# Analysis of factors causing a decline in regular resources (“core”)

# Introduction

In the multilateral system, regular resources or “core” has always been the most indispensable and flexible funding source that ensures the independence, effectiveness, and resiliency of development agencies. This form of voluntary funding represents an expression of trust and investment by contributing partners to agencies. Recent trends, however, have shown a decline in the volume and proportion of core funding within agencies' overall resource allocation. Project-specific and earmarked funding practices, which have increasingly been supported by many donor countries, are leaving agencies with limited flexibility to address complex and multifaceted development issues.

The imbalance in core and non-core funding is more pronounced in the UN development system. Compared to other multilateral institutions, the UN development system receives most of its funding as earmarked contributions. The trend to earmark contributions to the UNDS has steadily grown since the early 2000s, reaching a striking 83% of all revenues in 2020 (a higher share than the 62% seen for the total UN system)[[1]](#footnote-2). Since UN organizations were designed to operate with core funding support, such high levels of earmarking “create high transaction costs, drives fragmentation, makes the UN less strategic and impactful, and damages the multilateralism that should carry the UN and its development work”.[[2]](#footnote-3)

Over the last two decades, Member States and UN organizations have been raising the alarm on this perilous trend in core funding, resulting in the Funding Compact as a concrete effort to address the imbalance. The Compact’s rationale relies on reciprocity between the UNDS and Member States: while the UNDS commits to improving its accountability, efficiency, and coherence, Member States commit to earmark a smaller share of their funding. Despite these efforts, however, the trend of declining core and increased earmarking has not been reversed. This paper responds to a call by Member States to conduct a detailed analysis of the factors contributing to the decline of core resources and the potential implications on the ability of UNDP to deliver on its Strategic Plan, 2022-2025, and identify measures to address this, which should be taken by UNDP and considered by Member States.

# The trend of core funding to UNDP

UNDP has enjoyed long-standing and broad support from its core contributing partners. From 1992 to 2022, funding to UNDP has grown from US$1.6 billion in 1992 to US$4.8 billion in 2022 (as shown in Figure 1). Prior to 1996, UNDP received more core than non-core funding. Following the Rio Conference and the establishment of environment-related vertical funds, and combined with the growing preference for earmarking, UNDP’s non-core funding climbed while core volumes stagnated. In 1992, core made up 75% of UNDP’s total funding. Since then, the share of core funding has been on a decline reaching a meager 12% in 2022.

**Figure 1**

Looking more closely at the declining core trend, a cyclical pattern can be seen in Figure 2. In the eight years between 1992 and 2000, the volume of core funding revealed a negative growth, followed by a reversal and positive trend in the next eight years (from 2000 to 2008). Since the global financial crisis of 2008/9, core funding went into another cycle of decline, and for the first time, falling below the US$600 million mark in 2022.

**Figure 2**

# Analysis of factors contributing to the decline in Core Funding

This section attempts to identify the factors behind the funding patterns observed over the last three decades. The “Fishbone” or Ishikawa Diagram, illustrated in Figure 3, is used to identify and understand the underlying causes behind the decline in core funding. The method is based on the idea that a problem or effect can be broken down into its individual causes, which can be grouped into broader categories – political, economic, policy, systemic, institutional, etc.

**Figure 3**
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1) Political Factors:

Donor countries' changing political priorities influence their decisions to allocate core funding. Domestic concerns, national security issues, or domestic political dynamics lead to a re-evaluation of international development as a priority area. Changes in focus, political leadership, or ideology in donor countries impact aid policies and funding priorities.

Deciding to contribute core funding requires significant political considerations on the part of governments. One of the main considerations is political accountability towards their constituency. An often-heard argument in the aid arena is that donor governments prefer earmarked funding, to the detriment of core, because it is easier to justify to their constituencies that taxpayers’ money is being spent on a specific project/country, aligned with their international agenda or national priorities. On the contrary, an investment in an organization’s general mandate to achieve “longer-term, more systematic, complex and harder to measure results”, is much more difficult to convey to constituencies.[[3]](#footnote-4)

The political dynamics among institutions that oversee ODA also affect how core funding is allocated. While several line ministries are responsible for disbursing ODA, often UN agencies receive core resources from a single ministry (most often the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), while others provide earmarked funding. In addition, it has been found that “the recent phenomenon of amalgamation of previously independent national development agencies into line Ministries has also contributed to the shift toward more earmarked funding”[[4]](#footnote-5). OECD recommends that line ministries, other than those directly responsible for development funding, further understand their responsibility vis-a-vis global sustainable development and the importance of core funding. [[5]](#footnote-6)

While the UNDS remains the largest channel for multilateral aid, compared to other multilateral institutions such as banks and vertical funds, it is the only channel that receives less core resources with majority of the funding earmarked for specific projects. Channeling less core with short-term commitments to the UNDS while maintaining their core contribution levels to other institutions is another political decision taken by many donors.

2) Economic Factors:

Economic conditions in general have a bearing on the volume of aid. ODA commitments are often expressed as a percentage of gross national income (GNI) and since 1970, the 0.7% ODA/GNI target has been repeatedly re-endorsed at the highest level at international aid and development conferences. In 2022, only five DAC members – Denmark, Germany, Luxembourg, Norway, and Sweden – met or exceeded the 0.7% target[[6]](#footnote-7). Even when governments decide to keep their ODA/GNI commitments, a reduced economic output shrinks the amount of ODA, including funding for the multilateral system. Volatility in global financial markets and currency fluctuations affect the value of contributions and impact the purchasing power of aid budgets. For instance, the depreciation of the Euro against the US dollar in 2022 has affected the volume of core contributions to UN agencies, with a significant portion of their core portfolios received in Euros.

Economic downturns, budgetary constraints, or austerity measures in donor countries impact their ability to provide substantial funding for international development. When faced with economic challenges, including rising public debt, rising costs of essential services, or competing policy priorities, donors experience reduced fiscal capacity and tend to prioritize domestic concerns over international assistance resulting in aid budget cuts. Several donors have cited domestic budget constraints as a justification for cutting their core contributions.

Donors’ economic interests and commercial considerations could play a role in their aid policies. Donor countries often align their aid policies with their broader economic objectives, seeking to promote their economic interests while supporting development efforts. For instance, some donors do allocate more aid to their important trading partners[[7]](#footnote-8). Conditionalities also influence the availability and utilization of core funding, as agencies that do not meet the conditions face the possibility of losing financial support, impacting the stability and predictability of core funding for development. Balancing economic interests with development goals and ensuring aid effectiveness remain ongoing challenges in the formulation and implementation of aid policies.

3) Policy Factors:

As donor aid policy priorities change over time, funding priorities also shift affecting the availability, stability, and allocation of core resources. For instance, as media attention and public interest focus on emerging issues such as climate change, humanitarian crises, or security concerns, government policies change as well. Complex and multiple global challenges divert attention and resources away from long-term development. For instance, the ongoing war in Ukraine brought about major changes in ODA allocation and disbursement. OECD-DAC donors spent US$29 billion (14% of total ODA) to address in-donor refugee costs. While some donors like Germany, the Netherlands, Japan, and others mobilized additional budgets to offset in-donor refugee costs, many others decided to utilize resources from their existing ODA budget.

Different governments have differing views on the role of international development and the extent of their financial commitments. Shifting political ideologies can result in funding strategy adjustments, including a reduced emphasis on core funding leading to future funding uncertainty, making it difficult for development agencies to plan and implement long-term initiatives effectively.

Another policy factor is when some governments use earmarking as a strategy to indirectly influence the activities of partner agencies, to align with their own interests. Yet another involves the choice between grants and concessional loans. Although both instruments have their own merits as transfer modalities, funding channeled through loans is not eligible as core resources, impacting agencies that highly depend on core funding.

4) Perception-related Factors:

The influence of public perceptions about foreign aid or the link between aid and security/commercial interests is growing in intensity. In major partner countries, we are witnessing a growing trust deficit and skepticism toward public institutions, foreign aid, and multiculturalism, etc. These factors shape the narrative around aid, the levels, and modalities of delivery, including the share of unearmarked funding to key multilateral institutions. Responding to the growing trust deficit and retreat from multilateral commitments, the UN Secretary-General addressed the UN General Assembly in 2022, remarking that the “lack of trust that poisons every area of global cooperation” is rooted in the “divergence between developed and developing countries – between North and South – between the privileged and the rest” and is becoming more dangerous day by day[[8]](#footnote-9).

There has been growing skepticism and divergence of views among donor countries on the effectiveness of the multilateral system in achieving development goals. This sentiment has led to reduced enthusiasm for sustained core funding, and a preference for more visible, short-term projects that demonstrate immediate impact. Accordingly, some countries reduced their funding or decided to redirect it towards other forms of development cooperation. Several studies show the added value of multilateral aid as compared to bilateral aid such as their global reach, specific sectoral expertise, convening power, and diversity of financing instruments[[9]](#footnote-10). It is critical that DAC countries continue to protect their investment in multilateral ODA while ensuring complementarity with bilateral ODA.

The importance of core funding and its impact on tackling complex development challenges may not always be widely understood or appreciated by policymakers, donors, and the public at large. A lack of awareness about the need for sustained investments in building long-term capacities and addressing systemic issues leads to reduced emphasis on core funding in favor of more targeted and earmarked interventions.

5) System-wide Factors:

With reduced core funding, competition among development agencies has intensified. As agencies vie for project-specific grants, the focus is taken away from trying to secure more flexible resources for long-term development initiatives. Additional funding mechanisms such as pooled and thematic funds may also compete with core funding. In the recent past, several donors have shifted funding from core to thematic and pooled funds.

Another argument is that perceived inefficiencies by implementing organizations force donors to divert funding from core to earmarked, which can be better monitored. In the past, donors have sanctioned underperforming organizations by shifting to earmarked funding or cutting funding outright. However, the reverse effect whereby organizational improvements should lead to more core contributions is not evident. Even if the UNDS appears to be in much better shape than a few decades ago[[10]](#footnote-11), the earmarking of funds has continued to increase unceasingly, seemingly unrewarding organizations for their substantial improvements.[[11]](#footnote-12)

Another key issue is of course the diversification of core donors, or lack of it. Funding for the UNDS remains highly concentrated, with the top 12 countries providing 66% of total UNDS revenue. Seven of the twelve provide 20% or more of their funding through core funding (only Italy and Sweden provide more than 30% in core funding). High dependency on a handful of core donors put the organizations very vulnerable. To diversify the core donor base, UN agencies have expanded their resource mobilization strategies to include non-OECD DAC donors, who largely contribute to assessed core contributions. For example, Brazil, China, Mexico, and Turkey all provided more than half their UNDS funding as core contributions (Saudi Arabia and Qatar are notable exceptions).[[12]](#footnote-13) Despite their efforts, unfortunately, the volume of these core contributions still does not make up for the core reductions by the top OECD DAC donors.

6) Institutional Factors:

Somewhat related to organizational inefficiencies, concerns regarding accountability, reporting, and visibility requirements contribute to donors’ preference for earmarking. In this sense, it is easier for donors to use evidence from reports of individual projects they fund to show parliamentarians and taxpayers the results of their aid. On the contrary, core funding provides less direct visibility. Recognizing this issue, the Grand Bargain specifically called for aid agencies to “increase the visibility of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding, thereby recognizing the contribution made by donors”.[[13]](#footnote-14) In response, many UN agencies have carried out a concerted effort to celebrate their core funding donors (e.g., UNDP’s Partners at Core campaign). However, the increased effort to give donors visibility has not yet translated to increased core contributions for these organizations, suggesting further work and engagement with donors on the type of visibility expected is required. UNDP recognizes this is work in progress and is committed to continuously developing new, better, and more holistic ways of demonstrating impact and providing visibility to core contributions. UNDP’s third and current iteration of the Partners at Core campaign addresses core donor visibility at the country level in a deliberate, concerted effort.

From the turn of the millennium until today, earmarking has grown steadily from 50 to over 83 per cent of UNDS funding in 2020. This trend continued (for the UNDS, far beyond the levels in development banks) despite both UN organizations and Member States sounding the alarm about the detrimental consequences of earmarking. As argued by Baumann, “Once a certain level of earmarking has been reached, the system tips, and a vicious circle starts, whereby earmarking leads to further earmarking. In other words, earmarking becomes a driver of earmarking via unintended systemic effects”[[14]](#footnote-15).

In response to requests from Member States, the UN has made a concerted effort to become more accountable through improved transparency. Most UN funds and programmes now participate in the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and have set up their own transparency portals, significantly improving their aid transparency index. Nevertheless, as argued by Baumman, this has not translated into an increase in flexible funding, since “such transparency on disbursements might not facilitate the kind of accountability for results that donors want”.[[15]](#footnote-16) Therefore, a further conversation on the type of accountability donors need may also be required.

As stated above, earmarking leads to further earmarking. According to interviews with UN officials, quite often programs are designed with an eye toward the policy interests of donors. As a UN veteran put it: “Where it has become clear that donors are willing to fund a particular initiative […], a suitable proposal is sure to follow”.[[16]](#footnote-17) In turn, this creates a supply and demand problem, whereby agencies purposively design projects that donors may fund, rather than pitch their mandate, Strategic Plan objectives, and its wholistic funding needs. As many MOPAN reviews highlight, UN agencies remain too projectized, implementing a multitude of small projects that do not always align with their larger goals. The 2021 MOPAN assessment of UNDP reiterated that: “UNDP’s organizational structure, processes, and people still primarily reflect its traditional roles as a service provider and project implementing agency and are insufficiently aligned with its current multifaceted strategic ambitions and initiatives”.[[17]](#footnote-18) What needs to be clear is that UN agencies are forced to implement such a strategy to compensate for dwindling core resources.

# Implications

The implications of reduced flexible core funding are significant and far-reaching, affecting UNDP’s ability to effectively deliver on its strategic plan and respond to countries’ requests for assistance to pursue the SDGs or to deal with human-made or natural disasters. Among the major implications:

*Undermining the drive to end extreme poverty and promote sustainable development*

Core funding is inherently pro-poor since more than 80% of programmable core funding is directed to Low-Income Countries (LICs) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) where the needs are greatest and access to other forms of funding is limited. A cut in core funding will hit the most vulnerable hardest, making it difficult to implement programs and initiatives aimed at eradicating poverty, improving livelihoods, and achieving the SDGs. This limitation can thwart the battle against ending extreme poverty. With reduced core funding, UNDP country offices will have limited flexible resources to design interventions and experiment with innovative solutions to promote sustainable development that can be scaled up to attract additional funding. However, a decline in core funding restricts country offices’ ability to do so.

*Slow and ineffective crisis response*

Natural disasters, humanitarian emergencies, and other crises require swift and efficient responses. However, reduced core funding hampers UNDP's ability to allocate resources quickly and effectively in such situations. If the current decline in core funding remains unresolved, UNDP may not be able to be present on the ground before, during, and after emergencies, offering the international community a neutral and extensive platform to direct resources where they are most needed. Without adequate funding, the organization may struggle to provide timely assistance, deliver life-saving aid, and support recovery efforts, potentially leading to increased human suffering and prolonged periods of instability.

*Limited ability to leverage partnerships and resources*

Core funding acts as a catalyst for collaboration and partnerships with governments, IFIs, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders. It helps to leverage additional funding and resources to maximize the organization's impact. When core funding declines, the organization's ability to attract and secure additional funding diminishes. This limitation restricts the potential for strategic partnerships and reduces the overall leverage of resources, hindering the organization's ability to amplify its efforts and create a more substantial development impact. A strong programme based on core resources is a prerequisite for the effective delivery of earmarked non-core funds. The prevailing imbalance between core and non-core funding could jeopardize the mobilization and delivery of non-core-funded programmes.

*Increased risk of competition and challenges in upholding our normative mandates*

Reduced core funding can lead to heightened competition among organizations operating in the same field. As resources become scarcer, organizations may find themselves in competition for limited funds, partnerships, and projects, deepening the shift towards earmarked funding patterns. This increased competition can create challenges in upholding normative mandates, such as promoting human rights, gender equality, and social justice. Organizations may face difficulties in maintaining their advocacy efforts, providing technical expertise, and fulfilling their broader responsibilities. As a recent MOPAN assessment revealed, less core and uneven resourcing create an imbalance in resources across an organization’s strategic priorities and constitute a strategic and reputational risk. Resource allocation becomes driven not by the intent to achieve results anchored in corporate strategies, but rather by funding opportunities.

*Underinvestment in maintaining high quality and transparency standards*

Core funding helps UN agencies meet and maintain the highest standards of transparency, oversight, and accountability. With reduced core funding, there is less financial capacity to invest in such essential areas as independent evaluation, the ethics office, and development effectiveness. This limitation may lead to compromised quality control, reduced monitoring and evaluation capacity, and weakened transparency mechanisms. Consequently, the organization's ability to demonstrate and maintain credibility, accountability, and trust may be compromised, affecting its long-term sustainability and effectiveness.

To sum up, declining core funding has far-reaching implications, limiting an organization's capacity to address poverty, respond to crises, leverage partnerships, uphold normative mandates, and maintain high-quality standards. These implications can hinder the achievement of sustainable development goals and decrease the overall effectiveness and impact of the organization's work. It is crucial for organizations and stakeholders to recognize the importance of sustained and flexible core funding to ensure the successful realization of development objectives.

# Recommendations

Factors contributing to the decline in core funding vary among donors and are influenced by their unique contexts. The decline in core funding is a complex issue that requires dialogue, advocacy, and efforts to highlight the importance of sustained and flexible resources for addressing long-term development challenges.

The Funding Compact constitutes the first real systemic attempt in the last twenty years to reform the quality of UNDS financing. As for the Grand Bargain established in 2016, where many targets were not met, the obstacles to quality financing that the Funding Compact hopes to tackle, are political in nature. As things stand, donors might be lacking the required political traction in their own countries (beyond technical committees) to move forward on their commitments[[18]](#footnote-19). Therefore, it is important to mobilize political commitment to the Funding Compact by elevating the discussion political arenas, tasking senior political leaders to act as rotating champions of the Compact in the donor community, thus enhancing mutual accountability among Member States.

Addressing the decline in core funding requires concerted efforts from multiple stakeholders. Maintaining and increasing core funding is central to UNDP’s corporate Resource Mobilization Strategy and continuously ongoing resource mobilization efforts. The actions that UNDP is and should be taking include:

* *Strengthening strategic engagement with core donors:* Maintaining strong relationships with existing core donors and cultivating new ones is crucial. UNDP should invest in effective donor stewardship strategies, including regular communication, reporting, and showcasing the impact of core-funded interventions. Building trust and demonstrating the value and outcomes of their programs can help attract and retain funding from donors. Institutionally, it is critical to align internal incentives that favor core and flexible funding over project-level earmarking. The portfolio approach to thematic funds offers the second-best option to attract flexible funding and engage partners more substantively.
* *Strong advocacy for increased core funding:* UNDP should identify and engage key stakeholders in advocacy efforts to raise awareness about the importance of core funding and its impact on achieving development goals. This may involve engaging in dialogue with policymakers, key decision-makers, and influencers (goodwill ambassadors, former UN staff, media personalities, etc.) to highlight the value and necessity of sustained core funding for effective development work. Targeted and well-timed advocacy campaigns, policy briefs, and evidence-based research can help make a compelling case for increased funding support. The refreshed “Partners@Core” campaign 3.0 offers a great opportunity for this.
* *Diversify the core donor base:* UNDP is proactively seeking to increase core funding beyond OECD-DAC donors. The New Strategic Partners strategy is being developed as part of UNDP’s corporate Resource Mobilization Strategy 2022-25, with the aim of stepping up UNDP’s engagement with emerging partners, including securing core funding. Similarly, UNDP plans to explore individual/digital giving initiatives to attract core funding from individuals. Diversifying the core donor base will help UNDP reduce its reliance on a limited set of core donors and provide more stability and flexibility in resource allocation.
* *Emphasize efficiency and cost-effectiveness*: As part of its commitment to the UN reform’s efficiency agenda, UNDP should continue to focus on maximizing the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of its programs and operations. Conducting regular assessments and evaluations to identify areas for improvement, streamlining processes, and implementing innovative approaches can help optimize resources and demonstrate the organization's commitment to delivering results with limited funding. UNDP must sharpen its value proposition articulating how core remains the smart investment.
* *Invest in fundraising capabilities*: In a tough and competitive funding environment, UNDP should prioritize building strong fundraising capacities and assets within its teams centrally as well as on the ground. This includes developing comprehensive resource mobilization strategies, training staff in fundraising techniques, and investing in tools and technologies to support effective partnerships and communications efforts. It is important for development agencies to strengthen their communication and reporting mechanisms to demonstrate the value and impact of core funding. Building a diverse portfolio of funding streams can help mitigate the impact of declining core funding and improve the organization's overall competitiveness in securing funding.

Member States that traditionally back UNDP and provide core funding could consider taking several actions to address the current decline in core funding:

* *Renew and demonstrate political commitment through core support*: the unrestricted core funding to the UN development system remains one of the key expressions of trust and political backing. As long-standing supporters of sustainable development and UNDP, it is recommended that Member States protect their investment in core funding and potentially increase their core contributions to reverse the decline in core funding. This may involve reviewing their Funding Compact commitments and considering meeting the 30% core contribution individually as well as collectively. Additionally, Member States can advocate for increased protection of core investment in a truly multilateral system like the UNDS and its key entities, which offer an unmatched global platform to provide development and humanitarian assistance to countries and communities around the world.
* *Provide multi-year funding commitments*: in line with the Funding Compact commitment, Member States can consider offering multi-year funding commitments. Multi-year funding provides greater stability and predictability for organizations, enabling them to plan and implement longer-term programs and initiatives more effectively. This will help reverse the share of contributions received through multi-year agreements to 50% (in 2022 the share stands at 33% in 2022). To ensure the predictability of core contribution and elevate the quality of funding dialogues, Member States could also consider exploring the applicability of ‘replenishment rounds’ for UN funds and programmes in line with their Strategic Plan cycle.
* *Support advocacy efforts*: Member States can support UNDP and its sister agencies in their advocacy efforts to raise awareness about the importance of core funding and the value of a strong and inclusive multilateral system. This may include articulating a strong case for multilateralism, promoting the UN organization's mandates given to them by Member States, actively participating in relevant international forums, and using diplomatic channels to advocate for increased political and financial support from other Member States and donors. This could contribute significantly to changing public perceptions and building back trust in key public and global organizations.
* *Enhance policy coherence*: Member States are encouraged to strive for policy coherence across different government departments and agencies involved in funding decisions to ensure the prioritization of core and flexible funding over strictly earmarked fund allocation. Inconsistent policies, conflicting priorities, and fragmented funding streams can create challenges for organizations like UNDP. By promoting coordination and coherence, Member States can ensure a more effective and streamlined approach to core funding allocation.
* *Engage in funding dialogue and seek solutions*: Member States are encouraged to deepen their regular Structured Funding Dialogues with UNDP and sister agencies to understand their funding needs, challenges, and priorities. By working closely with the agencies, Member States can ensure that funding allocations align with the organizations' strategic objectives and priorities, thus maximizing the impact of core funding. As part of the collective commitment to enhance the usefulness of these dialogues, promoting honest, constructive, and solution-oriented deliberation and ensuring the discussions and conclusions reach decision-makers in the capital should be a priority going forward.

Addressing the decline in core funding requires a multi-faceted approach that combines diversification of funding sources, effective advocacy, efficiency improvements, strategic partnerships, and sustainable business practices. Additionally, fostering stronger partnerships with donors, governments, and civil society organizations can facilitate dialogue and collaboration to reverse the downward trend in core funding. By implementing these measures, Member States and organizations impacted by reduced core funding can mitigate the challenges and ensure the continuation of their vital development work.
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