In 2014, a year marked by multiple large-scale emergencies, the volume of international humanitarian assistance received rose to new heights. An estimated US$24.5 billion was provided, a rise of 19% from the previous record high of US$20.5 billion in 2013. This is the second consecutive year that international humanitarian assistance has substantially grown – a change from previous single year peaks.

As this total grew, so did the volume of funding to the UN-coordinated appeals – up to US$12 billion from US$8.5 billion in 2013. However, even this 41% rise in funding failed to match the scale of the increased requirements, which reached a record high of US$19.5 billion. This meant that, despite record volumes of funding, there was a 38% shortfall overall and a widely varying shortfall in funding between appeals.

In 2014 not only were there more appeals – including for the Ebola virus disease outbreak, Iraq and Ukraine – but the requirements grew for the largest appeals, notably Syria and South Sudan. Requirements were concentrated in a small number of large appeals – together, the five largest appeals accounted for 53% of total requirements to all 31 appeals. These were once again dominated by the demands of the Syria crisis response, which attracted 59% of all funding to the appeals. Total appeal requirements are still growing in 2015.

Requirements from the International Red Cross and Red Crescent (ICRC) Movement also grew – reaching a combined US$1.6 billion and attracting US$1.4 billion in funding. While the bulk of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) requirements were driven by the same large-scale crises as the UN appeals, including Syria, the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC) appeals were dominated by the Ebola response.
What is humanitarian assistance?

Humanitarian action is designed to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain and protect human dignity during and in the aftermath of emergencies. This definition is set out in the Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles and Good Practice Guidelines. In this report, when used in the context of data, humanitarian assistance refers to the financial resources for this action.

Humanitarian assistance can come from many sources – international (spent outside the country from which the resources originate) and domestic (originating and spent within the crisis-affected country).

As well as being focused on emergencies, humanitarian assistance differs from other forms of foreign and development assistance or domestic expenditure because it is intended to be governed by the key humanitarian principles of:

- **humanity** – saving human lives and alleviating suffering wherever it is found
- **impartiality** – acting solely on the basis of need, without discrimination between or within affected populations
- **neutrality** – acting without favouring any side in an armed conflict or other dispute
- **independence** – ensuring autonomy of humanitarian objectives from political, economic, military or other objectives.

These are set out in the fundamental principles of the RCRC Movement, reaffirmed in UN General Assembly resolutions and enshrined in numerous humanitarian standards and guidelines such as the Sphere Humanitarian Charter and the new Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability launched in December 2014.¹

There is no universal obligation or system for reporting expenditure on international or domestic humanitarian assistance (see Chapter 9). The main reporting systems for international humanitarian assistance are that of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affair (OCHA)’s Financial Tracking Service (FTS). The 29 OECD DAC members are obliged to report their humanitarian assistance to the DAC systems as part of their official development assistance (ODA), in accordance with definitions set out by the DAC.² Some other governments also voluntarily report to the DAC. The FTS is open to all humanitarian donors and implementing agencies to voluntarily report contributions of internationally provided humanitarian assistance, which are checked against specific definitions of humanitarian context and activities.³

The GHA report analyses international humanitarian assistance reported to the OECD DAC by DAC members, and reported to the FTS for all other donors. For domestic assistance, we use data reported by the specific national authorities where available. Between these international and national sources, what is included as humanitarian assistance can vary. GHA reports what others report as ‘humanitarian’ but aims to consistently label and source the data used.
International humanitarian response

For the second year running, donors responded to a rise in major crises and increased their international humanitarian assistance to record levels in 2014. Reaching US$24.5 billion, this was an increase of nearly a fifth (19%) from the previous high of US$20.5 billion in 2013.

The 2014 rise was driven by the response to rising needs from new emergencies against a backdrop of major ongoing crises. The response to the Ebola virus disease outbreak accounted for US$3.2 billion of international humanitarian assistance while US$1.2 billion went to the needs arising from the Iraq conflict. At the same time, the crises in South Sudan and Syria escalated in 2014, accounting for US$7.4 billion of international humanitarian assistance reported to the UN OCHA FTS.

While funding has now grown for two years in a row, previously, assistance has risen in response to major crises – for example in 2008 due to the global food price crisis, and in 2010 following the Haiti earthquake and Pakistan floods – but then subsequently dropped. Both of the recent rises have been substantial – international humanitarian assistance has risen by US$6.7 billion since 2012, which was dubbed a year “of no mega-disasters”. This is an increase of more than 38% and shows that in the face of growing demands, more assistance can be mobilised.

This international humanitarian assistance comprises reported contributions from government donors and European Union (EU) institutions as well as from non-governmental (or private) donors – including individuals, trusts and foundations and companies and corporations. As Chapter 3 explores, funding from both groups increased from 2013 to 2014 – from private donors by nearly 8% (slightly less than the 2012–2013 rise) and from governments and EU institutions by just under 24% (more than the 2012–2013 rise).

For the second year running, donors responded to a rise in major crises and increased their international humanitarian assistance to record levels in 2014.

FIGURE 2.1

International humanitarian response, 2009–2014

Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC, UN OCHA FTS, Central Emergency Response Fund, International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook, UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination data and GHA’s unique dataset for private contributions.

Notes: Figures for 2014 are preliminary estimates. Totals for some years may be different from those reported in previous GHA reports due to updated data and methodology. Private figures are in current prices (see Data & Guides for full methodology).
UN-coordinated appeals: funding and requirements

The UN-coordinated appeals represent the largest collective request for international humanitarian assistance. In 2014, this request totalled an unprecedented US$19.5 billion. Requirements have climbed year on year for the past four years and continue to rise. Largely driven by increased requests for responses to ongoing crises in Syria and South Sudan, and to the new Iraq and Ebola crises, the 48% rise between 2013 and 2014 was the highest in the last nine years.

This record request attracted US$12 billion of international humanitarian assistance, the highest level to date and an increase of over 41% from the previous year. Yet this was still insufficient to meet identified needs. Growing funding did not keep pace with growing demand – the record request to date was met with an increase in the shortfall from the year before. Just 62% of requirements were met in 2014, a drop from 65% in 2013, and below the average of 65% over the past decade.

UN-coordinated appeals do not of course represent all humanitarian requirements and funding – significant demands and resourcing exist outside the appeals. Globally, more international humanitarian assistance flowed outside than inside these appeals. Taking the example of Syria in 2014, and looking at the figures reported to the UN OCHA FTS alone, US$1.1 billion was reported as funding to the UN appeal for needs within Syria, but an additional US$1.1 billion was delivered outside the appeal within Syria through other responses.

The UN-coordinated appeals are based on the needs assessed and responses planned by a group of UN agencies and NGOs in specific countries. Some international agencies responding in an appeal country are not included (notably the RCRC Movement [see page 28] and Médecins Sans Frontières), nor are the requirements of affected-state governments. Also, not all emergencies prompt such appeals: some are dealt with by affected-state authorities (see Chapter 3); some are covered by IFRC appeals only or appeals by specific humanitarian agencies; and others may be ‘forgotten’ (see Chapter 4).

FIGURE 2.2

Funding and unmet requirements, UN-coordinated appeals, 2005–2014

Source: Development Initiatives based on UN OCHA FTS and UNHCR data.
Notes: 2012 data includes the Syria Regional Response Plan (RRP) 2012 monitored by UNHCR. UN-coordinated appeals include strategic response plans (SRP) and those inside and outside the previously named consolidated appeals process (CAP). 2014 data includes the Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak Response Plan. Funding to the Ebola Response Plan in 2014 is calculated using decision dates up to and including 31 December 2014. 2014 data includes the Ebola appeal. Data is in current prices.
In 2014, the appeals showed the clear stretch on humanitarian response – not only were there more appeals than in 2013 but the largest appeals grew. There were 31 appeals in 2014, 8 more than in the previous year, including significant new appeals for Iraq, the Philippines Typhoon Haiyan response (both of which were Level 3 [L3] crises – the highest level on the UN’s emergency scale – see analysis on page 58), the Ebola response, as well as Nigeria, the Sahel region and Ukraine.

A small number of large appeals accounted for the majority of requirements – 53% of total requirements were within the top five appeals. The demands of the Syria crisis heightened and requirements grew to unprecedented levels – levels that are still growing in 2015. Combined, the Syria Humanitarian Assistance Response Plan (SHARP) and the Syria Regional Refugee Response Plan (3RP) called for nearly US$6 billion in 2014, up from US$4.4 billion in the previous year. The South Sudan appeal also grew significantly – from just under US$1.1 billion in 2013 to over US$1.8 billion in 2014, with an additional US$0.7 billion for the South Sudan Regional Refugee Response Plan.

At the other end of the scale there were more appeals for less than US$100 million – 11 in 2014 compared to just 4 in 2013. But these smaller appeals tended to have less of their needs met: with the exception of the high-profile crisis in Ukraine, all were less than 50% funded. In contrast, South Sudan, Iraq and the Ebola response, which each requested over US$1 billion, were 90%, 75% and 81% funded, respectively.

As donor resources stretched to respond to the unprecedented number and scale of appeals, the levels of funding between appeals varied more starkly than in the previous year and the difference grew between the best- and worst-funded appeals. This difference was 78 percentage points in 2014 – the largest gap since 2008.
The combined requirements of UN-coordinated appeals continued to rise into 2015. Early requirements were for US$20.9 billion and are likely to grow in the course of the year.\(^4\) The appeals also aim to reach more people. So far in 2015 over 95.2 million people are targeted in the appeals to receive humanitarian assistance – even without counting the Ebola response\(^5\) – compared with just under 87.5 million people in 2014\(^6\) and just over 78.4 million people in 2013.\(^7\)

With more funding requested, the average amount required per person has decreased slightly for the first time in the last three years (a decrease of just over 1%) between 2014 and 2015: this compares with two previous annual rises of 22% (2013 to 2014) and 53% (2012 to 2013). Beneath these averages, there are many factors influencing the cost of providing humanitarian assistance to different people in different locations. These include the type of assistance required, availability of existing services, and costs of procuring and transporting relief items.\(^8\)

Aggregate per capita costs also mask significant differences between appeals. The largest appeals have driven up the global average and in 2015 the gap between these and other appeals has widened substantially. For example, the Syria 3RP (and the South Sudan RRP) request almost double the amount per person of the other appeals in 2015.

In the case of the 2015 Syria 3RP, this rise (from US$576 in 2014, to US$851) partly reflects the nature and context of the response but also partly reflects the increasingly ambitious scope of the appeal, beyond providing emergency response to longer-term development dimensions (see Chapter 7).

Financial requirements are broken down into a ‘refugee component’ and a ‘resilience component’ – the latter accounting for 38% of the total amount requested.
The average funding provided per person also increased between 2013 and 2014, though not at the same rate as the amount requested per person. In 2014, average per capita funding to the appeals rose 13% from 2013, up to US$123. Again, there are significant differences: the South Sudan 2014 appeal attracted US$425 per person (US$474 per person requested) compared to the Nigeria 2014 appeal, which received only US$2 per person (US$12 per person requested).

Counting the numbers of people in need of international humanitarian assistance and costing the response is not an exact science, and methods vary between appeals. However, the 2014 move from consolidated appeals to a humanitarian programme cycle, in which humanitarian needs overviews are followed by strategic response plans, has generated more-comparable data between crises on the numbers of people in need and targeted.

Several appeals are also using ‘alternative costing’ approaches. There is currently no standardised methodology behind this, with each humanitarian country team developing its own approach. However, what these appeals have in common is a move away from using the overall costs of individual projects as the starting point. Instead they use the average costs of delivering specific types of goods and services to estimate overall funding requirements. In 2014 the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) commissioned an external review of ‘alternative costing’ and UN OCHA is now conducting its own analysis ahead of producing new guidance.

With more funding requested, the average amount required per person has decreased slightly for the first time in the last three years.
Revised requirements and funding per targeted person in UN-coordinated appeals, 2013, 2014, 2015

2013
- Myanmar – Rakhine: 498, 611
- Syria RRP: 406, 559
- Myanmar – Kachin: 225, 427
- Kenya: 218, 390
- South Sudan: 258, 357
- Somalia: 154, 303
- Mauritania: 221, 267
- Djibouti: 83, 233
- Sudan: 128, 229
- oPt: 147, 223
- Syria SHARP: 141, 207

2014
- Syria (RRP): 363, 576
- oPt: 260, 490
- South Sudan: 425, 474
- Somalia: 228, 467
- Myanmar: 306, 456
- South Sudan Regional: 244, 449
- Haiti: 203, 398
- CAR: 219, 309
- Djibouti: 84, 296
- Chad: 108, 295
- Philippines – Typhoon Haiyan: 156, 259

2015
- Syria 3RP: 851
- South Sudan Regional: 801
- oPt: 441
- South Sudan: 441
- Myanmar: 353
- Somalia: 313
- CAR: 306
- Chad: 272
- Mauritania: 265
- Mali: 243
- Syria: 237
Source: Development Initiatives based on UN OCHA’s FTS and UN-coordinated appeals.

Notes: 2014 and 2015 figures in particular are subject to change. No figures are provided for average US$ funding per person in 2015 as commitments/contributions for 2015 are still ongoing. Does not include the following: Ukraine SRP in 2014 since only a small amount of the appeal requirements were apportioned to 2014, with the bulk of appeal requirements appearing in 2015; the Republic of Congo appeal which was included in funding for the CAR crisis but for which no separate appeal document is available; the Sahel Regional SRP in 2014 or 2015 since it overlaps with nine SRPs for countries in the Sahel region; the Ebola Virus Disease Outbreak Response Plan in either 2014 or 2015 since no comparable target population figures were included in the appeal documents. Data is in current prices.
Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement appeals

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) maintain independence from the UN-coordinated appeals system. In 2014, the ICRC and IFRC together requested over US$1.6 billion and received nearly US$1.4 billion.

ICRC’s appeal has grown for the second consecutive year, reaching US$1.4 billion in 2014. Compared to the UN appeals, and indeed those of the IFRC, ICRC appeals are well funded, with a 10% shortfall in 2014 and 8% in 2013.

The increased requirements in 2015 are driven by escalations of need in high-profile countries: South Sudan (with requirements up 105% on the previous year), CAR (up 98%), Liberia (up 221%), Syria (up 56%), Lebanon (up 92%), as well as a new appeal for Ukraine.

There was a strong overlap in the crises responded to by the largest UN and ICRC appeals – six of the ten largest ICRC appeals for responses to crises that were also in the ten largest UN-coordinated appeals. All of the conflict-related crises classified as L3 emergencies by the UN system in 2014 (CAR, Iraq, South Sudan and Syria) were in the ten largest requirements within ICRC appeals and together these crises accounted for 29% of the ICRC’s total response.

IFRC’s mandate includes disasters caused by natural hazards, creating smaller but more volatile funding demands than those of the ICRC, which focuses on conflicts. IFRC’s peak requirements in 2010, and peak levels of funding, reflected the crises in Haiti and Pakistan. IFRC also relies on private sources for the bulk of its funding, making for starker variations in funding levels than the ICRC, which is largely government-funded.

The rise in the total amount requested by the IFRC from 2013 to 2014 was largely driven by the Ebola response, for which the combined appeals for affected countries totalled nearly US$103 million. However, the rise also resulted from new appeals in response to conflict situations, including US$27.5 million requested for the Syrian refugee response in Lebanon and Jordan and US$23.4 million in response to the Iraq crisis.

IFRC appeals were issued for all crises classified by the UN as L3 emergencies – namely Syria, South Sudan, CAR and Iraq – as well as Ebola. Combined, responses to these major crises called for nearly US$173 million, 87% of the total requested by IFRC in 2014. In terms of funding they accounted for nearly US$98 million – 90% of the total received.

However, in addition to these high-profile crises, the IFRC also issued ten smaller appeals in response to disasters caused by natural hazards in 2014 for which there were no UN-coordinated appeals. These comprised the drought in Kenya, floods in Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, Serbia, Bosnia, Paraguay, Honduras and the Solomon Islands and the earthquake in Chile. Levels of funding ranged from 98% for the Pakistan floods to 1% for the Kenyan drought appeal.

FIGURE 2.6

Funding to ICRC and IFRC emergency appeals against requirements, 2010–2014

Source: Development Initiatives based on IFRC reports, ICRC annual reports and OECD DAC.
Notes: IFRC figures in this graph may differ from previous years reports. Each year GHA reviews all the latest emergency appeal documents; figures and dates are often subject to change. CHF (Swiss Francs) amounts have been converted to US$ based on OECD exchange rates. Requirements for ICRC are based on initial requirements and budget extensions/reductions from annual reports.