

The following are notes used to accompany a Powerpoint presentation made in 2004 at the annual BIAZA conference at Marwell Zoo. Please excuse the verbal style

Introduction

Ladies and Gentlemen, in the next 15 mins I am going to talk to you about just three things. First 2 sources of funds, which I think particularly appropriate for UK zoos involved with 'in situ' conservation. These are:

1. USA grant making foundations
2. The funding opportunities inherent in EU enlargement.

Given the time constraints, my limited ambition is only to stimulate your interest, *not* to go into all the details.

... and then the third subject is..

- the thing I *really* came here today to talk about,
- the thing I am most passionate about
- the biggest opportunity our community has *ever had* to make a really major impact on conservation

namel, the potential inherent in "advocacy"

that is to say: the chance to positively influence major decision makers nationally and internationally in respect of the conservation need as a whole

This is something that many zoo directors and other leaders are already pursuing. I am here to applaud this tendency, but to urge that it should go *further* and *faster*, *more strategically* and as a *higher priority* in our work

Those who have heard me speak before, or who know me, will know that a fundamental contention of mine is that advocacy (or "*marketing your organisation or cause toward decision makers*") and major funding are, in the final analysis, actually one and the same thing.

But first...

1. US Foundations...

THE BIGGEST PHILANTROPIC MARKET ON EARTH (but then, it is the biggest market of *any kind* on Earth)

In terms of competing priorities for your time, effort and intellectual focus, please consider these facts

- There are 60,000 grantmakers in the USA
- \$3.1 billion went outside the USA in 2002 (- likely to have gone down a little in 2003 but still huge)
- 9.8% of this went to animals / environment
- The UK is the single largest foreign recipient
- the overwhelming majority of funds awarded to the UK is for projects run by UK based organisations but deployed outside the UK itself.

This is an *exceptionally* good fit between funder and fund seeker. But to the best of my knowledge, US foundations are largely virgin territory for our community.

Please also note as well that, unlike many other funding opportunities, this is a possibility open to private zoos, as well as charitable zoos.

Why are UK organisations in pole position?

- There is no language barrier
- A dependable and solid audit trail
- Prestige of institution
- The writ of empire still runs deep
- UK institutions provide an entree to the former British Empire

(... and because we actually know to ask.) We have a culture of seeking funds in the UK – *more* developed than Europe – *less* developed than US or Australia. In the USA any zoo of a reasonable size would have at least one person dedicated *solely* to foundations grants

It is largely only our overseas programmes that are likely to be of interest. It is hard to see a US foundation funding a UK domestic project. With *one* salient exception. Not 'Edinburgh Zoo', but rather 'the Royal Zoological Society of Scotland' (because the brand name of the latter is infinitely alluring for a US audience)

The picture is constantly changing. Here are just some of the trends that affect the likelihood of getting a grant

- September the 11^h
- Stock market
- Dot commers
- Eastern Europe

Okay, so how do you actually get the money?

First use the summaries of remits in public sources to measure the overall universe of potential foundations (*there is a long list of such sources that I have not had time to prepare for today, email me and I will send you a copy*). It will probably be very long and unmanageable list. There is a foundation that in principle will support pretty much *any* cause.

Now narrow the list down by looking not only looking at the published guidelines of the organisation, but also the list of actual grants made. Then do yourself a huge favour and ring up a successful former grant recipient. 9 times out of 10 they will be only too happy to tell you about their experience. This 'human intelligence' is immensely valuable – *because the real 'giving culture' may well be very different indeed from the published declaration*

There are a large number of informational resources in published and web form. The research process can be demanding, but ultimately worthwhile. Alternatively there are research agencies set up to short cut this process on your behalf which I can recommend.

And now the difficult bit. You now have to consider whether to set up something called a 501c3, the US legal entity that most foundations require to make a grant to (..typically called "The American Friends of Marwell Zoo"). This is not as complex as it looks – but it does incur a cost and takes about 6 months to achieve.

Compose the application precisely according to the requirements of the foundation. Do not send anything extra.

If and when you receive a grant, say thank you, file on a report in your use of the grant, and in due course ask for some more!

I want to wrap up US Foundations now. I would just offer the thought that is setting up a 501c3 seems daunting and expensive for one organisation, it would be entirely possible for a number of zoos to get together, or the Federation as whole to set one up. "US Friends of the Zoological Societies of Great Britain" has a certain ring to it. Thereafter the individual contributors could draw US funds through this conduit.

I am not suggesting that accessing such funds is easy. I *am* suggesting that there is a shed load of money here. Our community is not getting its fair share. With a bit of focus, resource, patience, and this guy's attitude (Indiana Jones slide) it can reap very exciting rewards. WE ARE MISSING A TRICK HERE!

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any further information on any aspect of the above (JohnRegan@freeuk.com)

2. Europe – the funding potential for in situ conservation in Enlargement

Before I proceed, let me make it clear, that in this context I am not making any

personal political point on behalf of European concepts: EU as a whole, the constitution, the overall consequences of Enlargement

I am merely pragmatically pointing out a *huge* financial opportunity in the context of zoos and wildlife conservation

Let us orientate ourselves a little within the confusing “rain forest” of EU funding with its “rich but frustrating eco-system of elusive funding life forms”

Let us first eliminate certain areas. So for the purpose of today, we are *not* talking about

- Structural, ‘vertical’ funds (Objective 1 ,2 or 3)
- Transnational funds (eg Leonardo, Socrates, Life, etc.)
- Europeaid (‘aid’ for countries far outside the current or future EU) *it is particular shame we do not have the time to do this, as it could potentially apply to your in situ projects – anyone wants to talk to me about it separately please get in touch – in fact anyone wants a free short audit of the EU funds around a particular programme in a particular geographic location, get in contact and I will see what I can do*

We are talking about the billions of Euros that are flooding into CESs (‘Central & Eastern States’) 10 countries that joined 2 weeks ago, plus 3 ‘candidate states’ : Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey

This money is to align these states to Western Europe economically, and in every other sense. It is to help them adopt and implement EU legislation (including the EU Zoos Directive). It also about developing these cultures toward the liberal market economy and away from post Soviet mentalities. The overall agreement between the new states and the European Commission as to what is required for their alignment with EU laws, procedures and norms is called ‘the ACQUIS’

So what?

Well, there are three big funding instruments pouring billions of Euros into the development of these states

1. ISPA is specifically about environment - this will tend to prioritise clean water and air quality, but species or habitat protection can be included
2. SAPARD is about restructuring the rural economy, including *eco-tourism* and *sustainable development* of agriculture. This programme already involved in protection of wild life in forest habitats in Slovenia.
3. PHARE is the one I know best as I am currently acting on behalf of EAZA (however thus to draw down funds for the development of zoos in Bulgaria, and *not* for in situ conservations as such) . It is split into two programmes:
 - ‘Institution building’ - human resources, strategies, management skills, regulatory frameworks

- 'Investment support' - co-financing of capital projects to do with economic, social and cultural cohesion

All or any of these financial instruments will have a relevance to wildlife conservation, where the relevant EU legislation needs to be applied. CEES are under huge pressure at the moment to align themselves – the 3 candidate nations even more so. These funds (billion of euros) have been pre-allocated *but they cannot be used*, unless good enough projects involving credible expertise are tabled. Furthermore the project cannot draw on experts from *outside* the current EU. Thus professional guidance from Western Europe is at a premium. *They have to use you guys.*

In précis then the CEESs needs your help to access their funds to support your project, which benefits their wildlife.

The way forward is to make contact with an appropriate partner in a CEES – ideally a dept of Gov't - determine between you a project of mutual interest and which somehow would fit the AQUIS

Not remotely suggesting that accessing these funds is easy or even that one can guarantee success.

But, as Government money sloshes around the globe, this is where a lot of it happens to be at the moment. There is an imperative on all kind of charitable or 'mission based' organisations wishing to access *really major* funds in the service of their cause to align themselves with appropriate government agenda. In the most positive of senses this is a major international bandwagon – *why not jump on it...?!*

I will briefly mention a 4th element in 'accession funding'. TAIEX provides something beloved to zoo professionals everywhere, namely the cost of flights, accommodation and living expenses to consult with colleagues in other countries (specifically in this case of course – the accession nations). TAIEX applications have to be officially generated by an Accession state, and can fund UK professionals going to a CES, CES professionals coming here, or a special seminar in a CES. In each case TAIEX is all about sharing skills, techniques and knowledge.

I would like to finish off the opportunities in enlargement issue on a more philosophical note

The still extant but increasingly threatened flagship mammals of central and eastern Europe are 'our' biodiversity. Or at least 'as near as dammit', taxonomically these are the vanished large species of the British Isles. The issue certainly revolves our common shared European heritage.

The foreign tourists may think of the Romanian peasant making hay by hand and using a horse drawn cart as 'quaint'. We, as conservationists, may see the nigh

pristine wilderness of the Carpathian Mountains as 'a biological Eden'.

Everyone else unfortunately sees these things as signs of drastic economic underdevelopment. These things will change. Much will go. The question is, this time, *can* we strike a balance between economic growth and the protection of natural heritage...? In this fast re-run of the last several centuries of Western Europe, can we intervene (- with someone *else's* money, mark you) to negotiate a *modus vivendi* between economic development and the needs of wildlife.

There is a second chance at Eden here. An opportunity for UK zoos to get in on the ground floor – and be funded to do so to

And in as much and as soon as I wax philosophical, I cannot resist immediately afterwards veering towards the opportunistic and the practical.

For what a truly inspirational story to take to the UK and Europe's most senior decision makers! "*UK zoos working together to safeguard the biodiversity of their own continent*". Signalling to those who are the gateway to major resources, not only that zoos do have a role in conservation, but that they are not 'obsessed with the exotic'. They also understand their responsibilities to their own 'back yard'.

Which brings me neatly to the final piece of thinking I want to offer you. My former points have been largely practical.

My last point is rather more philosophical, but still with certain critical practical outputs.

3. Advocacy

In the matter of zoos' role in wildlife conservation, the single topic of this conference, where can the battle *really* be won...?

Classically we have 3 arenas: in situ; ex situ; education. Many would say that this latter is our greatest opportunity.

(Picture of child playing)

When she is PM or Chair of BP, - or if we want to talk real influence - Chair of News International, if we and others have succeeded in rewiring the fundamental assumptions and attitudes of a generation, we will have achieved something important.

BUT THERE IS ANOTHER ACTIVITY - ANOTHER 'KIND OF OF EDUCATION' (- or, if you will, 'another kind of marketing')

A fourth element in our tool box that is only beginning to receive attention – ADVOCACY to senior decision makers.

We do not need to wait for decision makers to grow up. CHANGE THEIR MINDS NOW

Advocacy is defined as a strategic programme to engage with the most senior figures in Government, Business and the Media. To constantly find ways to put our community, its work, the social outputs of such work, and our visions for the future in the path of the mighty.

And it should not be an incidental activity – not the 100th matter we *may* get round to, if we have time after all the other pressing issues that concern zoo decision makers and other conservationists.

Because the future of conservation is not really in our hands, IT IS IN THEIRS

The World Zoo Conservation Strategy, in prioritising its audiences, places national and international policy makers at No 1.

No less a figure than Sir David Attenborough, when recently reviewing his career, was asked what had *really* motivated him to spend 60 years making wildlife films. “*Was it perhaps*”, inquired the interviewer, “*a abiding passion for conservation*”...?

With excruciating honesty, he admitted it probably wasn't. His motive force had probably been that he just enjoyed being near to animals, observing them and learning more and more about them. If he had had a true vocation for conservation, if he had his time over again, if he really wanted to make the most impact that one man can, he should have been *obliged* to enter politics.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I greatly fear..... we must *all* ‘enter politics now’ ...

If advocacy to Government is imperative in the service of our overriding mission, there are *other* reasons for zoos to prioritise an influencing and advocacy strategy – less ethical, more pragmatic rationales.

In terms of the welfare of one's *individual* organisation, one needs to make friends in ‘peacetime’ to protect against the threats, and elements outside of your control that *will* sooner or later threaten the wellbeing of your organisation.

I am speaking of those occasional intractable difficulties that require leverage beyond that normally accessible to one's executive or board. These might include the Foot& Mouth epidemic, or Customs & Excise reluctance in respect of the £30 million VAT repayment, or the Government's threat to strip away the annual £5 million Gift Aid advantage, etc

The *worst possible* time to be presenting ourselves in front of sources of political influence is abruptly and suddenly when we have a problem.

It is ineffective and it is a little rude. How infinitely better to have a natural process of developing friends and allies in peacetime, extending a willingness to 'give' as well as 'get' and to be positively involved in their interests, instead of simply holding one hand out for help in time of need.

And advocacy is not only about warding off the *negative*, it is also about being aware and taking advantage of the *positive*.

You cannot be fully aware of the big opportunities and exciting agenda that are out there unless you are talking to people who run your region or nation.

Your organisation cannot be a very obvious partner in big projects and therefore a recipient of resources, unless you are already 'top of mind'.

We need to make *strenuous, strategic and prioritised* efforts to increase the feeling of *ownership, understanding, familiarity and affection* around the UK zoos (collectively and individually) on the part of the decision making community.

To place a more 'Darwinian' complexion on all this, the environment we exist in is constantly changing. The entity that is aware of this, is conscious of, and capitalises upon, 'new niches of opportunity' and forms of resource will prosper; the one that stolidly pursues a narrow agenda in disdain of the changing outside world will inevitably decline

One last way of looking at the need for advocacy. Many of the organisations represented in this room have visionary projects, a entire next generation of zoological entities. In order to deliver these, you *are going to need* well placed advocates in high places.

For any of the zoos represented here, whether private or charitable, to make that really big development, to really change and grow, you will need external capital. No matter how financially successful your organisation is, your operating profit or charitable surplus may be enough to grow *incrementally*, but your own resources will *never* be enough to make a 'quantum leap' in your operation.

In this context, I ask you to contrast the considerable emphasis historically placed on the management and marketing of our gates, with the historic lack of emphasis on marketing to decision makers

I have up to here offered some thoughts on why we need an advocacy strategy. Now I offer a perspective on how we can have one

Why should Gov't listen to us? Because we have a number of 'secret weapons'

15 million visitors. ¼ of all the voters, consumers and ultimate decision makers in

the UK visit one of our zoos ever year. *I do not think Government knows this (- yet!)*

And more important than the size of this audience is its makeup. With the possible exception of the teenage years, pretty much *every* section of society (ethnically, economically, socially, and in age terms) goes to the zoo. There is no significant element in the UK demographic that feels excluded or disinterested.

It is arguable that there is no other public venue of some serious ethical or education purpose that has access to this cross section of the UK public.

I do not think Government knows this (yet)

And of course we have a story to tell about *education*. In addition to the huge number of formal education sessions, every child in the country must visit a zoo at least twice in their childhood.

About *tourism* (which in the wake of Foot & Mouth the Govt is beginning to really focus on). About creating *real jobs*. Jobs in tourism are 'real' jobs, permanent jobs. Not like jobs in manufacturing or in call centres, which may go to India or Eastern Europe at any time. Or **any other job that does not absolutely require the physical proximity of the worker to the consumer**. Tourism is one of the few sectors where jobs are not vulnerable to international outsourcing.

About regional distinctiveness. The geography of our zoos lends itself to affirming the specialness and distinctiveness of the regions and nations of the UK and Ireland. Although it is to be recognised that our zoos have some work to do to break through the public perception that all zoos constitute much the same offer.

About economic urban and rural regeneration. Traditionally Govt has used the arts, museums, sports, waterside development and recently aquariums as flagship projects for urban and social regeneration. Why not zoological attractions ? It is great credit to our colleagues at Paignton that 'The Living Coasts' in Torquay is perhaps the *only* such example to date.

In recent years we have seen the failure (or highly equivocal performance) of a host of government sponsored tourist and cultural attractions (the Pop Museum in Sheffield, the Earth Centre, Doncaster, the Royal Armouries in Leeds, etc). Amongst the flaws that have blighted these ambitions were certainly

- untested brand new general leisure propositions,
- untested brand new management teams
- untested brand new institutions

Yet the zoo concept is *already* proven. *People will go to zoos* - no feasibility study required The great British and Irish zoos are decades, in some case centuries, old, existing - robust, proven institutions run by some of the finest, most

entrepreneurial management talent in the UK leisure industry.

Zoos are a safe bet in terms of regeneration investment. *Government does not know this (yet).*

I do not think GOVT has ever been really give cause to focus on *any* of the above... When it is made to, the partnership between progressive UK zoos and Govt may become something very exciting indeed.

I will conclude with this....

What we achieve as a community by ourselves - under our own steam - is *undoubtedly* remarkable

We maintain stable genetically managed populations as an insurance for endangered species. That is admirable

We are a net financial contributor to overseas wildlife conservation – out of our own pockets, our gate income. That is estimable

We move forward the conservation awareness of 15 million people ever year. That is commendable.

But we *do* know, do we not, that given the scale of the extinction crisis facing, what we can achieve with our own resources alone is, in the final analysis, frustratingly *limited*

My fundamental contention is that..

If, we work strategically as community and not in a fragmented way

If we are vocal and eloquent as a community about our work and our worth

If, as a consequence, we swing the weight Govt behind us

What we can achieve is probably without **ANY LIMIT AT ALL**

I commend these ideas to you, and I commend *you* for having already engaged with them.

Thank you,

John Regan

Johnregan@freeuk.com

0161 434 1681