

WHERE THE GREEN GRANTS WENT

Patterns of UK Funding for Environmental and Conservation Work

3



Jon Cracknell & Heather Godwin

for the Environmental Funders Network

MAY 2007

About the authors

Jon Cracknell and Heather Godwin both work for the family of the late Sir James Goldsmith. Heather has worked for the family since 2000. She splits her time between the JMG Foundation and other grant-making structures supported by the family, including The Ecology Trust. Jon is the director of the JMG Foundation and the Secretary of The Ecology Trust, a UK charity that also supports environmental work. He has worked on environmental issues since 1992 and co-ordinates the Environmental Funders Network on a part-time basis.

The authors would like to thank Heather Blake, Charlotte Beazley, and Charlotte McDonald for their help with this report. Sue Hodge of Bentley Jennison accountants also provided very helpful advice for

Section 3. This report was designed, as were its first two editions, by Peter Bishop (peterbishop000@btclick.com). It was printed on 100% recycled paper using renewable energy by Severnprint Limited.

We are very grateful for the financial support of the following funders: the Arcadia Trust (formerly the Lisbet Rausing Charitable Fund), the Ashden Trust, the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, the JMG Foundation, the Polden Puckham Charitable Foundation and Sharegift. We would also like to thank the staff of those trusts that reviewed the report and provided very helpful comments. Views expressed in the report are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as official positions of any of the funding organisations or of The Ecology Trust.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDERS NETWORK (EFN)

The EFN was set up in July 2003 to provide a networking mechanism for the staff and trustees of UK and other European environmental grant-making organisations. The Network seeks to promote discussion between grant-makers working in this field and to provide opportunities for collaboration. The Network does not have any capacity for collectively assessing or handling applications for grants – **SO PLEASE DON'T SEND US APPLICATIONS!**

Funders interested in joining the EFN or finding out more about its work should contact Jon Cracknell: info@greenfunders.org

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
THE SCOPE OF THIS REPORT	4
SECTION 1	
1 TRUSTS: THE FUNDING LANDSCAPE	5
2 BENEFICIARY ORGANISATIONS	8
3 GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION	10
4 WHICH ISSUES RECEIVE THE MOST SUPPORT?	12
5 WHAT KINDS OF APPROACH RECEIVE THE MOST BACKING?	14
SECTION 2	
FEEDBACK SEMINAR	16
SECTION 3	
ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATIONS: SOURCES OF INCOME	21
DETAILED INCOME BREAKDOWN FOR 75 SELECTED UK ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATIONS	30
APPENDIX A	40
APPENDIX B	42
APPENDIX C	43
SELECTION OF TRUSTS FROM GROUPS 1 & 2	44
WEBSITES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATIONS	45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This report is the third edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*. It analyses grants data from 176 UK trusts and foundations for the financial year 2004/05.
- Together these 176 trusts made 1,788 grants to environmental work, worth more than £33.6 million. The average grant size across the whole group was £18,816.
- As in previous years, a small number of large funders dominate the field, with the ten largest trusts providing just under 60% of the grants made. Environmental grants were on average just 11% of the total grants made by the 176 trusts in 2004/05.
- A majority of the trusts making environmental grants (110 out of 176) are generalist funders, with under a fifth of their total grants allocated to environmental issues. At the other end of the scale are a small group of specialist trusts, 18 in total, which make more than 80% of their grants towards environmental work.
- If the trusts in the study which gave under 10% of their total grants to the environment had raised their environmental grant-making to 10% of their total giving, then this would have generated an additional £13.8 million.
- Across the first three years of *Where The Green Grants Went* research, a total of 1,316 different grantee organisations have received grants, with 3,268 grants given in all. The 'broad yet shallow' distribution of trust funding is clear, with 800 of the 1,316 grantee organisations having received only one grant in the three years of research.
- The report includes a list of the grantee organisations which received the most funding from the trusts analysed across the first three years of *Where The Green Grants Went*. The top 50 beneficiary organisations account for £33.4 million of grants over this period, or 46.3% of the total granted in the three years.
- In the 2004/05 financial year, the share of grants going to UK based projects fell to under two-thirds (62.5%). UK trusts funding environmental issues give strongly to international work, compared both to UK trusts funding other charitable issues, and to their overseas counterparts that make environmental grants.
- The small amount of money directed towards non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working at the European Union level remains striking, given that more than 80% of European environmental legislation is determined by the EU, and that EU policies are influential around the world.
- Grants that directly tackle climate change amounted to just 8.3% of the grants made by 97 of the largest funders. This remains a worryingly low figure, and one that is surprising, given the potential for climate change to impact many other projects supported by environmental funders.
- 'Practical conservation work' stands out as the approach funded by the widest number of trusts. Educational projects also gain widespread backing.
- A feedback seminar with experienced fundraisers from 14 environmental organisations identified six themes that concern grantees: a) how to identify funders more efficiently; b) the grant-making process; c) trusts' understanding of how their grantees operate; d) work that is hard to raise money for; e) the role of trusts in relation to other sources of grant funding; and f) opportunities for collaboration. Much more detail is provided in section 2 of the report.
- This year's report looks for the first time at the income of environmental organisations, using a sample

of 75 NGOs, from the largest UK environmental groups down to some of the smaller ones.

- The combined income of these 75 organisations was £423.5 million in 2004/05, of which £63.5 million was spent on raising funds, giving a combined net income for the sample of £360 million.

- Between them, the 75 NGOs employed more than 6,600 staff, at a total cost of £134.3 million, or 37.3% of their net incoming resources.

- Of the total incoming resources of £423.5 million, 54.5% took the form of unrestricted income, and the remaining 45.5% was restricted income which had to be applied to a particular activity.

- The most important income streams for environmental groups were, in order: a) grants and project income at £161.6 million (38%); b) donations and legacies at £94 million (22%); c) membership subscriptions at £75.2 million (18%); and d) trading and earned income at £67 million (16%). The remaining income came from investment income, sponsorship and a diverse range of smaller income sources.

- The top ten organisations ranked by income accounted for nearly 70% of the total income of the 75 NGOs in the sample, whilst the ten smallest organisations received under 0.5% of the total income. Resources are heavily concentrated in the largest environmental groups, a pattern observed in other areas of charitable activity.

- The grants made to these 75 organisations by the 176 trusts amounted to just under 3% of their total combined income of £423.5 million. Had the sample of environmental organisations included a greater number of small organisations, then the overall contribution from charitable trusts would have been higher in percentage terms.

- This is because the importance of trust funding as a share of the income of UK environmental NGOs increases steadily as the organisations get smaller. For the larger organisations in the sample of 75, trust income generally represents less than 2% of their overall income. However, for the ten smallest organisations trust funding accounts for more than 20% of their income on average, and in some cases up to 40% or 50%.

- The £33.6 million in environmental grants from the 176 trusts represents just 1.6% of the £2.04 billion given by 498 of the UK's largest grant-making trusts. This is a disturbingly small figure, particularly in the context of declining levels of statutory support for environmental work.

- Only 25 of the top 500 fundraising charities in the UK are environmental organisations. Their combined income represents 6.5% of the income of the top 500.

- Other research suggests that environmental groups are more strongly supported by high-level donors than is the case for charities as a whole. Some 12% of high-level donors give to environmental groups, compared to just 5% of all charity donors.

- Of the 75 environmental organisations in the sample, just ten received more than 25% of their income from 'membership subscriptions' while 15 got more than a quarter of their income from 'trading and earned income' activities. 'Donations and legacies' accounted for more than 25% of income for 24 of the organisations.

- The most important income stream for the 75 NGOs was 'grant and project income'. Although this represents only 38% of total incoming resources for the 75 organisations as a whole, it comprises more than 50% of the income for 43 of the organisations. It is particularly important for the smaller organisations.

THE SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report is the third edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*, and analyses grants data from the financial year 2004/05.¹ For a few trusts, data was only available for the 2004 calendar year (a close match), or for periods which varied from the standard 2004/05 financial year by one or two months.² In these cases the financial year with the closest fit to April 2004 to March 2005 has been used.

The number of trusts whose grants have been analysed in this report has increased significantly compared to *Where The Green Grants Went 2*, from 35 to 176 trusts. This report's coverage of UK philanthropy on environmental issues is thus considerably more comprehensive than that in the previous *Where The Green Grants Went* studies. The grants lists of 385 trusts were reviewed in order to identify the 176 analysed in this report, with 209 discarded as not relevant, on the basis that they did not make sufficiently high levels of environmental grants. Although the coverage is now more comprehensive, there are undoubtedly additional trusts active in this field. These will be added to future editions as they are discovered. The coverage of Scottish trusts in particular is weak at present, as information on their grant-making is less readily available.

The first section of the report looks at the grants made by 176 trusts funding environmental and conservation work. The grants from trusts making more than £40,000 of environmental grants in 2004/05, and those covered in earlier editions, are analysed in some detail. Ninety-seven trusts met these criteria. The other 79 trusts made environmental grants worth between £10,000 and £40,000 in 2004/05. Grants from these funders are not analysed in the same level of detail.

The second section of the report summarises the comments made by experienced fund-raisers from 14 environmental NGOs at a grant-making feedback seminar held in September 2006. The fundraising directors were asked for feedback on the ways in which trusts and other funders might be able to make more effective use of their resources.

The third section of the report focuses on the sources of funding for the environmental movement in the UK. It presents an overview of the funding received in 2004/05 by a selection of 75 environmental organisations, looking at their total income, and the income streams from which it was derived. Consideration is also given to research by the Charities Aid Foundation, and analyses of philanthropic funding patterns in other countries.

¹ The first two editions of the research can be downloaded from the EFN website www.greenfunders.org

² The term 'trust' is used throughout the report to denote private philanthropic grant-making organisations. Sometimes these are actually networks, or have been set up as foundations or limited companies. 'Trust' is used as a short-hand for all these.

SECTION ONE

1 TRUSTS: THE FUNDING LANDSCAPE

This report analyses the grants data of 176 UK trusts funding environmental and conservation work. Together these 176 trusts made 1,788 grants worth more than £33.6 million in 2004/05, with an average grant size across the whole analysis of £18,816. These trusts can be broken down into three groups:

Firstly, the 35 trusts whose 2003/04 grants were analysed in *Where The Green Grants Went 2* (hereinafter referred to as Group 1). In 2003/04 these 35 trusts made 807 environmental grants worth a total of just over £20.1 million. In 2004/05 the same 35 trusts made 808 environmental grants, which is remarkably consistent. The grants were worth more than £21.1 million, an increase from one year to the next of 5.1%, somewhat higher than the rate of inflation, and a welcome development in the context of reductions in overall levels of grant-making from charitable trusts between 2003/04 and 2004/05. As in previous years, a small number of large funders dominate the field, with the five largest trusts in the group of 35 contributing 66% of the £21.1 million total. Average grant sizes in this group vary from more than £171,000 for one of the larger trusts, to less than £2,000 at the lower end: a huge range. The average grant size across the 35 trusts was £26,196.

Secondly, 62 trusts new to the grants analysis in this edition (hereinafter referred to as Group 2). All these trusts made more than £40,000 of environmental or conservation grants in 2004/05. There is considerable diversity within this group of trusts, with some having proactive and focused environmental programmes, and others making just a handful of qualifying grants or, in some cases, only one. Together, these 62 trusts contributed an additional £10.9 million, spread across 536 grants. The average grant size for this group was lower than that of Group 1 at £20,383, again with wide variations from one trust to the next.

Thirdly, 79 trusts making lower levels of grants, between £10,000 and £40,000 in 2004/05 (hereinafter referred to as Group 3). Some of these are large trusts that only make small numbers of environmental grants; others are very small trusts. Together, their 444 grants amounted to £1.5 million, with average grant sizes of just £3,495.

Below the surface

Closer analysis of the 35 trusts studied in both 2003/04 and 2004/05 reveals changes in their annual level of environmental grants similar to those identified in *Where The Green Grants Went 2*. A total of 15 trusts showed reductions in the value of the environmental grants they made

Table 1: Overview of funding from trusts in 2004/05

	Environmental grants (£)	Number of grants	Average grant size (£)	Number of trusts
Group 1	21,166,385	808	26,196	35
Group 2	10,925,320	536	20,383	62
Group 3	1,551,589	444	3,495	79
TOTAL FOR ALL GROUPS	33,643,294	1,788	18,816	176

Table 2: *Total trust funding for 2004/05 broken down by groups of ten trusts*

Trusts ranked in order of their environmental giving	Amount granted (£)	As % of all environmental grants given	Number of grants	Average grant size (£)
Trusts 1 - 10	19,975,636	59.4	352	56,749
Trusts 11 - 20	4,059,668	12.1	287	14,145
Trusts 21 - 30	2,429,817	7.2	142	17,111
Trusts 31 - 40	1,548,386	4.6	70	22,120
Trusts 41 - 50	1,201,992	3.6	109	11,027
Trusts 51 - 60	881,710	2.6	96	9,185
Trusts 61 - 70	727,119	2.2	107	6,796
Trusts 71 - 80	557,650	1.7	58	9,615
Trusts 81 - 90	450,218	1.3	73	6,167
Trusts 91 - 100	392,644	1.2	77	5,099
Trusts 101 - 110	302,128	0.9	64	4,721
Trusts 111 - 120	250,671	0.7	60	4,178
Trusts 121 - 130	221,475	0.7	81	2,734
Trusts 131 - 140	184,350	0.5	51	3,615
Trusts 141 - 150	151,700	0.5	38	3,992
Trusts 151 - 160	137,700	0.4	61	2,257
Trusts 161 - 170	110,430	0.3	51	2,165
Trusts 171 - 176 (just six trusts)	60,000	0.2	11	5,455
TOTALS	33,643,294	100	1,788	18,816

between the two years, while the other 20 showed increases. Both reductions and increases were often more than 40% from the one year to the next, and, in some cases, considerably larger. Furthermore, many of the trusts whose environmental grants had declined between 2002/03 and 2003/04 saw their grant-making in this area bounce back up in 2004/05. This reinforces a sense of underlying variability behind the top-line figures, where the almost identical numbers of grants and similar levels of overall funding suggest a static situation.

Towards a typology of trusts

This report looks for the first time at the proportion of each trust's overall grant-making accounted for by environmental or conservation grants, expressed as a percentage of the total grants made by these trusts on all issues in 2004/05. Grantees often call

for the size of the environmental grants 'pie' to be increased. One way in which this could be achieved, would be for trusts that currently make some grants on environmental issues to increase the amount that they contribute to this work. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3 opposite.

It is not surprising that the percentage of environmental grants among total grants made falls across the three groups, from 15.0%, to 8.9%, to just 3.6%. For the 176 trusts taken together, the average figure is 11%.

A clear majority of trusts making environmental grants (110 out of 176), are what one might term generalist funders, with under a fifth of their total grants going to environmental issues. Trustee and staff time will often be spread across the various

Table 3: *Environmental grants as a percentage of total grant-making in 2004/05*

	Total environmental grants (£)	Total all grants (£)	Environmental grants as % of total
Group 1	21,166,385	139,420,072	15.2
Group 2	10,925,320	123,035,494	8.9
Group 3	1,551,589	43,609,174	3.6
ALL GROUPS COMBINED	33,643,294	306,064,740	11.0

In more detail

% of total grants to environmental issues	Under 20%	20 - 40%	40 - 60%	60 - 80%	80 - 100%
Group 1: No. of trusts	15	10	4	2	4
Group 2: No. of trusts	36	9	3	2	12
Group 3: No. of trusts	59	12	3	3	2
COMBINED TOTALS	110	31	10	7	18

philanthropic categories, giving less time for grant-makers to develop expertise in any one field, unless the trust is a large one. This point was raised by the NGO fundraising directors whose feedback features in Section 2 of the report.

At the other end of the scale, there are a small number of what one might term specialist environmental funders, with 18 trusts making more than 80% of their grants to environmental and conservation initiatives. These specialist funders are found across the whole spectrum of

grant-giving trusts, from the large to the very small.

If the trusts in this study which gave less than 10% of their total grants to environmental issues in 2004/05 had raised their environmental grant-making to 10% of their total giving, then this would have generated an additional £13.8 million, a not insubstantial sum in the context of overall giving of £33.6 million from the 176 trusts. There would appear to be scope for more funding from within trusts that already have at least a toe in the water.

2 BENEFICIARY ORGANISATIONS

Across the first three years of *Where The Green Grants Went*, a total of 1,316 different grantee organisations have received support, with a total of 3,268 grants recorded over that period of time. If these grants had been divided evenly, then each of the 1,316 beneficiary organisations would have received just under 2.5 grants. In practice, 800 of the 1,316 organisations have received only one grant in the three years, whilst some of the organisations which receive the most trust funding have secured upwards of 40 grants over the same period (as shown in Table 4 opposite). The ‘broad yet shallow’ distribution of trust funding remains striking. It raises the question of whether it would be productive to ‘bundle’ trust grants together in some way, and then distribute them to a smaller group of organisations.

Looking at Group 1 trusts for 2004/05, their 808 grants were spread across 545 different beneficiaries. In 2003/04, by comparison, 807 grants were shared between 533 different beneficiaries. This is a strikingly similar set of top-line figures. However, no less than 270 of the 2004/05 grantees, more than half, were new in 2004/05, i.e. they had not received funding in either 2002/03 or 2003/04, according to the research done for earlier editions of *Where The Green Grants Went*. It is unclear how many more potential grantee organisations there are, and whether the process of adding new grantees at this rate can be sustained year after year, or whether at some point a ceiling will be reached. At the other end of the scale, there were 134 beneficiaries of the Group 1 trusts that have received at least one grant in each of the three years that this research has been undertaken.

When the 536 grants made by the Group 2 trusts are factored in, the number of new grantee organisations increases again. Another 182 new beneficiary organisations are added to the list, a

smaller number relative to the number of grants being made, but nonetheless a significant new group of beneficiaries. Adding the 444 grants made by the Group 3 trusts brings another 72 new grantees into the fold.

Which organisations are the top recipients of trust funding?

For the first time this year, a list is included of the beneficiary organisations that received the most funding from the trusts under analysis in 2002/03, 2003/04 and 2004/05. With three years of data available, it is becoming easier to distinguish organisations that regularly receive trust funding from those that might have received just one or two large grants, although some of the latter do feature in the list below.

The figures given below cannot be considered to be ‘complete’ for any given organisation, as they only cover grants from trusts covered in successive editions of *Where The Green Grants Went*. All that the table shows is the amount of money given by the 30, then 35, then 176 trusts, across the 3 years, and the number of individual grants that make up this total.

Some organisations are much more reliant than others on funding from charitable trusts, as shown in Section 3 of the report. The fact that a given organisation does or doesn’t feature in the list below should not be taken as any kind of guide to its effectiveness. Nor should it be used as a guide to the likely total income of the organisation, as the tables in Section 3 demonstrate. The list simply shows the figures at face value.

The total amount received by these 50 organisations, £33.4 million, represents 46.3% of the total of just over £72 million given across the three years by the trusts.

Table 4: *Top 50 recipients of trust funding, 2002/03 to 2004/05 (three financial years)*

Beneficiary organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	Beneficiary organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants
Fauna & Flora International	2,400,393	30	Beds, Cambs, Northants & Peterborough Wildlife Trust	479,912	8
Forum for the Future	2,143,400	25	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	474,725	26
Whitley Laing Foundation/ Whitley Fund for Nature	1,695,806	13	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	457,533	20
Natural History Museum	1,376,647	6	Wildscreen Trust	434,000	9
FARM Africa	1,331,645	7	Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment	412,000	1
Wildlife Conservation Research Unit (Oxford University)	1,290,700	21	Rainforest Action Network	405,104	7
Marine Stewardship Council	1,172,500	12	New World Foundation	400,000	2
Soil Association	1,049,740	46	Rufford Small Grants for Nature Conservation	392,080	1
National Botanical Institute	1,000,000	2	South & West Wales Wildlife Trust	370,000	2
WWF UK	964,320	29	New Economics Foundation	359,502	13
Pesticide Action Network UK	832,266	22	Blacksmith Institute	350,000	3
Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy	797,116	20	Renewable Energy Foundation	350,000	3
Butterfly Conservation	778,353	17	Global Canopy Foundation	345,515	15
Cowes Town Waterfront Trust	750,000	2	Royal Parks Foundation	330,000	2
Friends of the Earth (England, Wales & N. Ireland)	733,123	31	TRAFFIC International	329,458	5
Elm Farm Research Centre	675,559	8	Royal Horticultural Society	325,600	11
Global Witness Trust	675,000	7	Tusk Trust	323,370	19
Woodland Trust	664,026	45	Practical Action (Intermediate Technology Development Group)	318,980	11
Friends of the Earth International	634,453	10	International Rivers Network	317,775	4
Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens	576,162	10	International Centre of Insect Physiology & Ecology	315,750	1
Plantlife International	563,990	31	London Wildlife Trust	304,570	5
Sustrans	542,600	22	Scottish Association for Marine Science	301,534	3
Game Conservancy Trust	527,744	19	Pesticide Action Network USA	300,000	2
Global Greengrants Fund	515,000	3	Waste & Resources Action Programme	300,000	1
Environmental Investigation Agency	513,691	11			
Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group	497,793	6			
			TOTALS	33,409,935	631

3 GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

As in the last two editions, the geographical distribution of grants made by the trusts has been tracked. The figures in this section relate only to the 97 trusts in Groups 1 and 2, and do not include Group 3 trusts making smaller amounts of grants. The distribution of grants is shown in Table 5 below, along with comparative figures for 2003/04 for the smaller group of 35 trusts analysed in *Where The Green Grants Went 2*.

It is clear from the table, that the addition of the 62 trusts in Group 2 to the study has had a marked impact on the figures for the geographical distribution of grants. The share going to the UK (68.8% in 2002/03, 68.5% in 2003/04) has dropped to 62.5% or less than two-thirds of the total sum granted. This is surprising, not least because the share of UK trust funding on the environment going to international work was already very high by comparison with that of environmental grant-makers in other parts of the world. It is also very high when compared with the

Association of Charitable Foundations' estimate that just 7% of funding from the top 500 UK charitable trusts goes to overseas initiatives.³

As in previous years, some of the grants recorded as supporting international work were made to UK groups, but for international work rather than domestic projects. Funding of this kind forms the bulk of the 'general international' grants identified, which remains the second largest category (after the UK) and has grown with the addition of the data from the new trusts. The biggest change is in the share of grants going to Africa, which has jumped from 5.6% in 2003/04 to 13.4% for 2004/05. This reflects the addition to the survey of trusts with a strong focus on either African conservation projects and/or sustainable agriculture initiatives. The share of funding to countries in Europe other than the UK, to Asia and to Central America & Latin America remains relatively unchanged. The share going to North American groups has, however, dropped

Table 5: *Geographical distribution of grants for 2004/05, Group 1 & 2 trusts*

Region	2004/05		2003/04	
	Grants made (£)	% of total	Grants made (£)	% of total
United Kingdom	20,062,540	62.5	13,785,373	68.5
General international	6,098,564	19.0	3,372,382	16.8
Africa	4,287,859	13.4	1,136,747	5.6
Other Europe	625,245	1.9	484,555	2.4
Asia	479,017	1.5	478,954	2.4
Central & Latin America	361,473	1.1	123,376	0.6
North America	155,690	0.5	737,484	3.7
Australasia	21,318	0.1	13,807	0.1
TOTALS	32,091,706	100	20,132,678	100

³ Cited in Alison Harker and Steven Burkeman, *Stepping Up The Stairs: increasing the impact of progressive philanthropy in the UK*, Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, 2005. Available at: http://www.carnegieuktrust.org.uk/publications/stepping_up_the_stairs

significantly, from 3.7% to just 0.5%. This in part results from changes in policy within one of the larger grant-making trusts in the survey.

The list of countries that can be individually identified has grown from 2003/04; at 57 countries, it is now impressively diverse, as can be seen from Box 1 below.

The small amount of funding directed towards NGOs based in Belgium and working at the Brussels level remains striking. The analysis did not pick up a single trust grant destined for Belgium in the 2004/05 financial year, and whilst some of the ‘general international’ funding (19% of the total grants) is likely to have gone to organisations working at the European Union level, there is a clear case for increased funding in the future. Given that more than 80% of

European environmental legislation is determined by the EU, and that policies adopted by the EU have impacts on regulatory processes around the world, there would seem to be opportunities for funders to make high-impact grants by supporting more EU-level activity.

Box 1: *Countries in which at least one grant was made in 2004/05, by Group 1 & 2 trusts*

Argentina, Armenia, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Republic of Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Russia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States, Vietnam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

4 WHICH ISSUES RECEIVE THE MOST SUPPORT?

As with earlier editions of *Where The Green Grants Went*, the grants analysed for 2004/05 span a very wide range of activity, from research into ‘peak oil’ to surveys of bats, and from preservation of rare cattle breeds to campaigns against gold mines. Many environmental organisations work on a range of issues at any one point in time, and it is not always possible to tell from the description of a grant exactly what purpose the money is being provided for. The methodology and coding approach used in the first two editions has been repeated here, and the 18 issue categories (described in more detail at Appendix A) have also

been retained. The figures given below should not be taken as estimates of all the money coming into a given issue from the UK trust sector, because these activities may well be funded by trusts not included in this analysis.

As in the previous section showing geographical distributions, the addition of grants from 62 new trusts has had a clear impact on the shares of funding received by different issues. It is the introduction of these new trusts that accounts for most of the changes in the shares, rather than underlying re-allocation of money from the

Table 6: *Distribution of grants by issue, Group 1 & 2 trusts*

Issue	2004/05				2003/04			
	Grants made (£)	% of total	No. of grants	No. of trusts	Grants made (£)	% of total	No. of grants	No. of trusts
Biodiversity and species preservation	8,294,767	25.9	372	62	5,331,632	26.5	134	26
Agriculture	5,608,269	17.5	158	50	1,695,051	8.4	74	23
Countryside preservation & open space	3,183,476	9.9	152	51	2,740,797	13.6	119	22
Multi-issue	2,078,532	6.5	112	46	1,583,604	7.9	94	26
Oceans and coasts	1,895,014	5.9	48	21	896,409	4.5	19	12
Sustainable development	1,781,551	5.6	65	28	1,243,918	6.2	59	19
Energy	1,501,070	4.7	47	25	485,716	2.4	36	14
Built environment	1,328,947	4.1	35	21	370,707	1.8	26	13
Forests and woodland	1,250,921	3.9	103	43	1,352,318	6.7	52	23
Waste	1,055,307	3.3	28	14	423,871	2.1	14	7
Toxics and pollution	971,635	3.0	24	12	1,016,413	5.0	22	11
Trade and development	827,193	2.6	44	18	533,161	2.6	38	10
Climate and atmosphere	742,807	2.3	32	10	440,774	2.2	12	6
Human rights and environmental justice	432,794	1.3	22	13	579,574	2.9	15	5
Transport	430,545	1.3	41	23	624,717	3.1	34	14
Rivers and lakes	417,450	1.3	30	16	528,212	2.6	32	11
Biotech and nanotech	209,144	0.7	23	6	200,320	1.0	23	3
Environmental law	82,284	0.3	8	7	85,484	0.4	4	3
TOTALS	32,091,706	100	1,344	n/a	20,132,678	100	807	n/a

Group 1 trusts. The broadening of research this year means that the figures given provide a more reliable assessment of the way in which grants are shared between different issues.

As can be seen from the table, the big winner in terms of its share of the overall funding is ‘agriculture’, up from 8.4% in 2003/04 to 17.5% in 2004/05. This results in part from the inclusion of a large trust with a strong interest in agriculture among the new trusts in Group 2. However, it is clear that plenty of the other Group 2 trusts also provide support for work on agriculture, the number of trusts making grants to this issue having increased from 23 in *Where The Green Grants Went 2*, to 50 in 2004/05. Other issues in which the number of trusts has notably increased include ‘biodiversity and species preservation’ (an additional 36 trusts), ‘countryside preservation and open space’ (29 trusts), ‘multi-issue grants’ (20), and ‘forests and woodland’ (20). Grants on forests and woodland issues seem to be smaller on average (£12,145) than those in many other issue categories. The majority of the 97 trusts under consideration fund five or less of the issues identified above, with 63 in this category.

In previous editions, concern has been expressed about the low share of trust funding that goes to work directly geared to tackling climate change, defined as work falling into the categories of ‘energy’, ‘climate and atmosphere’, and ‘transport’. It is clear that work in other issue categories, particularly those of ‘forests and woodland’ and ‘agriculture’, will also contribute towards reducing carbon emissions, but ‘energy’, ‘climate and atmosphere’, and ‘transport’ are arguably most central to the challenge.

The situation shows little change in 2004/05 from 2003/04, with just 8.3% of trust funding going into these three categories, a little more in

terms of share than in 2003/04 (7.7%) and not quite as much as in 2002/03 (8.8%). With the widening of the number of trusts covered in the research the money available for climate work rises from £1.55 million to £2.67 million, a welcome development. In particular, more money seems to be available for work on energy issues than earlier reports suggested. Despite this, the 8.3% share is worryingly low, in the context of overall environmental funding from trusts, and the £2.67 million figure is tiny as a percentage of all charitable trust giving.

Both the magnitude of the challenge and the importance of trying to limit the damage from climate change become clearer by the week; indeed, climate change has the potential to overwhelm much of the other work being funded by environmental trusts. For example, there are now numerous scientific reports about the impact that climate change is having on biodiversity, a key interest of environmental grant-makers. It will be interesting to see whether levels of support for climate change work have risen during the 2005/06 financial year, given the rapid increase in public and political attention to the issue.

Critiques of the funding priorities of US environmental foundations point to the importance of dealing with systemic problems like climate change, rather than reliance on land conservation as a strategy, as reported in Liz Galst’s stimulating article in *Plenty* magazine.⁴ Galst quotes sociologist Robert J. Brulle of Drexel University, an expert on US foundations and the environment movement. As Dr. Brulle puts it: “The task of changing from a society that’s not ecologically sustainable to one that is, is an immense task. But buying and preserving more land, especially in the face of global climate change, isn’t a strategy that’s even remotely going to get you there.”

⁴ Liz Galst, ‘The Imperfect Gift’, *Plenty* magazine, January 2007

Available at: http://www.plentymag.com/features/2007/01/the_imperfect_gift.php

5 WHAT KINDS OF APPROACH RECEIVE THE MOST BACKING?

As in previous reports, grants made by the 97 trusts in Groups 1 & 2 have been analysed in order to try and determine the main type of activity, or ‘approach’, of each grantee organisation. This remains difficult, given that much of the work being funded is of a multi-dimensional nature. A single beneficiary organisation may be simultaneously carrying out education work, campaigning to change policy, conducting research, and also running some kind of service, such as a certification scheme. The methodology adopted in the previous editions has been retained here, with a focus on the core approach of each organisation. More details are provided in Appendix B.

As with the ‘Geography’ and ‘Issues’ sections of this report, the addition of the new trusts in Group 2 has made a marked impact on the share of trust funding going to some of the ten ‘approach’ categories. In particular the share taken by ‘service delivery’ projects has jumped spectacularly, from 3.0% in 2003/04 to 14.9% for 2004/05. The share accounted for by ‘research’

is also up significantly, from 12.1% to 20.1%. The main reductions in share are accounted for by the ‘practical conservation work’ category, down from 32.1% to 24.3%, and the ‘advocacy and campaigning’ category, down from 20.1% to 14.3% within the overall total. As with the issues analysis in the previous section, these new figures give a more accurate picture of what is happening, given the increased number of grants analysed.

The increase in the share of funding going to ‘research’ can largely be accounted for by grants made by trusts that are new to the analysis, the 62 trusts in Group 2. There is strong support for research work amongst some of these trusts, on issues including conservation, farming, botany, waste management, transport, and fisheries.

For the ‘service delivery’ category the story appears to be rather different, in that there seems to have been an underlying shift in the proportion of grants made to service delivery activities by trusts in the original 35-strong Group 1. Some of these

Table 7: *Distribution of grants by ‘approach’ taken by grantee – Groups 1 & 2*

Approach	2004/05				2003/04			
	Grants made (£)	% of total	No. of grants	No. of trusts	Grants made (£)	% of total	No. of grants	No. of trusts
Practical conservation work	7,787,181	24.3	418	70	6,459,107	32.1	215	30
Research	6,458,754	20.1	183	46	2,431,196	12.1	82	26
Service delivery	4,788,189	14.9	121	44	610,730	3.0	33	22
Advocacy and campaigning	4,593,355	14.3	219	49	4,049,515	20.1	179	28
Educational	3,372,738	10.5	205	57	2,627,268	13.0	121	29
Community	2,236,201	7.0	103	30	1,718,107	8.5	95	19
Grant-making bodies	1,310,269	4.1	26	17	1,338,329	6.6	11	7
Representative	710,714	2.2	30	22	359,752	1.8	25	16
Media	636,430	2.0	29	17	387,067	1.9	31	11
Historic preservation	197,875	0.6	10	9	151,607	0.8	15	8
TOTALS	32,091,706	100	1,344		20,132,678	100	807	

trusts have significantly stepped up the number of grants they make to this kind of work. Added to this are some grants from the new Group 2 trusts, plus a re-categorisation of the work of one or two generally well-funded organisations to ‘service delivery’ and away from other categories.

‘Practical conservation work’ stands out as the activity funded by the widest number of trusts, with a high proportion, 70 out of 97, having made a grant of this type. Educational projects also gain widespread backing, with 57 trusts having made at least one grant of this type.

The discovery that a smaller share of overall trust funding seems to be going into ‘advocacy and campaigning’ gives cause for concern, in the light

of the big systemic changes which will be needed in the future to tackle environmental problems. Beth Breeze’s research into the greatest achievements of UK philanthropy, conducted for the Institute of Philanthropy, is very interesting in this respect.⁵ With the help of research partners, she asked nearly 1,000 experts what they believed were the most important philanthropic achievements, both historically and in the modern era. The report identifies “innovation”, “speed”, and “risk-taking”, as the three distinguishing features of the most successful philanthropy, with “campaigning which led to major social change” seen as the third great achievement of UK philanthropy since 1900, alongside “famine relief and long-term aid to developing countries” and “health research and pioneering health services”.

⁵ Beth Breeze, *UK Philanthropy’s Greatest Achievements: a research-based assessment of philanthropic success*, London: Institute for Philanthropy, 2006. Available at: <http://www.instituteforphilanthropy.org.uk/media/UK%20Achievements.pdf>

SECTION TWO – FEEDBACK SEMINAR

A seminar held in London provided an opportunity for fundraising directors from environmental NGOs to discuss issues of common concern and ways in which the grants market could function more effectively, for both funders and grant-seekers. Fourteen well-known organisations, spanning a range of different approaches and organisational size, took part in September 2006. In the rich discussion, six themes emerged. These comments are, naturally enough, made from the perspective of the grant-seekers, who comprise only one side of the funding ‘dance’. The intention is to organise a similar seminar for grant-makers in the coming months, and then to try to engage both groups in finding practical ways of improving the way the grants market works.

The six themes that emerged were:

- a)** identifying funders,
- b)** the grant-making process,
- c)** trusts’ understanding of how their grantees operate,
- d)** work for which it is hard to raise money,
- e)** role of trusts relative to other sources of grant funding,
- f)** opportunities for collaboration.

Identifying funders

- NGOs would greatly appreciate more easily accessible and detailed information about possible funding sources, whether in the trust sector or elsewhere. This is particularly important for smaller organisations with no full-time fundraising teams. Currently, there is a huge reliance on Directory of Social Change publications.

- More tightly defined funding criteria would be welcome, along with more information on the interests of trustees. Fundraisers feel that this would allow them to make more appropriately targeted applications, thus saving time and energy for both them and their funders.

- It is clearly frustrating for grant-seekers who meet with a flat rejection when it seems that they have identified the perfect funder on paper. Participants described situations where a trust’s guidelines said that they were interested in funding work on a particular issue, yet applications for such work were met with letters saying “we don’t fund work on that issue”. This causes confusion and encourages grant-seekers to make applications even if the work doesn’t seem to fit squarely with a funder’s stated guidelines.

- Personal contacts between trustees, trust staff, and grant-seeking organisations are crucial. From an NGO perspective, time spent on getting to know funders and build up relationships eats into the time available to deliver high-quality work. Participants in the seminar were very keen to find ways of breaking down the ‘them and us’ divide.

The grant-making process

- Some trusts allow prospective applicants to have a phone discussion before they submit an application. There was wide support for this from the NGOs present.

- An initial one or two page letter of enquiry stage was seen as efficient for both parties. The John Ellerman Foundation’s application procedure was cited as an example of good practice.

- A common application form used by different funders would be welcome.

- More broadly, the NGOs felt it would help if funders could move away from paper-based systems towards face-to-face conversations. This would particularly help smaller and less experienced grant-seekers and those representing minority groups.

- A clear timetable for decisions on applications is very good practice. Participants supported the idea

of grant programmes being opened at certain times of the year, with the total fund available specified, along with the average size or number of grants that the funder expects to make. Quicker decisions would also be greatly appreciated by grant-seekers.

- Applicants find it very problematic when they don't get any feedback on why their application was rejected. Rejections of proposals made seemingly on the whim of individual trustees also cause great frustration, particularly if they come after detailed discussions between funder and grant-seeker.
- Some trusts have rules stipulating that organisations may not make further applications for 12 to 18 months. This can lead to the grant-seeking organisation losing contacts which it has spent a long time establishing.
- From the grant-seeker perspective, it is really important to keep the funding relationship as flexible as possible, with the minimum bureaucracy and administration load. The more requirements funders impose on their grantees, the less time grantee organisations can spend doing their 'real' work.
- It is very important that the evaluation of projects incorporates a more long-term perspective – “three years, not three weeks” as one participant put it. Collaboration between funders and grantee organisations on the development of evaluation guidelines might be useful.
- Criteria tend to be weighted towards output measures, such as the number of trees planted, the number of leaflets circulated and so on. In practice, the process by which a project is delivered may turn out to be equally important in the long term, for instance if sectors of the community not normally involved in environmental work can be brought on board. The NGOs felt that sometimes funders don't seem to be very interested in these benefits, and that the focus is strongly on environmental outcomes at the expense of social ones.
- How the capacity of funders to handle applications could be enhanced was a recurring

theme. Relatively few funders making grants on environmental issues have staff and trustees with expertise in this area. The creation of some kind of mechanism allowing non-specialist trustees to draw on expert advice might help improve the grants market. The appointment of more trustees with direct experience of working in the non-profit sector might also help.

Trusts' understanding of how their grantees operate

- There was widespread support for the creation of forums where funders and grant-seekers could meet together to discuss how social change happens and how NGOs work on a day-to-day basis. Discussion about the length of time that it can take to effect change was seen as particularly important. Particular challenges for NGOs at present include the 'stop-start' nature of funding, regular demands from funders for 'new' and innovative projects, and a reluctance on the part of funders to support work that doesn't have immediately quantifiable outcomes.
- As one participant put it, “I can see the attraction of 'new' projects for funders, but this doesn't mean that the hoary old problems can be set to one side. They still need to be solved.” The pressure for new approaches can lead to grant-seekers feeling that they have to dress old problems up as new ones. In addition to this, many grantee organisations have responsibilities to existing programmes of work which they cannot simply drop in order to pursue the “new new thing”.

Things for which it is hard to raise money

- At the top of almost everyone's list was core funding. In an anecdote about one of the funds linked to the Lottery, a participant told how they had received a response to a funding request stating that “we don't fund anything called overheads”. This clearly makes it hard for an organisation to carry out its work. As with the pressure for innovation, the reluctance of funders to contribute to core costs leads to grant-seekers going to considerable lengths to hide these costs

in their funding requests. It is hard to see how this really benefits either funders or grantees.

Difficulties in obtaining core funding are shared by environmental organisations in other countries. Research carried out by the Canadian government in 2003, and reported by the Canadian Environmental Grantmakers Network, shows that the unwillingness of funders to support core operations was one of the top two external funding problems for environmental organisations, along with reductions in government funding.⁶

Meanwhile in the United States, a 2005 report by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy shows that the ten best-funded conservative advocacy organisations in America received 90% of their foundation funding in the form of general operating support.⁷ By contrast, their counterparts on the left of the political spectrum received just 16% of their foundation funding as general operating support.

- Grants for capacity building are also vital, but can be hard to obtain. Funders want the organisations that they are funding to be well managed, but often provide no dedicated funding for this purpose.

- A third problem area relates to campaigning work. Aside from public donations, the charitable trust sector is one of the few potential sources of funding for campaigns, as government funding bodies and corporate donors are very unlikely to back campaigning. Analysis of just under £200 million of ‘public sector’ grants in *Where The Green Grants Went 2* showed just £183,000 going towards advocacy and campaigning work.

- Participants felt it would be very useful to discuss jointly with funders the types of campaigning

activity allowed under charity law. They had the sense that some trusts perceive campaigning as by definition an activity for extremists, and that campaigning thus has a negative aura.

- A further challenge for fundraisers comes when funding is needed for work that integrates social and environmental concerns. There was widespread agreement that it is easier to find funding for purely environmental issues, and consensus that it would be helpful if funders were able to widen their definitions of what constitutes environmental work.

- Ironically, given the pressure from trusts for new approaches (described above) many of the organisations at the seminar felt that when it comes to truly innovative work it is very hard to secure funding. This is because new ideas are unlikely to fit in with the established criteria of trusts. (There is clearly a tension here between the demand from grant-seekers for greater clarity over funding criteria and their concern that not enough flexible funds are available for innovation.) It was suggested that every funder should reserve an element of their available funds to support innovation within the sector.

The problem of “funding inertia” – whereby organisations that are funded tend to stay funded, and those that are broke tend to stay broke – is highlighted by Christopher Hayes in his thought-provoking article of June 2006.⁸ Hayes describes a Catch-22 situation for new organisations and those with a novel approach or issue, who can “only secure funding if they have a good reputation and a demonstrated record of achieving results, [even though] without any money it’s hard to gain much of a reputation or get much of anything done”.

⁶ Canadian Environmental Grantmakers Network, *A Profile of Environmental Nonprofit & Voluntary Organizations in Canada*, October 2004. Available at: www.cegn.org

⁷ National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, *Not All Grants Are Created Equal: why non-profits need general operating support from foundations*, Washington D.C., 2005. Available at: www.ncrp.org/downloads/PDF/core-op_final_low_res.pdf

⁸ Christopher Hayes, ‘The New Funding Heresies: what everyone knows (but no one will say) about funding the left’, *In These Times*, 26th June 2006. Available at: <http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/2697/>

- Climate change was right at the top of the list of issues that are hard to fund. There are many opportunities for trusts to get engaged in this issue. Hopefully the recent shifts in public, corporate and political engagement will encourage more funders to become active.
- International environmental work was also seen as hard to fund. This seems surprising, given that 37% of funding from UK environmental trusts in 2004/05 was directed to work outside the UK.
- NGOs had difficulty securing funding for work directed towards the political parties in the UK. Given the competition that currently exists between the three main parties over environmental issues, it may be that trusts are missing out on an opportunity.
- Finally, it is sometimes the smallest sums of money that are the hardest to secure. Smaller organisations especially may only need a small sum to carry out a particular piece of work, which can be problematic if funders are set up to make grants only above a certain size.

Role of trusts relative to other sources of grant funding

- Although the discussion focused mainly on charitable trusts, some comparisons were made between statutory funders and corporate funders. It was pointed out that trusts have a potential for flexibility and creativity which mark them out from other sources of grants. Statutory funders in particular were seen as inflexible, and, in the words of one participant, “totally unable to think out of the box”.
- Statutory funders are also seen as more bureaucratic. Several fundraisers referred to the “nightmare” audit trails that grantees have to follow. Commenting on the grants programme of one Government department, a participant noted that it “required a shocking amount of information, and just wasn’t worth the effort”.
- Concern was expressed that more and more statutory funding is currently being routed

through Regional Development Agencies. These in turn are seeking projects geared primarily towards economic development.

- Reliance on statutory funding is risky: changes in political priorities and control can lead to funding streams drying up with little or no warning.
- The decision-making process can be very slow. People spoke of some proposals taking two years to go through the whole funding process, by which time the priorities of the organisation submitting the bid had changed. The present fast-moving nature of the media, political and business debate over sustainability poses particular challenges in this respect.
- Many of the organisations present were uncomfortable with corporate funding. Companies were perceived as wanting so much in return for grants that some grantees felt that they ended up worse off than when they started.
- Some organisations described how they were constantly receiving offers of funding from corporations, but were unable to accept this money, either because there were strings attached or because it would be unacceptable to their members.
- The NGOs felt it would be useful if more companies were to set up their own foundations operating independently from the parent company, and/or if there could be some common fund into which companies made donations, with the contributions being pooled before they were re-granted to NGOs.
- NGOs would welcome a chance to discuss with charitable trusts whether or not the funds of these trusts are currently being used in the most effective way. As one fundraiser bluntly put it, “Why do trusts ‘waste’ money on things that government and companies are willing to fund?” – particularly when most trusts only have relatively small sums of money to give away. This issue is revisited in Section 3.

Opportunities for collaboration

- Grant-seekers strongly desire more direct personal contact with funders, as mentioned above. Beyond this, grant-seekers are very keen to find ways of developing more of a partnership with funding organisations, in place of the current model of “competitive begging”. More recognition all round that funders and the organisations they fund are “on the same side” would be very welcome.
- It would be valuable if NGOs collaborated more effectively and more regularly, as funders often request. Both brand competitiveness and differing perspectives on how to effect change can act as a barrier to cooperation. Larger organisations tend to be better equipped to form partnerships, since these are often demanding in terms of resources.
- The Baring Foundation and the Network for Social Change were both praised for organising events for past grantees, enabling these organisations to come together and discuss how

to effect social change. The Big Lottery Fund was seen as a leader in developing a partnership funding approach.

- Whilst increased collaboration between funders would be a positive development, some participants stressed the importance of a diverse group of funding sources. One participant questioned whether efforts to bring trusts together were really as important as reaching out to statutory funders, given that they are able to provide much greater resources than the charitable trust sector.

In conclusion

This initial foray into gathering feedback from grantees has thrown up a range of ideas which members of the Environmental Funders Network may well want to follow up in the months to come. Providing forums for funders and grant-seekers to meet and discuss ways of improving the functioning of the environmental grants market is a particularly important suggestion.

SECTION 3 – ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATIONS: SOURCES OF INCOME

In the second edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*, an initial analysis was made of public sector funding programmes which made grants similar to those of charitable trusts. It was estimated that the total amount of funding from the public sector was roughly ten times that from charitable trusts. Future research is likely to revisit these public sector programmes, with a view to making the analysis more sophisticated. This has not proved easy to research, but the fourth edition of *Where The Green Grants Went* will hopefully provide some new insights.

The decision was taken this year to build on the second edition by looking at the sources of income for a selection of environmental organisations in the UK. The goal was to understand how charitable trust grants relate to other income streams; and also to look at how much income different organisations had during the 2004/05 financial year. To this end, 75 environmental NGOs were selected and the tables in this section compiled, based on the Statement of Financial Activities in their annual accounts for 2004/05 (or the nearest equivalent financial period). The sample was based on a subset of the organisations listed in Table 4 above, augmented by a selection of (usually) smaller environmental groups, so as to ensure some diversity. The website addresses of these 75 organisations are given at the end of this report.

It is important that the figures given below are not taken as indications of the total funding available to environmental groups in the UK, as clearly there are a vast number of organisations not included in the analysis; indeed, it is impossible to know how many groups might qualify for such a piece of research. The Canadian government research referred to above estimated that there were 4,424 environmental non-profit and voluntary organizations active in Canada

in 2003, just 2.7% of all Canadian non-profit and voluntary groups by number.⁹ Future editions of this research may attempt to move towards similar estimates for the UK.

Health warnings

Before diving into the results of the analysis some health warnings are required. The first of these relates to the way in which the income streams in Table 9 have been categorised. This is not straightforward, as different sets of accounts record the same kind of income in different ways, particularly where grants are concerned. Appendix C gives more information on the categories used. The figures given for total incoming resources, net assets, staff numbers, salary costs and the amount granted to each organisation by the 176 trusts, are firmer than those given for the breakdowns of income by source.

An additional problem arises when the activity of a given organisation is conducted through both a charitable arm and a non-charitable limited company, as is the case for some campaigning organisations. Here the two sets of income have been amalgamated in order to produce ‘consolidated’ figures.

After some deliberation the National Trust was excluded from the sample of 75 organisations. The main reason for this is its size relative to the other groups. With total incoming resources of more than £314 million in 2004/05, and just under 5,000 staff, it is roughly four times the size of the next largest environmental organisation, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. Inclusion of the National Trust would therefore have distorted all the other figures. In addition much of the work of the Trust can best be described as ‘heritage-related’ rather than ‘environmental’ as the word is used for the other groups featured here.

⁹ Canadian Environmental Grantmakers Network, *op. cit.*

Our approach to the national network of Wildlife Trusts also needs explanation. There are currently 47 individual wildlife trusts, often organised at a county level, with coordination provided by a national head office. Together these 48 independent charities had an income of £102 million in 2004/05. All but 13 of the local trusts had a gross income of more than £1 million in the year in question, with the larger ones raising considerably more. In terms of their combined income, the 48 Wildlife Trusts would rank as one of the UK's top 30 charities, with more income than the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. The sample of 75 organisations used here however, includes the national head office (the Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts) and a selection of four of the individual Wildlife Trusts.

Another factor to bear in mind when looking at the income figures is that there can be considerable variation from year to year in the income of individual organisations. The figures presented here provide a snapshot – and nothing more. In addition some organisations, such as Fauna & Flora International and the Elm Farm Research Centre, were holding major grants when their financial year ended that they were due to pass on in the following financial year. This had the effect of making their recorded income for 2004/05 larger than it would typically be.

Finally, it's important to remember that, for some of the organisations listed, not all of their incoming resources are used for environmental work, as some of these organisations work on other issues as well as the environment. Equally, featured organisations may have received grants from charitable trusts not included in the 176 covered in this report, and which fund in the fields of development, or human rights. The figures given here as 'income from trusts', relate only to the 176 trusts actually covered by this report.

With these caveats, what can be learnt about the income of these 75 organisations?

Some top-level figures

The 75 NGOs in the sample had combined incoming resources of £423.5 million in 2004/05, of which £63.5 million was spent on raising funds, the bulk of this on trading activities or membership recruitment and support. When this sum is deducted, the 75 organisations had a combined net income of £360 million. Between them they employed more than 6,600 staff, at a total cost of £134.3 million, which is 31.7% of their total incoming resources or 37.3% of their net incoming resources. Of the total incoming resources, some £230.9 million (54.5%) took the form of unrestricted income, whilst the remaining £192.5 million (45.5%) was restricted income that had to be applied to a particular activity. The total net assets of the 75 organisations at the end of the financial year amounted to £329 million.

At first sight, £423.5 million may seem like a lot of money, but in comparison, the replacement cost profits in 2004 of British Petroleum (just one oil company) were some £8.4 billion. In December 2005, *The Times* reported that during that year BP had spent more than £82 million on corporate advertising around the world,¹⁰ an amount larger than the total incoming resources of the largest organisation in our sample of 75.

The most important income streams for the NGOs were, in order: a) 'grants and project' income, totalling £161.6 million, or 38% of the total incoming resources; b) 'donations and legacies', totalling £94 million, (22%); c) 'membership subscriptions', totalling £75.2 million (18%); and d) 'trading and earned income', at £67 million (16%). Three other categories of 'investment income', 'sponsorship', and 'other incoming resources' provided between them £25.6 million, or 6% of the total incoming resources.

As with the distribution of grants from charitable trusts, so the income of the 75 organisations was heavily concentrated in the largest organisations. As Table 8 shows, when the organisations are

¹⁰ Amanda Andrews, 'BP doubles corporate ad budget in \$150m bid for greener image', *The Times*, 24th December 2005

Table 8: *Income, staff numbers, and importance of trust funding for 75 UK environmental organisations*

Rank	Organisation	Total income (£)	As % of income to all 75 organisations	Staff numbers	Income from the 176 trusts	As % of each NGO's total income
1	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	80,848,000	19.09	1,432	274,883	0.3
2	WWF UK	39,364,000	9.30	290	360,500	0.9
3	Groundwork Trusts, Federation	38,515,719	9.09	113	20,000	0.1
4	Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts	26,485,343	6.25	52	13,900	0.1
5	Sustrans	23,563,049	5.56	140	119,550	0.5
Organisations 1 - 5: Totals		208,776,111	49.30	2,027	788,833	0.4
6	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	23,074,000	5.45	1,194	270,675	1.2
7	Woodland Trust	17,102,000	4.04	227	375,026	2.2
8	Practical Action (formerly Intermediate Technology Development Group)	15,091,000	3.56	421	226,987	1.5
9	Fauna & Flora International	13,929,085	3.29	48	794,761	5.7
10	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust	11,759,000	2.78	278	80,400	0.7
Organisations 6 - 10: Totals		80,955,085	19.12	2,168	1,747,849	2.2
11	Greenpeace	10,683,837	2.52	104	20,250	0.2
12	Friends of the Earth (England, Wales and N. Ireland)	8,490,415	2.00	149	259,564	3.1
13	Soil Association	7,682,062	1.81	174	570,264	7.4
14	Birdlife International	7,028,459	1.66	146	73,200	1.0
15	International Institute for Environment and Development	6,430,741	1.52	60	55,895	0.9
Organisations 11 - 15: Totals		40,315,514	9.52	633	979,173	2.4
16	FARM Africa	5,891,583	1.39	188	1,331,445	22.6
17	Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group	5,709,801	1.35	142	122,754	2.1
18	Game Conservancy Trust	5,256,713	1.24	96	114,813	2.2
19	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (Foundation & Friends of)	5,174,810	1.22	35	86,700	1.7
20	Henry Doubleday Research Association	4,299,899	1.02	141	13,250	0.3
Organisations 16 - 20: Totals		26,332,806	6.22	602	1,668,962	6.3
21	Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society	4,135,217	0.98	43	7,000	0.2
22	British Trust for Ornithology	3,876,295	0.92	98	18,503	0.5
23	Forum for the Future	3,834,368	0.91	67	656,500	17.1
24	Campaign to Protect Rural England	3,035,119	0.72	59	214,500	7.1
25	New Economics Foundation	3,019,083	0.71	46	166,130	5.5
Organisations 21 - 25: Totals		17,900,082	4.23	313	1,062,633	5.9

WHERE THE GREEN GRANTS WENT 3

Rank	Organisation	Total income (£)	As % of income to all 75 organisations	Staff numbers	Income from the 176 trusts	As % of each NGO's total income
26	Devon Wildlife Trust	3,002,099	0.71	54	69,500	2.3
27	Learning Through Landscapes Trust	2,993,837	0.71	37	79,000	2.6
28	Beds, Cambs, Northants & Peterborough Wildlife Trust	2,655,710	0.63	59	197,912	7.5
29	Elm Farm Research Centre	2,414,926	0.57	12	204,159	8.5
30	Compassion in World Farming	2,312,731	0.55	34	52,750	2.3
Organisations 26 - 30: Totals		13,379,303	3.16	196	603,321	4.5
31	Berks, Bucks & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	2,232,442	0.53	42	11,290	0.5
32	Global Witness	2,146,815	0.51	29	280,000	13.0
33	Marine Stewardship Council	2,137,670	0.50	27	883,000	41.3
34	British Butterfly Conservation	1,936,141	0.46	37	352,353	18.2
35	London Wildlife Trust	1,715,023	0.40	36	114,500	6.7
Organisations 31 - 35: Totals		10,168,091	2.40	171	1,641,143	16.1
36	TRAFFIC International	1,626,098	0.38	14	103,000	6.3
37	Plantlife International	1,433,942	0.34	27	399,814	27.9
38	Institute for European Environmental Policy	1,387,897	0.33	23	0	0.0
39	Environmental Investigation Agency	1,287,477	0.30	25	208,415	16.2
40	Bioregional Development Group	1,189,720	0.28	25	194,000	16.3
Organisations 36 - 40: Totals		6,925,134	1.64	114	905,229	13.1
41	Wildscreen Trust	1,150,897	0.27	16	244,500	21.2
42	Tusk Trust	1,058,968	0.25	3	140,080	13.2
43	Global Action Plan	1,023,642	0.24	27	46,750	4.6
44	Envolve	969,421	0.23	19	18,175	1.9
45	Pesticide Action Network UK	833,087	0.20	11	314,000	37.7
Organisations 41 - 45: Totals		5,036,015	1.19	76	763,505	15.2
46	Bat Conservation Trust	832,906	0.20	15	45,686	5.5
47	Royal Parks Foundation	809,935	0.19	3	330,000	40.7
48	Marine Conservation Society	805,460	0.19	20	34,500	4.3
49	Farms for City Children	799,514	0.19	42	40,800	5.1
50	Transport 2000	787,398	0.19	14	46,500	5.9
Organisations 46 - 50: Totals		4,035,213	0.95	94	497,486	12.3

WHERE THE GREEN GRANTS WENT 3

Rank	Organisation	Total income (£)	As % of income to all 75 organisations	Staff numbers	Income from the 176 trusts	As % of each NGO's total income
51	Community Recycling Network	768,676	0.18	15	5,000	0.7
52	Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens	740,602	0.17	13	84,162	11.4
53	Green Alliance	692,091	0.16	9	14,600	2.1
54	People & Planet	620,274	0.15	24	86,963	14.0
55	Black Environment Network	597,206	0.14	18	1,500	0.3
Organisations 51 - 55: Totals		3,418,849	0.81	79	192,225	5.6
56	Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development	571,698	0.13	7	29,000	5.1
57	Countryside Foundation for Education	544,228	0.13	6	78,000	14.3
58	Rainforest Foundation	536,956	0.13	7	12,000	2.2
59	SUSTAIN - the alliance for better food and farming	529,413	0.13	8	23,473	4.4
60	Galapagos Conservation Trust	477,649	0.11	4	82,000	17.2
Organisations 56 - 60: Totals		2,659,944	0.63	32	224,473	8.4
61	Women's Environmental Network	451,144	0.11	19	0	0.0
62	Save The Rhino International	378,059	0.09	4	20,000	5.3
63	Scottish Native Woods	325,474	0.08	7	23,000	7.1
64	Buglife	284,321	0.07	4	141,452	49.8
65	Hawk & Owl Trust	265,123	0.06	9	30,160	11.4
Organisations 61 - 65: Totals		1,704,121	0.40	43	214,612	12.6
66	Andrew Lees Trust	262,925	0.06	34	17,000	6.5
67	Tourism Concern	227,661	0.05	6	5,000	2.2
68	Country Trust	227,641	0.05	9	61,967	27.2
69	Global Canopy Foundation	201,629	0.05	3	115,500	57.3
70	PLATFORM	196,116	0.05	5	106,690	54.4
Organisations 66 - 70: Totals		1,115,972	0.26	57	306,157	27.4
71	Common Ground	191,778	0.05	4	45,000	23.5
72	Environmental Law Foundation	186,783	0.04	4	11,500	6.2
73	Atlantic Salmon Trust	182,080	0.04	5	31,000	17.0
74	The Corner House	130,114	0.03	4	50,000	38.4
75	Corporate Watch	76,830	0.02	6	21,000	27.3
Organisations 71 - 75: Totals		767,585	0.18	23	158,500	20.6
TOTALS		423,489,825	100	6,628	11,754,101	

ranked in terms of income, the top ten account for nearly 70% of the total incoming resources. By contrast the ten smallest organisations account for under 0.5%. This finding corresponds well to the observation in *Charity Trends 2006*, by Cathy Pharoah and her co-authors, that there is a huge imbalance of resources between the larger and smaller fundraising charities.¹¹ Their research shows that “of the £5.9 billion donated to the top 1000 charities from individuals, legacies, companies and trusts, the top 500 fundraising charities attracted £5.3 billion, and the next 500 charities just £670 million”.

Charity Trends 2006 suggests that there has been a real-term increase in the total income of the UK environmental sector of 11.8% between 2003/04 and 2004/05, from £877 million to a little over £1 billion. The 75 organisations analysed here had a combined total income of £423.5 million. If the National Trust (£314 million) and the income received by Wildlife Trusts that are not covered here (£65.9 million) were added in then the combined figure would be £802.7 million. It seems reasonable to suggest that a further £200 million is distributed amongst a much wider number of smaller organisations. This is something that future editions of the research may attempt to track.

How important is trust funding?

In order to try and get a sense of the relative importance of trust funding to environmental organisations, the funds provided to each of the 75 organisations by the 176 trusts were added together. The grants totalled £11.8 million, which is just below 3% of the combined total income of the 75 organisations. Had the sample of environmental organisations included a large number of small NGOs, then the overall contribution from charitable trusts would have been higher in percentage terms. However, the fact

remains that for this sample of 75 organisations the contribution amounted to just 3%.

It is interesting to compare this figure with those found by North American researchers. The Canadian research of 2003 cited earlier shows a very close correspondence, with family and community foundations contributing just 2% of the overall income of Canadian environmental organisations. Research in America, however, such as that carried out by Robert J. Brulle, shows that foundation funding often represents between 20% and 40% of the income of American environmental organisations.¹² Concern has been expressed at the level of influence that foundations thus gain over the strategic priorities and political tactics adopted by the environmental movement.

One obvious conclusion from the 3% figure in the UK is that it is vital that trusts target their contributions in order to get maximum impact. Alison Harker and Steven Burkeman observe that, “Trusts in particular are of modest significance in the scale of things, and ... if they are to play a distinctive and useful role, then they need to apply their funds strategically; ... if those funds are simply used as a marginal addition to income from government for the delivery of services, then they will be wasted.”¹³

When the importance of trust income to organisations of different sizes is analysed, then the picture becomes more interesting still. It is clear from Table 8 that for the larger organisations, the trust grants in general represent less than 2% of their total incoming resources. As the organisations in the sample get smaller in terms of income, so the importance of funding from trusts increases. For the ten smallest organisations, grants from the 176 trusts represent more than 20% of their income; in some cases, around

¹¹ Cathy Pharoah et al, *Charity Trends 2006*, London: Charities Aid Foundation, 2006

¹² Robert J. Brulle and J. Craig Jenkins, ‘Foundations and the Environmental Movement: priorities, strategies, and impact’, in Daniel Faber and Deborah McCarthy, *Foundations for Social Change: critical perspectives on philanthropy and popular movements*, Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005. Available at: <http://www.pages.drexel.edu/%7Ebrullerj/Faber%20Book%20BrulleJenkins%20Chapter.pdf>

¹³ Alison Harker and Steven Burkeman, *op. cit.*

40% or 50%. This shows how reliant smaller environmental organisations may be on trust funding in order to carry out their work. That also applies to groups working in the peace and security field, as shown by Nick Perks of the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust in *Money for Peace*.¹⁴ Some might argue that funders would get a better philanthropic return by supporting these smaller organisations with limited opportunities to secure funds from other sources, who may also have greater opportunities to innovate and respond to changing circumstances.

What share of funding do environmental causes receive?

In order to try and get a clearer picture of the share of philanthropic funding directed towards environmental causes, the figures for the 176 trusts were set against those published by the Charities Aid Foundation (CAF) in *Charity Trends 2006*. The CAF report provides figures for grants made by the largest 500 grant-making trusts in the UK, which together represent approximately three quarters of the value of all charitable trust giving. When the Big Lottery Fund's 'New Opportunities Fund' and 'Community Fund' are taken out of the CAF listing of the Top 500 trusts, then the other 498 trusts made a total of £2.04 billion worth of grants in 2004/05. The £33.6 million in environment grants from the 176 trusts under study (87 of whom feature in the CAF list) represents just 1.6% of this total sum, a disturbingly small figure, and one which underlines the importance of increasing the volume of environmental grant-making. This is particularly urgent given declining levels of statutory support for environmental work, funding that is crucial to overall income levels in the sector.

There is also an interesting discrepancy between the figures provided by CAF for environmental grant-making by trusts and those given here. For the first time in the 2006 report, the authors estimated the value of grant-making made to

different causes within the overall voluntary sector. They did this by looking at the distribution of funding preferences across their 500 top trusts, and what proportion each single cause accounted for out of the total. Some 62 of the 500 trusts had 'environment' listed as a funding preference. The CAF researchers calculated that environment as an issue constituted 6% of all the funding preferences identified. When this 6% is applied to their total grants figure of £2.73 billion (including the 'New Opportunities Fund' and 'Community Fund') the total given to the environment is calculated as £166 million, nearly five times the amount that can be identified from the 176 trusts. Had the 'New Opportunities Fund' and 'Community Fund' been included in *Where The Green Grants Went 3* then the level of environmental grants recorded would undoubtedly have been higher, perhaps in the order of £90 million or £100 million. But it is hard to see how the figure of £166 million could have been reached.

There would seem to be two likely explanations for this discrepancy. Firstly, that the CAF definition of environmental activity is quite a lot wider than the one used here; and secondly, that trusts listing the environment amongst their funding preferences give the issue relatively less money compared to the other causes that they fund. This corresponds well to the finding that most trusts making environmental grants are generalist funders which give less than 20% of their funding to environmental work, as shown in Table 3 above.

CAF suggests that the relative poverty of environmental organisations, compared to other parts of the voluntary sector, results in part from the "traditionally ambiguous status of environmental causes as a charitable objective". It is perhaps worth pointing out here that since 2003 the Charity Commission has recognised 'sustainable development' as a charitable purpose in its own right, something that will hopefully lead to increased funding over time.

¹⁴ Nick Perks, *Money for Peace: a study of income of UK peace organisations*, York: Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, 2005.

Available at: www.jrct.org.uk/documents.asp?section=00010006

In addition to listing the largest 500 trusts, *Charity Trends 2006* includes a listing of the top 500 fundraising charities in the UK, ranked in terms of the amount of voluntary income they raised in 2004/05. Of the charities listed, a total of 25 qualify as environmental using the criteria applied in *Where The Green Grants Went*. Together their combined income totals £629.4 million, or 6.5% of the income of all 500 leading fundraising charities if the National Trust is included. Without the National Trust the combined income figure drops to £377.3 million, or 3.9% of the total.¹⁵

If the charitable trust sector provides a smaller share of support to environmental organisations than is the case for the voluntary sector as a whole, then environmental groups must be getting their funding elsewhere. Research by the National Council for Voluntary Organizations and the Charities Aid Foundation suggests that one important source of support is high-level donors among members of the public. *UK Giving 2005/06* found that 12% of high-level donors (defined as those giving more than £100 per month) gave to environmental groups, compared to just 5% of all donors. The authors report that, “Charities that help children and the environment are strongly supported by higher-income people, who give over two and a half times more per person to these causes than all people taken together.”¹⁶

Income streams revisited

This data leads back to the figures above for different income streams received by environmental groups. Looking at membership donations, just ten of the 75 organisations in the sample received more than 25% of their income from this source (as defined by the NGOs in their accounts). Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth stand out as the two organisations most clearly reliant on their members for income: in part a consequence of the vital importance for these organisations of remaining independent of funding from government

sources and corporations. The costs of building and maintaining a membership base can be seen in Table 9 in the fundraising expenditure by some of the more membership-dependent organisations. All but one of the ten organisations receiving more than 25% of their income from membership were in the top half of NGOs ranked by income. Membership income is clearly important for organisations with a more campaigning orientation, since it is generally unrestricted and provides flexibility.

Smaller organisations may struggle to develop a membership base in a competitive marketplace, yet still want to carry out campaigning work. This is certainly the case for some of the organisations towards the smaller end of the sample of 75. In the absence of members the potential funding sources for advocacy and campaigning can be very limited indeed. It seems that this is one area where trusts could add value very effectively by applying their relatively small resources in a targeted way. This point is echoed in Bernard Mercer’s forthcoming report for New Philanthropy Capital.¹⁷

Turning to ‘trading and earned income,’ exactly one fifth (15 out of 75) of the organisations in the sample received more than 25% of their incoming resources from this source. Typically, these organisations are providing services and carrying out consultancy work, or manage properties where they receive entry fees from the public and can sell merchandising, food and so on.

Organisations receiving more than 25% of their income in the form of ‘donations and legacies’ were spread fairly evenly across the sample of 75, from higher to lower income, with 24 organisations getting a quarter or more of their funds in this way. As noted earlier, the ‘donations and legacies’ category is not always very clearly defined in the accounts of NGOs, and it is difficult to draw firm conclusions without additional research.

¹⁵ The National Trust income figure used by CAF is different from that given on page 21, which was taken from the Trust’s annual accounts.

¹⁶ National Council for Voluntary Organizations & Charities Aid Foundation, *UK Giving 2005/06: results of the 2005/06 survey of individual charitable giving in the UK*, London, 2006. Available at: <http://www.cafonline.org/pdf/UK%20Giving%202005%20-06.pdf>

¹⁷ Bernard Mercer, *Greening Philanthropy: an introduction for donors and funders*, London, New Philanthropy Capital, forthcoming

The most important income stream for the 75 NGOs was 'grant and project income'. Although this represented just 38% of the total incoming resources of £423.5 million, for 43 of the organisations it represented more than half of their income. These organisations are more concentrated in the lower half of the income distribution, with only 12 of the organisations in the bottom half of Table 8 receiving less than half their income in the form of 'grant and project income'.

The analysis above shows how charitable trust funding is much more important for the smaller organisations in the sample. The larger organisations with well-known brands, by contrast, often receive significant income from statutory sources, in the form of large block grants of millions of pounds. To a large extent, it is this funding that accounts for the concentration of many of the available resources in a small number of large environmental organisations.

IN CONCLUSION

We hope that the findings we have presented in this report will be of interest to funders and the prospective donors of environmental organisations, and to those working in the environmental movement.

We would appreciate feedback on any aspect of the report (via info@greenfunders.org or the

EFN website), as well as suggestions for ways in which this research could be developed in the future. We hope to continue exploring the issues raised here in the next edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*, and we also plan to start exploring different concepts and metrics for the 'effectiveness' of environmental organisations. We would particularly welcome ideas on this theme.

JC & HG - May 2007

Table 9: Detailed income breakdowns for 75 selected UK environmental organisations, for 2004/05 or nearest equivalent financial year

	Andrew Lees Trust	Atlantic Salmon Trust	Bat Conservation Trust	Beds, Cambs, Northants & Peterborough Wildlife Trust	Berks, Bucks & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	Bioregional Development Group	Birdlife International	Black Environment Network
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	84,810	97,276	220,123	145,752	199,447	43,051	710,131	114,075
Membership income	0	0	0	659,299	1,174,474	0	597,903	0
Grant & project income	169,070	43,630	444,004	1,551,911	725,785	786,713	5,665,115	478,813
Trading & earned income	0	0	155,438	145,190	93,289	187,674	32,906	0
Sponsorship	0	0	0	0	0	51,167	0	0
Investment income	0	38,076	4,067	24,675	39,447	7,791	22,404	4,318
Other income	9,045	3,098	9,274	128,883	0	113,324	0	0
Total incoming resources	262,925	182,080	832,906	2,655,710	2,232,442	1,189,720	7,028,459	597,206
Cost of generating funds	3,744	not available	58,896	489,990	487,834	133,002	200,121	not available
Net incoming resources	259,181	182,080	774,010	2,165,720	1,744,608	1,056,718	6,828,338	597,206
Net assets	132,842	1,030,854	470,192	4,137,525	5,599,942	308,151	3,390,136	149,855
Staff	34	5	15	59	42	25	146	18
Salary costs	129,418	125,032	343,652	1,129,043	971,027	529,375	2,743,531	379,957
Group 1 - 3 trust income	17,000	31,000	45,686	197,912	11,290	194,000	73,200	1,500
This income as % of total	6.5	17.0	5.5	7.5	0.5	16.3	1.0	0.3

	Butterfly Conservation	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	British Trust for Ornithology	Buglife	Campaign to Protect Rural England	Common Ground	Community Recycling Network	Compassion in World Farming
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	421,709	411,000	870,352	20,000	2,432,146	26,381	0	1,628,335
Membership income	258,389	65,000	425,266	14,333	388,363	0	0	412,209
Grant & project income	906,526	13,442,000	2,001,401	229,342	20,250	154,660	647,834	5,073
Trading & earned income	228,070	6,618,000	0	14,883	53,558	9,718	85,448	241,288
Sponsorship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Investment income	120,914	24,000	84,134	5,763	68,536	1,019	1,364	17,203
Other income	533	2,514,000	495,142	0	72,266	0	34,030	8,623
Total incoming resources	1,936,141	23,074,000	3,876,295	284,321	3,035,119	191,778	768,676	2,312,731
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>111,132</i>	<i>6,488,000</i>	<i>196,044</i>	<i>42,287</i>	<i>887,680</i>	<i>not available</i>	<i>not available</i>	<i>429,057</i>
Net incoming resources	1,825,009	16,586,000	3,680,251	242,034	2,147,439	191,778	768,676	1,883,674
Net assets	13,557,234	5,871,000	3,547,275	321,166	2,122,336	32,251	130,458	878,467
Staff	37	1,194	98	4	59	4	15	34
Salary costs	828,851	9,321,000	2,178,297	78,308	1,434,892	117,373	398,759	808,396
Group 1 - 3 trust income	353,353	270,675	18,503	141,452	214,500	45,000	5,000	52,750
This income as % of total	18.2	1.2	0.5	49.8	7.1	23.5	0.7	2.3

	Corporate Watch	Country Trust	Countryside Foundation for Education	Devon Wildlife Trust	Elm Farm Research Centre	Environmental Investigation Agency	Environmental Law Foundation	Engolve
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	4,686	226,777	407,041	1,264,051	1,894,935	163,837	5,088	22,896
Membership income	491	0	0	279,982	0	295,415	12,071	32,886
Grant & project income	64,032	0	103,615	928,925	0	813,639	126,927	521,395
Trading & earned income	1,085	0	33,194	395,551	485,763	2,630	42,417	362,027
Sponsorship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Investment income	83	864	0	43,590	25,380	11,956	280	2,791
Other income	6,453	0	378	90,000	8,848	0	0	27,426
Total incoming resources	76,830	227,641	544,228	3,002,099	2,414,926	1,287,477	186,783	969,421
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>not available</i>	9,784	73,480	269,336	41,119	145,498	4,906	176,682
Net incoming resources	76,830	217,857	470,748	2,732,763	2,373,807	1,141,979	181,877	792,739
Net assets	5,296	50,886	335,444	3,606,852	2,152,967	304,196	-8,743	180,629
Staff	6	9	6	54	12	25	4	19
Salary costs	57,782	131,325	158,247	1,040,199	285,373	583,932	115,435	416,968
Group 1 - 3 trust income	21,000	61,967	78,000	69,500	204,159	208,415	11,500	18,175
This income as % of total	27.3	27.2	14.3	2.3	8.5	16.2	6.2	1.9

	FARM Africa	Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group	Farms for City Children	Fauna & Flora International	Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens	Forum for the Future	Foundation for International Environmental Law & Development	Friends of the Earth (England, Wales, & N. Ireland)
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	2,107,051	205,809	0	9,337,182	0	120,418	48,638	2,667,692
Membership income	0	0	0	77,442	7,998	869	0	5,274,585
Grant & project income	3,740,583	3,455,419	312,532	4,224,560	642,447	3,247,807	436,041	384,573
Trading & earned income	0	1,590,055	476,505	268,176	78,649	185,024	64,544	38,533
Sponsorship	0	424,658	0	0	0	0	0	0
Investment income	43,949	32,097	3,647	21,725	5,754	9,788	3,304	44,715
Other income	0	1,763	6,830	0	5,754	270,462	19,171	80,317
Total incoming resources	5,891,583	5,709,801	799,514	13,929,085	740,602	3,834,368	571,698	8,490,415
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>909,720</i>	<i>5,460</i>	<i>6,706</i>	<i>505,533</i>	<i>not available</i>	<i>44,270</i>	<i>51,127</i>	<i>901,351</i>
Net incoming resources	4,981,863	5,704,341	792,808	13,423,552	740,602	3,790,098	520,571	7,589,064
Net assets	3,110,292	1,293,058	2,593,549	1,528,014	424,390	1,155,548	183,058	1,179,187
Staff	188	142	42	48	13	67	7	149
Salary costs	1,658,741	3,418,457	500,441	1,423,097	388,183	2,206,575	357,340	4,515,982
Group 1 - 3 trust income	1,331,445	122,754	40,800	794,761	84,162	656,500	29,000	259,564
This income as % of total	22.6	2.1	5.1	5.7	11.4	17.1	5.1	3.1

	Galapagos Conservation Trust	Game Conservancy Trust	Global Action Plan UK	Global Canopy Foundation	Global Witness	Green Alliance	Greenpeace	Groundwork Trusts (Federation)
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	191,153	2,235,558	417	0	11,029	2,692	1,871,748	97,291
Membership income	81,911	1,281,310	0	0	0	74,465	8,413,238	0
Grant & project income	191,945	1,065,968	681,409	190,460	2,131,252	410,055	2,043	38,275,354
Trading & earned income	5,866	432,289	323,771	9,303	0	183,117	356,013	0
Sponsorship	0	126,097	18,045	0	0	17,000	0	0
Investment income	2,609	43,410	0	1,866	4,534	3,565	40,795	143,074
Other income	4,165	72,081	0	0	0	1,197	0	0
Total incoming resources	477,649	5,256,713	1,023,642	201,629	2,146,815	692,091	10,683,837	38,515,719
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>199,475</i>	<i>1,879,383</i>	<i>53,552</i>	<i>22,636</i>	<i>80,453</i>	<i>33,989</i>	<i>2,317,998</i>	<i>857,312</i>
Net incoming resources	278,174	3,377,330	970,090	178,993	2,066,362	658,102	8,365,839	37,658,407
Net assets	191,720	2,293,295	-102,155	46,581	551,143	167,866	2,323,244	1,580,014
Staff	4	96	27	3	29	9	104	113
Salary costs	95,067	2,607,128	632,874	98,661	1,003,790	284,530	3,786,808	3,926,995
Group 1 - 3 trust income	82,000	114,813	46,750	115,500	280,000	14,600	20,250	20,000
This income as % of total	17.2	2.2	4.6	57.3	13.0	2.1	0.2	0.1

	Hawk & Owl Trust	Henry Doubleday Research Association	Institute for European Environmental Policy	International Institute for Environment & Development	Learning Through Landscapes	London Wildlife Trust	Marine Conservation Society	Marine Stewardship Council
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	46,687	325,045	0	73,802	209,000	312,634	218,375	3,689
Membership income	90,844	709,304	0	0	157,372	164,062	126,257	0
Grant & project income	102,358	1,032,217	160,423	6,294,080	2,448,639	639,096	417,699	1,989,868
Trading & earned income	16,084	1,894,681	1,219,457	61,071	158,446	579,519	23,536	131,129
Sponsorship	0	88,485	0	0	0	0	0	0
Investment income	5,875	7,306	3,454	0	20,180	8,689	19,593	12,984
Other income	3,275	242,861	4,563	1,788	200	11,023	0	0
Total incoming resources	265,123	4,299,899	1,387,897	6,430,741	2,993,837	1,715,023	805,460	2,137,670
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>44,571</i>	<i>1,309,776</i>	<i>not available</i>	<i>135,805</i>	<i>40,371</i>	<i>86,421</i>	<i>88,580</i>	<i>149,129</i>
Net incoming resources	220,552	2,990,123	1,387,897	6,294,936	2,953,466	1,628,602	716,880	1,988,541
Net assets	297,129	4,190,833	351,596	2,619,598	1,480,949	890,498	624,183	788,374
Staff	9	141	23	60	37	36	20	27
Salary costs	102,471	1,963,124	763,023	2,258,208	970,823	836,719	342,616	800,460
Group 1 - 3 trust income	30,160	13,250	0	55,895	79,000	114,500	34,500	883,000
This income as % of total	11.4	0.3	0.0	0.9	2.6	6.7	4.3	41.3

	New Economics Foundation	People & Planet	Pesticide Action Network UK	Plantlife International	PLATFORM	Practical Action (Intermediate Technology Development Group)	Rainforest Foundation	Royal Botanic Gardens Kew (Foundation & Friends of)
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	7,931	68,761	0	561,317	11,468	6,776,000	0	2,766,763
Membership income	23,239	0	0	329,844	0	0	0	2,002,835
Grant & project income	2,904,713	495,679	792,114	386,796	177,751	0	530,565	0
Trading & earned income	76,693	7,686	33,215	13,125	6,634	7,137,000	0	33,228
Sponsorship	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Investment income	6,507	0	7,758	24,871	263	105,000	6,391	371,984
Other income	0	48,148	0	117,989	0	1,073,000	0	0
Total incoming resources	3,019,083	620,274	833,087	1,433,942	196,116	15,091,000	536,956	5,174,810
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>66,930</i>	<i>77,455</i>	<i>14,471</i>	<i>167,718</i>	<i>2,375</i>	<i>2,341,000</i>	<i>105,743</i>	<i>699,845</i>
Net incoming resources	2,952,153	542,819	818,616	1,266,224	193,741	12,750,000	431,213	4,474,965
Net assets	1,131,448	138,964	312,350	1,985,094	52,924	6,033,000	164,994	8,415,446
Staff	46	24	11	27	5	421	7	35
Salary costs	1,353,208	419,968	298,171	738,856	63,850	5,226,000	196,855	955,356
Group 1 - 3 trust income	166,130	86,963	314,000	399,814	106,690	226,987	12,000	86,700
This income as % of total	5.5	14.0	37.7	27.9	54.4	1.5	2.2	1.7

	Royal Parks Foundation	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts	Save the Rhino International	Scottish Native Woods	Soil Association	SUSTAIN - the alliance for better food and farming	Sustrans
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	802,135	25,028,000	3,420,907	196,944	0	1,107,452	0	2,102,519
Membership income	0	23,988,000	414,971	8,643	0	913,018	23,825	0
Grant & project income	0	12,980,000	19,302,576	163,443	301,046	1,515,985	460,852	11,225,462
Trading & earned income	0	16,884,000	2,085,957	7,438	21,405	4,130,112	28,227	10,034,452
Sponsorship	0	714,000	242,300	0	0	0	0	0
Investment income	7,800	1,064,000	1,018,632	1,591	2,365	15,495	2,844	0
Other income	0	190,000	0	0	658	0	13,665	200,616
Total incoming resources	809,935	80,848,000	26,485,343	378,059	325,474	7,682,062	529,413	23,563,049
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>87,660</i>	<i>17,826,000</i>	<i>533,749</i>	<i>156,199</i>	<i>29,457</i>	<i>446,045</i>	<i>18,248</i>	<i>473,833</i>
Net incoming resources	722,275	63,022,000	25,951,594	221,860	296,017	7,236,017	511,165	23,089,216
Net assets	489,691	103,021,000	26,083,454	69,169	166,043	1,004,592	327,180	3,869,465
Staff	3	1,432	52	4	7	174	8	140
Salary costs	107,084	32,051,000	1,284,443	95,962	207,398	4,208,248	228,103	3,214,164
Group 1 - 3 trust income	330,000	274,883	13,900	20,000	23,000	570,264	23,473	119,550
This income as % of total	40.7	0.3	0.1	5.3	7.1	7.4	4.4	0.5

	The Corner House	Tourism Concern	TRAFFIC International	Transport 2000	Tusk Trust	Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust	Wildscreen Trust
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)								
Donations & legacies	0	48,913	0	145,605	441,500	1,101,788	1,869,000	0
Membership income	0	0	541,422	18,483	0	2,436,669	2,518,000	0
Grant & project income	121,346	161,255	1,046,378	347,077	599,753	86,710	1,194,000	588,479
Trading & earned income	8,171	0	14,496	271,027	0	352,963	6,012,000	456,771
Sponsorship	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,000	47,118
Investment income	597	1,996	0	5,206	11,715	11,044	158,000	14,866
Other income	0	15,497	23,802	0	6,000	146,043	0	43,663
Total incoming resources	130,114	227,661	1,626,098	787,398	1,058,968	4,135,217	11,759,000	1,150,897
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>not available</i>	<i>1,141</i>	<i>not available</i>	<i>22,159</i>	<i>213,255</i>	<i>1,564,685</i>	<i>5,072,000</i>	<i>13,310</i>
Net incoming resources	130,114	226,520	1,626,098	765,239	845,713	2,570,532	6,687,000	1,137,587
Net assets	85,480	133,950	404,816	285,630	424,604	373,810	18,769,000	1,060,900
Staff	4	6	14	14	3	43	278	16
Salary costs	78,522	125,796	540,486	448,003	142,154	988,458	5,642,000	331,321
Group 1 - 3 trust income	50,000	5,000	103,000	46,500	140,080	7,000	80,400	244,500
This income as % of total	38.4	2.2	6.3	5.9	13.2	0.2	0.7	21.2

	Women's Environmental Network	Woodland Trust	WWF UK
SOURCES OF INCOME (£)			
Donations & legacies	0	7,704,000	8,388,000
Membership income	13,178	3,830,000	17,107,000
Grant & project income	395,245	3,490,000	0
Trading & earned income	0	1,009,000	1,085,000
Sponsorship	0	444,000	5,921,000
Investment income	1,256	625,000	555,000
Other income	41,465	0	6,308,000
Total incoming resources	451,144	17,102,000	39,364,000
<i>Cost of generating funds</i>	<i>55,424</i>	<i>3,493,000</i>	<i>10,037,000</i>
Net incoming resources	395,720	13,609,000	29,327,000
Net assets	107,791	63,511,000	22,307,000
Staff	19	227	290
Salary costs	330,845	5,708,000	10,026,000
Group 1 - 3 trust income	0	375,026	360,500
This income as % of total	0.0	2.2	0.9

APPENDIX A

We have used the same 18 ‘issue’ categories as in the first edition of this research. These are explained in the list below. We would welcome feedback from readers as to the extent to which these seem appropriate and useful.

1 Agriculture – this is a particularly broad category, including support for organic farming, educational projects on agriculture (such as city farms), projects that promote community-based agriculture and marketing schemes, training for farmers in developing countries, campaigning against the control of the food chain by agribusiness companies, organisations backing small farmers, and also an element of support for organisations working on rural economy issues.

2 Biodiversity and species preservation – again, a broad category, with the focus on work that protects particular species, be they plant or animal, vertebrate or invertebrate. Included within this is support for botanic gardens and academic research on botany and zoology, protection of birds and their habitats, funding for marine wildlife such as whales, dolphins and sharks, projects that aim to protect endangered species such as rhinos and elephants, and defence of globally important biodiversity hotspots.

3 Biotech and nanotech – a much narrower category, with the focus on grants made around the issues of agricultural biotechnology (GM crops), nanotechnology and the threats posed to the environment by the coming together of these kinds of emerging technologies.

4 Built environment – this category covers grants to support the preservation of historic buildings such as churches, National Trust properties, and other heritage or museum trusts. It is particularly important to note that the figures for the amount of money given to work on the built environment are not intended to be comprehensive, since there are many trusts not in the analysis which support this kind of work.

5 Climate and atmosphere – the bulk of the money in this category is targeted towards work on

climate change, with a small tranche going towards the issue of ozone depletion. Projects include national and international climate change campaigning, work targeting the carbon footprints of major corporations, and issues around the Kyoto Protocol and the need for equity in global agreements on climate change.

6 Countryside preservation and open spaces – as with ‘agriculture’ and ‘biodiversity’ above, this is a broad category which encompasses support for public gardens and open spaces, backing for wildlife trusts, conservation trusts and nature reserves (and the protection of wildlife habitats), as well as visitor centres seeking to educate the public about the countryside. Often this work is carried out by community-based or county-wide organisations.

7 Energy – key pieces of work here include support for renewable energy (both in the UK and overseas) via research and implementation of projects on the ground, campaigning against oil and other fossil fuel industries around the world, and campaigning on nuclear industry issues.

8 Environmental law – this category receives relatively limited funds in the overall analysis, but is one that it is important to include since the professional support provided by environmental law organisations can be very important for the other work described here. Most of the funds provided under this heading went either to organisations which provide legal support to community-based organisations in the UK, or to international work on issues such as trade policy and climate change.

9 Forests and woodland – the main types of activity supported by this strand of funding are, on the one hand, educational and campaigning work around tropical forests and, on the other, the development and protection of domestic woodland in the UK, through tree-planting schemes or forest protection programmes.

10 Human rights and environmental justice – this category covers grants to organisations that are particularly focused on human rights abuses and the

justice dimensions of environmental campaigning, elements that are too often overlooked. There are also a small number of grants for work on the interface between environmental issues and peace and security. Nearly all of the grants in this category were international in nature.

11 Multi-issue work – while every effort was made to allocate each grant to a specific issue category, there was a block of grants where this was impossible, typically because these grants were in the form of core funding to campaigning organisations working on a range of different campaigns or conducting research on a range of different environmental issues. Also included in this category are grants to support media titles such as magazines and news services which report on a wide range of environmental issues. The final, and significant, strand of activity included in this category is funds provided to re-granting organisations or awards schemes, since for these it is impossible to know the final destination of the initial grant.

12 Oceans and coasts – grants in the oceans and coasts category included support for marine conservation projects of various kinds, scientific and policy research on marine issues, support for certification schemes and work on fisheries' management issues.

13 Rivers and lakes – similarly to the preceding category, work funded on rivers and lakes included academic research into hydrological issues, conservation projects (particularly in relation to the Thames), campaigning and educational work.

14 Sustainable development – the sixth largest of the issue categories is, along with 'agriculture' and 'biodiversity', fairly broad in nature. Projects supported in this category were generally of an educational nature, were community-based, or were geared towards policy research.

15 Toxics and pollution – this category spans issues ranging from support for work on air pollution to campaigns against gold mining and funding for work aimed at reducing the use of pesticides and other toxic chemicals. Grants on environmental health issues are also included here.

16 Trade and development – the trade and development category is also fairly broad, incorporating work on corporate-led globalisation and international trade policy (as promoted by the World Trade Organisation, World Bank, and International Monetary Fund), campaigning on private sector finance flows, and 'solutions-oriented' work focused on the re-localisation of economic activity.

17 Transport – grants relating to roads and aviation policy are included under transport, as are more hands-on and solutions-oriented projects that aim to increase the number of people cycling or to promote walking. The decision was taken to include both leisure-related transport activities and commercial ones within this category.

18 Waste – recycling and composting schemes (often run at the community level) were key beneficiaries of grants in this final category, along with campaigns against the incineration of waste.

APPENDIX B

As with the ‘issues’ categories described in Appendix A the methodology for ‘approaches’ is the same as that used in *Where The Green Grants Went 1 & 2*. In some cases it is difficult to separate the approach from the issues on which an organisation is working. The following ten categories have been used:

1 Advocacy and campaigning – the focus here is on organisations that are primarily interested in effecting social or political change. Included in this section are: i) campaigning organisations, ii) networks of campaign groups, iii) organisations providing professional advice to campaigners (e.g. legal support), and iv) watchdog organisations that track particular issue areas. The definition of campaigning was quite tight, and it may be that this category underestimates the amount of campaigning work being supported, for reasons set out below.

2 Community – organisations that work first and foremost to improve the welfare of their local community, including: i) community groups, ii) networks of community organisations, iii) amenity organisations (e.g. those concerned with a local park or gardens open to the public).

3 Educational – while much work on conservation and environmental issues has an educational component, organisations in this category are those which have a primarily educational mission, either on specific environmental issues or on the environment in general. In addition to organisations that define their focus as ‘environmental education’ this category also includes museums, groups setting up conferences, those organising training programmes, and those running environmental arts projects.

4 Grant-making bodies – as mentioned previously, some of the grants analysed in this report were given to other grant-making bodies, either for re-granting purposes, or for the support of awards schemes. The work that is funded with this money will ultimately fit into one of the other categories identified here, but it has not been possible to track all of the top-level grants through to their final destinations, for reasons of time.

5 Historic preservation – in general this analysis does not cover grants towards the preservation of churches and other historically important buildings. However, when trusts amongst the 176 under study did make grants of this kind, they were included in the survey for the sake of completeness.

6 Media – this category relates to grants given specifically to support writing books, environmental magazines, documentary films and news services on the environment.

7 Practical conservation work – this is the largest of the ‘approach’ categories. This category covers organisations that have conservation at the core of their mission, including: i) conservation trusts, ii) wildlife trusts and reserves, iii) national parks, and iv) visitor centres. Practical work on species conservation was also included. It is worth noting that some of the groups active in this area may be involved in advocacy and campaigning work in order to try and effect changes in conservation-related policies, and that some of their work is undoubtedly of an educational nature.

8 Representative – some of the organisations considered can best be thought of as ‘representative’ bodies in that they first and foremost represent the interests of a particular sector of society, such as organic farmers, family farmers, cyclists, ramblers and so on. Again, there may be an element of advocacy and campaigning work or educational work carried out by these groups, but those included in this category define their main mission as providing a ‘voice’ for a particular sector or issue.

9 Research – this category includes: i) academic research of a scientific or other nature carried out by universities or research councils, and ii) policy research carried out by organisations that are primarily ‘think-tanks’.

10 Service delivery – the final ‘approach’ category refers to organisations whose main mission is the provision of a practical ‘on-the-ground’ service to the public, for example cycle taxis, or recycling projects or advice services on alternative technologies.

APPENDIX C

These are the criteria used in order to code the sources of income of the 75 environmental organisations analysed in Section Three of the report.

1 Donations and legacies – this is probably the least clearly defined of the income categories, as different organisations record incoming donations and legacies in different ways. Where ‘legacy’ income is mentioned it is always included in this category. ‘Donations’ are in general donations from members of the public, or monies raised via fundraising events. However, some organisations record grants received from charitable trusts as donations and it can be difficult to separate these from other donations. Wherever possible grants from trusts have been taken out of this category and have been recorded in the ‘grant and project income’ section below.

2 Membership income – there is also an element of uncertainty in this category. Generally speaking, organisations record income from their membership base, but some also include an element of donations that are not paid in the form of membership dues and when this happens these are not always separated out, due to a lack of sufficient information in the accounts. There may also be occasions where some membership income is recorded in the donations and legacies category.

3 Grant and project income – this category includes all grants given to the organisation by charitable trusts, government funding agencies, and corporate or other donors, including those that directly support programmatic work and those that are for core funding. As noted above, there are some organisations who record this income stream as ‘donations’ so it may be that the importance of this category has been slightly underestimated.

4 Trading and earned income – included here are all trading activities, admission charges, consultancy fees, royalties, conference fees, research contracts with other organisations, rent and income from training events.

5 Sponsorship income – a category of marginal importance, only included are funds explicitly described as sponsorship by the organisations receiving them.

6 Investment income – all income from interest on bank accounts, investment portfolios and sales of shares.

7 Other incoming resources – sources of income that do not fit into these other categories, or where the organisation in question does not provide enough detail to allow funds to be allocated correctly.

SELECTION OF TRUSTS FROM GROUPS 1 & 2

The following trusts were amongst those in Groups 1 & 2 whose grants form part of the analysis. In due course the intention is to include profiles of the work of these funders and other trusts from Groups 1 & 2 on the www.greenfunders.org website.

The Arcadia Trust (formerly the Lisbet Rausing Charitable Fund)
www.arcadiatrust.org

Ashden Trust www.ashdentrust.org.uk

Baring Foundation www.baringfoundation.org.uk

Bernard Sunley Charitable Foundation

The Bromley Trust www.thebromleytrust.org.uk

Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation www.gulbenkian.org.uk

City Bridge Trust (formerly the Bridge House Trust)

www.bridgehousegrants.org.uk

Dulverton Trust www.dulverton.org

The Ecology Trust

Ernest Cook Trust www.ernestcooktrust.org.uk

Ernest Kleinwort Charitable Trust

Esmée Fairbairn Foundation www.esmeefairbairn.org.uk

Garfield Weston Foundation www.garfieldweston.org

HCD Memorial Fund

Holly Hill Charitable Trust

JJ Charitable Trust

JMG Foundation

John Ellerman Foundation www.ellerman.org.uk

The Manuka Club www.manukaclub.org

Mark Leonard Trust

Mercers Charitable Foundation www.mercers.co.uk

Mr. and Mrs. JA Pye's Charitable Settlement

Network for Social Change

www.thenetworkforsocialchange.org.uk

Northern Rock Foundation www.nr-foundation.org.uk

Peter de Haan Charitable Trust www.pdhct.org.uk

Polden Puckham Charitable Foundation

www.polden-puckham.org.uk

The Prince's Charities Foundation

The Robertson Trust www.therobertsontrust.org.uk

The Roddick Foundation

Rufford Maurice Laing Foundation www.rufford.org

Sharegift www.sharegift.org

Sheepdrove Trust

Sigrid Rausing Trust www.sigrid-rausing-trust.org

Tubney Charitable Trust www.tubney.org.uk

Tudor Trust www.tudortrust.org.uk

The Underwood Trust

Westminster Foundation

WEBSITES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATIONS LISTED IN SECTION 3 OF THE REPORT

Andrew Lees Trust www.andrewleestrust.org.uk
 Atlantic Salmon Trust www.atlanticsalmontrust.org
 Bat Conservation Trust www.bats.org.uk
 Beds, Cambridgeshire, Northants & Peterborough Wildlife Trust
www.wildlifebcnp.org
 Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust
www.bbowt.org.uk
 Bioregional Development Group www.bioregional.com
 Birdlife International www.birdlife.org
 Black Environment Network www.ben-network.org.uk
 Butterfly Conservation www.butterfly-conservation.org
 British Trust for Conservation Volunteers www.btcv.org
 British Trust for Ornithology www.bto.org
 Buglife www.buglife.org.uk
 Campaign to Protect Rural England www.cpre.org.uk
 Common Ground www.commonground.org.uk
 Community Recycling Network www.crn.org.uk
 Compassion in World Farming www.ciwf.org.uk
 Corporate Watch www.corporatewatch.org.uk
 Country Trust www.countrytrust.org.uk
 Countryside Foundation for Education
www.countrysidefoundation.org.uk
 Devon Wildlife Trust www.devonwildlifetrust.org
 Elm Farm Research Centre www.efrc.com
 Environmental Investigation Agency www.eia-international.org
 Environmental Law Foundation www.elflaw.org
 Envolve www.envolve.co.uk
 FARM Africa www.farmafrica.org.uk
 Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group www.fwag.org.uk
 Farms for City Children www.farmsforcitychildren.org
 Fauna & Flora International www.fauna-flora.org
 Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens
www.farmgarden.org.uk
 Forum for the Future www.forumforthefuture.org.uk
 Foundation for International Environmental Law & Development
www.field.org.uk
 Friends of the Earth (England, Wales & Northern Ireland)
www.foe.co.uk
 Galapagos Conservation Trust www.gct.org
 Game Conservancy Trust www.gct.org.uk
 Global Action Plan UK www.globalactionplan.org.uk
 Global Canopy Foundation www.globalcanopy.org
 Global Witness www.globalwitness.org

Green Alliance www.green-alliance.org.uk
 Greenpeace UK www.greenpeace.org.uk
 Groundwork Trusts (Federation of) www.groundwork.org.uk
 Hawk & Owl Trust www.hawkandowl.org
 Henry Doubleday Research Association
www.gardenorganic.org.uk
 Institute for European Environmental Policy www.ieep.eu
 International Institute for Environment & Development
www.iiied.org
 Learning Through Landscapes www.ltl.org.uk
 London Wildlife Trust www.wildlondon.org.uk
 Marine Conservation Society www.mcsuk.org
 Marine Stewardship Council www.msc.org
 New Economics Foundation www.neweconomics.org
 Pesticide Action Network UK www.pan-uk.org
 People & Planet www.peopleandplanet.net
 PLATFORM www.platformlondon.org
 Plantlife International www.plantlife.org.uk
 Practical Action (Intermediate Technology Development Group)
www.itdg.org
 Rainforest Foundation www.rainforestfoundationuk.org
 Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (Foundation & Friends of)
www.rbgekew.org.uk
 Royal Parks Foundation www.royalparks.gov.uk
 Royal Society of Wildlife Trusts www.wildlifetrusts.org
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds www.rspb.org.uk
 Save the Rhino International www.savetherhino.org
 Scottish Native Woods www.scottishnativewoods.org.uk
 Soil Association www.soilassociation.org
 SUSTAIN – the alliance for better food and farming
www.sustainweb.org
 Sustrans www.sustrans.org.uk
 The Corner House www.thecornerhouse.org.uk
 TRAFFIC International www.traffic.org
 Transport 2000 www.transport2000.org.uk
 Tourism Concern www.tourismconcern.org.uk
 Tusk Trust www.tusk.org
 Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society www.wdcs.org
 Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust www.wwt.org.uk
 Wildscreen Trust www.wildscreen.org.uk
 Women's Environmental Network www.wen.org.uk
 Woodland Trust www.woodland-trust.org.uk
 WWF UK www.wwf.org.uk

