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## 26.11 Number and proportion of persons with disabilities who have access to rehabilitation services (based on WHO and IDDC indicator), disaggregated by sex, age, disability, type and sector of service, and geographical location

#### Level 2: Indicator that can be produced with existing data but has not been reported on

The [WHO Model Disability Survey](https://www.who.int/disabilities/data/model-disability-survey4.pdf?ua=1) has a series of questions on the use of rehabilitation services. This survey also asks many questions about the need for support, but not specifically about the need for rehabilitation services.

The Peru “[Disability National Survey](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26017542/)”, conducted between July 2012 and March 2013, also collected information on the use of rehabilitation services in rural and urban settings - in and around several Peruvian cities. Access to rehabilitation-specific care was defined as the self-reported access to disability-specific rehabilitation therapy, such as physical therapy, psychological or psychiatric therapy, language therapy, emotional support or occupational therapy. Table 1 presents the percentage of all persons with disabilities who received services, so the denominator includes all persons with disabilities, even those who did not need services. It is not an indicator of the percentage of people needing services who received them.

**Table 1:** Factors associated with access to rehabilitation care

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Access to rehabilitation care |
| ***Sex*** |  |
| Female | 12.2% |
| Male | 12.8% |
| ***Age*** |  |
| <12 years | 29.4% |
| 12–19 years | 19.2% |
| 20–35 years | 13.4% |
| 36–64 years | 13.9% |
| 65+ years | 8.7% |
| ***Education Level*** | |
| No education | 9.2% |
| Primary | 9.9% |
| Secondary | 16.6% |
| Superior | 19.7% |
| ***Socioeconomic Position*** | |
| Lowest | 3.8% |
| Middle | 12.5% |
| Highest | 19.2% |
| ***Study Area*** | |
| Rural | 2.9% |
| Urban | 15.4% |
| ***History of Chronic Disease*** | |
| No | 11.2% |
| Yes | 14.4% |
| ***Health Insurance*** |  |
| No | 9.1% |
| Seguro Integral de Salud | 8.0% |
| Social Security | 20.6% |
| Other (private, etc.) | 26.9% |
| ***Dependency*** |  |
| No | 9.2% |
| Yes | 16.8% |
| *Source:* Antonio Bernabe-Ortiz and others, “Disability, caregiver's dependency and patterns of access to rehabilitation care: results from a national representative study in Peru”, *Disability and Rehabilitation*, Vol. 38, No. 6 (28 May 2015), pp. 582-588 | |

## 26.12 Number and proportion of persons with disabilities who needed rehabilitation services in the last 12 months and did not get the services they needed (based on WHO and IDDC indicator), disaggregated by sex, age, disability, kind and sector of service, and geographical location.

#### Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries

This indicator could be collected by a national disability survey. The WHO Model Disability Survey, as mentioned in indicator 26.11, collects information on the use of rehabilitation services, but not the need, although it does collect extensive information on supports needed.

The independent research organization SINTEF, in cooperation with the South African Federation of the Disabled, collected data on awareness, need and use of rehabilitation in many African countries. One example is found in the “[Living Conditions Among People with Activity Limitation in Zambia”](https://www.sintef.no/globalassets/upload/helse/levekar-og-tjenester/zambialcweb.pdf), conducted in September 2006.

Table 2 shows an example of this Zambian report. For a summary of results from a number of SINTEF/SAFOD surveys, consult the 2018 [United Nations flagship report](https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2019/07/disability-report-chapter2.pdf) “Disability and Development Report: Realizing the Sustainable Development Goals by, for and with persons with disabilities”, a portion of which is reproduced in table 3.

**Table 2:** Which of the services, if any, are you aware of and have ever needed/received? Zambia, 2006, SINTEF

|  | Aware of service | | Need Service | | Received service | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Health Services | 2,287 | 79.8 | 2,198 | 76.7 | 1,738 | 79.3 |
| Traditional Healer | 2,106 | 73.5 | 926 | 32.3 | 582 | 62.9 |
| Medical rehabilitation | 1,762 | 61.5 | 1,812 | 63.2 | 679 | 37.5 |
| Counselling for parent/family | 1,179 | 41.2 | 1,354 | 47.3 | 295 | 21.9 |
| Assistive device services | 1,717 | 59.9 | 1,642 | 57.3 | 301 | 18.4 |
| Educational services | 1,557 | 54.3 | 1,347 | 47 | 239 | 17.8 |
| Counselling for disabled | 1,277 | 44.6 | 1,468 | 51.2 | 209 | 14.3 |
| Welfare service | 1,500 | 52.4 | 1,794 | 62.6 | 151 | 8.4 |
| Vocational training | 1,292 | 45.1 | 1,006 | 35.1 | 84 | 8.4 |
| *Source*: Arne H. Eide and M.E. Loeb, eds., *Living Conditions among People with Activity Limitations in Zambia. A National Representative Study* (Oslo, SINTEF, 2006), p.124 | | | | | | |

**Table 3:** Percentage of persons with disabilities who needed but could not receive rehabilitation services in 9 countries around 2011

| Country | Needed but could not receive rehabilitation services |
| --- | --- |
| Nepal | 82% |
| Zambia | 80% |
| Malawi | 76% |
| Lesotho | 74% |
| Eswatini | 70% |
| Mozambique | 66% |
| Zimbabwe | 57% |
| Botswana | 46% |
| South Africa | 28% |
| *Source:* United Nations, *Disability and Development Report. Realizing the Sustainable Development Goals by, for and with persons with disabilities* 2018 (New York, 2019), p. 54 | |

## 26.13 Level of satisfaction of persons with disabilities with habilitation and rehabilitation services received, disaggregated by sex, age, disability, kind and sector of service, and geographical location.

#### Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries

This indicator can be collected via national disability surveys or from specific client satisfaction surveys from authorities providing rehabilitation services, such as the one carried out annually by the Department of Rehabilitation of California. The consumer satisfaction survey results of 2019 are available at [dor.ca.gov - PDF](https://dor.ca.gov/Content/DorIncludes/documents/PublicInformation/2019%20CSS%20Executive%20Summary%20-%20PDF.pdf).

## 26.14 Number and proportion of persons with disabilities who have access to assistive devices and technologies appropriate to their needs, disaggregated by sex, age, disability, type of product, and geographical location (based on WHO and IDDC indicator).

The data sources related to indicator 20.21 are useful for this indicator, in addition to the information below.

#### Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries

The independent research organization SINTEF, in cooperation with the South African Federation of the Disabled, collected extensive data on this in many countries, mostly in Africa. The [SINTEF studies](https://www.sintef.no/en/projects/studies-on-living-conditions) can be found here.

Results from these studies, summarized in table 5, were reported in the 2018 [United Nations flagship report](https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2019/07/disability-report-chapter2.pdf), “Disability and Development Report: Realizing the Sustainable Development Goals by, for and with persons with disabilities”.

**Table 4:** Percentage of persons with disabilities who need but do not have assistive products (e.g. sign language interpreter, wheelchair, hearing/visual aids, braille), in 12 countries, around 2013

| Country | Needs but does not have | Needs and has received |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Malawi | 89% | 11% |
| Zambia | 84% | 16% |
| Mozambique | 84% | 16% |
| Lesotho | 82% | 18% |
| Cameroon | 78% | 22% |
| Nepal | 77% | 23% |
| Eswatini | 68% | 32% |
| Sri Lanka | 64% | 36% |
| Zimbabwe | 63% | 37% |
| Botswana | 44% | 56% |
| South Africa | 38% | 62% |
| Chile | 33% | 67% |
| *Source:* United Nations, *Disability and Development Report. Realizing the Sustainable Development Goals by, for and with persons with disabilities* 2018 (New York, 2019), p. 55 | | |

Data on assistive devices are also collected by the [WHO Model Disability Survey](https://www.who.int/disabilities/data/model-disability-survey4.pdf?ua=1). The [Philippines MDS 2016](https://psa.gov.ph/sites/default/files/2016%20NDPS.pdf), is an example of the use of this survey, a table from which is reproduced below.

**Table 5:** Assistive products and modification: Percent distribution of individuals age 15 and over who used and still need assistive product and modifications, by disability level, Philippines 2016

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Level of Disability* | | | No. of respondents |
| Mild | Moderate | Severe |
| ***Mobility and self-care*** | | | | |
| use | 7.8 | 39.7 | 52.5 | 439 |
| use but need more | 1.4 | 26.6 | 72.0 | 134 |
| ***Seeing*** | | | | |
| use | 19.3 | 57.5 | 23.2 | 2,221 |
| use but need more | 16.8 | 51.6 | 31.2 | 448 |
| ***Hearing and communication*** | | | | |
| use | 11.2 | 53.6 | 35.2 | 23 |
| use but need more | 0 | 38.8 | 61.2 | 8 |
| ***Work*** | | | | |
| use | 27.3 | 57.5 | 15.2 | 197 |
| use but need more | 23.3 | 51.4 | 14.4 | 81 |
| ***Education*** | | | | |
| use | 22.8 | 69.9 | 7.3 | 73 |
| use but need more | 17.0 | 45.9 | 7.8 | 61 |
| ***Modifications at home*** | | | | |
| use | 7.4 | 58 | 34.5 | 137 |
| use but need more | 4.2 | 38.1 | 32.5 | 69 |
| ***Modifications in the community*** | | | | |
| use | 18.5 | 64.4 | 17.1 | 1,213 |
| use but need more | 17.5 | 51.9 | 16.6 | 663 |
| *Source*: Philippine Statistics Authority and Department of Health, *National Disability Prevalence Survey (Model Functioning Survey) 2016* (Quezon City, 2019), p. 62 | | | | |

## 26.15 Number of persons with disabilities benefiting from specific measures, such as tax and customs exemptions or financial support or subsidies, to access assistive devices and technologies specifically for habilitation and rehabilitation purposes, disaggregated by sex, age, disability, geographical location, and kind of measure. (See also 20.20)

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

Theoretically, this could be obtained from the administrative data for any programmes that provide specific measures. However, as different measures may be provided through different systems, it would require a fair amount of coordination – and a unique personal identifier – to not double count people who are receiving multiple measures.

## 26.16 Number and proportion of persons with disabilities using assistive devices and technologies disaggregated by sex, age, disability, kind of product, and geographical location (based on WHO and IDDC indicator).

#### Level 1: Indicator for which data are already being produced and reported on in at least some countries

This could be obtained through a national disability survey, such as the [WHO Model Disability Survey](https://www.who.int/disabilities/data/model-disability-survey4.pdf?ua=1). The [Model Disability Survey of Afghanistan](https://asiafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Model-Disability-Survey-of-Afghanistan-2019.pdf), in 2019, collected this information, some of which is presented in table 7.

**Table 6:** Use of assistive products and modifications

| Type of Product | Percentage using assistive devices |
| --- | --- |
| Spectacles | 4.1 |
| Case or Walking Sticks | 3.2 |
| Chair for the Shower, Bath or Toilet | 1.0 |
| Pressure Relief Cushions | 0.7 |
| Orthosis, Lower Limb, Upper Limb or Spinal | 0.5 |
| Crutches, Axillary or Elbow | 0.5 |
| Incontinence Products | 0.5 |
| Tricycle | 0.5 |
| Hearing Aids | 0.5 |
| Therapeutic Footwear, Diabetic, Neuropathic, Orthopaedic | 0.3 |
| Manual Wheelchair | 0.3 |
| Prosthesis lower limb | 0.3 |
| Products for memory support | 0.3 |
| Walking Frame | 0.2 |
| Electric Wheelchair | 0.1 |
| White Cane | 0.1 |
| Magnifier | 0.1 |
| Communication Board, Books, or Cards | 0.1 |
| *Source*: The Asia Foundation, *Model Disability Survey of Afghanistan 2019* (2020), p. 69 | |