

Version 1: November, 2025

Equity and Justice Infrastructure: mapping of funding across the UK

Working research paper

Please note this is an edited version of a research paper submitted to Journal of Philanthropy. London Funders has published a summary report based on the analysis referred to here (accessible [via the London Funders website](#)). The full paper has links to source material and greater depth of analysis for those who would like to explore the research in more detail.

Summary

Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations (EJIJs) are the scaffolding behind movements for change. They build capacity, connect networks, share knowledge, and advocate for systemic transformation on behalf of equity-focused, grassroots organisations. When well supported, EJIJs act as force multipliers — strengthening communities, amplifying underrepresented voices, and sustaining progress long after moments of crisis.

Yet despite their vital role, these organisations remain underfunded and often less visible in traditional funding landscapes. In 2024, London Funders brought together funders and infrastructure organisations to understand how we can better support the EJIJs that enable equalities-led organisations to thrive.

The subsequent research brought together financial grants data alongside data from in-depth interviews with funders, EJIJs, and equalities organisations; and two national surveys, involving over 100 infrastructure and frontline organisations, to explore EandJ infrastructure across the UK.

This work helps to provide a systematic mapping of funding for equity and justice infrastructure in the UK and for funders to understand how we can best invest in this support into the future.

Introduction

This project focuses on a specific subset of social sector organisations – specialist infrastructure organisationsⁱ that provide capacity-building type support to equity and justice organisations,ⁱⁱ (hereon, **equity and justice infrastructure organisations** or **EJIOs**).

Following Covid-19, there was a shift in the sector towards better understanding and resourcing equity and justice organisations (also referred to as community-led and/or equity-led groups).ⁱⁱⁱ There was sector-wide recognition of the ability of these groups in efficiently reaching their communities where public institutions and larger and/or general non-profits were unable to.^{iv} Despite growing recognition of these groups and a better understanding of their resource and capacity problems, there is little to no research on who provides infrastructure support to these organisations and who funds their infrastructure support.

Earlier in 2024, we conducted a rapid literature review of UK-specific literature on equity and justice infrastructure organisations. Our review confirmed the paucity of literature on equity and justice organisations that are UK-specific.^v As a result, this report also borrows from literature from other contexts.

Our rapid review^{vi} of literature suggests that strategically funding specialist infrastructure organizations can yield outsized benefits across health, education, civil rights, and economic equity parameters – key tenets of liberal democracies.^{vii} Some evidence from within the US indicates that these organisations become vulnerable without intentional support and their absence can limit social progress.^{ix} In some cases, these infrastructure organisations amplified the effectiveness of grassroots action by building capacity^{xi}, fostering networks^{xii}, and/or advocating for systemic change.^{xiii} Some case studies show that well-supported networks responded faster in crises,^{xv} leveraged larger pools of funding and helped marginalized communities claim more resources than isolated groups could on their own.^{xvii} The evidence provides some evidence of an opportunity to invest in an area that provides unprecedented ability to advance justice – a key policy agenda for the current UK government(s).^{xviii}

To strategically invest in the sector, we would benefit from greater evidence about the state of funding, demand and supply of specialist infrastructure organisations which provide support to equity-focused grassroots groups and the impact of these organisations. This report moves towards filling this gap. Through a review of data from Charity Commission, OSCR, CCNI and accounts data, two surveys (n=52 and n=54) and 44 stakeholder interviews helps to map the presence, size and type of investment into these organisations (assessed by funding). It also examines its impact (what changes were reported as a result of funding and EJIO or receiving support from an EJIO) and need across the UK.^{xix}

Social inequity is on the rise in the UK.^{xx} Equity and Justice Organisations (EJOs), defined as led by-and-for organisations working on issues relating to social equality and justice (a detailed definition is available in Appendix I), working alongside their communities to challenge some of these systems face unique challenges in the third-sector - from funding to general support and resilience.^{xxi} Research from Civil Society Consulting revealed the funding challenges equity led organisations face – funders and funding processes are biased towards larger and established organisations and funders lack contextual knowledge and risk-appetite required to sustainably fund by led by and for organisations.^{xxii} Funders such as the Civic Power Fund and Joseph Rowntree Foundation have also echoed these findings in the context of their specific equity-focused funds.^{xxiii} There is some evidence to suggest that some EJOs receive relatively low funding, and sector-specific research highlights the disparity in funding available for grassroots organisations focused on equality and justice issues.^{xxiv}

There is *some* literature and knowledge on the need and impact of general infrastructure organisations that provide support to third-sector organisations. However, there is limited evidence of the need and impact of infrastructure organisations providing *specialist* support (hereafter referred to as equity and justice infrastructure organisations or EJIOs) to EJOs, especially in the UK.^{xxv} There is also limited knowledge on the state of funding for EJIOs in the UK.

Literature Review

We conducted a rapid review of literature on EJIOs. A full We collated 115 documents through targeted Google and Google Scholar searches. After an initial screening for relevance and accessibility, 65 documents were included for detailed analysis. Full methodology and the literature review can be found in the Appendix. Only UK-specific literature was included in our search. We assessed the included literature to answer the following questions –

1. How are EJIOs defined?
2. What is the role of EJIOs?
3. What is the impact of EJIOs?
4. What does the funding landscape look like for EJIOs?
5. What is the state of the sector in terms of growth and overall sector capacity?

This review enabled us to identify gaps in knowledge and shaped our research questions.

Definition and Role of Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations (EJIOs)

Infrastructure in the voluntary sector is often described as the "backbone", "foundation", "civil society support" or "scaffolding" necessary for civil society organisations to operate effectively.^{xxvi} Infrastructure organisations provide capacity building, development support, networking, knowledge sharing, and collaborative advocacy support. These services enable

frontline organisations - those working directly with individuals and communities - to enhance their effectiveness and achieve collective impact.^{xxvii} Infrastructure organisations also act as intermediaries between small groups and the broader sectors (such as between public and private sectors), ensuring these organisations are not isolated from decision-making processes.^{xxviii} Infrastructure organisations also support advocacy efforts for policy changes that foster more inclusive and equitable resource distribution. This means providing both the tools and the strategic capacity needed by EJOs to influence policy, public discourse, and public sector decision-making processes.^{xxix} We did not find UK-specific literature defining EJOs. However, grey literature from non-profits and public-sector bodies defined them as specialist infrastructure organisations with either sub-sector focus or equalities focus.^{xxx}

Impact of Infrastructure Support

Evidence on the impact of infrastructure organisations comes primarily from literature published by implementing organisations and funders. One research report by Rob Macmillan on the impact of infrastructure organisations acknowledged that the “evidence base somewhat fragmented and disparate, typically derived from single project or programme evaluations rather than a more comprehensive study of infrastructure as whole.”^{xxxi} Macmillan concluded that infrastructure organisations made an impact both *within* individual third sector organisations and *beyond and between* individual third sector organisations. They strengthened individual organisations through expert advice, funding support, and capacity building, while also enhancing their credibility and internal learning. Beyond individual organisations, they fostered collaboration, amplify the sector’s voice, and support community engagement through coordinated networks and representation at various administrative levels.^{xxxii} Impact reports and assessments of individual infrastructure organisations’ provide some evidence of the value of infrastructure organisations in providing strategic sector support, brokering relationships and improving sector influence.^{xxxiii} Literature studying the role of infrastructure organisations position them as an “accountability broker, networker, bridge, communicator, resource mobilizer, catalyst, and convener.”^{xxxiv} Explanations of their impact in literature is “rooted in transaction cost economics, participatory democracy, organizational institutionalism.”^{xxxv} There is also some evidence of them fostering “collaboration over competition, which can strengthen communities even in lean economic times.”^{xxxvi} Literature also explores the unique value of the network effect of infrastructure organisations for youth and older people’s organisations.^{xxxvii}

There is some theoretical basis to understand some of the correlation between the importance of infrastructure and movement-building. D’Emilio (2002) notes that “change comes in the form of alternating cycles of what we might colloquially call leaping and creeping”.^{xxxviii} In *Social Movements and Philanthropy: How Foundations Can Support*

Movement Building, Barbara Master notes that “[d]uring the “creeping” times, the infrastructure, organizations, relationships, and leaders of a movement are built so that during the great “leaping” times – those so-called “movement moments” – public engagement, attitudes, and policies rapidly move forward. How well the infrastructure for the movement is built determines how high the leap will be when the ripe time comes.”^{xxxix}

Funders also note that infrastructure organisations can “have a role in advancing social justice and diversity, equity, and inclusion in the sector”. Existing literature makes the case that charity sector infrastructure bodies should play a greater role in speaking out on behalf of the sector where individual charities are reluctant to raise issues with funders out of fear for their future funding. Infrastructure bodies can take the initiative in highlighting the negative impacts of certain current grant-making practices, following the example set by organisations like IVAR.

Additionally, there are two key documents that provide some evidence of the economic case for infrastructure organisations. One report assesses impact via a Social Return on Investment calculation, thereby estimating the monetary value of benefits received by each of the stakeholders in an organisation. An SROI assessment of the general infrastructure organisation, Voscur, revealed that for each £1 invested into the organisation, Voscur created £11.82 in social value.^{xi} In *Unleashing the Power of Civil Society*, authors provide an economic case for civil society organisations (defined to include infrastructure organisations).^{xii} They note that “investment in [this] social infrastructure is estimated to yield economic, *social* and fiscal benefits worth £3.2 million over 10 years from every £1 million invested in it, with gains including increased employment, reduced crime, and improved health outcomes.”^{xiii} In this context, civil society organisations are theorised as the “creators of social capital”.^{xiii}

Demand for Infrastructure Organisations

Similar to knowledge on the impact of infrastructure organisations, the need of these organisations have also been largely pieced together from grey literature – surveys by funders and individual organisations’ reports.

Esmee Fairbairn’s survey of its grants plus program which provides infrastructure support to grantees revealed that 42% of respondents accessed Funding Plus support in 2023 compared to 27% in 2017. However, there were only 81 responses to the 2017 survey in contrast with 187 responses in 2023.^{xiv} Wandsworth Council’s needs assessment found a need for funding infrastructure and capacity building in its VCSE sector.^{xv} Paul Hamlyn Foundation’s report on its Backbone Fund (which provides funding to infrastructure organisations) also notes that infrastructure organisations “can have a role in advancing social justice and diversity, equity, and inclusion in the sector.”^{xvi}

Impact reports of specific infrastructure support programs highlight areas of demand for infrastructure support. Some evidence of specific areas of demand comes from Robertson Trust's third sector capacity building support survey (total number of respondents = 540). Respondents noted high demand (71%) for funding strategy support, especially respondents with an annual income of less than £1m. A large number of respondents (43%) noted the need for long-term learning programmes but only 16% noted assessing any long-term learning programmes. Tailored capacity building support was in demand alongside 1 to 1 peer support.^{xlvii}

Funding and Challenges

There is little evidence and/or exploration of the funding landscape for infrastructure organisations. We only found two relevant reports that provide some discussion of funding landscape for EJIOs. The Sector Infrastructure Funding Analysis report, by 360Giving, provides some insight into funding for specialist infrastructure organisations and Funding Justice report by Civic Power Fund, analyses investment into the justice sector.^{xlviii}

Given the lack of literature on funding, we also conducted manual analysis of the data for the specialist organisations specified within the 360 report, "Sector Infrastructure Funding Analysis".^{xlix} An analysis of funding for 700 mapped infrastructure organisations in the UK revealed a "[lack of growth] in real terms over the last decade, following large falls in the size of the sector before that. This is despite growth in the charity sector as a whole over the same period." Furthermore, the "number of voluntary sector infrastructure bodies has declined since 2006, particularly amongst local infrastructure bodies", spending, in real terms, "by all types of voluntary sector infrastructure bodies is lower in 2020-21 than in 2011-12", "spending on voluntary sector infrastructure has not matched the growth in the voluntary sector over the last ten years" and "five funders provide one third of grant funding to voluntary sector Infrastructure."^l Funding Justice report by Civic Power Fund provides some discussion of low investment into infrastructure-type activities. Funding Justice 2 "found that the dominant share of social justice funding in 2021/22 was focused on 'the final stages of social transformation... rather than the movements that make these changes possible to begin with'."^{li} There was some evidence around the source of funding for infrastructure organisations. Two reports noted that funding mostly came from government sources.^{lii}

Reports noted the impact of Covid-19 on the infrastructure sector. During the Covid-19 crisis, public authorities leveraged the reach of infrastructure organisations to reach communities. However, the support provided during the Covid-19 pandemic to infrastructure organisations declined after 2021.^{liii}

One report from 2010 also noted the funding cuts suffered by Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) organisations. However, the dataset included a mix of BME infrastructure

organisations alongside BME frontline organisations.^{liv} Another report provided some evidence of low income growth for grassroots organisations, especially post-pandemic.^{lv}

Who are the Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations (Supply)

In line with findings around general infrastructure organisations, we found EJIO availability across the UK to be scant. There are over 400,000 registered charities and over 76,335 social enterprises in the UK.^{lvi} We mapped 196 charities, 22 CICs/Companies and 1 unregistered organisation in the UK providing specialist infrastructure support to EJOs. We refer to these 220 organisations as the EJIOs informing this report. A table of key terms we will use while describing our data and findings is below:

Term	Meaning
Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisation or EJIOs	Specialist infrastructure organisations that provide capacity-building-type support to EJOs.
Equity and Justice Organisation or EJOs	Led by and for organisations that advance social equity and justice by working with communities disproportionately impacted by systemic inequality and injustice.
Equity and Justice Infrastructure (EJI) Focused or EJI-focused	Majority of their services and functions are specialist infrastructure support (as listed in the functions section of Appendix 1) provided to EJOs. The total number of EJI focused organisations on our list is 138, out of which 30 are London-only organisations.
Equity and Justice Infrastructure (EJI) Adjacent or EJI-adjacent	One or some, but not the majority, of their services and functions are specialist infrastructure support to EJOs. The total number of EJI-adjacent organisations on our list is 81 out of 25 are London-only organisations.

25% (55) of the mapped organisations provided services only in London. This finding might be attributed to London’s most diverse population, population density and thereby more demand for equity and justice infrastructure organisations’ services. **94 (43%) organisations**

provided services nationally.^{lvii} Our conversations with some EJIOs revealed that while they are registered as national charities on Charity Commission, they do not have equal and proportionate service provision in every single region across the UK. Therefore, it remains difficult to obtain an accurate indication of equity and justice infrastructure service provision nationally. Some organisations also mentioned that while they have ambitions to provide services nationally, they are often London-focused due to the concentration of funding available to them in London.

"We serve a national community, but it's hard to get regional funding – most grants are London-centric." – EJIO providing services primarily in London

Very few specialist infrastructure organisations mapped beyond London provided local or hyper-local services. Stakeholder interviews with EJIOs in other parts of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland also provided support for this trend. An organisation providing specialist infrastructure support in Scotland noted that they work in partnership with hyper-local organisations to deliver services in rural Scotland, however, most of their work remains concentrated in Edinburgh and Glasgow. This is because of a higher demand for their services in these two cities. Given that most of their staff was based in Glasgow and Edinburgh, they found that the partnership model to deliver infrastructure support ensured they were not domineering and provided support while also ensuring people with contextual knowledge and pre-existing community trust were leading efforts. The organisation also mentioned that an ad-hoc partnership model works for them because there is low and inconsistent demand in other parts of Scotland, which has meant that they prioritise their limited resources to build service provision mainly in cities where there is more demand. Similarly, our interviews in Wales revealed a similar ad-hoc partnership model to deliver support as and when need arises.

Young Women's Movement – Partnerships Across Scotland

The Young Women's Movement (YWM), is a national organisation for young women and girls, has expanded its reach beyond Edinburgh and Glasgow through a strategic partnership model. By collaborating with local authorities and third sector partners, YWM has delivered youth-led programmes in areas such as Perth and Kinross, Angus, and Dundee.

YWM works with local councils and organisations like NSPCC Scotland to deliver programmes such as Young Women Know in Perth and Kinross, Dundee, and Angus. As a part of this project, YWM catalysed formation of youth-led groups (e.g. Bold Girls Ken in Perth) to co-produce campaigns on healthy relationships, consent, and service access. Participants created toolkits, hosted community events, and present directly to

policymakers. Campaigns fed into local and national consultations, including Parliamentary sessions.

In June 2025, the Bold Girls Ken group from Perth and Kinross won the Sheila McKechnie Foundation Young Campaigner Award. Their campaign on consent, developed through Young Women Know, demonstrated the success of YWM's locally rooted, youth-led model.

A collaborative delivery model meant co-designing programs with local authorities and youth organisations to ensure local needs are met. Through targeted partnerships, The Young Women's Movement has successfully extended its reach into communities across Scotland. Its model supports meaningful youth participation, effective local delivery, and measurable policy impact, while working in partnership with local youth organisations and leaders.

Majority of the mapped organisations were EJIOs - their main organisational function was to provide specialist infrastructure support to by and for led equity groups. We included some "EJI-adjacent organisations"^{lviii} which were recommended by frontline organisations in our stakeholder interviews and surveys. 37% (80) of the mapped organisations were EJI-adjacent organisations.^{lix} Therefore, the list comprised of EJI-focused organisations and EJI-adjacent organisations.

What do we mean by EJIO-adjacent?

We included One Newham in our list. One Newham is a general infrastructure organisation that also hosts 4 specialist networks/forums for equity-led organisations - Staywell Partnership - Organisations working with older people, Newham Youth Partnership, Disability Rep Forum / RUF, and Children's Network Newham. However, its main function is to provide general infrastructure support to all third-sector organisations in Newham. A detailed note on definitions is available in Appendix 1.

We further categorised organisations based on their main focus of services.^{lx} Our categorisation still follows a methodology privy to scrutiny. We recognise that this is not an accurate representation of the intersectional nature of the work done by all of these organisations. In order to avoid a double count of funding data, we also had to adhere to one primary categorisation. But, the benefit of sub-sector specific discussions that any insights from sub-sector level data would initiate outweighs the cost of not capturing the cross-sector reach of most of these organisations.

Based on this categorisation, we noticed that most EJIOs focused primarily on Race and Ethnicity (73) and Children and Young People (57), constituting ~60% of the total mapped organisations. Few mapped organisations were focused on Older People (5 or 2%). We did not find any Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland specific infrastructure organisations

focusing on Older People. Out of the 5 mapped organisations, 3 reported providing services across the UK. Despite a small number of mapped organisations, their combined income was relatively high. We attribute this to the inclusion of Age UK on the list – an EJI-adjacent Older People’s infrastructure organisation which reports consolidated income to Charity Commission, skewing this figure.^{lxi}

The low number of EJIOs for Older People might also be because there are simply fewer led by and for organisations serving older people and therefore the number of specialist infrastructure organisations for older peoples’ charities is also fewer. For example, Race and Ethnicity as a category includes many sub-groups. We included multiple specialist infrastructure organisations focused on specific racial and ethnic subgroups in our list. For example, in London, we included London Gypsies and Travellers working with gypsies and traveller communities, Latin Elephant working with Latin American communities and Tower Hamlets Somali Organisations Network working with Somali communities. Older People’s sector does not have similar sub-categories and as a result, fewer organisations might be able to meet the demands of the sub-group. This hypothesis does not hold similarly for Children and Young People EJIOs which also does not have similar sub-categories as Race and Ethnicity EJIOs. Part of the list can be explained by 14 individual Young Foundation’s subsidiaries included in the list (such as Young Camden, Young Westminster, etc.). However, we still found a relatively good spread of local, regional and national Children and Young People EJIOs – indicating a relatively better infrastructure provision for the sector which continues to face issues due to rising child poverty and unemployment.^{lxii}

Funding Trends

We extracted funding data for registered charities from Charity Commission for England and Wales, Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) and Charity Commission for Northern Ireland (CCNI). You can read more about the data in Appendix 2. Some trends are assessed regionally because of the lack of standardised data across regions. Summary of included data:

	England/Wales	Scotland	Northern Ireland	Total
Registered charities	183	7	8	198
Registered Charities with Data Available	177	7	7	191
CICs/Companies	20	0	2	22
Total EJIOs included in Data Analysis	177	7	9	193

[Please note that data can be viewed on a microsite via London Funders website]

EJIOs across the UK saw a decline in investment between 2020 and 2024. Funding data shows a moderate, steady growth between 2020-23. This might be an effect of Covid-related funding which was made available in 2020, and multi-year grants were distributed over a period of 3-5 years. Data shows that funding rose steadily from £350.3 million in 2020 to £397.3 million in 2023, a total increase of 13.4% over three years. The highest annual growth occurred in 2022 (+6.0%), possibly linked to post-pandemic investment or increased attention to equity and justice issues during that time. However, upon adjusting for inflation, this moderate, steady growth trend disappears. **An inflation adjusted trend shows a steady decline in funding, unable to keep up with rising costs.**

Similarly, an analysis of nominal or face value funding figures shows that in 2024, funding decreased by £10.06 million (-2.5%), marking the first decline in nominal values in five years. While relatively modest compared to more volatile subsectors, this decline might reflect tightening budgets, funding consolidation, or donor fatigue. **The real terms decline between 2020 and 2024 is much sharper, declining by 10.18%.** The inflation adjusted values reflect our findings from stakeholder interviews as well. Interviewees noted that the funding landscape for EJIOs is characterized by inconsistency, precariousness, and regional unevenness. While there has been a recent increase in recognition, partly attributed to the funding made available to them during Covid by funders such as City Bridge Foundation, interviewees noted that funding has not kept pace with costs. Out of the 16 EJIOs interviewed, all agreed that their funding in real terms had declined. Additionally, out of the EJIOs that responded to our surveys (n=42), 30 (71.4%) noted a decline in funding. We did not note any overlap between the organisations that responded to the survey and the ones that were included in the stakeholder interviews.

We also examined funding changes across five years (2020-24) between EJI-focused organisations and EJI-adjacent organisations in England and Wales. EJI-adjacent organisations' figures are significantly larger. This might be because of the wider range of projects and services that they provide their wider regional coverage. Funding data currently does not disaggregate based on project so it is difficult to conclude what percentage of their total funding goes towards resourcing equity and justice infrastructure projects. So while they might be well-resourced overall, it does not reflect a well resourced equity and justice infrastructure service provision. We also note that EJI-focused organisations' funding increased more sharply in 2022 and followed a declining trend post 2023. Funding for EJI-adjacent organisations also faced decline in 2023 but the rate of decline reduced in 2024. Funding for EJI-adjacent organisation increased by 0.16% in 2021, 0.33% in 2022, 6.16% in 2023 and declined by 2.08% in 2024. In contrast, funding for EJI-focused organisations increased by 14.7% in 2021, 26.3% in 2022, and declined by 2.68% in 2023 and 3.94% in

2024. This might be because of their smaller income - even funding cuts to one project could lead to sharper fluctuations in funding data.

Subsectors and Funding Challenges

Data disaggregated by assigned focus areas provided some insight into sector-specific funding trends. Investment into Children and Young People focused EJIOs consistently dominate in total funding, exceeding £120 million annually between 2020-24. Since our list contained a number of Young Foundations, we tested if they were skewing our results. However, even after analysing funding without the Young Foundations in the dataset, the funding continued to exceed £120 million annually. Despite being the category with strong funding, Children and Young People funding grew only modestly (+2.3%) between 2020-24.

Funding for Older People’s EJIOs followed with £634,732,123 invested between 2020-24. However, when we analysed the data without Age UK – a national EJIO – the number dropped significantly to £5,732,123, a 99.1% decrease. This is concerning, especially given a large population of older people living with some unmet social needs.^{lxiii} Findings from a 2016 report also noted that the voluntary sector plugged in social care gaps when statutory funding was cut.^{lxiv}

Race and Ethnicity organisations saw the largest relative growth (+90.3%) between 2020 and 2024, possibly reflecting increased interest in funding racial justice issues post-Covid 19 and the Black Lives Matter Movement. Disability funding grew by nearly 60%, suggesting rising prioritisation or visibility of disability rights in the funding landscape. Faith-based organisations saw a slight decline (-6.5%).

Funding Trends: EJI Focused and EJI-adjacent Organisations

EJI-adjacent organisations receive the majority of funding, nearly 3 times more than EJI Focused organisations.

Classification	Total Funding (£)	Share of Grand Total
EJI Focused	£488,496,825	25.2%
EJI-adjacent	£1,447,396,922	74.7%
Grand Total	£1,935,893,747	100%

EJI Focused Organisations saw their funding peak in 2023 with £110.6 million – an overall increase of ~40% from 2020 to 2023. This was followed by a slight dip in 2024 (declined by 4%) suggests possible plateau. In contrast, EJI-adjacent organisations' funding was much more stable year-on-year than EJI Focused, with small increases and funding peaking in 2023. There was still a slight dip in 2024 (2.1%).

Some categories are also much more dependent on EJI-adjacent organisations for support than others. Funding for Older People's EJIOs is overwhelmingly concentrated within EJI-adjacent organisations. This suggest a lack of specialised infrastructure services for Older People's EJIOs. Since it is also not possible to disaggregate funding data by the project for Older People's EJI-adjacent organisations, we cannot certainly say what percentage of total EJI-adjacent funding was allocated towards serving the needs of Older People's EJIOs.

Data on funding sources by government and other categories was not available for _ organisations from Scotland and Northern Ireland as the OSCR and CCNI do not disaggregate funding data by sources like the Charity Commission of England and Wales does. Therefore the following analysis only applies to 177 charities in England and Wales for which funding data was available. We analyse accounts data for charities in Scotland and Northern Ireland later in the report to fill this data gap.

Government grants and contracts form a only around 28% of total funding going towards EJIOs. However, funding from non-government sources fell sharply in 2024, declining by 23.2% between 2023 and 2024. Funding from government grants peaked in 2023 and funding from government contracts peaked in 2024, potentially showing a rising dependence on government contracts for funding.

Across all five years, the LGBTQ+ sector saw the highest government investment by share of the total funding going into the sector. 44% of the LGBTQ+ sector funding came from government grants and contracts. This is followed by the Pan-Equalities sector (41.7%) and Children and Young People (35.7%). However, the Pan-Equalities sector saw increased investment until 2023, then a dip in 2024. The sectors with lowest share of funding coming from government sources are Older People (3.1%), Faith-based organisations (22.6%) and Disability sector EJIOs (29.1%).

Over time, government investment increased for Race and Ethnicity EJIOs where government contracts and grants rose from ~£13.6 million in 2020 to ~£22.0 million in 2024. This post-2020 surge might possibly reflect increased interest in response to racial justice movements. For the Women and Girls EJIOs, government investment more than doubled from ~£6.2 million in 2020 to ~£8.0 million in 2024. The Disability and Faith EJIOs showed fairly flat government investment over 5 years. We noticed that for Older People's EJIOs, grants and contracts declined from £6.5M in 2020 to just £0.5M in 2024. This shows a

pullback in public funding possibly masked in total income by Age UK's large non-govt support.

There is a general decline in funding share from non-government sources across multiple sectors which might hint towards shifting priorities amongst non-government funders. While funding from government sources has increased across most sectors, non-government sources continue to fund majority share of total funding across all sectors.

EJI Focused organisations are also more dependent on government income overall: ~37% vs ~21%. EJI-adjacent organisations rely much more on non-government sources (~ 80%). EJI Focused organisations rely slightly more on grants than contracts. Share of funding from government contracts for EJI Focused organisations increased by 156.5% between 2020-24. EJI-adjacent organisations lean slightly more toward contracts. This may reflect that EJI Focused organisations receiving more targeted or strategic government grants, especially for smaller, project-based work. EJI-adjacent organisations potentially having larger infrastructure and capacity to deliver contracted services.

Overall funding decline for EJI Focused organisations is reflected even when disaggregated by funding source. Government income (contracts + grants) grew steadily from £23M in 2020 to £38M in 2023, then plateaued in 2024. Non-government income peaked in 2022 and declined slightly thereafter. For EJI-adjacent organisations, non-government income remained consistently high (~£220M–£240M annually). Government grants peaked in 2023, then fell in 2024 but contracts dipped in 2022, and recovered strongly in 2024.

Dependence on government contracts and grants come with their own advantages and disadvantages. There is some evidence that “grants and contracts from government help nonprofits to survive and grow (Gazley 2008; Salamon 2003).”^{lxv} Government grants and contract also provide an avenue for grantees to interact with and influence policymakers.^{lxvi} Growing dependence on government sources of funding, therefore, might indicate some level of professionalisation of the sector. However, there are some disadvantages to a growing reliance on government sources of funding. There is some evidence that it can “restrict nonprofit flexibility, paradoxically weakening one of the key advantages public agencies gain through contracting”.^{lxvii}

In the case of the Equity and Justice Infrastructure sector, these costs might be magnified. EJI Os work with led by and for frontline organisations (EJOs) that work with marginalised communities. Ensuring community representation and local knowledge is often crucial to provide specialist services to these communities which are often overlooked in mainstream knowledge and institutions.

Geographical Distribution of EJI Os

Based on data from CCEW, CCNI and OSCR, we tagged location of each EJIO on our list. We further refined this data by sending our list for a review to sector EJIOs.^{lxviii} Data suggested that a significant number of organisations worked throughout England and Wales. Out of the 220 EJIOs on our list, 66 worked in more than one region^{lxix} 122 worked across regions. We noted 38 EJIOs working in Scotland and 37 in Northern Ireland.^{lxx}

Within London, EJIOs providing services locally in London dominate the list potentially to meet the higher demand due to London's population density and diversity. In addition to the EJIOs mapped to individual boroughs, 18 also reported providing services throughout London (all boroughs). There is a notable underrepresentation in rural and smaller authorities, suggesting possible access or capacity gaps.^{lxxi}

Manual Accounts Review: Unrestricted and Restricted Funding

We also conducted a manual review of accounts data for EJI Focused organisations to assess how unrestricted and restricted funding has changed over the years. Findings show a consistent rise in restricted funding forming majority of the total funding for EJI Focused organisations.

London (EJI Focused organisations included – 28)

Funding data was unavailable for 1 organisation. Approximately 10% of total funding analysed was not categorised as restricted or unrestricted. The following findings are based on the rest of the funding data which was disaggregated by restriction. Restricted funding increased by ~47% between 2020 and 2024. This is based on values not adjusted for inflation. Unrestricted funding declined by ~42% between 2020 and 2024, without adjusting for inflation. Throughout the years, majority of the funding was in the form of restricted funding, with the exception of 2020, where unrestricted funding was slightly higher than restricted funding (~6%). This might reflect increase in unrestricted funding during Covid.^{lxxii}

In Wales, unrestricted funding formed a small share of total income (under 30% between 2020-22 and peaking at 35.6% in 2024). This increase in unrestricted funding might suggest a stronger emphasis on flexible funding. Please note the small sample size of organisations in Wales

In Scotland, funding is heavily weighted toward restricted funds, which can limit flexibility. We also noticed a decreasing unrestricted share over time (especially 2023–2024) which may increase reliance on project-specific or conditional grants. Over the five years, there has been a decline in unrestricted funding, declining from forming 29% of the total funding in 2020 to only 23% in 2024.

Similarly, in Northern Ireland, unrestricted funding formed a very small part of total funding – consistently under 10% of the total income. While the % of income from unrestricted funding sources increased slightly (from 5% in 2020 to 9.5% in 2024), it can be attributed to the overall income declining significantly.

Findings On Funding Trends from Stakeholder Interviews

We conducted 44 stakeholder interviews.^{lxxiii} Out of these, 16 interviews were with EJIOs and explored questions around funding trends. Three key findings around funding emerged:

1. Declining funding in real terms (all 16 EJIOs said that their funding had declined due to inflation)
2. Higher reliance on short-term funding (all 16 EJIOs said that they were reliant on short-term funding for most of their work. The EJIOs noted that while a few funders provide long-term funding – such as City Bridge Foundation’s Anchor Fund – it only covers some of their funding. Most of their funding still comes from short-term grants and contracts. 4 EJIOs specifically noted anxiety around depending on a handful of funders due to the funding challenges that funders have been talking about around diminishing returns from their endowments and shifting priorities. There is some evidence around use of diversification of income sources for non-profits as a way to build institutional capacity.^{lxxiv}
3. General dissatisfaction with dependence on government funding. Majority of the interviewees noted that funding from contracts is restricted, which limits the organisations’ ability to repurpose any part of the contract for capacity-building or other crucial organisational activities. Contracts also generally require defined outputs within a stringent timeline further adding pressure on EJIOs, many of which are not well resourced. One Scotland-based EJIO noted that they no longer depend on any government grants and contracts to ensure autonomy.

Conversations with funders and local authorities explored funding strategy and we found that:

1. Majority of the funders had no specific funding strategy for funding EJIOs
2. Majority of the funders were keen on funding EJIOs but did not due to knowledge gaps and lack of other funders funding EJIOs

Need (Demand) for Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations in the UK

Literature provides some evidence of their role in building sector capacity and resilience. We tried to map their need through stakeholder interviews and surveys. We sent out surveys to EJIOs.^{lxxv} Out of the 51 organisations that responded to our question around sufficiency of EJIOs,

1. 30 (59%) felt that it was inaccessible and/or insufficient to meet the needs of their organisation
2. Only 8 (16%) felt that it was sufficient to meet the needs of their organisation
3. 15 (29%) felt that it was accessible in terms of its cost
4. 16 (31%) felt that it was accessible in terms of location of service provision

Our stakeholder interviews further echoed these findings. EJIOs reported being unable to meet current demand in England, Wales and Scotland.

“Demand has increased significantly. Our organisation has also grown a lot and this has enabled us to open opportunities across Scotland by moving to online/hybrid formats. In-person events are still an issue and we are unable to meet demand due to funding and capacity.” –EJIO, Scotland

“Demand fluctuates and changes. Recently demand has gone down because organisations haven’t been able to sustain themselves – lot of our members have ceased to exist despite there being a need for their services.” - EJIO, Wales

Some organisations mentioned having to focus on creating deeper engagement and providing fewer services due to resource constraints.

“Demand has fluctuated, there was an upsurge during Black Lives Matter. We have met demand when we want to but it requires some re-prioritisation. There are some things we would have liked to do and there was demand for, but had to decline due to capacity reasons. We have also had to scale down our training offer. There is a lot of demand by education and health institutions for our services but we are currently unable to prioritise them.” –EJIO, Scotland.

“We have had to change how we do things a lot due to resource limits... Initially we were supporting about 3000 people a year. In 2023, we shifted how we do things. We now support half of that but more in-depth. Demand for our work has increased a lot.” – National EJIO, providing services primarily in London

Our stakeholder interviews with 12 local government authorities (out of 44) and London Councils (representative body) across London also revealed that most interviewees had observed some demand for specialist infrastructure support from organisations and community led groups in their boroughs. However, councils also expressed concern regarding their own funding crisis, which in many cases meant that they are unable take action on different needs that are emerging across their borough.^{lxxvi}

Most boroughs (Hounslow, Barnet, Richmond, Wandsworth) acknowledge growing general demand for support among small, community-led organisations. However, few

explicitly identify demand for “equity/justice infrastructure” as a distinct or articulated need. Small, under-resourced organisations serving equity groups (e.g., migrants, ethnic minorities, LGBTQ+, disabled communities) are under increasing strain due to shrinking grants, rising need and administrative burdens (e.g., registration barriers).

There’s limited and fragmented supply of dedicated equity/justice infrastructure organisations across the boroughs we talked to. For instance, Hounslow previously had a race equality council—which is now defunct. However, equality networks exist in the borough but often informal/unregistered. Many effective, community-led mutual aid or ethnic groups are unregistered, informal, and unsupported by formal funding or infrastructure (e.g., Bengali food banks in Hounslow). In Barnet, infrastructure largely sits within generalist CVS organisations or emerging community alliances.

General Voluntary Sector Infra: Was significantly cut (e.g., Hounslow lost 50% of grant funding between 2014–2015). While there has been some rebuilding pre- and post-Covid (e.g., Hounslow’s Thriving Communities Fund, Barnet’s partnerships), equity/justice-specific infrastructure is non-existent as a funding line. This often falls between the cracks (neither service delivery nor large enough to be infrastructure). Between 2019–2022 Greater London Authority (GLA) Civil Society Roots program funded specialist infrastructure organisations.^{lxxvii}

There was a consensus that there is a need for specialist infrastructure support. Councils saw value in equity-led groups, but few are positioned or resourced to support them beyond issue-specific grants or time-limited funds.

Interviews with 28 (16 independent trusts and foundations and 12 London local authorities) funders also revealed very few specialised funding opportunities for EJIOs. All interviewees agreed that there was value in funding EJIOs and most of them funded some EJIOs through their other funding streams or providing specialised infrastructure support through a “funder plus” offer (capacity-building support provided in addition to financial support). Most interviewees agreed that funding for EJIOs was not prioritised because of resource constraints and because of lack of awareness about EJIOs and their work.

Funder Plus: Who Provides What?

Some funders provide non-financial or additional financial support to grantees to build their capacity through trainings, facilitating networks and collaboration and developing technological products to support grantee needs. This type of support is often referred to as “funder plus” support.^{lxxviii}

Disrupt: Providing Funding For Technological Needs

Disrupt Foundation is a UK-based funder committed to strengthening social justice infrastructure by supporting both organisations and projects that enable long-term systemic change. With a modest annual budget of £2 million, Disrupt focuses on funding

infrastructure across three dimensions - access to justice, tech for good, and community planning.

Kompasi^{lxxxix}, a tech platform funded by Disrupt emerged out of the general need for better referral services for vulnerable migrants. The platform provides details on local organisations taking referrals, alongside other information like their current capacity, eligibility, etc – consolidating a wealth of knowledge for people going through the immigration process requiring a range of support. Disrupt’s approach recognises that tech-based or efficiency-based solutions often won’t solve injustice alone but it can empower communities to navigate, resist, and reshape unjust systems.

Their “funder-plus” model extends beyond grants, providing grantees with tailored support, most often technical expertise such as CRM setup or platform evaluation. This hands-on approach helps assess and respond to recurring infrastructure needs, especially for membership-based organisations structured like unions, which often face challenges around regional organising and membership systems.

Disrupt strategically backs organisations like Common Knowledge, enabling them to develop better training and resources for community organisers. Legal infrastructure is another key focus, especially where access to justice intersects with racial or migrant justice. Rather than funding legal providers directly, Disrupt supports organisations like Law for Life and Strategic Legal Foundation to train frontline workers to identify legal leverage points, such as strategic litigation.

Disrupt's community planning dimension has funded a group of architects who work with communities on radical planning alternatives, enabling communities to challenge new developments in their area.

Paul Hamlyn Foundation: Bringing Together Ideas for Change Through Annual Residential

Paul Hamlyn Foundation’s Migration Fund offers a unique funder plus offer for its grantees – bringing them together in-person over a multi-day residential. Grantees have an opportunity to attend workshops, panels, connect with key stakeholders in the migration sector and take time to rest.^{lxxx} Residential agendas are responsive and done after conducting a sector-wide needs-assessment.

Esmee Fairbairn Foundation

Esmee Fairbairn Foundation’s Funding Plus is a responsive, demand-led programme offering UK-based grantees up to £9,000 to commission capacity-building support—ranging from strategy, organisational development, mental-health and wellbeing coaching, to communications consultancy. The programme provides tailored support to grantees in areas such as strategic and organisational development, communications and advocacy, leadership skills, and wellbeing coaching. It helps organisations enhance evaluation, income diversification, digital strategy, and public engagement, while also prioritising mental health and diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.

City Bridge Foundation: Anchor Fund

In 2023, City Bridge Foundation launched its Anchor Programme—co-designed through extensive engagement with civil society support organisations—to provide long-term (7–10 year) core funding (£50k–£150k annually) to equity-focused infrastructure charities across London. The first £13.9 million tranche supported 13 organisations, including those championing racial justice, disability rights, and gender equity, enabling systemic impact by freeing recipients from short-term fundraising pressures. Evaluations highlighted that recipients could now build capacity, form lasting partnerships, influence policy, and take strategic risks—transforming sector practices and demonstrating the unique value of multi-year core investment.^{lxxxix}

Comic Relief: Global Majority Fund

In 2020, Comic Relief with partners (National Emergencies Trust, City Bridge Foundation, Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, Health Foundation), launched the Global Majority Fund to support Global Majority communities disproportionately affected by COVID-19. COVID-19 exposed and intensified long-standing structural inequities faced by racialised communities—financial precarity, digital exclusion, and health disparities. Global Majority Fund came in to plug the gap left by traditional funding models which overlook BME-led grassroots organisations, providing little to no flexible or core funding.^{lxxxii}

In Phase I of the Global Majority Fund, over 110,000 individuals were supported through 644 grassroots organisations, with 449 initial grants distributed via intermediary partners. These grants addressed a wide range of urgent community needs, including mental health services, food aid, domestic abuse prevention, youth support, and violence reduction. In addition to delivering services, the fund significantly enhanced the capacity of intermediary organisations (ITPs), providing them with guidance to strengthen strategic planning, develop grant-making systems, and improve internal governance. One ITP reflected, “I have gained in confidence as a leader ... I have a clearer vision of ... strategic tasks.”^{lxxxiii} Beyond capacity building, ITPs also participated in peer learning and convening spaces, fostering shared experiences, advocacy efforts, and a collective focus on community wellbeing.^{lxxxiv}

The Phase I evaluation of the Global Majority Fund highlighted several key lessons for funders. Granting decision-making autonomy to intermediary organisations (ITPs) was shown to strengthen equity and responsiveness, while combining core support with downstream grants proved an effective model for building organisational resilience. The evaluation also identified systemic gaps in the funding landscape, calling for more inclusive and flexible emergency funding approaches. It further urged funders to adopt practices rooted in racial justice, including providing unrestricted, long-term, trust-based

funding. Reflections from Phase III convenings reinforced these insights, with continued calls for the sector to prioritise Global Majority-led organisations, embrace flexible and sustained core funding, and support efforts to build influence through advocacy and challenge systemic racism in philanthropy.^{lxxxv}

In 2025, Voice4Change England, in partnership with Comic Relief, launched the **Race Equality and Infrastructure Flexible Fund**, offering one-year grants of up to £50,000 to Black and Minoritised Ethnic (BME) infrastructure organisations across five English regions—East of England, East Midlands, North East, South East, and Yorkshire and Humber—to support core costs associated with capacity building and regional service delivery. The fund will strengthen infrastructure provision for BME-led support networks, enhancing their ability to develop locally and shape regional race-equality initiatives.^{lxxxvi}

Corra Foundation: Human Rights Fund for Scotland

The Independent Human Rights Fund for Scotland is a collaborative fund hosted by the Corra Foundation and supported by AB Charitable Trust, Baring Foundation, The Binks Trust, Cattnach, The Robertson Trust, The Indigo Trust, and the William Grant Foundation. The fund was launched to strengthen the ability of Scottish civil society to realise and defend human rights through funding, capacity-building, and shared learning. The fund has supported pan-equalities infrastructure organisations such as Human Rights Consortium.^{lxxxvii}

A key learning from the fund’s development was the value and complexity of participatory grant-making. The advisory and decision-making panels included individuals with lived experience in areas such as disability, environmental justice, LGBTQ+ rights, and housing. This approach was seen as essential to ensuring that funding decisions were grounded in real-world expertise and community priorities. However, the fund also recognised challenges, including the underrepresentation of certain groups, such as Roma, Gypsy, and Traveller communities, and the need for more accessible processes for contributors.^{lxxxviii}

Impact of Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations in the UK

In the literature review section of this paper, we discussed some evidence around the role of general infrastructure organisations in a)

Our findings around the impact of EJIOs also aligned with this existing research. Findings are came from case studies, 44 stakeholder interviews and 1 survey (n=59).

Our survey of EJOs provided some direct input from frontline organisations who reported receiving specialist infrastructure support in the past. They were asked to explain the benefits of receiving specialist infrastructure support.

Respondents (EJOs) felt that the support increased their organisational capacity, sustainability, and strategic capacity. This enabled them to access funding, improve governance, plan for the future, and amplify their voice and impact in communities they serve in some cases. We categorised 42 individual responses across 7 impact areas – organisational processes and practices, income generation, strategy and planning, voice and influence, leadership and skill development, governance and collaboration and peer-support.^{lxxxix}

Our stakeholder interviews provided additional support by describing events where EJOs had made an impact across one or more of the 7 impact areas. We identified four dimensions of impact that came up the most number of times in our semi-structured stakeholder interviews (n=44).

- 1. Trust and Community Connection:** EJOs organisations hold deep trust within marginalised communities, grounded in shared identity, experience, and cultural understanding—qualities that mainstream institutions often lack.

“By us, for us, with us... there is a level of trust, knowledge of community issues and experience of inequity that the system throws out.” – London-based EJO

Case Study: Using EJOs to Build Trust and Reach Communities – Race Council Cymru

During the Covid-19 pandemic, Race Council Cymru (RCC) emerged as a vital intermediary organisation, effectively bridging the gap between Wales’ Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) grassroots communities and public institutions. Representing over 300 ethnic minority organisations and facilitating five regional hubs, RCC leveraged its embedded community presence to amplify underrepresented voices and mitigate the disproportionate effects of the crisis on BAME populations.

As death rates and infection statistics revealed stark racial disparities, RCC played a central role in influencing Welsh Government policy. Chair Judge Ray Singh CBE and Vice-Chair Professor Emmanuel Ogbonna led the First Minister’s Advisory Committee on the Impact of Covid-19 on BAME Groups, in collaboration with the British Association of Physicians of Indian Origin (BAPIO). Through this committee and extensive community consultations, RCC helped shape public health and socio-economic responses rooted in lived experience.

RCC conducted regular virtual meetings with grassroots organisations, collecting real-time data on challenges such as increased health risks, economic hardship, housing insecurity, and access to food and medicine. These consultations fed directly into policy dialogues with Public Health Wales and other stakeholders. The organisation highlighted how

structural racism and pre-existing inequalities compounded the pandemic's effects on BAME communities, reinforcing the need for targeted, systemic interventions.

RCC's intermediary role extended beyond pandemic relief. In the wake of the Black Lives Matter protests, it supported regional youth leaders to form Black Lives Matter Wales and facilitated the development of a manifesto presented to the Welsh Government. This grassroots movement, empowered by RCC's infrastructure, signalled a long-term commitment to tackling systemic racism.

In summary, RCC's ability to convene, advocate, and translate grassroots needs into actionable policy positioned it as an indispensable intermediary during the pandemic.^{xc}

Rosa Fund-Imkaan Partnership – Covid Emergency Fund

Co-designed by Rosa and Imkaan in direct response to the "dual pandemic"—Covid-19 plus a surge in violence against Black and minoritised women—the fund was born from collaborative research and advocacy led by the Women's Resource Centre and Imkaan. Their 2020 briefing highlighted the critical lack of race-conscious, rapid-response funding and structural underinvestment in specialist "by and for" organisations. Drawing on this, Rosa mobilised over £630,000 from generous donors such as Esmée Fairbairn, Oak Foundation, Indigo Trust, and Emmanuel Kaye Foundation to launch the emergency grant programme aimed specifically at BME women's organisations.^{xc}

27 by and for BME organisations were funded, **3,147 women and girls** directly benefitted, with 100% of grantees affirming improvements in access to support and mental wellbeing. 96% stated the funding enhanced sustainability or resolved cash-flow issues; crucially, 93% used funds to adapt working methods—upgrading IT and enabling remote delivery.

Rosa Fund provided fund administration capacity while Imkaan provided a strong reach into communities through its membership network.

Ubele Phoenix Fund

During the peak of the Covid-19 crisis, Ubele anchored The Phoenix Fund, distributing £2.4 million in direct grants (£2 m) and infrastructure support (£0.4 m) to 184 grassroots community groups in England, selected from over 1,400 applications. By centring lived-experience networks and participatory grant-making, Ubele ensured resources reached those most affected by systemic inequality—empowering communities to define and respond to their own needs.^{xcii}

Ubele co-founded **The Phoenix Way** in May 2021, partnering with six regional hubs to build on its pandemic-era grant work. Backed by major funders—the National Lottery Community Fund, Youth Endowment Fund, Lloyds Bank Foundation, Foundation Chanel, and Global Fund for Children—TPW has invested **£6.5 million** from 2023 to 2024 in Black and racially minoritised communities. . Through a series of participatory funding rounds, TPW awarded **£2 million** to 47 youth-focused groups in April 2023 and **£2.2 million** to 36

organisations working with at-risk young people in late 2023, reaching a total of **138 community-led organisations** with flexible, community driven -funding.^{xciii}

The evaluation of year one of the Phoenix way revealed several critical impacts:

Community-led governance and trust: Structures such as grant panels were co-designed with community partners, fostering genuine ownership and transparency

Focus on systemic issues: Funded projects addressed structural racism—e.g., Rekindle in Manchester tackled inequities in education and race equality.

Flexible, multi-year funding: Grant-holders reported that this flexibility enabled meaningful planning and response to local needs

Valuing local expertise: Lived experience was deliberately prioritised over technical credentials, supporting swift identification of issues like loneliness and food insecurity during the pandemic.^{xciv}

- 2. Lived Experience Leadership, Building Capacity and Amplifying Voices:** Being led by those with lived experience enables more relevant, responsive, and empathetic support, and ensures that strategies reflect real-world challenges and solutions. For example, Rosa Fund – a national women and girls’ sector funder – provides infrastructure support to the women and girls sector through tailored trainings, networking events and an online conference. It partners up with women and girls to provide capacity building support. Rosa Fund grantees reported that having facilitators who have contextual knowledge of the sector along with women and girls’ issues is beneficial and also required as they understand their challenges better and are able to aptly respond to them. Rosa Fund also worked with Sheila Mackenzie to providing training on campaigning to its grantees under their Voices Fund. As a result of this partnership, Rosa Fund found that the long-term impact of the training which built campaigning capacity amongst grantees provided a net-gain to Rosa as a funder. Previously, they would provide small pots of funding to encourage campaigning, however, without proper training, this funding did not materialise as well as it did post-trainings.

“We're led by people with lived experience – that's our strength.” –EJIO, London

“Specialism is important. It is important to have cultural competence. Having a real understanding of issues allows them to provide bespoke support and lead in a way that is responsive.” – National Funder

“We have specific expertise on anti-racism, how to change organisational processes, influence attitudes – that's not something mainstream bodies can do.” –EJIO, Glasgow

Addressing Asian and Diaspora Need: SEEAC

Southeast and East Asian Centre (SEEAC) — London

The Southeast and East Asian Centre (SEEAC) is a community interest company based in London, working with Southeast and East Asian communities across the UK. Established during the Covid-19 pandemic, SEEAC supports marginalised Asian communities through casework, social support, community organising, research, and advocacy for systemic change (from stakeholder interviews).

Sector Role and Value

SEEAC plays a vital role as a specialist infrastructure provider for Southeast and East Asian communities—an often-overlooked group in UK racial justice work. It combines direct support (e.g. casework, mental health help) with campaigning and coalition-building to improve visibility and influence policy. Through its “Enabling ESEA Community Resilience” project, it collaborates with Bahay Kubo Housing Association (BKHA) and Kanlungan Filipino Consortium to provide support, resources and opportunities to vulnerable ESEA communities and individuals from diverse backgrounds, including Filipino, Vietnamese, Indonesian, Malaysian, Korean, Thai, Japanese and others.

While its capacity is limited, the organisation engages with cross-sector and racial justice networks, making Asian migrant and diasporic needs more visible in national conversations (from stakeholder interviews). Providing infrastructure support alongside frontline firefighting can often be challenging due to funding constraints but still crucial.

Funding Challenges / Trends

SEEAC’s funding has grown from zero to £300,000 annually over five years, sourced from the National Lottery, Paul Hamlyn Foundation (PHF), and corporate partners like Pokémon International (from stakeholder interviews). However, most funding remains project-based, with little core support. Advocacy, campaigning and partnerships are especially difficult to fund, as service grants restrict political work. SEEAC also faces barriers as a CIC: some funders only support registered charities (from stakeholder interviews).

Problems Addressed and How It Works

SEEAC addresses structural racism, policy invisibility, and lack of culturally competent services for East and Southeast Asian communities. It provides casework and community programming, runs mental health and employment support initiatives, and delivers research-informed advocacy. It also offers community events to strengthen social connection. Through consultancy support (e.g. fundraising strategy) and Paul Hamlyn Foundation’s residencies, it has benefited from some funder-plus capacity building (from stakeholder interviews).

Impact and Learning

SEEAC’s work has increased access to support services and contributed to stronger community infrastructure. It has widened its reach through networks and policy engagement, and its insights inform advocacy on immigration, racial justice, and mental

health. SEEAC highlights the need for both generalist and culturally specific infrastructure to be fully effective—and is currently prioritising its own organisational development after scaling quickly during COVID (from stakeholder interviews).

Leveraging Lived-Experience Leadership to Reach Communities: LGBT Equity Fund by LGBT Consortium

In 2022, National Lottery partnered with LGBT Consortium – a network of LGBTQ+ groups in the UK – to distribute £1.6m in small grants to grassroots, community-led groups. As an infrastructure body led by and for LGBT+ communities, Consortium brought unique sector knowledge and deep-rooted trust to the grantmaking process, enabling it to reach communities often excluded from traditional funding streams.

The National Lottery Community Fund partnered with LGBT Consortium due to its position as a trusted intermediary with a “by and for” ethos. Consortium embedded lived experience throughout the design, delivery, and governance of the Equity Fund.^{xcv}

LGBT+ communities—particularly those with intersecting marginalised identities such as Black and People of Colour, disabled, trans, intersex, older, and rural LGBT+ people—continue to experience systemic barriers to funding. The Fund was designed to respond to long-standing inequities by resourcing grassroots groups that are led by and for these communities. The Final Evaluation identified that traditional grantmaking models often rely on power dynamics, language, and criteria that alienate or exclude these groups.^{xcvi}

LGBT Consortium acted as a trusted intermediary, using its lived experience leadership and deep community connections to design an inclusive and supportive application process, facilitate participatory grantmaking through community panels and provide post-grant capacity-building support. This approach ensured that funding decisions were made by and for the communities they aimed to serve, fostering trust, accessibility, and relevance.

The Equity Fund was successful in:

1. **Reaching Underserved Communities:** Funding was successfully directed to “led by and for” intersectional LGBT+ organisations, including those supporting D/deaf, Disabled, Neurodivergent people, LGBTQI+ women, older LGBT+ people, and trans and non-binary individuals.
2. **Catalysing Organisational Growth**
Grantees experienced significant development in governance, community engagement, evaluation, partnerships, and programme delivery—supported by both funding and tailored capacity-building.
3. **Creating Stronger Sector Connections**
The Fund fostered greater inclusion and collaboration across the LGBT+ voluntary

sector, with grantees feeling more connected and empowered to advocate for their work.

4. Enhancing Service Delivery

Organisations improved their ability to understand and meet community needs, with increased confidence in delivering impactful, well-evaluated programmes.

5. Improving Fundraising Readiness

Grantees gained skills and confidence in fundraising with 52% saying that they felt better equipped to apply for funding, 54% said that they better understood funding processes and 56% said that they felt ready to apply.^{xcvii}

- 3. Shifting Capital:** A number of intermediary groups are working to shift financial and social capital to historically underfunded and overlooked groups. Organisations such as Black Funding Network and Pathway Fund provide specialist support to black-led organisations and social enterprises to connect them to funders, connect them to their own community members and incubate, invest in and launch their ventures.

“We have become infrastructure of infrastructure – organisations we support are also infrastructure often – we want to build the ecosystem.” – EJIO in London

Case Study: Shifting Power to Racially Minoritised Communities – Black Funding Network, Pathway Fund and DiNN

In response to low-funding accessed by people and organisations from Black and Ethnic Minoritised backgrounds, organisations such as Do It Now Now, Black Funding Network, Ubele and Pathway Fund have emerged as intermediaries to funnel support – financial and other – into overlooked communities.^{xcviii}

Do It Now Now (DiNN): DiNN is a London-based social justice organisation focused on empowering Black leaders through participatory, community-led programming. Serving as a conduit between funders and grassroots, DiNN’s “London Now Now” campaign connects 30,000 Black Londoners with capacity-building and funding structures by 2030. DiNN also houses Centre Black, a research hub that transforms lived experiences into actionable insight to guide policy and funding decisions. Through these intermediary roles, DiNN shifts power away from traditional funders, placing decision-making in community hands.^{xcix}

Black Funding Network: Black Funding Network (BFN) is a London-based community interest company founded in 2020 to support small, Black-led charities and social enterprises through fundraising and infrastructure support. It operates a giving circle model, where donors and potential grantees attend pitch events and directly fund

participating organisations. BFN supports Black-led groups with annual incomes under £100,000 and fewer than 20 staff, working primarily across London but open to groups UK-wide.^c

Pathway Fund: An impact investment wholesaler led by Black and Ethnically Minoritised professionals, Pathway Fund allocates capital via fund managers and intermediaries to black and ethnically minoritised organisations and social enterprises. It also provides training and support alongside funding to ensure sustainability.^{ci}

Sector Role and Value

DINN operates as an “infrastructure of infrastructure,” offering tailored support to Black-led groups—many of which are themselves ecosystem enablers. It delivers grant programmes like Common Call, supports CICs navigating exclusion from traditional charity models, and produces influential research (e.g., Resilience in Motion) that captures the lived experience and operational realities of Black organisations. DINN also advocates for participatory philanthropy and equitable funding processes. As the sector faces funding challenges after post-pandemic funding levels have declined or stagnated while cost-of-living continues to rise, DINN’s entrepreneurship training helps organisations set up a trading arm to ensure organisational sustainability by diversifying income sources.^{cii}

BFN and Pathway Fund play a unique role in the UK equity infrastructure landscape by reclaiming philanthropy and making it more accessible. They build community, incubate sustainable organisations, facilitate learning among donors, and raise the visibility of overlooked grassroots work in Black communities. At BFN, organisations that participate receive pitch preparation and coaching, helping them build fundraising skills and confidence.

Problems Addressed

DINN addresses systemic inequity in funding, capacity, and voice for Black-led groups. Through core funding, infrastructure grants, and training, it supports over 150 organisations per year. Its Common Call Fund provides unrestricted support, while programmes also help groups improve governance, leadership, and impact measurement. DINN also protects Black organisations from the burden of navigating exclusionary systems by acting as a buffer and advocate.

BFN addresses deep-rooted inequities in philanthropic funding. Black-led organisations are significantly underfunded and often excluded from funder networks. BFN selects small, impactful organisations to pitch at donor events, helps them prepare, and facilitates connections with donors. Groups typically receive £6,000–£10,000 per event. The model is “by us, for us, with us”—grounded in cultural relevance, trust, and community-led giving.

Impact and Learning

DINN’s Resilience in Motion research revealed that 59% of Black-led organisations surveyed could not survive six months without urgent support, helping shape funder strategy in real time. Its work enables grantees to better govern, manage risk, and sustain

impact. DINN emphasises that infrastructure for racial justice must be permanent—not project-based—to build true equity.^{ciii}

Since launch, BFN has hosted eight events, raising funds for 24 Black-led organisations. The ripple effects include mentorships, strategic partnerships, and greater fundraising independence among grantees. BFN also fosters community among donors and demonstrates that inclusive philanthropy is possible and powerful (from stakeholder interviews). Its work is redefining how Black communities engage in—and benefit from—philanthropy.

These organisations exemplify resource reallocation towards a sector that has been historically underfunded and overlooked. By shifting capital to BAME organisations, it also

- 4. Policy Change:** Infrastructure organisations have successfully influenced public bodies and policies through expert guidance and advocacy, embedding anti-racism and human rights frameworks into institutions.

"Campaigning funds enabled us to campaign... [and] influence local practice considerably." EJIO

"The support and connections has given [org] a voice and a platform." EJO

Influencing Policy Changes: Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights, Human Rights Consortium, Committee on Administration of Justice, Inclusion London

The Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights (CRER) is a Black-led infrastructure organisation in Scotland that actively campaigns for racial justice through a blend of evidence-based research, policy advocacy, grassroots coordination, and strategic legislative engagement.^{civ}

Child Poverty (Scotland) Act 2017: CRER partnered with MSP Jackie Baillie to ensure the Act includes specific duties requiring ministers and local authorities to consider and report on poverty within protected groups (sections 9, 10, and 13).

Social Security (Scotland) Act 2018: Collaborating with MSPs Mark Griffin and Jackie Baillie, they inserted clauses for equality advancing principles, requirements to consult equality groups on the social security charter and reviews, and mandates to report on impacts and equality monitoring.

CRER also has been commissioned by the Scottish Government to review anti-racist policymaking and by the Equality and Human Rights Commission to assess the

effectiveness of the public sector equality duties in Scotland as well as designing EHRC's principles for meaningful evaluation of anti-prejudice work.

Other organisations have demonstrated their ability to successfully influence policy similarly. In late 2022, Inclusion London successfully secured a suite of protections and supports for Disabled Londoners as the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) was expanded. After identifying the disproportionate financial burden faced by those reliant on adapted vehicles, the organisation campaigned for and achieved **temporary exemptions until 2027** for around 280,000 benefit recipients, **enhanced scrappage grants** for wheelchair-accessible and specially adapted cars, and **new grace periods** for carers and nominated drivers. By collaborating closely with the Mayor's office and TfL, participating in launch events, submitting accessible briefings, and maintaining public pressure they ensured that the expanded ULEZ included meaningful, equity-focused modifications rather than imposing blanket financial penalties.^{cv}

Human Rights Consortium (HRC) is also working to influence the passing of a Scottish Human Rights Bill which the Scottish Government has committed to passing a new Human Rights Bill for Scotland by May 2026. The government has set up groups to advise on the Bill. HRC sits on the Human Rights Bill Governance and Engagement Advisory Board as well as an Implementation Core and Wider Engagement Group, thereby directly influencing the contents of the Bill.^{cvi}

The Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ) has informed transformative legal and policy changes in Northern Ireland, including a landmark victory in March 2025 when the High Court ruled that Stormont's Executive had legally *breached* its duty established under the 1998 Good Friday and 2006 St. Andrews Agreements to adopt an anti-poverty strategy. This prompted renewed government commitment to produce a concrete cross-departmental strategy. In 2015, CAJ lobbied "successfully to ensure that the Policing Board retained its independent Human Rights Adviser function."^{cvi}

Interviewees also provided recommendations based on their experience accessing funding for providing specialist infrastructure support to EJOs. The following key recommendations emerged (based on recommendations mentioned in most interviews (>50)):

1. **More unrestricted, long-term funding** is crucial to build a sustainable, innovative and impactful ecosystem according to the interviewed EJOs and EJIOs. Organisations highlighted issues with restricted, contract-based or project-based funding such as precarity, loss of organisational knowledge due to their inability to plan ahead or

retain staff, and reduced wellbeing due to constant fire-fighting. Organisations mentioned key benefits such as freedom to innovate when they receive unrestricted funding.

We talked to an EJIO in Northern Ireland that predominantly draws funding from statutory sources. While discussing funding issues, it mentioned that it received year-to-year funding for a 7 year project. This led to staff retention due to them being unable to plan long-term as they could not be sure if the yearly funding would continue being renewed each year. They lost key staff, spent a considerable amount of resources training new staff and building organisational knowledge from scratch. The organisation mentioned that if they had just received the 7-year funding at once, it would have been transformational. Not only would they have more resources to deploy towards the cause, they would not be in a state of constant crisis due to feeling of precarity.

2. **Measuring the impact of systems change work is difficult - funders need to adapt.**

Organisations mentioned that they do not feel that funders understand the value of providing specialist infrastructure support. However, they also mentioned that funders were quick to leverage their reach and expertise during Covid-19.

Organisations felt that if funders invest in building a stronger equity and justice sector by funding EJIOs, there would be long-term benefits, including a stronger and better resourced sector prepared for times of crisis.

3. **Funders need to collaborate.** Both funders and EJIOs recognised the value of collaborations. EJIOs mentioned that new collaborations have taken a streamlined approach to applications, reducing burden and exposing organisations to multiple funders. Funders who participated in collaborations highlighted the value of shared learnings.

4. **Focusing of building equity and justice infrastructure is crucial, especially now.** Both funders and EJIOs discussed rising demand – due to inequality, inflation and rise in far-right politics. Some interviewees cautioned that in the context of the UK's eroding welfare system, minoritised communities will face amplified harm. It is crucial to strengthen the sector best placed to provide support to them.

(Re)-Emerging Practices

Beyond funding challenges, examples of various funding approaches also emerged during our desk research and stakeholder interviews. A significant number of funders we talked to mentioned interest in philanthrocapitalism^{cxviii} as a tool to meet demand in the context of stagnating or declining endowments and funding pots. This presents both new opportunities and risks - especially in the equity and justice infrastructure sector. While proponents view philanthrocapitalism as a more “efficient and effective” alternative to traditional giving, some warn that it often simply imports neoliberal market logic into social causes.^{cxix}

As traditional grantmaking struggles to meet escalating demand, especially within equity and justice infrastructure organisations, funders are piloting innovative approaches that offer valuable lessons for the UK. In 2024, London Funders conducted a survey of its 174 members.^{cx} 43 funders completed the survey. 32 funders reported an increase in demand (increase in grant funding applications), 10 reported no increase in demand and 1 reported a decrease in demand. Most respondents (n=43) reported a 10-25% increase in funding requests, with some experiencing the highest application volumes seen in four to five years.^{cx}

There is some support for this reported increase in demand, at least from some funders in the ecosystem from Association of Charitable Foundations (ACF).^{cxii} There is also some indication of more funder interest in social investments since 2021. In London Funders’ 2021 Member Audit, 9% reported making social investments. In the latest 2024 Member Audit, 13% reported making social investments.^{cxiii} Moreover, in the recent years, a few new social investments have been launched. The Futurebuilders England fund, the first of its kind in the UK, which invested into charities alongside social enterprises was launched in 2004. Since then, some traditional funders have either launched or expanded their impact investment funds.^{cxiv} Intermediary investment funds such as Pathway Fund, Do It Now Now, Black Funding Organisation have also emerged since 2015.^{cxv} While there is more research required to assess the impact or effectiveness of these alternative models to fund EJIOs, our interviews reveal a growing appetite amongst traditional funders to take these alternate approaches.

Examples of Alternative Funding Models to support infrastructure

The **Unlocked Futures programme** by New Profit offers **unrestricted grants and leadership support** to social entrepreneurs, especially system-impacted leaders working on criminal justice reform. Meanwhile, Emerson Collective’s “frictionless philanthropy” model delivers long-term funds with minimal reporting thereby liberating organisations to innovate without the administrative burden, a potentially transformative approach for under-resourced charities and social enterprises. A venture philanthropy approach can provide development

finance support and build organisational capacity for entrepreneurial social purpose organisations.^{cxvi}

Large-scale pooled funding initiatives, such as the Ford Foundation's \$1 billion commitment to Mission-Related Investments (MRIs), show how endowments can be aligned with their wider justice goals while unlocking more capital.

Collaborative funds such as the Rockefeller Gender Fund, which targets global gender equity by investing in women's leadership, and the Families and Workers Fund, which aims to create one million good careers in climate and infrastructure, demonstrate how shared risk and collective intelligence can drive substantial social returns.^{cxvii}

In the UK, collaborative funds are being used to fund long-term positive change. Propel, £100m pooled fund provides long-term grants to "organisations led by and for groups experiencing structural inequality."^{cxviii}

Conclusion

This report set out to map and understand the funding landscape of Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations (EJIOs) in the UK—organisations that play a critical, yet often overlooked, role in supporting equity-led groups working at the frontlines of social justice. While there was some evidence about the importance of general infrastructure organisations, our findings add to a subset of that research. Our findings reveal a troubling decline in real-terms investment and a growing reliance on short-term, restricted, and government-sourced funding. Our findings also reveal positive funder attitude towards funding EJIOs and perceived positive benefits of EJIOs

Despite these challenges, the impact of EJIOs is clear. Our survey and interviews show that infrastructure **support strengthens organisational capacity, enhances strategic planning, and fosters collaboration and influence**. EJIOs are uniquely positioned to **build trust, shift power, and catalyse change** but only if they are adequately resourced.

To realise the full potential of EJIOs, we must reimagine how infrastructure is funded and valued. This includes increasing unrestricted, long-term funding and investing beyond London. Funders and policymakers must also recognise infrastructure as a public good which is essential to a thriving, equitable civil society.

This report is a first step. Further research is needed to deepen our understanding of EJIOs' long-term impact, explore funding models that centre justice and sustainability, and develop metrics that capture the value of systems change. As inequality deepens and democratic spaces shrink, investing in equity and justice infrastructure could be crucial for empowering vulnerable communities and safeguarding their rights.

Appendix 1: Definitions

Concepts of equity and justice are broad and ever-evolving. Definition and scope for this study was set by our advisory group, formed of both funders and specialist infrastructure organisations. Our literature review and sector-wide consultations further refined our definitions of equity and justice organisations and equity and justice infrastructure organisations. A list of advisory board members who provided input based on their work in the sector is below:

Name	Type
Trust for London	Funder
Paul Hamlyn Foundation	Funder
Greater London Authority	Funder
National Lottery	Funder
Lloyds Foundation	Funder
LGBT Consortium	Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisation
Inclusion London	Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisation
HEAR Network	Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisation
Women's Resource Center	Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisation
London Councils	Funder
City Bridge Foundation	Funder
Ubele	Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisation

The group decided the definition of “equity and justice infrastructure organisations” as well as “equity and justice organisations” - which are at the receiving end of the infrastructure support. Definitions were agreed-on based on the expertise and knowledge of advisory group members, all of which work in or fund the equalities sector in the UK.

Equity and Justice Organisations (EJOs):

The group defined EJOs as “led by and for organisations that advance social equity and justice by working with communities disproportionately impacted by systemic inequality and injustice.”

Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations (EJOs)

The group defined EJOs as “specialist infrastructure organisations that provide capacity-building-type support to EJOs.” The specific communities of interest (that the EJOs we looked at, support) for the purposes of this paper are as follows:

1. Young people and children
2. Older people
3. Racial and ethnic minorities
4. Deaf and disabled people
5. Women and girls
6. Faith-based minority groups

The group also developed a list of specific functions which would be considered “capacity-building type support” for this paper.

- umbrella body for EJOs
- general organisational development (audits, trainings on emerging issues in the sector, it infrastructure - data privacy audits, cloud set-up and management, etc.)
- governance support (governance strategy, senior leadership recruitment/management, etc.)
- workforce training, retention and development (leadership training, professional development programs)
- fundraising and/or business development support
- development/administration support/legal support
- financial hosting mental health and wellbeing support for the sector
- support or provide mentoring networks from peer organisations
- promote volunteering – host and place interns/young professionals in the sector, provide workforce development to young professionals in the sector, etc.
- networking and connection forums/spaces, spaces to collaborate, provide physical infrastructure
- campaigning, advocacy and communications support for organisations
- research, learning and policy support, monitoring and impact evaluation support
- provide resources/spaces to or facilitate connections with community leaders
- other general support for EJOs
- imaginative spaces/training, anti-oppression, anti-racism training, diversity equity and inclusion training
- pooled funds (hosting/distributing), collaborative funds (hosting/distributing)
- partnership and consortia development - networking/collaboration support within the sector
- collating and circulating sector-wide news, sharing sector needs, jobs, etc

Appendix 2: Methodology

Our first priority was to create an initial list of equity and justice infrastructure organisations that did not miss any small organisations that might be providing specialist support to equity and justice organisations. In May 2024, we circulated the final definition for review amongst

our advisory group and their affiliated members (for example, Inclusion London is a membership network of 70 organisations). Based on the feedback that we received, we refined our definition to include any organisation(s) providing one or more services that are specialist and catered towards equity and justice organisations.

To Develop a List of Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations

Using GrantNav Grants Analysis:

1. We created a dataset of all grants made by the 288 funders that report to 360Giving between 2019 and October 2024 (data of last data-pull) in the UK. We then queried this database to only return grants that had either titles or descriptions that contained at least one of our pre-decided keywords (the code along with keywords is provided in Appendix 4).
2. This returned a dataset of all grants (11,238 in London and 29,840 UK-wide) made between 2019 and October 2024 which could be grants towards specialist infrastructure projects leading us to a list of potential equity and justice infrastructure organisations. This list has many limitations - 1) 360Giving does not contain data from every funder in the UK. 2) Data submission is voluntary and not all funders report grants data in a homogenous and detailed manner. 3) Many entries would have been ignored because of a null value or broad description in the description column such as “core grant” or “grant to [org name]”.
3. However, even with these limitations, this additional step helps us assess the following: 1) existence of organisations that are not infrastructure-focused but provide a few specialist infrastructure support projects or services and 2) a picture of grants going only towards specialist infrastructure projects as opposed to all funding going to specialist infrastructure organisations.
4. This grant list was then manually reviewed to remove irrelevant entries. Cleaned data was then used to create a list of all recipient organisations in this list and a manual review of all organisations to include any organisation that provided one or more than one specialist infrastructure service to equity and justice groups.

Using 360Giving Infrastructure Dataset:

5. We also used 360Giving’s infrastructure dataset to filter specialist infrastructure organisations. We then manually reviewed all organisations on the list to only include the ones that met our criteria.

Using sector consultations:

6. As a part of this project, we also surveyed equity and justice organisations and equity and justice infrastructure organisations. Both these surveys returned names of organisations that either self-reported providing specialist infrastructure support to

EJOs or had provided support to self-identifying EJOs who filled out the survey. We manually reviewed and added the organisations mentioned based on our criteria.

7. We also reached out to a number of organisations to review our list and recommend other organisations. We then reviewed their recommendations to ensure they fit our definition:
 - a. London Plus
 - b. NAVCA
 - c. Black South West Network
 - d. ISRAAC Somali Community Association
 - e. Race Council Cymru
 - f. CAMBRIDGE ETHNIC COMMUNITY FORUM
 - g. MERSEYSIDE DISABILITY FEDERATION
 - h. Mid-Ulster Disability Forum
 - i. NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF WOMEN'S ORGANISATIONS
 - j. OPAAL (UK) - THE OLDER PEOPLE'S ADVOCACY ALLIANCE (UK)
 - k. Scottish Alliance of Regional Equality Councils Ltd
 - l. STAFFORDSHIRE COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY YOUTH SERVICES
8. We individually requested recommendations for regional EJOs from the following, either during stakeholder interviews or via email:
 - a. Human Rights Consortium
 - b. Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust
 - c. Corra Foundation
 - d. Wales Funder Forum
 - e. Funders Forum for Northern Ireland
 - f. AB Charitable Trust
9. We also received a list developed by the Greater London Authority of specialist infrastructure organisations. We manually reviewed organisations and added them to our list if they fit the definition.^{cxix}

This process, after manual checks, returned a list of 220 organisations (198 registered charities and 21 CIC/companies and 1 unregistered organisation).

Out of these 198 organisations, we categorised 49 as London-only, 84 as National, 7 as Northern Ireland based and 7 as Scotland based organisations. In order to add data on their regional focus, we used data from Charity Commission for England and Wales (CCEW), Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) and Charity Commission for Northern Ireland (CCNI). Since this categorisation was based on regulators' data, it does not provide nuanced data on level of service provision locally or regionally. Data on regional focus of organisations regulated by OSCR or CCNI were done manually. Data on regional focus of organisations regulated by CCEW was extracted through the CCEW API. Code used for the same is attached

in Appendix 4. For CICs and unregistered organisations, a manual assessment of their regional focus was done based on their listed contact information and project descriptions and location of delivered projects using a review of their official website.

We disaggregated the 220 organisations by if they are:

1. Equity and Justice Infrastructure (EJI) Focused: Majority of their services and functions are specialist infrastructure support (as listed in the functions section of Appendix 1) provided to EJOs. The total number of EJI focused organisations on our list is 139, out of which 30 are London-only organisations.
2. Equity and Justice Infrastructure (EJI) Adjacent: One or some, but not the majority, of their services and functions are specialist infrastructure support to EJOs. The total number of EJI-adjacent organisations on our list is 81 out of 25 are London-only organisations.

To Examine the Funding Landscape for Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations and the Need and Impact of Equity and Justice Infrastructure Organisations

1. Surveys: We circulated two sets of surveys – a total of 4 surveys. In Phase 1, we circulated 2 surveys – for EJOs and EJIOs in London. In phase 2, we adapted the same surveys for a UK-wide audience and circulated the 2 updated surveys aimed at EJOs and EJIOs nation-wide. Changes included shorter questions, removal of questions which collected data which was publicly available and removal of London-specific questions. For both phases of circulation, we used the following dissemination methods:
 - a. Through social media: we posted the surveys on our LinkedIn page and on our website.
 - b. Through funder networks: London Funders has a membership network of 174 funders, out of which _ are National funders. We requested our funders to circulate the surveys amongst their grantees.
 - c. Through the advisory board: advisory board members also circulated the surveys in their membership networks.
 - d. We also individually e-mailed each of the 220 organisations on our list, urging them to fill out our survey.

We received responses from organisations that work in more regions than just London for our London-only surveys. As a result, we assessed responses from surveys based on the target audience (EJO and EJIO) rather than regional focus. To ensure that the surveys were comparable, we did not consider the questions from the London-only surveys (phase 1) which were absent from the UK-wide surveys (phase 2).

A summary of survey response rates are listed below:

Survey Focus	Respondents
EJIOs	42
EJOs	59

2. Stakeholder Interviews:

We conducted 44 stakeholder interviews. An overview of our stakeholders based on type is below:

Type	Number
Independent Trust/Foundation	16
Local Authority/Government (all based on England)	12
EJIO	16
TOTAL	44

3. Funding Data:

For the 198 registered charities, we extracted funding data from Charity Commission for England and Wales (CCEW), Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) and Charity Commission for Northern Ireland (CCNI). Since the data available across these three sources was different, we conducted region-specific data analysis on funding. Funding data for organisations regulated by OSCR or CCNI were extracted manually. Data from CCEW was extracted through the CCEW API. Code used for the same is attached in Appendix 4. We could not access funding data for 5 organisations which are not included in the funding data analysis.

For CICs and unregistered organisations, we manually extracted funding data from their accounts documents available either on their website or on Companies House. We also manually extracted information from accounts documents on amount of total income which was restricted vs. unrestricted for EJI Focused organisations.

Funding data for each year was not consistent. The number of organisations that reported data for each financial year is listed below:

Year	Number of Organisations that Reported Funding Data (total organisations included in the dataset =)
2020	179

2021	182
2022	186
2023	190
2024	170

The disparity in these figures could be because in many cases the organisation have only been active for less than 5 years, some organisations have yet to report their 2024 data or because some organisations did not have to report their income due to their size in line with Charity Commission rules for all 5 years.

There were limitations to the methodology:

1. Incomplete and Uneven Data Coverage

- a. Unbalanced Panel: Funding data was not consistently available across all years for all organisations. This creates an unbalanced panel, which can skew longitudinal analysis and limit comparability.
- b. Missing Data: Some organisations had no available financial data, particularly CICs and unregistered entities, which may have led to underrepresentation of certain types of EJIOs.
- c. Regional Disparities: Data from Scotland and Northern Ireland was manually extracted due to lack of standardised reporting formats, potentially introducing inconsistencies or errors.

2. Reliance on Self-Reported and Grey Literature

- a. The literature review acknowledges a paucity of UK-specific academic research, which limits the ability to triangulate findings or benchmark against robust theoretical frameworks.

3. Manual Categorisation and Subjectivity

- a. Organisations were manually categorised as EJI-focused or EJI-adjacent, and assigned a primary thematic focus. This process, while necessary, introduces subjectivity and may oversimplify the intersectional nature of many organisations' work.
- b. The decision to assign a single primary category for funding analysis may obscure cross-sectoral contributions and lead to misrepresentation of impact.

4. Limited Sample Sizes

- a. Surveys had relatively small sample sizes (n=42 for EJIOs, n=59 for EJOs), which may not be representative of the broader sector.

- b. Stakeholder interviews (n=44) provided rich qualitative insights but may reflect the perspectives of more engaged or accessible organisations and funders.
- 5. **Potential Selection Bias in Mapping**
 - a. The mapping of EJIOs relied on keyword searches in grant databases, sector consultations, and manual reviews. This approach may have missed smaller, informal, or emerging organisations, especially those not captured in formal databases or lacking digital presence.
- 6. **Limited Disaggregation of Funding Data**
 - a. Funding data does not disaggregate by project or service type, especially for EJI-adjacent organisations. This makes it difficult to assess how much of their funding actually supports equity and justice infrastructure work.
- 7. **Geographic Ambiguity**
 - a. Organisations listed as “national” may not provide equal service across all UK regions. The methodology acknowledges this but lacks a systematic way to adjust for regional service disparities, especially in rural or underserved areas.
- 8. **Grant Length Data Gaps**
 - a. Only **36% of grants** in the 360Giving dataset include information on grant duration. This limits our ability to assess the prevalence of long-term funding. Where possible, grant length was manually added for key funders such as City Bridge Foundation (CBF), but this remains incomplete.
- 9. **Registered Address Skew**
 - a. Several organisations use **paid registered address services** (e.g., c/o addresses in Westminster, Camden, and City of London), which may skew geographic analysis. These addresses do not necessarily reflect where services are delivered or where staff are based.
- 10. **DEI Data Standards and 'By and For' Analysis**
 - a. There is currently **no standardised equalities data taxonomy** across funders in the UK. This limits our ability to conduct robust analysis of “by and for” organisations—those led by and for marginalised communities. We consulted our advisory group to validate assumptions, but this remains a methodological constraint.
- 11. **Intersectionality in Charts**
 - a. Some charts in this report present data by primary category (e.g., Race and Ethnicity, Disability), which may **miss the intersectional nature** of many organisations’ work. This was necessary to avoid double-counting in funding analysis, but it does not fully reflect the cross-cutting impact of EJIOs.
- 12. **Restricted vs. Unrestricted Funding – CBF Effect**
 - a. City Bridge Foundation (CBF) is a major funder of EJIOs in London and provides **restricted grants** but they are only restricted by geography (within

London). Since many London-based organisations receive CBF funding, this may **inflate the proportion of restricted funding** in our analysis.

13. Furlough Funding Post-2020

- a. The spike in funding observed in 2020-2021 may be partially explained by **Covid-related furlough support** and emergency grants. These temporary funding streams may not reflect long-term investment trends and should be considered when interpreting year-on-year changes.

Appendix 3: Surveys and Stakeholder Interview Guides

1. [Phase 1 survey for EJIOs](#)
2. [Phase 1 survey for EJOs](#)
3. [Phase 2 survey for EJIOs](#)
4. [Phase 2 survey for EJOs](#)
5. [Stakeholder Interview Guide](#)

Appendix 4: Code

1. [Code – scrape organisations based on keywords to develop initial EJIO list.](#)
2. [Code – Charity Commission of England and Wales API – region](#)
3. [Code – Charity Commission of England and Wales API – funding](#)
4. [Initial literature review documents reviewed \(autumn 2024\)](#)

Endnotes

ⁱ We define infrastructure organisations as specialist organisations that support EJOs by helping them build capacity whether that's through training, governance support, fundraising help, or creating spaces to connect and collaborate.

ⁱⁱ We define "equity and justice organisations" as equity-led groups or by and for led groups focusing on issues of social equity and justice.

ⁱⁱⁱ As noted by some key funders in their communications:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/media/39158/download>

<https://www.citybridgefoundation.org.uk/news-and-blog/the-story-of-the-anchor-programme>

https://londonfunders.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/LCR%20Learning%20Reports%202i_Equity_Spreads.pdf (During Covid-19, there are a few funder collaborations that channel funding to equalities organisations but they almost exclusively focus on only one of the equality groups, such as Comic Relief's funding in partnership with National Emergencies Trust for BAME-led organisations or UK Community Foundation's funding to BAME infrastructure organisations (also in partnership with National Emergencies Trust). Compared to these initiatives, LCR has a pan-equalities remit which not only ensures that a broad spectrum of marginalised groups are supported, it also facilitates moving beyond the silos, recognising that many of the issues that marginalised groups face are interconnected. One area that LCR may benefit from in the future is the 360giving's Equalities Data Standards project, also coordinated by TSIC, aiming to provide a taxonomy for those funding voluntary sector organisations to adopt in streamlining how equalities data is being collected and used)

<https://www.parliament.scot/-/media/files/committees/public-audit-committee/correspondence/2022/paul-johnston-annexe.pdf>

https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/bsc_grants_guidance_a2i_lp_accessible_0.pdf

<https://rosauk.org/our-programmes/covid-19-response-fund-for-bme-womens-organisations/>

<https://www.comicrelief.com/funding/tackling-injustices/global-majority-fund/>

^{iv} https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/briefing_-_community-led_approach_-_final_-_designed_for_publication.pdf and

https://londonfunders.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/LCR%20Learning%20Reports%202i_Equity_Spreads.pdf

^v You can read the literature review via www.londonfunders.org.uk/resources-publications

^{vi} <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>

^{vii} Laura Tomasko et al., The Social Sector Infrastructure: Defining and Understanding the Concept (Washington, DC: Urban Institute and George Mason University Schar School of Policy and Government, 2023), <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/social-sector-infrastructure-definition>.

^{viii} Traci Endo Inouye et al., Evaluation of the Capacity Building for Minority-Led Organizations Project, (Oakland, California: Social Research Policy Associates and The California Endowment (TCE), 2012), <https://www.d5coalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/spr-evaluation-of-the-capacity-building-for-minority-led-organizations-project.pdf>.

^{ix} <https://carleton.ca/panl/wp-content/uploads/Enhancing-policy-leadership-for-Canadas-charitable-and-nonprofit-sector-A-conversation-starter-Nov-2021.pdf> (pg. 23-25 and 11-15)

^x https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_nonprofit_starvation_cycle also provides some evidence of poor infrastructure of non-profits rendering them unable to carry on their charitable functions efficiently

^{xi} <https://www.shu.ac.uk/centre-regional-economic-social-research/publications/measuring-the-impact-of-third-sector-infrastructure-organisations> citing https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/65f03713c1b91171910c63a5/661d2aea95c65191af711909_Connecting%20Locally%20-%20final%20report%20Nov%202022.pdf

^{xii} <https://civilsocietycommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FINAL-Unleashing-the-power-of-civil-society-%E2%80%93-for-upload.pdf>

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41061155>

^{xiii} There is some evidence that different types of infrastructure organisations are effective in achieving different outcomes. So, not all types of equity and justice infrastructure organisations considered within this project will be equally effective in achieving policy advocacy outcomes or providing sector representation – this would depend on the type of the infrastructure organisation and the sector context. Philips et al. analyse effectiveness of infrastructure organisations based on three dimensions – formal vs. informal, decentralised vs. centralised and representative vs. leadership. They find that different combinations of these dimensions can be used to achieve different purposes. These three dimensions of structure can be combined in different ways. "For instance, if an intermediary is set up quickly to fill a leadership gap, it might be informal, centralized and leadership-oriented. If the intent is to create a sustained grassroots-based organization, the structure might be formal, decentralized and representative." <https://carleton.ca/panl/wp-content/uploads/Enhancing-policy-leadership-for-Canadas-charitable-and-nonprofit-sector-A-conversation-starter-Nov-2021.pdf>

^{xiv} <https://ssir.org/articles/entry/movement-accountable-intermediaries-philanthropy> provides examples of amplified reach and access by infrastructure organisations.

<https://thecenterforimplementation.com/toolbox/building-infrastructure-and-partnering-with-communities>

<https://www.socialventures.org.au/our-impact/social-sector-intermediaries-what-are-they-and-what-do-they-need/>

<https://londonplus.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/London-CVS-Network-Impact-Report.pdf>

^{xv} <https://ssir.org/articles/entry/movement-accountable-intermediaries-philanthropy> - provides case study of the emergent fund in mobilising resources in times of crisis

https://londonfunders.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/IVAR022%20Learning%20from%20Emergency%20responses%20report_Low%20Res.pdf – discussing London Funders’ collaborative fund to respond to Covid crisis

^{xvi} <https://ssir.org/articles/entry/movement-accountable-intermediaries-philanthropy>

<https://www.panoramaglobal.org/publications/insights-the-power-of-well-funded-collaborative-funds>

<https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1268&context=tfr>

<https://www.macfound.org/about/how-we-work/using-intermediaries-for-impact>

<https://ssir.org/articles/entry/collaborative-funds-local-partnerships>

^{xvii} David Brown et al., Study On Nonprofit And Philanthropic Infrastructure (Nonprofit Quarterly),

<https://nonprofitquarterly.org/wp-content/uploads/infrastudy.pdf#:~:text=study%20of%20New%20York%20City,holistic%20and%20effective%20basis%20possible>.

^{xviii} <https://labour.org.uk/change/break-down-barriers-to-opportunity/#respect>

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a75176e40f0b6360e47348f/Agenda-2030-Report4.pdf>

<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/the-kings-speech-2024> - this speech did receive criticism for not being bolder when it comes to social justice issues but it still signals some focus on resolving social inequalities

<https://www.gov.scot/policies/poverty-and-social-justice/>

<https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/topics/social-inclusion> and <https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/articles/delivering-social-change-introduction>

<https://www.gov.wales/written-statement-publication-welsh-government-strategic-equality-and-human-rights-plan-2025-2029>

<https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/communities-and-social-justice>

^{xix} The survey and stakeholder interview guide is attached in the Appendix

^{xx} <https://post.parliament.uk/addressing-economic-inequalities/#:~:text=In%202021%2F22%2C%2037%25,Wealth%20inequality>

<https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/library/underfunded-and-overlooked>

^{xxi} <https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/library/underfunded-and-overlooked>

^{xxii} <https://www.civilsocietyconsulting.co.uk/newsblog/m53egkir270bcj5y2mp2rnwxziv836-jswy3-wj2az>

^{xxiii} <https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/media/insights/documents/LGBT-Futures-Equity-Fund-Independent-Evaluation.pdf>

<https://www.jrf.org.uk/race-and-ethnicity/driving-racial-equity-in-social-investment> - “Most Black and Ethnic Minoritised-led voluntary, community and social enterprises (VCEs) are small (with a turnover of less than £500,000). They exist in a wider context where 90% of all funding available goes to the country’s biggest charities (turning over £500,000, or more) and where many must plug the funding gap themselves. 60% of the financing for the UK’s Black and Ethnic Minoritised-led VCEs comes from the personal savings and the employment income of their directors, whereas only 20% derives from grants. These organisations are impacted by a lack of intermediary support and have less access to inclusive funding products. As a result, Black and Ethnic Minoritised-led social enterprises tend to be smaller and less resilient. Very few investment funds (representing less than 1% of UK financial assets) are managed by people from Black and Ethnic Minoritised communities, which also compounds the lack of funding flowing to Black and Ethnic Minoritised-led organisations.”

<https://fundingjustice.civicpower.org.uk/report/funding-justice-3/> - notes that less than 5% of funding from the UK’s largest grantmakers in 2022-23 went towards tackling injustice

^{xxiv} <https://domesticabusecommissioner.uk/early-findings-from-our-mapping-show-a-huge-discrepancy-of-services-across-england-and-wales-and-an-acute-lack-of-funding-that-prevents-services-being-able-to-meet-demand/> - Organisations run ‘by and for’ minoritised communities were 5 times less likely to receive statutory funding than mainstream domestic abuse organisations.

<https://www.civilsociety.co.uk/news/minoritised-led-charities-report-being-refused-funding-because-of-race-or-ethnicity.html> - In response to Pathway Fund’s survey of 1,000 Black and ethnic minoritised-led organisations, 76% reported having funding rejected because of their race or ethnicity.

<https://rosauk.org/2025/04/24/underfunded-under-resourced-and-under-the-radar-the-state-of-the-uk-women-and-girls-sector-research-published-today/> - Today we are publishing a report from Pro Bono Economics that Rosa commissioned to better understand the challenges facing our sector. Our **previous research** revealed just 1.8% of charitable funding goes to organisations run by and for women and girls. We know our sector is running on fumes while delivering vital support to women and girls at every stage of their lives. This report shows there is growing competition for funding at a time of increased need; 91% of organisations said that demand for their services had increased over the past 12 months.

^{xxv} Dennis R. Yount and Elizabeth A.M. Searing. Resilience and the Management of Nonprofit Organisations. Chapter 10. Lester M. Salamon. The Resilience Sector Revisited The New Challenge to Nonprofit America.

<https://www.dropbox.com/sc/fi/sc5nffq6hi0k6v7eclny/REPORT-PUBLIC-EDIT-2018-Towards-Healing-OCF-and-engaging-in-Reconciliation-Final-report-2018-12-20.pdf?rlkey=0ooz0m0i0si76h6qacn0z1hivande=2anddl=0>

<https://www.forblackcommunities.org/assets/docs/Unfunded-Report.pdf>

xxvi <https://commonvision.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Common-Vision-Futures-Playbook-Civil-Society-Infrastructure-FINAL-May2022.pdf>

https://londonfunders.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/SME574%20London%20Funders%20Report_For%20Web.pdf

xxvii <https://commonvision.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Common-Vision-Futures-Playbook-Civil-Society-Infrastructure-FINAL-May2022.pdf>

<https://londonplus.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/London-CVS-Network-Impact-Report-pdf-2022-23-3.pdf>

xxviii <https://commonvision.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Common-Vision-Futures-Playbook-Civil-Society-Infrastructure-FINAL-May2022.pdf>

xxix Ibid.

xxx <https://www.360giving.org/wp-content/uploads/Infrastructure-Analysis-Report-220223-2.pdf>

<https://www.london.gov.uk/media/73140/download>

xxxi <https://www.shu.ac.uk/-/media/home/research/cresr/reports/m/measuring-impact-ts-infrastructure-orgs.pdf>

summarising Macmillan, Rob (2006), A Rapid Evidence Assessment of the Benefits of Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure (London: NCVO) is available from www.changeup.org.uk/nationalprojects/INP.asp

xxxi Macmillan, Rob (2006), A Rapid Evidence Assessment of the Benefits of Voluntary and Community Sector Infrastructure (London: NCVO) is available from www.changeup.org.uk/nationalprojects/INP.asp

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/26991/1/building-capabilities-voluntary-sector.pdf>

xxxi https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/02/0809132_impact_of_changeup.pdf https://www.vai.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Key_Findings_Supporting_Central_Londons_local_third_sector.summary.pdf

https://www.communityfoundation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Mosaic_Jig_or_Abstract_Report.pdf

xxxiiv Jennifer Shea. (2011). Taking Nonprofit Intermediaries Seriously: A Middle-Range Theory for Implementation Research. , 71(1), 57–66. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02306.x citing Benjamin, forthcoming; Sherman 2002; White House 2008

xxxi Jennifer Shea. (2011). Taking Nonprofit Intermediaries Seriously: A Middle-Range Theory for Implementation Research. , 71(1), 57–66. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02306.x citing Benner 2003; Briggs 2008; Brown and Kalegaonkar 2002)

xxxi Jennifer Shea. (2011). Taking Nonprofit Intermediaries Seriously: A Middle-Range Theory for Implementation Research. , 71(1), 57–66. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2010.02306.x 63

xxxi “Research shows that isolated organizations are the ones most likely to struggle and fail (Galaskiewicz and Bielefeld 1998). Without supportive networks and effective outreach efforts, organizations may limit their access to resources and fail to establish a positive image or reputation within the community. Intermediary organizations, such as regional arts councils or affinity groups of nonprofit child care providers, for example, provide connecting links among individual groups. They can be important resources for younger organizations that are starting out and vital networks for older organizations. These groups offer opportunities for organizations to share information, learn from one another, and coalesce on issues of common concern. In short, they help build the organizational relationships (or social capital) that are important to organizational stability” https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/71301/building_capacity.PDF 22

xxxi D'emilio, J. (2002). The world turned: Essays on gay history, politics, and culture. London: Duke University Press. 89.

xxxi <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1094&context=tfr> 14.

xl <https://uwe-repository.worktribe.com/OutputFile/915640>

xli <https://civilsocietycommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FINAL-Unleashing-the-power-of-civil-society-%E2%80%93-for-upload.pdf> 14. “Civil society is an expression of the connections that exist between individuals and institutions in every part of our nation. It can also be more narrowly conceptualised as the set of organisations that provide the infrastructure for those connections, from charities to trade unions and from housing associations to social enterprises.”

xlii <https://civilsocietycommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FINAL-Unleashing-the-power-of-civil-society-%E2%80%93-for-upload.pdf> 18

xliii <https://civilsocietycommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FINAL-Unleashing-the-power-of-civil-society-%E2%80%93-for-upload.pdf> 18

xliv Esmee Fairbairn Funding Plus Survey 2023.

https://esmefairbairn.ams3.cdn.digitaloceanspaces.com/media/documents/2023_Funding_Plus_survey_summary.pdf

xliv Wandsworth Voluntary Sector Needs Analysis 2023.

https://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/media/ecjnide2/voluntary_sector_needs_analysis_report_2024.pdf “Individual organisations have developed volunteer networks and pathways, but shared infrastructure is lacking – smaller VCSOs in particular need guidance on supporting and managing volunteers, which would reduce their frictional costs and free up time and resources to focus on service delivery”

xli <https://www.phf.org.uk/assets/documents/Nexus-Evaluation-Backbone-Summary-Report-1.pdf?v=1715613215> 8

xlii <https://www.therobertsontrust.org.uk/media/maf0msj/third-sector-capacity-building-survey-results.pdf>

-
- ^{xlviii} <https://insights.threesixtygiving.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/Infrastructure-Analysis-Report-220223.pdf>
<https://fundingjustice.civicpower.org.uk/>
- ^{xlix} <https://insights.threesixtygiving.org/360/infrastructure/>
- ⁱ Ibid.
- ^{li} <https://fundingjustice.civicpower.org.uk/report/an-analysis-of-social-justice-grantmaking-in-the-uk-2021-2022/executive-summary/#easy-footnote-bottom-4-245>
- ^{lii} <https://insights.threesixtygiving.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/Infrastructure-Analysis-Report-220223.pdf>
<https://www.navca.org.uk/connecting-locally>
- ^{liii} <https://civilsocietycommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FINAL-Unleashing-the-power-of-civil-society-%E2%80%93-for-upload.pdf> notes “The Covid pandemic shone a spotlight on just how critical civil society is, with the seemingly spontaneous growth of mutual aid groups, the support the sector provided to the most vulnerable, and the momentous efforts of the volunteers who made the vaccine rollout a success”
- ^{liv} <https://www.irf.org.uk/race-and-ethnicity/race-equality-and-justice-in-the-charity-sector>
- ^{lv} https://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/CSJF-Overlooked_and_Underfunded.pdf noted “For example, total gross income for all charities has grown by 8.34 per cent post-pandemic, compared with growth for small charities which sits at 3.24 per cent, well below the average small charity average expenditure rate.”
- ^{lvi} <https://www.charityexcellence.co.uk/how-many-charities-in-the-uk/> notes 360,079 charities in England and Wales, ~45,000 in Scotland and 7,205 in Northern Ireland.
- ^{lvii} We categorised geographical reach based on data from Charity Commission of England and Wales, OSCR and Charity Commission of Northern Ireland. All 94 organisations registered as National service providers were registered on Charity Commission on England and Wales.
- ^{lviii} See definition in Appendix 1
- ^{lix} Definitions are available in Appendix 1.
- ^{lx} In order to do this, we analysed how the organisation described their organisation and projects on its website/social media. EJOs are intersectional - all of the organisations on our list worked across different communities and issues. For example, organisations which were Youth focused (such as Youth Action) also had programs specifically focused on issues faced by racialised youth or disabled youth. This made the categorisation difficult. However, in order to ensure we examine how funding has changed for different sub-sectors/issue-areas, we decided to categorise groups under multiple themes/issues but assign them one Primary category and other Secondary categories. Funding analysis was done using their assigned primary categories.
- ^{lxi} Age UK notes that “Throughout the Strategic Report and in this Financial Review, the charity’s trading income continues to be expressed in net terms rather than gross, unless stated otherwise. Age UK’s accounts are consolidated, which means they include the income (and costs) of its charitable and trading subsidiaries. Age UK’s network of charity shops and Age Co generate significant income, but the cost of doing so is considerable. Their respective costs include their rent, electricity and maintenance of the charity shop estate and the marketing of financial services, Independent Living Solutions products and other commercial products and services. When considered at gross level only, this can make it appear that the charity has far more income available to spend on charitable activities than it does. We spent 111 per cent of our net resources on charitable activities (£65.2 million), following the designation of funds in 2021/22 to 2022/23.” https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/en/charity-search?p_p_id=uk_gov_ccew_onereg_charitydetails_web_portlet_CharityDetailsPortlet&p_p_lifecycle=2&p_p_state=maximized&p_p_mode=view&p_p_resource_id=%2Faccounts-resource&p_p_cacheability=cacheLevelPage&uk_gov_ccew_onereg_charitydetails_web_portlet_CharityDetailsPortlet_objectiveId=A16515797&uk_gov_ccew_onereg_charitydetails_web_portlet_CharityDetailsPortlet_priv_r_p_mvcRenderCommandName=%2Faccounts-and-annual-returns&uk_gov_ccew_onereg_charitydetails_web_portlet_CharityDetailsPortlet_priv_r_p_organisationNumber=4044343
- ^{lxii} <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/unemployment/bulletins/youngpeoplenotineducationemploymentortrainingneet/february2025>
<https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/child-poverty-statistics-causes-and-the-uks-policy-response/>
- ^{lxiii} <https://www.ageuk.org.uk/latest-press/articles/2-million-older-people-now-have-some-unmet-need-for-social-care/>
- ^{lxiv} <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/insight-and-analysis/reports/social-care-older-people-home-truths>
- ^{lxv} Collaboration and Professionalization: The Contours of Public Sector Funding for Nonprofit Organizations David F. Sua’rez 309
- ^{lxvi} Collaboration and Professionalization: The Contours of Public Sector Funding for Nonprofit Organizations David F. Sua’rez Citing Chaves, Stephens, and Galaskiewicz 2004; Galaskiewicz 1985
- ^{lxvii} Ibid. 309
- ^{lxviii} A list of organisations that reviewed our list is noted in Appendix 1.

^{lxix} the regional categories were ‘Throughout England’, ‘Throughout England and Wales’, ‘Scotland, Northern Ireland’, ‘Throughout London’ or names of local authorities’ – this is based on CCEW’s regional categorisation which was also applied to organisations manually geo-tagged from OSCR and CCNI. This means that if an organisation worked in England and Wales, it was tagged to be only working on one geographic region as tagged under ‘Throughout England and Wales’.

^{lxx} Organisations reporting to be working across the UK are tagged under all regions, including Scotland and Northern Ireland on Charity Commission. However, their service provision might not be consistent across all countries.

^{lxxi} Local authorities with only 1 mapped EJIO: Bath And North East Somerset, Bedford, Blackburn With Darwen, Blackpool, Bristol City, Central Bedfordshire, Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, Denbighshire, Derbyshire, Devon, Dorset, East Sussex, Gateshead, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Isles Of Scilly, Lancashire, Lincolnshire, Luton, Newcastle Upon Tyne City, North East Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire, North Somerset, North Tyneside, Nottinghamshire, Peterborough City, Rotherham, Rutland, Sheffield City, Shropshire, Slough, Somerset, South Gloucestershire, South Tyneside, Stockton-on-tees, Stoke-on-trent City, Sunderland, Telford and Wrekin, Thurrock, Walsall, Warrington, Warwickshire, Worcestershire

^{lxxii} <https://www.ivar.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Evidence-review-Why-restrict-grants-IVAR-March-2023-FINAL.pdf> noting “This dynamic was also highlighted during the Covid-19 pandemic when a rise in unrestricted funding shifted decision-making powers away from funders and towards funded organisations closer to the community (Ayer and Anderson, 2022).”

^{lxxiii} See Appendix 2 and 3.

^{lxxiv} https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/71301/building_capacity.PDF citing Cordes et al. (2000).

^{lxxv} You can read more about the surveys and methodology in Appendix 1.

^{lxxvi} <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/news-and-press-releases/2025/london-councils-responds-parliamentary-report-warning-cliff-edge-local#:~:text=Boroughs%20in%20the%20capital%20face,growing%20demand%2C%20and%20rising%20costs.>

^{lxxvii} <https://www.london.gov.uk/media/73140/download>

^{lxxviii} <https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/communities-and-social-justice/civil-society/civil-society-roots>

^{lxxix} <https://www.the-sse.org/funder-plus/>

^{lxxx} <https://www.kompasi.org/>

^{lxxxi} https://www.phf.org.uk/news-and-publications/creating-spaces-for-rest-and-exploration-reflections-from-the-2024-migration-residential?utm_source=chatgpt.com

^{lxxxii} <https://www.citybridgefoundation.org.uk/news-and-blog/learning-from-the-first-round-of-the-anchor-programme>

^{lxxxiii} <https://www.citybridgefoundation.org.uk/funding/the-anchor-programme>

^{lxxxiv} <https://www.tsip.co.uk/blog/driving-systems-change-disrupting-traditional-funding-with-the-anchor-model>

^{lxxxv} <https://www.comicrelief.com/news/united-for-change-global-majority-fund-partners-launch-a-bold-call-to-action/>

^{lxxxvi} <https://actionforraceequality.org.uk/comicrelief-global-majority-fund/>

^{lxxxvii} https://assets.ctfassets.net/zsfivwzfgl3t/69ASONV7fWxLME2tES6MuF/b14b3ef634327dc15383f33a49b48fa9/Global_Majority_Fund_Phase_1_evaluation_05.10.22.pdf

^{lxxxviii} <https://www.comicrelief.com/news/united-for-change-global-majority-fund-partners-launch-a-bold-call-to-action/>

^{lxxxix} <https://www.voice4change-england.org/raceequalityandinfrastuctureflexiblefund>

^{lxxxx} <https://www.corra.scot/grants/independent-human-rights-fund-for-scotland/>

^{lxxxxi} <https://www.corra.scot/participation-and-the-independent-human-rights-fund-for-scotland/>

^{lxxxxii} We arrived at these impact areas based on the number of responses that mentioned them.

^{xc} <https://business.senedd.wales/documents/s108618/COV%20VS%2017%20-%20Race%20Council%20Cymru.pdf>

^{xc} <https://rosauk.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Rosa-Covid19-BME-Report-Final.pdf>

^{xcii} <https://thephoenixwayuk.org/impact-so-far>

^{xciii} <https://thephoenixwayuk.org/>

^{xciv} <https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/media/insights/documents/TheWayOfTheWay-v1.pdf?mtime=20231121160759&focal=none>

^{xcv} <https://www.consortium.lgbt/grantgiving/equityfund/the-people-behind-the-fund/>

^{xcvi} <https://www.tnlcommunityfund.org.uk/media/insights/documents/LGBT-Futures-Equity-Fund-Independent-Evaluation.pdf?mtime=20240313161300&focal=none>

^{xcvii} Ibid.

^{xcviii} Ibid.

^{xcviii} <https://www.pathwayfund.org.uk/new-page#:~:text=Over%20%C2%BE%20of%20Black%20and,trust%20and%20approach%20social%20investors.>

^{xcix} <https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/three-quarters-minority-led-charities-refused-finance-due-race-research-finds/finance/article/1883418>

^{xcix} <https://www.doitnownow.com/news/problems-with-restricted-funding#:~:text=In%20addition%2C%20a%20study%20conducted,our%20findings%20and%20funding%20opportunities.>

^{xcix} <https://www.doitnownow.com/our-manifesto>

<https://www.doitnownow.com/our-initiatives/centre-black>

^c <https://www.blackfundingnetwork.org/>

^{ci} <https://www.pathwayfund.org.uk/>

^{cii} <https://www.doitnownow.com/innovate-now-with-city-bridge-foundation>

^{ciii} <https://www.doitnownow.com/reports/resilience-in-motion-london-black-led-impact-organisations>

^{civ} <https://www.crer.org.uk/policy-parliamentary-engagement>

^{cv} <https://www.inclusionlondon.org.uk/news/uhez/>

^{cvi} <https://www.hrcscotland.org/work-bill/>

^{cvi} <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/czjekz19kplo>

<https://caj.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/A-Beacon-of-Hope-The-Story-of-CAJ-by-Maggie-Beirne-June-2016.pdf>

^{cvi} Philanthrocapitalism refers to using private-sector practices—entrepreneurial management, market logic and metrics—to drive philanthropy. Bishop and Green define it as “the growing role for private sector actors in addressing the biggest social and environmental challenges”. In practice this means large donors and foundations apply business-style strategies and outcome-driven approaches to charity. Haydon, Steph and Jung, Tobias and Russell, Shona. (2021). ‘You’ve Been Framed’: A critical review of academic discourse on philanthrocapitalism. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 23. [10.1111/ijmr.12255](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12255).

^{cix} Haydon, Steph and Jung, Tobias and Russell, Shona. (2021). ‘You’ve Been Framed’: A critical review of academic discourse on philanthrocapitalism. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 23. [10.1111/ijmr.12255](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12255).

<https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/may/24/the-trouble-with-charitable-billionaires-philanthrocapitalism>

^{cx} <https://londonfunders.org.uk/join-us/meet-our-network>

^{cx} <https://www.ukgrantmaking.org/blog/the-view-from-londonfunders/#:~:text=Our%20survey%20revealed%20some%20striking,to%20cope%20with%20rising%20costs.>

^{cxii} https://acf.org.uk/acf/acf/Blog/2024/rising_demand.aspx

^{cxiii} In 2021-22, London Funders had 172 members and 58% completed the survey. In 2024-25 London Funders had ___ members and ___% completed the survey.

^{cxiv} Between 2021-25,

^{cxv} <https://blackequityorg.com/future-100-growth-fund/> - set up in 2022 - <https://www.skygroup.sky/article/sky-announces-1m-partnership-with-the-black-equity-organisation-to-back-black-british-entrepreneurs>

Pathway Fund was established in 2022 <https://www.pathwayfund.org.uk/>

DINN was established in 2016

<https://www.doitnownow.com/#:~:text=Do%20it%20Now%20Now%20was%20founded%20in%202016.>

^{cxvi} https://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2019-10/Beyond_the_Cheque.pdf

^{cxvii} <https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/news/leaders-launch-new-1bn-gender-fund-to-advance-global-equality-and-womens-leadership/>

<https://familiesandworkers.org/families-and-workers-fund-launches-initiative-to-advance-one-million-good-careers-in-climate-and-infrastructure/>

^{cxviii} <https://londonpropel.org.uk/about-propel/>

^{cxix} <https://www.london.gov.uk/media/39158/download>