique 2025 HNRP, p. 33:

"There is also a need for data collection on persons with disabilities in a centralized and harmonized manner that could allow proper analysis and programing."

Indicator 2: Risk & Barrier Analysis

- Not meeting: Disability absent or listed generically as "vulnerability" without causal analysis.
- Partially: Mentions needs of persons with disabilities and broadly references barriers/inequalities.
- Fully: Describes specific, contextual barriers (e.g., inaccessible services, discrimination) and systemic factors shaping heightened risk for persons with disabilities.

Results

2025: 43 % fully meeting, 19 % partially meeting, 38 % not meeting

2024: 52.5 % fully meeting, 19 % partially meeting, 28.5 % not meeting.

Pattern: Fewer documents describe specific barriers or underlying systemic factors.

Good practice example: Ukraine 2025 HNRP, p. 16:

"People with disabilities, including children, are disproportionately affected by the war. They report barriers to accessing shelters, health care, social services and humanitarian aid distribution points. Households with a member with a disability report increased livelihood needs and face difficulties meeting basic needs due to lower income levels. Health care is a top priority for 59 per cent of such households, compared to just 19 per cent of households without a member with disabilities. These households also have greater needs in relation to protection, food and housing."

Indicator 3: Diversity & Intersectionality

- Not meeting: Treats persons with disabilities as a single, homogeneous group.
- Partially: Names sub-groups (e.g., women, children with disabilities) without analyzing how identities intersect.
- Fully: Analyzes how disability intersects with age, gender, displacement, etc., with concrete examples of differentiated risks/needs.

Results

2025: 38 % fully meeting, 57 % partially meeting, 5 % not meeting.

2024: 19 % fully meeting, 38 % partially meeting, 43 % not meeting.

Pattern: Increasing recognition that disability intersects with gender, age and displacement status, shaping risks and needs.

Ukraine 2025 HNRP, p. 16:

“Children with disabilities face extensive challenges, including limited access to assistive technologies, inadequate infrastructure and communication barriers, which complicate their mobility and participation in society.(...) Men and adolescent boys face challenges linked to military service, economic hardship and societal expectations. Men accounted for 80 per cent of civilian casualties from landmines and unexploded ordnance, while boys made up an additional 10 per cent. Men and boys, especially those who are internally displaced or living with disabilities, encounter barriers to accessing health care and psychosocial support. The stigma surrounding mental health services often deters men from seeking help, even when it is available.”

Indicator 4: Cross-Sectoral Attention

- Not meeting: No sector addresses disability-related needs.
- Partially: Needs of people with disabilities are addressed in ≤5 sectors.
- Fully: Needs of people with disabilities are addressed in >5 sectors with sector-specific examples.

Results

2025: 48 % fully meeting, 19 % partially meeting, 33 % not meeting.

2024: 19 % fully meeting, 38 % partially meeting, 19 % not meeting.

Pattern: The breadth of sector coverage across sectors declined, likely reflecting shorter HNRP sector chapters.

Percentage of documents addressing the needs of persons with disabilities in sectoral chapters:⁸

Sector	2025	2024
CCCM	38.1 %	50.0%
Education	66.7 %	81.3%
Food security	42.9 %	31.3%
Health	42.9 %	37.5%
Nutrition	4.8 %	37.5%
Protection (incl. CP/GBV/Mine Action)	52.4 %	68.8%
WASH	57.1 %	68.8%
Shelter / NFI	47.6 %	43.8%

Indicator 5: Engagement with Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs⁹)

- Not meeting: No mention of OPDs/persons with disabilities as actors in the response.

⁸ In 2024, 10 HNOs were assessed against indicator 4. In 2025, 21 HNOs/HNRPs were assessed against indicator 4.

⁹ Organizations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs).

Disability Reference Group, Operational Definition of Local/National OPDs for the Purpose of Monitoring Engagement in Humanitarian Action, 2024. Available at: <https://disabilityreferencegroup.org/portfolio-items/operational-definition-of-local-national-opds-for-the-purpose-of-monitoring-engagement-in-humanitarian-action/>

* Note that the DAG does not review whether any reference to OPDs in HRP/HNRPs are OPDs in line with the operational definition.

- Partially: Acknowledges OPDs' presence but not their role in needs assessment, planning, implementation and monitoring.
- Fully: Concretely describes the role of OPDs as actors in the response.

Results

2025: 39 % fully meeting, 4.5 % partially meeting, 56.5 % not meeting.

2024: 19 % fully meeting, 19 % partially meeting, 62 % not meeting.

Pattern: Modest improvement in 2025, with more description of concrete roles of OPDs, although quality of description of participation is uneven and not yet systematic.

Good practice example: Somalia 2025 HNRP, p. 57:

"The Somali NGO Consortium (SNC) will help create an enabling environment for NGOs through coordination meetings with the Government, collective advocacy initiatives, facilitating dialogues, information sharing. SNC will provide capacity building and institutional support to minority right organisations, women led organization, organization supporting persons with disabilities to strengthen inclusion of marginalized and minority groups in the humanitarian response."

Good practice example: Myanmar 2025 HNRP, p. 32:

"For the 2025 HNRP, consultations were held with 35 representatives from 21 OPDs, encompassing a diverse range of disabilities. These consultations were conducted in local language and utilized sign language interpretation. This allowed participants to share experiences and identify key priorities. The TAG also collaborated with the Needs Monitoring and Analysis Working Group to improve the disability disaggregated data collection for the MSNA to further strengthen the HNRP."

Indicator 6: Comprehensive Response

- Not meeting: No reference to disability inclusion, or only broad, general reference to inclusion.
- Partially: Description of targeted OR mainstreaming activities only, or weak linkage to needs identified in the HNO.
- Fully: Clear description of a twin-track approach (targeted AND mainstreaming activities) with concrete activities linked to needs identified in the HNO.

Results

2025: 43.5 % fully meeting; 30 % partially meeting, 26 % not meeting.

2024: 33 % fully meeting, 52 % partially meeting, 14 % not meeting.

Pattern: Reflection of a twin-track approach remains strong; fewer documents explicitly link targeted and mainstreamed actions back to the HNO analysis.

Good practice example: Nigeria 2025 HNRP, p. 37:

"To empower women and girls and people with disabilities, the HNRP will promote their active participation and leadership in decision-making processes at all levels, ensuring that their voices are heard in community consultations and project implementation. Economic empowerment initiatives will provide vocational training, access to microfinance and cash-based interventions to help women and girls, and people with disabilities build sustainable livelihoods. Additionally, the HNRP recognizes the needs of vulnerable boys and men, providing

support for their physical and emotional well-being. This inclusive approach aims to foster equality, resilience and sustainable recovery for all individuals affected by the crisis.”

Nigeria 2025 HNRP, p. 60:

“The Protection Sector will also work with the Disability Working Group to strengthen attention on the needs of people with disabilities in the humanitarian response.”

Nigeria 2025 HNRP, p. 69:

“WASH facilities will also incorporate provisions for persons with disabilities such as ramps, handrails and wide opening doors.”

Indicator 7: Complaints & Feedback Mechanisms

- Not meeting: No reference to accessibility of feedback and complaints mechanisms.
- Partially: General reference to accessibility of complaints and feedback mechanisms, without concrete and specific detail.
- Fully: Specific description of how complaints and feedback mechanisms will be made accessible (e.g. Sign Language, Braille, easy-to-read, multiple channels).

Results

2025: 4.5 % fully meeting, 67 % partially meeting, 26 % not meeting.

2024: 0 % fully meeting, 33 % partially meeting, 76 % not meeting.

Pattern: Major uptake of commitment to accessibility of complaints and feedback mechanisms but detailed descriptions are still rare.

Indicator 8: Monitoring Framework

- Not meeting: No reflection of disability in the monitoring framework.
- Partially: At least one indicator monitoring disability inclusion together with other issues.
- Fully: At least one indicator specifically monitoring disability inclusion.

Results

2025: 48 % fully meeting, 48 % partially meeting, 4.5 % not meeting.

2024: 47.5 % fully meeting, 47.5 % partially meeting, 5 % not meeting.

Pattern: Reflection of disability inclusion in monitoring frameworks remains very high overall, although over half lack disability specific indicators.

Good practice examples of disability-specific indicators:

- *“# of children with disabilities (Girls/Boys) provided with eyeglasses.” (Education, Yemen).*
- *“Number of persons with disability receiving rehabilitation services disaggregated by age and sex (Health, South Sudan).*
- *“# of individuals with disabilities treated and referred for further care.” (Health, Mozambique).*
- *# of trainings on disability inclusion based on the IASC guidelines for members of civil society (Protection, Cameroon)*

Good practice examples of disability disaggregated indicators:

- “Número de personas con acceso a servicios de saneamiento seguros, protectores y separados por género (desagregado por edad, género y condición de discapacidad)”¹⁰ (WASH, El Salvador)
- “Nombre de femmes et filles adolescentes y compris les survivant-e-s de VBG, chef de ménage ayant bénéficié d’une assistance en espèce/Cash désagrégué par âge/handicap.”¹¹ (Protection, Mali).
- “Nombre d’enfants et FEFA (y compris en situation de handicap) affectés par la malnutrition aiguë sévère ayant accès aux services EHA au niveau des centres de prise en charge et des ménages.”¹² (Nutrition, DRC).

Annex A: Indicator Results

Indicator	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Assessed (n)
1 – Data	23.8% (5)	76.2% (16)	0.0% (0)	21
2 – Analysis of risk	38.1% (8)	19.0% (4)	42.9% (9)	21
3 – Intersectionality	4.8% (1)	57.1% (12)	38.1% (8)	21
4 – Cross-sectoral attention	33.3% (7)	19.0% (4)	47.6% (10)	21
5 – OPD engagement	56.5% (13)	4.3% (1)	39.1% (9)	23
6 – Comprehensive response	26.1% (6)	30.4% (7)	43.5% (10)	23
7 – Feedback mechanisms	26.1% (6)	69.6% (16)	4.3% (1)	23
8 – Inclusive monitoring	4.3% (1)	47.8% (11)	47.8% (11)	23

Annex B: Country Scores

Country	Document	Indicator 1	Indicator 2	Indicator 3	Indicator 4	Indicator 5	Indicator 6	Indicator 7	Indicator 8
Syria	Humanitarian Response Priorities	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting

¹⁰ Number of people with access to safe, protective, and gender-segregated sanitation services (disaggregated by age, gender, and disability status).*

¹¹ Number of women and adolescent girls, including GBV survivors and heads of household, who received cash assistance, disaggregated by age and disability.**

¹² Number of children and PLW (pregnant and lactating women), including those with disabilities, affected by severe acute malnutrition who have access to WASH services at treatment centres and at the household level.***

**** Translation provided by HNRP Review Assistant.

Country	Document	Indicator 1	Indicator 2	Indicator 3	Indicator 4	Indicator 5	Indicator 6	Indicator 7	Indicator 8
Venezuela	HRP	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting
Sudan	HNRP	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting
Somalia	HNRP	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting
South Sudan	HNRP	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting
Nigeria	HNRP	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Mozambique	HNRP	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting
Mali	HNRP	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Honduras	HNRP	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Haiti	HNRP	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Guatemala	HNRP	Not meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting
El Salvador	HNRP	Not meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
DRC	HNRP	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Colombia	HNRP	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Chad	HNRP	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
CAR	HNRP	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Cameroon	HRP	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting

Country	Document	Indicator 1	Indicator 2	Indicator 3	Indicator 4	Indicator 5	Indicator 6	Indicator 7	Indicator 8
Burkina Faso	HNRP	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Afghanistan	HNRP	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting
Ukraine	HNRP	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Yemen	HNRP	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting
Venezuela	HNRP	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting	Partially meeting
Sudan	HRP	Partially meeting	Not meeting	Fully meeting	Partially meeting	Fully meeting	Fully meeting	Not meeting	Partially meeting