WHERE THE GREEN GRANTS WENT

4

Patterns of UK Funding for Environmental and Conservation Work

Jon Cracknell, Heather Godwin, and Harriet Williams

NOVEMBER 2009

Acknowledgements

Jon Cracknell, Heather Godwin and Harriet Williams all work for the family of the late Sir James Goldsmith. 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. 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. Harriet joined the JMG Foundation in 2005 and also takes day-to-day responsibility for the work of The Manuka Club (www.manukaclub.org). She previously worked as a journalist and has a MSc in Environmental Change and Management from the University of Oxford.

The report was designed, as were earlier editions, by Peter Bishop (peterbishop000@btclick.com) and printed by Severnprint in Gloucester (www.severnprint.co.uk) on 100% recycled paper using renewable energy.

Over the last six years, the Environmental Funders Network has received grants from a number of funders, for whose support we are very grateful. They include: the Ashden Trust, the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, the Freshfield Foundation, the JMG Foundation, the Lisbet Rausing & Peter Baldwin Trust, the Polden Puckham Charitable Foundation, the Schroder Foundation, Sharegift and the Waterloo Foundation.

The network has been guided by a reflection group which comprises Tim Glass (John Ellerman Foundation), Sarah Ridley and Nick Forster (Tubney Charitable Trust), Danyal Sattar (Esmée Fairbairn Foundation), and Angela Seay (David & Elaine Potter Foundation). The authors would like to take this opportunity to thank them for their leadership and ongoing support.

Feedback from members of the reflection group has benefited this report. We have also received very helpful comments from: Beth Breeze, Professor Andrew Dobson, Dr. Brian Doherty, David Emerson, Tony Juniper, Peter Madden, Jonathon Porritt, Professor Chris Rootes, Chris Rose, Jo Temple and Rebecca Willis.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as official positions of any of the funding organisations, the Environmental Funders Network or The Ecology Trust.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDERS NETWORK (EFN)

The Environmental Funders Network (www.greenfunders.org) was set up in July 2003 to provide a networking mechanism for the staff and trustees of environmental grant-making organisations in the UK and other European countries. The Network seeks to promote discussion between grant-makers working in this field and to provide opportunities for collaboration. It has links to similar networks of environmental grant-makers in other parts of the world. More than 85 different trusts and foundations have been involved in events run by the EFN since 2003, most notably in the quarterly lunches hosted by members of the network.

The Network does not, collectively, have any capacity to assess applications for grants.
PLEASE DO NOT SEND FUNDING REQUESTS TO THE EFN WEBSITE AS WE CANNOT RESPOND TO THEM.

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

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the fourth edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*. It looks at the availability of grants for different types of environmental work, and at the distribution of such grants over a five-year period. The focus is on a detailed analysis of grants data from 97 trusts and foundations, mainly UK-based; this analysis is supplemented by research on environmental giving from more general sources.

The report identifies the following key trends:

Environmental grant-making is growing...

- Over the two financial years from 2004/05 to 2006/07, the total value of environmental grants made by the core group of 97 trusts increased by 67.9%, or nearly 10 times the rate of inflation. Between 2004/05 and 2005/06 there was a 43.7% rise, to a total of £46 million. The following year saw a further increase of 17%, leading to a total for 2006/07 of £53.9 million in grants given.
- Average grant sizes also increased. In 2005/06 the 97 trusts made 1,351 grants in all, with an average grant size of £34,000. The following year 1,510 grants were made, averaging £35,700.
- This growth in trust funding for environmental causes is very welcome. It comfortably outstrips the growth in overall charitable trust giving over the five years from 2002/03 to 2006/07.
- The field of environmental philanthropy is dynamic at the moment, with new funders entering the sector and well-known names stepping up their grant-making and leadership roles. Many of the most innovative funders in UK philanthropy are now engaging with environmental issues.

...but from a low base

- This growth in activity and the value of grants comes from a low base. An analysis of the accounts of 114 of the 299 largest grant-making trusts in the UK shows that environmental grants represent less than 3% of total trust funding.
- Moreover, the share of income provided by UK trusts to environmental organisations, remains lower than the average contribution of trusts to voluntary-sector income in the UK.

The US is pulling ahead

- On a per capita basis, US foundation giving on the environment is nearly four times that of UK trusts and foundations; moreover, the gap is still growing.
- US foundations made around $2.69 billion of environmental grants in 2007, equating to £1.34 billion, or 19 times the environmental funding provided by UK trusts. Environmental grants represent nearly 7% of giving from the largest US foundations, the highest share on record and more than twice the proportion given in the UK.

Climate change remains a blind spot

- The impact of climate change on public health, global poverty, security, migration, human rights and prospects for future generations is now widely recognised. All of these are issues of great interest to the largest charitable trusts in the UK, yet by and large these trusts do not engage with efforts to de-carbonise economies and lifestyles.
- Indeed, less than 0.3% of the grants made by the largest grant-making trusts in the UK were directed to climate change mitigation in the period under review.
- Even among the core 97 environmental funders, grants directed towards tackling climate change represented less than 10% of green giving in both 2005/06 and 2006/07, even if grants relating to tropical deforestation are included.
- By contrast, US foundations are estimated to have given $325 million for climate change work in 2008 (equivalent to £175 million): nearly three

times the amount granted in 2006, and an increase of 483% on the 2004 total of $57.7 million.[1]

Environmental grant-making is concentrated...

- Environmental grant-giving remains heavily concentrated in a small number of trusts. Of the group of 97 trusts, the 20 largest accounted for £43.7 million of grants in 2006/07, or 81% of the total.
- The 97 trusts studied themselves account for nearly 80% of all environmental grant-making by UK trusts and foundations, estimated at £69.6 million in 2006/07.
- Recipients of grants are similarly concentrated. The 100 organisations which received the most funding represent just 5.3% of all grantees by number, but secured 61.6% of the total grants by value over five years. The top 200 recipient organisations together account for more than three-quarters of the money given by trusts and foundations.
- Three-quarters of all grants made by environmental trusts fall into the categories of biodiversity and species preservation, agriculture and food, terrestrial ecosystems, and multi-issue work. Little funding is provided for addressing climate change or resource depletion.

...and shows significant variability from year to year

- There is considerable turbulence on both the supply and demand side of the grants market. Levels of environmental funding rose or fell more than 50% year-on-year for a third of the 97 trusts under analysis. On the grantee side, income from trusts often rises or falls by more than 50% from one year to the next.
- Of the 1,900 organisations funded by the 97 core trusts over the five years of this research, 57.7% only ever received one grant. Just 294 organisations (15.4%) managed to secure five grants or more during the five years under study.
- These swings in annual grant income are partly explained by multi-year funding, but none the less, the sense of a wide, shallow distribution of environmental grants remains.

Overseas grants are increasing, while sub-national gaps exist in the UK

- In 2006/07, the share of grant money supporting work in the UK fell below 50% for the first time, to 45.6%.
- Africa remains the continent receiving the greatest share of international grants, which are generally directed towards conservation projects or sustainable agriculture initiatives.
- Very little money is directed towards work at a pan-European level and within EU institutions, despite the fact that more than 80% of the environmental legislation affecting the UK is framed at the European level.
- At the sub-national level, the South West, Scotland, London, and the East of England accounted for 77.4% of the grants made by trusts to local projects in 2005/06 and 68.3% the following year. In population terms, these four regions account for 38.5% of the total UK population.
- Among the regions most under-funded relative to population size are the East Midlands, West Midlands, and Yorkshire & The Humber.

Environmental philanthropy – the best it can be?

- Philanthropy is widely perceived to have the potential to catalyse innovation, combining resources

[1] Paige Brown, *Climate and Energy Funders Survey 2008*, prepared for the San Francisco-based Climate and Energy Funders Network. The survey actually estimates total foundation funding on climate change in 2008 to be $394 million. However, this includes some grants made by European-based funders; the survey also uses a wider definition of climate-change funding than used in this report. For this reason the more conservative figure of $325 million has been quoted for the US.

with foresight and a certain freedom from the strings attached to government or corporate giving.

- This report suggests that grant-makers are having difficulty in maximising this potential in the environmental arena. In particular, the non-involvement of so many trusts in tackling climate change – a massive threat to landscapes, wildlife and humanity – marks a big disconnect between challenge and response.
- The report explores reasons why grant-makers find it difficult to act on climate change or other systems-wide environmental problems.
- Finally, the report suggests some ways forward for grant-makers.

INTRODUCTION

This report, fourth in the series *Where The Green Grants Went*, provides data on trust and foundation funding for environmental work in the two financial years of 2005/06 and 2006/07.[2] When this information is added to the data from earlier reports, a five-year longitudinal time series is created. This sequence provides insights into the way in which the grants market functions over time, a dimension rarely explored in philanthropic research. Thus, the report's findings will hopefully be of interest to all grant-makers, not just those in the environmental field.

This report is part of an emerging body of knowledge. As in earlier editions, the focus is on private trusts and foundations registered in, or largely managed from, the United Kingdom. Colleagues from funder networks in other parts of the world are also involved in tracking environmental philanthropy. An updated overview of US environmental grant-making has just been published by the Environmental Grantmakers Association[3]; later this year, the Canadian Environmental Grantmakers Network will report on environmental philanthropy in Canada. Last year, funders involved in the newly formed Green Grantmakers Network in New Zealand published similar research.[4] International comparisons are provided where this seems useful.

The range of environmental concerns addressed in this report is much wider than traditional species-based or place-based conservation activity. Conceptualisation of the nature of environmental problems has undergone fundamental change since the world's oldest conservation organisations were founded, as Box 1 demonstrates. The last century has seen substantial progress in the passage of regulation designed to reduce pollution or protect specific habitats. Yet these gains are increasingly offset by the emergence of more systemic problems threatening the fabric of life on Earth, such as damage to the global climate system and the unsustainable consumption of natural resources.

Box 1: *Three types of environmental problem*

Type One (early 1900s to today): In many industrialised countries, the environmental movement grew out of conservation and the realisation that the world's great wildernesses and wildlife stocks were not inexhaustible but would require management if their use was to be sustainable.

Type Two (1960s to today): Environmental concern in the 1960s crystallised around a newer set of challenges, as the impact of human activity manifested itself in smogs, filthy rivers, damage caused by pesticides and habitat destruction. These problems tend to be both acute and geographically confined. Their effects (like poor air quality) are generally immediately felt and related to identifiable causes (like polluting factories). They can usually be addressed at a regional or national level.

Type Three (1980s to today): Climate change and the over-consumption of natural resources (fish stocks, water, forests, soils) head the list of latter-day environmental challenges. These issues differ materially from earlier types. They tend to be chronic, with impacts often remote or difficult to perceive, so that they may be seen as problems for the future which affect others – 'them', 'over there'. International collaboration is usually needed to address these problems.

[2] Many trusts prepare their accounts using the standard UK financial year from the beginning of April through to the end of March, e.g. April 2006 to March 2007. Where trusts use different accounting periods, their grants have been allocated to the April-March financial year which fits most closely to their practice..

[3] Environmental Grantmakers Association, *Tracking the Field, Volume 2: A Closer Look at Environmental Grantmaking*, New York, Foundation Center & Environmental Grantmakers Association, September 2009.

[4] Saints Information Limited, *Green Grants in NZ*, a report for the Hikurangi Foundation and ASB Community Trust, 2008.

Modern environmentalism has to respond to all three types of problem simultaneously. A scorecard of the competency of the environmental movement (broadly defined) might rate its response to Type One problems as 'good'. There is considerable expertise in the fields of species and habitat protection, underpinned by a strong scientific base. Although governments can and should go further, conservation objectives have been widely incorporated into policy and business practice.

Similarly, many wealthy countries now routinely manage acute pollution and other Type Two problems. Here too, the movement might be considered to have achieved a 'good' level of competency. Sophisticated laws and institutions have been developed to protect the air and water and to clean up industrial practices. However, Type Two problems still blight the lives of hundreds of millions in less wealthy parts of the world, where less progress has been made on the goals of technology transfer or other means of circumventing the heavy pollution that tends to accompany industrialisation.

Together, Type One and Two problems comprise the comfort zone for much environmental grant-making, whether from private trusts and foundations, from corporate funders or from government itself.

However, the difficulty is that gains made in dealing with both types of problem stand to be undermined by Type Three challenges, where the scorecard arguably reads 'a long way to go'.

Type Three problems are quite different in nature to those which preceded them. They raise uncomfortable questions about modern lifestyles and conventional economic growth. Tackling the causes of sea-level rise, or the exhaustion of natural resources, requires intervention in sectors or geographies far removed from the immediate symptoms of the problem. Societies have so far failed to come up with an adequate response.

Many of these current problems have impacts reaching far beyond the boundaries of traditional green concern. Both climate change and future competition for resources are set to have major impacts on public health, global poverty, security, migration, human rights and the prospects of future generations.

Report structure

This report is divided into five sections. The first considers the availability of grants for environmental work in the context of overall UK trust funding and identifies the issues which environmental funders most like to support.

The second section focuses specifically on funding for work on climate change mitigation, and explores some of the reasons given by funders for not engaging with complex Type Three environmental problems.

In the third section, some of the different value sets at work in UK environmentalism are laid out. Understanding these is important when considering 'effectiveness' in environmental funding, the report suggests.

The fourth section provides updated figures on which environmental organisations receive the most support from UK trusts, tabulated both by total funding and by numbers of grants.

Finally, the fifth section surveys the geographical distribution of grants, concluding with further reflections on how the grants market functions overall.

SECTION ONE

TRUST FUNDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Overview of the funding landscape

In 2006/07, UK trusts and foundations gave a total of £69.6 million to environmental issues. This figure has been calculated by adding the environmental grants made by the 97 trusts that are the main focus of this report to environmental grants made by other trusts featured in the top 300 trusts, as identified in *Charity Market Monitor 2008*.[5]

The 97 trusts are the same ones that were analysed in detail in the third edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*. Many are generalist funders, making grants to other areas alongside the environment. Some of them have large budgets, some much smaller – in total, 56 of the 97 trusts feature in the *Charity Market Monitor* list. Together, the 97 trusts account for just under 80% of the total giving of £69.6 million. Some trusts listed in *Charity Market Monitor* and not part of this group of 97 will be integrated into future editions, along with new trusts and foundations that have only become active in the last year or two.[6]

In 2005/06 the core group of 97 trusts made 1,351 environmental grants worth a little over £46 million, with an average grant size of just over £34,000. This represents an increase of 43.7% in overall environmental giving compared to the previous year.

In the following year, 2006/07, the funding from these 97 trusts increased again, by 17.1%, to £53.9 million, distributed via 1,510 grants. The average grant size for this second year was nearly £35,700. In total, trust funding rose between the financial years 2004/05 and 2006/07 by 67.9%, or nearly 10 times the rate of inflation. In future editions of this research it will be possible to chart the impact of the recession on trust giving for environmental issues. Grants in 2006/07 were not affected by the credit crunch and resulting financial turmoil. In subsequent years, it will be interesting to chart the effects of these events.

Meanwhile, over the longer five-year timespan, trends are encouraging. The table overleaf shows the total amount given by the 30 trusts covered in the first edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*, in each of the five financial years from 2002/03 to 2006/07.[7] Annual percentage increases were modest to begin with (7.1% and 6.1%) but have increased sharply in the last couple of years, by 37.2% and 28.7% respectively. Over the five years from 2002/03 the increases are considerably higher than the growth in overall trust funding in the UK.[8] The number of grants made by the 30 trusts grew more slowly than the total amount given, with the corollary that average grant size for this initial group of 30 trusts has gone up significantly, to more than £44,000.

Expanding the number of trusts considered to cover the full set of 97 (including the initial 30 trusts) reveals the significant year-on-year growth referred to above.

[5] Cathy Pharaoh, *Charity Market Monitor 2008: Volume 2*, *Grantmakers and Corporate Donors*, London: Waterlow Professional Publishing, 2008.

[6] The funders featuring in the *Charity Market Monitor* include a number of corporate foundations that had been consciously omitted from earlier editions of *Where The Green Grants Went*. Other foundations not previously identified will be included in future editions. Most of the funding from trusts not included in the core group of 97 is directed towards agriculture projects (mainly in the developing world) or conservation work.

[7] These 30 trusts were the only UK environmental foundations that had been identified by the authors when the first edition was compiled. Subsequent editions have incorporated data from more trusts.

[8] As reported in *Charity Market Monitor 2008*, *op. cit.*

Table 1: *Environmental grants from 30 selected trusts from 2002/03 to 2006/07 (five years)*

	2002/03	2003/04	% +/-	2004/05	% +/-	2005/06	% +/-	2006/07	% +/-
Initial 30 WTGGW trusts									
Total grants (£)	18,313,159	19,608,880	7.1	20,809,367	6.1	28,557,986	37.2	36,746,804	28.7
No. of grants	673	733	8.9	735	0.3	803	9.3	827	3.0
Avg. grant size (£)	27,211	26,752	-1.7	28,312	5.8	35,564	25.6	44,434	24.9

Table 2: *Environmental grants from 97 selected trusts from 2004/05 to 2006/07 (three years)*

	2004/05	% +/-	2005/06	% +/-	2006/07	% +/-
All 97 trusts						
Total grants (£)	32,022,655	n/a	46,023,787	43.7	53,897,987	17.1
No. of grants	1,338	n/a	1,351	1.0	1,510	11.8
Avg. grant size (£)	23,933	n/a	34,066	42.3	35,694	4.8

As for the initial group of 30, the growth in the value of grants given by the 97 trusts comfortably outstripped the growth in the number of grants given, with the result that the average grant size across the whole survey of 97 rose to nearly £35,700, or 49% more than two years previously. Trusts that fund environmental work have not only increased their giving but are also making bigger grants. Additionally, the proportion of these trusts' total giving directed to environmental work is slowly creeping up, approaching an average of 15%.

The issues trusts like to fund

Grants analysed here span a very wide range of activities, from city farms to cycling campaigns, from rhino protection to direct-action training. Following discussions with environmental grant-making colleagues around the world[9], 2005/06 and 2006/07 grants have been assigned to 13 broad issue categories (see Appendix A for a full description). The results are shown in Table 3. The same health warning is offered as in previous

Box 2: *Annual grants budgets – a rocky ride*

Individual trusts record significant rises and falls in their environmental grant-making from one year to the next. Between 2004/05 and 2005/06, 48 trusts increased the amount they gave to environmental causes, while exactly the same number reduced their environmental grant-making. One trust's grant-making remained unchanged. Between 2005/06 and 2006/07, the proportion of funders increasing their grant-making went up: 63 made more environmental grants, 31 cut back, one remained the same, while two stopped environmental grants altogether.

The amount of funding committed by individual trusts also varies over time. Between 2004/05 and 2005/06, the grant-making of 39 trusts either rose or fell by 25% or less. A further 21 trusts recorded increases or decreases of between 25% and 50%. For 35 trusts, grant-making levels either rose or fell by more than 50% compared to the previous year. Two trusts were inactive.

A similar pattern is repeated between 2005/06 and 2006/07. A total of 35 trusts showed increases or decreases of 25% or less. A further 20 saw their environment grants rise or fall between 25% and 50%. For 40 trusts, grant-making levels went up or down by more than 50%. Two trusts were inactive.

Part of this turbulence may be explained by multi-year grants being committed in a single year.

editions, that the figures given below cannot be taken as comprehensive estimates of all the money coming into a given issue from the UK trust sector, since it is not possible to ascertain that all trusts funding a given issue have been identified.

Trust funding for environmental work remains heavily concentrated in three broad categories: biodiversity and species preservation, agriculture and food, and terrestrial ecosystems. Together, these accounted for two-thirds of all grants by value in 2005/06 (66.2%) and more than six-tenths of the number of grants made in 2006/07 (61.8%). When the multi-issue category is added in – covering grants in support of organisations working on various environmental issues – the figure rises to 75.1% for 2005/06 and 76% for 2006/07. Three-quarters of all the environmental grants being made by trusts fall within these four categories. In both years, each of these four categories received funding from at least 50 out of the 97 trusts under consideration.

The small amount of money directed towards Type Three problems is striking. For the purposes of this report climate funding is defined as funding directed towards mitigating climate change, rather than helping societies to adapt to it. The value of climate grants is calculated by adding together the total of the grants made in the categories of 'climate and atmosphere', 'energy' and 'transport'. There is no doubt that work in other issue categories contributes towards reducing carbon emissions, but these three categories are considered to be particularly central to the challenge. In 2005/06 and 2006/07, the situation is little changed from earlier years, with just 7.9% of the money granted by the 97 environmental foundations going into

Table 3: *Distribution of grants by issue, for 2005/06 and 2006/07*

	2005/06				2006/07			
Issue	**Grants (£)**	**% of total**	**No. of grants**	**No. of trusts**	**Grants (£)**	**% of total**	**No. of grants**	**No. of trusts**
Agriculture & food	9,062,071	19.7	208	55	9,849,947	18.3	204	57
Biodiversity & species pres.	11,629,979	25.3	386	66	18,975,079	35.2	440	71
Climate & atmosphere	1,384,604	3.0	53	21	1,251,491	2.3	59	20
Coastal & marine	1,413,006	3.1	40	19	2,007,750	3.7	41	20
Consumption & waste	577,593	1.3	30	16	470,512	0.9	27	17
Energy	1,134,978	2.5	53	27	1,523,453	2.8	68	34
Fresh water	727,846	1.6	44	28	1,475,389	2.7	45	20
Multi-issue work	4,090,698	8.9	167	51	7,643,255	14.2	205	62
Sustainable communities	2,780,618	6.0	78	26	2,378,394	4.4	82	24
Terrestrial ecosystems	9,773,600	21.2	179	61	4,480,053	8.3	208	63
Toxics & pollution	1,385,739	3.0	22	10	1,350,982	2.5	21	10
Trade & finance	975,761	2.1	41	18	1,656,027	3.1	55	23
Transport	1,087,295	2.4	50	19	835,654	1.6	55	20
TOTALS	**46,023,788**	**100.0**	**1,351**	**n/a**	**53,897,986**	**100.0**	**1,510**	**n/a**

[9] We are collaborating with colleagues in the Australian Environmental Grantmakers Network, the Canadian Environmental Grantmakers Network, the Environmental Grantmakers Association (US), and the European Foundation Centre, with a view to developing shared categories for coding environmental grants.

these three categories in 2005/06, and even less, 6.7%, the following year. If grants aimed at curbing tropical deforestation are included, the picture looks marginally better. These amounted to £721,910 in 2005/06 and £874,384 in 2006/07, lifting the percentage of grants directed at tackling climate change to 9.4% and 8.3%, respectively.

Other systemic problems also record low levels of funding. Tools such as environmental footprinting and WWF UK's One Planet Index have raised awareness of unsustainable resource use, yet the 'consumption and waste' issues category received only 0.9% of grants by value in 2006/07. Another set of systemic issues relate to 'trade and finance' – broadly, the failure of international economic institutions to advance environmental protection – which received 3.1% of grant funding in 2006/07. The category of 'sustainable communities' fared slightly better at 4.4%, although only a fraction of work in this category is geared towards the behaviour changes needed to reduce consumption in line with the cuts in carbon and resource use called for by many scientists.

Where do these grants come from?

Environmental grant-making remains heavily concentrated in a small number of trusts. The ten largest givers from the core group of 97 trusts in 2006/07 accounted for £37.9 million worth of grants (70.3% of the total). All of these trusts made more than £1 million of environmental grants in that financial year. If the list is expanded to cover the top 20 trusts then the figure rises to £43.7 million worth of grants (81% of the total); only trusts which made more than £420,000 of environmental grants qualified for inclusion in the top 20.

Thus, analysis reveals the importance of the decisions made by the trustees of these larger trusts. Most of the rapid growth of the last two years has resulted from a small group of larger givers significantly increasing their grant-making. A group of fewer than 20 trusts can be identified as 'market-shapers'. If these trusts were to cut back on their environmental grant-making, the impact would be drastic.

One encouraging trend is the recent emergence of new environmental foundations or grants programmes, most of whose grants are not included in this report, either because the trusts are too new, or because they are based overseas. The field is dynamic at present, with the likes of the European Climate Foundation, Children's Investment Fund Foundation, enoughsenough.org, Zennström Philanthropies, the Pure Climate Foundation, the Roddick Foundation, the Waterloo Foundation and the Tellus Mater Foundation all increasing their activity. Grants from the new UK-based trusts will be featured in future editions.

Alongside these newer funders, a set of well-known names like the Sainsbury Family Charitable Trusts, the family of Rowntree trusts, Carnegie UK Trust, the Baring Foundation, City Bridge Trust, The Funding Network and Comic Relief are demonstrating leadership either by increasing their environmental grant-making or by working with their peers to raise awareness of environmental issues. A set of intermediaries including the Community Foundation Network, Institute for Philanthropy, and Coutts Philanthropy Service are also helping to draw more money into the field. Many of the most innovative funders in UK philanthropy are now embracing the need to provide more money for environmental issues. This is an encouraging development.

When patterns of grant-making from the 97 trusts are looked at over time, three different kinds of environmental funder can be identified:

a) Gift-givers – generalists without staff specialising in the environment. These funders tend to make grants to a wide range of organisations, often to 'household names' within the mainstream of the environmental movement. These trusts range in size from those making small annual amounts of grants through to some of the largest funders.

b) Thematic funders – with a tighter programmatic focus on a limited number of environmental issues, or on particular approaches to environmental work. They have staff specialising in the environment on

either a part-time or full-time basis; and they may commission research (or carry it out in-house) to inform their grant-making strategies. They tend to be more interested in social and political change than the first group. Again, they vary in size from small to large.

c) Advocates – represent a new development. They are influenced by American philanthropy and have an explicit focus on social and political change coupled with a more business-oriented approach to evaluation. Staff working for these trusts are often experts in the fields where grants are being made; and trustees and donors tend to be younger with a more entrepreneurial outlook. These funders tend to be more 'hands-on' and directive towards their grantees.

These trusts' differing understandings of effectiveness in environmental funding will be explored in more detail in Section Three.

Environmental philanthropy – still a Cinderella

Both the growth in environmental grants from existing funders and the emergence of new funders are to be welcomed. However, this growth is from a very low base. Environmental issues remain a low priority for the great majority of UK charitable trusts.

In order to assess the amount given to environmental issues compared to other charitable causes, the list of the top 300 grant-making trusts from *Charity Market Monitor 2008* was used. Having removed the Big Lottery Fund, a sub-set of the remaining 299 trusts was studied in detail. All the grants from trusts that *Charity Market Monitor* identifies as funding either 'conservation and protection' or 'international activities' were analysed. In addition, the sample included all those trusts from the core group of 97 environmental funders also ranked in the top 300 list, plus others from which it was thought likely that environmental grants might have been made. In total, the accounts of 114 of the 299 trusts were analysed closely.

These 114 trusts made environmental grants worth £60.1 million in 2006/07.[10] This is less than 3% of the total grant-making of the 299 trusts, which amounted to £2.06 billion. Trusts which provide funding for environmental issues tend to give less money to these causes than to the others that they support. Moreover, the contribution to income of environmental organisations provided by UK trusts is lower than the average contribution to voluntary-sector income in the UK provided by trusts. The National Council of Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) estimates that 9% of income for general charities engaged in environmental work comes from the voluntary sector (principally trusts and foundations). However, this figure includes funding for animal welfare organisations, which we exclude from our analysis.[11] Government is estimated to provide a further 19% of income for the environmental sector. At 28%, combined income from these two sources is lower for environmental organisations than for all other sectors analysed by NCVO, with the exception of grant-making foundations themselves, research organisations and religious organisations.[12]

By comparison with the UK, American foundations are estimated to have made $2.69 billion of environmental grants in 2007, which equates to £1.34 billion, or 19 times the environmental funding provided by UK

[10] This figure is lower than the total giving for the sector – estimated at £69.6 million in 2006/07 – because 56 trusts from the core group of 97 do not qualify for inclusion in the top 300 trusts identified in *Charity Market Monitor 2008*. Adding their grants to the £60.1 million from the top 300, gives the figure of £69.6 million referred to on page 3.

[11] In the previous edition of this research a considerably lower figure, of just 3%, was given for the proportion of environmental group income provided by trusts and foundations, albeit using a much smaller sample size than that used by NCVO. It is clear that trust funding is relatively more important for smaller environmental groups than for larger ones.

[12] National Council for Voluntary Organisations, *The UK Civil Society Almanac 2009*, London: NCVO, 2009, p.45.

trusts. When population size is taken into account, US foundation giving on the environment on a per capita basis is nearly four times that in the UK. Environmental grants represent nearly 7% of giving for the largest US foundations, the largest share ever recorded, and more than twice the proportion in the UK. The sector is growing quickly in the US, with the Foundation Center reporting that the category 'environment and animals' experienced the fastest growth of any subject area between 2006 and 2007.[13]

[13] Environmental Grantmakers Association, *op. cit*.

SECTION TWO

CLIMATE CHANGE – PHILANTHROPY'S BLIND SPOT?

As noted in the sub-section 'The Issues Trusts Like To Fund' in Section One, less than a fifth of the money granted by the core group of 97 trusts is directed to systemic environmental challenges, described as Type Three problems in the Introduction. Of these, climate change receives the most attention, but even among environmental funders it is still a minority concern, at least for practical grant-making purposes.

Comparisons with other countries are again instructive. Among members of the US-based Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA) funding for climate change almost doubled between 2005 and 2007, representing more than 15% of EGA members' giving in the latter year. In the whole field of US environmental grant-making growth rates are even more striking, with US foundations estimated to have given $325 million (equivalent to £175 million) for climate change work in 2008, nearly three times the amount granted in 2006, and an increase of 483% on the 2004 total of $57.7 million.[14]

Turning to the 299 large trusts identified in *Charity Market Monitor 2008*, less than 0.3% of grants made were directed towards climate change, worth a little over £5.9 million at a generous estimate.[15]

This lack of engagement in climate change on the part of large UK trusts funding on public health, international development or faith-based work might not have been surprising a few years ago. But key institutions in all these fields have been ringing alarm bells for some time now. These include all relevant UN agencies as well as many of the grantees with whom these funders deal. High-profile UK development groups like Oxfam, Christian Aid, Tearfund, and the World Development Movement are heavily involved in campaigning on climate change, to give just one example.

The box overleaf gives some specific examples of what political, religious and civil society[16] leaders have to say on the subject of climate change.

Despite the fact that climate change threatens to undo, or at the very least complicate, much of the good work of charitable trusts, they remain largely unengaged in efforts to de-carbonise economies and lifestyles. The same can be said even of funders more explicitly focused on environmental protection.

Why is it that UK foundations do not engage with the challenge of climate change like their American counterparts? Why do non-environmental funders, particularly those funding health and development, still make so few grants with climate-change components? And why is climate still a relatively low priority, even among green funders? The following sub-section explores these questions.

[14] Paige Brown, *Climate and Energy Funders Survey 2008*, prepared for the San Francisco-based Climate and Energy Funders Network. The survey actually estimates total foundation funding on climate change in 2008 to be $394 million. However this includes some grants made by European-based funders, and the survey also uses a wider definition of climate change funding than used in this report. For this reason the more conservative figure of $325 million has been quoted for the US.

[15] In addition to direct grants to climate change, one third of the money allocated to 'multi-issue' environmental work by the 114 trusts was included when calculating the £5.9 million figure.

[16] When using the term 'civil society' we refer to a broader range of groups, societies and organisations than just those with charitable status, including both formal and informal associations.

Box 3: *Recognising the gravity of climate change*

'The warming of the planet [and] the effects of extreme weather events can affect some of the most fundamental determinants of health: air, water, food, shelter, and freedom from disease. In short, climate change can affect problems that are already huge, largely concentrated in the developing world, and difficult to combat.' **Margaret Chan, Director General, World Health Organisation**

'Abrupt climate change scenarios could potentially de-stabilize the geo-political environment, leading to skirmishes, battles, and even war due to resource constraints such as food shortages [and] decreased availability of fresh water ... Nations with the resources to do so may build virtual fortresses around their countries, preserving resources for themselves.' **Pentagon report on climate change**

'The world is rapidly approaching the point of dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Drastic emissions reductions by the rich are required to ensure that the legitimate development needs of the world's poor can be met.' **World Council of Churches statement**

'Human rights – to security, health, and sustainable livelihoods – are increasingly being threatened by changes to the Earth's climate.' **Mary Robinson, former UN Commissioner for Human Rights**

'Climate change is one of the most important issues challenging mankind. The task of protecting the environment depends not only on legislation, but rather on the awakening of conscience and serious acts of self-censorship.' **Muslim 7 Year Action Plan on Climate Change, endorsed by 200 Islamic scholars, governments, and civil society leaders**

'All across the world, in every kind of environment and region known to man, increasingly dangerous weather patterns and devastating storms are abruptly putting an end to the long-running debate over whether or not climate change is real. Not only is it real, it's here, and its effects are giving rise to a frighteningly new global phenomenon: the man-made natural disaster.' **US President Barack Obama**

'As climate change destroys livelihoods, displaces people, and undermines entire social and economic systems, no country – however rich or powerful – will be immune to the consequences. In the long-run the problems of the poor will arrive at the doorstep of the wealthy, as the climate crisis gives way to despair, anger and collective security threats.' **Archbishop Desmond Tutu**

'Climate change is the central poverty issue of our times. Climate change is happening today and the world's poorest people, who already face a daily struggle to survive, are being hit hardest.' **Jeremy Hobbs, Executive Director, Oxfam International**

'The more we care about future generations, or more vulnerable people than ourselves, the more we will choose early action. And the more we recognize that some of our consumer behaviours are not immutably necessary to our happiness, but the product of manufactured desires and simple habits, the easier we will find it to change behaviour.' **Adair Turner, chair of Financial Services Authority and former Director-General of the Confederation of British Industry**

'Climate change poses global social, environmental and economic risks and demands a transformational change in how we manage our global economy.' **Poznan Communiqué on Climate Change, endorsed by 140 global business leaders representing many of the world's largest companies**

'This of course is the deep injustice at the heart of this crisis. It is not just that climate change is going to hit hardest those who already face the biggest disadvantages and challenges. It is that this additional burden falls on those who have done least to cause it.' **Kofi Annan, former UN Secretary General**

'I am concerned about the burden that we will leave for our children and grandchildren, if we do not take a leadership role in addressing global warming. A moral burden, as species disappear from the planet, as people are displaced by rising seas, or impoverished by increased droughts in the subtropics and by increased floods and climate variability in other regions.' **Dr. James Hansen, NASA Goddard Institute of Space Studies**

Why don't trusts engage more with climate change?

Complex, system-wide problems pose a challenge for any funder. It can be hard to know where to start when approaching these kinds of problems, while grants that are made tend to carry high levels of risk and uncertainty. This is just as true for a health funder trying to prevent disease, or a young offenders' funder trying to act on the causes of crime, as it is for a green funder seeking species protection via a stable global climate. It can be easier to gear efforts towards tackling effects rather than underlying causes. The environmental community has a stronger track record on the former than the latter, as outlined in the Introduction.

Trusts themselves give a number of reasons for the low level of grants made on environmental issues in general and climate change in particular. Broadly, these reasons relate to a lack of mandate, a lack of opportunity (including knowledge and tools) or a lack of confidence.

Lack of mandate:

- Few trusts have environmental issues listed among their charitable objects; trusts may well have been created before environmental awareness reached its current level. It is noticeable that newer and younger trusts, and their trustees, often lead the way on this agenda.
- Some trusts may be uncomfortable funding work aimed at the political and behavioural change required for an effective response to climate change and other Type Three environmental problems. This work often requires a deeper level of policy-related intervention than has been usual for trusts and foundations. Until relatively recently, it was not even clear that this kind of intervention is allowed by the Charity Commission.

Lack of opportunity:

- High-quality proposals on climate change from both environmental and other civil society organisations may be in short supply. Some funders perceive environmental organisations as less professional than other parts of the third sector. If this is a real constraint on grant-making, then clearly remedial action is required from grant-seekers.
- There is a lack of tools and systems to evaluate work aimed at driving social and political change. This concern is the subject of ongoing research, practice and debate, extending beyond environmental philanthropy. However, new frameworks for thinking about how organisations create change, like Social Return on Investment (SROI), are already available for funders willing to try them.

Lack of confidence:

- Concerns have been voiced over the 'non-tangible' or 'open-ended' nature of much of the work needed to tackle Type Three problems.
- Defeatism is a common response to climate change and other major environmental challenges, which can seem too hard to tackle. Since even environmental groups disagree on how to fix complex problems, it can be difficult for funders to work out where to start. The Environmental Funders Network has started to map out the capacity of environmental groups around different approaches, so that funders can orient themselves in the sector.
- Negative and sometimes apocalyptic messages associated with environmentalism generate frustration. More effective narratives are needed about climate change; there are opportunities for trusts to support the sharing of information on effective communications and outreach strategies.

Most of these responses are not unique to trust funders. Collectively, society is in a state of paralysis regarding climate change – for evidence, look no further than the gap between climate science and the political response. The difficulty is that ignoring these challenges is not going to make them go away. With the global population expected to exceed more than nine billion people by the middle of this century, pressure on resources will only increase. Changes to how we currently live are inevitable; the question then becomes whether or not the process of transition is managed, or whether it is chaotic. The very nature of the problem challenges philanthropists to play a leading role.

Despite the hurdles identified above, some trusts are making headway in their climate funding, as described in the case studies below. Each involves innovation in some way; for instance, the level of public mobilisation associated with *The Big Ask*, the non-financial support developed by the Ashden Awards, or the convening of an international civil society coalition on lower carbon cars.

Box 4: *Three examples of high-impact climate change philanthropy*

The Big Ask

The UK's Climate Change Bill became law in November 2008. The Climate Change Act commits the government to reduce emissions in line with five-year carbon budgets. It is the first of its kind in the world. The Act was a victory for Friends of the Earth and its *The Big Ask* campaign, proof of how public mobilisation and persistence can make change happen. The campaign has subsequently been taken up by Friends of the Earth offices across Europe.

When the campaign was launched in 2005, UK climate policy was in poor shape, with the government set to miss its own modest goals for cutting carbon emissions. *The Big Ask* called for a proper legal framework, capable of delivering an 80% emissions cut by 2050.

Over the next three years, nearly 200,000 people contacted their MP, by email, letter and in person. The government responded with a draft Climate Bill, described by then-Prime Minister Tony Blair as a 'revolutionary step'. Hundreds of MPs voted to strengthen the Bill as it went through parliament; and *The Big Ask* was finally answered when government accepted the 80% target.

Besides mobilising its own supporters, Friends of the Earth worked with other groups through the Stop Climate Chaos coalition. Its policy experts liaised with MPs and commissioned academic research. Celebrity endorsements and an 'online climate march' kept the campaign in the public eye, as the draft Bill became the subject of tens of opinion columns, both for and against.

Behind the headlines, *The Big Ask* was a tightly managed campaign calling for considerable resources. Friends of the Earth made staff time and expertise available, while donors had to hold their nerve – this was never a campaign to be won overnight but one that advanced on multiple fronts.

The campaign cost around £3.6 million over three years, much of it contributed by trusts and individual major donors, including members of the Environmental Funders Network. 'These grants helped us deliver a much more hard-hitting and sustained campaign than we would otherwise have been able to,' says Charlotte Leyburn, Friends of the Earth development manager.

The Sheepdrove Trust, founded by the Kindersley family, was one of *The Big Ask* sponsors. 'It's a no brainer, what else can I say?' replies Peter Kindersley, asked about the Trust's support. 'I personally think climate change is the biggest threat out there, and they secured a good result.'

Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy

The Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy, set up in 2001 by Sarah Butler-Sloss, are living proof of how action on climate change can yield tangible social and economic benefits for local communities.

Over 100 projects have benefited from the scheme, around one-third in the UK and the rest in developing countries. Applicants go through a rigorous assessment process, culminating in an annual Awards ceremony in London. Besides prize money, winners receive an ongoing package of support to help their organisation scale up its reach and impact.

The international Awards programme focuses on projects that increase access to clean energy services. The uptake of efficient stoves or solar lighting – both affordable, simple technologies – can dramatically improve quality of life as well as reducing carbon emissions and other environmental impacts such as fuel wood collection.

'I was aware of the problems of climate change and of poverty and wanted to address them together through sustainable energy,' says Butler-Sloss. 'Without access to modern forms of energy it's very difficult to have good health, education or livelihoods. By bringing clean energy to people you are transforming lives.'

A recent analysis of ten Awards winners found that between them they had benefited more than nine million people, saving around 1.9 million tonnes of CO_2 per year. A multiplier effect can be extrapolated via a range of social indicators, from improvements in female literacy to fewer deaths from infectious disease.

The Ashden Awards are supported partly by the Ashden Trust, which Sarah and Robert Butler-Sloss founded in 1989. The Awards' success has attracted sponsorship from funders including the Waterloo Foundation, Zennström Philanthropies and the John

Ellerman Foundation, as well as the support of figures such as Al Gore and David Attenborough, who have spoken at the prestigious Awards ceremonies. As Heather Stevens, chair of the trustees of the Waterloo Foundation, puts it:

'Clean energy can help health and biodiversity as well as reducing carbon emissions. Our 2009 award supports a scheme in Kampala, Uganda, where local forests are often cleared for vital fuel wood. Our winner converts agricultural waste from coffee and peanuts into briquettes and installs clean-burning stoves. Lower wood demand keeps the local forests standing; cleaner burning stoves improve the health of the cooks!'

Vehicle fuel economy

In December 2008, the European Union signed off its first legally binding fuel economy targets, with the aspiration of nearly halving carbon emissions per mile by 2020. Six months later, President Obama appeared in the White House Rose Garden to announce stronger US fuel economy standards, flanked by executives from Ford, General Motors and BMW.

The US rules alone should save over one million barrels of oil every day, hence carbon emissions equivalent to 194 coal-fired power plants.

The peaceful scene at the White House belied a long battle between the auto industry and environmentalists, marking an important staging post in trans-Atlantic campaigns for cleaner cars.

In climate terms, road transport presents a massive challenge and a massive opportunity. While the sector accounts for one-fifth of total carbon emissions, it ought to represent 'low-hanging fruit' or an easy win through adopting cleaner technologies.

The last five years have seen green groups of all persuasions work hard to accelerate the car industry into an era of cleaner cars. Campaigning groups like Greenpeace and the Rainforest Action Network made headlines with colourful publicity stunts, on one occasion dressing up as characters from the *Flintstones* cartoon to deliver a message to the EU parliamentarians about 'Stone Age' cars.

Behind the scenes, groups such as Brussels-based Transport & Environment and the US Natural Resources Defense Council did the rounds of the EU institutions and the US Senate respectively, presenting evidence of how low-carbon cars save money, create jobs and boost energy security.

The whole effort was timed around key decision points in the policy process, and required coordination amongst environmental groups and funders. The European campaign received funding from the Oak Foundation, the JMG Foundation, and in its latter stages from the European Climate Foundation (ECF), which formed in 2007. In total, foundations supported the campaign with roughly 2,420,000 euros over five years, equivalent to £1,713,000.

Martin Rocholl, ECF policy director, says, 'It was the foresight of the Oak Foundation and JMG Foundation to bring environmental groups together almost five years ago, which built the foundation for success. Equally important was the availability of medium to long-term funding. The amazing success is we now have binding legislation – while we wanted it to be stronger, it's still by far the strongest in the world.'

More work needs to be done in order to try and shut down loopholes and tighten the standards further. But after years of delay – European carmakers have stalled regulatory action for two decades – vehicle fuel economy is starting to move in the right direction.

SECTION THREE

UNDERSTANDINGS OF 'EFFECTIVENESS'

Given the modest sums granted to environmental causes, questions of the 'effectiveness' with which grants are being made are of particular importance. The resources available to philanthropists are very small compared to those available to the state and the market. A good analogy describes philanthropic grants as acupuncture needles, tiny in width, but potentially powerful when inserted into the right part of the body politic.

One way to think about effectiveness is through which types of activity funders support. Environment groups often choose different approaches to achieve the same ends. Efforts to protect the orang-utan in Indonesia, for instance, encompass groups who rescue individual animals, research species distribution, raise conservation finance, campaign to end deforestation for palm oil, or seek to improve forest governance. All of these approaches can be seen as legitimate means to achieve orang-utan conservation, even though the nature of the work being carried out varies widely.

One factor influencing the choices made by funders is the ease of evaluating success. Philanthropic literature is full of debate about effectiveness, much of it about metrics for capturing the success of grants. These tend to be geared towards direct interventions rather than indirect ones. Taking the orang-utan example, it is simpler to quantify the impact of a re-homing scheme for orphan orang-utans: 'This project saved X orang-utans'; than to assess a campaign to reform forest governance: 'Did the work save any orang-utans, or could it in future? Have there been significant improvements in governance? And if so, can these be attributed to the campaign?'

Funders are understandably cautious about supporting work which is difficult to evaluate. One way forward is to accelerate the development of robust, qualitative indicators, grounded in an understanding of the opportunities and risks associated with different interventions. The weighting of factors such as time-limited political opportunities, the scale of change resulting from success, and the scope for innovation may make higher risk/higher reward strategies more attractive.

Of course, organisations are not limited by a lack of financial resources alone. Political will, strong leadership and intellectual gravitas may also be in short supply. The provision of non-financial capital raises opportunities for funders to move towards a social investment model that involves supplying information, skills, influence and voice as well as direct grants.

This section of the report does not attempt to summarise all the methodologies or variables that can be factored into the assessment of the effectiveness of individual grants or whole funding programmes. It focuses instead on the different values, priorities and beliefs at work in the UK environmental movement, expressed here as eight distinct 'discourses'. The discourses on which a funder focuses will shape their understanding of how positive change comes about – and consequently of what constitutes effectiveness. Before setting out these discourses, some observations are made about common funding approaches of UK trusts.

Common approaches

Although most environmental problems offer a number of possible interventions, grants analysed for this report tend to cluster around a small number of approaches. Large amounts of funding – by grant numbers and value – go to organisations engaged in some kind of research, either on the scientific aspects of environmental issues or, less commonly, in relation to policy. The enthusiasm of grantees

(and their funders) for generalised environmental awareness-raising initiatives is also striking.

What lessons about the effectiveness of environmental philanthropy can be inferred from the clustering of trust funding around certain approaches?

One useful filter is the question of who else is carrying out or funding the work. Academic institutions and government-funded programmes turn out a steady stream of relevant research. And governments and leading companies both fund awareness-raising and practical conservation, on a far greater scale than the philanthropic sector.

Given the scarcity of philanthropic capital, it seems relevant to ask whether trust grants are truly adding value by filling a genuine gap, or simply topping up activities that could find sponsorship elsewhere.

A second useful question is how likely any approach might be to bring about the desired outcome. In the transition to a sustainable economy, for instance, a lot of effort is invested in research quantifying the challenge and outlining policy solutions. Yet these policies are a long way from practical application. Where change has occurred, it is more often because of a shift in political dynamics. A good example is *The Big Ask* campaign described above, which led the UK government to convert its carbon targets from long-term aspirations to short-term deliverables.

Equally, it is not clear that generalised awareness-raising does translate into significant changes in public behaviour. Certainly, behaviour is not shifting at anything like the rate needed to address issues like climate change, resource scarcity or biodiversity loss. There may be opportunities for funders to increase impact by re-thinking approaches to shifting policy or behaviour, by widening the base of organisations calling for change, and by helping to initiate debate around topics like regulation, choice, and personal freedom. Better and more grounded visions of what a green future might look like are needed, along with more creative messaging that reaches beyond the already converted.

Discourses of environmentalism

Research shows that funders have diverse ideas about what issues are important and about how to achieve desired outcomes. Environmentalism clearly means different things to different people.

This sub-section explores eight key discourses within UK environmentalism. Each has its own assumptions and priorities, which in turn reflect a distinct way of looking at the environmental agenda.

The analysis draws on research by American academics Robert Brulle and J. Craig Jenkins[17], and their counterparts in Australia and the UK.[18] Brulle and Jenkins identify a number of discourses, which they use to segment the US environmental community.

Understandings of what constitutes success differ widely among different environmental discourses. Take the example of protecting the orang-utan. For a conservation organisation, the establishment of a nature reserve may represent a major success. A climate-change campaigner, by contrast, might question the long-term viability of such a reserve, given the risk that Indonesian forests will become

[17] 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: www.pages.drexel.edu/~brullerj/Faber%20Book%20BrulleJenkins%20Chapter.pdf

[18] John S. Dryzek, *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005; John S. Dryzek, David Downes, et al, *Green States and Social Movements: environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Norway*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003; Timothy Doyle, Doug McEachern, *Environment and Politics*, 3rd edition, London: Routledge, 2007.

increasingly vulnerable to fire and drought. An environmental justice organisation might not regard the project as positive at all, if it had negative consequences for forest peoples.

Eight thumb-nail sketches of the different value systems currently alive in the UK movement follow. The first four are described as mainstream, meaning that their recommendations are partly applied by decision-makers, or at least recognised. The others are categorised as alternative, meaning that they are newer or encounter heavier resistance from decision-makers.

Some environmental groups are named as examples of each discourse. These examples are intended to help readers recognise the differences between discourses, and not to suggest that the named group is associated solely with any individual discourse. Many of the larger organisations, in particular, may operate in several discourses at the same time.

Mainstream discourses

Countryside management:
UK habitats have been managed for game and other animals since Norman times. Key concerns include the impacts of farming on wildlife, public access, landscape preservation and wider rural development. There are tensions with government over specific policies, but groups working within this discourse do not seek far-reaching social or economic change. Organisations work chiefly at local or national level. Groups associated with this discourse include the Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust, the Countryside Alliance and the British Association for Shooting & Conservation. Research carried out over the last five years suggests that this work is well-funded relative to other discourses.

Conservation:
Traditionally focused on protecting species and places, this discourse is underpinned by science and a sound understanding of good conservation policy and practice. Key concerns include land management, and increasingly, the conservation challenge posed by climate change and resource consumption. Organisations work at local, national and international levels. As in the previous discourse, there are tensions with government but rarely a focus on seeking far-reaching social and political change. Examples of organisations working within this discourse include Fauna & Flora International, the Wildlife Trust network, British Butterfly Conservation, and the Woodland Trust. Analysis of grant-making data suggests this discourse is very well-funded relative to others.

Environmental regulation:
This discourse focuses on the use of legislation and market signals to mitigate the environmental consequences of economic growth. Familiar concepts include 'polluter pays' and cost-benefit analysis. Key concerns include the protection of human health from environmental harms. Much work within this discourse is focused on government institutions at the national and international level. Social and political change is pursued, generally in incremental terms. Examples of organisations working at least in part within this discourse include the Pesticide Action Network UK, the Institute for European Environmental Policy, and Environmental Protection UK. Relative to other discourses, funding for work on environmental regulation appears good.

'Light green' sustainable development:
This discourse, which emerged in the 1990s, is a version of the sustainable development narrative, often presented as a market-based alternative to regulation. The emphasis is on making economic growth consistent with environmental protection through a combination of new technology and behaviour change. Public engagement through green consumerism is a high priority. Governments tend to be very supportive of work in this vein; there is strong corporate engagement too. Work takes place at local to international level. Examples of this kind of approach include the business programme of Forum for the Future, some initiatives by The Climate Group,

and corporate engagement work such as that carried out by WWF-UK. Relative to other discourses, work of this kind is very well funded.

Alternative discourses

'Dark green' sustainable development:
Groups working within this discourse seek to shift societal priorities fundamentally rather than just limit the impacts of business-as-usual. A more politically ambitious discourse than its 'light green' counterpart, it focuses on changing paradigms in key sectors of the economy like food, energy and transport. Work is carried out at national, European and global levels. Social and political change is a high priority. The Campaign for Better Transport, Bioregional Development Group, Soil Association, Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace all do some of their work within this discourse. Relative to other discourses, the funding available for this work is quite limited, particularly given the scale of changes sought.

Environmental justice:
Environmental justice organisations focus on the inequitable burden of pollution falling on vulnerable and low-income communities. Their work is framed by the concepts of rights, justice, and empowerment. Some groups focus on global and inter-generational issues, whilst others concentrate on local impacts arising from sources of pollution. For example, community-based activism is gaining ground in the UK. Political change, particularly in decision-making processes, is a priority. Examples of organisations working in this way include the Black Environment Network, Capacity Global, the UK Without Incineration Network, and the Rights and Justice Centre of Friends of the Earth in the UK. Relative to the other discourses set out here, there is very little funding available.

One planet, fair shares:
Organisations working within this discourse explicitly address limits to economic growth and the need to reduce inequality in resource consumption between rich and poor countries. Key concerns include materialism, consumption and human well-being. This discourse is strongly global, with specific work carried out from local to international level. The level of social and political change sought is high; the ideas articulated often encounter strong resistance from policy-makers. Groups working in this discourse include the Global Commons Institute, the Transition Town network and the New Economics Foundation. The level of funding available for this discourse is poor, relative to others discussed here.

Anti-globalisation and global justice:
Groups within this discourse explicitly challenge global capitalism, with activists seeking to take back power from corporations and from what are seen as unaccountable elites. The 'Battle of Seattle' at the 1999 World Trade Organisation negotiations focused attention on this discourse. Individuals typically belong to national networks of activists, which in turn form part of wider global protest communities. Criticisms of the status quo tend to be trenchant, although the alternatives sought are not always clearly articulated. Governments are likely to respond in a hostile manner, with heavy policing. Networks such as Climate Camp and Rising Tide provide British examples. Funding for groups in this discourse is, relatively speaking, very limited.

The analysis sketched above is by no means comprehensive. Many academic researchers and environmental professionals have given these questions more thought. But it seems useful to ground discussions of effective grant-making in such perspectives, at least in part.

Implications for funders

It is interesting to consider how these discourses map onto funder practice. The great majority of trust funding is currently focused in the first five discourses described above. Very little money is available for work that grapples with enormously difficult issues like economic growth, population growth, consumption, wellbeing, and environmental justice.

Some discourses are clearly linked with one of the three types of environmental problem described in the Introduction. *Countryside management* and *conservation* discourses are strongly associated with Type One, while *'dark green' sustainable development* can be located in the systemic challenges identified in Type Three. Other discourses apply across all three types of environmental challenge. Thus, *environmental regulation* and *'light green' sustainable development* are as likely to be invoked in tackling climate change as they are in controlling trade in endangered species.

Indeed, the world's response to Type Three problems like climate change is principally couched in terms of *environmental regulation* and *'light green' sustainable development*. These discourses undoubtedly provide important tools for managing carbon emissions. But it is far from clear that they are sufficient on their own; indeed, it seems vital to strengthen discourses that are currently less mainstream.

Turning to the three types of environmental funder described on pages 10 and 11, some tentative conclusions can be drawn about the range of discourses within which each one operates.

Most 'gift-givers' fund work falling within the *countryside management* and *conservation* discourses, which are relatively easy to evaluate in service delivery terms and often involve little, if any, challenge to the political status quo. 'Thematic funders' cover a wide range of discourses, but are the principal sources of funding for the *'dark green' sustainable development*, *one planet, fair shares,* and *global justice* discourses. There is also a clearly identifiable group of 'thematic funders' who support *conservation work*. 'Advocates' tend to focus on the *environmental regulation* and *'light-green' sustainable development* discourses, accelerating progress within more politically mainstream arenas.

SECTION FOUR

THE MOST WIDELY SUPPORTED GRANTEES

Five years of longitudinal data allow for a detailed investigation of the grants market. This section provides an overview of the grantee organisations receiving the most support from trusts and foundations over this time. It is important to bear in mind that grants from only 30 trusts and foundations were considered in the first year of study. This increased to 35 trusts in year two and to 97 trusts in the most recent three years.

As well as identifying the organisations in receipt of most funding from the trusts under study, the analysis lists the organisations receiving the largest number of grants, and those that have been funded in each of the five years.

The figures given below may not capture all trust income for any particular organisation, as it may be receiving support from other trusts which have not yet been included in the research. In addition, the figures do not attempt to smooth out multi-year grants. If a grantee receives three years' worth, or even five years' worth, of funding in one financial year, all that funding has been assigned to the year in which the grant was made.

Which organisations are the top recipients of trust funding?

The list overleaf is testimony to the effectiveness of different environmental organisations in raising grants from trusts and foundations, but should not be interpreted as an indicator of effectiveness more broadly, for all the reasons already outlined above.

Grants received by the 100 organisations shown in table 4 total a little over £106 million, and account for 61.6% of the total grants given over the five year period. Income is heavily concentrated amongst a small number of grantees. These top 100 organisations represent just 5.3% of all the grantees by number, but have secured nearly two-thirds of the total grants.

The next 100 recipients account for a further £23.4 million, or another 13.6% of the total grants, meaning that the top 200 recipient organisations together account for more than three-quarters of the money given by trusts and foundations.

This skewing of income towards a relatively small number of charities is common across the charitable sector. Cathy Pharoah and colleagues report that 'just 3% of charities with annual incomes of £1 million or over earn 80% of the total income of registered charities.'[19] The organisations receiving the largest amounts of funding from the trusts in this study tend to have one or two major funders which invest significantly in the organisation and fund it over multiple years. Large grants made by the biggest foundations distort the list to a certain extent.

The top 100 recipients include a wide range of organisations, from conservation groups to re-granting bodies (including awards schemes), to advocacy and campaigning organisations, educational institutions, scientific research institutes, universities, media titles, certification bodies and hands-on service delivery charities.

[19] Cathy Pharoah, *op. cit.*

Table 4: *Top 100 recipients of trust funding, 2002/03 to 2006/07*

Rank	Grantee organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	No. of years
1	Fauna & Flora International	5,631,793	54	5
2	Kilimo Trust	4,710,382	3	2
3	University of Cambridge	4,370,750	6	3
4	Will Woodlands	4,000,000	1	1
5	FARM-Africa	3,956,300	18	5
6	Whitley Fund for Nature/Whitley Laing Foundation	2,858,806	21	5
7	Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies	2,782,086	1	1
8	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	2,445,900	26	5
9	Forum for the Future	2,445,625	33	5
10	Marine Stewardship Council	2,062,500	19	5
11	WWF-UK	1,925,820	59	5
12	Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy	1,920,630	40	5
13	Natural History Museum	1,918,348	17	5
14	Rufford Small Grants for Nature Conservation	1,903,653	3	3
15	Wildlife Trust for Beds, Cambs, Northants & Peterborough	1,832,412	15	4
16	Global Witness	1,781,000	17	5
17	Woodland Trust	1,759,376	71	5
18	Pesticide Action Network UK	1,707,986	37	5
19	Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, University of Oxford (WildCRU)	1,707,829	46	4
20	British Butterfly Conservation Society	1,563,238	35	5
21	Soil Association	1,543,279	78	5
22	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	1,394,783	47	5
23	Friends of the Earth (England, Wales & Northern Ireland)	1,389,834	66	5
24	Royal Horticultural Society	1,377,600	30	5
25	Environmental Investigation Agency	1,298,264	24	5
26	Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens	1,293,830	20	5
27	Elm Farm Research Centre	1,272,559	22	5
28	Friends of the Earth International	1,256,814	17	5
29	Plantlife International	1,125,275	45	5
30	Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment	1,059,530	3	3
31	Sustrans	1,030,475	33	5
32	Great Fen Project	1,000,000	1	1
33	National Botanical Institute of South Africa	1,000,000	2	2
34	New Economics Foundation	899,892	29	5
35	Rainforest Action Network	867,886	13	5
36	Wildscreen Trust	848,400	24	4
37	Rothamsted International	827,555	3	3
38	National Trust	809,505	37	5
39	Cowes Town Waterfront Trust	750,000	2	2
40	Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust (formerly Game Conservancy Trust)	744,942	33	5
41	Campaign to Protect Rural England	728,557	50	5
42	Blacksmith Institute	725,000	6	5
43	Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group	715,793	8	5
44	New World Foundation	700,000	4	4
45	University of Bristol	685,649	7	3
46	London Wildlife Trust	676,100	15	5
47	Global Canopy Foundation	638,515	24	5
48	International Centre of Insect Physiology & Ecology	635,000	2	2
49	Dorset Wildlife Trust	633,439	21	5
50	Buglife	632,712	8	4

Rank	Grantee organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	No. of years
51	National Trust For Scotland	631,250	15	5
52	Global Greengrants Fund	630,000	6	5
53	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture	598,128	3	3
54	Marine Conservation Society	591,500	36	5
55	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	590,025	45	5
56	Herpetological Conservation Trust	588,110	5	3
57	John Muir Trust	569,851	5	3
58	International Rivers Network	568,289	7	5
59	Wiltshire Wildlife Trust	561,561	16	5
60	Zoological Society of London (London Zoo)	551,575	12	4
61	Assynt Foundation	550,000	1	1
62	Ponds Conservation Trust	543,036	8	5
63	Green Alliance	537,156	14	5
64	Lichfield & Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust	536,500	13	3
65	TRAFFIC International	531,958	8	5
66	Tusk Trust	528,220	30	5
67	Ecosystems Limited (publisher of *The Ecologist* magazine)	525,913	12	4
68	Practical Action (formerly Intermediate Technology Development Group)	524,198	19	5
69	Council for Scientific & Industrial Research	505,600	3	3
70	Wildlife Trust of South & West Wales	502,850	7	3
71	Devon Wildlife Trust	495,014	41	5
72	Slow Food Foundation	490,654	1	1
73	European Environmental Bureau	480,000	3	3
74	Kent Wildlife Trust	473,451	19	5
75	Peace Parks Foundation	470,625	6	5
76	Royal Parks Foundation	470,500	6	3
77	International Institute for Environment & Development	463,003	8	4
78	Carbon Disclosure Project	457,910	7	5
79	People & Planet	457,131	28	5
80	Forests and European Union Resource Network (FERN)	455,000	3	3
81	Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development (FIELD)	445,750	13	5
82	Campaign for Better Transport (formerly Transport 2000)	442,525	25	5
83	International Network for Improvement of Banana and Plantain	440,000	2	2
84	Renewable Energy Foundation	440,000	6	3
85	National Agricultural Research Organisation	435,781	3	3
86	Environmental Research Association	434,259	19	5
87	Friends of the Earth Europe	428,673	14	4
88	PLATFORM	425,577	19	5
89	Global Action Plan	423,650	19	5
90	Trees for Life	423,181	22	5
91	Bioregional Development Group	419,000	22	5
92	Royal Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh	412,855	10	5
93	The Corner House	409,500	6	4
94	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	400,250	4	2
95	SeaWeb	400,000	1	1
96	Institute for European Environmental Policy	399,090	5	4
97	University of Aberdeen	397,963	14	4
98	Eden Project	388,000	9	4
99	Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside	384,550	5	3
100	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	369,223	17	5

Which organisations receive the largest number of grants?

In this sub-section, attention is directed to which organisations received the largest numbers of grants over five years. Here the list of the top 100 looks rather different. Some organisations appear in both lists, but those that feature in Table 4 as a result of having received just a few large grants are now excluded.

This second table gives a better sense of those organisations well known to a range of trusts and foundations (what one might term 'household names'), because in general the organisations in the list have been receiving grants from several trusts, possibly five or more.

It is possible, though, for an organisation to feature in this list having only received funding from one trust, if that funding was provided in the form of multiple grants. Some trusts give more than one grant to a grantee organisation during the course of a financial year, for example. So, if a trust had given a particular grantee a grant on a quarterly basis for each of three years, these 12 grants would each be counted individually in the table below, and the organisation would just qualify for the top 100. In general, this is not a problem with the list in Table 5 and the organisations shown do in practice receive grants from a range of different trusts and foundations.

This table gives an interesting insight into the functioning of the grants market in terms of some of the organisations which have received relatively large numbers of grants but not very much overall grant income. Examples would be the Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust, Tree Aid, The Country Trust and some of the county wildlife trusts. These organisations belong to a group of grantees in receipt of regular funding from the 'gift-giving' trusts described on page 10, those without a particular strategic focus to their grant-making, whether by issue, geography, or approach. Grants of this kind contribute significantly to the 'broad and shallow' distribution of funding discussed in more detail below.

Table 5: *Top 100 grantees by numbers of grants received, 2002/03 to 2006/07*

Rank	Grantee organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	No. of years
1	Soil Association	1,543,279	78	5
2	Woodland Trust	1,759,376	71	5
3	Friends of the Earth (England, Wales & Northern Ireland)	1,389,834	66	5
4	WWF-UK	1,925,820	59	5
5	Fauna & Flora International	5,631,793	54	5
6	Campaign to Protect Rural England	728,557	50	5
7	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	1,394,783	47	5
8	Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, University of Oxford (WildCRU)	1,707,829	46	4
9	Plantlife International	1,125,275	45	5
10	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	590,025	45	5
11	Devon Wildlife Trust	495,014	41	5
12	Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy	1,920,630	40	5
13	Pesticide Action Network UK	1,707,986	37	5
14	National Trust	809,505	37	5
15	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust	293,940	37	5
16	Marine Conservation Society	591,500	36	5
17	British Butterfly Conservation Society	1,563,238	35	5
18	Forum for the Future	2,445,625	33	5
19	Sustrans	1,030,475	33	5
20	Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust (formerly Game Conservancy Trust)	744,942	33	5
21	Tree Aid	197,355	33	5
22	Royal Horticultural Society	1,377,600	30	5
23	Tusk Trust	528,220	30	5
24	New Economics Foundation	899,892	29	5
25	People & Planet	457,131	28	5
26	The Country Trust	205,707	27	4
27	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	2,445,900	26	5
28	Countryside Foundation for Education	189,000	26	4
29	Campaign for Better Transport (formerly Transport 2000)	442,525	25	5
30	Farms for City Children	239,590	25	4
31	Environmental Investigation Agency	1,298,264	24	5
32	Wildscreen Trust	848,400	24	4
33	Global Canopy Foundation	638,515	24	5
34	Elm Farm Research Centre	1,272,559	22	5
35	Trees for Life	423,181	22	5
36	Bioregional Development Group	419,000	22	5
37	Centre for Alternative Technology	124,522	22	5
38	Whitley Fund for Nature/Whitley Laing Foundation	2,858,806	21	5
39	Dorset Wildlife Trust	633,439	21	5
40	Corporate Watch	226,670	21	5
41	Royal Holloway, University of London	199,891	21	3
42	Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens	1,293,830	20	5
43	Bat Conservation Trust	312,963	20	4
44	BirdLife International	238,600	20	5
45	Compassion in World Farming	129,750	20	5
46	Sussex Wildlife Trust	118,500	20	5
47	Marine Stewardship Council	2,062,500	19	5
48	Practical Action (formerly Intermediate Technology Development Group)	524,198	19	5
49	Kent Wildlife Trust	473,451	19	5
50	Environmental Research Association	434,259	19	5

Rank	Grantee organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	No. of years
51	PLATFORM	425,577	19	5
52	Global Action Plan	423,650	19	5
53	Barn Owl Trust	39,250	19	5
54	FARM-Africa	3,956,300	18	5
55	Rainforest Concern	313,953	18	5
56	Natural History Museum	1,918,348	17	5
57	Global Witness	1,781,000	17	5
58	Friends of the Earth International	1,256,814	17	5
59	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	369,223	17	5
60	Scottish Native Woods Campaign	322,950	17	5
61	Survival International	139,000	17	4
62	Wiltshire Wildlife Trust	561,561	16	5
63	Durrell Wildlife Conservation Society	305,500	16	3
64	Grasslands Trust	285,900	16	4
65	Council for National Parks	264,209	16	5
66	Genewatch UK	257,322	16	5
67	Galapagos Conservation Trust	217,500	16	4
68	Forest Stewardship Council	129,000	16	4
69	Peter Bunyard	73,833	16	4
70	Wildlife Trust for Beds, Cambs, Northants & Peterborough	1,832,412	15	4
71	London Wildlife Trust	676,100	15	5
72	National Trust For Scotland	631,250	15	5
73	Chelsea Physic Garden	187,150	15	5
74	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	176,480	15	5
75	Save The Rhino International	63,500	15	5
76	Green Alliance	537,156	14	5
77	Friends of the Earth Europe	428,673	14	4
78	University of Aberdeen	397,963	14	4
79	British Trust for Ornithology	220,103	14	4
80	Garden Organic (formerly Henry Doubleday Research Association)	207,650	14	3
81	Green Light Trust	175,807	14	5
82	GM Freeze (formerly Five Year Freeze Campaign)	172,000	14	5
83	Elephant Family	95,000	14	4
84	Rainforest Action Network	867,886	13	5
85	Lichfield & Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust	536,500	13	3
86	Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development (FIELD)	445,750	13	5
87	Hawk & Owl Trust	301,360	13	4
88	Earthwatch Institute (Europe)	262,260	13	4
89	FARM - the independent voice of farmers	183,766	13	4
90	World Development Movement	164,345	13	5
91	Scottish Wildlife Trust	160,500	13	5
92	Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund	91,947	13	3
93	International Society for Ecology and Culture	88,500	13	5
94	Zoological Society of London (London Zoo)	551,575	12	4
95	Ecosystems Limited (publisher of *The Ecologist* magazine)	525,913	12	4
96	SUSTAIN: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming	313,361	12	5
97	Wild Cattle of Chillingham/Chillingham Wild Cattle Association	218,000	12	2
98	University of Oxford - Botanic Garden (including Friends of)	141,404	12	5
99	The Wildlife Trusts/Royal Society for Nature Conservation	105,900	12	4
100	Alburnus Maior (Roşia Montana)	34,948	12	5

Which organisations are most regularly funded?

The third and final table in this section comprises a list of all the organisations receiving one or more grants from the 97 trusts under study in each of the five financial years. This table focuses on the grantees which receive the most ongoing support for their work. There were 122 organisations qualifying for inclusion. They are shown in Table 6, ranked in order of their total grant income.

The list gives another perspective on the most widely supported organisations, shining the spotlight on a number of grantee organisations getting regular support from just one trust (any organisation receiving just five grants in the five years is funded like this), and revealing organisations which manage to raise only relatively small amounts of money, despite being regularly supported. Average grant sizes for some of the organisations towards the foot of the table are very modest, with 27 of the organisations in the list receiving less than £10,000 on average for each grant secured; half of these average less than £5,000 per grant.

'Demand side' experience

A lack of consistency in the supply of grants was discussed in Section One, which found that the environmental budgets of individual trusts vary significantly from one year to the next.

This turbulence is experienced on the demand side of the market as well. The data reveal the stop-start nature of trust funding and confirm the very striking scattergun distribution of grants across a large number of grantees, as commented on in earlier reports.

Table 6: *Grantees with at least one grant in each of the five financial years 2002/03 to 2006/07*

Rank	Grantee organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	No. of years
1	Fauna & Flora International	5,631,793	54	5
2	FARM-Africa	3,956,300	18	5
3	Whitley Fund for Nature/Whitley Laing Foundation	2,858,806	21	5
4	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew	2,445,900	26	5
5	Forum for the Future	2,445,625	33	5
6	Marine Stewardship Council	2,062,500	19	5
7	WWF-UK	1,925,820	59	5
8	Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy	1,920,630	40	5
9	Natural History Museum	1,918,348	17	5
10	Global Witness	1,781,000	17	5
11	Woodland Trust	1,759,376	71	5
12	Pesticide Action Network UK	1,707,986	37	5
13	British Butterfly Conservation Society	1,563,238	35	5
14	Soil Association	1,543,279	78	5
15	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	1,394,783	47	5
16	Friends of the Earth (England, Wales & Northern Ireland)	1,389,834	66	5
17	Royal Horticultural Society	1,377,600	30	5
18	Environmental Investigation Agency	1,298,264	24	5
19	Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens	1,293,830	20	5
20	Elm Farm Research Centre	1,272,559	22	5
21	Friends of the Earth International	1,256,814	17	5
22	Plantlife International	1,125,275	45	5

Rank	Grantee organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	No. of years
23	Sustrans	1,030,475	33	5
24	New Economics Foundation	899,892	29	5
25	Rainforest Action Network	867,886	13	5
26	National Trust	809,505	37	5
27	Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust (formerly Game Conservancy Trust)	744,942	33	5
28	Campaign to Protect Rural England	728,557	50	5
29	Blacksmith Institute	725,000	6	5
30	Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group	715,793	8	5
31	London Wildlife Trust	676,100	15	5
32	Global Canopy Foundation	638,515	24	5
33	Dorset Wildlife Trust	633,439	21	5
34	National Trust For Scotland	631,250	15	5
35	Global Greengrants Fund	630,000	6	5
36	Marine Conservation Society	591,500	36	5
37	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers	590,025	45	5
38	International Rivers Network	568,289	7	5
39	Wiltshire Wildlife Trust	561,561	16	5
40	Ponds Conservation Trust	543,036	8	5
41	Green Alliance	537,156	14	5
42	TRAFFIC International	531,958	8	5
43	Tusk Trust	528,220	30	5
44	Practical Action (formerly Intermediate Technology Development Group)	524,198	19	5
45	Devon Wildlife Trust	495,014	41	5
46	Kent Wildlife Trust	473,451	19	5
47	Peace Parks Foundation	470,625	6	5
48	Carbon Disclosure Project	457,910	7	5
49	People & Planet	457,131	28	5
50	Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development (FIELD)	445,750	13	5
51	Campaign for Better Transport (formerly Transport 2000)	442,525	25	5
52	Environmental Research Association	434,259	19	5
53	PLATFORM	425,577	19	5
54	Global Action Plan	423,650	19	5
55	Trees for Life	423,181	22	5
56	Bioregional Development Group	419,000	22	5
57	Royal Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh	412,855	10	5
58	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	369,223	17	5
59	Earth Economics (form. Asia Pacific Environmental Exchange Project)	340,000	5	5
60	Wildlife Protection Society of India	335,440	5	5
61	Scottish Native Woods Campaign	322,950	17	5
62	Rainforest Concern	313,953	18	5
63	SUSTAIN: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming	313,361	12	5
64	Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust	293,940	37	5
65	Southern African Wildlife College	275,000	5	5
66	Wildlife Trust of India	267,662	11	5
67	Council for National Parks	264,209	16	5
68	Genewatch UK	257,322	16	5
69	BirdLife International	238,600	20	5
70	Corporate Watch	226,670	21	5
71	Sierra Madre Alliance	224,000	5	5
72	UK Centre for Economic and Environmental Development	212,425	10	5

Rank	Grantee organisation	Total grants (£)	No. of grants	No. of years
73	Environmental Justice Foundation	205,300	10	5
74	Tree Aid	197,355	33	5
75	Rivers & Fisheries Trust for Scotland/Assoc. West Coast Fisheries Trusts	197,000	8	5
76	Chelsea Physic Garden	187,150	15	5
77	Conservation Foundation	178,699	11	5
78	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	176,480	15	5
79	Green Light Trust	175,807	14	5
80	GM Freeze (formerly Five Year Freeze Campaign)	172,000	14	5
81	World Development Movement	164,345	13	5
82	Scottish Wildlife Trust	160,500	13	5
83	Gaia Foundation	159,967	11	5
84	Corporate Europe Observatory	155,000	8	5
85	University of Oxford - Botanic Garden (including Friends Of)	141,404	12	5
86	Global Commons Institute	138,000	5	5
87	Royal Highland Education Trust	136,480	7	5
88	Compassion in World Farming	129,750	20	5
89	Centre for Alternative Technology	124,522	22	5
90	Institut pour la relocalisation de l'économie	122,321	11	5
91	Sussex Wildlife Trust	118,500	20	5
92	Reforesting Scotland	115,500	10	5
93	French edition of *The Ecologist* magazine	105,867	9	5
94	Tree Council	102,250	8	5
95	Feasta - The Foundation for the Economics of Sustainability	95,400	7	5
96	Wild Things - Ecological Education Collective Limited	91,704	7	5
97	International Society for Ecology and Culture	88,500	13	5
98	Stroud Valley Project	81,792	6	5
99	Vauxhall City Farm	78,500	7	5
100	Mouvement pour le Droit et le Respect des Générations Futures	63,733	5	5
101	Save The Rhino International	63,500	15	5
102	Colin Hines/Finance for the Future	63,000	7	5
103	Rainforest Foundation UK	60,812	9	5
104	Sponge for Sustainability	54,000	7	5
105	Cornwall Wildlife Trust	53,326	8	5
106	Aviation Environment Federation	50,500	5	5
107	Rare Breeds Survival Trust	47,050	9	5
108	Arabic edition of *The Ecologist* magazine	44,762	7	5
109	Barn Owl Trust	39,250	19	5
110	Treesponsibility	38,790	5	5
111	Econexus	37,931	10	5
112	Alburnus Maior (Rosia Montana)	34,948	12	5
113	Scottish Seabird Centre	31,350	8	5
114	Marine Connection	30,000	11	5
115	Spanish edition of *The Ecologist* magazine	26,314	7	5
116	Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society	25,520	9	5
117	Born Free Foundation	24,500	5	5
118	Ecology Project International	23,107	5	5
119	International Otter Survival Fund	22,850	11	5
120	Lochaber & District Fisheries Trust	11,700	8	5
121	Coventry City Farm	11,000	6	5
122	Agroforestry Research Trust	5,750	11	5

Thus, if the percentage increase or decrease in grant income from trusts from one year to the next is calculated for all organisations receiving grants in more than one year, the figures are dramatic. Looking at the top 50 'risers' from one year to the next – that is, those organisations whose grant income had increased – percentage increases range from 400% up to 15,000% or more.

The figures are also striking for the 'fallers', organisations whose funding had decreased from one year to the next. A total of 502 grantees receiving grants in 2004/05 (totalling £8.7 million) did not receive a grant the following financial year. Likewise, 348 grantees receiving grants in 2005/06 (totalling £13.3 million) got nothing in 2006/07.

Such rollercoaster swings in grant income can to a certain extent be attributed to organisations receiving multi-year funding in one block grant. Expenditure of this kind can be planned within the organisation, as can the end of multi-year grants. However it seems that on the demand side the underlying grants market remains turbulent. This point was brought home during a seminar held with experienced fundraisers during the writing of *Where The Green Grants Went 3*. Participants noted that 'particular challenges for NGOs at present include the stop-start nature of funding, [plus] regular demands from funders for new and innovative projects.'[20] For organisations which rely heavily on trust grants as a source of income, this turbulence is much more of a problem than for those with a more diversified income base.

The fragmented nature of the grants market has become more pronounced over the last five years. Over this time, this series of reports has identified and coded a total of 6,129 grants. These have been distributed amongst 1,900 different grantee organisations. If the grants are averaged out amongst grantee organisations, then each would have received a little over three grants spread across the five-year period. In practice, however, 1,096 of these grantee organisations, or 57.7%, have received only one grant at any time during the five years in question. A further 279 organisations (14.7%) secured just two grants during the five years. Only 294 organisations (15.4%) managed to secure five or more grants during the five years under study.

This sense of a broad but shallow distribution of grants is reinforced when examining in how many years out of five each grantee organisation secured at least one grant. A total of 1,193 organisations (62.8%) only received grants in one of the five years under study. Some 292 organisations (15.4%) were funded in two of the five years, and 183 (9.6%) secured grants in three of the five years researched. For four of the five years, 110 organisations (5.8%) were given grant funding; just 122 grantees (6.4%), as listed in table 6 above, received grants in all five financial years.

[20] Jon Cracknell and Heather Godwin, *Where The Green Grants Went 3*, May 2007, p.17, available at www.greenfunders.org. This section of the report contains many other observations about grant-making practice from a group of experienced environmental fundraisers..

Box 5: *Who is funded – some reflections*

Innovation versus fragmentation

What are the consequences of trust funding being heavily concentrated on a relatively small number of grantees? Does this represent an effective allocation of resources? Would it be beneficial if funders supported a wider range of organisations, some of them smaller?

One line of thinking suggests that this would be beneficial – that strength comes through diversity and that we should 'let a thousand flowers bloom'. An alternative view is that it makes sense to concentrate resources on larger grantees or those with high profiles, assuming that they are more likely to effect change, and that it is more efficient to concentrate resources on small numbers of lead organisations, so as to avoid duplication. There is a clear tension here, between on the one hand exploiting the potential that philanthropy has for funding innovation, and on the other hand avoiding further fragmentation of the sector.

Mapping of capacity gaps

One way of squaring the circle is for funders to develop a good knowledge of civil-society capacity in relation to specific environmental issues, as well as a good understanding of the levers – political, economic, and social – likely to bring about change. Funders including the Tubney Charitable Trust, Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, European Climate Foundation and Children's Investment Fund Foundation are increasingly investing in such research. This development is welcome. Within the Environmental Funders Network, a sub-group of trusts are mapping NGO capacity around tropical deforestation, in order to explore the best ways of capturing the complexity of civil society structures. There may also be merit in specialist environmental funders pooling their knowledge of 'hot opportunities' on a regular basis, and then providing this to more generalist trusts.

In future, there is a need to map the distribution of philanthropic grants more systematically, relative to the grants made by larger funding agencies such as central government, the Big Lottery Fund and the Heritage Lottery Fund. Trusts have a comparative advantage in funding work that challenges business-as-usual, since this is rarely supported by government and corporate funders, but at present there is little understanding of how philanthropic funding relates to funding provided by these other types of donors.

Reducing project churn and recognising the vulnerability of smaller organisations

As noted above, grantee organisations find the stop-start nature of trust funding and the demands of donors for new approaches problematic. Providing more secure ongoing funding with a long-term mindset may help trusts to get a better return on their investments.

Finally, it is important to bear in mind that smaller organisations tend to be much more dependent on trusts and foundations for income than the larger, 'household name' groups. Smaller groups have less ability to secure public funding, legacies, or trading and earned income, although they may be performing a vital specialist role within the overall ecosystem of environmental organisations.

SECTION FIVE

GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS

As in previous editions, this report analyses the geographical distribution of the grants made by the 97 trusts under analysis. Results are shown in Table 7 below, along with comparative figures for 2004/05 from the same set of 97 trusts.

The figures in Table 7 reveal a strengthening of the trends identified in the last edition of the report. The total share of grants directed to work in the UK has fallen from 62.5% in 2004/05 to 53.3% in 2005/06 and then a new low of 45.6% in 2006/07, dropping below the 50% level for the first time. Previous editions of this report noted that the share of UK trust funding going to international work is high in relation to the grants made by UK trusts in other areas of philanthropic activity. It is striking that less than half of the funds provided in 2006/07 were directed towards work in the United Kingdom. In the US, members of the Environmental Grantmakers Association directed 34.1% of their 2007 grants to international work, a higher proportion than usually found in US philanthropy. International grants from UK trusts are distributed to a wide range of countries: in 2005/06, a total of 50 different countries were identified as recipients of at least one grant; in 2006/07 this figure rose to 58.

As in previous years, some grants recorded as supporting international work were made to UK-based organisations, but for international work rather than domestic projects. Funding of this kind forms the bulk of the 'general international' grants identified above, which is still the second largest category after the UK, having grown in importance to represent 36.9% of all grants in 2006/07. Big beneficiaries of this kind of funding include international conservation organisations (e.g. Fauna & Flora International, Plantlife International, and the Wildlife Conservation and Research Unit (WildCRU) at the University of Oxford), international advocacy organisations (e.g. Friends of the Earth International, Global Witness), and awards schemes which re-grant to projects internationally (e.g. Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy, Whitley Awards for Nature). Average grant sizes for these grants and for grants made to initiatives in Africa tend to be significantly higher than the average for all grants analysed in this research.

Table 7: *Geographical distribution of grants for 2004/05 through to 2006/07*

Region	2004/05		2005/06		2006/07	
	Grants (£)	% of total	Grants (£)	% of total	Grants (£)	% of total
United Kingdom	20,062,540	62.5	24,550,336	53.3	24,562,881	45.6
General international	6,098,564	19.0	12,757,747	27.7	19,903,640	36.9
Africa	4,287,859	13.4	5,815,160	12.6	5,946,265	11.0
Other Europe	625,245	1.9	1,577,804	3.4	1,651,248	3.1
Asia	479,019	1.5	673,226	1.5	777,057	1.4
Central & Latin America	361,473	1.1	363,684	0.8	497,464	0.9
North America	155,690	0.5	265,526	0.6	553,093	1.0
Australasia	21,318	0.1	20,307	0.0	6,339	0.0
TOTALS	**32,091,708**	**100.0**	**46,023,788**	**100.0**	**53,897,987**	**100.0**

Grants to projects in Africa fell slightly as a percentage of the total grants given over the three years, from 13.4%, to 12.6%, and then to 11%. Despite this, Africa is easily the continent receiving the greatest share of international grants. In general, these support either conservation projects, or sustainable agriculture initiatives, some of which sit on the borderline between environmental and overseas development activity.

The European Union

In previous editions, concern has been expressed about the small number of grants provided to environmental organisations across continental Europe, and particularly to those focused on the institutions of the European Union. It is possible that some of the 'general international' grants referred to above are being used for work at a pan-European level and it is encouraging that the proportion of grants given directly to grantees across Europe has risen a little.

However, the mis-match between the importance of the European Union in setting environmental policy and the willingness of UK-based funders to support European-focused work remains stark. More than 80% of the environmental legislation applied across the European Union, and therefore in the UK, is framed at the EU level. With 27 member states and 497 million consumers the policies adopted by the EU are of huge importance globally. The EU is a key negotiating bloc on issues like climate change, alongside the United States, China, and India. As the *Financial Times* puts it:

'Sometimes voluntarily, sometimes through gritted teeth and sometimes without even knowing, countries around the world are importing the EU's rules ... whether they like it or not, rice farmers in India, mobile phone users in Bahrain, makers of cigarette lighters in China, chemicals producers in the US, accountants in Japan and software companies in California have all found that their commercial lives are shaped by decisions taken in the EU capital.'[21]

The EU includes many countries among the leaders of global environmental policy, as measured by the Environmental Performance Index 2008, developed by Yale and Columbia Universities.[22] Twelve of the top 20 ranked countries in the world are members of the European Union. In addition, European Union countries comprise nearly two-thirds of the membership of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

Research is currently underway to identify the 10 largest environmental organisations (measured by staff and income) in each of the 15 largest countries of the European Union (measured by population). The work is not complete yet, but initial findings suggest that UK environmental groups are considerably larger in terms of staffing and income than many of their counterparts in other European countries, sometimes by a factor of 10. Relatively speaking, in the UK there are a lot of environmental organisations and these are well-resourced compared to their counterparts in southern, central and eastern Europe. It would appear that environmental funders could get a good return on investment by supporting environmental organisations in some of the less well-resourced parts of Europe.

There are also opportunities in Brussels itself. In 2007, the 'Green 10'[23] grouping of environmental organisations working in Brussels had a little

[21] Tobias Buck, 'Standard bearer', *Financial Times*, 10th July 2007

[22] Yale University & Columbia University, *Environmental Performance Index 2008*, available on-line at http://epi.yale.edu/Home. The UK ranks 14th in this index, behind Costa Rica, Colombia, and Latvia, amongst other countries.

[23] The Green 10 is an informal network that brings together staff from the following environment groups working on EU policy: Birdlife International, CEE Bankwatch, Climate Action Network Europe, European Environmental Bureau, Friends of the Earth Europe, Greenpeace EU Unit, Health & Environment Alliance, International Friends of Nature, Transport & Environment, and the WWF European Policy Office.

over 100 staff, roughly equivalent to two of the larger county wildlife trusts in the UK. Experience suggests that increasing the number of Brussels-based advocates for strong environmental rules is a cost-effective strategy for grant-makers, not least given that there are between 7,000 and 10,000 commercial lobbyists now based in Brussels.

Since the last edition of this research, the European Climate Foundation has been established, explicitly to take advantage of these kinds of opportunities and in response to the lack of funding for pan-European advocacy work on climate and energy issues. This is a welcome development, and it is clear that more funding of this kind will be needed in the future. UK trusts and foundations have a particularly important role to play in Europe, given the long tradition of trust and foundation giving in the UK compared to other European countries. Research carried out by the European Foundation Centre in 2008 suggests that UK trusts would account for about half of Europe's 'top 30' environmental foundations. Philanthropic resources are currently heavily concentrated in the UK and do not find their way to other parts of the European Union very effectively, even though 80% of the environmental legislation applied in the UK is framed there.

Within the UK

This year, the report provides an analysis of the geographical distribution of grants within the United Kingdom, following up on data presented in the second edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*. In 2005/06, a total of 844 grants worth a little over £24.5 million were made to support environmental work in the UK. These grants have been divided into those which support nationally-focused work, and those which are focused on a specific geographic area within the UK (a county for example, or a particular community). Of the 2005/06 grants made to UK grantees a total of 455 grants worth a little over £10.8 million (44.2% of all UK-focused grants) supported work at the national level, with the remaining 389 grants worth £13.7 million (55.8% of the total) going to organisations working at sub-national level.

In 2006/07, a total of 936 grants were made to support environmental work in the UK. These were worth almost exactly the same amount as in the previous year, at £24.5 million. In this second year a total of 524 grants worth £14.3 million (58.3% of all UK grants in 2006/07) went to nationally-focused work, with the remaining 412 grants, worth £10.2 million (41.7%) supporting work at sub-national level. The share between national and sub-national projects thus changed quite markedly between the two years.

For both years, the distribution of the sub-national grants has been analysed in terms of UK government regions, in order to see which parts of the country benefit the most from grants to support local environmental initiatives. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 8 opposite.

Although there are some significant variations between the two years, four regions top the rankings for both years, namely the South West, Scotland, London, and the East of England. In 2005/06, these four regions accounted for 77.4% of the grants made by trusts to local environmental initiatives in the UK, although in population terms they account for only 38.5% of the UK population. In 2006/07, the four top regions accounted for 68.3% of the grants made to local projects, less than in 2005/06 but still representing a strong concentration of grants relative to their share of population. The figures for the South West for 2005/06 were distorted by one particularly large grant; over time it seems likely that this region's share of sub-national grants will be closer to the 14.8% observed in 2006/07 than the 39% seen in 2005/06.

[24] Had the Yorkshire Dales Millennium Trust been included in the group of 97 trusts then this would have raised the share of grants going to work in Yorkshire & The Humber. It will be included in future editions of this research.

Table 8: *Sub-national grants to UK grantees, broken down by Government region*

Region	2005/06 Grants (£)	2005/06 % of total	2006/07 Grants (£)	2006/07 % of total	% total population
East Midlands	395,445	2.9	84,856	0.8	7.1
East of England	1,317,715	9.6	1,275,651	12.5	9.1
London	2,110,432	15.4	1,726,262	16.9	12.4
North East	543,952	4.0	373,934	3.7	4.3
North West	489,332	3.6	864,150	8.4	11.5
Northern Ireland	0	0.0	217,571	2.1	2.9
Scotland	1,830,202	13.4	2,472,385	24.1	8.6
South East	782,512	5.7	573,254	5.6	13.6
South West	5,351,940	39.0	1,516,599	14.8	8.4
Wales	407,022	3.0	271,830	2.7	4.9
West Midlands	164,432	1.2	618,400	6.0	8.9
Yorkshire & The Humber	312,871	2.3	249,696	2.4	8.4
TOTALS	**13,705,855**	**100.0**	**10,244,588**	**100.0**	**100.0**

The regions receiving the smallest share of grants relative to their population size across the two years are the East Midlands, Yorkshire & The Humber[24], Northern Ireland, the West Midlands, and the South East. In the second edition of *Where The Green Grants Went*, using grants data from 2003/04, the five regions with the lowest shares of grants relative to population size were Yorkshire & The Humber, Wales, the North West, and then the East and West Midlands. It seems fairly clear that Yorkshire & The Humber and both the East and West Midlands lose out relative to other regions of the UK when it comes to grants from trusts to local environmental initiatives.

Where are grantees located?

For this report, the locations of the head offices of UK-based environmental organisations were also categorised, in order to explore where in the country most environment groups are located. A list was generated of all UK-based organisations receiving a grant in either 2005/06 or 2006/07. The question of where the organisation carried out its work was ignored; instead, the focus was simply on where the head office is located. Each grantee organisation was counted just once, so that even if eight grants were made to the same organisation, the head office would be counted only once to generate the figures in Table 9 overleaf.

It comes as no surprise that London is the region with the highest concentration of head offices, accounting for a little under a third of all UK groups receiving grants in both 2005/06 and 2006/07. The South East and South West are comfortably the second and third most favoured regions, with Scotland and the East of England completing the top five. Between them, the three southernmost regions account for 58.8% of head offices in 2005/06, and 60.5% in 2006/07. These figures support the impression gained when coding grants, that many environmental organisations are clustered together in the southern part of the UK, with cities like Bristol and Oxford standing out. As with the distribution of sub-national grants, Yorkshire & The Humber and both East and West Midlands appear to have few environmental organisations relative to their population sizes. This is also true for the North West.

Table 9: *Distribution of head offices of UK environment groups, by Government region*

Region	2005/06		2006/07		
	Envt. group offices	% of total	Envt. group offices	% of total	% total population
East Midlands	20	3.5	17	2.9	7.1
East of England	41	7.2	38	6.6	9.1
London	166	29.1	167	28.8	12.4
North East	13	2.3	14	2.4	4.3
North West	28	4.9	30	5.2	11.5
Northern Ireland	0	0.0	5	0.9	2.9
Scotland	68	11.9	67	11.6	8.6
South East	83	14.5	94	16.2	13.6
South West	87	15.2	90	15.5	8.4
Wales	21	3.7	13	2.2	4.9
West Midlands	26	4.6	23	4.0	8.9
Yorkshire & The Humber	18	3.2	22	3.8	8.4
TOTALS	**571**	**100.0**	**580**	**100.0**	**100.0**

Box 6: *Where trusts fund – some reflections*

Given the strength of the UK philanthropic sector compared to that in many other countries, it is encouraging that UK funders are prepared to provide so much support to international environmental initiatives. The Type Three environmental problems referred to throughout the report are all global in nature and cannot be addressed without international action. Decisions taken by the governments of the United States, China, India, Brazil and Indonesia (to name just a few) are of vital importance for the environment here in the UK. The atmosphere does not distinguish each tonne of carbon by its country of origin.

There is a need for more funding at the pan-European level, for reasons outlined above. The fact that UK environmental groups are relatively well-resourced means that they have on occasion been able to play a prime-mover role, with other countries copying strategies and tactics developed in the UK and applying them in their own political context. The case study of *The Big Ask* campaign makes this point, while a similar dynamic could be seen in opposition to genetically modified food in the late 1990s. Yet for this dynamic to become more widespread, environmental organisations in countries with smaller philanthropic sectors will need more resources. There is a role for UK trusts here.

The fact that English is widely spoken internationally also creates a particular set of opportunities, as does the concentration of financial resources in the City of London. Trusts may be able to increase the impact of their grants by taking these kinds of factors more actively into account.

Within the UK, it appears that there are regions to which few environmental grants flow, and where the number of environmental organisations is disproportionately low. Funders could help to change this and so broaden public engagement across the country, over time.

IN CONCLUSION: A NOTE FROM THE AUTHORS

As noted above, this report forms part of a growing archive of research into environmental philanthropy. We hope that its findings and observations will interest funders, prospective donors and those working within the environmental movement. As with earlier editions, we see this report as a work in progress, a staging post on a journey to gain a more thorough understanding of the way in which environmental initiatives receive funding. We plan to continue exploring some of the issues raised in this report in the coming months. We would very much welcome feedback and suggestions on how future editions could be made more useful. Please send such suggestions to info@greenfunders.org.

JC, HG & HW – November 2009

APPENDIX A

As noted earlier, the 'issue' categories in this report are fewer in number than in the previous three editions of *Where The Green Grants Went*. Feedback from readers on these categorisations would be welcome.

1 Agriculture and food – remains a very broad category. It includes: support for organic and other forms of sustainable farming; training and research to help farmers in developing countries; campaigns relating to the control of the food chain; initiatives opposed to factory farming; horticultural organisations and projects; education on agriculture for children and adults (e.g. city farms); opposition to the use of genetically modified crops and food irradiation; work on food safety and on the genetic diversity of agriculture (including seed banks); and soil conservation.

2 Biodiversity and species preservation – again a broad category, focused on work that protects particular species, be they plant or animal, vertebrate or invertebrate. Included within this is: support for botanic gardens and arboretums; academic research on botany and zoology; the 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; defence of globally important biodiversity hotspots, including the use of refuges, reserves and other habitat conservation projects; and wildlife trusts.

3 Climate and atmosphere – the bulk of the money in this category is targeted towards: work on climate change, with a much smaller sum directed towards the issue of ozone depletion; also work on acid rain, air pollution and local air quality.

4 Coastal and marine ecosystems – this category includes: support for work on fisheries; aquaculture; coastal lands and estuaries; marine protected areas; and marine pollution (such as marine dumping).

5 Consumption and waste – this category covers: work directed at reducing consumption levels; initiatives that look to re-define economic growth; projects on waste reduction, sustainable design and sustainable production; recycling and composting schemes; and all aspects of waste disposal, including incinerators and landfills.

6 Energy – this category covers: alternative and renewable energy sources; energy efficiency and conservation; work around fossil fuels; hydroelectric schemes; the oil and gas industries; and nuclear power.

7 Fresh water – this category covers: all work relating to lakes and rivers; canals and other inland water systems; issues of groundwater contamination and water conservation; and projects relating to wetlands.

8 Multi-issue work – there remain grants which are hard to allocate to specific categories, generally because the grant takes the form of core funding to an organisation that works on a range of different issues, or because the grant supports environmental media titles or environmental education projects covering a wide range of issues. In addition, some grants provided to generalist re-granting organisations are captured in this category, since it is not possible to tell which issues will be supported when the funds are re-granted.

9 Sustainable communities – grants included in this category support: urban green-spaces and parks; community gardens; built environment projects; and community-based sustainability work.

10 Terrestrial ecosystems and land use – as with 'agriculture' and 'biodiversity', this is a broad category encompassing: land purchases and stewardship; national or regional parks; landscape restoration and landscape scale conservation efforts; tree planting, forestry and work directed to stopping de-forestation; and the impacts of mining.

11 Toxics and pollution – this category covers all the main categories of toxics impacting on the environment and human health: hazardous waste; heavy metals; pesticides; herbicides; radioactive wastes; Persistent Organic Pollutants; household chemicals; other industrial pollutants; and noise pollution.

12 Trade and finance – the trade and finance category encompasses: work on corporate-led globalisation and international trade policy; efforts to reform public financial institutions (such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and Export Credit Agencies); similar work directed at the lending policies of private banks; initiatives around the reduction of developing countries' debt; and local economic development projects and economic re-localisation.

13 Transport – transport includes: grants relating to all aspects of transportation, including public transport systems; transport planning; policy on aviation; freight; road-building; shipping; alternatives to car use plus initiatives like car pools and car clubs; the promotion of cycling and walking; and work on vehicle fuel economy.

WEBSITES OF ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATIONS LISTED IN SECTION FOUR OF THE REPORT

Agroforestry Research Trust **www.agroforestry.co.uk**
Alburnus Maior (Salvaţi Rosia Montana)
www.rosiamontana.org
Andrew Lees Trust **www.andrewleestrust.org.uk**
Ashden Awards for Sustainable Energy
www.ashdenawards.org
Assynt Foundation **www.assyntfoundation.org**
Atlantic Salmon Trust **www.atlanticsalmontrust.org**
Aviation Environment Federation **www.aef.org.uk**
Barn Owl Trust **www.barnowltrust.org.uk**
Bat Conservation Trust **www.bats.org.uk**
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**
Blacksmith Institute **www.blacksmithinstitute.org**
Born Free Foundation **www.bornfree.org.uk**
British Butterfly Conservation Society
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**
Campaign for Better Transport (formerly Transport 2000)
www.bettertransport.org.uk
Carbon Disclosure Project **www.cdproject.net**
Centre for Alternative Technology **www.cat.org.uk**
Chelsea Physic Garden **www.chelseaphysicgarden.co.uk**
Common Ground **www.commonground.org.uk**
Community Recycling Network **www.crn.org.uk**
Compassion in World Farming **www.ciwf.org.uk**
Conservation Foundation
www.conservationfoundation.co.uk
Cornwall Wildlife Trust **www.cornwallwildlifetrust.org.uk**
Corporate Europe Observatory **www.corporateeurope.org**
Corporate Watch **www.corporatewatch.org.uk**
Council for National Parks **www.cnp.org.uk**
Council for Scientific & Industrial Research **www.csir.org.gh**
Country Trust **www.countrytrust.org.uk**
Countryside Foundation for Education
www.countrysidefoundation.org.uk
Cowes Town Waterfront Trust **www.cowes.co.uk**
Devon Wildlife Trust **www.devonwildlifetrust.org**
Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund **www.gorillafund.org**
Dorset Wildlife Trust **www.dorsetwildlifetrust.org.uk**
Durrell Wildlife Conservation Society **www.durrell.org**
Earth Economics (form. Asia Pacific Environmental Exchange Project) **www.eartheconomics.org**
Earthwatch Institute **www.earthwatch.org**
Ecology Project International **www.ecologyproject.org**
Econexus **www.econexus.info**
Ecosystems Limited (publisher of *The Ecologist* magazine)
www.theecologist.org
Eden Project **www.edenproject.com**
Elephant Family **www.elephantfamily.org**
Elm Farm Research Centre **www.efrc.com**
Environmental Investigation Agency
www.eia-international.org
Environmental Justice Foundation **www.ejfoundation.org**
Environmental Law Foundation **www.elflaw.org**
Envolve **www.envolve.co.uk**
European Environmental Bureau **www.eeb.org**
FARM-Africa **www.farmafrica.org.uk**
FARM – the independent voice of farmers **www.farm.org.uk**
Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group **www.fwag.org.uk**
Farms for City Children **www.farmsforcitychildren.org**
Fauna & Flora International **www.fauna-flora.org**
Feasta – The Foundation for the Economics of Sustainability
www.feasta.org
Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens
www.farmgarden.org.uk
Forests and European Union Research Network (FERN)
www.fern.org
Forest Stewardship Council **www.fsc.org**
Forum for the Future **www.forum4future.org**
Foundation for Internat. Environmental Law & Development (FIELD)
www.field.org.uk
Friends of the Earth (England, Wales & Northern Ireland)
www.foe.co.uk
Friends of the Earth International **www.foei.org**
Friends of the Earth Europe **www.foeeurope.org**
Gaia Foundation **www.gaiafoundation.org**
Galapagos Conservation Trust **www.gct.org**

Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust (formerly Game Conservancy) **www.gwct.org.uk**
Garden Organic (formerly Henry Doubleday Research Association) **www.gardenorganic.org.uk**
Genewatch UK **www.genewatch.org**
Global Action Plan **www.globalactionplan.org.uk**
Global Canopy Foundation **www.globalcanopy.org**
Global Commons Institute **www.gci.org.uk**
Global Greengrants Fund **www.greengrants.org**
Global Witness **www.globalwitness.org**
GM Freeze (formerly Five Year Freeze Campaign) **www.gmfreeze.org**
Grasslands Trust **www.grasslands-trust.org**
Great Fen Project **www.greatfen.org.uk**
Green Alliance **www.green-alliance.org.uk**
Green Light Trust **www.greenlighttrust.org**
Greenpeace UK **www.greenpeace.org.uk**
Groundwork Trusts (Federation of) **www.groundwork.org.uk**
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust **www.hwt.org.uk**
Hawk & Owl Trust **www.hawkandowl.org**
Herpetological Conservation Trust **www.herpconstrust.org.uk**
Institute for European Environmental Policy **www.ieep.eu**
International Centre of Insect Physiology & Ecology **www.icipe.org**
International Institute for Environment & Development **www.iied.org**
International Institute of Tropical Agriculture **www.iita.org**
International Network for Improvement of Banana and Plantain **www.inibap.org**
International Otter Survival Fund **www.otter.org**
International Rivers Network **www.internationalrivers.org**
International Society for Ecology and Culture **www.isec.org.uk**
John Muir Trust **www.jmt.org**
Learning Through Landscapes **www.ltl.org.uk**
Lichfield & Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust **www.lhcrt.org.uk**
London Wildlife Trust **www.wildlondon.org.uk**
Kent Wildlife Trust **www.kentwildlifetrust.org**
Kilimo Trust **www.thekilimotrust.org**
Marine Connection **www.marineconnection.org**
Marine Conservation Society **www.mcsuk.org**
Marine Stewardship Council **www.msc.org**
Mouvement pour le Droit et le Respect des Générations Futures **www.mdrgf.org**
National Agricultural Research Organisation **www.naro.go.ug**
National Botanical Institute of South Africa (now SANBI) **www.sanbi.org**
National Trust **www.nationaltrust.org.uk**
National Trust for Scotland **www.nts.org.uk**
Natural History Museum **www.nhm.ac.uk**
New Economics Foundation **www.neweconomics.org**
New World Foundation **www.newwf.org**
Norfolk Wildlife Trust **www.norfolkwildlifetrust.org.uk**
Peace Parks Foundation **www.peaceparks.org**
Pesticide Action Network UK **www.pan-uk.org**
People & Planet **www.peopleandplanet.net**
PLATFORM **www.platformlondon.org**
Plantlife International **www.plantlife.org.uk**
Ponds Conservation Trust **www.pondsconservation.org.uk**
Practical Action (formerly Intermediate Technology Development Group) **www.itdg.org**
Prince's Foundation for the Built Environment **www.princes-foundation.org**
Rainforest Action Network **www.ran.org**
Rainforest Concern **www.rainforestconcern.org**
Rainforest Foundation UK **www.rainforestfoundationuk.org**
Rare Breeds Survival Trust **www.rbst.org.uk**
Reforesting Scotland **www.reforestingscotland.org**
Renewable Energy Foundation **www.ref.org.uk**
Rivers & Fisheries Trust for Scotland/Assoc. West Coast Fisheries Trusts **www.westcoastfisheries.org.uk**
Rothamsted International **www.rothamsted-international.org**
Royal Botanic Gardens, Edinburgh **www.rbge.org.uk**
Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew **www.kew.org**
Royal Highland Education Trust **www.rhet.org.uk**
Royal Horticultural Society **www.rhs.org.uk**
Royal Holloway, University of London **www.rhul.ac.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**
Rufford Small Grants for Nature Conservation **www.rufford.org**
Save the Rhino International **www.savetherhino.org**
Scottish Native Woods Campaign **www.scottishnativewoods.org.uk**
Scottish Seabird Centre **www.seabird.org**
Scottish Wildlife Trust **www.swt.org.uk**

SeaWeb **www.seaweb.org**
Sierra Madre Alliance **www.sierramadrealliance.org**
Slow Food Foundation **www.slowfoodfoundation.org**
Soil Association **www.soilassociation.org**
Southern Africa Wildlife College **www.wildlifecollege.org.za**
Sponge for Sustainability **www.spongenet.org**
Stroud Valley Project **www.stroudvalleysproject.org**
Survival International **www.survivalinternational.org**
Sussex Wildlife Trust **www.sussexwt.org.uk**
SUSTAIN: The Alliance for Better Food and Farming **www.sustainweb.org**
Sustrans **www.sustrans.org.uk**
The Corner House **www.thecornerhouse.org.uk**
The Country Trust **www.countrytrust.org.uk**
Tourism Concern **www.tourismconcern.org.uk**
TRAFFIC International **www.traffic.org**
Tree Aid **www.treeaid.org.uk**
Tree Council **www.treecouncil.org.uk**
Trees for Life **www.treesforlife.org.uk**
Treesponsibility **www.treesponsibility.com**
Tusk Trust **www.tusk.org**
UK Centre for Economic and Environmental Development **www.ukceed.org**
University of Aberdeen **www.abdn.ac.uk**
University of Bristol **www.bristol.ac.uk**
University of Cambridge **www.cam.ac.uk**
University of Oxford – Botanic Garden **www.botanic-garden.ox.ac.uk**
Vauxhall City Farm **www.vauxhallcityfarm.org**
Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society **www.wdcs.org**
Whitley Fund for Nature/Whitley Laing Foundation **www.whitleyaward.org**
Wild Cattle of Chillingham/Chillingham Wild Cattle Association **www.chillinghamwildcattle.com**
Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust **www.wwt.org.uk**
Wildlife Conservation Unit, University of Oxford (WildCRU) **www.wildcru.org**
Wildlife Protection Society of India **www.wpsi-india.org**
Wildlife Trust for Beds, Cambs, Northants & Peterborough **www.wildlifebcnp.org**
Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside **www.lancswt.org.uk**
Wildlife Trust of India **www.wildlifetrustofindia.org**
Wildlife Trust of South & West Wales **www.welshwildlife.org**
Wildscreen Trust **www.wildscreenorg**
Wild Things – Ecological Education Collective Initiative **www.wildthings.org.uk**
Will Woodlands **www.willwoodlands.co.uk**
Wiltshire Wildlife Trust **www.wiltshirewildlife.org**
Women's Environmental Network **www.wen.org.uk**
Woodland Trust **www.woodland-trust.org.uk**
World Development Movement **www.wdm.org.uk**
WWF-UK **www.wwf.org.uk**
Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies **www.environment.yale.edu**
Zoological Society of London (London Zoo) **www.zsl.org**