Fair share analysis for revised Syria Crisis appeals

In preparation for the launch of the new UN SHARP and RRP appeals, Oxfam has put together a fair share analysis based on the current appeals and including appeals from the ICRC, IFRC and Government of Jordan.[1]

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 uses the four appeals (RRP5, revised SHARP, ICRC and IFRC) as a proxy for total needs. For sourcing inputs by country, Oxfam has relied exclusively on the FTS. It is a systematic and reasonably reliable source of information. It captures data for both OCHA's SHARP, UNHCR's regional response plan and ICRC's appeal.[2] It also has the added benefit of reinforcing Oxfam's calls for transparency, as 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.[3]

In addition to bilateral contributions, ECHO 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 2010.[4] For EU countries, the share of ECHO contributions have been calculated on the basis of information provided in the original template and is again based on share of contribution to ECHO's total budget.

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. The following section addresses how the DAC's total fair share is calculated. The final section addresses calculations for high income non-DAC countries.

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

Previous Oxfam fair share analyses have assigned the DAC responsibility for 90% of the appeals for the Sahel crisis. However, as Syria is located in the Middle East (firmly within the sphere of influence of the Gulf states) assigning only 10% share to non-DAC countries seemed inaccurate. To come up with an alternative, Oxfam investigated several different ways of calculating DAC total fair share.

- 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.[5]
- To date in 2013, the DAC have committed 54% of all funds channelled through the UN appeals.[6]

An average of these calculations is 61%, rounding down gives us 60% as an approximation of DAC donor fair share.

Calculating non-DAC countries fair share:

For countries outside of the DAC the calculations are more complicated. The previous Oxfam Sahel crisis analysis only looked at fair share within the DAC. However, the importance of Gulf donors to humanitarian responses in the Middle East means that for the Syria response analysis, Oxfam needs to establish a way of measuring non-DAC donors' performance. The Sahel analysis offers a starting point – looking at share of GNI, but only for high income non-DAC

---

[1] Both the Governments of Jordan and Lebanon appeals are included in the Regional Response Plan. 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.

[2] 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.

[3] Affiliates were asked to cross-check the FTS data with data from their governments to supplement the FTS. However, no additional *committed* funds were identified during the preparation period.

[4] See http://www.unocha.org/cerf/our-donors/funding

[5] Total adjusted to remove funds itemised as unearmarked INGO, carryover, various and private.

[6] As above.

countries with populations above 1 million.[7] For the Syria Crisis, all high income non-DAC countries plus Russia have been included.

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 and Russia at 35 percent. Within the group fair share was allocated on the basis of share of GNI as with DAC countries.

---

[7] The World Bank defines high income countries as those with GNI per capita of over USD $12,480 in 2011. For this analysis I have included all high income non-DAC countries PLUS the Russian Federation.

This spreadsheet summarises the findings of this fair share analysis.
Calculations are based on other sheets - see "source" row for details.

REQUIRED FUNDS ($m)	5880
AVAILABLE FUNDS ($m)	3154
SHORTFALL ($m)	2726
% FUNDS COVERED	54%

DAC share (%)	60%	(see note below)
DAC share ($m)	3528

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

		Bilateral pledge for Syria 2013 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	
	Source:	sheet 4	sheet 8	C + D		sheet 1	G - E	E / G	
	Australia	64.7	1.3	66.0		79.8	13.8	83%	Australia
	Austria	4.7	12.3	17.0		33.4	16.4	51%	Austria
	Belgium	16.1	16.3	32.5		42.3	9.8	77%	Belgium
	Canada	85.4	2.2	87.6		137.3	49.7	64%	Canada
	Denmark	51.5	12.8	64.3		28.0	-36.3	230%	Denmark
	Finland	11.3	9.0	20.3		21.5	1.2	94%	Finland
	France	15.4	93.3	108.7		230.9	122.2	47%	France
	Germany	188.2	105.1	293.3		296.0	2.7	99%	Germany
	Greece	0.1	10.7	10.8		25.9	15.1	42%	Greece
Bilateral DAC members	Ireland	7.6	6.6	14.2		15.2	1.0	93%	Ireland
	Italy	14.1	71.0	85.1		179.3	94.2	47%	Italy
	Japan	82.0	0.2	82.2		496.2	414.0	17%	Japan
	Korea, Republic of	1.1	0.3	1.4		89.9	88.5	2%	Korea, Republic of
	Luxembourg	6.0	1.8	7.8		3.4	-4.4	232%	Luxembourg
	Netherlands	16.0	24.9	40.9		68.5	27.6	60%	Netherlands
	New Zealand	0.0	0.1	0.1		10.8	10.6	1%	New Zealand
	Norway	43.3	5.7	49.0		36.7	-12.3	134%	Norway
	Portugal	0.0	7.6	7.6		19.6	12.0	39%	Portugal
	Spain	9.3	47.3	56.5		123.0	66.5	46%	Spain
	Sweden	36.0	18.7	54.7		41.4	-13.3	132%	Sweden
	Switzerland	16.0	0.5	16.5		50.4	33.9	33%	Switzerland
	United Kingdom	241.6	70.5	312.1		202.0	-110.1	154%	United Kingdom
	United States	818.2	0.4	818.6		1296.6	478.0	63%	United States
	Kuwait	324.0	0.1	324.1		70.2	-253.9	461%	Kuwait
HI Non-DAC	Russian Federation	17.8	0.2	18.0		620.4	602.4	3%	Russian Federation
	Qatar	2.7	0.0	2.7		78.7	76.0	3%	Qatar
	Saudi Arabia	373.0	0.0	373.0		200.0	-173.0	187%	Saudi Arabia
	United Arab Emirates	47.3	0.0	47.3		143.3	96.0	33%	United Arab Emirates
	TOTALS	2,493	519	3,012		4641	1280.9	n/a	TOTALS

Multilaterals	CERF	42.2
	ECHO	618.2

TOTAL (INCL. MULTILAT)	3,154

Notes
1. DAC share of needs was set at 60% based on a combination of DAC share of GNI, DAC share of 2012 appeals and share to date of 2013 appeals. High Income non-DAC countries fair share was set at 35 percent.
2. The total available funds is based on the FTS Total Humanitarian Funding per donor. It includes contributions outside of either SHARP or RRP which donors have reported such as to ICRC or bilaterally. As such this total does not correspond to the total funding for the two appeals.
3. Total required funds is estimated from projected Regional Response Plan 5, revised SHARP, IFRC and ICRC appeals.