HUMANITARIAN FINANCING

Sudan’s response plan is half funded. Essential services remain at risk.

Last updated 2026-11-11 | Version 2

Scope: Sudan; country financing and the 2026 Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan

Evidence: OCHA FTS snapshot, 11 November 2026; UN operational reporting, 6 November 2026

https://salientone.eu/humanitarian/insights/sudan-humanitarian-funding-2026-response-gap/

The central finding

Sudan’s 2026 Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan has US$1.45 billion in reported funding against US$2.87 billion in requirements: 50.4% coverage as of 11 November. That leaves US$1.42 billion unfunded. The financing position remains fragile because reported commitments are not the same as payments, funding is concentrated among a few named sources, and resources available nationally do not establish that essential supplies reach each affected community. Recent UN reporting on depleted shelter stocks shows why the funding percentage must be read alongside actual service availability.

Main findings

- The plan’s 50.4% financial coverage does not mean half of people’s needs have been met. Requirements, funded activities and assistance received are different measures.

- The US government, UK government and ECHO together account for 56.8% of the broader US$1.56 billion Sudan country total. This concentration does not establish that any of them plans to reduce funding.

- US$253.4 million of that country total remains recorded as commitments. Payment timing and the ability to turn resources into supplies matter alongside the amount reported.

Evidence and reporting periods

50.4% | Funding coverage of the Sudan 2026 response plan

FTS snapshot, 11 November 2026. US$1.445 billion divided by current plan requirements of US$2.866 billion. Includes reported paid funding and commitments; excludes pledges.

Sudan's humanitarian funding gap

US$1.42 billion | Unfunded requirements in the response plan

FTS and HPC snapshot, 11 November 2026. Current requirements minus reported plan funding. This is a financial gap, not a count of people without assistance.

US$1.56 billion | Broader reported humanitarian funding for Sudan

FTS country boundary for 2026, retrieved 11 November 2026. Country-level incoming funding, including funding outside the response plan. Do not add it to the plan total.

56.8% | Share of country funding from the US government, UK government and ECHO

FTS country boundary for 2026, retrieved 11 November 2026. Based on the three separately identified funders in FTS. Other institutions are reported separately, so these are not consolidated national contributions.

A large financing gap remains late in the plan year

The OCHA Financial Tracking Service reports US$1,445,445,408 in incoming funding for the Sudan Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan 2026. The HPC plan record gives current requirements of US$2,866,228,593. The resulting funding coverage is 50.4%, with US$1,420,783,185 still unfunded. These are the values retrieved on 11 November 2026; they are a dated reporting snapshot and may change as contributions are reported or revised.

Salient One analysis

A gap of this scale means the published plan cannot be financed in full from the resources currently recorded. It does not identify which locations, activities or households bear the shortfall. Some services may be substantially funded while others face interruption. Nor does a financial coverage ratio measure whether assistance is sufficient, sustained or accessible to the people who need it.

The denominator matters. Coverage is measured against this plan's requirements, not against every humanitarian need in Sudan. If requirements are revised, the percentage can change without an equivalent change in funding. Equally, additional financing can improve the percentage without resolving access restrictions or restoring a service that has already closed.

Country funding and plan funding answer different questions

The broader Sudan country query returns US$1,559,151,227 in incoming funding for the 2026 reporting boundary. It includes funding associated with the response plan and other reported humanitarian financing. The country and plan totals therefore overlap and must not be added. The country query also records US$6,611,395 in pledges separately from funded contributions.

Salient One analysis

The country total describes reported financing associated with Sudan; the plan ratio describes financing against a defined collective appeal. Using the larger country total as the numerator of the plan's funding percentage would imply that all of those resources finance the plan. That is not what the two queries establish.

The reporting year also differs from the budget year attached to an individual contribution. The Sudan extract includes contributions with earlier budget years and records without a budget year. It

is therefore not a measure of entirely new donor decisions made during 2026. No year-on-year growth rate is inferred from this snapshot.

Three funders account for more than half of country funding

The US government accounts for US$500.0 million of the country total, the UK government for US$219.5 million, and the European Commission's humanitarian aid department (ECHO) for US$165.9 million. Together, they provide US$885.4 million, or 56.8% of the US$1.559 billion total. FTS lists some institutions separately, so these figures are not consolidated national contributions.

Salient One analysis

This concentration makes the continuity of a small number of funding relationships consequential. A delay or reduction affecting one large source could be difficult to replace quickly. The data do not show that such a reduction is planned, or that the three sources will act together. Concentration is an exposure in the current financing structure, not evidence of future withdrawal.

The distinction between an original donor and an intermediary is also important. A source organisation can itself be a fund or an organisation passing resources onwards. Counting source names does not establish the number of independent donors behind the response, and grouping every institution with a similar name can conceal different financing arrangements.

Commitments need to become usable resources in time

Of the country total, US$1,305,747,634 is recorded as paid and US$253,403,593 as commitments. Commitments account for 16.3% of reported funding. The separately recorded pledges are excluded from both amounts. The total includes US$37.9 million in reported in-kind contributions, so it is not all cash. These statuses describe the contribution records; even paid contributions do not establish that supplies have been purchased, delivered or received by affected people.

Salient One analysis

An organisation with a signed commitment may be able to plan or pre-finance activities, depending on its agreements and reserves. Another may have to wait for payment. The commitment share alone cannot establish arrears or a payment failure, because the extract does not provide the contractual due dates needed for that judgement.

For time-sensitive assistance, however, the distinction is operationally important. Procurement, transport and distribution take time. A contribution that arrives after a critical delivery window may improve the annual funding total without preventing an earlier interruption. The relevant concern is the relationship between payment schedules, available stocks and when people need assistance.

Shelter reporting shows the limits of the national total

At the UN Geneva briefing on 6 November, UNHCR reported that the collective shelter response required US$179 million and was 35% funded. IOM described depleted stocks and an urgent need for flexible funding. The briefing also described insecurity and logistical constraints affecting

delivery. These are operational statements from 6 November, not sector estimates recalculated from the 11 November FTS extract.

Salient One analysis

That evidence explains how a response plan can be around half funded while an essential service faces acute shortages. National financing aggregates together resources assigned to different purposes, organisations and places. A funded activity elsewhere does not automatically replenish shelter supplies. Flexible funding can help address such mismatches, but its practical effect depends on allocation authority, supply availability and safe delivery.

Money is not the only constraint. The same briefing described attacks on relief transport, while IOM also reported improved access to some communities. More funding cannot by itself secure a route. Improved access cannot maintain assistance if stocks are exhausted. These constraints need to be considered together rather than attributing every interruption to a single cause.

Pooled funding is a channel, not an additional layer of resources

The Sudan Humanitarian Fund is the named destination for US$484.9 million, or 31.1%, of the country's incoming funding in this extract. That identifies a recipient channel. It does not establish how much has subsequently been allocated, paid to implementing partners or spent. The extract also contains 217 internal flows, which are excluded from the incoming funding total.

Salient One analysis

Pooled arrangements can provide a way to direct contributions towards collectively identified priorities. Their relevance depends on subsequent allocation and delivery, not just incoming receipts. Adding transfers from a fund to the contributions that financed it can count the same resources more than once. Nor can a recipient list show the eventual share reaching local organisations without tracing onward funding and its terms.

What would indicate a stronger response

Salient One analysis

A stronger financing position would combine a smaller plan gap with resources arriving in time for essential services. For the shelter response, evidence of replenished stocks and sustained distributions would be more informative than an improved national percentage alone. For affected communities, the test is whether assistance becomes reliably available, sufficient and responsive to their priorities.

The immediate analytical priority is to connect financing to continuity: which essential services face interruption, which commitments are scheduled to be paid, and whether resources can reach the places where assistance is needed. The present evidence supports concern about the remaining gap, concentration and supply constraints. It does not support a forecast of donor cuts, a national estimate of people reached, or a claim that every unpaid commitment is overdue.

Sudan's humanitarian funding gap

How to read this snapshot

The country analysis covers all 999 records returned across ten API pages on 11 November 2026. The 744 incoming records marked single and recorded as paid or commitment sum exactly to the API's US$1,559,151,227 incoming funding total. Shared-boundary records and internal transfers are excluded from that calculation. Source organisations are grouped by the full combination recorded on each flow, so a jointly attributed contribution is not counted once for each organisation.

FTS is a reported financing record, not an expenditure audit or a direct observation of assistance. Reporting updates can change the snapshot. The plan and country queries have different scopes; amounts are in current US dollars as returned by the API. The calculations do not estimate unmet needs outside the plan, compare donor generosity, or attribute humanitarian outcomes to particular contributions.

Sources and evidence notes

OCHA FTS: Sudan Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan 2026 funding

Retrieved 11 November 2026, 11:34 UTC; 2026 plan reporting boundary

data.incoming.fundingTotal = 1,445,445,408 USD; pledgeTotal = 6,611,395 USD. Coverage calculation also uses the current requirements in the HPC plan record below.

Used for: Figure: Funding coverage of the Sudan 2026 response plan; A large financing gap remains late in the plan year; Country funding and plan funding answer different questions; How to read this snapshot

https://api.hpc.tools/v1/public/fts/flow?year=2026&planId=1514&limit=1&page=1

OCHA HPC: Sudan Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan 2026 requirements

Retrieved 11 November 2026; plan period 1 January-31 December 2026

Plan ID 1514; revisedRequirements = 2,866,228,593 USD. Funding coverage = 1,445,445,408 / 2,866,228,593; gap = 2,866,228,593 minus 1,445,445,408.

Used for: Figure: Unfunded requirements in the response plan; A large financing gap remains late in the plan year

https://api.hpc.tools/v1/public/plan/code/HSDN26

Sudan’s humanitarian funding gap

OCHA FTS: Sudan country funding flows for the 2026 reporting boundary

Full ten-page extract retrieved 11 November 2026, 11:33-11:34 UTC; 999 unique flow IDs

Follow meta.nextLink for the complete extract. Country calculations select boundary=incoming, onBoundary=single and status=paid or commitment: 744 flows, 1,559,151,227 USD. Paid: 1,305,747,634; commitment: 253,403,593. Three named sources: 500,031,802 + 219,536,378 + 165,864,404 = 885,432,584 USD (56.8%). Sudan Humanitarian Fund destination: 484,868,313 USD (31.1%). Shared incoming and internal amounts are not added; organisation combinations remain distinct. Included in-kind contributions: 37,872,970 USD; total is not all cash. Exact FTS names for the three funders: United States of America, Government of; United Kingdom, Government of; European Commission's Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department.

Used for: Figure: Broader reported humanitarian funding for Sudan; Figure: Share of country funding from the US government, UK government and ECHO; Country funding and plan funding answer different questions; Three funders account for more than half of country funding; Commitments need to become usable resources in time; Pooled funding is a channel, not an additional layer of resources; How to read this snapshot

https://api.hpc.tools/v1/public/fts/flow?year=2026&countryISO3=SDN&limit=100&page=1

United Nations Office at Geneva: Sudan shelter response briefing

6 November 2026; statements by UNHCR and IOM representatives in Sudan

Opening Sudan section: UNHCR’s US$179 million collective shelter requirement and 35% funding; IOM’s statements on depleted stocks, access and flexible funding. The sector statement has a different reporting date and scope from the national FTS snapshot.

Used for: Shelter reporting shows the limits of the national total

https://www.unognewsroom.org/story/en/3316/un-geneva-press-briefing-06-november-2026/9864

OCHA HPC public API documentation: the FTS flow model

Documentation accessed 11 November 2026

Summary and FTS flow endpoint: incoming, internal and outgoing flows are defined relative to a query boundary. The response supplies aggregate funding and pledges separately.

Used for: How to read this snapshot

https://api.hpc.tools/docs/v1/

Reported facts are attributed to the sources above. Salient One analysis is the publisher’s interpretation and conditional reasoning. This report is desk analysis, not direct field reporting or live operational reporting.