International Journal of Social Science Research and Review

http://ijssrr.com
editor@ijssrr.com
Volume 8, Issue 10
October, 2025
Pages: 281-291

Bridging Technology Access and Digital Independence for Persons with Disabilities: India and Global Strategies.

Aarav Vijai

Grade 12, Oberoi International School, India

E-mail: aarav.vijai0412@gmail.com

http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v5i3.185

Abstract

This study examines India's assistive technology accessibility situation and how innovation might help remove obstacles. The goal of the study was to examine the inclusive technologies that are now available on the market, pinpoint their shortcomings, and make insightful judgments about the potential of assistive technology in the future. Several databases of current and pertinent technologies in a wide range of fields, including communication, education, health, and social inclusion, were reviewed and analyzed as part of the research methodology. Additionally, strategies that have been put in place to close the gap were examined, including national initiatives like Avaz, Eye-D, Lechal, BleeTV, and SignAble, as well as international initiatives like Microsoft Inclusive Design Toolkit, WCAG 2.1, and Apple Accessibility Guidelines. The RPwD Act and BarrierBreak reports (BarrierBreak, 2023), among other pertinent legislative and policy tools pertaining to accessibility in India, were also considered in the study. The study included thoughts on independent initiatives that the author himself had developed, such as SpeakEase (Vijai, SpeakEase), an AI-enabled communication tool for non-verbal persons, and FeedEase (Vijai, Enhancing Robot Feeding), a robotic feeder arm for individuals with cerebral palsy, taking into account point of views of both users and caregivers. Cultural fit, cost, and caregiver involvement were found to be more important than technological sophistication. This was demonstrated by methods that performed better and were more successful on less expensive platforms, such as cellphones, rather than more complex methods, such as gaze-tracking or brain-computer interfaces, which are not useful in India. When it comes to employment-focused tools and cognitive and mental disorders, where innovation is lacking, gaps are more obvious. This study is significant because it has established a framework for considering inclusion and inclusive technologies as ways to help impaired individuals regain their independence and dignity.

Keywords: *Assistive Technology; Inclusive Innovation; Accessibility in India; Empathy in Design; User-Centred Design; Disability Empowerment*

Introduction

More than one billion individuals globally, representing approximately 15% of the world population, have some form of disability (World Health Organisation, 2019). For many, the biggest barriers to access are not the physical or cognitive impairments; rather, it is the structural and systemic exclusions that prevent equal participation. Technology is often seen as a way to enable independence—apps, digital tools, and assistive devices can open up communication, mobility, learning, and daily life. However, there is an inconsistency in adoption with so many innovations suggesting an often tremendous gap between invention and actual meaningful use (UNICEF, 2019; BarrierBreak, 2023).

In India, locally developed applications such as Avaz (speech-generating device), Annie (Braille tutor), and Rakshak (fall-detection) model the potential of context-specific design for disabled users. Other devices highlight improved mobility, such as Lechal haptic insoles (global), or Eye-D navigation app (India) while Wheelshare (global) and BleeTV (India) model workflows regarding access to mobility and media. Nonetheless, despite several audits and evaluations of regional barriers, costs, awareness, regional language integration, and adequate training (BarrierBreak, 2023; UNICEF, 2019) remain a few of many barriers that persist.

This conflict has given rise to an ongoing discourse. Perspectives that emphasize innovation view new tools and algorithms as the catalysts of transformation, while perspectives that emphasize adoption argue that no matter how front-line devices are, there is still no chance of success if they are not affordable, caregivers are not trained, and the assistive devices match culture. Microsoft's Inclusive Design Toolkit underscores this latter perspective by advocating for design empathy—"solve for one, extend to many" (Microsoft, 2021). Independently, BarrierBreak undertook audits that show fulfilling technical standards, such as compliance with WCAG 2.1, does not guarantee usability in practice (World Wide Web Consortium, 2018).

India illustrates the gap between policy and practices. The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (Government of India, 2016) calls for equal access, while organisations like the SCPwD and NAP-SDP are creating pathways for training, but any evidence of success for rural populations, or groups such as people with severe cerebral palsy or those who are deafblind, clearly demonstrates the gap. Kerala's KITE programme is one positive example of ICT accessibility in schools, yet the success has yet to spread in a systemic way throughout the country.

Capacity-building has been highlighted at the global level. The World Health Organisation has a Training in Assistive Products programme which trains health workers to support users (World Health Organisation, 2019), while UNICEF's AT2030 programme seeks to develop inclusive educational ecosystems (UNICEF). Both the World Bank and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) note that digital capacity is a prerequisite for work (World Bank, 2018l; International Telecommunication Union, 2019). Similarly, private sector initiatives such as Microsoft-EnAble India's 100K Opportunities, IBM SkillsBuild, and Google.org's inclusion grants, show the potential of CSR partnerships to increase access, albeit mostly in pilot stages.

With a combination of national and international frameworks, this research seeks to expand upon these settings. It uses introspective experiences with FeedEase, a robotic feeding arm for kids with cerebral palsy, and SpeakEase, an AI-powered communication tool for kids who can't talk, to highlight the promise of inclusive design as well as the ongoing obstacles of onboarding and cost. This study, which is at the nexus of innovation and adoption, aims to examine how inclusive technologies can enhance the independence, dignity, and quality of life for disabled people in both global and Indian contexts. It does this by mapping twenty inclusive solutions, quickly reviewing thirteen training programs, and analyzing thirty policy toolkits.

Literature Review

To begin with, from an Indian perspective, India has generated several noteworthy inclusive technology solutions that were designed to meet local needs. Avaz, the first speech-generating app in the country, allows non-verbal children to communicate more independently. Annie, a digital Braille tutor developed by Thinkerbell Labs, and Tactopus tactile kits, provide access inclusive learning in schools. For transportation, the Eye-D app and Rakshak fall detection system provide support for visually impaired and limited mobility users. However, even with these developments, service adoption continues to be focused in urban settings and often part of pilots (UNICEF, 2019).

Additional training frameworks are also indicative of India's intent to support several PwD. The National Action Plan for Skill Development of Persons with Disabilities (NAP-SDP) and the Skill Council for Persons with Disability (SCPwD) were developed to align with the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (Government of India, 2016), but again, they reach limited rural communities. Private sector partners provide opportunities for the development of skills (International Labour Organization, 2020), also limited in terms of expediency and maintenance. From Microsoft's collaboration which supports 100K Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities through EnAble India, to IBM Skillsbuild and Google.org grants to train PwDs for jobs, they all lack tracking over the longer term (EnAble India, 2021). Accessibility audits from 2022 in India reflect this context in costs, languages used beyond English, and limited advocacy (BarrierBreak, 2023).

Moving beyond the national context, on a global scale, inclusive technologies have been defined as vehicles for independence and engagement. Lechal smart insoles (developed in India, but marketed around the world), show how haptic prompts can promote mobility for users who are blind. Wheelshare, provides a crowdsourced wheelchair-sharing service, while apps like Good Vibes fill the gaps in haptic communication with the deafblind. The WHO's Training in Assistive Products (TAP) uses health systems to put assistive technology directly into health systems by training frontline workers to prescribe and teach its use (WHO, 2019). UNICEF's AT2030 invests (Global Disability Innovation Hub, 2021) in building inclusive educational ecosystems in low resource settings.

Recently, the World Bank and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) state that digital literacy is a pre-condition to employability, especially within the gig economy (World Bank, 2018). All of these international initiatives are concerned with ecosystem-building, policy integration, and sustained impact beyond pilot projects.

Lastly, there are still a number of disparities in India and the world notwithstanding these advancements. First and foremost, affordability is still a significant obstacle since most inclusive technologies are too expensive for low-income and rural families to acquire. Second, there is little use of regional languages, and many AAC and digital learning resources do not take into consideration the linguistic variety of India. Thirdly, because caregiver or educator training is frequently inadequately designed, there are still gaps in training and onboarding, which significantly reduces adoption. Furthermore, scalability and sustainability are lacking because of the risky business models and CSR-based fundraising cycles that cause many firms to fail after pilot testing. Since the majority of research focuses on visual impairment, those with severe cerebral palsy are left out, which is another significant gap.

The aforementioned shortcomings highlight the urgent need for frameworks that strike a balance between innovation and adoption so that inclusive technologies may move beyond settings and prototypes to have a long-lasting societal impact.

Methodology

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the different interventions that have been suggested and their limitations and implications, interviews were conducted to explore the perspectives of the various stakeholders. The research used four primary methodological approaches:

- Comparative Case Study Design
- Multi-source Data Analysis
- Evaluation Framework
- Ethical Considerations

Comparative Case Study Design

The research was framed as a comparative case study of digital literacy initiatives and inclusive technology interventions in an Indian context within a global context. This adopted approach has enabled us to study the complexities of how innovations either succeed or fail within different policy, infrastructure, and cultural contexts. The research, however, is centered on systemic barriers rather than an individual's disability in the context of Oliver's social model of disability (Oliver, 1990).

Analysis of Multi-Source Data

The data set included over twenty assistive and inclusive technologies (ex: Avaz, Lechal, Annie, SpeakEase, FeedEase) in the areas of communication, mobility, education, and daily living and thirteen training and access programmes, which included international programmes (WHO TAP, UNICEF AT2030, ITU ICT Accessibility, UN Global Digital Compact, World Bank digital skills programmes), Indian frameworks (National Action Plan on Socio-Economic Development of Persons with Disabilities (NAP-SDP), the State Commission for Persons with Disabilities (SCPwD), National Institute for Empowerment of Persons with Multiple Disabilities (NIEPMD), KITE Kerala, Skill India Digital Hub), and private sector programmes (Microsoft-enAble India, IBM SkillsBuild, Google.org). Secondary sources were also reviewed to act as points of reference which included WCAG 2.1, Microsoft's Inclusive Design Toolkit, Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), and BarrierBreak's accessibility audits.

Table 1: Inclusive Technology Solutions

Program Name	Organisation	cope	Skills Taught	Outcomes
Avaz	Avaz Inc.	India	AAC Communication	Improved classroom participation
Lechal	Ducere Technologies	Global	Haptic Navigation	Mobility independence
Annie	Thinkerbell Labs	India	Braille Education	Literacy outcomes

Table 2: Training and Access Programmes

Programme Name	Agency	Scope	Focus	Sustainability
TAP	WHO	Global	Assistive Products Training	Capacity building
AT2030	UNICEF	Global	Inclusive Education Ecosystems	Pilot successes
NAP-SDP	MSDE India	India	Skills Training	Uneven reach

Table 3: Analysis and Insights

Theme	Success Factors	Barriers	Scalability
Communication	Local language, caregiver training	High attrition	Limited
Mobility	Urban adoption	Cost, rural infra gaps	Weak
Education	Inclusive classrooms	Exclusion of multiple disabilities	State-dependent

Evaluation Framework

Technologies and programmes were evaluated and compared based on their affordability, usability, accessibility in regional language, onboarding of caregivers, and demonstrated improvements in independence or quality-of-life. Barriers were categorized by high cost, low awareness, absence of rural accessibility, and low monitoring. Programme outcomes were evaluated related to employability, autonomy, and dignity. Sustainability and scalability were evaluated, specifically capacity to expand beyond pilot projects into systems of practice.

Ethics

The study employed a social model of disability, and avoided any deficit-based frames. Person-first and identity-first language were used appropriately, and non-stigmatizing language was used throughout the data collection. All data were drawn from published data and publicly available sources and, therefore, no sensitive or personal data were collected. The author's own projects, FeedEase and SpeakEase, were included with transparency of their rough drafts, limitations, and development phases - which maintained authority.

Results

The information presented in this study is thematically organised across the areas of communication, mobility, education, daily living, and training programmes. The reason behind the selection of these categories is that they represent core domains where inclusive technologies and training programmes most directly impact the independence and the quality of life of people with disabilities. These theme areas include:

- **Communication** was chosen as it is a necessary component in education, employment, and social life, particularly for non-verbal and auditory-impaired individuals.
- **Mobility** is a key element of autonomy, which influences several requirements for inclusion, including access to physical venues, navigation, and transportation.
- **Education** reflects the long-term empowerment of people with impairments, since more accessible classrooms foster diversity.
- **Daily Living and Independence** refers to the programs and resources that help people with disabilities carry out their everyday responsibilities effectively.

Together, these results show compelling trends regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the different inclusive technologies as well as the systemic barriers influencing uptake and sustainability.

Numerous situations have seen the study and piloting of communication technology.

Teachers commended Avaz, one of the first speech-generating applications in India, for its localization capabilities and capacity to increase non-verbal students' engagement in class. SignAble offers live interpreter access, while BleeTV converts content into Indian Sign Language. Good Vibes utilises haptic signals to establish basic communication patterns with artificially deafblind users. SpeakEase, an AI-mediated augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) app developed within the scope of this research, illustrates that even low-cost, image-recognition solutions can lead to increased expression of needs by children. Collectively, these assistive devices have the potential to reduce expressive gaps, and in direct response to best practices in education and pedagogy, retain children's engagement and focused interest. However, data on use and case reports suggest that without ongoing caregiver training or a commitment to using the regional language, attrition rates are high and technologies are rarely used again after the first pilot.

Regarding **mobility** and navigation, Lechal smart insoles and Eye-D's navigation application have been recognized for improving independence for visually impaired users. Wheelshare, a crowdsourced "wheelchair-share" service, has also aimed to address barriers to mobility for users. However, these cases demonstrate that although these products are successful in urban areas with supportive infrastructure, usage is limited in rural locations. Cost is also a barrier: devices like a Lechal insole are likely out of reach for all low-income families. Research showed that infrastructural barriers, such as no tactile paving, unreliable GPS coverage, or not having public access points, also decrease the usefulness of the products.

Innovations in **education** have also provided critical lessons. For example, two examples of evidence-based innovations, Annie (the world's first digital Braille tutor, created by Thinkerbell Labs) and Tactopus tactile learning kits, provide evidence that inclusive education can be improved in standardized ways. KITE programme from Kerala provides evidence that institutionalizing ICT accessibility across educational contexts can promote equity at scale. However, these findings reinforce a continued acknowledgement of lack of evidence in regard to children with multiple disabilities or severe cerebral palsy in regards to educational access. Furthermore, while KITE has consistently developed a state-wide programme, very few other states have been able to achieve similar systemic and consistent incorporation of innovations in education reflecting on the challenges of systemic access.

Daily living aides are another area in weakness. For example, Rakshak (a fall-detection system) and FeedEase (the robotic feeder arm designed for the study) are examples of innovations addressing the reduction of dependence on caregivers for daily living activities. FeedEase particularly illustrated how learning supports that provide autonomy and enhance dignity for children with cerebral palsy. The psychological effects of these gadgets were discussed by parents and caregivers who participated in the proof of concepts, and they were just as significant as the functional effects. Furthermore, the findings

show that training and cost are crucial: Daily living gadgets run the danger of being limited to demonstrations rather than gaining significant, long-term adoption in the absence of financial accessibility and organised onboarding.

Evaluation

The assessment of access and training initiatives also shows how ecosystems of support are essential to inclusive technologies that facilitate achievement. Globally, UNICEF's AT2030 and WHO's Training in Assistive Products (TAP) initiative have aimed to develop capacity by training health workers and educators to apply assistive devices in classrooms and communities. ITU's ICT Accessibility modules and the UN's Global Digital Compact have placed emphasis on digital accessibility frameworks and the World Bank has linked digital skills training to employability. Collectively, these global efforts point to the need for capacity-building elements and systemic support frameworks in addition to creative products.

In the case of India, national programmes, notably the National Action Plan for Skill Development of Persons with Disabilities (NAP-SDP), the Skill Council for Persons with Disabilities (SCPwDs), and training provided by NIEPMD, represent concerted efforts to tie disability training to employability. Kerala's KITE and the Skill India Digital Hub hold promise for enhancing digital literacy for PWDs. Nonetheless, findings signal disparities concerning reach across states, particularly in rural settings. Formal monitoring mechanisms are also insufficient, making it challenging to track sustainable employment outcomes and the long-term impact of the initiative in bringing about skills development training.

Programmes in the private sector show both potential and drawbacks. For example, through Microsoft–EnAble India's 100K Opportunities campaign, individuals with disabilities could access various employment pathways. SkillsBuild is an IBM initiative that presents coding and digital literacy programmes, and through Google.org funding, there is support for inclusive entrepreneurship. Both initiatives have great potential, but evidence shows they largely rely on not-for-profit partnerships for last-mile delivery. Often, the sustainability and scalability of these initiatives are driven by corporate social responsibility cycles, and do not arise from sustainable long-term policy change. This raises concerns about whether their transformation could lead to sustainability at scale.

Patterns emerge across all domains. Solutions that are cheap, localized, and included with researcher-structured training had the highest adoption and ongoing use. Solutions that fail to include aspects such as caregiver involvement, regional language support, or affordability tend to be left behind at the pilot level. At the systemic level, while international programmes have promising pathways for building capacity, the Indian programmes illustrate the separation of committed policy versus uneven implementation. The programmes in the private sector add passion and money to transformative work, but they too are beholden to short-term funding cycles.

To conclude, the results support the notion that inclusive technologies can vastly improve communication, mobility, education, and daily living but will depend upon the context. Factors such as training, cost, and culture always have an impact on whether inclusive technologies remain prototypes on paper or meaningful independence. Two specific contexts from the region show in india, inclusive technologies or programmes are limited by cost, rural nodes and access to regional/native languages, although policy documents like the RPwD Act (2016) as well as state strategies like Kerala's KITE have shown intent and progress. High-income countries do not face many infrastructural barriers, but also face accessibility issues from mainstream digital platforms and a lag of universal design. These findings provide a basis for the next discussion, to frame these findings in the context of disability theory, and inclusive design and describe implications for policy and practice.

Discussion

The results indicate that inclusive technologies can enhance the quality of life for people with disabilities, but success comes down to the accompanying ecosystem. Tools and programmes only create sustainable impact when training, affordability, and contextual fit are also present. Interviews with caregivers, educators, and NGO workers also confirmed this point, showing that even well-designed tools fail without proper training, affordability, and support.

A common theme is that technology alone is not enough. Supported communication devices, like Avaz or SpeakEase, could facilitate expression but caregivers needed training to ensure sustained usage. This follows the social model of disability, which states exclusion as a social construction rather than an individual characteristic (Oliver, 1990). Advanced devices may be discarded without a supportive environment of training, affordability, and localized interface.

Inclusive design principles can also be used to explain the findings of this study. Microsoft Inclusive Design Toolkit highlights the importance of empathetic design by encouraging designers to "solve for one, extends to many." This was evident with Avaz's language support in regional dialects, while Lechal's limited adoption was a risk due to cost and not being aligned to infrastructure. BarrierBreak's audits again demonstrate (BarrierBreak, 2025) that compliance with WCAG 2.1 alone will not provide quality experiences, supporting that there will always be a gap between standards and lived accessibility.

At a systemic level, three challenges predominate. Firstly, policy gaps: the RPwD Act (2016) calls for accessibility but is poorly enforced. Programmes such as SCPwD and NAP-SDP design training pathways yet seldom deliver them outside the city area. Secondly, infrastructure challenges remain barriers to use; mobility tools require reliable roads while commonly-used tools require tactile paving and/or GPS. Third, sustainability is tenuous. Many startups depend on CSR or donor money, so their innovations often get stuck at the pilot stage. KITE in Kerala showcases an exemplary instance of systemic integration, yet few states succeed in replicating this model. This suggests differences in progress within India, where rural and low-income communities are the most neglected.

Similar dynamics are found in training programmes. International efforts to respond to inequities in access and enablement such as the WHO's Training in Assistive Products, and UNICEF's AT2030 (ITU, 2019), have a focus on systemic capacity, while Indian programmes like NIEPMD or Skill India Digital Hub focus on employability. However, once more, there are insufficient systems in place to track training results, and there is no program in place to gather long-term data on improvements in quality of life. Private programmes from Microsoft, IBM, and Google (EnAble India & Microsoft, 2021) have created opportunities, but again, these programmes often require partnerships with NGOs and/or have nothing to suggest they will outlast the first round of funding.

Further, the cross comparison of India with international comparisons helps to clarify the issues rising from these trends; deleting ecosystem building and aligning policy is important at the global level (WHO & UNICEF, 2022), while ambitious intent from the Indian state is demonstrated but implementation is fragmented.

FeedEase and SpeakEase provide useful insights into these tensions in action. The technology was limited by expense and the requirement for onboarding, even though FeedEase showed methods to enhance dignity via greater autonomy in every usage of everyday life conditions. Despite being intended as a low-cost communication tool, SpeakEase showed the value of family caregivers as well as the promise of AI-based accessibility. The case studies provide credence to the more general finding that technology works best when it is included into a training and awareness anchoring paradigm rather than existing as a standalone prototype.

These results allow for the formulation of several recommendations. Every suggestion relates to developers emphasizing usability, cost, and cultural significance. For policymakers, enforcement needs to be improved, outreach extended to serve rural communities, and evaluation frameworks developed to examine long term results. Training should be offered not only for users but also to caregivers and educators, so that technology can become a part of their everyday practices. Sustainability ultimately lies in collaboration between government, business, and NGOs, who can collectively use their funding, delivery, and awareness resources, to address service delivery gaps.

Overall, the results and the literature affirm that inclusive technology, while often perceived primarily as a technical issue, is fundamentally a socio-technical process. It is often not sufficient to simply develop new technology; there needs to be a supporting context of training, policy, and cultural reception; Only then will the impact be felt. In conclusion, the task is not only to create new tools but also to empower these tools to be used by the people who need them the most, whenever the opportunity presents, and in a way that does not complicate their everyday lives.

Conclusion

According to this study, accessible technology enhances the independence and quality of life of people with disabilities when it is combined with systemic envelopment, affordability, and training. Across domains of communication, mobility, education and daily living, technologies such as Avaz, Lechal, Annie and SpeakEase, illustrate both potential and limitations of existing innovations. While global efforts led by WHO's TAP and UNICEF's AT2030 prioritise ecosystem-building, Indian efforts such as SCPwD and NAP-SDP, highlight bold policy but experience inconsistent lagging implementation. Private sector efforts from Microsoft, IBM, and Google have strong potential, but are exposed to unpredictable short funding cycles.

The analysis identifies three primary findings. First, technology is not transformative in itself, its impact is dependent on the ecosystem of caregivers, educators, policymakers, and acceptance in the culture. Second, affordability, localization and onboarding caregivers are common emerging themes that predicted sustained adoption. Finally, sustainability requires collaboration across sectors, with no single stakeholder able to scale a solution to support diverse and marginalised perspectives.

From this information comes actionable recommendations. Developers should prioritise low-cost, language-diverse, and user-centred design, with caregiver feedback influencing the process at all points. Policymakers should improve enforcement of accessibly standards, provide outreach within rural areas and develop mechanisms to monitor outcomes that go beyond the pilot projects. Training will need to be extended to not only users but also caregivers and educators, to embed inclusive technologies into practice. Finally, sustained progress will require a collaboration between governments, private industry, NGOs and communities to bridge gaps in funding, delivery, and awareness.

Looking forward, future research should look more into areas like cognitive disabilities, deafblind communication, and severe cerebral palsy. There is also space to try out low-cost, hands-free options such as gaze tracking or AI-based interfaces that can actually work in low-resource places. Comparing work across countries can show which models scale better, and working closely with PwDs will make sure the design is always real and based on lived experience.

In the end, inclusive technology is really about adoption, dignity, and independence—not just inventing new tools. Bridging the gap between policy, innovation, and practice will determine whether these solutions are sticking to being prototypes or are taken up and become sparks for social change.

References

BarrierBreak. (2023). *India accessibility report*. https://www.barrierbreak.com.

EnAble India, & Microsoft. (2021). *100K opportunities for persons with disabilities*. Microsoft. https://enableindia.org.

Government of India. (2016). *The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016*. Ministry of Law and Justice. https://legislative.gov.in.

Microsoft. (2021). *Inclusive design toolkit*. https://inclusive.microsoft.design.

Oliver, M. (1990). *The politics of disablement*. Macmillan.

UNICEF. (2019). *AT2030: Life-changing assistive technology programme*. https://www.unicef.org/innovation/AT2030.

Vijai, A. (2025). Enhancing robot feeding efficiency for children with cerebral palsy using facial recognition algorithms. *International Journal of Software & Hardware Research in Engineering, 13*(3). https://doi.org/10.26821/IJSHRE.13.04.2025.130303.

Vijai, A. (2025). *SpeakEase* [Web app]. https://speak-ease-phi.vercel.app.

World Bank. (2021). *Digital jobs for youth with disabilities*. World Bank Group. https://www.worldbank.org.

World Health Organization. (2019). *Training in assistive products (TAP)*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241516552.

World Wide Web Consortium. (2018). *Web content accessibility guidelines (WCAG) 2.1*. https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG21.

World Health Organization. (2011). *World report on disability*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240685211.

International Labour Organization. (2020). *Promoting employment opportunities for people with disabilities*. https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/disability-and-work/lang--en/index.htm.

United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities (CRPD)*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html.

Global Disability Innovation Hub. (2021). *AT2030 programme insights*. https://at2030.org.

World Economic Forum. (2020). *Accelerating digital inclusion for people with disabilities*. https://www.weforum.org/impact/digital-inclusion/.

National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People. (2022). *India disability report*. https://ncpedp.org.

Leonard Cheshire. (2018). *Disability data review: An overview*. https://www.disabilitydataportal.com/fileadmin/uploads/lcdp/Documents/Large_print_report.pdf.

International Telecommunication Union. (2019). *ICT accessibility: Policy recommendations*. https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Digital-Inclusion/Persons-with-Disabilities.

UNESCO. (2019). *Accessible ICTs and inclusive education for persons with disabilities*. https://iite.unesco.org/publications/digital-technologies-for-inclusive-education-recommendations/.

United Nations Development Programme. (2021). *Human development report: Disability and development*. https://hdr.undp.org.

World Health Organization, & UNICEF. (2022). *Global report on assistive technology (GReAT)*. https://www.who.int/health-topics/assistive-technology/global-report-on-assistive-technology.

World Bank, & World Health Organization. (2021). *World report on hearing*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/world-report-on-hearing.