In June 2023, the EC’s Directorate-General for International Partnerships (DG-INTPA) officially launched an inequality marker (the I-marker).[[1]](#footnote-2) The I-marker assesses “whether, and to what extent, inequality reduction is an objective of a donor’s intervention and, therefore, how likely it will have an impact on reducing within country inequalities.” The I-marker works in a broadly similar way to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development-Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) disability policy marker, but there are also some important differences in how it was developed and how it is used (Table 1).

**Table 1: I-marker and the disability policy marker**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **I-marker** | **Disability policy marker** |
| **Marker scoring system[[2]](#footnote-3)** | 3-point scale (principal objective/significant objective/not targeted)[[3]](#footnote-4) | 3-point scale (principal objective/significant objective/not targeted) |
| **Marker created by…** | DG-INTPA | OECD-DAC |
| **Marker used by…** | DG-INTPA. Other parts of the EU institutions, EU Member States and other partners are encouraged to use the marker, but it is not yet clear how far they will do so.[[4]](#footnote-5)  | Used by 21 OECD-DAC members (including all DGs within the EC)[[5]](#footnote-6) |

Source: author’s analysis. Please note the table does not seek to be exhaustive.

As Table 1 shows, the I-marker is not yet used widely outside DG-INTPA. But within DG-INTPA’s work, the I-marker is rapidly becoming a high-profile tool.

## Does the I-marker include inequalities based on disability?

The I-marker “focuses on the bottom (poorest) 40 per cent of the income/wealth distribution (or other socio-economic parameters) or socio-economically disadvantaged individuals, households or groups.” This very broad approach could potentially be interpreted in different ways.

In principle, the I-marker is designed to help capture the intersection between inequalities affecting individuals (or households) and inequalities affecting groups.[[6]](#footnote-7) So in theory, the answer is yes: the I-marker could sometimes include inequalities based on disability, alongside other forms of group-based inequalities.

At the same time, it is not guaranteed that the I-marker would always include disability-based inequalities. In places, the I-marker guidance focuses on economic inequalities affecting the “bottom 40%” of individuals/households.

For example, one of the key approaches in the guidance – Distributional Impact Assessment based on an ’Equity Tool’ – looks mainly at wealth-based inequalities at individual/household level.[[7]](#footnote-8) It is true that the Equity Tool can be expanded to include group-based inequalities,[[8]](#footnote-9) however, this is an optional add-on. Against this background, staff applying the I-marker may decide to focus solely on economic inequalities affecting individuals/households. Please see more discussion on this challenge in the risks section below.

To learn more about the I-marker, check out EDF’s [Annual report – Towards equality: assessing EC funding for disability inclusion worldwide: Ddata from the OECD-DAC disability policy marker](https://www.edf-feph.org/content/uploads/2024/01/Marker-report-final.docx) (December 2023).

For more information, contact Erika Hudson, EDF International Cooperation Policy Officer at Erika.hudson@edf-feph.org.
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