

The Van Tienhoven Foundation for International Nature Protection in 2016

On 19 November 1930, Pieter Gerbrand van Tienhoven founded the 'Stichting tot Internationale Natuurbescherming' (Foundation for International Nature Protection), to promote balance in nature, by protecting threatened flora and fauna and the conservation of geologically important areas.

Our aims:

1. make small grants available in order to finance direct actions that lead to change in policy and practice. This is especially the case for those ecosystems and its living organisms that are threatened or under pressure outside the Netherlands;
2. promote knowledge into the causes of threats and pressures on nature, in order to generate concrete actions that halt, counteract or mitigate these causes;
3. influence and collaborate with governmental, non-governmental organisations, communities, individuals, and other relevant stakeholders for the sake of the conservation of nature.

Since 2005, a Code of Conduct, revised charters and a website contributed to more transparency, documentation and continuation of the objectives of the Van Tienhoven Foundation to professionally serve a wider conservation community.

Board 2016:

Dr. O.S. Bánki	www.gbif.org
Dr. R. Buij	www.alterra.nl
Drs. T.H. van Koolwijk	www.vk-consult.nl
Drs. B.A.S. Looise (Treasurer)	www.woerdensport.nl
Drs. F.J.A. Saris (Chairman)	www.sovon.nl
Dr. K.D. Schuijt	www.wnf.nl
Drs. M.J. Vervest (Secretary)	www.wetlands.org

The board met three times in 2016.

In 2016, the board, together with WNF INNO Fund, facilitated & supported the research of a Master student at WUR, Kelly van Gils, on “The role of small funds in international nature conservation”. In total 18 people from small funds were interviewed and 2 small fund recipients. (Annex A: *Executive Summary*).

The results and recommendations of this research were discussed at the second workshop with small grant funds for nature conservation, organized by the board of the Van Tienhoven Foundation jointly with the WNF INNO Fund in September 2016. The representatives of the small grant funds exchanged experiences and challenges with grant making and explored ideas and options for further collaboration. Follow up actions were agreed, among which a facebook group of small grant funds (led by Prins Bernhard Nature Fund).

In 2016, in line with its objectives, the board of the foundation decided to maximise its contribution to sustainability and to look for a bank that is best equipped to ensure investments that will potentially maximise benefits for nature and for people. Therefore all assets were moved from ABNAMRO Bank to the Triodos Bank.

Since the Van Tienhoven Stichting receives far more applications than it is able to finance, the board of the foundation has decided to refine its criteria and to focus on projects that are:

- practical, hands-on and directly applicable in order to generate change
- initiated, owned or widely supported by local stakeholders, in order to ensure sustainability
- focused on threatened species and ecosystems and/or key biodiversity areas
- aimed at countering the human-induced causes for these threats, in order to have maximum conservation impact
- exemplary for a wider problem, serve as a catalyst for raising awareness and engaging other stakeholders
- leveraging and demonstrating that small grants and individual efforts can make a difference

In 2016 the board has adjusted the application format which is available at the website and can be filled online. Applicants are requested to provide references and share more information upfront, including their website, social media, track record and their annual review. Room in the application format for the actual description of the proposed project has been reduced.

Approved Projects 2016

The Van Tienhoven Foundation made available a budget of € 112,500 Euro for grant making in 2016, which included € 37,850 balance from its 2015 grant budget.

In 2016, the Van Tienhoven Foundation has received a total of 52 applications.

The board has approved the following project proposals for a total sum of € 94,215:

- Michael F. Garbo, Eliminating commercial bush meat hunting in Liberia, € 9,522.
- Volampeno, Blue-eyed Black Lemur, € 10,000
- E. Danquah, Red-hot peppers to protect elephants Ghana € 9,900
- Wong Pui May, MYCAT Malaysia. € 10,000
- A. Oposa. Shark Shelter. € 8,915
- Rabin Kadariya, Himalayan Black Bear. € 3,740
- Brazil, lowland tapirs conservation. € 9,802
- Madagascar, Aro Velona, Uapaca bojeri plant € 4,789
- Zambia, Birdwatch, organophosphate poisoning. € 10,000
- Samoa, Samoan Conservation Society, impact of Tilapia, € 7,757
- Madagascar, Group of civil society organisations Komanga, Lemurs: €9,250

Financial Report

Per December 31st, 2016, the total assets of the foundation are € 3.962.751, which is a decrease of 0,2% in comparison to January 1st 2016.

For a summary of the Financial Report 2015 of the Van Tienhoven Foundation and Budget 2016: See Annex B.

The board of the Netherlands Foundation of International Nature Protection.

Annex A *Executive Summary*

Master Thesis **'The role of small funds in international nature conservation'**

Kelly van Gils, M.Sc. Forest & Nature Conservation, Wageningen University, September 2016

Executive Summary

This thesis focuses on the understanding of the role of small funds in nature conservation. This is important, because funding is one of the core means to achieve successes in nature conservation. Even though big funds are usually the focus of attention, small funds might also play an important role by financing concrete small initiatives that are not eligible for larger funding yet. Not much is known about these small funds and their significance with regard to nature conservation. The studies on small funds that have been conducted in other sectors such as nutrition and science, defined special characteristics of small funds. By looking at small funds in other sectors, it was seen that those small funds fulfil a specific niche in the funding market. In order to discover if small funds in nature conservation also operate in a specific niche, this thesis is guided by the following research question: 'What is the role of small funds in nature conservation?'

The methodology used for investigation consisted of 18 interviews with small fund providers, two interviews with small fund recipients, and two observations of decision-making processes when projects receive a grant. The results from the interviews and observations were tested by asking people that are involved with big funds to reflect on the characteristics of small funds. The scope of the data collection consisted of European small fund providers.

The results show that small funds are defined by their small budget, the small organisational structure of small fund providers and the short time period of the projects funded. With regard to the budget, there is no consensus on what amount defines a small fund. The amount of money is simply considered small when it is compared to the amounts spend in multi-year large nature conservation efforts. There can be various motivations to provide small funding, but it appears that the decision to provide small funds is often based on limitations of resources rather than specific motivations. If small fund providers would have more resources, they would give more money to larger projects. Nevertheless, there are also some small fund providers that made the conscious decision to provide small funds. They prefer to keep the amount available per project small even if they would have a larger budget available. These small fund providers are mainly motivated by the ideas of seed money, innovation, providing extra stimuli to projects or as a means of diversifying investments.

As small funds are limited in size, they appear to have specific characteristics. These characteristics describe the small fund providers, the projects funded, as well as a combination of both. According to small fund providers the main characteristics of the projects funded include flexibility, simplicity, innovation and focus on a local approach and concrete results. This leads for small fund providers to face less bureaucracy than big fund organisations. The small fund recipients also corroborated all of these characteristics. As small funds have these characteristics, they could make a large impact in a short period of time. This is possible because of the type of projects that are targeted by small funds. Following this line of thought, it turns out that small funds in nature conservation operate in a specific niche. Small funds allow early-career conservationists to start up in either trying out new ideas or by focusing on a specific area or species that needs attention. This focus could include operating inside an existing project, as extra stimuli. Small funds often support projects that would have otherwise received no

funding, due to an uncommon focus or because they do not have the capacity to apply for a big fund. The existence of this niche is not only recognised by small fund providers themselves, but also by the persons that are strongly involved with big funds. As small and big fund each operate in their own niche, it is important for both types of funding to exist as they complement each other.

A main insight that has been discovered by this thesis is that the importance of small funds is often underestimated. This is because half of the small fund providers of this research perceive that they are forced into the niche of small funds, due to a limitation of resources rather than due to a conscious motivation. One option to address this issue is by building relationships among small fund providers, which could be done by exchanging knowledge with each other. However, this collaboration has not yet happened due to the small fund providers' lack of capacity. The idea small fund providers have about knowledge exchange is that it should include the sharing of information about specific applicants or geographical areas, as well as the processes of small fund provision. This process of exchanging information will align small funds and allow them to become more aware of their place within the total funding market. Additionally, co-funding could in some cases be a way to make the investments more efficient. One concrete example of exchanging information is to start up a platform that allows for communication between the small funds. At this platform, the small funds could better align their objectives and learn from each other to improve their own way of providing funds. This can also lead to a greater recognition of the role of small funds.

Concluding, small funds fulfil a very specific role in the conservation funding market by focusing on a specific type of projects to invest in, which would have not received any funding if small funds would not exist. This specific focus, together with the characteristics of small funds, is also where the added value of small funds lies. Nevertheless, there is still a greater need for the appreciation of the importance of small funds. Even though small funds could fulfil an important niche, the role of small funds is currently undervalued because the small fund providers feel that they forced into this niche due to their lack of resources. Becoming more conscious of their role and better alignment between small funds could help them improve their value in the conservation funding market.

Annex B Summary of Financial Report 2016

<u>Balance Sheet December 31 2016</u>					
<u>Assets</u>					
				31-12-2016	31-12-2015
. Current Assets					
Other Receivables				2.668	15.733
. Securities					
				3.520.249	2.995.263
. Liquids					
				439.834	960.491
Total Assets					
				3.962.751	3.971.487

<u>Liabilities</u>					
				31-12-2016	31-12-2015
. Foundation Reserve					
Foundation Reserve				45	45
Other Reserve				3.945.558	3.965.420
				3.945.603	3.965.465
. Current Liabilities					
Creditors				919	-
Other Liabilities				16.229	6.022
				17.148	6.022
Total Liabilities					
				3.962.751	3.971.487

<u>Profit and Loss Account 2016</u>					
			Actual	Budget	Actual
			<u>2016</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2015</u>
<i>Income</i>					
Securities and Bonds Income			102.110	97.000	183.037
Subsidies and Awards			-94.215	-112.500	-44.668
Gross Margin			7.895	-15.500	138.369
<i>Expenses</i>					
Sales Expenses			1.152	1.150	442
Office Expenses			881	1.100	949
General Expenses			798	1.100	450
Sum of Operating Expenses			2.831	3.350	1.841
<i>Financial Costs and Expenses</i>					
Interest Income			-2.552	-3.000	-11.408
Financial Costs			27.478	22.000	18.439
Sum of Financial Costs and Expenses			24.926	19.000	7.031
Net Result			-19.862	-37.850	129.497