



Shayma, 6, plays with her 15-day-old brother Hussein, in the warehouse her family rents in Bab al Tabbaneh in Tripoli, Lebanon, 15 May 2014. The family was recently connected to a main water supply as part of an Oxfam-funded campaign to renovate sanitation facilities in the impoverished neighbourhood. Photo: Sam Tarling/Oxfam

A FAIRER DEAL FOR SYRIANS

International commitments needed to arrest the deepening crisis in Syria and the region

The number of people killed, displaced or in desperate need of assistance as a result of the conflict in Syria continues to rise. A staggering 190,000 people have been killed and 6.5 million displaced inside Syria. And with 3 million refugees, it is now one of the biggest refugee crises since the end of the Second World War. The crisis is posing a serious risk to the security and stability of neighbouring countries and has contributed to the destabilization of Iraq.

The sheer scale of this crisis demands specific and increased commitments from members of the international community to help alleviate the suffering: to fully fund the aid response, to offer refugees resettlement, and to halt the transfer of arms and ammunition. This briefing shows that the international community is falling far short in each of these areas.

1 INTRODUCTION

While the world's attention is on crises in Gaza, Ukraine and elsewhere, the humanitarian crisis in Syria continues to deteriorate beyond anything that could have been envisaged when protests broke out over three years ago. A staggering 190,000 people have been killed and 6.5 million displaced inside the country, and the conflict shows little sign of abating. There are three million registered refugees from Syria in neighbouring countries and an unknown number who have not registered. Jordan's planning minister has highlighted the fact that the presence of Syrian refugees in Jordan is akin to 'the United States absorbing the entire population of Canada'.¹

These numbers do not even begin to capture the trauma and horror of the conflict. They fail to reflect the stories of the millions of men, women and children who have been forced to flee their homes or their country, nor their current fears, hopes and aspirations for the future. Stories like that of Iyad and Nawal and their family, who fled Syria after two of their children – Farah and Imad – were injured by a cluster bomb. With shrapnel still embedded in Farah and Imad's legs, the whole family fled Syria and were sleeping rough without food or clean water in northern Lebanon when Oxfam staff met them.² They were wearing wet clothes and had no money to buy nappies for their youngest baby. This is the harsh reality of life as a refugee among millions of refugees – a reality that the international community must not turn its back on.

Long held predictions of the conflict destabilizing the region are coming true. The Syria conflict is also now intimately linked to the crisis unfolding in Iraq, which has created its own difficult-to-fathom statistics and untold stories of human tragedy.

This briefing argues that the sheer scale of this crisis demands specific, and in some cases significantly increased, commitments from the international community to help those affected. One of the challenges in mobilizing the international community to respond effectively in situations such as this is to encourage each country to contribute fairly – whether that be in terms of aid dollars, supporting refugees, or other measures. Oxfam has developed three key indicators to help guide the level of commitment that each wealthy country should make in order to fairly alleviate the suffering of those affected by the Syria crisis:

- The level of funding each country makes available for the humanitarian response, relative to the size of its economy (based on gross national income);
- The number of Syrian refugees each country has helped to find safety through offers of resettlement or other forms of humanitarian protection, again based on the size of the economy;³
- Each country's commitment to taking practical action to end violations of human rights and international humanitarian law by halting transfers of arms and ammunition. In addition to reconvening talks aimed at ending the crisis, which collapsed in Geneva this year, halting arms transfers would be one way that members of the international community could signal their commitment to a political, rather than military, solution to the crisis.

The primary responsibility for ensuring respect for the rights of the Syrian people lies with the Syrian government and the armed groups fighting in the country.

Nevertheless, the international community has a vital role and responsibility to assist and provide protection to those affected by this crisis. This briefing demonstrates that the international community is falling significantly short of even the minimum required

of it. As a whole, the international community has not contributed nearly enough to the aid response, has left neighbouring countries to cope with an ever-increasing number of refugees, and has failed to unite in order to halt transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria.

Oxfam delivers aid inside Syria, providing clean water to more than one million people. In neighbouring countries Lebanon and Jordan the organization is helping hundreds of thousands of refugees who have fled the conflict.⁴

2 AN URGENT FUNDING GAP

The UN has launched its largest ever humanitarian appeal for Syria. Shamefully, well over halfway through the year, the UN appeals are only 40 percent funded. Other agencies like the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) have their own appeals, as do the governments of Jordan and Lebanon. An aggregate of all of these appeals puts the total need at \$7.7bn.⁵

Already, humanitarian agencies have had to cut their programmes and target assistance to those most in need, owing to insufficient funds. In October 2013 the World Food Programme (WFP) in Lebanon had to cut 30 percent of beneficiaries from its food aid programme.⁶ In Jordan, Oxfam has had to halt its cash programming to refugees in host communities. The negative impacts of these aid cuts are compounded by the fact that the savings and assets of refugees are already seriously depleted.⁷ As a result, the situation is set to substantially worsen for thousands, if not millions of people. Dalya, a refugee from Homs living in Tripoli with her four children, told Oxfam, 'Sometimes I can't pay the rent. Last month I had to sell my asthma medicines in order to pay'.

This combination of diminished savings and reduced assistance means that refugees will increasingly be forced to resort to risky, negative coping mechanisms, including 'child labour, survival sex, early marriage, skipping meals and begging'.⁸

'The current level of funding ... does not enable us to achieve the goal of enrolling more than 172,000 children next year in schools or launch a necessary vaccination campaign for all children under 5 years.'

Ninnette Kelly, UNHCR representative in Lebanon, 3 July 2014

GIVING WHAT'S FAIR

In order to prevent these negative outcomes, governments must dig deep and provide humanitarian funding commensurate with the scale of need. Appeals by the UN, the ICRC and host governments are directed at all members of the international community, and are non-prescriptive. For this reason, Oxfam has calculated what would be a fair share, based on the size of the economy of each country.⁹

The analysis includes members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and high-income non-DAC countries.¹⁰ Each country's fair share is calculated as a percentage of total need¹¹ based on each country's share of total, combined gross national income (GNI). Each country's contributions include both bilateral and imputed multilateral funding (from the Central Emergency Response Fund of the UN and EU member states through ECHO, the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department).

Figure 1: Funding: summary of fair share analysis findings, as of 1 September 2014¹²

2014 Fair share analysis				Key
Country	2014 contributions US\$ million (incl. imputed CERF ¹³ and ECHO ¹⁴ share)	Fair share US\$ million	% Fair share contributed	
Australia	29.2	109.6	27%	>90% fair share contributed
Austria	10.8	41.6	26%	
Belgium	17.6	50.0	35%	
Canada	149.3	165.5	90%	50–90% contributed
Czech Republic	6.5	29.0	22%	
Denmark	43.9	27.0	163%	<50% contributed
Finland	18.0	23.3	77%	
France	87.8	269.2	33%	>90% fair share contributed
Germany	250.6	382.6	66%	
Greece	8.9	32.0	28%	>90% fair share contributed
Iceland	0.0	1.2	0%	
Ireland	17.0	18.4	92%	>90% fair share contributed
Italy	66.5	223.3	30%	
Japan	132.9	516.5	26%	>90% fair share contributed
Korea, Republic of	2.1	172.8	1%	
Kuwait	300.0	29.9	1003%	>90% fair share contributed
Luxembourg	6.2	3.9	158%	
Netherlands	55.8	81.5	68%	>90% fair share contributed
New Zealand	5.1	14.7	34%	
Norway	79.4	37.5	212%	>90% fair share contributed
Poland	11.9	91.0	13%	
Portugal	10.6	29.1	36%	>90% fair share contributed
Qatar	60.0	32.2	186%	
Russia	4.0	677.2	1%	>90% fair share contributed
Saudi Arabia	172	175.7	98%	
Slovakia	2.0	14.9	13%	>90% fair share contributed
Spain	45.2	166.4	27%	
Sweden	43.7	46.9	93%	>90% fair share contributed
Switzerland	23.7	50.2	47%	
United Arab Emirates	94.2	77.9	121%	>90% fair share contributed
United Kingdom	365.8	260.1	141%	
United States	1070.3	1772.4	60%	>90% fair share contributed
TOTAL	3,191	7332¹⁵	43.6%	

Note: Information is drawn from publicly available sources including EDRIS and FTS and checked with government representatives where possible. Australia, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Qatar, Russia, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and the United Kingdom all provided additional data.

Oxfam's fair share analysis demonstrates that, out of 26 DAC donors, only 11 have met over 50 percent of their fair share of funding for Syria so far in 2014. And some countries, such as Italy, Japan and France, have provided less than 35 percent of their fair share.¹⁶

Thankfully, this underfunding has been somewhat mitigated by generous donations from a small number of states. The UK, Luxembourg, Norway and Denmark, along with Gulf donors such as Qatar, United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Kuwait, and others have each provided 30 percent more than their fair share of funding for the humanitarian response.

There has also been an increase in transparency related to the funding of the response since September 2013, when Oxfam first conducted an analysis on the crisis. Governments such as Qatar have put their contributions through the UN Financial Tracking Service for the first time. This greater transparency will enable a clearer identification of gaps and give a better idea of the size of the contributions of different countries, thereby highlighting starkly the considerable scale of the shortfall.

Limitations of assessing only funding contributions

Securing sufficient funding is not the only consideration in providing humanitarian relief for the Syria crisis. Measures must also be taken to ensure that those in need can access assistance provided by humanitarian agencies and governments. A fully funded humanitarian response will not necessarily help the 241,000 Syrians living under siege to get access to food, medical supplies and other essential items deliberately denied by the government or opposition groups, or the 4.7 million people in areas which are 'hard to reach' because of pervasive insecurity.

The UN Security Council has now passed two resolutions – negotiated and agreed with strong leadership from non-permanent members Australia, Jordan and Luxembourg – to demand an increase in humanitarian access; and the Syrian government and armed groups must ensure that they are implemented so that Syrian civilians can access the aid they desperately need.

While the analysis in this briefing primarily relates to humanitarian operations,¹⁷ there also needs to be longer term support for the governments and the (often) poor communities that host refugees, to assist with the significant population increases and concomitant increased strain on resources and services in host countries. In Lebanon, 170,000 people are being pushed into poverty by the crisis, and the unemployment rate has doubled to 20 percent.¹⁸ For their part, the host governments must provide refugees with adequate options to be self-sufficient, to look after themselves and their families, and to contribute to the economy of their hosts.

In other words, the statistical analysis is an indicator of the absolute minimum that governments ought to fund, and, to date, the international community has committed to fund only 43.6 percent of this absolute minimum.

Box 1: Contributions of neighbouring countries

Using the same methodology of measuring state spending on assistance to refugees relative to the country's GNI gives an indication of how generous neighbouring countries have been in comparison with rich donors.

Jordan has spent \$522m in 2014. If it were treated as a traditional donor, this would mean that Jordan would already have spent 7,468 percent of its fair share.

There is no information available on spending by Turkey for 2014, but the Government of Turkey has committed to maintain the same level of funding as last year.¹⁹ If this commitment is honoured, Turkey will have spent 803 percent of its fair share by the end of 2014. The World Bank estimates that Lebanon's expenditure has increased by \$1.1bn as a result of the crisis, which would equate to 9,477 percent.²⁰

3 A MASSIVE REFUGEE CRISIS: THE WORLD'S RESPONSIBILITY TO DO MORE

The vast majority of the refugees with whom Oxfam works wish eventually to return to Syria when it is safe. The sobering fact is that they will be unable to do so for some time. Three million refugees from Syria are registered in neighbouring countries, making this one of the largest refugee crises since the end of the Second World War. And the crisis is set to get bigger, with the UN predicting that there will be 3.59 million registered refugees in neighbouring countries by the end of 2014.²¹

Neighbouring countries have shown extraordinary generosity in hosting these refugees. This generosity is being stretched to breaking point, however, and refugees and poor communities in host countries are paying the price. There have been worrying developments, including the closing of borders of countries neighbouring Syria. Palestine refugees from Syria (PRS) cannot enter Jordan and are facing increased restrictions on entry to Lebanon, and there have been cases of PRS being forcibly returned to Syria.

The scale of the refugee crisis is posing serious risks to the stability of neighbouring countries. This is particularly so in Lebanon, the smallest country bordering Syria, with a fragile economy and unstable political context that is closely linked to that of its neighbour. Despite the fact that its population was less than 4.5 million prior to the conflict, Lebanon is hosting 38 percent of those fleeing Syria, over 1.1 million refugees.

'Responsibility needs to be taken for refugees – people who have lost everything – and they cannot be put up in no-man's land, to say nothing of sending them back to Syria ... Lebanon cannot on its own bear the burden ... we have to convince our European partners to accept more refugees.'

German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, speaking while visiting Lebanon, 31 May 2014.

Box 2: Palestine refugees: a story of perpetual displacement²²

Ibrahim, 43, his wife Afaf, 37, and their 14-year-old son Abd have been living in the Palestinian refugee camp of Burj Barajneh in Beirut since fleeing Syria nearly two years ago.

Ibrahim hails from a long line of displaced Palestinians. His family is from Nablus and his parents found refuge in Syria after the creation of Israel. 'I was born in Yarmouk. That is where home is'.

Yarmouk, described as a Palestinian camp in Damascus, has evolved over the years into a city. Now besieged, many of its streets have been reduced to rubble, and most of its population has fled.

'I was king in my house. Now I barely survive here, with no source of income, and no hope', adds Ibrahim. In Lebanon, PRS can't work, have limited access to healthcare outside of the existing camps, and rely on aid to survive.

Out of despair, the family sent an asylum request to the Australian government. 'We were told that there was no embassy here. So we just mailed our forms through the post for 8,000 Lebanese Pounds (\$5)', explains Afaf. Ever since, she has waited and wonders why 'Australia has not sent for us yet'.

'If things don't change soon,' Ibrahim insists, 'I will send Abd by boat to his aunt in Denmark', although he cannot afford the smugglers fees, and his wife will never let her only child out of her sight. 'I will go back to Yarmouk, and if my house has been destroyed, I will rebuild it stone by stone with my own hands'.

RICH COUNTRIES MUST OFFER MORE

Rich and developed countries, not least those which have signed the 1951 Refugee Convention and are committed to its principles, should do more to offer third state international protection to refugees. While showing solidarity and offering support to Syrian refugees is a responsibility of all states, Oxfam is calling for a commitment from rich countries in particular²³ to offer international protection by the end of 2015 to just 5 percent between them of the projected total Syrian refugee population. Any such figure is of course a matter of judgement, not scientific certainty, but this would equate to 179,500 refugees offered resettlement or other types of protection by the end of 2015. It is well within the capabilities of rich countries to resettle or offer other forms of protection to this number of refugees from Syria. But to date, rich countries have only committed to offer safe haven to 37,432 of the 3 million refugees registered in neighbouring countries.

Rich countries should do this first to offer a lifeline to some of the most vulnerable refugees who are struggling to survive, languishing in camps and with limited livelihood options. By doing so they would also help alleviate the pressure on poor communities in neighbouring countries that host these refugees. The second imperative is to provide support for the host countries which have very real concerns about resources and services, economic planning and security.

While a smaller programme would no doubt be beneficial to individuals selected, there must be greater pledges to take into account the massive scale of the crisis, and in order to offer anything more than a symbolic assistance to neighbouring countries. Offering protection to 5 percent of the projected refugee population, while still a fraction of the total, would make a significant impact on the ground. Especially if matched with a fully funded aid response, it would help to ease the strain being felt by host governments and host communities in the region.

According to Oxfam's research, rich and developed countries have pledged to host 1 percent of the total number of Syrian refugees registered in neighbouring countries – only one-fifth of the 5 percent recommended by Oxfam.²⁴

Figure 2: Refugees: summary of fair share analysis findings, as of 1 September 2014

Country	Pledges: ²⁵ refugee places by end of 2015	Fair share	% of fair share contributed
Australia	4064.0	3937.7	103%
Austria	1500.0	1495.5	100%
Belgium	150.0	1780.2	8%
Canada	200.0	5950.0	3%
Czech Republic	0.0	1042.5	0%
Denmark	140.0	970.3	14%
Finland	500.0	838.0	60%
France	500.0	9674.8	5%
Germany	26400.0	13752.5	192%
Greece	0.0	1150.7	0%
Iceland	0.0	44.1	0%
Ireland	345.0	661.6	52%
Italy	0.0	8026.9	0%
Japan	0.0	18563.8	0%
Korea, Republic of	0.0	6210.7	0%
Luxembourg	60.0	140.3	43 %
Netherlands	250.0	2930.9	9%
New Zealand	100	529.2	19%
Norway	1000.0	1347.2	74%
Poland	0.0	3271.7	0%
Portugal	23.0	1046.5	2%
Russia	0.0	13074.9	0%
Slovakia	0.0	537.3	0%
Spain	0.0	5982.1	0%
Sweden	1200.0	1684.0	71%
Switzerland	500.0	1804.3	28%
United Kingdom	500.0	9350.1	5%
United States	0.0	63702.3	0%
TOTAL	37,432	179500	

Key

>90% fair share contributed
50–90% contributed
<50% contributed

Note: The USA has not indicated an upper limit on the numbers of Syrians it will accept through its resettlement programme, but has not made any specific pledges to date. The US is the world's largest resettlement country, with an annual ceiling of approximately 70,000 refugees in recent years.

The UK has said that it will take 'several hundred' refugees under a humanitarian admissions programme, which Oxfam has represented as 500 in its chart.

To reach the 5 percent Oxfam is calling for, governments should increase their quota for Syrian refugees and consider specific programmes of humanitarian admission. Moreover, resettlement for Syrians should not result in the denial of places for Somalis, Afghans, Iraqis, Congolese or refugees from any other countries.²⁶

Germany, Austria and Australia are the only wealthy countries from the group of countries sampled to have pledged more than their fair share. Germany is committed to offering

a haven to 26,400 refugees from Syria, an example other countries should follow. Ten countries surveyed have not made any pledges at all.

Box 3: Seeking asylum: a right, not a privilege

People have a right to flee to safety across international borders, and states are obliged to allow people to claim asylum in their countries, regardless of their race, religion, gender or national identity. Since states have specific obligations concerning the processing of asylum claims and affording rights to refugees under international law, asylum numbers and policies are beyond the scope of this briefing.

The increase in the number of Syrians attempting to claim asylum beyond neighbouring countries has been accompanied by more reports of refugees making risky passage across the seas, and of detention and ill-treatment of asylum seekers on arrival.²⁷ This situation will only worsen if circumstances do not change and refugees become more and more desperate.

Pledges into action

The United States has not set an upper limit on the number of refugees from Syria that it would accept through a resettlement programme, but between April 2011 and 31 July 2014, only 145 Syrians had been relocated to the country. Indeed, three years into this conflict, only 5,000 refugees have been relocated to third countries through resettlement or humanitarian admission programmes facilitated by the office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).²⁸ Significant increases in pledges from developed countries would need to be accompanied by the mechanisms to carry out these programmes responsibly, through (among other measures) effective support to the UNHCR, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and other UN agencies, and close coordination with neighbouring countries.

Importantly, those who relocate to a third country must have the full support of the host government and protections under the law. Furthermore, the selection of refugees for resettlement and humanitarian admission programmes must be based on vulnerability, not other criteria such as level of education, wealth or HIV status. Some governments have attached criteria relating to ethnicity and religion to their admission programmes, including Austria, which has been generous with pledges but has stipulated that a certain number must be Syrian Christian.²⁹

In addition to offering refuge to a fair number of the most vulnerable, governments could also consider innovative ways to support refugees from Syria to secure legal residence through other means, such as providing Syrian graduates with visas to study in their countries, as Portugal has made available to 42 students. Switzerland (3,750), Sweden (2,837) and Saudi Arabia have relocated several thousand refugees through generous family reunification policies. Ireland is also processing family reunification requests made through a special programme.

Another option for policymakers is to extend work visas to refugees, provided they are afforded adequate protections and support on arrival. Many refugees from Syria are well educated, skilled and have much to offer host countries, although refugees should not primarily be treated as an asset for host countries which might benefit from the influx of qualified immigrants.

Box 4: 'A bomb flattened our brand new home'³⁰

'To reach the Jordanian border, we walked for more than an hour at night. I was holding my two-month-old son tightly, my heart pounding with fear. When I got to the crossing, I couldn't find my husband and four daughters. Then gunfire erupted behind me. I thought I lost them. Those were the most terrifying minutes of my life'.

Ghossoun, 38, a school teacher, remembers her family's escape from Syria as she sits on a mattress in Jordan, where they sought refuge a year-and-a-half ago. She has six children, aged from four months to 12 years.

Her husband Samer, 39, an agronomy specialist, recalls the deterioration of the security situation in Daraa, southwest Syria, and the moment in early 2013 when the shelling became unbearable. 'We fled under a heavy downpour of rain'.

As they moved from village to village to reach Jordan without attracting the soldiers' attention, they left their belongings along the way. When they finally reached Amman, they rented a run-down two-room flat for 150 Jordanian Dinars (JOD) a month (\$210), and survived on day jobs that Samer managed to find from time to time, in addition to receiving humanitarian aid.

Ghossoun's brother took the difficult decision to pay a smuggler 3,000 JOD (more than \$4,000) to make the dangerous trip to Sweden via Algeria and Libya. From there he crossed the Mediterranean on a small boat to Italy. 'Even if we wanted to, we couldn't take that dangerous journey. Where would we get the money from?' Ghossoun asks, cradling Rita, her four-month-old daughter.

4 NO ARMS FOR ATROCITIES

*It is essential to stem the flow of arms pouring into the country. It is irresponsible for foreign powers and groups to give continued military support to parties in Syria that are committing atrocities and flagrantly violating international principles of human rights and international law.*³¹

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, 20 June 2014

The massive humanitarian catastrophe that continues to engulf Syria is fuelled by Kalashnikovs, bombs and missiles, and by the widespread and systematic violation of humanitarian law. Weapons continue to be transferred to parties which have been known to commit such violations, and the risk of diversion is very high. States have an obligation to ensure that arms and ammunition supplied by them are not used to commit violations of international humanitarian law and human rights, in line with the principles of the recently agreed Arms Trade Treaty.³² The withholding of arms and ammunition from parties which are known to commit such violations is one of the clearest ways that supporters of the opposing sides can signal that egregious conduct of the conflict will not be tolerated.

Some governments argue that arms and ammunition transfers may 'level the playing field', create more 'favourable' battlefield realities, or enable a decisive victory. Yet in reality, the continued supplies of arms, spare parts and ammunition are undermining the prospects of a political solution to the crisis, encouraging both parties to hold on to the prospect of a military victory. During the week of the Geneva II peace talks in early 2014, the Russian government transferred a consignment of weapons to the Syrian authorities, thereby undermining its own diplomatic efforts to persuade the parties to agree a process to end the crisis.³³ A total cessation of arms transfers would send an unequivocal message to the warring parties that a political solution must be actively pursued.

A handful of governments in the region, as well as certain permanent members of the UN Security Council, are providing weapons to parties in Syria, and a number of other countries have ambiguous policies in this respect. Some of those providing the least aid, such as Russia, are providing the greatest amount of military hardware. The gulf countries demonstrate varied degrees of commitment to the humanitarian response, yet are the major financers of arms and ammunition transfers to the opposition, in coordination with, among others, the United States.³⁴

'When we first started demonstrating, soldiers would use stun grenades. Then they moved to Kalashnikovs with live ammunition, until one day they used a T52 tank against the crowds of unarmed civilians. By then, we had stopped holding individual burials and were putting our relatives and friends in mass graves.'

Amjad, 27, from Daraa

Figure 3: Policies and practice on arms to Syria, as of 1 September 2014

Policy/practice on arms to Syria		
Australia		Considers that transfers to Syria would be illegal under Australian law
Austria		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Belgium		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Brazil		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Canada		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
China		Historic supplier of arms and ammunition to the Syrian government. Chinese arms have found their way to opposition groups via Sudan, although not directly supplied by China.
Czech Republic		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Denmark		While not transferring arms, statements by government officials have indicated 'openness' to doing so
Finland		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
France		France has transferred arms and ammunition to Free Syrian Army
Germany		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Greece		Greek policy is unclear, although Greek authorities have seized arms shipments headed for Syria
Iceland		No clear policy
India		No clear stated policy position on transfers. Official press statements indicate opposition to militarization.
Iran		According to multiple reports, Iran has provided consistent and significant military support to the government of Syria.
Ireland		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Italy		Supported lifting EU arms embargo.
Japan		No clear statement, but until earlier in 2014, Japan had a self-imposed ban on arms exports of any kind.
Jordan		No clear policy, reports of transfers through territory
Korea, Republic of		No clear policy, but in 2011 seized a shipment of missile parts headed to Syrian government from N Korea
Kuwait		An ambivalent position on arming Syrian opposition groups; has not placed sufficient restrictions on citizens to send funds to purchase arms and ammunition.
Lebanon		No clear policy
Luxembourg		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Netherlands		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
New Zealand		All transfers subject to stringent controls, in line with new Arms Trade Treaty
Norway		Norway has not taken a clear position on the arming of Syria's rebels, although it stresses the need for protection of civilians, including from explosive weapons and its support for the chemical weapons disarmament effort.
Poland		Was strongly opposed to lifting EU arms embargo
Portugal		Supported UK and France on lifting of EU arms embargo
Qatar		According to multiple reports has been providing arms and ammunition to opposition groups
Russia		Major supplier of arms and ammunition to the government of Syria
Saudi Arabia		According to multiple reports has been providing arms and ammunition to opposition groups, stated policy of providing arms to Free Syrian Army
Slovakia		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
South Africa		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Spain		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Sweden		Against all transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria
Switzerland		Against all arms and ammunition transfers to Syria
Turkey		Transfers through Turkish territory and reports of support to opposition groups
United Arab Emirates		UAE does not have a clearly stated policy, but cooperated with Swiss investigation when Swiss grenades exported to UAE were filmed with Syrian opposition groups in 2012
United Kingdom		Despite advocating for the lifting of the EU arms embargo, the UK has only supplied non-lethal equipment, assistance, and training to the Syrian opposition. However, it does not rule out supplies of arms in future.
United States		Policy is to transfer arms and ammunition to vetted opposition groups

Sources: SIPRI, Stratfor, *New York Times*, Reuters, PBS, *Washington Post*, Bloomberg, CNN, government statements, *Chinese Journal of International Law*, Andalou Agency, Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya, UN Panel of Experts reports.

Limitations of methodology/analysis

By assessing whether states have a clear policy against, are ambiguous toward, or are active in arming parties to the conflict, Oxfam has determined their commitment to preventing violations committed using arms and ammunition. The analysis provides only a partial picture, however, as some parties have used arms to systematically violate rights, and some donors have been more cautious in the support they give to armed parties. It can also give an indication of the extent to which members of the international community favour a political resolution of the crisis, although other factors – such as their diplomatic efforts to resume the Geneva process – must also be taken into account.

In addition, given the secretive and often shadowy nature of arms transfers and the fact that governments do not often publicize their policies and certainly not their practices, Oxfam has relied on reports by credible international and regional news organizations such as the *New York Times*, reputable independent organizations such as the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) or academic publications.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This briefing has shown that there is only 43.6 percent of the funding needed for an adequate aid response to the Syrian crisis and that governments have only committed to offer safe haven to 37,432 of the three million refugees registered in neighbouring countries. At the same time, the international community has failed to agree that there should be a halt to the transfers of arms and ammunition that are fuelling violations and the conflict itself. Oxfam recommends:

1. DAC donors, Gulf countries and Russia should adequately fund the humanitarian response, ensure those who need it can access aid, and offer support to host governments to meet humanitarian needs. To do so they must:
 - a. provide their fair share of funding and ensure that pledges made are delivered through flexible mechanisms to allow programme implementation by multiple actors, including governments, the UN, INGOs and national organizations;
 - b. provide increased development financing to neighbouring countries, both bilaterally and through international financial institutions, for infrastructural improvements (to the water system, for instance) and support for education and health sectors, in order to ensure that both host communities and refugees can access basic services;
 - c. work with the Lebanese, Jordanian, Turkish and Iraqi authorities to ensure that the humanitarian response and economic aid packages help the prospects of both refugees and poor communities in these countries to have income-generating opportunities.
2. All members of the international community should ensure that those in need can access safety and assistance and live in dignity. In particular, members of the UN Security Council should use their influence to ensure the implementation of the Security Council Resolutions 2139 and 2165 on humanitarian aid by all parties to the conflict in Syria.
3. Neighbouring countries should ensure that all those affected by the conflict in Syria can flee, regardless of their nationality, gender, political affiliation or other potentially discriminatory forms of identification.
4. Rich and developed countries, in particular those which have signed the 1951 Refugee Convention, should commit to offering effective international protection to a fair share of Syrian refugees. To achieve this they should:
 - a. either initiate or rapidly expand resettlement programmes through the UNHCR and set up specific humanitarian admission programmes for Syrian refugees, in addition to pledging to accept their fair share of refugees by the end of 2014; this should be part of a global effort to increase the capacity of the UNHCR-facilitated resettlement programme;
 - b. base resettlement and humanitarian protection programmes on vulnerability alone;
 - c. ensure that those resettled or offered protection are given adequate and

ongoing support to integrate into the receiving country. Particular services need to be offered to survivors of sexual violence and other human rights violations;

d. offer support to host governments in the region, the UNHCR, IOM and other UN agencies and INGOs to scale up resettlement programmes;

e. governments should look for innovative ways to give extra support to refugees from Syria, and access to different avenues for legal residence, such as through offering university places, work permits and family reunification, while offering them full protections in line with the 1951 Refugee Convention. This includes governments, such as Gulf countries, that have the resources to offer international protection to Syrians but have yet to sign the Convention.

5. The international community should show practical commitment to ending violations of international humanitarian and human rights law in Syria, and support for a negotiated end to the crisis by:

a. halting transfers of arms and ammunition to Syria, including through the imposition of a UN Security Council arms embargo;

b. bringing all possible political pressure to bear on those who are continuing to supply arms to stop transfers immediately, and suspending all defence and military cooperation programmes with countries supplying belligerents;

c. reconvening talks for a political solution to the crisis as a matter of urgency. There must be adequate and effective participation of women and Syrian civil society in any such process, in line with UNSCR 2139.

NOTES

All websites last accessed in August 2014, unless otherwise stated.

- 1 'As Syrian Refugees Develop Roots, Jordan Grows Wary', New York Times, 5 October 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/06/world/middleeast/as-syrian-refugees-develop-roots-jordan-grows-wary.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0
- 2 Interview with Oxfam staff, October 2013.
- 3 This does not include numbers granted asylum in either neighbouring countries or elsewhere, as states have specific obligations related to individuals who arrive in their territory seeking asylum.
- 4 For further details of Oxfam's humanitarian response to the crisis see <http://www.oxfam.org/en/emergencies/crisis-syria>
- 5 As of 1 September 2014.
- 6 WFP (2013) Syria Crisis Response, Situation Update, 24 October–5 November, <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/WFP%20Syria%20and%20Regional%20Situation%20Update,%2024%20Oct%20-5%20Nov%202013.pdf>
- 7 Survey on the livelihoods of Syrian refugees in Lebanon, conducted by the Beirut Research and Information Center for Oxfam, <http://www.oxfam.org/en/policy/survey-livelihoods-syrian-refugees-lebanon>
- 8 UNHCR Regional Refugee Response Plan, Mid-Year Update, Lebanon, p. 8, <http://www.unhcr.org/syriarrp6/midyear/docs/syria-rp6-myu-lebanon.pdf>
- 9 For further details of how Oxfam calculated each country's fair share in relation to the Syria crisis, see this background: http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/oxfam-fair-share-analysis-un-syria_appeal-17sept2013.pdf
- 10 The World Bank defines high-income countries as those with a GNI per capita of over USD\$12,480 in 2012.
- 11 DAC countries are allocated 60% of total need and non-DAC (including host countries) are allocated 35%. Five percent is left unallocated to account for other funding, including from middle- and low-income non-DAC countries and private donors.
- 12 In calculating the overall amount required, Oxfam included appeals from the governments of Lebanon and Jordan which were published at a donor conference in Kuwait in January 2014, and updated numbers from UN appeals. This explains why the overall amount is different to that published in January 2014 by Oxfam.
- 13 CERF funding is estimated based on the percentage of funding to CERF from each country in 2012. This percentage is then applied to the total CERF commitments to the Syria response for 2014. As of 1 September, CERF funding for the Syria response was USD \$0. For country contributions to CERF, see <http://www.unocha.org/cerf/our-donors/funding>
- 14 Countries' share of ECHO funding was calculated on the basis of each member state's contribution to the total ECHO budget in 2011. Data for contributions by country is available at http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/2011/2011_en.cfm.
- 15 Combined DAC and high-income non-DAC fair share is set at 95% of total need. The list of countries presented here does not represent all the countries included in the analysis, and as a result the total figure is greater than the sum of the fair share for the countries listed.
- 16 In some cases the delay in transfer of funds is beyond donor countries' control, including contractual challenges not of their making. For example, Irish Aid has transferred funding to Oxfam Ireland for a project but authorization for implementation has not yet been agreed with national authorities.
- 17 This briefing does not cover non-earmarked contributions. Many governments, such as the Netherlands, make generous annual contributions to the UN and ICRC that are not specifically for the Syria response and are therefore not covered by this analysis.
- 18 World Bank: Lebanon: Economic and Social Impact of the Syrian Conflict, Sept 2013, <http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/MNA/LBN-ESIA%20of%20Syrian%20Conflict-%20EX%20SUMMARY%20ENGLISH.pdf>
- 19 Communication between the Government of Turkey and Oxfam, August 2014.
- 20 World Bank, op. cit.
- 21 UNHCR, 2014 Syria Regional Response Plan, Mid-Year Update, <http://www.unhcr.org/syriarrp6/midyear/docs/syria-rp6-myu-strategic-overview.pdf>
- 22 Interview by Oxfam staff, Beirut, Lebanon. August 2014.
- 23 Members of the OECD DAC. Russia is also included in the analysis given the size of its economy, its economic support to the Syrian government and historic ties with the country. The calculation of their fair share of 5% of the projected refugee population (according to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR], 3.59 million by the end of the year) is based upon each state's GNI. There is no

international guideline or standard for refugee resettlement. This percentage is a measure Oxfam has developed for this briefing.

- 24 Oxfam calculated this percentage on pledges made through the UNHCR resettlement scheme as well as public information related to humanitarian admission programmes. The figures for some are unclear. For example, while the United States has not specified an upper limit, specific pledges remain zero. The UK has said that it will take 'several hundred' refugees under a humanitarian admissions programme, which Oxfam has represented as 500 in its chart.
- 25 These pledges have in some cases already led to relocation of refugees.
- 26 Current capacity for refugee resettlement globally stands at 80,000 refugees annually; see: <http://www.unhcr.org/5006a6aa9.html>. Three countries – the United States, Canada and Australia – provide 90% of existing global resettlement places through UNHCR's programme. Some new countries are becoming resettlement countries – including Hungary, Japan and Germany – but take time to build their capacity to do so properly. This does not include specific humanitarian admission programmes. Two non-DAC countries that have pledged refugee resettlement places – Hungary and Uruguay – are not included in this report.
- 27 UNHCR (2014) 'Syrian Refugees in Europe: What Europe Can Do to Ensure Protection and Solidarity', 11 July 2014, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/53b69f574.html> According to the UNHCR, 123,600 Syrians have sought asylum in 'EU+' countries (the 28 EU member states plus Switzerland, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein).
- 28 Email from UNHCR, 8 August 2014.
- 29 'Austria expands the humanitarian admission programme from 500 to 1500 Syrian refugees', <http://www.resettlement.eu/news/austria-expands-humanitarian-admission-programme-500-1500-syrian-refugees>
- 30 Interview by Oxfam staff, Zaatari refugee camp, Jordan, August 2014.
- 31 An extract from Ban Ki-moon's address, delivered at Asia Society in New York on Friday, June 20, 2014 'Crisis in Syria: Civil War, Global Threat'. The complete transcript is available on the Asia Society website: <http://asiasociety.org/blog/asia/complete-text-ban-ki-moons-address-crisis-syria-civil-war-global-threat>
- 32 Oxfam, as part of the Control Arms Coalition, has long campaigned for more effective controls on arms transfers which drive humanitarian crises and fuel violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. On 2 April 2013 the UN General Assembly adopted the landmark Arms Trade Treaty, regulating the trade in conventional weapons and ammunition.
- 33 Jonathan Saul (2014) 'Russia steps up military lifeline to Syria's Assad – sources', Reuters, 17 January, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/01/17/us-syria-russia-arms-idUSBREA0G0MN20140117>
- 34 See for example 'Arms Airlift to Syria Rebels Expands, With Aid From C.I.A.', *New York Times*: <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/25/world/middleeast/arms-airlift-to-syrian-rebels-expands-with-cia-aid.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>

© Oxfam International September 2014

This paper was written by Daniel Gorevan. Oxfam acknowledges the assistance of Abigael Baldoumas, Joelle Bassoul, Martin Butcher, Steph Cousins, Camilla Jelbart-Mosse, Alexandra Saieh, Karl Schembri, Nicolas Seely and colleagues across the Oxfam confederation in its production. 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 e-mail 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. E-mail 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 978-1-78077-695-8 in September 2014.

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 17 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:

Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)
Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)
Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)
Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)
Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)
Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)
Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)
Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)
Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)
Oxfam Intermón (Spain) (www.oxfamintermon.org)
Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)
Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)
Oxfam Japan (www.oxfam.jp)
Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)
Oxfam New Zealand (www.oxfam.org.nz)
Oxfam Novib (Netherlands) (www.oxfamnovib.nl)
Oxfam Québec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)

Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org.

www.oxfam.org



OXFAM