

Revenue Fragility

Nonprofit Resource Guide

Chapter 2 What Revenue Fragility Means

Ronald John Hays

Assistance in Drafting and Review by Sol Halvern, Ron's ChatGPT AI Assistant. October 14 2026

Chapter 1 introduced a problem that a balanced budget can leave unresolved. A nonprofit may have enough revenue to operate today while depending on arrangements that will be difficult to sustain if circumstances change. Chapter 2 gives that condition a precise meaning. The purpose is to help nonprofit executives and board members recognize vulnerability before a disruption forces an operating decision.

Revenue fragility is the susceptibility of an organization's revenue structure to disruption that could impair its ability to sustain operations and fulfill its mission.[1]

The definition directs attention to the revenue structure, the disruption it could experience, and the resulting effect on the organization. A funding change matters because people, services, and commitments depend on the resources that funding provides. The same dollar loss can have very different consequences for two organizations.

A nonprofit with sufficient available reserves and an established replacement source may absorb a reduction without interrupting services. Another nonprofit may have to reduce services immediately because its remaining resources cannot meet the same obligations. The amount lost is only part of the explanation. Leaders also need to understand what remains available and how much time the organization has to respond.

Revenue tranches provide the unit of analysis

A revenue tranche is a distinct segment of a nonprofit's total revenue, classified according to the revenue taxonomy. Together, the organization's revenue tranches make up its total revenue.[1] This definition gives the analysis a consistent starting point. A tranche has an identity in the taxonomy; its vulnerability requires further examination.

The revenue taxonomy is the structured classification system that identifies and organizes revenue sources into defined categories and subcategories. Those subcategories are called revenue tranches. [1] A consistent taxonomy allows leaders to compare the same kinds of revenue over time and across organizations without continually changing the meaning of the labels.

The framework examines revenue through the Business, Governmental, and Philanthropic domains. Business revenue arises through exchange activity. Governmental revenue originates through public authority and funding systems. Philanthropic revenue arises from voluntary contributions. Hybrid arrangements combine characteristics of the foundational domains and require attention to the actual arrangement.[2]

The domains orient the reader, but the analysis must reach the relevant tranches. Individual > Sustainer and Grants > Foundations > Private are different paths within the taxonomy. Both may involve philanthropic support, yet their renewal decisions, restrictions, and patterns of payment can

differ substantially. Government > State identifies another taxonomy path. The particular state agency, funding agreement, payment terms, and renewal date belong in the supporting record.

The taxonomy identifies the tranche. Reliability, restrictions, cost, and timing describe how that tranche behaves. Those characteristics must not become substitute taxonomy categories. Calling a receipt "stable funding" may express an opinion, but it does not identify the receipt's place in the revenue structure.

Classification also does not remove the need to examine individual payers. Two grants may occupy the same taxonomy path while coming from different foundations. Those foundations may make independent decisions, or their support may depend on the same matching requirement. Leaders need both the classification and the underlying relationships to judge exposure.

How disruption becomes an operating problem

Several characteristics help explain revenue fragility. Each can create exposure, but its significance depends on the other characteristics and the obligations the revenue supports. No single characteristic establishes the condition by itself.

Reliability and instability

Reliability concerns whether the organization can reasonably expect the revenue to arrive in the anticipated amount and period. A gift received repeatedly may have a useful history without carrying a commitment for next year. A funding agreement may establish a payment schedule while leaving renewal unsettled.

Instability becomes consequential when the organization makes commitments that require more predictability than the tranche provides. An executive director who hires permanent staff using an uncertain annual award needs a plan for the period after that award ends. The problem lies in the relationship between the expected funding and the commitment, not simply in the existence of uncertainty.

Financial staff should distinguish a documented commitment from a forecast based on past receipts. Development staff may have good reasons to expect renewal, but those reasons need to be stated. A leader's confidence and a payer's commitment are different kinds of evidence.

Dependency and concentration

Concentration describes how much revenue rests in a particular tranche, payer, or related group of sources. Dependency concerns what the organization relies on that support to accomplish. A large share of total revenue may support a discrete program with adjustable costs. A smaller share may support expenses essential to the entire organization.

Consider an unrestricted contribution that represents 8 percent of total revenue but covers the unfunded portion of the organization's administration. Its loss could affect every program. A percentage measured against total revenue would understate its operating significance unless the analysis also identified the costs it supports.

A major funding relationship can be worth maintaining. Leaders should examine the payer's ability and willingness to continue, the terms of the arrangement, and the commitments that would remain after a reduction. The percentage alone cannot answer those questions.

Restrictions and flexibility

Restrictions determine whether revenue can serve the need that arises. Funding for one program may provide strong support for that program while leaving the organization little room to address a shortage elsewhere. The relevant question is how much usable support remains for the particular obligation under review.

Finance staff need to distinguish donor restrictions and contractual limits from internal spending plans and board designations. These conditions can affect availability in different ways. An organization should not assume that all resources described as "reserved" can be released through the same decision.

Financial reporting already recognizes the importance of resource availability. The Financial Accounting Standards Board's nonprofit reporting guidance addresses liquidity and the availability of financial assets for general expenditure.[3] Revenue fragility analysis builds on that information by examining the tranches that supply the resources and the circumstances under which their support could change.

Restricted revenue can be dependable and highly useful. Exposure arises when leadership expects it to perform a function its terms do not permit, or when restricted growth creates continuing expenses without adequate support for those expenses.

Timing and cash availability

Timing concerns the interval between the organization's need to pay and its receipt of usable cash. A delay can impair operations even when the expected annual revenue remains unchanged.

Suppose a nonprofit spends \$75,000 each month on eligible services and receives reimbursement 90 days after each month's expenditure. Under that simplified assumption, approximately \$225,000 of spending occurs before the first reimbursement arrives. Finance staff must assess the cash required to bridge that interval and the effect of any additional delay.

A dependable payment received too late can therefore create serious exposure. Leaders need to identify both the normal payment cycle and the consequences if that cycle lengthens. An annual revenue total cannot show whether payroll falls due before the next receipt.

Cost and net revenue contribution

Gross revenue describes the amount generated before the defined costs attributable to that revenue. The framework uses Cost of Revenue Raised, or CORR, to examine the fully loaded cost of acquiring, maintaining, administering, complying with, and fulfilling a revenue source.[4] Later chapters develop the calculation and allocation method.

At this stage, the essential distinction is between the gross amount and the net revenue contribution that remains after the defined costs. A tranche producing \$400,000 with \$80,000 in attributable costs leaves \$320,000 of net revenue contribution. That arithmetic does not establish that \$320,000 is unrestricted or uncommitted. Leaders still need to examine its permitted uses and the obligations it already supports.

The cost boundary matters. Finance staff must identify which costs the calculation includes and allocate shared costs consistently. For a service agreement, fulfillment costs may include the

services the organization must deliver to earn the revenue. Those costs should not be counted again in a subsequent calculation.

A small net contribution does not, by itself, establish poor performance or high fragility. Revenue that covers the cost of a mission program can be valuable. The exposure appears when leaders count on a contribution the arrangement cannot produce, overlook costs, or cannot sustain the required spending while waiting for payment.

Replaceability and response time

Replaceability concerns the organization's practical ability to obtain usable resources when existing support declines or ends. Leaders need to assess the likely amount, the time required, the cost of obtaining it, and the terms attached to it.

An executive director may reasonably identify foundation grants as a possible replacement for lost support. That possibility becomes a plan only when staff identify eligible funders, application schedules, decision dates, and the purposes those funders will support. A promising prospect does not meet next month's payroll.

Replacement also requires organizational capacity. Development staff may already be fully committed to maintaining existing relationships. A new revenue effort may require time or spending that the organization cannot supply during a crisis. An assessment should account for that constraint before assuming that another tranche can grow quickly enough.

The relevant comparison is between the organization's available response time and the time needed to obtain suitable replacement resources. A replacement that arrives after services must close may come too late to prevent mission impairment.

How revenue tranches behave together

Revenue fragility depends on the behavior of the whole structure. Separate tranches can share a decision maker, referral source, event, economic condition, or program requirement. Their accounting labels may differ while their exposure overlaps.

A private foundation grant may require the organization to maintain a publicly funded service. Individual gifts may be solicited specifically to support that same service. If the public funding ends, leaders must examine whether the foundation award and the gifts can continue supporting the remaining activity. The loss could extend beyond the original Governmental tranche.

Similar relationships can arise within one tranche. Hundreds of sustainers provide many individual payment decisions, but those donors may be concentrated in one employer or community. A local disruption could affect several donors at once. Counting donors supplies useful information; it does not establish complete independence.

These connections explain why adding revenue lines may produce less protection than leaders expect. The assessment needs to show which sources can change together and which remain available when a specific disruption occurs. Chapter 20 examines these relationships in greater depth.

Reading a two million dollar revenue structure

Consider a hypothetical nonprofit with an annual revenue budget of \$2 million and a matching expense budget. The following table uses existing taxonomy paths. The figures and funding arrangements are illustrative, rather than findings about a real organization.

Taxonomy path	Annual revenue budget	Share of total
Government > State	\$900,000	45%
Grants > Foundations > Private	\$400,000	20%
Individual > Sustainer	\$400,000	20%
Earned Income > Fee for Service > Individual	\$300,000	15%
Total	\$2,000,000	100%

The State tranche accounts for 45 percent of planned revenue. Assume one state agency supplies the entire \$900,000 through an agreement that requires the nonprofit to incur eligible expenses before reimbursement. The Private foundation tranche supplies \$400,000 for a separate program, with its award ending after the budget year. The Sustainer tranche consists of recurring unrestricted gifts from many individuals. The fees come from individuals paying for services.

These details immediately change the meaning of the balanced budget. The finance director must determine how much cash the State agreement requires the organization to advance. The executive director and grant manager must address what happens to the foundation-supported program when its award ends. Development staff must assess sustainer retention and the cost of maintaining that support. Program staff must examine whether the fees cover the commitments associated with the services.

Suppose the state agency reduces its annual payment by 20 percent. The planned gross revenue loss is \$180,000, or 9 percent of total revenue. The remaining State revenue would be \$720,000, bringing the revised total to \$1.82 million if all other receipts remain unchanged. Those figures describe the revenue change. They do not yet establish the net operating effect.

Finance staff must determine which expenses could fall with the reduction and which would remain. The executive director must identify any continuing service requirements, staffing commitments, and lease costs. Restricted foundation support for a separate program may not be available to fill the resulting gap.

Assume the Sustainer tranche has the \$80,000 attributable cost described earlier. Its \$320,000 net revenue contribution is already included in the resources supporting the original budget. Leaders cannot count it a second time as new money available to replace the \$180,000 reduction. Only additional receipts, available reserves, permitted reallocations, or actual expense reductions would change the revised position.

The example shows why an assessment must follow a disruption through the revenue structure and into operations. A board that knows the gross reduction has a starting point. A board that also

knows the remaining obligations, resource limits, and response time can judge the choices available to management.

Recognizing fragility before a crisis

Fragility can exist while funding continues. A nonprofit can receive an annual award on time for years and still lack the ability to withstand its loss. Past receipt helps establish a pattern; it does not show what the organization could do if the pattern changes.

The definition also requires attention to consequences. A possible funding change that the organization can absorb without impairing operations has a different significance from one that would force the suspension of essential services. The analysis should explain that difference rather than label every uncertain receipt fragile.

For an initial assessment, leaders can connect the possible disruption to the obligations it would affect, then compare those obligations with the resources and response options available. This is a way to organize inquiry. It does not establish a validated formula, scoring threshold, or probability of failure.

Reserves may provide time to respond, and adjustable costs may reduce the immediate loss. Neither establishes that the underlying revenue structure has become more durable. A reserve can finance a transition while leaders develop replacement support; it cannot indefinitely replace recurring revenue without being replenished.

This distinction allows a board to accept a funding opportunity deliberately. Board members can weigh the mission benefit alongside the dependence the opportunity creates. The executive director can then prepare a response proportionate to the exposure. The purpose of the framework is to support those decisions with a clearer view of the resources involved.

Making the first assessment

The first assessment begins with classification and evidence. Finance and development staff should identify the revenue tranches in the approved taxonomy and retain the original labels from the source records. When a record does not support a more specific classification, staff should retain the appropriate Unclassified designation rather than infer a missing fact.

Staff should then record the period and basis of each amount. A budget, an actual receipt, and a forecast answer different questions. Combining them without explanation can make an expected payment appear to be a completed result. The assessment also needs to distinguish revenue recorded in the accounts from cash received and available for the purpose under review.

Useful evidence can include agreements, grant notices, donor records, invoices, payment histories, and documented explanations from responsible staff. The person preparing the record should identify the source and date. The reviewer should record any unresolved assumptions or disagreements. Unknown renewal terms or unsupported cost estimates should remain visible.

Form 990 provides useful revenue and expense information. The Internal Revenue Service's Part VIII instructions organize revenue reporting and allow smaller program service revenue sources to be combined on line 2f.[5] A completed return may therefore help reconcile totals without providing all the detail needed to identify and assess the framework's tranches. The taxonomy information must be collected from the organization when its available records do not supply it.

Audited financial statements and liquidity disclosures also contribute evidence. Leaders should use that evidence alongside the underlying agreements and operating information. Financial reporting and revenue fragility analysis serve related purposes, but an assessment cannot assume that a reporting category supplies every characteristic needed for the taxonomy.

The executive director should identify the management decision that requires attention. Finance staff should establish the amount, costs, payment terms, and available resources. Development or grant staff should explain the relationships and replacement prospects relevant to their work. Program leaders should identify the obligations and services affected. The board should review the exposure and the proposed response. An analyst should record the responsible role rather than assume that a particular organization assigns these tasks to the same job titles.

Preparing to examine revenue architecture

Revenue fragility becomes understandable when leaders can connect a possible disruption to the tranches involved and the operations those tranches support. The analysis has to reach beyond the revenue total to show what can change, what resources remain usable, and how the organization could respond in time.

Chapter 3 develops Revenue Architecture, the arrangement of those supports and their relationships. That structure provides the setting in which individual tranches strengthen one another, share dependencies, or leave commitments exposed. Examining the architecture gives leaders a more complete basis for deciding which revenue to strengthen and which vulnerabilities require action.

Source notes

[1] Ronald John Hays, Revenue Fragility Core Definitions, agreed October 4, 2026. The definitions of Revenue Fragility and Revenue Tranche appear verbatim; the discussion of Revenue Taxonomy follows the same reference.

[2] Ronald John Hays project materials, Revenue Tranch Worksheet v5.5 Revenue Zero Start, Master Data Sheet; Revenue Fragility Master Book Development and Integration Process, version 1.0, August 29, 2026, section 3. These materials supply the taxonomy paths and foundational domains used in this chapter.

[3] Financial Accounting Standards Board, Accounting Standards Update No. 2016-14, Not-for-Profit Entities Topic 958 Presentation of Financial Statements of Not-for-Profit Entities, August 2016. See the liquidity and availability guidance and illustrative disclosures. https://storage.fasb.org/ASU_2016-14.pdf

[4] Ronald John Hays project materials, Revenue Fragility Cost of Revenue Raised, September 10, 2026. This chapter introduces the management concept; Chapters 14 and 15 develop CORR and net revenue contribution.

[5] Internal Revenue Service, Instructions for Form 990 Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax, 2025, Part VIII Statement of Revenue, line 2. <https://www.irs.gov/instructions/i990>