

2025 Spending Review – Wildlife and Countryside Link submission

February 2025

This submission is on behalf of Wildlife and Countryside Link ([Link](#)).

Executive summary

Legally-binding, globally important and nationally vital targets have been set in the Environment Act 2021, Environmental Improvement Plan, and the Convention on Biological Diversity. These will only be achieved with decisive strategic action, across Government, to address the mounting challenges of biodiversity loss, climate change, and sustainable development.¹ Decisions in this Spending Review are likely to determine whether targets for 2030 are met.

There is a major block on the road to achievement; a critical funding shortfall for nature recovery estimated between £44 billion and £97 billion by 2030.² The autumn Budget did not address this shortfall, with key existing public funds coming to an end, concerns about the future of others and a lack of long-term multi-year funding to progress the often decades-long projects needed to deliver meaningful environmental change.

There is a pressing need for additional investment to bridge the environmental funding gap. Private investment is failing to be secured at the levels needed, with a critical need for more public funding in the short to medium-term alongside action to address the regulatory interventions needed for business to play its part.

Environmental recovery is needed for the Government to meet all five of its missions and is a prerequisite for a secure and prosperous economic future. If environmental decline is not stopped, economic consequences will escalate. These are likely to include falling farm yields, the extinction of economically significant species in the UK, more exposure to costly environmental risks such as flooding and drought, and worsening human health.³

¹ Office for Environmental Protection. (2024). Progress in improving the natural environment in England 2022/2023.

² The Green Finance Institute. (2021). The Finance Gap for UK Nature.

³ Wildlife and Countryside Link. (2024). The role of nature recovery in furthering the key missions of the UK Government.

Key Recommendations

We recommend that the Spending Review should prioritise:

1. Scaling Up and Accelerating Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) Delivery
 - The Government remains off track to meet EIP targets; funding must be simplified, sustained, and increased to ensure success.
 - Increased public investment is required to address the nature finance gap, with a focus on long-term project viability over short-term funding cycles.
 - Natural England, regulators and local planning authorities require urgent investment to meet statutory deadlines and provide effective monitoring and enforcement towards EIP delivery and sustainable infrastructure growth.
2. Natural Infrastructure Investment
 - Government's 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy should plan to invest in Critical Natural Infrastructure alongside other essential infrastructure (including a long-term investment programme and pipeline of priority projects).
 - The Office for Budget Responsibility's climate and nature team funding should be increased to allow improved analysis of fiscal policy with regard to meeting Net Zero and binding nature-recovery targets.
3. Nature- and Climate-Friendly Farming and Fisheries
 - The £3.5 billion annual agricultural budget is insufficient; an increase to £5.9 billion is needed to support sustainable land management.
 - Environmental Land Management (ELM) schemes must be fully funded to enable nature recovery, climate resilience, and food security.
 - Maintained or increased funding is vital to implement and meet Fisheries Act and Fisheries Management Plans (FMPs) goals.
4. Health and Education:
 - A cross-Government investment of £500 million is needed to match the NHS investment in social prescribing Link Workers via the GP contract.
 - £50 million would enable all English schools to make managed, sustainable improvements to school grounds, providing access to nature for all children.
5. Revenue-Raising Measures
 - The Polluter Pays principle should be strengthened, including a Nature Recovery Obligation for high-impact industries.
 - Guaranteeing the Water Restoration Fund and its ringfencing would reinforce the Government's commitment to 'cleaning up Britain's rivers, lakes and seas'.
 - The proposed Nature Restoration Fund from developers must go significantly beyond "offsetting", with environmental gains delivered upfront and transparently. Lessons must also be learned from exemptions, monitoring and enforcement problems with Biodiversity Net Gain.

Natural Infrastructure Investment

Ecosystems are “Critical Natural Infrastructure” that support key services for the UK economy, from pollination and food provision to ill-health prevention, to flood risk management.

Just like other infrastructure assets, the UK’s Critical Natural Infrastructure requires investment and maintenance, otherwise its ability to support the economy and society will fail. Like other sectors, attracting capital to deliver those essential requirements requires certainty and a supportive regulatory environment. The difference to other sectors is that nature is not just a passive asset requiring continuous maintenance but a dynamic system capable of renewal—if we provide the right support at the right time. Natural ecosystems have an extraordinary capacity to regenerate but need a strategic injection of funds to unlock the regenerative processes.

However, at the moment, the UK’s Critical Natural Infrastructure is in a state of long-term decline. There is no predictable, long-term public investment maintaining this vital natural capital. Indeed, no Government has properly assessed the investment needed. The result is a failure to attract long-term private capital, no pipeline of delivery projects, and an unstable investment environment. It is essential to ensure dedicated funding for project development costs within the pipeline. This aspect is often overlooked, yet the resources required for 30by30, for example, highlights its critical importance—particularly for coastal projects, where early-stage investment can significantly impact project success.

The Government’s 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy⁴ should plan for investment in the UK’s Critical Natural Infrastructure alongside other essential infrastructure like energy and water. Nature is essential to “enabling resilient growth”, to “accelerating Net Zero by 2050”, and to shifting “from treating illness to prevention”.

In common with other Critical National Infrastructure, we recommend that the 10 Year Infrastructure Strategy should include a long-term investment programme, a forward pipeline of projects and a priority projects list for Critical Natural Infrastructure. These projects will be as fundamental to delivering the Government’s growth mission as any other and they will make a global contribution to the future of our economy and environment.

Furthermore, the Treasury should increase the Office for Budget Responsibility’s (OBR) funding to allow it to expand its climate and nature team. This will enable the OBR to greatly improve its analysis of fiscal policy with regard to meeting Net Zero and binding nature-recovery targets, saving money by improving scrutiny and creating growth by driving spending towards job-creating businesses in green industries.

According to research by the World Economic Forum, £35.5 trillion (\$44 trillion) of global GDP is moderately or highly dependent on nature and its services, yet the significant potential for

⁴ HM Treasury. (2025). 10 Year infrastructure working paper.

private investment in natural capital has not been realised.⁵ There has not been a clear enough political signal for investment in nature, or a credible pipeline of investible projects at scale. A clear regulatory requirement for investment in nature recovery (such as the Nature Recovery Obligation described below) and a dedicated project pipeline for Critical Natural Infrastructure would catalyse vital investment in nature restoration.

With this submission, we have included a compendium of possible projects that could form the basis of a future pipeline. Delivery of these projects and others like them is critical for the Environmental Improvement Plan, for sustainable economic growth, for attracting large-scale investment in Critical Natural Infrastructure, and for demonstrating leadership on the world stage. These projects need to be sufficiently funded to enable long-term engagement and commitment from the private sector and civil society to ensure their effective design, delivery, and long-term support for sustaining outcomes.

Nature- and Climate-friendly Farming

The UK's farming sector faces unprecedented challenges from climate change and biodiversity loss. Extreme weather events are making both planting and harvest times increasingly unpredictable, affecting crop growing seasons and yields. For example, the 2024 UK wheat harvest was 20% lower than 2023.⁶ Due to weather and ground conditions, farmers are being forced to delay planting and/or harvesting resulting in the UK facing increased food imports and higher costs for consumers. For example, extreme weather events added £361 to the annual average UK food bill in 2022/23. With updated Environment Agency modelling showing that 59% of Grade 1 agricultural land in England is already at risk of flooding from rivers and the sea, such impacts upon farmers and consumers are only set to increase.⁷

Biodiversity loss is another critical consequence of environmental decline. The UK has experienced a 41% decrease in species abundance since 1970, with farmland birds declining by 54% over the same period.⁸ Unsustainable land and sea management, as well as climate change, are the key drivers of this loss and should be a focus of action ahead.

The economic implications of these challenges are substantial. Nature degradation threatens to slash the UK's GDP by 12%, surpassing the economic impacts of both the COVID-19 pandemic and the 2008 global financial crisis.⁹

The budget for nature and climate-friendly farming and land management, the largest proportion of Defra's budget, is critical to addressing these risks. It must balance productivity with environmental stewardship and nature's recovery. This would ensure action now, in the short term, to get on the right pathway for sustained action that secures the long-term

⁵ World Economic Forum. (2020). Nature Risk Rising: Why the Crisis Engulfing Nature Matters for Business and the Economy.

⁶ Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs. (2025). Cereal and Oilseed Production in the United Kingdom 2024.

⁷ Energy and Climate Intelligence Unit. (2024). Climate and Food: Home and Away

⁸ State of Nature Partnership. State of Nature Report 2023.

⁹ Green Finance Institute. (2024). Assessing the Materiality of Nature-Related Financial Risks for the UK.

sustainability of UK farming while addressing the twin challenges of climate change and biodiversity loss.

The current annual agricultural budget of £3.5 billion for the UK is grossly inadequate to meet our legally binding nature and climate targets.¹⁰ All four nations have expressed an intention to transition to new farm payment schemes following the UK's exit from the European Union, but progress is highly varied.

In England, four years into the development of the new Environmental Land Management (ELM) schemes, a fully rounded offer is not yet available to farmers. The two high-ambition ELM schemes, Countryside Stewardship Higher Tier and Landscape Recovery have been continuously deprioritised and access to funding in these schemes is restricted by resourcing capacity. This delayed, patchy system causing insecurity for farmers is a far cry from the expected post-Brexit farm support system of generous rewards for nature friendly farming. A flat or reduced farming budget in the Spending Review will continue and exacerbate these trends, which threaten both environmental delivery and the rural economy.¹¹

The private finance the previous Government hoped to leverage (£0.5 - 1 billion) has been slow to come through. Consequently, the Treasury will need to bridge the gap with extra funding in the short term while private markets remain undeveloped. The Government should make it a priority to establish the regulatory and governance mechanisms needed to bring forward private investment in future.¹²

Environmental Land Management schemes are not just crucial for supporting sustainable food production and nature-friendly farming - they underpin a wide range of land management efforts across England. According to the Environmental Improvement Plan (2023), the Government considers ELM to be the significant contributor to delivering vital actions to restore and maintain protected sites, drive conservation initiatives in National Parks and National Landscapes, reduce agricultural water pollution, and deliver on 30by30.

Aside from a few specific tree-planting funds, the Government has placed the success of these wider environmental goals almost entirely on ELM. Without adequate investment in this scheme, the country risks failing to achieve meaningful nature recovery, leaving critical habitats and biodiversity in decline, as well as climate resilience across the UK such as water storage and management. ELM is the foundation upon which England's environmental ambitions rest, and it must be fully resourced to deliver the transformative change required.

To start securing the short, sustained, and long-term viability of farming and effectively address the climate and nature crisis, we must increase the annual investment in nature-friendly and high animal welfare farming and land management across the UK to £5.9 billion

¹⁰ RSPB, The Wildlife Trusts, and National Trust. (2024). Scale of Need report. For farming, nature, and climate.

¹¹ Wildlife and Countryside Link. (2024). Making Environmental Land Management a Success: Investing in Higher Tier and Landscape Recovery.

¹² Woodland Trust. (2024). Leading from the front The Role of the Public Sector in Delivering Nature Recovery.

per year for the next ten years. In England, this translates to an investment of £3.1 billion per year.

This level of funding would provide a step-change in real incentives and support in crucial areas: for example £63 million per annum is required for ELM scheme advice, £1,061 million per annum for priority habitat management, and £1,198 million per annum for Net Zero land use change action.¹³ Swiftly increasing access to Higher Tier and Landscape Recovery must be a priority.

We need a planned approach to nature's recovery with the Government firmly in the lead, helping ensure the Lawton principles¹⁴ for ecological restoration are applied at the scale of whole landscapes and, ultimately, the country. A national nature recovery network in more than just name.

Funding for nature-friendly farming and land management funding must be accompanied by robust regulatory frameworks to deliver effective implementation and accountability, to ensure long-term value for money. Strong, well-implemented regulations will need to ensure that funds are allocated efficiently and transparently, whilst setting clear benchmarks for environmental improvements and safeguarding against potential misuse or greenwashing.

Sustained and increased funding for Animal and Plant Health is essential to safeguard the UK's agricultural and environmental resilience. The ongoing threats posed by bird flu (HPAI) and bluetongue virus (BTV) - alongside the persistent risk of notifiable diseases such as foot and mouth disease (FMD) from mainland Europe - demand a proactive, well-resourced response. Ash Dieback, caused by the fungus *Hymenoscyphus fraxineus*, serves as a stark example of the potential economic and ecological devastation that can result from inadequate biosecurity measures. The estimated cost of up to £15 billion for Ash Dieback alone underscores the magnitude of the problem, with more than half of this cost expected to occur within the next 10 years. The UK plant health risk register now includes more than 1,000 pests and disease whilst researchers have identified 47 other tree pests and diseases that could enter Britain, potentially adding another £1 billion or more in costs.¹⁵

Strengthening import controls and biosecurity measures is crucial to prevent the introduction of new pests and diseases. Likewise, increasing UK tree production can reduce reliance on imports and minimise the risk of introducing new diseases. This approach would also support the UK's forestry and horticulture industries.

As climate change accelerates the spread and frequency of disease outbreaks, the role of the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) in monitoring, managing, and preventing these threats has never been more critical. The UK remains committed to eradicating Bovine Tuberculosis (bTB) by 2038, yet achieving this goal requires continued investment in disease

¹³ RSPB, National Trust, and The Wildlife Trusts. (2024). Scale of Need Report: For Farming, Nature, and Climate.

¹⁴ Lawton report. (2010). Making Space for Nature: A review of England's Wildlife Sites and Ecological Network.

¹⁵ Hill, L., Jones, G., Atkinson, N., Hector, A., Hemery, G., & Brown, N. (2019). The £ 15 billion cost of ash dieback in Britain. *Current Biology*, 29(9), R315-R316.

control, research, and both plant and animal biosecurity measures. Ensuring long-term, sustainable funding for APHA will strengthen the country's ability to respond to emerging biosecurity challenges, protect the agricultural sector, and maintain public confidence in food security and environmental health.

Fisheries and the blue economy

To meet the goals and measures set in the Fisheries Act and Fisheries Management Plans (FMPs), it is vital that Defra should maintain or increase funding to ensure the successful implementation of the FMPs.

As an independent coastal state, the UK has committed to sustainable management of our fish stocks through the Fisheries Act, Joint Fisheries Statement, and the establishment of 43 FMPs. Defra has identified at least 114 evidence gaps in the five published FMPs, and more are expected in those currently in consultation. These evidence gaps show that Defra needs funding for fisheries management in England. While some funding has been ringfenced, public funds are needed to implement activities that will enable FMPs to be effective, as the last round of the Fisheries Industry Science Partnership scheme (under the UK Seafood Fund) will be completed in March 2025. The Spending Review should address this gap.

Additionally, Defra should publish a comprehensive breakdown of its fisheries budget. This is currently unclear as it is too closely associated with its marine budget, making it difficult for the Treasury or external groups to evaluate the needs and effectiveness of Defra's spending on fisheries.

Spending on a sustainable blue economy can deliver job creation,¹⁶ equitable economic growth,¹⁷ and increased financial resilience¹⁸ in an uncertain climate. The political narrative of environmental protection being a trade off with economic progress is false, as demonstrated by the opportunities presented here. Analysis of restoration programmes in the US revealed that 15-30 jobs are created for every \$1 million USD spent. This creates six time more jobs than the equivalent investment into oil and gas. There is also trillions of pounds of financial risk linked to ocean health¹⁹ – so it simply makes good economic and financial sense to spend money on managing those risks and supporting delivery of these opportunities.

Investment in the Delivery of the Environmental Improvement Plan

As the Office for Environmental Protection concluded, the 'Government remains largely off track to meet EIP ambitions and must speed up and scale up efforts in order to achieve them'.²⁰ Defra's recently published EIP review headline findings also detail that 'simplified,

¹⁶ Marine Conservation Society. (2024). Blue jobs: investing in the future of coastal communities.

¹⁷ Marine Conservation Society. (2024). Achieving Equity First Published: May 2024 through a Blue Economy.

¹⁸ Marine Conservation Society. (2023). Ocean-related risks First Published: September 2023 and dependences in the UK.

¹⁹ WWF. (n.d.). Navigating Ocean Risk. Shaping the Transition to a Sustainable Blue Economy.

²⁰ Office for Environmental Protection. (2024). EIP progress 2022/2023 report.

sustained funding’ is needed and ‘skills and capacity issues’ must be addressed.²¹ The scaling up of action and accelerated delivery that are needed can only happen with corresponding increased, long-term investment. Consequently, the 2025 Spending Review is pivotal in determining whether the UK meets its 2030 Environment Targets.

Scaling up and speeding up

There is currently an estimated £56 billion finance gap for the action needed to restore nature in the UK over and above current public investment.²² Private investment has yet to yield the funds to plug the investment gap, and the environment are suffering as a result.

Currently nature, its worth, and the investment certainty is not understood enough by many private investors to give the confidence to drive the substantial investment needed to restore existing degraded habitats and create additional habitat at the levels required to reach key 2030 targets. For those who have the appetite to invest, there are key blockers in the way. These include a lack of regulation, with codes only for woodland and peatland. With Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) disclosure recommendations not yet mandatory, there is also a perceived lack of an even playing field which also affects confidence in the market. Though welcome efforts have been made by Government, philanthropic environmental funders and the nature sector to help drive-up private investment, including the Government’s Projects for Nature fund, progress has been limited to date. This situation is unlikely to dramatically change in the short to medium term.

Public investment in nature restoration at scale, alongside organisational revenue generation and grant funding, is therefore crucial to deliver the legally binding species abundance target and globally important 30by30 commitment. Substantial publicly funded and publicly run schemes such as the Higher Tier Countryside Stewardship and Landscape Recovery schemes within Environmental Land Management will be vital to EIP delivery. Alongside this, projects from environmental charities and grass-roots community groups will contribute significantly to EIP delivery. Projects bring economic and community benefits such as flood and drought resilience, enhanced water and soil quality, pollinator boosts, improved community nature spaces and consequent health and well-being increases.

Delivery also needs to be spatially targeted at those areas with the greatest potential for nature’s recovery as identified through Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS). Funding the delivery of LNRS priorities is a key way of contributing to the delivery of the EIP.

Simplified, sustained funding

Existing schemes like the Nature for Climate Fund, Species Recovery Fund, and Forestry Commission’s England Woodland Creation Offer (EWCO) have helped secure substantial projects towards species and habitat recovery, and woodland creation towards critical

²¹ HM Government. (2025). Interim statement on the EIP Rapid Review.

²² Green Finance Institute. (2021). Finance Gap for UK Nature report.

targets. But the Nature for Climate Fund, despite a small extension in the 2024 Budget, has an uncertain future, which would be a major funding stream loss. The EWCO is also crucial to enable the further increase in woodland creation needed to achieve the Government's 16.5% woodland cover target and its real-world impacts on nature recovery and carbon sequestration. Any loss or decrease in this fund would have major impacts.

The Species Recovery fund, while also very valuable for EIP delivery, takes a largely short-term funding approach, which fails to give the predictability needed for many EIP projects. These projects often need active management and delivery for decades, such as the 30 years it took to reestablish Bittern populations.²³

This short-term approach is a common issue, with most environmental public funding schemes offering capital funding only for a maximum of three years, with no revenue funding for on-going costs. This is a major barrier to the ambitious large and smaller scale projects that are needed to reach EIP targets. These need long-term revenue funding for project management, coordination, advice and more in order to be successful.

The current emphasis on short-term, one-off, shovel-ready projects delivered on unsustainably tight budgets risks undermining both outcomes and partnerships. A more strategic approach would foster stronger cross-sector engagement, ensuring that expertise is retained and built upon. Reinvigorating meaningful, long-term cooperation between sectors is essential to achieving lasting conservation success.

The 2020-21 Green Recovery Challenge Fund (GRCF) demonstrated good value for money, with direct benefits to 448,318 hectares and 1.7 million trees planted. However, the same "cliff-edge" short timescales for funding limited ambition in the magnitude of the schemes put forward. Yet the fund was still oversubscribed by a near factor of ten,²⁴ showing how much further there is to grow potential delivery. The lack of long-term funding also led to poor prospects for green job creation and retention, contributing to the skills and capacity gap that Defra's OEP review identified. More consistent funding prioritised for nature recovery projects, rather than singular pots of money, is therefore needed to meet EIP gaps.

As demonstrated by both the OEP and Defra EIP reviews, the current EIP portfolio is not working effectively enough. Multi-year projects that can make meaningful consistent change to the natural environment, without the uncertainty of potential loss of funding biannually, will be key in allowing the government to meet their targets in the long run. This is vital for the Government to have such funding foresight now to deliver targets by 2030.

Ensuring long-term funding for the NWCU is not just about tackling crime—it is essential for nature recovery. Wildlife crime threatens already vulnerable species and habitats, undermining conservation efforts and the restoration of our natural environment. The National Wildlife Crime Unit has led over 200 cases of wildlife crime since 2021, many linked

²³ The Geographical. (2024). Booming brilliant year for the bittern – Britain's loudest bird.

²⁴ ICF. (2021). Evaluation of the Green Recovery Challenge Fund. Interim evaluation – final.

to major serious organised crime groups. The Labour Party have taken their Safer Streets plan forward but the link between wildlife crime and organised crime is being forgotten as The Met Wildlife Crime Unit has been cut.²⁵ Defra and the Home Office must confirm long-term funding for the NWCU so that it may continue and expand.

Additional Funding Complexities and Impacts for EIP Deliverers

The future pipeline of projects will rely heavily on the capacity of the eNGO sector, which plays a crucial role not only in delivering habitat management but also in shaping the intellectual design of such schemes. This sector is uniquely positioned to secure wider public support, leverage additional funding, and mobilise volunteer engagement, making it a highly cost-effective contributor. However, for eNGOs to continue fulfilling this role sustainably, they must receive appropriate support. In this context, Full Cost Recovery (FCR) is particularly relevant - while Government agencies explicitly account for their core costs in service charges (e.g. licensing), recent Government proposals appear to expect NGOs to absorb these costs while only funding direct habitat work. This disparity risks undermining the sector's ability to contribute effectively and sustainably.

For many EIP delivery organisations, funding uncertainties have been further complicated by National Insurance changes in the Budget. The aims behind the changes are laudable and have not disproportionately affected the environment sector pension contributions more than any other sector. But it has meant a substantial and unexpected amount of money has had to be redirected and this is impacting delivery schemes that would contribute to EIP targets.

While the sector will be able to build the increased staffing costs into future business cases, this does leave a short-term revenue issue that also has longer-term project development ramifications. The issue is further compounded by the wider lack of long-term multi-year funding essential to build a sustained and ambitious project pipeline, as well as generate and retain the skilled workforce needed to deliver projects that can take decades.

Recent research by Wildlife and Countryside Link with 22 environment charities has given insight on the funding conditions for environment charities and the impact of increased National Insurance (NI) requirements on project delivery. Between them, the 22 organisations surveyed have 15,589 employees and their NI contributions have increased by a combined £15.1 million annually. The NI increase represents an average annual organisational expenditure rise of 2%. The increase in annual expenditure ranges from a 0.7% rise to 14% for organisations where staff-related payments represent a higher proportion of costs.

Wider funding uncertainties, along with NI changes, are having big impacts organisationally and on the viability of EIP-focused projects, with particularly high knock-on effects on staffing. Worryingly, half (50%) of those surveyed now have lower staffing numbers and less capacity to deliver projects. Over a third (36.3%) have frozen recruitment and are leaving roles vacant. Over a quarter (27.3%) have paused staffing for some or all new projects.

²⁵ BornFree. (2024). Met Police announce reduced focus on wildlife crime.

This has already led to the loss of multiple projects that would contribute to EIP delivery and a reduction in ambition for many more. One in 10 organisations are abandoning or postponing one or more major projects, with almost 3 in 10 (27.3%) abandoning or postponing multiple smaller-scale projects. More than a quarter (22.7%) are reducing the scope of major projects with almost 3 in 10 (27.3%) reducing the scope of smaller projects.

Further impacts reported include a third having reduced capability to fundraise for EIP related projects, and a third having reduced ability to engage with Government and industry.

Probably the starkest finding in the research is that almost three quarters of environmental organisations (72.2%) say they now lack resources to effectively plan and develop new projects. This is hugely worrying for the future delivery of the EIP and may be dramatically limiting for the level of ambition of projects put forward in future.

Wildlife and Countryside Link has identified over 300 [shovel-ready projects](#) through its survey on EIP project funding, highlighting significant opportunities where public and voluntary sector priorities align. While these projects are primed for immediate implementation, maintaining a strong pipeline of future initiatives may require overcoming capacity constraints. Strengthening collaboration and investment now can help ensure continued alignment between government and voluntary sector ambitions.

Together, these projects could deliver a minimum of: 432,500 hectares of habitat restoration, creation or improved management, protect and help restore hundreds of species (with dozens that are of principal importance or are Amber or Red-listed), capture or avoid 1,821,271 tonnes of CO₂ per year, create at least 2330 jobs, and support and work with over 600 farmers and other landowners.

However, though these statistics are impressive, the sector could go much further. A few example ambitious projects are detailed below, though there are many more across England. Projects of even greater scale and ambition could be devised and delivered with the security of a long-term funding scheme that facilitates project development and delivery. Long-term funding would also help allow the long-term monitoring which is critical to assess contribution to EIP 2030 targets. The Landscape Recovery Fund has massive potential to achieve those objectives and outcome from agri-environment schemes. We need the same long-term vision and approach in other schemes.

When linked into Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) - perhaps through fast-tracking funding applications if furthering LNRS recommendations - such supported projects could pack even more of a punch for nature. Ensuring close link-up with LNRS devised priorities will be crucial for Defra in delivering critical habitat and species interventions in the places they are needed most.

Being part of a well-aligned, supportive partnership is crucial for driving nature's recovery at scale, working at geographic scales ranging from river catchments and protected landscapes to pan-regional ecosystem-led partnership programmes (such as Big Chalk, Great North Bog and the Midlands Forest Network). These 'middle ground' partnerships connect organisations

and catalyse impact, providing line of sight from national ambition and targets to project delivery by local partners - in Big Chalk's case, across 20% of England's land area.²⁶ With the right support, they can help the Government assure itself (and other nations) that the nature targets it has committed to are achievable and that progress will be monitored and evaluated consistently. It is a vital feedback loop, which eNGOs can help make happen.

- 1. Peatland Restoration - £1.7 million in project costs over three years.** Cumbria Wildlife Trust, Defra and the Environment Agency to re-wet 950 hectares of modified and drained bog to a fully functioning state. This would see an increase in specialist plants, invertebrates and birds, improve water quality, reduce flooding, and create 126,000 carbon credits, alongside enhanced access for 250,000 people who use Skiddaw Forest.
- 2. Northern Forest Ash Woodland Recovery programme - £9,800,000 over 5 years.** A Woodland Trust project to transform the declining Ash woodlands of the Yorkshire Dales into a connected resilient landscape rich in tree diversity. The project seeks to reverse the decline of degraded woodland habitats, bringing woods into active management and transforming them into wildlife-rich habitats. This would include a landscape scale project with delivery on 46 Estate sites and third party land, including training and upskilling landowners.
- 3. Nature restoration in the Heart of the Dales - £30,000,000 in project costs over five years.** The National Trust will create new woodland, restore 3000 ha of peat, 3000 ha of grassland as well as restoring rivers in the Wharfe catchment. The total area of impact will be 9,400ha using conservation grazing techniques and working with farm tenants to help them produce sustainable farm business plans, and will make a range of access improvements. With 15 FTE roles, this project will capture 1774 tCo2e (tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent) per year totalling 150,000 tCo2e over 50 years.

Key recommendations for EIP funding in the Spending Review

All contributors towards EIP delivery, be that Local Authorities, arms-length bodies, grass-roots community organisations, or environmental charities, need the same things in the funding context from the Spending Review:

- 1. A project pipeline** that is substantial enough to deliver EIP targets
- 2. For proper join-up between EIP objectives and adequately resourced funding vehicles** to deliver them
- 3. Funding certainty** – with schemes that have a long life-span and will not see the funding landscape shifting within 2-3 years
- 4. Funding streams that build-on and extend existing delivery funds** such as the Species Recovery Fund

²⁶ Big Chalk. (2024). Big Chalk follows the chalk into Norfolk: our partnership just got bigger!

Investment in Local Ecological Skills, Monitoring and Enforcement

Good regulations and rules, if not effectively implemented, will still fail to deliver the intended environmental and economic benefits. Existing environmental regulations in England, such as site protections for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), water quality rules like the Farming Rules for Water, and new mandatory planning policies such as Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), have the potential to genuinely protect important and vulnerable habitats and species and to contribute to nature's recovery. Unfortunately, these rules are not consistently applied. This results in environmental damage and, often, public funds being used to make up for a shortfall in compliance - such as failures to enforce good slurry management on farms, or the failure to enforce storm overflow permits in the water sector. In both cases, lack of transparent data and shortcomings in enforcement have led to harm to nature and inefficient use of public money. There are also delays in the planning system when applications are submitted affecting SSSIs. If it was accepted that these sites are off-limits for certain developments and automatically rejected, then developers would know not to invest time on needless applications.

Properly applied regulation also plays a role in enabling wider sustainable economic growth, by setting out clear requirements and minimum standards that ensure compliance with environmental law. This can create a level playing field for different sectors and provide certainty and stability for investment. Previous 'red tape' challenges have found that, effectively applied, regulation is important for and appreciated by businesses.

In the first instance, monitoring is necessary to guide action. For example, only 27.6% of features of SSSIs have an up-to-date condition assessment.²⁷ Data we obtained from JNCC under the Environmental Information Regulations (2004) shows that only 37 out of the 374 (9.9%) UK Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) have enough monitoring in place to assess if their management measures are working. Information from monitoring is also essential to inform management actions to rectify the breach or issue. It is possible that management is not delivering as intended. If monitoring demonstrates rules are not being met and action is not being taken in line with the regulations, enforcement must be taken to require action and to rectify the issue. The EIP includes an interim target for all SSSIs to have an up-to-date condition assessment by 31 January 2028. Natural England have an ambitious plan to deliver against this target but to keep it on track requires an increase in funding and resources.

Maintaining stability for businesses and achieving the government's environmental and climate objectives would be best served by better implementation on the ground. Consequently, the Defra spending envelope should ensure that its regulators and executive agencies are protected as part of the settlement.

Monitoring and enforcement of existing environmental regulations is largely done by the Environment Agency and Natural England. With significantly reduced budgets over the last decade, however, these bodies have not been able to fulfil their statutory monitoring and

²⁷ ENDS Report. (2025). Three quarters of SSSI features 'not assessed in last five years'.

enforcement duties.²⁸ The dire consequences of funding cuts through the 2010s are still being felt now. As the Environment Agency's advice-led approach to enforcement is finally stabilised, it is vital to maintain funding for regulators delivering on existing environmental, health, societal and welfare commitments.

Local planning authorities

Local planning authorities (LPAs) also have a crucial role in monitoring and enforcement of environmental regulations, in particular of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). However, there is long-standing low capacity and expertise within planning teams in local authorities, especially on biodiversity and ecology. A 2022 survey commissioned by Defra found that as many as 26% of LPAs do not have any access to ecological expertise. This was before the implementation of mandatory BNG. While the recent £9 million of funding from the Government to support LPAs to recruit ecologists for BNG is welcome, this is not sufficient given new burdens and the already-strained system. A more recent survey from MHCLG found that 72% of planning departments indicated they have skills gaps with regards to ecology and biodiversity, and 75% of those said that these skills gaps had impacted on their readiness for BNG.²⁹

In addition, LPAs have limited resources for enforcing planning conditions (including BNG), with 80% of enforcement officers already reporting that there were not enough officers in their team to carry out the workload.³⁰

International experience of biodiversity offsets shows that lack of capacity in and enforcement by local councils is a key reason why offsets fail to deliver. Early reviews of BNG implementation have already highlighted lack of monitoring and enforcement, in particular for onsite delivery of biodiversity gains, as a risk to BNG delivering as intended for such a flagship policy.³¹

The planning system

Investment in the planning system is crucial to unlocking economic growth, but sustained underinvestment has left the system struggling with delays and inefficiencies, particularly in environmental expertise across government and local authorities.³² A lack of capacity is causing significant bottlenecks. For example, between 2022 and 2023, Natural England failed to meet deadlines for 17.1% of nationally significant infrastructure project applications, with over a fifth of those delays attributed to under-resourcing and excessive workloads. Similarly, nearly 20% of statutory deadlines for local infrastructure and development projects were

²⁸ UK Parliament. (2021). Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Questions for the Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs.

²⁹ MHCLG. (2025). Local Authority Planning capacity and Skills Survey 2023.

³⁰ RTPI. (2022). Planning Enforcement Resourcing. The scale and nature of resourcing challenges faced by enforcement teams.

³¹ Green Finance Institute. (2024). Biodiversity Net Gain: A Roadmap for Action.

³² Wildlife and Countryside Link. (2024). Letter to Chancellor RE: Unlocking critical infrastructure by investing in environmental planning expertise.

missed, with 83.28% of these delays caused by insufficient capacity and high levels of staff turnover.³³

As ambitions for renewable energy deployment, housebuilding, and transport infrastructure grow, the need for significant investment in the planning system and statutory nature conservation bodies (SNCBs) becomes even more pressing. Without this, mounting pressure on an already strained system will exacerbate delays, leading to far-reaching socioeconomic and environmental consequences. Delayed infrastructure projects hinder economic opportunities. Research by the RSPB shows that each gigawatt of offshore wind installed generates £2.4 billion in economic investment, creates 750 full-time construction jobs over 4.5 years, and provides up to 85 full-time operational jobs. Similarly, Renewable UK highlights that onshore wind projects can deliver up to £75 million annually to local communities through targeted benefit schemes.³⁴ But these projects will not be unlocked swiftly without proper funding for planners and SNCBs.

Failing to properly invest in the planning system also carries environmental risks. Poorly managed energy infrastructure projects can result in cabling and grid connections being routed through ecologically significant areas, causing irreversible damage to precious habitats and landscapes and requiring applicants to spend millions on mitigation and compensation. Additionally, a lack catchment scale planning consideration is resulting in the demise of whole river systems like the Wye and Severn due to the over proliferation of Intensive Poultry Units (IPUs). By investing in the planning system, the UK can both unlock economic aims including growth and ensure that infrastructure and development projects are delivered efficiently and sustainably. This requires investment in data collection and other national monitoring programmes, the effective use of new technologies for example remote sensing, and the effective sharing of data by investing in bodies (such as Local Environmental Record Centres; LERCs) that do so. This is a backbone of strategic planning.

Invest in a Natural Health Service to Save the NHS £millions

Nature-based health and well-being programmes can save hundreds of millions of pounds each year and reduce society's reliance on the NHS.

A Rapid Economic Assessment³⁵ published in 2023 found that green prescribing can save more in healthcare costs than the price of running a green prescribing scheme. Green Prescribing enables GPs and other health care practitioners to refer people to nature-based programmes to improve physical and mental health. The review found that if the green prescribing programmes evaluated were delivered at scale, to a similar demographic of 1.2 million people living with poor mental health, it would achieve cost savings to the NHS of

³³ Natural England. (2023). Corporate report: Natural England's response times to planning consultations in England.

³⁴ Renewable UK. (2021). The onshore wind industry prospectus.

³⁵ The Wildlife Trusts. (2023). Natural Health Services. A rapid economic assessment of the Wildlife Trusts' Natural Health Services.

£635.6 million. This from a funding requirement of £534 million. At least £100M in cost savings to the NHS

A report published in 2024 on envisaging a social prescribing fund in England³⁶ sets out a model, co-designed with over 100 organisations, to channel long term funding to local community groups and services which support health and wellbeing. The proposed England-wide fund of £1 billion over 10 years would bring together contributions from the public, philanthropic and private sectors. In doing so, it would provide vital long-term funding for community groups and organisations to meet the rising demand for their activities and services – a key to tackling loneliness, reducing health inequalities and improving people’s health. The allocation of funds would be based on local health needs and could include support for evidence-based community projects such as the Government’s world leading Green Prescribing for Mental Health Programme.

A major evaluation of the social prescribing pilot programme showed that over 8,000 people took part, with 57% coming from the most economically under-served places. The programme also had a strong outreach in terms of ethnic diversity, with 21% of people coming from ethnic minority communities. There were big reductions in anxiety and depression symptoms, and significant improvements across well-being measures, with big increases in happiness and life satisfaction, alongside an increase in people’s feeling that “life is worthwhile”. There was a return on investment of £2.42 per £1 invested by HM Treasury, and so generating an economic return. It also compares well with other NHS interventions if looking through a cost-effective lens. The cost of a green prescription was about £500. Comparatively, cognitive behavioural therapy costs about £1,000 for 10 sessions. HM Treasury have already invested a further £2.3 million in the pilot programme, taking it to March 2025. It is now time to roll green prescribing out across the country, meeting the Government’s commitment in its own Environmental Improvement Plan.

A cross-Government investment of £500 million is needed to match the NHS investment in social prescribing Link Workers via the GP contract. There is strong support and consensus on the model, which uses the power of leverage and data to drive productivity and value.

Nature in Education – Preparing the Next Generation

Access to and engagement with nature within education will be vital to tackling and adapting to the biodiversity and nature crisis, as well as promoting health and wellbeing and the success of children and young people. The Government has recognised the importance of nature within education, including in the Environmental Improvement Plan and the Department for Education’s (DfE) Climate Change and Sustainability Strategy.

Making schools an equitable space for nature could be the key driver for levelling up children’s access to nature. Initiatives such as the National Education Nature Park demonstrate the intent of the DfE to bring children closer to nature as part of the school day, but it does not

³⁶ National Academy for Social Prescribing. (2024). New report calls for 'social prescribing fund'.

go far enough to ensure parity across the school estate. These schemes are “opt-in” and lack the sustainable exit strategies that will ensure a school embeds outdoor learning and nature connection as a statutory element of school life once the programme has come to an end.

The school estate, communities, and local environments differ extensively across England. This means that the ways children access nature also varies. Proximity to nature does not equate with access to it; many children in rural communities are as disconnected from the natural world as those living in urban areas.

A Government investment of £50 million would enable all schools in England to make manageable and sustainable improvements to school grounds, providing access to nature for all children within the school day.³⁷

Revenue-raising Measures

Further sources of funding need to be found for environmental recovery. At the moment, the UK economy is far from properly internalising the costs of environmental damage. As the Dasgupta Review of the Economics of Biodiversity³⁸ noted, “environmental externalities are a prime cause behind economy-wide inefficiencies”.

Implementing revenue-raising measures that address environmental externalities can generate significant funds while incentivising sustainable practices, delivering environmental protection, and bolstering innovation for cleaner technologies.

We recommend that the Government introduces a Nature Recovery Obligation on main polluting sectors. This should comprise (1) a duty of disclosure of key environmental risks and liabilities; (2) a requirement to publish Nature-Positive Pathways alongside Net Zero plans; and (3) regulatory obligations to contribute to environmental recovery in line with a fair apportionment of responsibilities. Such an obligation would help secure wider private investment in nature recovery, as well as improving economic efficiency.

The Polluter Pays principle can ensure that the costs of environmental protection are borne by those most responsible for pollution and resource depletion. As a local example, Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council has produced an ambitious policy to recover costs from polluters for contaminated land remediation.³⁹ At a national scale, contributions to nature restoration from polluting industries, such as chemical manufacturers, should be increased in line with Global Biodiversity Framework policies. In contributing to these levies, industries and businesses have a structured approach for working towards their nature positive pathways.

³⁷ National Academy of Social Prescribing. (2021). Envisaging a social prescribing fund in England.

³⁸ HM Treasury. (2021). Independent report. Final Report - The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review

³⁹ Stockton on Tees Borough Council. (2024). Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy 2024 to 2029.

For example, the Teesside Chemical Initiative estimated that a climate change levy, if applied in full, would generate £37.3 million per annum from Teesside chemical firms alone.^{40,41}

Investment in nature delivers multiple benefits and significant financial aid. A 2020 report by the National Trust made a powerful economic case for investment to introduce green spaces to the country's greyest urban communities.⁴² This report demonstrated how a £5.5 billion capital investment in this programme would deliver £200 billion in physical health and wellbeing benefits to the most disadvantaged communities. Additional benefits would include active travel, increased biodiversity, carbon capture and air quality enhancements from green infrastructure.

The World Economic Forum's New Nature Economy Report states that adopting nature-positive transitions in key socio-economic systems could unlock \$10.1 trillion globally in business opportunities by 2030.⁴³ Energy and extractives are one of these key systems. For example, implementing strategies to minimise waste generation and associated costs throughout project lifecycles, or incorporating renewable energy sources and energy-saving practices, would reduce long-term operational costs. Moreover, promoting "benign by design" production would encourage industries to consider environmental impacts earlier in the product/process development stage and lead to cost savings and potential recovery mechanisms.

Leveraging private sector funding is crucial for scaling up nature recovery efforts and ensuring long-term environmental sustainability. A key example is investment in Landscape Recovery Projects, which align with farming priorities and are increasingly required to explore blended finance models, combining public and private funding to maximise impact. Beyond individual projects, there is also a strategic need to advance the previous Government's commitments under the Nature Markets Framework, particularly the ambition to mobilise at least £500 million of private investment per year into nature recovery by 2027, rising to over £1 billion by 2030. Delivering on this goal will require robust policy support, investor confidence, and mechanisms to connect capital with high-impact projects. Initiatives such as the Defra-sponsored 'Projects for Nature Platform', supported by Lloyds Bank, are helping to bridge this gap by facilitating investment in nature-based solutions. Ensuring these frameworks and platforms are effectively implemented will be essential to unlocking the full potential of private sector funding for nature recovery.

⁴⁰ Select Committee on Trade and Industry Ninth Report. (n.d.). Impact on industry of the Climate Change Levy.

⁴¹ It is also crucial to assess the effectiveness of current subsidies and incentives. One area where public funds could be more strategically allocated is burning wood for bioenergy. Large-scale biomass generators have claimed billions in low-carbon subsidies. While bioenergy is often promoted as a renewable solution, large-scale bioenergy projects—particularly those reliant on woody biomass combustion—actually emit more CO₂ than coal²³ and raise "deeply troubling" concerns regarding their supply chain sustainability, cost-effectiveness, and their impact on land use and nature. Redirecting bioenergy investments into genuine renewables and nature-based solutions will produce better outcomes for nature, climate and value for money.

⁴² National Trust. (2020). Levelling up and building back better through urban green infrastructure. An investment options appraisal.

⁴³ World Economic Report. (2020). New Nature Economy Report Series.

Water Restoration Fund

The Treasury must maintain the ringfencing of the Water Restoration Fund (WRF), to adhere to the Government's manifesto promise to clean up UK waterways.

During the passage of the Water (Special Measures) Bill, parliamentarians from across the House pressed Defra Ministers to confirm the future of the Water Restoration Fund, set up by the previous Government in 2022 to ringfence environmental fines from water companies for freshwater restoration.

Defra Ministers responded by saying that the future of the Fund was being discussed with the Treasury. If the fund is discontinued, a significant source of funding for water restoration, embodying the polluters pays principle, could be lost to general Treasury funds. The Water Restoration Fund has been an important and impactful response to the public demand for more action to clean up England's waterways, and its diminishment would undermine efforts to deliver in this area.⁴⁴ Cancelling the Water Restoration Fund approach would also increase political uncertainty for project development in natural capital, undermining the development of a pipeline of projects for Critical Natural Infrastructure. Delays in disbursement of the first tranche of funding have already caused a number of significant private investment opportunities to be lost.

We urge the Treasury to resist the temptation to raid the Water Restoration Fund for general funds. The costs to the economy and society remain whether money is ringfenced or added to general funds.

Guaranteeing the Fund and its ringfencing would reinforce the Government's commitment to 'cleaning up Britain's rivers, lakes and seas', and to the Polluter Pays principle, fostering accountability and compliance within the water industry and ensure that customers and charities are not left to foot the bill for industry failures.

In its first round (earmarked for Defra, but not yet paid out), the Fund allocated up to £11 million for water improvement projects. With the proposed fines on Thames Water, Yorkshire Water, and Northumbrian Water for illegal sewage discharges in 2024 alone, the Fund could secure an additional £168 million for conservation delivery if these fines are ringfenced. This influx of funds would enable a significant expansion of restoration initiatives, directly translating into cleaner rivers, healthier ecosystems, and a more sustainable future. This strategic allocation of fines not only amplifies the impact of Government expenditure but also ensures that these initiatives are sustained and scaled up over time, fostering long-term environmental resilience.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Wildlife and Countryside Link. (2025). Letter to Secretary of State on the Water Restoration Fund.

⁴⁵ Wildlife and Countryside Link. (2025). Water (Special Measures) Bill: Written evidence for Public Bill Committee.

Nature Restoration Fund

As one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world, the UK must prioritise the protection and enhancement of its remaining biodiversity rather than tying nature recovery funding to further ecological degradation. Effective management of existing habitats must be the foundation of any successful recovery strategy. In steps where development is unavoidable, nature-positive planning reform is essential for the Government to meet its environmental targets at the same time as infrastructure development plans. The aims and expectations for the Nature Restoration Fund need to be explicit at the outset. Proposals for a Nature Restoration Fund could make a positive contribution if certain conditions are met (including: circumscribed and targeted reforms to the Habitats Regulations that do not weaken the law; clear scientific gateways for including environmental rules within the scheme; robust monitoring and enforcement). If lessons are learned around exemptions, monitoring and enforcement from the Biodiversity Net Gain scheme which is currently not meeting its potential.⁴⁶

For the scheme to be a success, it must go significantly beyond “offsetting” and it must ensure that environmental gains are delivered upfront and transparently. That will require upfront investment in projects that often have high upfront capital requirements. By significantly pump-priming the Nature Restoration Fund, the Government can begin to deliver significant natural infrastructure investment projects ahead of development needs, creating “headroom” at the same time as building public trust. Costs could then be recovered from developers as development projects are delivered.

Nature restoration also creates and supports jobs and skills, and boosts local and regional economies, offering communities a tangible stake in a greener future. Investing early in the NRF will accelerate these outcomes, delivering measurable returns for people, nature, and the economy.

Effective strategic compensation for unavoidable impacts to Marine Protected Areas from offshore wind development is reliant on the use of the Marine Recovery Fund. The recent announcement that this fund would be launched by late 2025 is very welcomed. However, there is a need for 'seed funding' from Defra to develop suitable compensation packages to sit on the library of measures prior to the Marine Recovery Fund being instigated. It will also be vital to ensure the Offshore Wind Enabling Actions Programme in Defra and DESNZ continue to be adequately resourced, alongside SNCBs and planning teams, to be able to deliver and maintain this work.

Financial Incentives to Grow the Circular Economy

As set out in Link’s paper *Financial Incentives to Grow the Circular Economy*,⁴⁷ the Circular Economy has the potential to massively boost economic growth and create almost 0.5 million

⁴⁶ Wildlife and Countryside Link. (2025). Lack of ambition of Biodiversity Net Gain leaves scheme missing the mark for nature one year on.

⁴⁷ Wildlife and Countryside Link. (2025). Financial Incentives to Grow the Circular Economy.

British jobs by 2035.⁴⁸ But without the right incentives for UK businesses and consumers, it risks getting left behind market leaders like the Netherlands.

One key policy needed to enable the Circular Economy is grant and scale-up funding for circular economy businesses. A review of the evidence on incentives for the circular economy found high upfront investment costs are a key barrier to expansion of circular economy businesses.⁴⁹ Both grant funding for innovation and funding for capital investment to allow circular economy businesses to grow and compete with linear alternatives are needed. This funding could be delivered through the National Wealth Fund.

Private funding for the Circular Economy is small but growing. The number of public market funds with a circular economy focus went up from 1 in 2018 to 10 in 2020, while the number of private market funds with a circular economy focus increased tenfold from 2016 to 2020.⁵⁰ Public investment now has the potential to crowd in private investment to a nascent market and make the UK a world leader.

Conclusion

Nature recovery is not a cost but a value-for-money investment in a more resilient, prosperous, and environmentally sustainable country. Supporting nature-friendly farming, unleashing the benefits of habitat restoration, embracing innovative funding mechanisms, and implementing robust polluter-pays principles are vital actions to meet nature targets. The UK can use delivering environmental improvements for delivering of all five of its missions and a secure economic foundation for growth.

Wildlife and Countryside Link (Link) is the largest nature coalition in England, bringing together over 85 organisations to use their joint voice for the protection of the natural world and animals.

For questions or further information please contact:

Lauren Moore, Policy Officer, Wildlife and Countryside Link, E: lauren@wcl.org.uk
Wildlife & Countryside Link, Vox Studios, 1 – 45 Durham Street, Vauxhall, London, SE11 5JH
www.wcl.org.uk

The following organisations have inputted into this submission:

Amphibian and Reptile Conservation
Angling Trust
Bumblebee Conservation Trust
CIEEM

⁴⁸ Green Alliance. (2021). Levelling up through circular economy jobs.

⁴⁹ Endress and Hauser. (n.d.). Embracing sustainable practices in the Circular Economy

⁵⁰ Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2020). Financing the circular economy: Capturing the opportunity.

Earth Trust
Earthwatch Europe
Freshwater Habitats Trust
Humane Society International
Institute of Fisheries Management
National Forum for Biological Recording
National Landscapes Association
National Trust
Open Spaces Society
Planet Patrol
Plantlife
River Action
RSPB
Seal Research Trust
Soil Association
The Rivers Trust
The Wildlife Trusts
Whale and Dolphin Conservation
Woodland Trust
ZSL