

Fair share analysis for revised Syria Crisis appeals

In preparation for the 2014 Kuwait donor conference, Oxfam has produced a set of fair share analyses for the Syria crisis. The first looks at cumulative contributions for 2012 and 2013 and the second is a projection for 2014. These are based on the current appeals, including those from the ICRC, IFRC and Government of Jordan.¹ It was updated on Friday 10 January with figures from the FTS.

Cumulative Fair Share for Syria Crisis 2012-13 (as of 10 January 2014)*

REQUIRED FUNDS (\$m)	6,668
DAC share (%)	60%
DAC share (\$m)	4001
% DAC Received	105%
Non-DAC Share (%)	35%
Non-DAC Share (\$m)	2334
% Non-DAC Received	190%

Colour coding
>90% fair share contributed
50-90% fair share contributed
<50% fair share contributed
shortfall >\$5m

		Bilateral Contribution so far (\$m)	Imputed share of CERF & ECHO (\$m)	Total incl. CERF/ECHO share (\$m)	Fair share in \$m	Shortfall (\$m)	% of fair share contributed
DAC members	Australia*	99.4	4.7	104.1	94.7	-9.4	110%
	Austria	10.9	19.4	30.3	36.0	5.7	84%
	Belgium	14.5	28.4	42.8	43.2	0.3	99%
	Canada*	203.3	0	203.3	143.0	-60.3	142%
	Czech Republic	2.5	10.3	12.7	25.1	12.3	51%
	Denmark	65.7	22.7	88.4	23.3	-65.1	379%
	Finland	26.7	14.5	41.2	20.1	-21.1	205%
	France	47.8	131.8	179.6	232.6	53.0	77%
	Germany*	416.8	148.9	565.7	330.6	-235.2	171%
	Greece	0.3	16.5	16.8	27.7	10.8	61%

	Iceland	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.1	0.7	30%
	Ireland	18.6	10.7	29.3	15.9	-13.4	184%
	Italy	36.3	101.7	138.0	193.0	55.0	71%
	Japan	136.7	0.8	137.4	446.2	308.8	31%
	Korea, Republic of	5.7	1.2	6.9	149.3	142.4	5%
	Luxembourg	11.3	3.6	14.9	3.4	-11.6	443%
	Netherlands	76.3	44.6	120.9	70.5	-50.5	172%
	Norway	101.6	21.4	123.0	32.4	-90.6	380%
	Poland	3.8	20.3	24.1	78.6	54.5	31%
	Portugal	0.2	19.6	19.8	25.2	5.4	79%
	Slovakia	0.2	3.7	3.8	12.9	9.1	30%
	Spain*	15.7	71.0	86.7	143.8	57.1	60%
	Sweden	77.6	36.8	114.4	40.5	-73.9	283%
	Switzerland	57.2	1.7	58.9	43.4	-15.5	136%
	United Kingdom*	565.8	103.7	669.6	224.8	-444.8	298%
United States	1349.0	1.4	1350.4	1531.3	180.9	88%	
Non-DAC	Saudi Arabia*	438.9	0.0	438.9	135.3	-303.6	324%
	Qatar	117.0	0.0	117.0	24.8	-92.2	472%
	UAE	84.9	0.0	84.9	60.0	-24.9	142%
	Russia	24.3	0.6	24.9	521.6	496.7	5%
	Kuwait	332.2	0.3	332.5	23.0	-309.5	1444%
	Iraq ⁱⁱ	99.2	0.0	99.2	22.1	-77.1	450%
	Jordan ⁱⁱⁱ	769.0	0.0	769.0	6.0	-763.0	12720%
	Lebanon ^{iv}	563.3	0.0	563.3	10.0	-553.3	5617%
	Turkey ^v	2001.0	0.1	2001.1	215.3	-1785.8	930%
	TOTALS	7,780	841	8,621	5019	-3602.4	n/a

Multilaterals	CERF	123.3
	ECHO	731.6

TOTAL (INCL. MULTILAT)	8,635
-------------------------------	--------------

*Includes bilateral funding and multilateral contributions through CERF and EU where relevant. Total need is calculated using the UN appeal (SHARP and RRP 6), appeals from ICRC, IFRC and UNRWA in Jordan. Oxfam's fair share calculations are based on percentage of gross national income using the World Bank's 2012 GNI, PPP (current international \$).

*Bilateral donor figures for countries marked with an asterisk have been confirmed by the Government, all others rely on the UN's Financial Tracking Service and may not include all aid given.

Fair Share Projection for the Syria Response in 2014

REQUIRED FUNDS (\$m)	6,755
DAC share (%)	60%
DAC share (\$m)	4053
% DAC Received	10%
Non-DAC Share (%)	35%
Non-DAC Share (\$m)	2364
% Non-DAC Received	0%

Colour coding
>90% fair share contributed
50-90% fair share contributed
<50% fair share contributed
shortfall >\$5m

		Bilateral Contribution so far (\$m)	Imputed share of CERF & ECHO (\$m)	Total incl. CERF/ECHO share (\$m)	Fair share in \$m	Shortfall (\$m)	% of fair share contributed ^{vi}
DAC members	Australia	0.0	0.0	0.0	95.9	95.9	0%
	Austria	0.0	3.6	3.6	36.4	32.8	10%
	Belgium	0.0	4.2	4.2	43.7	39.5	10%
	Canada	0.0	0.0	0.0	144.9	144.9	0%
	Czech Republic	0.0	1.9	1.9	25.4	23.5	7%
	Denmark	0.0	3.0	3.0	23.6	20.7	13%
	Finland	0.0	2.2	2.2	20.4	18.2	11%
	France	0.0	24.4	24.4	235.6	211.1	10%
	Germany	0.0	26.6	26.6	334.9	308.3	8%
	Greece	0.0	3.1	3.1	28.0	25.0	11%
	Iceland	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.1	0%
	Ireland	0.0	1.7	1.7	16.1	14.4	11%
	Italy	0.0	18.8	18.8	195.4	176.6	10%
	Japan	0.0	0.0	0.0	452.0	452.0	0%
	Korea, Republic of	0.0	0.0	0.0	151.2	151.2	0%
	Luxembourg	0.0	0.4	0.4	3.4	3.1	11%
	Netherlands	0.0	5.5	5.5	71.4	65.9	8%
Norway	20.2	0.0	20.2	32.8	12.6	62%	

	Poland	0.0	3.8	3.8	79.7	75.9	5%
	Portugal	0.0	3.6	3.6	25.5	21.9	14%
	Slovakia	0.0	0.7	0.7	13.1	12.4	5%
	Spain	0.0	13.0	13.0	145.7	132.6	9%
	Sweden	0.0	3.0	3.0	41.0	38.0	7%
	Switzerland	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.9	43.9	0%
	United Kingdom	257.8	14.1	271.9	227.7	-44.3	119%
	United States	0.0	0.0	0.0	1551.1	1551.1	0%
	Non-DAC	Saudi Arabia	0.0	0.0	0.0	137.1	137.1
Qatar		0.0	0.0	0.0	25.1	25.1	0%
UAE		0.0	0.0	0.0	60.8	60.8	0%
Russia		0.0	0.0	0.0	528.3	528.3	0%
Kuwait		0.0	0.0	0.0	23.3	23.3	0%
Iraq		0.0	0.0	0.0	22.3	22.3	0%
Jordan		0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	6.1	0%
Lebanon		0.0	0.0	0.0	10.2	10.2	0%
Turkey		0.0	0.0	0.0	218.1	218.1	0%
TOTALS		278	134	412	5084	10167.9	n/a

Multilaterals	CERF	0.0
	ECHO	135.7

TOTAL (INCL. MULTILAT)	414
-------------------------------	------------

Methodology Note

Before beginning the analysis two decisions needed to be made: estimating needs and establishing a source of information for how much each country has given. This analysis combines a number of appeals (see Table below) as a proxy for total needs. For sourcing inputs by country, we have relied on the FTS and additional intelligence from government sources. The FTS is a systematic and reasonably reliable source of information. It captures data for OCHA's SHARP, UNHCR's regional response plan and ICRC's appeal.^{vii} The FTS is publicly available and updated regularly. There are some concerns around lag between commitment and updating. Perhaps of greater concern, is that as reporting to the FTS is voluntary, many donors and some INGOs may not provide information to the system.^{viii} For this reason, FTS figures are checked with directly with donor governments where possible.

Estimating Total Need for the Syria Crisis			
	2012 \$ million	2013 \$ million	2014 \$ million
SHARP (OCHA)	348.34	1,400.5	2280
RRP (UNHCR)	487.98	2,981	4264.7
ICRC	27	57.48	117.81
IFRC		60.18 (also 2012)	77.42
UNRWA (Jordan) ^{ix}		4.25	14.6
Jordan		851.5	
Lebanon		449.6	
Total	863.32	5805.01	6754.53

Multilateral Contributions

In addition to bilateral contributions, imputed share of EU and CERF commitments are attributed where relevant. Share of CERF commitments are calculated on the basis of a country's share of the total donations to CERF in 2012.^x For EU countries, the share of EU contributions has been calculated on the basis of each member state's contribution to ECHO's total budget. This was calculating using the publically available figures of contributions per member state.^{xi}

Calculating DAC fair share of humanitarian assistance for the Syria response:

The share for the total DAC group was set at 60 per cent after looking at a range of indicators.

- In 2009, according to the World Bank, the DAC share of global GNI was 63%.
- In 2012, the DAC committed 66% of funds channelled through the UN appeals.^{xii}
- By mid-2013, the DAC had committed 54% of all funds channelled through the UN appeals.^{xiii}

Once the parameters for the analysis are set, for DAC countries the analysis is straightforward. Each DAC country's fair share is calculated on the basis of share of DAC GNI.

Calculating non-DAC countries fair share:

Non-DAC donors' humanitarian assistance has been rising over the past decade. Oxfam's fair share analysis for the Syria therefore includes all high income non-DAC countries with a GNI above 10 billion in 2012.^{xiv} Identifying the list of countries to include is only the starting point. The next step is to establish a total fair share for that group. Because other countries and private donors contribute to the UN appeals, it was decided to set the 'fair share' for high income non-DAC is set at 35 percent. Within the group fair share was allocated on the basis of share of GNI as with DAC countries.

ⁱ Both the Governments of Jordan and Lebanon appeals are included in the Regional Response Plan 5. However the full Government of Jordan appeal appears as an annex, as only prioritised needs are included in the appeal itself. Egypt, Iraq and Turkey have not produced appeals. Government appeals for 2014 have not been announced.

ⁱⁱ Government of Iraq spending estimates from a statement given by H.E. Hoshyar Zebari Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq in the Ministerial Meeting of the Refugee-Hosting Countries Bordering the Syrian Arab Republic available at <http://www.mofa.gov.iq/EN/Articles/display.aspx?id=MidvcBKCLUw=>

-
- iii Estimates for Government of Jordan spending since 2012 from Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan MOPIC and United Nations (2013) *Host Community Support Platform: Needs Assessment Review of the Impact of the Syrian Crisis on Jordan* November 2013: 3.
- iv Estimates for Government of Lebanon funding since 2012 from World Bank and United Nations (2013) *Lebanon: Economic and Social Impact Assessment of the Syrian Conflict: Executive Summary* September 2013: 7.
- v Estimates for Government of Turkey spending are from the FTS and AFAD (2013) *Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Field Survey Results* (Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry and Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency: Ankara): 10.
- vi 2014 Commitments for EU member states include the European Union's \$227.2 million contribution to the 2014 appeal. Only the United Kingdom has contributed bilateral funding as of 13 January 2014.
- vii This is captured as 'total humanitarian funding per donor' and 'other humanitarian funding to projects not listed in the appeal'. Moreover while there were initially concerns about the consistency of UNHCR's reporting to the FTS, they have instituted weekly meetings with OCHA to ensure that the information is updated regularly.
- viii Oxfam contacted governments to confirm data provided by the FTS. Where these figures have been provided, they have been included in the analysis. In case of discrepancy between donor figures and the FTS the higher figures have been used in the analysis.
- ix UNRWA's appeal for Jordan is not included in the consolidated.
- x See <http://www.unocha.org/cerf/our-donors/funding>
- xi Data for contributions by country is available at http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/2011/2011_en.cfm.
- xii Total adjusted to remove funds itemised as unearmarked INGO, carryover, various and private.
- xiii As above.
- xiv The World Bank defines high income countries as those with GNI per capita of over USD \$12,480 in 2012. For this analysis I have included all high income non-DAC countries with GNI above 10 bn in 2012. For this analysis I have included all high income non-DAC countries with GNI above 10 bn in 2012. Countries included: Qatar, Singapore, Bahamas, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Gabon, Hungary, Mauritius, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, Mexico, Oman, Romania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Malta, Malaysia, Cyprus, Bulgaria, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Israel, Slovenia, Estonia, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Russian Federation, and Turkey.