Financial outlook and funding challenges for UNEP – follow up from the 9th annual subcommittee of the CPR
Recap on funding trends and challenges
Challenge 1: imbalance core & non-core funding

Funding Trend 2002 - 2022

2022 income by source of fund (US$M)
Challenge 2: narrow funding base

- 15 Member States provide over 90% of total income to UNEP, including to the Environment Fund.
- Less than 50% of Member States contribute.

Environment Fund (2022)
Out of 193 Member States:
- 45 contributed their full share
- 38 contributed other amounts
- 110 didn’t contribute
Main findings & recommendations from 9th ASC funding dialogue
Focus on increasing core funding:

Promote Environment Fund as main fund for UNEP

Explain and apply the VISC as main tool
Contributors of their full share as per VISC are not only ‘traditional donors’

Contributions above full share of VISC in 2022
- Denmark
- Luxembourg
- Monaco
- Norway

Contributions equal to full share of VISC in 2022
- Albania
- Angola
- Antigua & Barbuda
- Armenia
- Barbados*
- Belarus
- Belgium (EUR 4M)
- Belize
- Bhutan
- Bosnia & Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Cyprus
- Dominican Republic*
- Eritrea
- Fiji
- Finland (EUR 2.5M)
- France
- Georgia
- Guyana
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Italy
- Jordan
- Latvia
- Mauritius
- Micronesia (FSO)*
- Mozambique
- Myanmar

*Note: The asterisk indicates contributions above the full share.
## Top-15 funding partners to the Environment Fund in 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$8.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$7.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>$7.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>$7.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>$7.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>$6.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>$5.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>$4.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>$4.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>$4.0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$3.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>$2.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$2.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>$1.4m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increase flexibility of earmarked funding:

Encourage partners that earmark funding to consider Thematic Funds.
Demonstrate & communicate narrative of UNEP as a partner of choice

Increase communication on achievements/results

Better explain UNEP’s mandate and role in tackling triple planetary crisis
Appreciate funding partners publicly

Provide visibility and appreciation to core funding partners through various tools
Enhance funding dialogue between Secretariat and Member States at global, regional and national levels.
In conclusion

The Secretariat proposes to continue the implementation of the recommendations and actions as guided, and update CPR regularly on progress.

The CPR is requested to guide Secretariat on above proposals and provide additional recommendations.
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