

General feedback on unsuccessful pre-applications in 2025

Last year we received almost 350 pre-applications for the 1st stage of our Conservation Insight Grants. Of these, 17 were invited to proceed to the 2nd stage and submit a full application form. Six projects were then awarded funding.

Please find below some general feedback on the pre-applications we received, including reasons why some were deemed ineligible in the 1st stage and some reasons why projects weren't invited to progress to the 2nd stage (though for many projects, the reason was purely due to the sheer number of applications that we received).

Reasons projects were deemed ineligible for consideration for 1st stage last year:

- **Incorrect start date** – we ask that projects start no earlier than January of the following year, any that start earlier are excluded from consideration
- **MSc or undergrad projects** – we state that we won't fund Masters or undergrad projects, and won't pay for any university fees, any applications requesting funding for these will be excluded from consideration
- **Work on bird species** – due to other funding streams available for projects on birds, we will not consider applications for work on birds
- **Applications from one-person bands** - we will only fund projects run by someone who is part of an NGO or university research department. The organisation must also have an organisational bank account.

Common reasons for projects being unsuccessful in progressing to 2nd stage:

- Applicant is a UK or other national working abroad – priority is given to applicants working in their own country
- Projects which include international travel in the budget are unlikely to be progressed to the second stage
- Projects where the aims are primarily to carry out surveys and assessments for a species – we are looking to fund projects that are addressing a critical threat to a species and implementing or testing a conservation action to mitigate it
- Projects where it's not clear how the action/s will be scaled up after the end of the project – we seek to fund projects which generate scientific evidence that can facilitate the conservation of a species, so any intervention must be transferable and scalable
- Proposed actions are not addressing the main threats identified for the species
- Budget – incorrect/vague/biased towards one very expensive item e.g. drone