

YEMEN ON THE BRINK OF FAMINE

Saving lives and forging a pathway to peace

Oxfam Fair Share Analysis April 2017

The number of people in need as a result of Yemen's conflict continues to rise, but the international aid response has failed to keep up. International donors should immediately commit to fully funding the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan. As the tables below show, some donor governments are pulling their weight, while others are not. Aid alone, however, cannot solve Yemen's crisis or put the country back on its feet. All sides and their international backers should stop the de-facto blockade and the conflict that are pushing Yemen towards famine.

TWO YEARS OF WAR

Two years since the escalation of conflict, Yemen's humanitarian crisis continues to deteriorate. Its economy has been shattered, food prices are on the rise and more than seven million people do not know where their next meal is coming from. Airstrikes, shelling, and other attacks on civilian infrastructure severely hamper the import of food and other essential supplies.

Famine looms across the country if immediate action is not taken. Nearly 70 percent of the population – 18.8 million people – are estimated to need humanitarian and protection assistance.¹ The latest Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) report indicates that the number of food-insecure people has jumped by three million in only nine months. Now, an estimated 17 million people are food insecure, and 6.8 million people are in IPC stage four – one step away from famine.²

WHERE ARE THE FUNDS TO SAVE LIVES?

In 2016, \$1.6 billion was requested to enable the UN, humanitarian organizations and their partners to reach 12.6 million women, men and children. At the end of the year, this Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) was only 62 percent funded.³

The 2017 request for \$2.1 billion to reach 12 million people represents a 30 percent increase compared to 2016.⁴ But this is the vital *minimum* needed to meet the most acute needs for life-saving and protection assistance. It certainly does not cover every need in the country with the greatest number of people needing emergency aid in the world.

Despite that, as of 19 April 2017, funding of this year's HRP stood at only 15.1 percent.⁵

FUND THE HRP NOW

In the face of looming famine, and Yemen's collapsing public and private institutions, all donors must immediately and generously step up to fully fund the 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan, including long-term, flexible funding. UN and other humanitarian agencies desperately need that funding – *and* donor governments' direct engagement on the ground – to rapidly scale up their life-saving work, provide immediate livelihood assistance wherever possible, and deploy staff to provide increased protection services, as well as strengthened accountability to affected people.

Recommendation 1: Every donor government should commit to funding its fair share of the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan.

PEACE NOW MORE THAN EVER

But aid alone will not prevent a man-made famine that would be utterly a result of this conflict. Airstrikes and ground fighting are causing huge humanitarian need and mass displacement, as well as creating an extremely challenging and dangerous environment for aid agencies to respond in.

Donor governments do not have a moral choice. They cannot provide their fair share in humanitarian funding OR help stop the violence that has driven the crisis and threat of famine. For those who provide generous funding, but still supply weapons, munitions, military equipment or technology, or logistical and financial support for such supplies, to any party to the conflict in Yemen, that is simply not good enough.

Every government with any influence should dramatically step up their diplomatic pressure on the warring parties, in and outside the country. Now more than ever, there must be a swift political, not military solution.

The international community, including donors, has an integral part to play in seeing this achieved – including pressing for a genuine peace process that includes civil society, including women's rights organizations, as well as traditional leaders.

Recommendation 2: Every government with any influence should redouble their diplomacy for peace, and specifically:

- Urge all parties to return to the table to agree a comprehensive and nationwide ceasefire, and negotiate within a truly inclusive political process that gives meaningful representation to Yemen's women and youth.
- Condemn all violations of international humanitarian law and human rights law, for which an international, independent and impartial commission of inquiry needs to be established to investigate alleged crimes.
- Where relevant, suspend all supplies of arms to any party that could be used to fuel Yemen's conflict.

MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN

Despite women and girls paying the highest price for the ongoing conflict, addressing women's particular suffering and their participation in the peace process has been extremely limited. This is primarily because the warring parties and their international supporters have failed to make meaningful concessions, and excluded not only women but other key elements of Yemeni society, such as youth. Such an approach has visibly failed to make progress, while increasing the misery of the whole population.

Women's local peace building efforts should be supported. By understanding the peacebuilding experience of women at the grassroots, the international community can not only learn about their immediate needs, but also identify how they can be supported to act as agents of even greater change and be involved in mechanisms for the resolution of the conflict.

Recommendation 3: Women’s meaningful participation in donor conferences, as well as their preparation and design, must be supported to ensure interventions appropriately target the needs of women affected by conflict.

- The barriers to Yemeni women raising their voices and telling their stories to the world must be removed. There is an urgent need to listen to their perspectives. Women and women-led grassroots organizations need longer-term financial support, capacity building tailored to their needs, and platforms for women to be heard.

ACCESS TO AND WITHIN YEMEN

But even if – shamefully – it takes time to bring peace, there must be immediate action to enable all Yemen’s people to have access to humanitarian aid, and to end the virtual blockade of the country. That means overcoming the deliberate obstacles to moving aid into and around the country.

Recommendation 4: Every government with influence should press all parties to the conflict to:

- Allow the cranes for Hodeidah port into the country.
- Reopen commercial airspace.
- Streamline approval processes for the movement of humanitarian goods and personnel.
- Avoid attacking civilian infrastructure including hospitals, schools, markets, humanitarian assets and water infrastructure, and stop impeding the access of humanitarian agencies.

That pressure for access cannot come from donor governments just sitting in their capitals.

Recommendation 5: Donor governments should increase their presence on the ground in Yemen, in order to:

- Increase their understanding of the realities of delivering humanitarian assistance in this extraordinarily challenging environment.
- Build their relationships with local actors both to influence respect for International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law, and support the humanitarian response.

Donor governments and humanitarian agencies should take all these steps in the spirit of strengthening genuine partnerships with Yemeni organizations on the ground.

Recommendation 6: Donor governments in particular should help build the capacity of national and local authorities – vitally based on humanitarian principles, and on International Humanitarian Law, as part of their efforts to improve humanitarian access.

Recommendation 7: International humanitarian NGOs should develop their mechanisms that allow Yemeni NGOs to become true partners.

SUPPORT SERVICES AND RECOVERY

At the same time, it is never too soon to support Yemen’s dire economic situation, and rebuild the services upon which millions of its people depend. Only 45 percent of all health facilities are still working; 1,600 schools are currently unfit for use due to conflict-related damage.⁶ Civil servants have not been paid for eight months. Donor governments should not wait to help strengthen Yemen’s state institutions, in order to be able to move towards reconstruction and recovery. Without greater international support, the health and education sectors cannot continue to function, but donor governments should also increase their focus on salaries and rebuilding livelihoods – not least to help people pay for services provided.

Table figures 2017⁷

(These figures are based on commitments recorded by the UN Financial Tracking Service up to 18 April 2017.)

REQUIRED FUNDS (\$m)	2,068
DAC share (%)	60%
DAC share (\$m)	1241
% DAC Received	26%
Non-DAC Share (%)	35%
Non-DAC Share (\$m)	724
% Non-DAC Received	2%
Total % of DAC and high income non DAC Required Funds Received	15.99%

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

		Direct Contributions 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	
Bilateral DAC members	Australia	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.0	28.0	0%	Australia
	Austria	1.6	1.4	3.0	11.0	8.0	28%	Austria
	Belgium	5.3	1.7	7.0	13.3	6.4	52%	Belgium
	Canada	24.9	0.0	24.9	40.9	16.0	61%	Canada
	Czech Republic	0.0	0.8	0.8	8.6	7.9	9%	Czech Republic
	Denmark	7.3	1.2	8.5	7.3	-1.2	117%	Denmark
	Finland	1.6	0.9	2.5	6.1	3.6	41%	Finland
	France	0.0	9.8	9.8	72.0	62.2	14%	France
	Germany	15.9	10.6	26.5	104.1	77.6	25%	Germany
	Greece	0.0	1.2	1.2	7.5	6.2	16%	Greece
	Iceland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0%	Iceland
	Ireland	0.0	0.7	0.7	6.6	5.9	10%	Ireland
	Italy	2.7	7.5	10.2	58.4	48.2	18%	Italy
	Japan	30.0	0.0	30.0	139.5	109.5	22%	Japan
	Korea, Republic of	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.7	45.7	0%	Korea, Republic of
	Luxembourg	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.9	14%	Luxembourg
	Netherlands	11.5	2.2	13.7	21.7	8.0	63%	Netherlands
	New Zealand	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.3	0%	New Zealand
	Norway	0.6	0.0	0.6	8.8	8.2	7%	Norway
	Poland	0.0	1.5	1.5	25.6	24.1	6%	Poland
Portugal	0.0	1.4	1.4	7.8	6.4	19%	Portugal	
Slovakia	0.0	0.3	0.3	4.1	3.9	7%	Slovakia	
Spain	0.0	5.2	5.2	42.1	36.9	12%	Spain	
Sweden	17.7	1.2	18.9	12.4	-6.5	152%	Sweden	
Switzerland	14.2	0.0	14.2	13.8	-0.4	103%	Switzerland	
United Kingdom	28.6	5.7	34.3	69.2	34.9	50%	United Kingdom	
United States	101.6	0.0	101.6	480.3	378.7	21%	United States	
	Saudi Arabia	10.5	0.0	10.5	78.8	68.3	13%	Saudi Arabia
	Qatar	1.3	0.0	1.3	14.1	12.8	9%	Qatar
	UAE	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.2	29.2	0%	UAE
	Russia	1.0	0.0	1.0	158.5	157.5	1%	Russia
	Kuwait	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	15.0	0%	Kuwait
	Oman	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	7.9	0%	Oman

Multilaterals & non-DACs	Non-DAC total	12.7
	CERF	0.0
	ECHO	54.3

Total Received	331
----------------	-----

Table figures 2016

REQUIRED FUNDS (\$m)	1,630
DAC share (%)	60%
DAC share (\$m)	978
% DAC Received	83%
Non-DAC Share (%)	35%
Non-DAC Share (\$m)	571
% Non-DAC Received	141%
Total % of DAC and high income non DAC Required Funds Received	99.40%

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

		Direct Contributions 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	
Bilateral DAC members	Australia	0.0	0.3	0.3	22.1	21.7	1%	Australia
	Austria	0.0	2.4	2.4	8.7	6.3	27%	Austria
	Belgium	3.3	3.2	6.5	10.5	4.0	62%	Belgium
	Canada	20.1	0.9	21.0	32.2	11.2	65%	Canada
	Czech Republic	0.0	1.3	1.3	6.8	5.6	18%	Czech Republic
	Denmark	9.7	2.5	12.2	5.7	-6.5	213%	Denmark
	Finland	5.2	1.8	7.0	4.8	-2.2	146%	Finland
	France	0.6	16.1	16.7	56.8	40.0	29%	France
	Germany	59.7	19.1	78.8	82.1	3.3	96%	Germany
	Greece	0.0	2.0	2.0	5.9	3.9	34%	Greece
	Iceland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	1%	Iceland
	Ireland	4.5	1.6	6.1	5.2	-0.9	117%	Ireland
	Italy	1.6	12.5	14.1	46.0	32.0	31%	Italy
	Japan	47.9	0.1	48.0	110.0	62.0	44%	Japan
	Korea, Republic of	0.3	0.2	0.5	36.1	35.6	1%	Korea, Republic of
	Luxembourg	1.1	0.4	1.5	0.8	-0.7	178%	Luxembourg
	Netherlands	16.2	5.7	21.9	17.1	-4.8	128%	Netherlands
	New Zealand	0.0	0.1	0.1	3.4	3.3	2%	New Zealand
	Norway	7.2	1.8	9.0	7.0	-2.0	129%	Norway
	Poland	0.0	2.5	2.5	20.2	17.7	12%	Poland
	Portugal	0.0	2.4	2.4	6.2	3.8	39%	Portugal
	Slovakia	0.0	0.4	0.4	3.3	2.8	14%	Slovakia
	Spain	0.6	8.7	9.3	33.2	23.9	28%	Spain
	Sweden	28.5	3.8	32.3	9.8	-22.6	331%	Sweden
	Switzerland	9.3	0.4	9.7	10.9	1.2	89%	Switzerland
	United Kingdom	172.3	12.3	184.6	54.5	-130.1	338%	United Kingdom
	United States	322.8	0.1	322.9	378.6	55.7	85%	United States
	Multilaterals & non-DACs	Saudi Arabia	292.2	0.0	292.2	62.1	-230.1	471%
Qatar		1.6	0.0	1.6	11.1	9.6	14%	Qatar
UAE		471.4	0.0	471.4	23.0	-448.4	2048%	UAE
Russia		0.0	0.1	0.1	125.0	124.9	0%	Russia
Kuwait		41.9	0.0	41.9	11.8	-30.1	356%	Kuwait
Oman		0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	-6.2	0%	Oman

Multilaterals & non-DACs	Non-DAC total	805.2
	CERF	14.4
	ECHO	89.6

Total Received	1,620
-----------------------	--------------

METHODOLOGY

The analysis uses the revised 2016 UN Humanitarian Response Plan for Yemen (\$1.6 billion) and the 2017 UN Humanitarian Response Plan for Yemen (\$2.1 billion) as an estimate of total need over each year. The analysis calculates the fair share for OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) countries *and* for high income non-DAC countries.⁸ It uses each country's total GNI to establish each country's fair share.

This analysis assumes that DAC countries, as a group, will collectively contribute 60 percent of the total amounts needed, and that high income non-DAC countries will contribute 35 percent. The remaining five percent is left unattributed to account for other sources of funding.

The analysis tracks direct humanitarian contributions from each government, as well as imputed national shares of funding, where relevant, from the UN's Central Emergency Response Fund and the European Commission Humanitarian Office. Contributions have been calculated using publically available sources from UN OCHA's Financial Tracking Service (FTS), and cross-checked with donor governments where possible.

A more detailed explanation of the fair share methodology can be provided on request.

Disclaimer

1. Various Humanitarian Pool Funds and general bilateral donations that have not as yet been published on the Financial Tracking Service (FTS website) have not been included above.
2. The analysis considers only funds that have been committed or paid. Pledges are not included.
3. The analysis above only includes contributions for humanitarian assistance and as such, direct budget contributions to the Government of Yemen and unearmarked contributions to UN institutions have not been included.
4. Where governments have been able to feed back directly on their humanitarian contributions in their own currency, these have been converted using a 2016 average compiled by the OECD and cross-checked with the figures on the FTS. This converted figure from governments has been used where this number is higher than that of the FTS.
5. DAC members undertake specific reporting commitments for official development aid. Their commitment to reporting aid flows is reflected in high levels of engagement with non-DAC tracking systems such as OCHA's FTS. Non-DAC donors do not always have the same systems in place to track, monitor and report ODA, including humanitarian assistance. As a result, their engagement with the FTS has historically been less consistent, although Gulf donors in particular have increased their reporting efforts significantly over the past few years. Moreover non-DAC donors do not necessarily subscribe to the same delineations for what constitutes ODA and more specifically humanitarian assistance, which has in some cases led non-DAC donors to seek to have direct budget contributions included as part of their fair share. Despite lower levels of reporting, the figures from the FTS have been used where available for reasons of consistency.
6. We acknowledge that countries might still increase their funding over the rest of the year. However, most countries had not met their fair share by the end of the year in 2016, thus there is the critical need for them to step up their funding for 2017.

NOTES

1 United Nations in Yemen (2017). *2017 Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan (YHRP)*. Available at: <http://ye.one.un.org/content/unct/yemen/en/home/publications/country-specific/2017-Yemen-Humanitarian-Response-Plan-YHRP.html>

2 IPC (2017). *Yemen: Projected Acute Food Insecurity Situation – March-July 2017*. Available at: <http://www.ipcinfo.org/ipcinfo-detail-forms/ipcinfo-map-detail/en/c/522844/>

3 Financial Tracking Service (2017). *Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan 2016*. Available at: <https://fts.unocha.org/appeals/513/summary>

4 United Nations in Yemen (2017). 2017 YHRP.

5 Financial Tracking Service website as of 19 April 2017. Available at: <https://fts.unocha.org/countries/248/summary/2017>

6 Ibid.

7 Last update: 18 April 2017.

8 The World Bank defines high-income countries as those with GNI per capita of over \$12,480 in 2015. For this analysis, we have included all high-income non-DAC countries with GNI above \$10 billion in 2015. This includes Bahamas, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Gabon, Hong Kong, Hungary, Israel, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Latvia, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Oman, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovenia, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and Venezuela.

© Oxfam International April 2017

This paper was written by Larissa Alles, based on analysis conducted by Amanda Brydon, and Oxfam's fair share methodology developed by Abby Baldoumas and other staff. It is part of a series of papers written to inform public debate on development and humanitarian policy issues.

For further information on the issues raised in this paper please email advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under ISBN 978-0-85598-957-6 in April 2017. Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 20 organizations networked together in more than 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty. Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org.