Inclusive Futures
Promoting disability inclusion

UKaid
from the British people

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 119

Query title	Evidence review on best practice on disability inclusion in the security sector
Authors	**Naomi Clugston and Emma Grant**
Date	**27th August 2024**
Query	1. Why is disability inclusion important for the security sector? 2. What evidence exists on best practice on disability inclusion in the security sector in the following areas: • Conflict and instability • State threats • Transnational threats • Women, Peace and Security
Enquirer	**International Security Fund (ISF)**

Contents

Executive Summary

This report explores the importance of taking a disability inclusive approach to security efforts. It is split into three sections: the first puts forward the case for disability inclusion in the security sector; the second provides the rationale for disability inclusion in specific security sector efforts, with illustrative examples of how this could be done; and the third provides recommendations from key informants (KI) working at the intersection of disability inclusion and security.

Disability: The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD) defines disability as those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others. Under this definition, it is barriers in society which are disabling, rather than disability being understood through a medical lens.

Inclusive Futures
Promoting disability inclusion

UKaid
from the British people

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 119

Making the case for disability inclusion in the security sector

Conflict and security interact with disability in various ways including but not limited to:

- **Conflict exacerbates the safety and security risks faced by people with disabilities.** The United Nations Human Rights Office (UNHR) estimates that in Gaza, 70% of civilians killed and 75% of civilians injured are women and children with disabilities (UNHR, 2024). Eyewitness accounts from the war in former Yugoslavia indicate that people with intellectual disabilities held in concentration camps and prisoner of war camps were repeatedly beaten or killed for not understanding and responding to orders (McInnes, K. 2023).
- **Conflict-related injuries can increase the number of people with disabilities.** It is estimated that 75% of those affected by landmines in Yemen will have disabilities and lifelong psychological trauma (Dashela, 2022). In Ukraine, it is estimated that the number of persons with war-related impairments increased by approximately 27,000 in the year following the Russian invasion (Machlouzarides and Uretici, 2023).
- **Grievances of veterans and ex-combatants with disabilities or injuries who are excluded from employment, benefits or services may result in further violence.** Examples are provided in more detail below from DRC and Sierra Leone (Lord and Stein, 2015).

People with disabilities make up a significant proportion of people living in fragile, and conflict affected states (FCAS). The World Health Organisation estimates that 16% of the global population has a disability (WHO, 2023). According to the Humanitarian Needs Assessment Programme in Syria, 28% of people aged 2 years and above have a disability, and in certain regions of Syria this number may be as high as 37% (HNAP, 2021).[1] Reflecting on these percentages, several KIs stressed that there are millions of people whose security needs and perspectives are being overlooked at present. Including people with disabilities in discussions and decision-making around security efforts is essential for ensuring that the safety and security of entire populations are promoted through this work.

A disability inclusive approach to security efforts is also key to supporting the UK, states and conflict parties to uphold their obligations to protect civilians under international law and supports the FCDO uphold its legal obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and the UK Equalities Act (UNHR, 2006).

A closer look at disability inclusion in different parts of the security sector

This review was unable to find a solid set of good practice or case studies around disability inclusion within the security sector. This major gap is in itself; an important finding of this review. Nevertheless, some helpful examples of 'emerging' practice or suggested

[1] These percentages are based on the results of a national household survey conducted in Syria in 2019 but the number of respondents is unknown.

approaches were uncovered. These examples are detailed in a table in Section 2 and point to both why and how disability inclusion can be considered in different parts of the sector, even if the evidence base is thin. In the absence of a robust evidence base, this list may aid HMG staff looking to find entry points for disability inclusion across the sector.

Recommendations

The following cross-cutting recommendations emerged from both interviews and literature around how to overcome some of the barriers identified through the research. Interviews with KIIs highlighted various individual and structural barriers and challenges to integrating disability inclusion into security efforts. These included but were not limited to 1) a perceived lack of commitment from security actors; 2) a lack of skills, expertise and resources to integrate disability inclusion effectively; 3) a lack of focus on disability inclusion in the international security architecture; and 4) prevailing discriminatory attitudes, norms and stigma around disability. A summary of these recommendations is provided below with further detail in the Recommendations section.

Recommendations for HMG Staff	
1	Conduct disability inclusive context analysis to inform the design of programmes.
2	Support Gender advisors with training around disability inclusion and ensure they have the resources they need to promote disability inclusion across security programmes.
3	Include people with disabilities alongside other beneficiary groups during programme design, implementation and monitoring.
4	Develop reporting incentives to ensure disability inclusion is given priority in programming.
5	Provide funding, training and resources to support implementing teams and partners to take a disability inclusive approach to programming.
6	Fund and partner with a diverse range of Organisations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs), such as women-led OPDs, to maximise the reach and effectiveness of programme activities.
7	Use and adapt existing tools to support programmes to include a focus on disability inclusion.
8	Ensure security policies internal to FCDO/HMG and implementing partners are disability inclusive.
9	Advocate for the development of a disability inclusive international security architecture.
10	Fund and publicise research into what works to include people with disabilities in security sector efforts.
Recommendations for programming	
11	Ensure that disability inclusive programming recognizes diverse disabilities and does not reinforce ‘hierarchies of disability’ through programme engagement.

12	Ensure that disability inclusive programming considers the needs of those with conflict-related disabilities and pre-existing disabilities.
13	Ensure that discussions around community security include the perspectives of people with disabilities.
14	Ensure people with disabilities are included in peacebuilding activities to maximise the likelihood of inclusive peace.
15	Address social norms that stigmatise people with disabilities and prevent their effective integration in communities.
16	Provide training on disability inclusion and human rights approaches to security forces.
17	Produce accessible communications in security sector programming.

Methodology

This evidence review has been developed through the Disability Inclusive Development (DID) Helpdesk, a research and advice service for FCDO and other UK government departments that provides evidence-based support on disability inclusion in policy and programming.

The report was guided by the following questions, co-created with the research enquirer:

1. Why is disability inclusion important for the security sector?
2. What evidence exists on best practice on disability inclusion in the security sector in the following areas:
    - Conflict and instability
    - State threats
    - Transnational threats
    - Women, Peace and Security

These questions were explored through both primary and secondary data collection. In the first instance, a rapid document review was conducted to understand the evidence on disability inclusion in the security sector. Relevant publications were sourced through online searches and signposting to relevant resources by research participants. Open-source publications with a global or regional scope were prioritised for this evidence review.

Secondary data was complemented by consultations with fourteen KIs. These were conducted using semi-structured interviews. Participants consulted as part of this research included three members of Organisations of Persons with Disability (OPD) / Disability-led networks. The other participants had experience working at the intersection between disability and security sector programming.

There were a number of limitations to this research, resulting from time constraints, the rapid nature of this query, and a lack of documented evidence on good practice for disability inclusion in the security sector. Due to the rapid nature of this research, it

was not possible to comprehensively review all possible relevant publications or to interview a high number of people with disabilities or members of OPD/ Disability-led networks. In addition, the lack of documented evidence on good practice for disability inclusion in the security sector meant that this review was not able to capture any examples. This does not necessarily mean that disability inclusion is not being integrated into security efforts in some contexts, rather that we were not able to find documented evidence of this or to speak to individuals with practice-based knowledge of these instances. However, this report does point to a broad lack of consideration for disability inclusion in conflict and security work and indicates that what work is being done is in its very early stages.

Making the case for disability inclusion in the security sector

In making the case for more disability inclusive approaches within the security sector, it is first important to understand the ways that conflict and security interact with disability. These include the following (non-exhaustive) points:

- **Conflict exacerbates the safety and security risks faced by people with disabilities.** The United Nations Human Rights Office (UNHRO) estimates that in Gaza, 70% of civilians killed and 75% of civilians injured are women and children with disabilities (UNHR, 2024).
- **Conflict-related injuries can increase the number of people with disabilities.** It is estimated that 75% of those affected by landmines in Yemen will have disabilities and lifelong psychological trauma (Dashela, 2022). In Ukraine, it is estimated that the number of persons with war-related disabilities increased by approximately 27,000 in the year following the Russian invasion (Machlouzarides and Uretici, 2023).
- **Barriers to health services, including mental health and psychosocial support, can pose a risk factor for future violence.** Research with 6,063 people across three conflict-affected regions of Indonesia and the Philippines found that people with conflict-related trauma including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) who could not access support were more likely to have attitudes that endorse violence at family and community level and thus poses a risk to peace (Affiat et al., 2024).
- **Grievances of veterans and ex-combatants with injuries or disabilities who are excluded from employment, benefits or services may result in further violence.** Examples are provided in more detail below from DRC and Sierra Leone (Lord and Stein, 2015).
- **Security responses may affect people with disabilities in particular ways.** For example, sanctions that include medical equipment such as prosthetics or similar can exacerbate challenges for people with disabilities (ODVV, 2019).

People with disabilities make up a significant proportion of people living in fragile and conflict affected states (FCAS). People with disabilities comprise approximately 16% of the global population, amounting to over one billion people worldwide (WHO, 2023). The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) estimates that of all people with disabilities living globally,

16% have an impairment that can be attributed to armed conflict (UNMAS, 2020). In some FCAS the proportion of the population with disabilities is much higher than 16%. According to the Humanitarian Needs Assessment Programme in Syria, 28% of people aged 2 years and above have disabilities, and in certain regions of Syria this number may be as high as 37% (HNAP, 2021). Reflecting on these percentages, several KIs stressed that there are millions of people whose security needs and perspectives are being overlooked at present. According to research by Conciliation Resources, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is the second most prevalent impairment type in post-conflict countries, but psychosocial initiatives are severely under-resourced in these contexts (Conciliation Resources, 2021).

Remember: People with disabilities are not a homogenous group- their needs will differ depending on their impairment. The needs of a person who is blind or has a visual impairment will differ from the needs of somebody with a physical impairment, and again for somebody with cognitive impairments. In addition, people with disabilities may be further excluded and marginalised due to other identity features such as gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, among others.

A disability inclusive approach to security efforts supports the UK, states and conflict parties to uphold their obligations to protect civilians under international law. International Human Rights Law requires that conflict parties 1) distinguish between civilians and combatants at all times, 2) do not launch attacks that could be expected to cause incidental loss of civilian life or injury to civilians that would be excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated, and 3) take constant care to minimise the incidental loss of civilian life, injury to civilians and damage to civilian objects (British Red Cross, nd.). The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) states in Article 11 that, "States Parties shall take, in accordance with their obligations under international law, including international humanitarian law and international human rights law, all necessary measures to ensure the protection and safety of persons with disabilities in situations of risk, including situations of armed conflict, humanitarian emergencies and the occurrence of natural disasters (UNHR, 2006)."

A disability inclusive approach to security programming also supports the FCDO to uphold its legal obligations under the UK Equalities Act. The UK Equality Act prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities and requires organisations to make reasonable adjustments to ensure their equal participation in activities and the full enjoyment of their human rights (UK Gov, 2010). In addition, it supports FCDO aims as outlines in FCDO's Disability Inclusion and Rights Strategy (FCDO, 2022), which lists inclusive humanitarian action as a key intervention area. This strategy also highlights other FCDO commitments such as the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action.

The perspectives and priorities of whole communities, including people with disabilities, are essential to ensure that security efforts meet the needs and promote the safety and security of entire populations. Efforts focused on improving the security of conflict-affected populations risk failing to achieve their aims if they exclude people with disabilities from their

programming. However, some KIs were sceptical whether security actors believe disability inclusion is relevant to their work, highlighting the need for further awareness raising in this area.

Finally, including people with disabilities within security sector roles also offers other important and tangible benefits. KIs told us that employing veterans with disabilities in military positions is an important way of demonstrating to existing personnel that the military looks after their staff and thus serves as a deterrent to drop-outs as well as a way of addressing stigma. Equally, one KI who himself has a physical disability spoke about the particular strengths that people with disabilities can bring to different parts of the security apparatus: he noted that people with auditory impairments can bring great value in scanning camera footage for threats, for example.

A closer look at disability inclusion in different parts of the security sector

This review was unable to find a solid set of good practice or case studies around disability inclusion within the security sector. Repeatedly, KIs confirmed that this was not an area where there had been much (or any) discussion, policy development or research. The paucity of literature confirms this gap. Several possible case studies shared by KIs were not well documented and thus felt more anecdotal than evidentiary. This major gap is, in itself, an important finding of this review.

Nevertheless, some helpful examples of 'emerging' practice, research, suggested approaches and considerations were uncovered. These examples point to both why and how disability inclusion can be considered in different parts of the sector, even if the evidence base is thin. Below, we set out examples of potential or actual approaches to disability inclusion highlighted by KIs or the literature review, and related evidence. We also highlight examples of the potential risks associated with not taking a disability inclusive approach where relevant. In the absence of a robust evidence base, this table may serve as an aid for HMG staff looking to find entry points for discussion around why and how disability inclusion is important across different parts of the security sector.

Inclusive Futures
Promoting disability inclusion

UKaid
from the British people

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 119

Pillar	Opportunity	Evidence, entry points, advice and considerations regarding a disability inclusive approach
Conflict & stability	**Tackling discrimination through security sector reform**	In South Sudan, one KI explained that there are currently significant barriers to remaining in the military for military personnel who become disabled through conflict. This has been a source of frustration and a potential source of grievance within the military, given the high risk of injury through work on the front line. In order to address this discrimination, the National Constitutional Review Commission lobby the government to ensure that personnel with disabilities are given employment opportunities that are accessible and to demonstrate to military personnel that there are continued professional opportunities for them if they incur an injury in the line of duty. The National Constitutional Review Commission has also worked with the military to address the stigma faced by personnel with disabilities. Another KI highlighted the potential for the inclusion of people with a range of impairments in security forces, to improve engagement with people with disabilities in communities. The KI reflected that having security forces that reflect the diversity of communities, when coupled with appropriate training, is likely to reduce stigma and improve understanding about the needs of people with disabilities.
	Finding entry points for disability-inclusive content within security sector training	As an alternative to stand-alone, silo-ed 'inclusion training' for security sector personnel, a more integrated approach to 'community safety' was advocated by one KI. This KI spoke about their experience in Somalia training security forces in peaceful community engagement and managing large crowds (for example). They emphasised the huge value of bringing together police trainees with community representatives such as OPD representatives (not something that is always included in this kind of training), suggesting that this would be a more organic way of bringing disability issues onto the radar of both new recruits / trainees as well as in-service training of existing personnel.

	Another example of where disability inclusive training is important for security forces can be seen when examining checkpoints. Police and military personnel are likely to work at checkpoints to monitor and control the movement of people and materials to prevent violence (Geneva Academy, 2019). People with intellectual, hearing or visual impairments, and neurodivergent people may respond unexpectedly to commands because these are not given in an accessible manner. One KI from Colombia described cases of people with disabilities being killed by armed actors due to being suspected of spying for the enemy, entirely based on discrimination, harmful norms and a complete lack of understanding about disability. Security forces should be trained in how to better understand and respond to the communication and other needs of people with disabilities to ensure people with disabilities are not targeted inadvertently and to keep whole communities safe.
Meeting standards and complying with international humanitarian law in the treatment of disabled internees and prisoners of war	There is no publicly available data on the proportion of detainees and prisoners of war with disabilities (Geneva Academy, 2019). However, in non-conflict settings, persons with disabilities represent an average of 50% of people detained, disproportionate given they make up on average 16% of the population. This is linked to a variety of factors including but not limited to, misconceptions of people with intellectual or psychosocial disabilities that characterise them as dangerous and prone to violence; public displays of poverty such as homelessness; and non-compliant behaviour with authorities that is deemed hostile rather than the result of inaccessible communication of commands and instructions (UNHR, 2019). The Geneva Academy anticipates that this number is higher in conflict contexts. Without clarity about the number of people with disabilities detained it is not possible to determine the policies and practices needed to ensure their enjoyment of International Human Rights Law protections (International Review of the Red Cross, 2019). For example, the regulation and prohibition of certain items, such as mobility aids, may need to be reviewed if a prisoner requires these for their survival and to ensure they have the same levels of autonomy as other prisoners. Similarly, communication approaches may need to be adapted for

	detainees with hearing impairments, so that these approaches are accessible. This is especially important in cases where non-compliance with directives could be misinterpreted as hostility.
Tackling stigma and ensuring accessible services for disabled ex combatants within Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration (DDR) programmes	Ex-combatants with disabilities are likely to face multiple challenges to effectively engaging in Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration (DDR) processes. For example, they are likely to face barriers to reintegration into communities due to disability-related stigma and discrimination on top of the stigma they may face due to their association with armed groups (Lord and Stein, 2015). These ex-combatants are also likely to face additional barriers to accessing health services, education and employment opportunities due to discrimination and a lack of accessibility. Ex-combatants with disabilities may also be excluded from the benefits associated with DDR processes if they "self-demobilised" following an injury. This occurred in Zimbabwe, where an estimated 37% of war veterans with disabilities did not receive demobilisation allowances because they had self-demobilised and were unaware of their entitlements or were required to travel long-distances to access them (ibid). In Colombia, accommodation at demobilisation areas and transportation to livelihoods and educations programmes as part of DDR processes were not accessible, excluding ex-combatants with disabilities (Velarde et al., 2019). Conducting a disability inclusive analysis during the design phase of DDR programmes is key to ensuring they meet the needs of people with disabilities. The exclusion of ex-combatants with disabilities from benefits and services can lead to additional grievances and pose a security risk itself. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, humanitarian workers reported that groups of ex-combatants with disabilities, extorted shopkeepers around Kinshasa and forcing them to pay a "disability tax" (Lord and Stein, 2015). In Sierra Leone in 2012, ex-combatants with disabilities were not effectively reintegrated into society following conflict and so some engaged in a demonstration that turned violent. Research from conflict-affected regions in Indonesia and the Philippines found that ex-combatants with conflict-related trauma were more likely to hold attitudes that endorsed violence at the family and community level (Affiat et al., 2024).

	Disability Inclusive DDR programming must be designed to ensure that conflict parties do not use this inclusion to undermine the disarmament process. One KI described an example from Sudan where conflict parties had used the commitment to a disability inclusive DDR process to exclusively put ex-combatants with disabilities forward for DDR, while ensuring that those combatants who were still able to fight remained outside of the DDR process. This enabled conflict parties to put a large number of people through the DDR process, while retaining an active fighting force themselves. Thus, while the inclusive nature of the DDR process was important for supporting ex-combatants with disabilities, it worked more as a social welfare programme, and did not achieve its aim of disarming the majority of combatants. It is thus key to analyse the potential perverse incentives such initiatives may generate to ensure the principle of Do No Harm.
Considering people with disabilities in design of international sanctions	There is increased recognition of the impact unilateral sanctions on countries can have on civilian populations and people with disabilities in particular. Sanctions that prevent targeted countries obtaining fuel, medical supplies, and medical equipment can significantly impact people with disabilities by preventing them from accessing the life-saving services they need (UNHR, 2021). In addition, the complex legislation around sanctions can cause some banks to withhold funding for urgent humanitarian aid, and transportation companies may refuse to handle shipments of humanitarian goods. This can mean that the equipment and goods needed by people with disabilities to live independent lives with full enjoyment of their human rights is denied to them in times of crisis.
Including people with disabilities in peace settlements	People with disabilities are often absent from peace negotiations. Research with people with disabilities in Colombia highlighted that disability issues were not sufficiently considered during the peace negotiations in Havana, Cuba (Velarde et al., 2019). Participants attributed this to a lack of political will and widespread stigma against people with disabilities. This stigma is illustrated by the way that a leader of the FARC (armed opposition movement) who is blind, distanced himself from the disability rights movement saying that he was not disabled on national media.

	The UN Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs highlight the importance of ensuring the meaningful participation of people with disabilities in peace processes (UNDPPA, 2024). Without this, the different needs of people with disabilities will not be identified or considered in peace deals, which lay the foundation for state building. They also highlight the importance that people with disabilities are invited to the negotiating table and to Security Council briefings to discuss issues beyond their disability-related experiences.
Ensuring peacebuilding processes are disability inclusive and can benefit the whole population	People with disabilities can be key contributors to peacebuilding efforts but can face significant barriers to involvement. Taking a disability inclusive approach to peacebuilding is essential for breaking down these barriers, which is important both from a rights perspective but also to achieve the best outcomes. One KI noted that including people with disabilities in peacebuilding efforts helps ensure these efforts benefit whole communities and do not exclude key groups. Another shared an example of where a peacebuilding programme had used sports for cross-community peacebuilding. They explained that by ensuring these sports were inclusive and encouraging people with disabilities from different communities to participate and demonstrate leadership, the programme was able to build trust across the communities and also build empathy and respect for people with disabilities. A blog by Saferworld shares the example of Sebit Khamis Marajan, a South Sudanese peacebuilder who is blind and who was elected by his community as chair of a community action group to help resolve conflict between people within a Protection of Civilians Camp (Saferworld, nd.).
Understanding the needs of mines survivors and affected communities in De-mining programmes	According to the UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS), Victim Assistance in the context of explosive mines includes “actions to meet the needs of people injured, survivors, families of people injured and killed, as well as affected communities” (UNMAS, 2019). This support should include emergency and long-term medical services, rehabilitation, psychosocial and mental health support, education and livelihood opportunities and social protection. The Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) and the Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons requires that States provide services and rehabilitation to survivors

	of mines and explosive remnants of war (UNMAS, 2019). It also requires that they support their social and economic reintegration. This is reiterated by the Convention on Cluster Munitions (Article 5). The needs of mine survivors will differ depending on their specific injuries and the long-term impacts of those injuries (Gender and Mine Action, 2018). Humanity International conducted surveys across 12 districts of Mozambique with survivors of mines and found that they had specific needs that differed from people with other impairments (H&I, 2015). This research found there is no clarity on the number of mine survivors in Mozambique, making it harder for policy makers and practitioners to understand and respond to the needs of those impacted by landmines. The living conditions for mine victims and people with disabilities more broadly at the time of this research were poor and the quality and availability of mobility aids and health and psychosocial services was limited.
Complying with IHL in the Rules of Engagement: understanding rights and barriers of persons with disability	If security forces orchestrating attacks do not take into consideration the needs of people with disabilities, they risk breaching the principle of proportionality in International Humanitarian Law (Geneva Academy, 2019). Understanding the characteristics, needs and barriers faced by a population inevitably facilitates more accurate predictions about the potential incidental harm of an attack and whether it can be considered proportionate. Military commanders should receive training on the rights of persons with disabilities and the variety of barriers that people with diverse disabilities face. This will help equip them with accurate and relevant information needed for considering the effect of an attack on the entire population while undertaking proportionality assessments. A review of military manuals and interviews with stakeholders suggests that parties to conflict have not considered whether advance warnings given to civilian populations are accessible to those with disabilities or give enough time for people with disabilities to respond to these warnings (Geneva Academy, 2019). This research highlights that, where it is possible to provide an accessible warning, failing to do so could amount to discrimination based on impairment and amount to a

	violation of the party's legal obligations under the CRPD and international law to take all necessary measures to ensure the safety of people with disabilities during armed conflict. Disability risk assessments are key to the development of advance warning systems and help ensure that people with disabilities can access, understand and respond to advance warnings intended to keep them safe in the context of attacks.
Addressing heightened risks for people with disabilities in emergency and evacuation situations	A 2019 review of precautions taken against the effects of attacks on civilians found that persons with disabilities appear to be consistently excluded from considerations about the nature and delivery of these measures (Geneva Academy, 2019). Evacuation procedures, transport, emergency information and places of shelter are rarely accessible for those who rely on assistive devices. This puts people with disabilities at disproportionate risk of being killed or injured and forces families to choose between fleeing to safety themselves or risking their lives to stay with a loved one. In addition, overcrowding at transport terminals can increase the risk of injury and can be dangerous and overwhelming for autistic people and people with intellectual disabilities, who may experience intense emotions due to crowds and noise (Martin and Buchanan, 2022) These risks were highlighted in 2023 by the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities who explained that due to exclusionary evacuation efforts, people with disabilities in Gaza were repeatedly blocked from accessing safety (UNHR, 2023). The International Disability Alliance has also highlighted that people with disabilities in Ukraine (especially those with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities) face greater risks of being left behind during evacuations and exposed to violence and abuse (International Disability Alliance, nd.). They also warn that thousands of children and adults with disabilities are trapped in institutions and are at risk of being abandoned due to conflict. Similar reports from Yemen find that, without access to assistive devices, people with physical disabilities face serious barriers to fleeing attacks (International Review of the Red Cross, 2023).

	In Kyrgyzstan, one FCDO partner brought representatives from different agencies and ministries together to participate in a simulation exercise for emergency response. This included a focus on how people with disabilities might be impacted in an emergency and helped participants think through the potential impact of emergencies on people with disabilities in their planning.
Ensuring check points are disability inclusive	Checkpoints are a widely used method of controlling the flow of people and resources within conflict-affected areas to promote the security of civilian populations. If policies about the treatment of people at checkpoints are not developed with consideration for the needs of people with disabilities, it can risk breaching the principle of Humane Treatment under International Humanitarian Law (Geneva Academy, 2019). This principle requires that the wounded and sick, prisoners of war, and others protected by International Humanitarian Law be treated humanely. In many contexts, policies such as prohibiting animals from crossing through checkpoints might not be considered inhumane. However, if a person with a visual impairment has a service dog that they need to navigate a checkpoint to reach a safe zone, prohibiting that animal from crossing would be considered inhumane. Efforts to support security forces design and establish checkpoints would benefit from disability analysis to ensure these checkpoints do not penalise those with disabilities by limiting their movement.
Understanding potential risks for persons with disability posed by autonomous weapons	Autonomous weapon systems are increasingly being directed by Artificial Intelligence (AI). Since these systems have not yet been used on a large scale, there is no documented evidence of disability-related AI bias in these systems. However, the International Review of the Red Cross anticipates that the bias seen within AI in other civilian contexts is likely to be replicated in the military space (Orozco et al. 2022). Examples of challenges that could arise through the use of AI-directed weaponry include: • People with physical or psychological disabilities may move or behave in ways that are “unexpected” and that an autonomous weapon is unable to understand. This could lead the weapons system to identify the person with a disability as a hostile threat and therefore target.

	• People with disabilities may face barriers to interpreting commands and warnings by autonomous weapons systems and be less able to respond by evacuating or concealing themselves or taking other life-saving measures. • Voice-recognition systems may not be effective for people who cannot communicate orally, who require more time to express themselves, or who do not speak in a way that a system would require to "validate" a person as not being a threat. These issues become more challenging for people with multiple impairments.
Conduct advocacy to promote disability inclusion across the security sector	One KI highlighted a programme where veterans with disabilities worked with other people with disabilities to advocate for the rights of people with disabilities to have equal access to services. Through these advocacy efforts, they also challenges stigma against people with disabilities by highlighting the valuable contributions they can bring to communities.

State threats	**Protecting everyone from cyber threats**	Without a disability inclusive approach to cyber security, cyber security efforts cannot guarantee that those with disabilities have equal access to the tools and resources necessary to protect them from cyber threats (Stone, 2023). Individuals without access to these tools and information may become more susceptible to cyber-crimes and less able to recognise and mitigate cyber threats. Through a KII with a representative of the ISF cyber-security team, we identified the following ways that disability inclusion could be relevant: 1. Programmes focused on training civilians such as children and parents on identifying common cyber-crime threats and how to stay safe in these contexts should consider how to adapt this training to ensure it is relevant to people with diverse impairments. For example, people with visual impairments may be more susceptible to phishing scams because of the barriers to reading and interpreting images in an email or messages that would help them to identify these scams (Button, 2023). Similar barriers may be faced by people with intellectual impairments. In addition, people with memory challenges may find it difficult to remember complex passwords, leading them to use single simpler passwords instead, which can make it easier for hackers to break into their personal accounts. People with disabilities who require carers to enter private passwords on their behalf are also at greater risk of privacy breaches and may prefer alternative solutions to help them maintain their independence and autonomy. Multi-factor identification may help address these issues by ensuring that biometric data is needed after entering a password to access personal accounts. 2. Programmes focused on supporting governments develop cyber-security systems to protect the personal data of populations should consider how the data of people with disabilities may be targeted and the different impact that cyberattacks could have on people with disabilities. For example, people with disabilities may become targets of crime if their medical data is stolen and used to identify them as more susceptible to cyber or other attacks. In addition,

cyberattacks that cause hospital systems to shut down can have a disproportionate impact on people with disabilities who require urgent services.

3. Programmes supporting civil society organisations, including OPDs, or other organisations to develop greater cyber resilience should ensure that systems and tools that help keep platforms safe such as completely automated public Turing test to tell computers and humans apart (CAPTCHA) are disability inclusive (W3C, 2021). Without taking a disability-inclusive approach, these security tools could exclude people with disabilities from accessing online platforms. For example, asking users who are visually impaired or dyslexic to identify textual characters in a distorted graphic may prevent users from successfully performing this task. Rather, disability inclusive options should be explored to ensure that organisations can keep data and platforms safe without excluding people with disabilities from engaging online.

4. Programmes working to combat disinformation should be aware of the particular risks that people with disabilities and people with different characteristics in positions of power face. For example, in recent years there has been substantial online speculation that Joe Biden and Donald Trump may have dementia or some form of mental health condition (Alzheimer's Society, 2024). While it is important that voters should be able to discuss a candidate's perceived mental and physical fitness for a position of power, speculation about undiagnosed mental health conditions or other cognitive impairments have been weaponised to smear their character and policies. The tone has tended to be demeaning, reinforcing outdated stereotypes that people with dementia are not worth listening to and are unable to contribute to society. Ableist attacks have also been perpetrated against activists such as Greta Thunburg in attempts to undermine her activism (Dave, A. et al. 2020).

Transnational threats	**Understanding how to identify and support people with disabilities in contexts of irregular migration**	In 2020, an estimated 12 million people who had been forcibly displaced were people with disabilities, but the prevalence is likely to be higher due to underreporting of disability (Migrant Protection Platform, 2023). Data gaps need to be addressed to support the development of a clearer global picture of disability within migration patterns to ensure that policies associated with migration are reflective of the needs of those with disabilities. Research by the European Union Agency for Asylum finds that in asylum processing centres across Europe, people with mental health conditions and psychosocial disabilities and/or intellectual disabilities are not consistently identified upon arrival (EUAA, 2024). This can cause delays in ensuring these people have access to the services and support they need. Civil society organisations working on the rights of people with disabilities have stressed the importance of sensitising frontline staff and providing them with training in the needs and rights of people with disabilities.

Transnational threats	**Supporting people with disabilities to stay safe during and after a terrorist attack**	People with disabilities are likely to face greater barriers to staying safe during and following a terrorist attack and may face greater challenges accessing appropriate support following a terrorist attack. For example, people with disabilities are more likely to be injured or killed if there is a rush to emergency exits, or to be separated from their support person in these instances. In addition, terrorist attacks can lead to injuries that can cause people to become disabled in conjunction with barriers in society. It is essential that warning systems, evacuation announcements and emergency exit signs are disability accessible to ensure that people with disabilities are able to evacuate safely following a terrorist attack. In some contexts, people with disabilities are also targeted by terrorist groups for recruitment. For example, research between 2004-2007 which examined the autopsies of suicide bombers used by the Taliban in Kabul, found that over 80% of these were people with disabilities or people with chronic illnesses. Dr Yusef Yadgari, Senior Assistant Professor at Kabul Medical University argued that this may be because people with disabilities face high levels of discrimination and impoverishment in Afghanistan and so were more likely to agree to become suicide bombers to make money for their families (Nelson, 2007).
	Recognising and addressing the heightened risks faced by people with disability (including children) in contexts of human trafficking	According to the United States National Disability Rights Network, people with disabilities are more likely to be subjected to human trafficking than people without disabilities (National Disability Rights Network, 2021). This is because human traffickers typically target individuals that they believe they can isolate and control, exploiting gaps in education, societal isolation and inadequate access to services and support to achieve this. People with disabilities are at disproportionate risk of sexual exploitation and forced labour in the context of human trafficking. For example, children with an intellectual disability are four to six times more at risk than children without intellectual disabilities (Nichols, 2022). This may be because they are less able to understand what sexual abuse is, less able to identify and avoid risky situations, particularly as they are more likely to be excluded from safeguarding or SRHR education, and more likely to be compliant to perceived “care givers”.

		In the United States, and possibly elsewhere, an emerging type of human trafficking targets adults with disabilities who are entitled to government benefits and involves the exploitation of people with disabilities so that traffickers can gain access to these benefits (Thomas and Strickland, 2024).
Women, Peace and Security	**Including women and girls with disabilities in the international security architecture**	UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, does not mention women with disabilities, and subsequent WPS resolutions only reference women with disabilities in relation to the impact of armed conflict on them but not in terms of their right to participate in peacebuilding. UNSCR 2250 on Youth, Peace and Security encourages states to comply with CRPD obligations but does not clarify how this should be done in practice. The exclusion of women and girls with disabilities from international security architecture and legislation puts them at greater risk by failing to recognise their existence and their rights in FCAS. One KII suggested that HMG staff would be well placed to advocate for the explicit consideration and integration of women and girls with disabilities in existing Women, Peace and Security and Youth, Peace and Security resolutions and efforts associated with them.
	Ensuring needs and priorities of women and girls with disabilities are included in peacebuilding efforts.	According to research by conciliation resources, women and girls with disabilities experience higher rates of gender-based violence and other forms of violence, especially in FCAS (Conciliation Resources, 2021). The risk of gender based violence is likely to be exacerbated for women and girls with disabilities who are adolescent, widows, living in rural areas, and those with diverse sexual orientations, gender identities, expression and sex characteristics (SOGIESC) though data on this is lacking. Women and girls with disabilities also face higher barriers to participating in peacebuilding efforts and discussions, causing their perspectives to be absent from decision-making. Women and girls with disabilities face substantial barriers to accessing services, education, land, marriage, health services and from participating in politics (Ortoleva, 2010). Including their perspectives in efforts that lay the foundations for peace are key to ensuring their needs are reflected in efforts to rebuild societies following conflict.

	Recognising the distinct experiences of women and girls with disabilities in DDR processes.	Very little is known about the experience of women and girls with disabilities in DDR processes. Girls and women associated with armed groups are used as medics, spies, lookouts, raiders, combatants, and domestic and agricultural labour, as well as sexual slaves, increasing the risk of physical and psychological impairments stemming from trauma and associated stigma and ostracization (Ortoleva, 2010). Anecdotal evidence suggests that women and girls with disabilities face challenges to engaging in DDR processes that are compounded by their gender and age. In the Intifada in Palestine, male ex-combatants with disabilities were considered heroes, while women ex-combatants were considered outcasts because their impairments were seen to stop them performing roles traditionally expected of women (Lord and Stein, 2015).

Recommendations

The following cross-cutting recommendations emerged from both interviews and literature and focus on how to overcome some of the barriers identified through the research. Interviews with KIIs highlighted various individual and structural barriers and challenges to integrating disability inclusion into security efforts. These included but were not limited to 1) a perceived lack of commitment from security actors; 2) a lack of skills, expertise and resources to integrate disability inclusion effectively; 3) a lack of focus on disability inclusion in the international security architecture; and 4) prevailing discriminatory attitudes, norms and stigma around disability. In addition, where disability inclusion has been integrated, there were concerns that the perspectives of a diverse range of people with disabilities were not being included, resulting in greater risk of exclusion for people with disabilities who also experience discrimination based on another aspect of their identity, including women with disabilities, older people, and LGBTQI+ people, and people with disabilities who are more likely to be excluded, such as people with psychosocial disabilities. Below, we have provided each recommendation with supporting source and rationale.

Recommendations for HMG Staff	
1	Conduct disability inclusive context analysis to inform the design of programmes.
2	Support GEDSI advisors with training around disability inclusion and ensure they have the resources they need to promote disability inclusion across security programmes.
3	Include people with disabilities during programme design, implementation and monitoring.
4	Develop reporting incentives to ensure disability inclusion is given priority in programming.
5	Provide funding, training and resources to support implementing teams and partners to take a disability inclusive approach to programming.
6	Fund and partner with a diverse range of Organisations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs), such as women-led OPDs, to maximise the reach and effectiveness of programme activities.
7	Use and adapt existing tools to support programmes to include a focus on disability inclusion.
8	Ensure internal security policies are disability inclusive.
9	Advocate for the development of a disability inclusive international security architecture.
10	Fund and publicise research into what works to include people with disabilities in security sector efforts.
Recommendations for programming	
11	Ensure that disability inclusive programming recognizes diverse disabilities and does not reinforce ‘hierarchies of disability’ through programme engagement.

12	Ensure that disability inclusive programming considers the needs of those with conflict-related disabilities and pre-existing disabilities.
13	Ensure that discussions around community security include the perspectives of people with disabilities.
14	Ensure people with disabilities are included in peacebuilding activities to maximise the likelihood of inclusive peace.
15	Address social norms that stigmatise people with disabilities and prevent their effective integration in communities.
16	Provide training on disability inclusion and human rights approaches to security forces.
17	Produce accessible communications in security sector programming.

Recommendations for HMG staff

1. **Conduct disability inclusive context analysis to inform the design of programmes.** One KI working within ISF highlighted the benefits of conducting a Gender, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) Analysis to inform the design of their programmes and think through how to take a disability inclusive approach. The disability focus of this analysis can help teams consider the needs and priorities of people with disabilities within communities and how the programme can ensure its outcomes reflect these. It also supports teams to take an intersectional approach, to ensure that the needs and priorities of people with disabilities in their diversity (including women and girls with disabilities, older people, younger people, ethnic and racial minorities, and LGBTQI+ people) are considered. Ensuring programmes are informed by a GEDSI analysis can help improve the effectiveness of programmes that support conflict affected communities by ensuring they reach more members of the community, do not exclude groups and do not exacerbate existing inequality or grievances. A GEDSI analysis will help identify where to focus resources to best support people with disabilities and identify opportunities to engage their expertise and leadership.

Remember: People with disabilities make up a significant proportion of conflict-affected populations. They are not separate communities. Integrating their perspectives, needs and priorities should not be seen as additional to integrating the perspectives, needs and priorities of other members of communities. Instead, an intersectional approach including people with disabilities is essential for ensuring the perspectives of whole communities are reflected in security programming.

2. **Support ISF Gender advisors with training around disability inclusion and ensure they have the resources they need to promote disability inclusion across security programmes.** Interviews with security actors and disability rights activists highlighted that where security actors are considering inclusion through a "Gender and Disability Inclusion lens" the primary focus tends to be on integrating gender, while disability inclusion is usually left out. This may be due to a lack of understanding around why disability inclusion is relevant to security efforts and a lack of knowledge about how to do this effectively. One KI explained that there is often a gap between what donors expect should happen with disability inclusion and what happens in practice. This KI argued that in some contexts gender experts are expected to provide disability inclusion expertise without having that expertise themselves. In practice, this means that programmes often offer no specific provisions or reasonable accommodations to ensure people with disabilities are included. Another KI argued that programmes should provide disability inclusive training to managers and ensure that managers' performance is assessed based on the inclusivity of their programmes. She argued that having disability experts without also training and holding managers to account for the inclusiveness of programmes, increased the risk that resources would be spent on expertise that were not implemented in practice. In some instances, resourcing specific disability inclusion expertise may be needed to complement gender expertise. The FCDO has access to a range of helpdesks including the Disability Inclusion Development Helpdesk which can provide technical assistance for GEDSI advisors looking for more information about how to integrate disability inclusion into the programmes they support.

3. **Include the perspectives of people with disabilities in programme design, and implementation and monitoring.** KIIs highlighted the importance of integrating disability inclusion at the design stage of a project. One KI explained that integrating disability inclusion into a programme after the design phase is a difficult and expensive approach. Another echoed this, arguing that integrating disability inclusion from the very start leads to better value and more effective programming. In addition, this KII emphasised the benefits of including the perspectives of people with disabilities in the implementation and monitoring of projects, to help ensure that their needs and priorities are mainstreamed throughout the programme cycle. Programmes seeking to de-bunk myths, fact check and champion alternative voices should include disability considerations. People with disabilities interact with the media environment in different ways and ISF programmes and Strategic Communications should endeavour to embed accessibility and ensure they do not reinforce negative stereotypes or further exclude people with disabilities

4. **Develop reporting incentives to ensure disability inclusion is given priority in programming.** Programmes need effective reporting incentives to keep disability inclusion a priority. Given the lack of documented evidence about what works to engage

people with disabilities in security efforts, monitoring and evaluating programmes with a disability inclusive lens will also help generate learning that can be shared across other teams.

5. **Provide funding, training and resources to support implementing teams and partners to take a disability inclusive approach to programming.** Multiple KIs highlighted that implementing partners often believe they are unable to integrate disability inclusion into their work because it requires technical skills and resources that they don't have. Partners need access to networks of support so that they can access and build the expertise and skills they need. In addition, KIs highlighted the importance of funding capacity building efforts for programme teams and partners to improve their understanding of the needs of people with disabilities, the importance of integrating them into security efforts, and their ability to do so effectively. In some cases they may also need additional funding to support their efforts (for example, to support reasonable adjustments such as accessible bathrooms), although in many cases people with disabilities can be integrated into decision making processes without requiring substantial funds. One KI from Colombia highlighted the importance of organisations publicising what they are doing to make their organisations and programmes disability inclusive, to inspire other organisations to make changes.

6. **Fund and partner with Organisations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs) to maximise the reach and effectiveness of programme activities.** Since the inclusion of people with disabilities across security efforts is relatively new, programmes may not have existing relationships with people with disabilities within the contexts in which they work. Programmes can help improve their ability to communicate with people with disabilities and include their perspectives in programmes by partnering with OPDs that comprise networks of people with disabilities. This could be integrated into the existing work by ISF with Women's Rights Organisations (WROs), for example by identifying organisations of women with disabilities[2]. Like WROs, OPDs are often underfunded. Funding OPDs is key to ensuring they can continue their work supporting people with disabilities in FCAS contexts and is essential for enabling them to participate effectively in security efforts. More information on meaningful engagement with OPDs can be found in FCDO's Programme Operating Framework (PrOF) guide: Engagement & consultation with organisations of persons with disabilities.

7. **Use and adapt existing tools to support programmes to include a focus on disability inclusion.** An interview with a representative from ISF found that using the

[2] See forthcoming evaluative review by UKISF Global MEL Partnership of ISF work with women's rights organisations, which describes how in Myanmar, the first national network led by and for women with disabilities and the first and only organisation in Rakhine State led by and for women with disabilities were established with support from CSSF/ ISF.

Gender Equality and Social Inclusion marker had helped them to take a more targeted approach to disability inclusion and to take an intersectional approach to security efforts. Another KII highlighted the importance of ensuring that there are ways to measure disability inclusion separately to gender inclusion, recognising that some programmes may do substantial work with men who have disabilities such as ex-combatants and that relying on tools that primarily measure gender inclusion can undermine the learning and progress of these programmes is not fully recognised or captured. The FCDO has a disability marker that can support these efforts, but further work is required to spell out how the different markers are used (the GESI Marker, GEM Marker, Disability Marker and OECD DAC marker on disability) and how best to capture and monitor data.

8. **Ensure internal security policies are disability inclusive.** FCDO internal teams, cross-HMG teams, and implementing partners that include organisations of people with disabilities and that work with people with disabilities should ensure that their security training and risk assessments are also disability inclusive. For example, programmes should be doing disability-inclusive risk assessments to ensure that the needs of beneficiaries and staff with disabilities are considered when assessing the risks associated with the programme. In addition, Hostile Environment and Awareness Training (HEAT) for teams that include or work with people with disabilities should take a disability inclusive approach to ensure that all team members know how to respond in crises.

9. **Advocate for the development of a disability inclusive international security architecture.** The WPS agenda is an example of where obligations for women's inclusion in security efforts have been integrated into the international security architecture. Our KIIs could not identify an equivalent structure to support the inclusion of people with disabilities beyond the international rights frameworks. In addition, the literature review highlighted that women with disabilities are only referenced in a limited capacity within the WPS resolutions. Two KIIs suggested that working towards the establishment of a more disability inclusive international security architecture could help systematise the inclusion of people with disabilities in these efforts.

10. **Fund and publicise research into what works to include people with disabilities in security sector efforts.** There is a significant lack of documented evidence around the experiences of people with disabilities in FCAS and what works to support them and their inclusion in decision-making in these contexts. Programmes can help fill this gap by commissioning and conducting research into these under-researched areas. Sharing this research widely will help improve learning and lessons sharing across security sector actors.

Recommendations for programming

11. **Ensure that disability inclusive programming recognises diverse disabilities and does not reinforce 'hierarchies of disability' through programme engagement.** One KI who had worked on disability inclusion in security and humanitarian contexts observed that disability inclusive programming tended to prioritise people with certain types of impairment over others. For example, she had observed that older men with visual impairments were often included as representatives of people with disabilities, especially in contexts where these men already had high social status. She highlighted the importance of more diverse representation for people with disabilities, to ensure that the perspectives of those with different needs and intersecting experiences of marginalisation (such as women with disabilities) were reflected in decision-making. Participation needs to be broad but appropriate, ensuring that information is provided in accessible formats, which may include audio, braille, easy read format, or with the support of care-givers, to consider the needs of all people with disabilities in these contexts. Those representing the perspectives of people with disabilities should be provided with training about how to advocate on behalf of people who have different impairments to themselves. In addition, several KIs highlighted the importance of including the perspectives of carers and families of people with disabilities in these discussions, since they are also likely to have specific needs to continue their care work.

12. **Ensure that disability inclusive programming considers the needs of those with conflict-related disabilities and pre-existing disabilities.** Multiple KIIs raised concerns that in contexts where disability inclusion is happening, the primary focus is on supporting people with impairments that were caused by conflict, such as landmine survivors. Whilst this is an important consideration and should encompass those with post-traumatic stress disorder, psychosocial and physical impairments, it is crucial that programming also recognises the impact that conflict has on people with pre-existing disabilities and the barriers they face to keeping themselves safe during conflict and participating in peacebuilding efforts. The literature review highlighted the difference in treatment of people with impairments caused by conflict, and those caused by other reasons. In Afghanistan, civilian landmine survivors with disabilities reported that they were not entitled to the same benefits afforded to ex-combatant landmine survivors. Similarly, following the revolution in Iran, civilians with disabilities who were injured during the conflict received lower social welfare benefits than ex-combatants. People with impairments unrelated to the conflict were not entitled to any social welfare benefits (Lord and Stein, 2019.). Governments and donors should coordinate efforts to support people with disabilities to ensure that support offered to those with disabilities is consistent and fair, regardless of the context of their disability.

13. **Ensure that discussions around community security include the perspectives of people with disabilities.** Our interviews highlighted the multiple specific needs of people

with disabilities and OPDs that should be represented in discussions around security to ensure that security efforts reflect and respond to these needs. Our interviews also highlighted that people with disabilities have multiple experiences and expertise beyond their disability and should have the opportunity to participate in discussions on a range of issues that will affect them. While it is essential that people with disabilities are included in discussions with a focus on their needs as people with disabilities, it is also essential that security actors do not limit their engagement to discussions around these needs.

14. **Ensure people with disabilities are included in peacebuilding activities to maximise the likelihood of inclusive peace.** Including people with disabilities in peacebuilding efforts is key to ensuring that these efforts work towards a peace that is inclusive of all people and a society that does not exclude or stigmatise people with disabilities. One KI argued that failing to include people with disabilities in peacebuilding efforts risks building weak and exclusionary foundations for peace, while including them ensures that their perspectives, priorities and expertise inform peacebuilding efforts.

15. **Integrate disability into conflict analysis to deepen understanding needed to address social norms that stigmatise people with disabilities and prevent their effective integration in communities.** Our KIIs highlighted the stigma and discrimination that people with disabilities often face within conflict-affected communities. Some KIs highlighted that in different cultures, superstitions around people with disabilities may lead communities to blame people with disabilities for the conflict itself. This stigma can lead to the ostracisation and exclusion of people with disabilities from communities, which can increase their exposure to violence, abuse and poverty. Programmes seeking to work with people with disabilities should consider ways to address social norms that put people with disabilities at risk of exclusion. One KI reflected on their experience in one context where veterans with disabilities are held in high regard by communities. Such contexts could offer an opportunity to help de-stigmatise disability more broadly. She highlighted one programme in South Asia where veterans with disabilities worked with other people with disabilities to advocate for the rights of people with disabilities to have equal access to services and challenge stigma against people with disabilities by highlighting the valuable contributions they can bring to communities.

16. **Provide training on disability inclusion and human rights approaches to security forces.** Security forces such as the police and the military are in positions of power and are often involved in activities that can significantly impact the lives of communities. One KII highlighted that security training often already has modules on “community safety” and that this is a useful entry point for integrating the needs and perspectives of people with disabilities into training. Since people with disabilities make up a significant proportion of communities, community safety efforts that do not consider people with disabilities, will not be fit for purpose.

17. **Produce accessible communications for security sector programming.** In FCAS, communicating the protocols communities are expected to abide by (e.g. curfews and checkpoints), the support available in crisis (e.g. evacuation plans), the peacebuilding activities being implemented (e.g. peace negotiations or community discussions), and the services and benefits available (e.g. DDR processes) is key to their effectiveness. Programmes wanting to include representatives from across all parts of society should ensure their communications products are available in formats that are accessible for people with a variety of disabilities. In Kyrgyzstan and the Philippines, FCDO partners have organised events with sign-language interpretation and produced manuals and documents in easy read formats so that they are accessible for people with intellectual disabilities. This came following concerns that people with disabilities were not always aware of their rights due to a lack of accessible information.

Key Contributors

This evidence review has been developed with the valued support of 12 interviewees from diverse regions and geographies who took part in key informant interviews (KIIs), including individuals working at the intersection between disability inclusion and security sector across a range of organisations (FCDO, international NGOs, consultancy and training providers, OPDs), and roles (programme staff, advisors, independent consultants, civil society leaders.

References

Affiat, R., Rahmadhani, P., and Nakayama, M. (2024) *Reconstructing masculinities: Gender dynamics after conflict in Aceh, Maluku and Bangsamoro Mindanao*. Sasakawa Peace Foundation.
Alzheimer's Society (2024) *Donald Trump, Joe Biden and dementia: Why not to diagnose from a distance*. Alzheimer's society.
British Red Cross (nd.) *International humanitarian law.* British Red Cross.
Button, A. (2023) Inclusive cybersecurity: how to ensure digital safety is for everyone. AbilityNet.
Conciliation Resources (2021) *Untapped peacebuilders, including persons with disabilities in building peace.* Conciliation Resources.
Dashela, A. (2022) *The calamity of landmines in Yemen.* Carnegie Endowment.
European Union Agency for Asylum (2024) *Persons with disabilities in asylum and reception systems.* EUAA.
FCDO (2022) *FCDO disability inclusion and rights strategy 2022 to 2030. Building an inclusive future for all: a sustainable rights-based approach*. FCDO.
Gender and Mine Action (2018) *Victim assistance responsive to gender and other diversity aspects*. Gender and Mine Action
Geneva Academy (2019) Briefing No. 14 Disability and armed conflict. Geneva Academy.
Humanitarian Needs Assessment Programme (HNAP) (2021) *Disability: Prevalence and Impact.* HNAP.

Humanity and Inclusion (2015) *The impact of demining*. Humanity and Inclusion.
International Disability Alliance (nd) *Through this conflict in Ukraine, what happens to persons with disabilities?* IDA.
International Review of the Red Cross (2023) *Persons with disabilities in armed conflict.* International review of the Red Cross. 105 (922)
Legislation.gov.uk (2010) Equality Act 2010. Legislation.gov.uk
Lord, J. and Stein, M. (2015) Peacebuilding and reintegrating ex-combatants with disabilities. Harvard Law School.
Machlouzarides, M., and Uretici, S., (2023) *A resilient picture: experiences of persons with disabilities in Ukraine.* EU4Recovery
Martin, R., and Buchanan, J., (2022) *Impacts of the Ukraine invasion for persons with disabilities and priority entry points in humanitarian response.* Disability Inclusion Helpdesk.
McInnes, K. (2023) Opportunities and failures to prosecute violence against persons with disabilities at the international tribunals for the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Sierra Leone. *International Review of the Red Cross.* 105 (922)
Migrant protection platform (2023) *Disability and human mobility.* Migrant Protection Platform.
Murray, E. & Nimr, R. (2022). The role of accessibility and funding disability inclusive peacebuilding. USIP.
National Disability Rights Network (2021) *Human trafficking: what it is and how it impacts the disability community.* NDRN.
Dave, A., Ndulue, E., Schwartz-Henderson, L., Weiner, E. (2020) Targeting Greta Thunberg: a case study on online mis/disinformation. German Marshall Fund
Nelson, S., (2007. *Disabled often carry out Afghan suicide missions.* NPR.
Nichols, A., and Heil, E., *Human trafficking of people with a disability: an analysis of state and federal cases.* Dignity: a journal of analysis of exploitation and violence. 7:1.
Organisation for Defending Victims of Violence (2019) *Sanctions and the people with disabilities.* ODVV.
Orozco, A., Martinez, J., Jaime, W. (2022) *The risks of autonomous weapons: an analysis centred on the rights of persons with disabilities.* IRRC
Ortoleva, S. (2010) *Women with disabilities: the forgotten peace builders*. 33. Loy. L.A. Int'l & Comp, L. Rev. 83. P.13.
Saferworld (nd.) *"Disability is not inability": leading efforts for peace and security in Malakal, South Sudan.* Saferworld.
Stone, M. (2023) The importance of accessible and inclusive cybersecurity. Security Intelligence.
Thomas, A and Strickland, H (2024) *Benefits trafficking: human trafficking of older adults and adults with disabilities.* Frontiers in Rehabilitation Schemes.
UN Department for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (2024) *Ensuring the equal participation of people with disabilities in peace processes*. UN Department for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs.
UNHR (2006) Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities. UNHR.;
UNHR (2019) *a/hrc/40/54: Rights of person s with disabilities- Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of persons with disabilities*. UNHR
Legislation.gov.uk (2010) Equality Act 2010. Legislation.gov.uk
UNHR (2021) *Unilateral sanctions hurt all, especially women, children and other vulnerable*

groups. UNHR.
UNHR (2023) *Gaza: UN expert demands unconditional humanitarian access and relief for people with disabilities*. UNHR.
UNHR (2024) *Palestinians with disabilities subject to unbearable consequences of the ongoing hostilities and violence in the OPT.* UNHR.
UNMAS (2019) *Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities UNMAS Statement on Victim Assistance*. UNMAS.
UNMAS (2020) *Persons with disabilities in armed conflict*. UNMAS.
Velarde, M et al. (2019) Social participation and inclusion of ex-combatants with disabilities in Colombia. Disability and the Global South. 6(2) Pg. 1736-1755
W3C (2021) *Inaccessibility of CAPTCHA: Alternatives to visual turing tests on the web.* W3C
World Health Organisation (2023) Key Facts: Disability. WHO

Inclusive Futures
Promoting disability inclusion

UKaid
from the British people

Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Report No: 119

About Helpdesk reports: The Disability Inclusion Helpdesk is funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office (FCDO), contracted through the Disability Inclusion Team (DIT) under the Disability Inclusive Development Inclusive Futures Programme. Helpdesk reports are based on between 3 and 4.5 days of desk-based research per query and are designed to provide a brief overview of the key issues and expert thinking on issues around disability inclusion. Where referring to documented evidence, Helpdesk teams will seek to understand the methodologies used to generate evidence and will summarise this in Helpdesk outputs, noting any concerns with the robustness of the evidence being presented. For some Helpdesk services, in particular the practical know-how queries, the emphasis will be focused far less on academic validity of evidence and more on the validity of first-hand experience among disabled people and practitioners delivering and monitoring programmes on the ground. All sources will be clearly referenced.

Helpdesk services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations and individual experts on disability, including Social Development Direct, Sightsavers, ADD International, Light for the World, Humanity & Inclusion, BRAC, BBC Media Action, Sense and the Institute of Development Studies (IDS). Expert advice may be sought from this Group, as well as from the wider academic and practitioner community, and those able to provide input within the short time-frame are acknowledged. Any views or opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of FCDO, the Disability Inclusion Helpdesk or any of the contributing organisations/experts.

For any further request or enquiry, contact enquiries@disabilityinclusion.org.uk

Suggested citation:

Clugston, N. and Grant, E. (2024) *Evidence review on best practice on disability inclusion in the security sector*, Disability Inclusion Helpdesk Research Report No. 119 London, UK: Disability Inclusion Helpdesk.