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Pakistan is one of the many leading recipients of humanitarian aid affected by multiple overlapping crises. Home to 35.2 million people living in absolute poverty, 1.7 million refugees and 453,000 internally displaced people in 2011, Pakistan experiences domestic and regional conflict and has endured large-scale flooding for two consecutive years.

Humanitarian aid alone cannot address such situations of fragility.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2010 major natural disasters in Haiti and Pakistan had wide-ranging effects on the collective humanitarian response: driving up overall international spending by 23% over the previous year; drawing in new government and private donors; and involving military actors in responses on a huge scale. These crises also shifted historic geographical concentrations of humanitarian spending, exacerbating the gap in unmet financing for a number of other countries.

In 2011 global humanitarian needs were smaller in scale, with the UN’s consolidated humanitarian appeal requesting US$8.9 billion, 21% less in financing, to meet the humanitarian needs of 62 million people, compared with US$11.3 billion requested to meet the needs of 74 million people in 2010. The overall international humanitarian financing response fell back by 9%, from US$18.8 billion in 2010 to US$17.1 billion in 2011. But despite the reduction in needs in the UN’s humanitarian appeals, the gap in unmet financing widened to levels not seen in ten years.

Humanitarian crises not only occur in parts of the world where many people are already poor; they deepen poverty and prevent people from escaping from it. Building resilience to shock and disaster risk therefore is not only the concern of affected communities and humanitarians; it is of fundamental importance in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and in the elimination of absolute poverty.

THE RESPONSE TO GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

The collective international government response to humanitarian crises reached an historic peak in 2010, growing by 10% to reach US$13 billion. Based on preliminary figures, total international humanitarian aid from governments fell by US$495 million, or 4%, in 2011. Humanitarian aid from Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors increased by US$1 billion between 2009 and 2010 (9%) and fell by US$266 million between 2010 and 2011 (2%). Humanitarian aid from governments outside of the OECD DAC group increased by US$156 million (27%) between 2009 and 2010, then fell by US$229 million (31%) in 2011.

Private funding has become increasingly responsive to need relative to government sources. Private contributions grew rapidly in 2010, up by 70% (US$2.4 billion) from 2009 levels and reaching US$5.8 billion. Initial preliminary estimates for 2011 indicate that levels of private giving have fallen back again but still remain above 2009 levels, at US$4.6 billion.

The impact of the global economic crisis is only now starting to be felt in development aid budgets. Official development assistance (ODA) from OECD DAC donors fell in absolute terms by US$4.2 billion (3%) in 2011. Humanitarian aid fell at a slightly lower rate (2%) than development assistance more widely (3%) in 2011, and thus grew as a share of total ODA by 0.1%. In the year following the Pakistan and Haiti ‘mega-disasters’, when overall humanitarian needs subsided, a reduction of just 2% demonstrated partial resilience in humanitarian spending amongst OECD DAC donors, particularly when viewed against a backdrop of aid budget cuts. The impact of the prospect of more severe cuts in ODA on humanitarian assistance remains to be seen.

While some donors were increasing their contributions to meet rising levels of need in 2010, however, others were reducing theirs, and over a period of several years the donor division of labour has gradually shifted. The top ten countries increasing their humanitarian aid spending between 2008 and 2010 (the United States, Canada, Japan, Sweden, Germany, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Norway, Australia and France) collectively increased their contributions by US$1.2 billion over the period. The ten donors with the largest humanitarian aid spending reductions between 2008 and 2010 meanwhile (Saudi Arabia, the European Union [EU] institutions, the Netherlands, Italy, Kuwait, Spain, Ireland, Austria, Thailand and Greece) collectively reduced their contributions by US$1 billion.

The overall rising trend in international humanitarian aid to recipient countries in 2010 masked a number of shifts in the traditional distributions of international humanitarian funding. The US$3.1 billion of humanitarian funds channelled to Haiti in 2010 was of a completely different order to the volumes typically received – more than double the amount received by the largest recipient in any other year to date. In each year since 2001, approximately one-third of total humanitarian aid has been concentrated among the top three recipient countries. In 2010, however, the share of the leading three recipients jumped to nearly half of the total, with Haiti receiving 25% and Pakistan 17%.

There were some clear ‘losers’ amidst the overall growth in international humanitarian aid spending in 2010. Among the 15 countries with the greatest reductions in humanitarian funding by volume, five
experienced an improvement in their humanitarian situation; of the remaining ten, all experienced
greater difficulties in raising funds within their UN funding appeals than in the previous year, with
many noting serious difficulties in raising funds in the first half of the year. In the most striking
examples, the proportion of funding needs met in the UN appeals for Nepal and Chad were 33%
and 31% lower, respectively, in 2010 than in 2009.

**FORCES SHAPING HUMANITARIAN NEED AND THE MIXED INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE**

The scale of global humanitarian crises abated in 2011, with 12.5 million fewer people targeted to
receive humanitarian assistance in the UN consolidated appeals process (CAP), and a further drop of
10.4 million in the expected numbers of people in need of humanitarian assistance in 2012. In 2011
the number of people affected by natural disasters fell to 91 million, substantially lower than the 224
million in 2010 and the lowest figure in ten years.

The structural vulnerabilities of the global economic system that gave rise to the global food crisis of
2008 remain largely unchanged, leading to a second price spike in 2011, with energy prices rising by
143% and food prices by 56% from their lowest points in 2009 to their peaks in 2011. Price volatility
remains acute, and the outlook is one of continued high prices.

Unmet humanitarian financing needs rose across the board in 2011, for UN CAP and other
appeals alike. The proportion of humanitarian financing needs within the UN CAP appeal that
remained unmet in 2011 was greater, at 38%, than in any year since 2001, despite overall reduced
requirements. UN appeals outside of the CAP in 2011 were funded to just 37% overall, however, well
below the average of 46% for the period 2000–2011. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
appeals in 2009 and 2010 had unmet requirements of 17% and 21% respectively, compared with just
11% and 10% in the two preceding years. International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) appeal funding requirements were just 50% met in 2011 against an average of 67%
for the period 2006–2011.

In 2010, consolidated appeals – which represent chronic, predictable humanitarian crises –
collectively saw an 11% reduction in the share of their appeal requirements met. In 2011 regular
consolidated appeals fared slightly better, with a 1% increase in the share of requirements met,
but the majority of them were worse funded in 2011 than they were two or three years previously.

**INVESTMENTS TO TACKLE VULNERABILITY**

Many of the leading recipients of humanitarian assistance are characterised as complex crises, with
countries often suffering from conflict and with very limited capacity to deal with disasters. All but
one of the top ten recipients between 2001 and 2010 are considered fragile states, and all have been
affected by conflict for 5–10 years.

In 2009, 68% of total official humanitarian assistance was received by countries considered long-
term recipients, i.e. countries receiving an above-average share of their total ODA in the form of
humanitarian aid for a period of 8 or more years during the preceding 15 years.

Building resilience to crises in these places is the most efficient and cost-effective way of preventing
suffering and protecting livelihoods, yet relatively small shares of international resources are
invested specifically in building resilience. Just 4% of official humanitarian aid (US$1.5 billion) and
0.7% (US$4.4 billion) of non-humanitarian ODA was invested in disaster risk reduction between 2006
and 2010.

Conflict-affected states receive the overwhelming majority of international assistance: on average,
between 64% and 83% of international humanitarian assistance was channelled to countries in
conflict or in post-conflict transition between 2001 and 2010. ODA investments in peace and security
sectors grew by 140% overall between 2002 and 2010 – and by 249% within the top 20 recipients.

Aid is a key resource to meet the needs of people vulnerable to and affected by crises. But many
other official and private resource flows have a role to play in creating broad-based growth – growth
that has the potential to reduce poverty and vulnerability, provided it is equitable and built on
investments that engage with and support the poor.
Fewer people were in need of humanitarian assistance in 2011 than in 2010 – but numbers appear to be rising again in 2012.

Source: UN consolidated appeals process (CAP)

In 2010, 53 of the 139 countries receiving international humanitarian aid had higher than average shares of their respective populations living on less than US$1.25 a day.

Just over US$8bn was spent in 46 countries that had an above average share of their population affected by natural disasters between 2001 and 2010.

39 countries receiving international humanitarian aid had been affected by conflict for five or more years over the previous decade. They collectively received US$10.7bn in 2010.

45 states categorised as ‘fragile’ received 88.6% of the total international humanitarian aid.
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Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC, UN OCHA FTS, CRED, INCAF, Uppsala Conflict Data Program, SIPRI and World Bank data

2010 74 million
2011 62 million
2012 61 million*

*This includes 10 million people in the Sahel affected by food insecurity and added to the appeal in May/June 2012
Natural disasters in Haiti and Pakistan drove sharp increases in both humanitarian needs and financing in 2010.

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC data, UN OCHA FTS data and our own research

Major natural disasters in Haiti and Pakistan contributed to a 23% increase in international humanitarian aid in 2010.

The overall international humanitarian financing response fell back by 9% in 2011. Both private and government contributions remained above 2009 levels.

Despite large increases in humanitarian financing, the gap between met and unmet needs in UN CAP appeals has widened by 10% over the last five years.

The funding gap also widened for other appeals in 2011.

Source: UN OCHA FTS and IFRC
Figure 1: Top 20 Government Contributors of International Humanitarian Aid, 2001–2010

1. United States
   US$34.1bn

2. EU Institutions
   US$14.6bn

3. United Kingdom
   US$8.5bn

4. Germany
   US$6.3bn

5. Sweden
   US$5bn

6. Netherlands
   US$4.8bn

7. Japan
   US$4.4bn

8. Norway
   US$4.2bn

9. France
   US$3.5bn

10. Spain
    US$3.4bn

11. Italy
    US$3.2bn

12. Canada
    US$3.2bn

13. Australia
    US$2.8bn

14. Switzerland
    US$2.3bn

15. Denmark
    US$2.2bn

16. Saudi Arabia
    US$2.1bn

17. Belgium
    US$1.5bn

18. Finland
    US$1.2bn

19. Ireland
    US$1.1bn

20. UAE
    US$0.9bn

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC and UN OCHA FTS data
Figure 2: Top 20 Recipients of International Humanitarian Aid, 2001–2010

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC and UN OCHA FTS data
FIGURE 3: Top 20 donors of international humanitarian aid, 2001-2010 (US$ million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011*</th>
<th>5 YEARS</th>
<th>10 YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU institutions</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>EU institutions</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>EU institutions</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>EU institutions</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>EU institutions</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>EU institutions</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>EU institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data for members of the OECD DAC, 2001-2010, includes core ODA to UNHCR, UNRWA and WFP (and to EU institutions where applicable). It is expressed in constant 2010 prices. Data for other donors is taken from UN OCHA FTS and is in current prices. All figures include contributions through the UN’s Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and pooled funding mechanisms. *Data for 2011 is preliminary. Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC and UN OCHA FTS data.
Source: OECD DAC, UN OCHA FTS and UN CERF data. *2011 data is based on contributions reported through UN OCHA FTS and is provided for illustrative purposes only.