

OECD DAC disability and gender markers

Data analysis 2018 – 2022

March 2024

Contents

Introduction	2
How the markers work	3
Methodology	4
Usage of the Disability and Gender Markers	4
Disability Marker.....	5
Gender Marker.....	6
Trends in Disability Data	7
Trends in Gender Data	9
Trends in percentage of funding marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive	12
Conclusions and Questions	13
% of eligible ODA marked by disability and gender	13
Number of countries using the disability and gender markers.....	13
% ODA marked disability inclusive and gender equitable	14
% ODA marked principally focused on disability and gender	14
% ODA marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive.....	14

Introduction

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is a group of 30 governments across the world’s richest countries, as well as the European Union. Through its Development Assistance Committee (DAC), the OECD is a major donor of Official Development Assistance (ODA). All OECD DAC funding is recorded in a central database known as the Creditor Reporting System. To break down the total allocations of funding, a number of policy markers have been introduced to disaggregate the figures.

In 1997, a gender marker was created, in which donor governments were asked to report the extent to which any given funding was related to issues of gender. As part of the annual reporting of their aid expenditure, DAC members are required to mark each project or programme according to whether it relates to promoting gender equality, alongside other policy markers for disaster risk reduction, climate change and many other areas. In 2018, an additional marker was introduced to enable DAC members to report their ODA according to whether it related to disability inclusion.

OECD DAC data on both gender and disability is available for five consecutive years from 2018 to 2022. To understand the extent to which OECD DAC funding is gender and disability

inclusive, Sightsavers has created a dashboard in PowerBI to visualise the data by country, year, gender and disability score.

This document provides background information on the OECD DAC markers on disability and gender, and an analysis of the data reported by the OECD across the first four years since the adoption of the disability marker. The purpose of the project is to understand the extent to which the disability marker is being used, the differences in usage between OECD members, and to identify any changes over the five years. By singling out the data marked gender inclusive, we can investigate the proportion of this funding which is also marked disability inclusive.

However, it is understood from the start that usage of the gender marker and disability marker is not directly comparable as the former is compulsory while the latter is optional. To this end, the aim is to analyse the intersectionality between the gender and disability markers, rather than to conduct an in-depth analysis of the gender data which has already been done by other organisations.

Through presenting and analysing the data on usage of the markers, we can promote greater awareness as to the usage of the disability and gender markers, to identify donor governments which have increased their usage of the markers, and encourage those governments which have not used the markers to begin doing so.

How the markers work

In 2018 the OECD DAC approved a **disability marker** to ‘track development finance that promotes the inclusion and empowerment of persons with disabilities’ for voluntary use. The voluntary adoption of the marker means that DAC members can now choose to state whether their Official Development Assistance (ODA) is disability inclusive. However, unlike with the majority of policy markers, reporting on the disability marker is not a requirement but is optional.

The disability and gender markers are the only tools, common across donors, which can track ODA supporting disability inclusion and gender equity. They can play a key role in monitoring and accountability, and can contribute to identifying gaps between policy commitments and their implementation. They can also play a role in supporting policy influencing on the need to increase spending on disability inclusion or gender equity.

The markers are forward-looking, as donors are reporting their spending *commitments*¹, which means that the data provides an earlier indicator of donor’s commitment and work on disability inclusion and gender equity. However, there is a lag in the OECD DAC system and so data is not available instantly – the most recent data available is for the year 2022, which was made available in January 2024. Having input data also means that, in theory, it can be put together with outcome data to better understand the cost and benefits of different approaches to disability inclusion and gender equity, although the data published by most donors will make this difficult to do at this point in time.

¹ Donors are reporting their spending commitments rather than their actual expenditure.

The markers cannot, and do not intend to, measure the outcome or impact of a programme or project. They must be complemented by monitoring and evaluation instruments to assess this. OECD DAC markers also have benefits beyond DAC members' reporting of aid in the CRS. Organisations which publish data to the **International Aid Transparency Initiative** (IATI) can also report against the disability marker.

Methodology

The data analysed was obtained from the **OECD statistics website**, following the **guidance on the OECD disability marker** published by the Center for Inclusive Policy in 2020. On the 'amount type' menu, we selected 'current prices' rather than 'constant prices', as we are analysing the amount of ODA in US Dollars which was committed in a given year, rather than the real value correcting for changes in prices since 2018. On the 'flow type' menu we selected 'commitments' rather than 'disbursements', as we are analysing the amount of ODA pledged by donors, rather than the amount actually spent. With these filters in place, we then downloaded the full data set for each year under review. Using a pivot table, we used additional filters in the downloaded dataset in Excel. We filtered out any values less than zero, as this would distort the figures. In the 'Type of Aid Name', we filtered the data to only include: "Basket funds / pooled funding", "Contributions to specific-purpose programmes and funds managed by implementing partners", "Core support to NGOs, private bodies, PPPs and research institutes", "Donor country personnel", "Other technical assistance", "Project-type interventions" and "Sector budget support".

In the rows, we inserted the 'Donor Name', filtering out all donors apart from OECD DAC members and EU Institutions. In the columns, we inserted the data by disability or gender and value, so that we could analyse the amount of OECD funding broken down by each category (0, 1, 2 or blank). To obtain the figures for the percentage of funding marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive, we added 'gender' as an additional filter, selecting only the data marked '1' or '2' for gender, and looking at the percentage of this which was marked '1' or '2' for disability in the columns.

The data for 2018, 2019, 2020 were originally downloaded in December 2022 at the start of the project, while the data for 2021 and 2022 were downloaded from the OECD CRS when it was made available. To check for data accuracy, the data for all five years was downloaded again in April 2024. This revealed some minor differences in the data, particularly for 2022, where additional OECD ODA had been reported. Annual OECD ODA data is not reported exclusively in one day in any given year. It is therefore possible that the data shown in the dashboard is not completely up to date, although the discrepancies would be very minor.

Usage of the disability and gender markers

OECD DAC data showing usage with the disability and gender markers and the percentage of funding marked according to the categories of 0 (not disability inclusive / gender equitable), 1 (significant focus on disability inclusion / gender equity) and 2 (principle focus on disability inclusion / gender equity) is now available for the years 2018 – 2022. Usage varies between countries and the dataset is therefore incomplete, but it is possible to analyse the data available and observe the trends over the course of the five years.

However, given that usage of the gender marker is a reporting requirement while the disability marker is optional, it is to be expected that the usage will be higher for the gender marker than the disability marker, and they are not directly comparable.

Disability marker

Usage of the disability marker has significantly increased since it was first introduced in 2018. In 2018, 21 of the 30 OECD members marked at least some of their ODA using the disability marker, ranging from 3% of funding in the case of Slovakia, to 100% for Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Poland. The UK was mid-table at 76%, while nine countries including the United States, Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands did not use the disability marker at all. Overall, the disability marker was used for 44.7% of eligible ODA in 2018.

In 2019, 22 OECD members used the disability marker. Czechia and Spain joined the countries marking 100% of their eligible ODA by disability, taking the total to six, a significant increase from 36.4% in 2018 to 100% in 2019 for the Czech Republic. The UK saw a decrease in the proportion of eligible ODA marked by disability from 76% in 2018 to 69% in 2019. The same countries did not use the marker at all as in 2018, with the exception of Hungary which marked one project providing medical support to Bangladesh representing 0.1% of its funding, the only instance of Hungary using the marker in the five years. Overall, the disability marker was used for 40.7% of eligible ODA in 2019, down from 44.7% in 2018.

In 2020, the number of OECD members using the disability marker remained at 22, with Hungary returning to not using the marker at all, but Denmark joining the group of countries using the marker. Greece marked 100% of its eligible ODA up from 10% in 2019, while Denmark marked 89.5% of its funding up from 0% in 2019, and the UK increasing from 69% to 88%. However, EU institutions marked 67% of their eligible ODA, down from 80% in 2019. In total, the disability marker was used for 40.3% of eligible ODA in 2020, almost no change from 2019.

In 2021, 21 OECD members used the disability marker, with Greece not using the marker at all, despite having marked 100% of its eligible ODA the previous year. Eight countries marked 100% of their funding using the disability marker, including Switzerland for the first time. Poland and Austria were very close behind at 99% and 98% respectively, while the UK had its highest ever showing at 91%. Overall, the disability marker was used for 38.5% of eligible ODA in 2021, the lowest proportion across the five years.

Finally in 2022, 23 OECD members used the disability marker, with ten countries marking 100% of their eligible ODA. Greece returned to using the marker for 100% of its eligible ODA, and the Slovak Republic increased its share from 90% in 2021 to 100% in 2022. Italy saw an increase from 58% in 2021 to 77% in 2022, while in Finland the figure increased from 60% to 86%. However, the figure for Poland was 11%, down from 99% in 2021, while France only marked 0.1% of its eligible ODA, down from 12% in 2021. Portugal used the disability marker for the first time, but only marked one ODA bilateral programme through the UN totalling less than 0.1% of its eligible ODA.

There have been some positive changes in the usage of the disability marker. Looking at the change from 2018 to 2022, a number of countries have shown significant increases in their usage of the disability marker: EU institutions from 77% to 100%, Denmark from 0% to 91%,

Czech Republic from 36% to 100%, Switzerland from 54% to 100%, Finland from 11% to 86%, Italy from 23% to 77% and the Slovak Republic from 3% to 100%. In spite of these changes, the total percentage of allocable ODA marked using the disability marker has remained fairly consistent, at 44.7% in 2018 and 44.2% in 2022. A number of countries showed a decrease in usage of the marker between 2018 and 2022: Korea from 96% to 76%, France from 9.5% to 0.1%, and Poland from 100% down to 11%. More importantly, some of the largest OECD DAC donors, including the US and Germany, have never used the disability marker at all, thereby outweighing the progress made by other countries.

Gender marker

As might be expected given that the gender marker has been in place since 1997 and is compulsory, usage of the gender marker has been significantly higher than that of the disability marker. Countries such as the United States, Germany and the Netherlands do not use the disability marker at all but use the gender marker for 100% or close to 100% of their eligible ODA, while the Scandinavian countries, Australia, New Zealand and Canada show very high usage of both markers. All 30 OECD DAC members use the gender marker at least to some degree, compared with six members who have never used the disability marker.

In 2018, all OECD DAC members used the gender marker on some of their eligible ODA, ranging from 4% for Hungary to 100% for the US. Eleven of the 30 OECD DAC members including the US, the Netherlands and Portugal used the gender marker for 100% of eligible ODA, compared to just four countries using the disability marker for 100% of eligible ODA. A further 12 countries had a score above 90%. Only six countries and the EU institutions used the gender marker for less than 90% of their eligible ODA, with Italy on 87%, Slovenia at 43% and Hungary showing the lowest figure at 4%. Overall, the gender marker was used for 94.1% of eligible ODA in 2018, compared to 44.7% for the disability marker.

In 2019, 15 OECD countries used the gender marker for 100% of eligible ODA, compared to six countries using the disability marker for 100% of eligible ODA. Countries including the US, Germany and the Netherlands used the gender marker for almost 100% of eligible ODA but didn't use the disability marker at all. Czechia increased its usage of both markers in 2019: usage of the gender marker rose from 66% in 2018 to 100% in 2019 for the gender marker, and from 36% to 100% for the disability marker. Hungary used the gender marker for 100% of its eligible ODA up from 4% in 2018, but only used the disability marker for 0.1% of its ODA. Overall, across the OECD, the gender marker was used for 94.9% of eligible ODA, compared to 40.7% for the disability marker.

In 2020, 14 countries continued to use the gender to mark 100% of eligible ODA (down from 15 in 2019 due to Czechia decreasing from 100% to 97%), while just six countries used the disability marker for 100% of eligible ODA. Luxembourg showed the lowest score, using the gender marker for just 8% of ODA down from 40% in 2019 and 100% in 2018, although it didn't use the disability marker at all in 2020. The figure for EU institutions was 67%, down from 80% in 2019. In total, the gender marker was used for 92.4% of eligible ODA across the OECD in 2020, compared to 40.3% for the disability marker.

In 2021, 25 of the 30 OECD DAC members reported more than 90% of their funding using the gender marker, compared to 12 countries for the disability marker. Finland improved its

score from 74% in 2020 to 99% in 2021 and Slovenia increased from 68% in 2020 to 84% in 2021, while Luxembourg soared from 8% in 2020 to 100% in 2021. Across the OECD, the gender marker was used for 94.2% of eligible ODA, compared to 38.5% for the disability marker.

In 2022, 23 OECD DAC members reported over 90% of their eligible ODA using the gender marker, compared to 14 members for the disability marker. EU Institutions marked 100% of their eligible ODA, up from 76% in 2021. However, France saw a decrease from 97% in 2021 to 64% in 2022, and Poland from 99% to 21%.

Analysis of the trends from 2018 to 2022 shows that in spite of some variations within individual countries, the overall usage of the gender marker remained consistent across the five years, with 94.1% of total OECD DAC eligible ODA marked by gender in 2018, and 94.9% in 2022. As the largest OECD DAC donors such as the US, Germany and the UK reported close to 100% of their funding by gender each year, this outweighed some of the changes in the figures for other OECD DAC members. These include Hungary increasing its usage of the gender marker from 4% in 2018 to 100% in 2022, the EU Institutions increasing from 77% to 100%, and France decreasing from 99% in 2018 to 64% in 2022.

Trends in disability data

Before analysing the trends in data, it is important to understand that as usage of the disability marker is low, fluctuating between 38% and 44% across the five years, the dataset is far from complete. This limits the extent to which we can understand the full picture and draw conclusions. Some of the biggest donors including the US and Germany have never used the disability marker. As a result, some of the trends in the data may be driven by a small subset of OECD members, while one country's increase in usage of the disability marker may not affect the picture for the OECD overall if that country's share of total OECD ODA decreases.

Nevertheless, the general trend remains positive and reflects progress made within particular countries which have adopted the disability marker. The proportion of eligible ODA which is marked as disability inclusive has increased between 2018 and 2022, but the progress has not been linear. The proportion of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive is calculated by adding the proportion with a principal focus (2) and significant focus (1) on disability. In 2018, 2.1% of ODA was marked disability inclusive, rising to 6.9% in 2019, dipping to 5.8% in 2020, increasing to 10.6% in 2021 and peaking at 10.9% in 2022. Meanwhile the proportion of eligible ODA which was marked not disability inclusive stood at 42% in 2018 and decreased to 33% in 2022. Across the five years, the Scandinavian countries, UK, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Czech Republic and EU Institutions have consistently had the highest scores in the percentage of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive.

In 2018, only 2.1% of OECD DAC eligible ODA was marked disability inclusive, of which 1.9% was marked as having a significant focus on disability, with 0.2% having a principal focus on disability. The breakdown by country reveals huge differences: Iceland was far out in the lead with 45% of its ODA marked disability inclusive, followed by Ireland on 25%, Sweden at 21% and the UK on 16%. These four countries were also the leaders in terms of the percentage of ODA marked as having a significant focus on disability. However, in terms of the percentage of eligible ODA marked as having a principal focus on disability, Finland

had the highest figure at 4.3%, followed by Italy at 2.4%, the Czech Republic and Poland both on 1.7% and the UK at 1%.

Looking at 2019, the overall proportion of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive increased markedly from 2.1% to 6.9%, of which 6.5% was marked as having a significant focus on disability while 0.4% had a disability as a principal focus. The UK had the highest proportion of ODA marked disability inclusive on 36%, up from 16% in 2018. Significant progress was made by Czechia which increased from 12% in 2018 to 28% in 2019, Japan which improved from 0.1% in 2018 to 18% in 2019, and the EU institutions which rose from 0.8% in 2018 to 6.7% in 2019. At the same time Iceland's proportion of funding marked disability inclusive stood at 35% down from 45% in 2018, while Sweden dropped from 21% to 13%. Looking at the percentage of eligible ODA marked as having a principal focus on disability, Italy had the highest in 2019 at 5.4%, up from 2.4% in 2018. The UK improved its score to 1.8% up from 1.0% in 2018, while Finland decreased its share from 4.3% in 2018 to 1.8% in 2019.

In 2020, the total percentage of OECD eligible ODA marked as disability inclusive decreased to 5.8%. This may partly be explained by a number of countries showing a year-on-year fall, such as the UK from 36% in 2019 to 21% in 2020, and Czechia from 28% in 2019 to 17% in 2020, as well as smaller decreases for the majority of countries which used the disability marker. The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 may have been a factor in affecting the allocation of ODA and disrupting standard practices and patterns globally, although as usage of the marker is so low, it is not possible to derive decisive conclusions from the data. Several countries saw an increase in the percentage of eligible ODA marked as disability inclusive, with Iceland increasing from 36% in 2019 to 52% in 2020, Ireland rising from 24% in 2019 to 37% in 2020, and the EU institutions going up from 6.7% in 2019 to 12.4% in 2020.

Regarding the percentage of eligible ODA marked as having a principal focus on disability, Norway showed the highest figure at 3.1% up from 1.7% in 2019, with Italy the second highest at 2.7% down from 5.4% in 2019. Meanwhile the UK saw a substantial drop from 1.8% in 2019 to 0.5% of ODA in 2020.

In 2021, 10.6% of eligible ODA was marked disability inclusive, nearly doubling from 5.8% in 2020. Of this, 10.3% was marked as having a significant focus on disability, while 0.3% had disability as the principal focus. Once again, Iceland had the highest proportion of its ODA marked as disability inclusive at a record 56.9%. The EU institutions showed the second highest at 34%, up from 12% in 2020, Japan came in third place at 31% of ODA, up from 14% in 2020, while the UK was fifth at 25% of ODA, up from 21% in 2020. Notable year-on-year progress was made by Finland increasing from 7% of eligible ODA in 2020 to 24% in 2021, while Australia increased its share from 8% of ODA to 18%, and Canada rose from 10% of ODA to 18%.

As in previous years, this pattern is mirrored in the countries' proportion of funding marked as having a significant focus on disability, given that this forms the majority of the total eligible ODA marked disability inclusive. As to the proportion of ODA marked as having a principal focus on disability, Finland was the highest once again at 4%, up from 1% in 2020, while Canada soared from 0.2% of ODA in 2020 to 2.9% and the second highest in the OECD DAC in 2021. The UK took joint fourth place at 1.9% of ODA, a significant improvement on its 0.5% score in 2020.

In 2022, the total proportion of OECD DAC eligible ODA marked disability inclusive reached its peak of 10.9%, of which 10.7% was marked as being significantly focused on disability. Iceland remained the OECD member with the proportion of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive at 51%, and Australia had the second highest figure at 34%, up from 18% in 2021. These were followed by Japan and the EU Institutions at 31%, Ireland on 27% and the UK on 24%, all very similar figures to 2021. Finland saw a decrease in the proportion of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive from 24% in 2021 to 5% in 2022, while the figure for Canada dropped from 18% to 3%.

As expected, the same trend can be seen in the proportion of eligible ODA marked significantly focused on disability, as the proportion is almost identical. Looking at the 0.2% of OECD ODA marked principally focused on disability, New Zealand showed the highest figure by far at 7.8% of its ODA, up from 0.5% in 2021. Ireland had the second highest at 3.7%, up from 1.7% in 2021, and 2.9% of Denmark's ODA was marked principally focused on disability, increasing from 0.7% in 2021. Finland saw a decrease from 4% in 2021 to 1.2% in 2022, while Canada fell from 2.9% to 0%.

Trends in gender data

The proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable has remained fairly consistent with some minor fluctuations across the five years from 2018 to 2022. This is to be expected given that usage of the marker is compulsory for member states and has been in place since 1997. The high point was 42.8% in 2022 compared to a high of 10.9% in 2022 for disability, while the low point was 39.8% in 2021 compared to 2.1% in 2018 for disability. As with the disability data, the majority of ODA marked gender equitable was in the category of gender as a significant focus (35% in 2021 and 37% in 2022), while a much smaller proportion was marked as having gender as the principal focus (3.9% in 2021 and 3.3% in 2022). The countries with the highest proportion of funding marked gender equitable have been the Scandinavian countries, Canada, the UK, Ireland and the Netherlands. However, there are some differences in the trends for the percentages of eligible ODA marked significantly and principally on gender, and looking at the data year on year reveals some interesting changes and comparisons with the disability data.

In 2018, 42.4% of eligible ODA was marked gender equitable compared to 2.1% marked disability inclusive, of which 38.7% was marked as having a significant focus on gender and 3.7% as principally gender focused. However, the data by country shows huge variances, with Canada marking 90% of its ODA as gender equitable compared to 2.1% as disability inclusive, and Poland showing the lowest proportion at 2% of ODA as gender equitable and 2.8% disability inclusive. Other high performers were Sweden marking 85% ODA gender equitable compared to 21.5% disability inclusive, Iceland with 83% ODA marked gender equitable compared to 45.5% disability inclusive, and Ireland showing 77% of ODA gender equitable compared to 25% disability inclusive. The UK was mid-table with 49% of ODA marked gender equitable compared to 16% marked disability inclusive, ahead of Germany on 39% and the US on 20% which both did not use the disability marker at all. The EU institutions marked 49.3% of eligible ODA as gender equitable, compared to 0.8% marked disability inclusive.

Given that the majority of funding marked gender equitable is in the category of significant focus, the same trend can be seen here, albeit with minor variations. Iceland showed the highest figure with 74% of eligible ODA marked significantly focused on gender compared to 45% significantly focused on disability, with Canada close behind marking 72% of ODA significantly focused on gender and 2.1% significantly focused on disability, and Ireland with 70% of ODA significantly focused on gender and 25% significantly focused on disability. However, the data showing the proportion of funding marked principally focused on gender shows a very different picture with Spain far in the lead at 32% of ODA compared to 0.9% marked principally focused on disability, with Canada and Sweden in second and third place on 17% of ODA compared to less than 0.1% of ODA marked principally focused on disability. At the lower end, Greece and Hungary didn't mark any of their ODA as having a principal focus on gender, and also didn't mark any as having a principal focus on disability.

In 2019, the proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable was 42.1% compared to 6.9% marked disability inclusive, of which 5.2% was marked as having gender as the principal focus, the highest proportion across the four years. Looking at individual countries, Canada, Iceland and Sweden continued to show the highest proportion of ODA marked gender equitable at 91%, 89% and 79% respectively, while their respective ODA allocations marked disability inclusive were 12%, 35% and 13%. The Netherlands increased its proportion of ODA marked gender equitable from 58% in 2018 to 76% in 2019 but did not use the disability marker at all, while the UK saw a smaller uptick from 49% in 2018 to 55% of ODA marked gender inclusive in 2019 compared to 36% marked disability inclusive. Japan's proportion of ODA marked gender inclusive decreased from 62% in 2018 to 30% in 2019 compared to 18.5% marked disability inclusive, while Hungary, Greece and Poland remained the countries with the lowest share of ODA marked gender inclusive.

The proportion of ODA marked as having gender as the principal focus shows some changes in 2019. Canada showed the highest figure at 25% of ODA compared to 0.5% marked principally focused on disability. Spain's figure decreased from 32% in 2018 to 18% in 2019, compared to 1.1% of ODA marked principally focused on disability. The UK proportion of ODA marked principally focused on gender stood at 6.9% in 2019 compared to 1.8% marked principally focused on disability.

In 2020, the total percentage of eligible ODA marked gender equitable rose to its peak of 42.8% compared to just 5.8% marked disability inclusive. Iceland had the highest proportion with 84% of ODA marked gender equitable compared to 52% marked disability inclusive. The Netherlands' figure continued to increase from 76% of ODA in 2019 to 81% in 2020 but did not use the disability marker at all. The UK marked 72% of ODA gender equitable in 2020 compared to 21% as disability inclusive. The percentage of ODA marked gender equitable was 51% for Japan, up from 30% in 2019, and much higher than the 14% marked disability inclusive. Germany and the US remained consistent at 45% and 22% of ODA respectively, and did not use the disability marker at all. Poland showed the lowest proportion of ODA marked gender equitable at 4.1%, still higher than its figure of 3.2% of ODA marked disability inclusive. The EU institutions saw a decrease from 47% of eligible ODA marked gender inclusive in 2019 to 39% in 2020. In Luxembourg, the percentage of ODA marked gender equitable decreased from 32% in 2019 to 6.3% in 2020 coming second to last, and didn't use the disability marker at all.

Meanwhile in terms of the eligible ODA marked as principally focused on gender, the Netherlands showed the highest figure at 35% of ODA up from 12% in 2019, and didn't use the disability marker at all. Spain had the second highest proportion at 18% of ODA marked principally focused on gender, compared to 0.7% marked principally focused on disability. Slovenia stood at 17% of ODA, up from 1.6% in 2019, while none of its ODA was marked principally focused on disability. Japan, Hungary and Greece had the lowest figures at 0.7%, 0.3% and 0.0% of ODA respectively in terms of allocation marked principally focused on gender, and all three countries had 0.0% marked principally focused on disability.

In 2021, the total proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable fell to 39.8% from 42.8% in 2020, while the percentage of ODA marked disability inclusive rose from 5.8% to 10.6%. The decrease in ODA marked gender inclusive is reflected in the country data. While Canada, Iceland and the Netherlands continued to show the highest proportions of ODA marked gender inclusive, some major donors saw some substantial decreases. In the US, the percentage of eligible ODA marked gender inclusive dropped from 22% in 2020 to 14% in 2021 (although it didn't use the disability marker at all), and in the UK fell it from 72% in 2020 to 48% in 2021 (compared to 25% marked disability inclusive). However, for the EU institutions, the proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable increased from 39% in 2020 to 48% in 2021.

As in the previous years, the same trends are reflected in the data showing the proportion of eligible ODA marked as significantly focused on gender. Looking at the eligible ODA marked as having gender as the principal focus, the Netherlands continued to show the highest proportion at 25%, although this marked a decrease from 35% in 2020 (while it didn't use the disability marker at all). Spain saw a small decrease to 15% of ODA marked principally focused on gender (compared to 0.7% marked principally focused on disability) while Slovenia slumped from 17% of ODA marked principally focused on gender in 2020 to 0.7% in 2021 (and 0% marked disability inclusive). In the UK, the percentage of ODA marked principally focused on gender dropped to 4.6% of ODA 2021 (compared to 1.9% marked principally focused on disability) and in the US it fell from 3% to 1.3% of ODA in 2021 (while it didn't use the disability marker at all), indicative of the general trend.

In 2022, the total proportion of OECD DAC eligible ODA marked gender equitable slightly increased to 40.3%, compared to 10.9% marked disability inclusive. The Netherlands had the highest percentage of its ODA marked gender inclusive at 85% (and didn't use the disability marker), while Switzerland had the second highest at 76% (compared to 4.3% marked disability inclusive). For the EU institutions, the figure increased from 48% in 2021 to 56% in 2022 (compared to 31% marked disability inclusive), while Canada saw a decrease from 94% marked gender equitable in 2021 to 56% in 2022 (compared to 3.2% marked disability inclusive).

Looking at the proportion of eligible ODA marked principally focused on gender equality, the Netherlands showed the highest figure at 31% (while it didn't use the disability marker), with Spain the second highest at 26% (compared to less than 1.7% marked principally focused on disability), up from 15% in 2021. New Zealand recorded 13% (compared to 7.8% marked principally focused on disability), up from 4.2% in 2021. Meanwhile Canada recorded 5.3% of its eligible ODA as principally focused on gender equity (compared to 0% marked principally focused on disability), down from 16% in 2021.

Trends in percentage of funding marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive

The percentage of eligible ODA marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive has seen a significant increase from 4.3% in 2018 to 25.4% in 2022. The trend is not linear as there was a decrease from 14.8% to 12% of ODA between 2019 and 2020, before doubling to 24% in 2021. Inevitably, data for this metric is only available for OECD DAC countries which use both the gender and disability markers to categorise their funding to some extent. In 2022, seven countries including Germany, the Netherlands and US did not use the disability marker at all, and therefore recorded 0% of their eligible ODA marked gender equitable as disability inclusive, but all seven countries used the gender marker at least to some extent.

In 2018, Iceland showed the highest proportion by a wide margin, with 54% of its ODA marked gender equitable also marked disability inclusive. The UK had the second highest figure at 30%, closely followed by Ireland at 29%. This follows the pattern in the disability data, with Iceland, the UK and Ireland also among the top four countries for the percentage of ODA marked disability inclusive in 2018.

In 2019, Japan showed the highest proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable that was also marked disability inclusive at 57%, a huge step up from its position of 0% in 2018 when Japan's usage of the disability marker was high with 98% of ODA marked, but only 0.1% marked disability inclusive. The UK had the second highest figure with 56% of ODA marked gender equitable that was also marked disability inclusive, up from 30% the year before. For Czechia the figure was 53%, up from 24% in 2018, giving it the third highest proportion in the OECD DAC. 2019 saw significant progress across the board, with New Zealand at 20% of ODA marked gender equitable that was also disability inclusive, up from 7.9% the year before, and Canada at 13% having recorded just 2.3% in 2018. Meanwhile the figures for Iceland and Sweden saw decreases to 39% and 14% of ODA respectively, down from 54% and 24% the year before.

In 2020, there was an overall decrease across the OECD DAC for the proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable which was also disability inclusive, although the picture differs significantly between countries. Iceland showed the highest figure once again at 54%, up from 39% in 2019, with Ireland showing 46% of ODA marked gender equitable which was also disability inclusive, up from 30% the year before. The EU institutions reported 30% of eligible ODA marked gender equitable as disability inclusive, more than doubling from 14% in 2019. Figures for many countries saw a year-on-year decrease, with Japan falling from 57% of ODA in 2019 to 23% in 2020, the UK decreasing from 56% to 24% and Czechia going down from 53% to 32%. Meanwhile Denmark began using the disability marker for the first time in 2020, with 5.9% of its ODA marked gender equitable also marked disability inclusive.

2021 saw a doubling in the percentage of OECD DAC eligible ODA marked gender equitable that was also marked disability inclusive, from 12% to 24%. Iceland had the highest figure at

69% of ODA up from 54% in 2020, closely followed by Japan on 65% (up from 23% in 2020), and the EU institutions on 62% up from 30% the year before. A general trend showed an increase across the board, with Italy's figure rising from 18% of ODA in 2020 to 40% in 2021, Australia's increasing from 15% of ODA to 36% and Poland from 11% of ODA in 2020 to 33% in 2021. Meanwhile Ireland and Czechia decreased slightly from 46% of ODA to 32% and 32% of ODA to 25% respectively.

In 2022, a record 25.4% of eligible ODA marked gender equitable was marked disability inclusive. Iceland recorded the highest figure at 66%, with Australia the second highest at 57%, up from 36% in 2021. The EU Institutions and Japan were the next highest at 53% and 52% respectively, a slight decrease from 2021. Poland and New Zealand recorded 41%, up from 33% and 20% respectively, while Canada's figure fell from 19% in 2021 to 5.7% in 2022.

Conclusions and questions

Looking across the OECD DAC disability and gender data from 2018 to 2022, we can draw a number of conclusions:

% of eligible ODA marked by disability and gender

- The proportion of eligible ODA marked by disability fluctuated with no overall increase or decrease across the period, with 44% of eligible ODA marked in both 2018 and 2022. 2018 and 2022 showed the highest figures, with slightly lower numbers for 2019, 2020 and 2021. The percentage of ODA marked by gender remained very high and almost static, 94% in 2018 and the same in 2022, with minimal variation in between.

Number of countries using the disability and gender markers

- In 2018, 21 of 30 OECD members used the disability marker at least to some degree, increasing to 23 in 2022 (although this includes Portugal applying it for just one project). In 2019 and 2020, 22 countries used the marker, as Denmark began using the disability marker in 2020, and there was one instance of Hungary using the marker for one project in 2019. In 2021, for the first time Greece didn't use the marker, reducing the number to 21, but it returned to using it again in 2022. In contrast, all countries used the gender marker at least to some degree every year.
- The number of countries marking 100% of their ODA using the disability marker increased from 4 in 2018 to 10 in 2022, and the number of countries marking over 90% increased from 10 to 14. The number of countries marking 100% of their ODA using the gender marker increased from eleven in 2018 to fifteen in 2022.

% ODA marked disability inclusive and gender equitable

- The proportion of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive across all five years is very low, with a highpoint of 10.9% of ODA in 2022. This is much lower than the proportion of ODA marked gender equitable at around 40% each year.
- While it is low, the proportion of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive has increased from 2.1% in 2018 to 10.9% in 2022. There have been fluctuations, but the general trend shows an increase in the proportion of ODA marked disability inclusive. In contrast, there is no general increase or decrease in the overall proportion of funding marked gender equitable.

% ODA marked principally focused on disability and gender

- Looking at the proportion of eligible ODA marked as principally focused on disability, there is no discernible change in the figures across the period, at 0.2% in both 2018 and 2022. While the data for individual countries shows some significant changes, this does not have a measurable impact on the overall picture for the OECD due to the low overall usage of the disability marker, notably the refusal to use it by large donors such as the US and Germany.
- The proportion of funding marked as principally focused on gender shows fluctuations but no overall increase or decrease, rising from 3.7% in 2018 to 5.2% 2019, and the lowest figure at 3.3% in 2022.

% ODA marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive

- The proportion of funding marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive shows a substantial increase from 4.2% in 2018 to 25.4% in 2022, although the trend is not linear, with a decrease from 14% to 12% between 2019 and 2020.

While the dataset allows us to observe some trends, anomalies and outliers in the data, further work and analysis is needed to determine the reasons behind the changes and variances in the figures. Nevertheless, the compilation enables us to identify some priorities to work on as well as some questions to take forward:

1. Nine DAC countries, including some of largest donors such as the US, Germany and the Netherlands, are not using the disability marker. There needs to be an on-going campaign to encourage all OECD countries to use the marker and identify any opportunities to raise this as an issue. Germany has committed to start using the marker, which is an important step forward, and this could be an opportunity to put pressure on other governments to do so as well. The dashboard can also be used as an advocacy tool, to show the differentiation by country, the gaps in the data, and emphasise the need for greater usage.

2. Usage of the gender marker is generally very high. However, engagement with countries such as Poland, which only used the gender marker for 20% of its eligible ODA in 2022, is important to understand the reasons for this, and to encourage all countries to report 100% of the ODA by gender.
3. Comparing the data between 2019 and 2020, the percentage of eligible ODA marked disability inclusive decreased from 6.9% to 5.8%, while the percentage of funding marked gender equitable slightly increased from 42.1% to 42.8%. It would be useful to conduct further analysis to understand why the proportion decreased for disability but increased for gender, and how the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic affected usage of both markers.
4. In four out of the five years for which we have data, Iceland has been the country with the highest percentage of ODA marked disability inclusive. In 2022, at 51%, the proportion was the highest among OECD DAC countries, and ahead of any other country by a margin of more than 15%. Further research could be undertaken to understand what can be learned from Iceland's experience.
5. In 2018 and 2021, Finland was an outlier with the highest proportion of funding marked principally focused on disability. In 2021, Finland's figure of 4.0% of ODA was by far the highest across the OECD, one of only four countries showing a percentage above 1.6%. It would be useful to carry out further enquiries to understand what can be learned from Finland's experience.
6. In 2019 and 2021, Japan had the highest or second highest proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable which was also disability inclusive. In 2021, Japan's share of ODA marked gender equitable was average at 46%, but it had the third highest proportion of funding marked disability inclusive at 31%, and the second highest percentage of eligible ODA marked gender equitable which is also disability inclusive at 65%. Additional investigations could be carried out to understand the reasons for this and what can be learned from Japan's experience.
7. In every 2018, 2019 and 2021, Canada recorded the highest proportion of eligible ODA marked gender equitable, and in 2020 when it had the second highest. Then in 2022, the figure fell to just 56%. The proportion of its ODA marked principally focused on gender was the highest in the OECD in 2019 at 25%, second highest in 2021 at 16%, and just 5.3% in 2022. It would be useful to engage with stakeholders to obtain an understanding of the details behind these changes.

For further information please contact Hannah Loryman, Head of Policy at hloryman@sightsavers.org and Nick Thorne, Global Advocacy Monitoring Advisor at nthorne@sightsavers.org