

IDDC and IDA¹ submission on the proposal for the introduction of a policy marker to track development finance in support of persons with disabilities in the CRS - DCD/DAC/STAT(2018)14

We strongly welcome the OECD DAC secretariat's proposal for the introduction of a 'policy marker to track development finance in support of persons with disabilities.'

There are an estimated one billion persons with disabilities globally². Persons with disabilities often experience multiple forms of discrimination and exclusion, which prevent them from participating equally in society and means they are more likely to live in poverty.

The lack of data on disability, both at the national level and in international development, is a major barrier to achieving inclusion. By introducing a policy marker on disability, the OECD can make a crucial contribution to improving the availability and quality of data that is collected on disability in relation to Overseas Development Assistance.

The inclusion of persons with disabilities will be crucial to achieving Agenda 2030's ambition to eradicate poverty and leave no-one behind. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) commits states to ensure that international cooperation is inclusive of and accessible to persons with disabilities.

The CRS does not currently include an effective way of tracking how ODA is spent on disability inclusion. As highlighted in the current proposal, neither of the current codes that mention disability, or the proposed SDG field, would adequately address the need to monitor ODA spent on disability inclusion.

The level of exclusion persons with disabilities experience, the global commitments that DAC members have made, and the current lack of effective measurement of ODA spent on disability inclusion provide a strong rationale for the introduction of a policy marker on disability.

Given the importance of this issue **we recommend that the policy marker is approved in 2018, for use in 2018 ODA reporting.** We propose that guidance be developed following adoption of the marker, to guide reporting and following the model of the Gender Equality policy marker handbook. This should include the assertion that a disability analysis and a 'do no harm' approach is necessary for all aid activities to ensure, at a minimum, the project does not perpetuate disability exclusion.

Suggested changes to the marker

While we welcome the development of the proposal, we would like to highlight a number of key areas in the current draft where the marker could be strengthened or improved.

We believe these changes would better align the marker with the language and approach of Agenda 2030 and the CRPD, ensuring that the marker is relevant to and in line with current development discourse. The changes would mean that the marker is more effectively able to capture the full range of interventions needed to lead to the inclusion of persons with disabilities. Finally, we believe these changes would make the marker clear to members and lead to its more accurate and effective use.

¹ The International Disability Alliance (IDA) is an alliance of eight global and six regional organisations of persons with disabilities. The International Disability and Development Consortium is a global consortium of disability and development non-governmental organisations (NGOs), mainstream development NGOs and disabled people's organisations (DPOs) supporting disability and development work in more than 100 countries.

² World Report on Disability, 2011,

Name of the marker – We support the UK’s initial suggestion to call the marker a ‘disability inclusion’ marker. This indicates to members from the marker’s objective is to measure the **inclusion** of persons with disabilities. This also aligns better with the gender equality marker which states are already familiar with.

2.2 Objective - We suggest strengthening the objective of the marker, by adding an additional point or changing the first objective to, *‘development co-operation activities that promote the inclusion and empowerment of persons with disabilities.’* This wording is more in line with the language and the objectives of Agenda 2030 and the CRPD as well as with the definition set out in 2.3.

2.3 Definition – We suggest strengthening the definition set out in paragraph 15 to give clearer guidance to members on what will be classified under the marker. We suggest adding the definition of disability set out in the CRPD, as well as explicitly referring to the *‘inclusion and empowerment of people with disabilities’* within the marker.

2.4. Criteria for eligibility – As with the objective we suggest adding *‘which promote the inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities’* as a clear criterion for eligibility.

2.5. Scoring – Based on our experience, even if disability is mentioned in broader programme objectives if the specific mechanisms and activities that will lead to inclusion are not explicit this objective will not be achieved. We believe that the scoring should be strengthened in order to ensure that programmes not only have the objective of disability inclusion but also contain **specific efforts** to ensure that inclusion takes place. As such, we suggest the marker contains the following wording:

Principle: We suggest that the principle marker explicitly says that disability inclusion should be *‘fundamental in its [a projects] design and expected results.’*

Significant: We suggest that the significant marker should contain specific wording around including *‘deliberate activities and mechanisms’* to support the objective.

2.6 – Example of activities

At present, we do not feel that this section gives sufficient guidance about the types of programmes that should be classified under the marker. While much of this can be set out in accompanying guidance, in line with the guidance that exists for the gender marker, in the meantime we suggest two changes to the existing proposal:

- An additional list ‘examples of activities that should be marked as not targeted’ could be added to the proposal as this would give clarity to members about the type of activities that would not count as principle or significant. An example could be *‘a programme aimed at improving basic services for the poor, states that it will also reach persons with disabilities because they tend to be amongst the poorest and so will require greater access to basic services, but does not contain specific mechanisms or activities to ensure inclusion.’*
- Ensure that the examples given promote the inclusion of persons with disabilities. We suggest replacing *‘support to special needs education programmes’* with *‘support for children with disabilities to access mainstream schools, this could include efforts to identify children with disabilities who are out of school, the provision of support assistants, investment in inclusive teacher training and the provision of accessible learning materials.’*

This submission was prepared by the International Disability and Development Consortium and the International Disability Alliance. For more information, please contact Hannah Loryman (hloryman@sightsavers.org)