



# Pointmaker

## TRANSPARENCY BEGINS AT HOME

### WHY CHARITIES MUST STATE WHO FUNDS THEM

WILLIAM NORTON

#### SUMMARY

- What is a charity obliged to do in return for its financial support?
- How much detail should a charity give about who funds it?
- The Charity Commission's new Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP) – to come into effect in January 2015 – seeks to answer these questions.
- However large charities appear unwilling to disclose such details, in particular information about the sources of their funding.
- The new SORP has been designed to address this problem; however it will fail unless the Charity Commission endeavours to enforce compliance.
- In total at least £3.1 billion of large charities' funds comes from public money. This represents 24% of their incoming resources.
- However the true figure may be as high £6.5 billion.
- The sources of charities' funding should be transparent and in the public domain for three reasons:
  - Democratic accountability. Public money is provided by taxpayers, not the charities' themselves. If charities are being supported by public money, then taxpayers have a right to know that and to know it directly from the charities.
  - The health of the charitable sector. If large charities are dependent for most of their income on public funds then ultimately they are dependent upon political affairs.
  - The role of the charitable sector. Once a private charity has undertaken services for a long time while dependent upon receiving public funds, the line between the public and private sectors begins to blur.
- This paper investigates how the disclosure principles in the SORP operate in practice, and urges the Charity Commission to apply them as intended.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

Charities are subjects of legitimate public interest. They enjoy privileged exemption from taxes on the grounds that they confer some form of public benefit to the community as a whole.

Governments of all colours have sought to encourage charities, as a means of strengthening civil society and for improving the delivery of public services. It is only reasonable, as an aspect of democratic accountability, to enquire how these groups have expanded.

This paper investigates how transparent charities are about their dealings with the state. It is confined to charities registered in England and Wales. Charities in Scotland and Northern Ireland are regulated separately (and it is harder to research information about public funding for them).

The data used in this paper is sourced from the Charity Commission's website,<sup>1</sup> accessed during September 2014. The 50 highest-income charities are identified and their latest available annual accounts reviewed. None of the charities has been contacted for clarification, as this would defeat the object of the exercise – which is to test the quality of the information already in the public domain.

## 2. BACKGROUND

Charities exist to provide a public benefit, not a commercial profit. The donations they receive are strictly gratuitous capital sums, not sales revenue. A conventional revenue profit & loss

account would not represent a true and fair reflection of a charity's activities.

The Charity Commission therefore issues a Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP), containing instructions on how charities should compile their annual report and accounts.<sup>2</sup> The current SORP came into effect on 1 April 2005. A charity has to prepare a Statement of Financial Activities which sets out its income and expenditure. There are also specialist SORPs for charities in sectors subject to additional regulators, for example registered social landlords and universities.

Under the current SORP the charity has to identify the following categories of "*Incoming Resources*":

- "*Voluntary income*"<sup>3</sup> (gifts that will not normally provide any return to the donor), i.e.
  - (a) gifts, donations and legacies;
  - (b) grants which provide core funding or are of a general nature and not for the performance of a service;
  - (c) membership subscriptions;
  - (d) gifts in kind.
- "*Activities for Generating Funds*"<sup>4</sup> (trading; fund-raising campaigns).
- "*Investment income*"<sup>5</sup>
- "*Income from Charitable Activities*"<sup>6</sup>, i.e.

<sup>1</sup> Charity Commission "*Register of Charities*" 2014.

<sup>2</sup> The SORP is issued by the Charity Commission jointly with the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator, since the same accounting standards apply to entities in both jurisdictions.

<sup>3</sup> SORP para 121.

<sup>4</sup> SORP para 137.

<sup>5</sup> SORP para 140.

<sup>6</sup> SORP paras 143-145.



- (a) primary purpose trading (sale of goods or services as part of direct charitable activities);
- (b) the sale of goods or services made by beneficiaries;
- (c) the letting of non-investment property;
- (d) contractual payments from government or public authorities where these are received in the normal course of trading under (a) to (c);
- (e) grants specifically for the provision of goods and services;
- (f) ancillary trades.

- “Other income” – which principally catches the disposal of assets.

The Trustees Report which accompanies the accounts must include a Financial Review identifying the principal sources of funds.<sup>7</sup>

A New SORP will come into effect from January 2015 to reflect changes introduced into general accounting principles by FRS 102.<sup>8</sup> There will now be separate SORPs for large and small charities. In the New Large SORP the categories disclosed in the Statement of Financial Activities will alter slightly:

- “Voluntary income” is re-named “Donations”<sup>9</sup> and is essentially unchanged.

Grants for core funding would still fall into this category.

- “Income from charitable activities”<sup>10</sup> includes income that is earned, conditional or performance-related grants and contractual arrangements with donors. There is more supporting detail in the body of the text about how a charity should account for performance-related grants.
- “Income from other trading activities”<sup>11</sup> covers anything involving a sale or exchange to raise funds for the charity, including the sale of donated goods.
- “Investment income”<sup>12</sup> and “Other income”<sup>13</sup> remain unchanged.

These changes do not represent a rewriting of the SORP. Rather they sharpen the focus on the conditions under which a charity receives income, and whether it is obliged to do anything in return.

There is also greater encouragement for this income to be reported in sub-categories rather than as aggregate totals.<sup>14</sup> The New SORP stresses that a greater degree of public accountability and stewardship is expected of larger charities and that this should be reflected in their reporting.<sup>15</sup> There is a far greater emphasis upon the *purpose* of preparing charity accounts in the first place: providing a high level

<sup>7</sup> SORP para 55.

<sup>8</sup> FRC “FRS 102: The Financial Reporting Standard applicable in the UK and Republic of Ireland” 2013.

<sup>9</sup> New SORP para 4.31-4.32.

<sup>10</sup> New SORP paras 4.33-4.34.

<sup>11</sup> New SORP paras 4.35-4.36.

<sup>12</sup> New SORP paras 4.37-4.38.

<sup>13</sup> New SORP paras 4.39-4.41.

<sup>14</sup> For example New SORP paras 4.29 and 4.42.

<sup>15</sup> For example, New SORP para 1.34.



of accountability and transparency to donors, funders, supporters and stakeholders.<sup>16</sup>

This paper investigates how the disclosure principles in the SORP operate in practice.

### 3. FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Which charities?

Table 1 sets out the top 50 regulated charities in England and Wales, measured by total incoming resources. This is calculated on SORP principles, rather than as pure income, so the **Canal & River Trust** ranks as number four because the £558.4m of assets transferred to it from the old British Waterways Board counts as resources becoming available.

According to the Charity Commission website they regulate 164,161 main charities and a further 16,705 linked (i.e. subsidiary) charities, with a total income of £64.2 billion. The Top 50 charities account for 21% of all charitable resources.

As many as eight charities on the list could be considered quangos, either because they are formal public bodies like **The Arts Council of England**, or 'near to government bodies' sponsored by the public sector such as **The Big Local Trust**. There is an increasing trend for such agencies to re-register as regulated charities. From the perspective of informed public debate however, it may be more significant that at least four entries are private bodies which perform contracts for the NHS (**Marie Stopes International**; **Nuffield Health**; **St Andrews Healthcare**; **Trustees of the London Clinic**; and the universities appear to have training contracts also) and a further six operate Academy schools (**CfBT Education Trust**; **Girls'**

**Day School Trust**; **Oasis Charitable Trust**; **Ormiston Trust**; **United Schools Foundation**; **Woodard Corporation**).

This list covers only regulated charities. Most English universities still have "exempt charity" status and so are not obliged to file accounts with the Charity Commission. Welsh universities lost this status on devolution. That explains their presence in Table 1 and the absence of more obvious, older institutions.<sup>17</sup> However the omission of the annual income of bodies such as the University of Cambridge (£1.4 billion) means that Table 1 provides a slightly distorted snapshot of the earnings of the Third Sector in England and Wales.

One further complication is the presence of two Save The Children entities. There are a total of 30 separate national Save The Children organisations, which are collectively members of a Save the Children Association (SCA), registered in Switzerland. **Save The Children International (SCI)** is the UK registered charity presence of the umbrella body. It is therefore distinct from **The Save The Children Fund**, the UK member of SCA, with a separate board and auditor and draws up its accounts in US dollars. **SCI** undertakes the overseas operations and programmes of SCA members. All of its income is provided by member groups such as **The Save The Children Fund**.

For the purposes of this exercise, to avoid double-counting, **SCI** will be ignored, and the analysis confined to the other 49 regulated charities. Although **SCI** does enjoy the support of considerable UK public money, all of this has been on-gifted by **The Save The Children Fund**.

The Open University (based in Milton Keynes) turns out to be the sixth largest charity in Scotland.

<sup>16</sup> New SORP paras 1.1, 1.11, 4.5.

<sup>17</sup> Exemption from registration in England & Wales does not apply elsewhere, with the perverse result that, e.g.



### **3.2 How much public money do they receive?**

Table 2 lists the amounts of public money from UK central government departments, quangos and local authorities, which can be identified



from the accounts of the remaining top 49 charities. They are ranked in order of the proportion contributed to incoming resources. Charities also receive support through their various tax exemptions. Table 2 is concerned only with direct money transfers, such as grants or fees. The combined total comes to £3.1 billion, or 24% of their incoming resources.

One complication involves registered social housing providers. These charities are eligible for social housing grants and other capital awards to finance the construction of affordable homes. Specific statutory rules prescribe the accounting treatment. Instead of recognising grant income of £x and expenditure on house-building of £y, the grant is ignored and the entity is deemed to have spent £(y-x) on construction. The houses are recorded in the balance sheet at this net value alongside separate social housing grant reserves. Potentially, e.g. on a future sale of the houses in question, the grant could be reclaimed as a debt, unless the proceeds are recycled into further construction work.

A significant element of public financial support is therefore left out of the incoming resources recorded in Table 2. The fairest way to reflect this is to add back the balances of social housing (and similar) grants that have been given to derive a notional combined asset value for each charity. These amounts, shown in the table below, total just under £1.1 billion and are not included in the Table 2 figures.

The 49 Top Charities also receive £195m from various EU bodies (approx. 1.5% of resources) and a further £140m from foreign governments and international bodies such as the UN (approx. 1%). As would be expected, these funds are skewed towards charities with overseas interests, **Oxfam** and **The Save the Children Fund** being the largest recipients.

However the Table 2 figures are *minimum* amounts. A sum is only scored where a specific money amount in the charity accounts can be identified as coming from public sources. Of the 49 charities reviewed, only four (**Charities Aid Foundation; Church Commissioners; Legal Education Foundation; Lloyd's Register Foundation**) can be said with reasonable confidence to receive no direct public funding. In the case of nine charities, marked by an asterisk in Table 2, it is clear that they are in receipt of some form of public support but insufficient information is provided to enable this to be quantified. Although in the case of some, such as the **Royal National Lifeboat Institution**, the amount is likely to be trivial. For others such as the hospital provider **Nuffield Health** and the social landlord **Anchor Trust**, this will involve considerable sums of money.



Two observations may be made from a review of top charities' accounts.

Firstly, there is no consistency as to the precise meaning of "grant". Some charities regard it as a donation in their voluntary income. Alternatively, if the money enables the charity to expand their services, they may account for it as income derived from their Charitable Activities. There is confusion as to the boundary between a grant and a payment under a contract. It might be thought that this reflects the facts of each case, the terms of the payments and the reasons why they are paid. That is unlikely given the differences in accounting treatment between charities operating in the same sector.

Consider the six charities which operate Academy Schools. When a charity takes over an existing state school as a new Academy, there will be a transfer of the assets from the local authority and the charity will receive grants from the Department for Education. There is no consistency between the six charities as to whether these sums are gifts or rewards for services rendered, or even whether they have the same status. Indeed some charities appear to display considerable inconsistency in preparing their accounts. For 2011/12 **Woodard Corporation** decided that a £3.6m grant from DfE represented "*Appeal Income*" – a description typically used to describe the total proceeds raised from a large number of separate donations that were prompted by a specific appeal campaign.<sup>18</sup>

Secondly, the quality of disclosure about public funding is variable. Some charities, such as **Oxfam**, **The Save the Children Fund** and **The National Trust**,<sup>19</sup> provide complete lists of the organisations (public or private) which have made grants to them.

At the other end of the spectrum, **Wellcome Trust** and **Oasis Charitable Trust** simply state a total amount for "*grants*" and decline to breakdown the figure into amounts contributed by the UK public sector or identify the payer.

In particular there is far less transparency about the fees earned for Charitable Activities. The accounts might detail the major grants received but not state who pays for the services they operate. A good example here is **Marie Stopes International**, which identifies 15 grants totalling £73m, but does not explain where £86m for services comes from on the grounds that "*It is not possible to allocate this between countries on a consistent and reliable basis*".<sup>20</sup> It is impossible to be certain about the source of a considerable proportion of the top charities' incoming resources.

### 3.3 How much uncertainty is there?

Table 3 lists the sums received by top charities where the annual report and accounts indicate that grants or fees have been received but a specific figure is not identified. The whole of the smallest possible income stream is classified as an "uncertain item" and the charities are ranked in order of the proportion contributed to incoming resources. So, if a charity mentions that it has received a grant from a government department,

provide less than £150,000, who are named individually on page 77 of the accounts, but their grants are aggregated into a single sum; and (c) the Big Lottery Fund, each of whose grants are disclosed to the exact penny on page 77 irrespective of their size.

<sup>20</sup> Marie Stopes International accounts for 2012, page 21.

<sup>18</sup> Woodard Corporation accounts for 2012/13, reference to 2011/12 in Note 5 on page 46.

<sup>19</sup> Somewhat oddly, the National Trust discloses grants from public bodies in three categories: (a) those that provide £150,000 or more, whose grants are specified in Note 2 to the 2012/13 accounts on page 39; (b) those that



but does not list the grants it has received, all reported grant income is treated as uncertain. Equally, if the Financial Review states that the charity has contracts with local authorities but then does not sub-divide the fees it receives, all fees for that service are counted.

Although there are fewer top charities in this group (32), the combined total of uncertain items at £3.4 billion, is larger than the combined quantified public funding for the original full list of charities. It is also disquieting that, notwithstanding the instructions in the SORP, 16 charities are unclear about the source of more than 49% of their income.

In practice some of this unquantifiable uncertainty is probably not significant. It is unlikely that anyone is too concerned about how much money **RNLI** receives from local authorities for providing beach lifeguards, particularly since it is clear from the accounts that the charity is overwhelmingly funded by donations from individuals. Nor is it significant how much **Cancer Research UK** earns in royalty fees from the NHS for the use of anti-cancer drugs which have been developed by its research subsidiaries. That appears to be commercial income generated without donative intent.

Three of the community service providers, **Action for Children, Age UK** and **Royal Mencap**, do provide estimates of the proportion of their income which is funded from public sources (87%; 73% of training fee income; and over 90% respectively). Those levels suggest that in fact almost all of their uncertain items are met through public contracts for services. That may also be a fair guide to the true overall position for equivalent operations in **Barnardo's, Leonard Cheshire Disability** and **NSPCC** where the annual reports suggest that local authorities are major buyers of services, but the accounts

do not take the final step and make that explicitly clear, with an attached figure.

**Methodist Homes** estimate that half of their residents and customers receive welfare assistance in meeting fees. That may also be true of the other housing providers (**Anchor Trust, Peabody Trust, Wakefield & District Housing**) but since it is not equated to a proportion of income it provides no guidance as to the true level of public support the organisations receive. These charities might claim that it is unrealistic to expect them to know the precise social security position of each of their tenants. That is a fair point – except that in their annual reports they complain that the Coalition's welfare reforms have put their own incomes at risk by squeezing benefits for their customers. So it seems that they are able to judge the social security positions of their users for some purposes after all.

A similar defence could be mounted for the academics (**Canterbury Christ Church University, Cardiff University, University of South Wales**). Each of these reports an aggregate total for fees charged to UK and EU students without indicating how much is borne by the UK taxpayer through the schemes for encouraging higher education. It probably would be too onerous for these bodies to check and report on how each of their students paid for their tuition fees. But that does not excuse their failure to report how much they have received for running training courses for the NHS or for teachers.

In some cases it is quite clear that a charity is not trying to provide an open disclosure of the amount of public money it receives. In its annual report **The British Council** emphasises the cuts to its grant-in-aid support from government and stresses how they have forced the charity to be





enterprising in winning new contracts. It is also clear from the unaudited blurb in the report that many of these contracts have been made with the UK government, swapping income from one hand for income from another. Unfortunately they neglect to state how much of their contract earnings this switch represents. So it is impossible to judge what the true position of the UK taxpayer towards the charity is. This is particularly disappointing given that the charity is a public quango. **AQA Alliance** and **CfBT Education Trust** provide many pages extolling the professionalism of the services they provide. Yet they then neglect to detail who is paying for most of them.

The most remarkable reticence involves taking money from the NHS. The annual reports of **Nuffield Health**, **St Andrews' Healthcare** and **The Trustees of the London Clinic** explain at great length how much assistance they have rendered to the NHS by helping out with the treatment of patients through their specialist services. This is certainly true. The management of **Nuffield Health** acknowledge that the growth in their business with the public sector has helped them through a difficult patch of a decline in private insurance work.<sup>21</sup> However, not one of these charities appear to be able to put a price tag on how much their services cost the NHS. Indeed, **Marie Stopes International** openly refuses to do so.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Under the current accounting requirements it is not possible to accurately assess the level of public funding of most major charities in England & Wales. Of the Top 50 highest-income charities, 32 indicate in their annual reports that they receive public money, but it is impossible

for the reader to quantify. There is no consistency in reporting the type of public support received. There is a widespread failure to identify the amount of public support received.

Some charities do manage to provide reasonably comprehensive disclosure (**The National Trust**, **Oxfam**, **The Save The Children Fund**). Those are indeed large, high-earning organisations but these problems cannot be explained by the burdensome complexity which full disclosure would impose. None of the organisations considered in this paper is small or amateur, with annual turnover of over £122m they should be able to handle compliance matters. As Table 3 indicates there is no correlation between the size of the uncertain income whose source is unclear and the turnover of the charity. There *may* be a link between failure to quantify taxpayer support and whether a charity's end-customers depend on welfare benefits to afford its services. There is a more obvious link if the charity is engaged in politically controversial subjects such as education and NHS reform.

Unfortunately it is unlikely that the New SORP, coming into force in 2015, will solve these problems. The New SORP will include a welcome clarification about the distinction between a grant for core funding and a fee for services, and hence the category under which taxpayer support should be reported by a charity. However that will not by itself make charities any more ready to quantify individual items of such funding. The New SORP will only succeed in shifting unquantified uncertain items from one part of the Statement of Financial

---

<sup>21</sup> Nuffield Health accounts for 2012/13, Trading Report, page 8.



Activities to another, or perhaps defer a failure to disclose into a later year.

Why does this matter? There are three reasons.

The first, and most obvious, is one of democratic accountability. If charities are being supported to a considerable extent by public money, then taxpayers have a right to know that and to know it from the charities themselves. This is particularly relevant if there is opacity in declaring public support in politically contentious areas such as NHS services and Academy schools.

Secondly there is also a valid concern for the health of the charitable sector itself. Accounting standards such as the SORP are there for a reason. If large charities are dependent for most of their income on public funds then ultimately they are dependent upon someone having made a political decision in their favour. Political decisions can change. They are more likely to do so in an environment where the public finances are under considerable pressure. We saw in the financial crisis what happens when a sector's accounting practices obscure the underlying robustness of its sources of income. When a charity is similarly dependent on a single source, that potential fragility should be obvious on the face of its accounts.

Lastly a wider question is raised about the role of the charitable sector. Once a private charity has undertaken services for a long time while dependent upon receiving public funds, the line between the public and private sectors begins to blur. It blurs in two ways. At some point does the

organisation cease to be a private body? More fundamentally does it cease to be a charity?

Consider **Marie Stopes International**. The charity's accounts do not specify the actual salary of their highest-paid employee (presumably the Chief Executive), but it is over £290,000. Additionally the accounts show that there are a further ten people employed each with earnings over £100,000.<sup>22</sup> The charity has 6,000 employees working in 38 countries around the world<sup>23</sup> and a turnover of over £173 million. The organisation has a strategic plan which "*sets out ambitious goals for Marie Stopes International in terms of health impact, organisational capacity building and enhanced revenue generation.*"<sup>24</sup> This involves strategies to "*dramatically expand*" services available to their "*clients*", "*building institutional capacity*" and "*forging enduring connections with governments*". They have discovered management-speak: "*Our team members are kept fully informed of the organisation's strategy and objectives. Their individual performance is reviewed at least twice a year and learning and development is an integral part of the staff appraisal process. All managers attend the Performance Plus Management Programme to create a supportive environment and ensure proper performance management.*"<sup>25</sup>

When the distinction between charity and corporation has become so blurred, it is vital that complete transparency is maintained regarding the quantity of funds received and the sources from which those funds were acquired.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

---

<sup>22</sup> Marie Stopes International accounts for 2012, Note 5, page 23.

<sup>23</sup> Marie Stopes International accounts for 2012, page 4.

<sup>24</sup> Marie Stopes International accounts for 2012, page 7.

<sup>25</sup> Marie Stopes International account for 2012, page 12.



As part of the consultation process over the New SORP there were representations that charities ought to disclose the level of income they receive from government. The SORP Committee overseeing the process rejected this suggestion: *“To require a parallel analysis by funder would be burdensome.”*<sup>26</sup> In doing so the SORP Committee (comprising three regulators; five finance directors of charities; four auditors of charities; and four professional advisers to charities) overruled the advice of their own Secretariat.

Furthermore the decision was disingenuous. Of course it would be undesirable for charities to draw up a completely separate second Statement of Financial Activities, divided by funding provider and parallel to one divided by type of income (Voluntary, Charitable Activities, etc.) Rather, all that would be required is a list of grants, identifying payer and amount – as some charities already manage – and a credible understanding of who pays for the services it provides.

The burdens of regulation should not be dismissed. It is a valid point that it would be too burdensome to require a charity to track the amount of welfare benefits used by purchasers of their services. Realistically it can be inferred that a provider of social housing will have tenants who rely upon housing benefit, or a university will have some students who have used public assistance to pay their tuition fees. But it is important to know when a public body has a contractual relationship with a charity for it to make a service available to such clients.

It is now too late to alter the New SORP. But that may not be necessary. The provisions it contains are more than adequate to ensure sufficiently comprehensive disclosure –

provided that charities comply with them in the spirit in which they are intended (as they have clearly not complied with the spirit of the current SORP). That can be enforced by a suitable accounts direction from the Charity Commission.

Large charities should disclose the total amount of public money which they receive. The sub-totals derived from central government, local government, and other agencies and quangos (including the Lottery) should be disclosed separately.

Under the New SORP, the auditors will have to review the terms on which money is received in order to comply with the disclosure requirements of the Statement of Financial Activities, in particular distinguishing more clearly the forms of incoming resources. It is difficult to understand how auditors can review each item of income without noticing who has paid it to the charity. The additional burden of repeating these names and numbers in the Notes to the Accounts ought to be minimal.

Larger charities also have to prepare a financial review which discusses the principal sources of funding and any threats to their continuation. If public bodies represent a principal source then these funds are supplied for ultimately political reasons, and therefore they could alter after an election.

It makes sense to reflect the differing vulnerability of the payments by distinguishing between the forms of authority which contributed the funds. Central and local government work to their own different cycles. The quangos in between often seem to inhabit a world of their own. Government departments and agencies ought to be identified individually,

---

<sup>26</sup> SORP Committee Minutes for 24 January 2014, para 3.11



but it might be acceptable for all local councils to be aggregated together.

Where a charity is in receipt of resources from more than one type of public authority, this tends to be for different activities which would now have to be reported separately in the Statement of Financial Activities anyway. It should not create a significant additional compliance burden whether public money is a principal source of funding or not. Any material increase in the work required for a large charity to complete the accounts will come from the adoption of the New SORP, not from higher standards of transparency concerning taxpayers' money.

After all, ultimately the funding is being provided by taxpayers, not the charities' themselves. Thus the source of such funding should be transparent and in the public domain.

**Table 1: TOP 50 REGULATED CHARITIES BY INCOMING RESOURCES**

	<b>CHARITY</b>	<b>ACCOUNTS</b>	<b>INCOME (£000)</b>	<b>STATUS</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>
1	Lloyd's Register Foundation	30/06/2013	951,392		Promotion of engineering research
2	The British Council	31/03/2013	781,289	Public body	Promotion of British culture
3	The Arts Council Of England	31/03/2013	746,425	Public body	Promotion of the Arts (Lottery distributor)
4	Canal & River Trust	31/03/2013	680,500	Public body	Operates inland waterways
5	Nuffield Health	31/12/2013	661,600		Medical services
6	Cancer Research UK	31/03/2013	536,557		Promotion of medical research
7	The National Trust For Places Of Historic Interest Or Natural Beauty	28/02/2013	456,926		Heritage and conservation
8	Cardiff University	31/07/2013	436,685		Education and research
9	The Charities Aid Foundation	30/04/2013	384,747		Promotion of other charities
10	Oxfam	31/03/2013	367,900		Humanitarian intervention
11	United Church Schools Foundation Ltd	31/08/2013	322,727		Schools
12	The Save The Children Fund	31/12/2012	283,748		Humanitarian intervention/child welfare
13	Wellcome Trust	30/09/2013	281,489		Promotion of bioscience research
14	Anchor Trust	31/03/2013	274,974		Social housing provider/care homes
15	CITB	31/12/2013	273,659	Public body	Training provider
16	British Heart Foundation	31/03/2013	263,607		Promotion of medical research
17	Barnardo's	31/03/2013	258,112		Child welfare
18	The Girls' Day School Trust	31/08/2013	233,553		Schools
19	The British Red Cross Society	31/12/2013	228,400		Humanitarian intervention/first aid
20	The Ormiston Trust	31/08/2013	222,679		Schools/child welfare
21	Big Local Trust	31/03/2013	216,354	Near to Govmt	Community development (Lottery distributor)
22	Save The Children International	31/12/2012	213,479		Humanitarian intervention/child welfare
23	CfBT Education Trust	31/03/2013	197,340		Schools
24	Royal Mencap Society	31/03/2013	196,584		Support for the disabled/residential care
25	University Of South Wales/Prifysgol De Cymru	31/07/2013	192,541		Education and research
26	The Royal National Lifeboat Institution	31/12/2012	191,034		Maritime rescue
27	The Salvation Army	31/03/2013	181,516		Poverty relief/religious services
28	Action for Children	31/03/2013	180,029		Child welfare/adoption services

29	<b>Methodist Homes</b>	31/03/2013	179,697		Social housing provider/care homes
30	<b>St Andrew's Healthcare</b>	31/03/2013	178,000		Mental care hospitals
31	<b>Marie Stopes International</b>	31/12/2012	173,412		Abortion clinics
32	<b>The Woodard Corporation</b>	31/08/2013	169,160		Schools
33	<b>JISC</b>	31/07/2013	163,718	Near to Govmt	Promotion of information sharing
34	<b>Oasis Charitable Trust</b>	31/08/2013	160,323		Schools/community centres/religious services
35	<b>Leonard Cheshire Disability</b>	31/03/2013	159,922		Support for the disabled/residential care
36	<b>Age UK</b>	31/03/2013	158,897		Care of the elderly
37	<b>Royal Commonwealth Society For The Blind</b>	31/12/2012	158,629		Treatment of the blind
38	<b>Macmillan Cancer Support</b>	31/12/2012	155,688		Treatment of cancer sufferers
39	<b>AQA Education</b>	30/09/2013	152,814		Provision of public exams
40	<b>The Legal Education Foundation</b>	31/07/2013	149,412		Promotion of legal education
41	<b>Marie Curie Cancer Care</b>	31/03/2013	148,952		Treatment of cancer sufferers
42	<b>Church Commissioners For England</b>	31/12/2013	139,700	Public body	Clergy welfare
43	<b>Royal Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Animals</b>	31/12/2012	132,803		Animal welfare
44	<b>Wakefield And District Housing Limited</b>	31/03/2013	131,832	Near to Govmt	Social housing provider
45	<b>Trustees Of The London Clinic Limited</b>	31/12/2012	131,173		Medical services
46	<b>The National Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Children</b>	31/03/2013	129,432		Child welfare
47	<b>The Royal British Legion</b>	30/09/2013	124,558		Servicemen's welfare
48	<b>Peabody Trust</b>	31/03/2013	123,146		Social housing provider
49	<b>Canterbury Christ Church University</b>	31/07/2013	122,970		Education and research
50	<b>Royal Society For The Protection Of Birds</b>	31/03/2013	122,114		Wildlife and conservation
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>13,482,198</b>		

---

**Table 2: QUANTIFIABLE UK TAXPAYER SUPPORT FOR THE TOP CHARITIES**



	CHARITY	INCOME (£000)	PUBLIC SUPPORT (£000)		NOTES
1	<b>The Arts Council Of England</b>	746,425	742,943	99.5%	Govmt/quango grants + National Lottery Distribution
2	<b>Big Local Trust</b>	216,354	214,499	99.1%	Big Lottery Fund grants for on-grant to community groups
3	<b>The Ormiston Trust</b>	222,679	214,935	96.5%	DfE grants; transfer of Academy school assets
4	<b>Canal &amp; River Trust</b>	680,500	587,700	86.4%	Transfer of British Waterways Board assets; DEFRA grants
5	<b>JISC</b>	163,718	130,001	79.4%	HE Funding Body grants; transfer of public assets
6	<b>United Church Schools Foundation Ltd</b>	322,727	229,186	71.0%	DfE grants; transfer of Academy school assets
7	<b>CITB</b>	273,659	175,985	64.3%	Statutory levy on construction industry plus some grants
8	<b>Cardiff University</b>	436,685	193,023	44.2%	Funding Body grants; research & training contracts (NHS)
9	<b>Marie Curie Cancer Care</b>	148,952	44,305	29.7%	Dept of Health/NHS funding for nurses and hospices
10	<b>Oasis Charitable Trust</b>	160,323	46,200	28.8%	Local authority transfer of Academy school assets
11	<b>University Of South Wales/Prifysgol De Cymru</b>	192,541	54,161	28.1%	Funding Body grants; research & training contracts (NHS)
12	<b>Canterbury Christ Church University</b>	122,970	30,647	24.9%	Funding Body grants; research & training contracts
13	<b>The British Council</b>	781,289	179,326	23.0%	Govmt/quango grants
14	<b>CfBT Education Trust</b>	197,340	42,414	21.5%	Local authority transfer of Academy school assets
15	<b>The Woodard Corporation</b>	169,160	25,583	15.1%	DfE grants for Academy schools
16	<b>Royal Society For The Protection Of Birds</b>	122,114	16,119	13.2%	Grants from central/devolved, agencies, councils, Lottery
17	<b>Marie Stopes International</b>	173,412	21,053	12.1%	DfID grants
18	<b>The Save The Children Fund</b>	283,748	33,768	11.9%	DfID/FCO/Lottery grants +councils and devolved govmt
19	<b>Oxfam</b>	367,900	38,262	10.4%	DfID/UK Govmt grants
20	<b>The British Red Cross Society</b>	228,400	21,575	9.4%	DfID/Lottery grants
21	<b>The National Trust For Places Of Historic Interest Or Natural Beauty</b>	456,926	35,553	7.8%	Grants from central/devolved, agencies, councils, Lottery
22	<b>Barnardo's</b>	258,112	14,163	5.5%	Grants from central/devolved, agencies, councils, Lottery
23	<b>The National Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Children</b>	129,432	6,524	5.0%	Fees for services from statutory bodies
24	<b>The Girls' Day School Trust</b>	233,553	9,441	4.0%	DfE grants for Academy schools
25	<b>Age UK</b>	158,897	4,942	3.1%	Grants from central/devolved, agencies, councils, Lottery
26	<b>Royal Commonwealth Society For The Blind</b>	158,629	4,655	2.9%	DfID/Scottish Govmt grants

27	<b>Royal Mencap Society</b>	196,584	4,961	2.5%	Grants from central/devolved, agencies, councils, Lottery
28	<b>Action for Children</b>	180,029	3,305	1.8%	Mainly local authority fees for child welfare services
29	<b>Peabody Trust</b>	123,146	2,144	1.7%	Lottery/local authority grants for community regeneration
30	<b>The Salvation Army</b>	181,516	1,862	1.0%	Local authority grants for community regeneration
31	<b>The Royal British Legion</b>	124,558	909	0.7%	MOD grant for servicemen's welfare
32	<b>Wakefield And District Housing Limited</b>	131,832	773	0.6%	Housing grant
33	<b>Leonard Cheshire Disability</b>	159,922	836	0.5%	DfID/Scottish Govmt/Lottery grants
34	<b>Macmillan Cancer Support</b>	155,688	656	0.4%	Dept of Health/Scottish Govmt/Lottery grants
35	<b>British Heart Foundation</b>	263,607	170	0.1%	MOD/Scottish Govmt grants
36	<b>Methodist Homes</b>	179,697	103	0.1%	Lottery grant
37	<b>Nuffield Health</b>	661,600	*		Hospital services provided to NHS
38	<b>Cancer Research UK</b>	536,557	*		Possibly NHS pays for use of anti-cancer drugs
39	<b>Wellcome Trust</b>	281,489	*		Grants for research projects
40	<b>Anchor Trust</b>	274,974	*		Registered social housing provided to welfare recipients
41	<b>The Royal National Lifeboat Institution</b>	191,034	*		Some lifeguard income comes from local authorities
42	<b>St Andrew's Healthcare</b>	178,000	*		Hospital services provided to NHS
43	<b>AQA Education</b>	152,814	*		Fees for examination services
44	<b>Royal Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Animals</b>	132,803	*		Fees for training schemes
45	<b>Trustees Of The London Clinic Limited</b>	131,173	*		Hospital services provided to NHS/MOD
46	<b>Lloyd's Register Foundation</b>	951,392	0	0.0%	
47	<b>The Charities Aid Foundation</b>	384,747	0	0.0%	
48	<b>The Legal Education Foundation</b>	149,412	0	0.0%	
49	<b>Church Commissioners For England</b>	139,700	0	0.0%	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,268,719</b>	<b>3,132,683</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	

---



**Table 3: UNQUANTIFIABLE UK TAXPAYER SUPPORT FOR THE TOP CHARITIES**

	CHARITY	INCOME (£000)	UNCERTAIN FUNDING (£000)		SOURCE OF UNCERTAINTY
1	Trustees Of The London Clinic Limited	131,173	131,064	99.9%	Failure to state fees earned from NHS
2	AQA Education	152,814	151,726	99.3%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
3	St Andrew's Healthcare	178,000	174,800	98.2%	Support from NHS and Education Funding Agency
4	Anchor Trust	274,974	264,851	96.3%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
5	Wakefield And District Housing Limited	131,832	124,583	94.5%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
6	Royal Mencap Society	196,584	179,023	91.1%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
7	Leonard Cheshire Disability	159,922	143,742	89.9%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
8	Action for Children	180,029	157,514	87.5%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
9	Peabody Trust	123,146	105,522	85.7%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
10	Nuffield Health	661,600	456,600	69.0%	Failure to state fees earned from NHS
11	The British Council	781,289	525,084	67.2%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
12	Oasis Charitable Trust	160,323	105,408	65.7%	Unclear source of grants
13	CfBT Education Trust	197,340	117,242	59.4%	No attempt to quantify public support whatsoever.
14	Barnardo's	258,112	142,187	55.1%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
15	Canterbury Christ Church University	122,970	65,067	52.9%	NHS contracts, funding for UK students
16	Marie Stopes International	173,412	85,876	49.5%	Refuses to disclose source.
17	Methodist Homes	179,697	77,679	43.2%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
18	University Of South Wales/Prifysgol De Cymru	192,541	81,099	42.1%	NHS contracts, funding for UK students, research training
19	Royal Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Animals	132,803	46,264	34.8%	Lack of disclosure over source of funds and fee payments
20	Cardiff University	436,685	98,094	22.5%	NHS contracts, funding for UK students, research training
21	JISC	163,718	33,378	20.4%	Unclear whether fees passed on to public funding bodies
22	The British Red Cross Society	228,400	44,000	19.3%	Fees/contract work paid by UK public sources.
23	The Royal British Legion	124,558	13,274	10.7%	Unclear proportion of residential care fees met by welfare
24	Wellcome Trust	281,489	16,900	6.0%	Failure to specify split of grants received UK/EU/US

25	Royal Society For The Protection Of Birds	122,114	5,615	4.6%	Unclear how much public support/grants for land use
26	Age UK	158,897	6,628	4.2%	Unspecified training course income
27	The National Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Children	129,432	2,445	1.9%	Unclear extent of fees paid by local authorities
28	The Royal National Lifeboat Institution	191,034	3,400	1.8%	Some lifeguard income comes from local authorities
29	Canal & River Trust	680,500	10,600	1.6%	Unspecified grants
30	The National Trust For Places Of Historic Interest Or Natural Beauty	456,926	1,213	0.3%	Unspecified grants
31	The Ormiston Trust	222,679	208	0.1%	Unspecified grants
32	Cancer Research UK	536,557	*		Possibly NHS pays for use of anti-cancer drugs
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13,482,198</b>	<b>3,371,085</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	

---

## SOME RECENT CPS PUBLICATIONS

**How Much Do We Use the NHS?** by Jesse Norman and Museji Takolia

“Healthcare statements would force the NHS to become more rigorous about cost assessment, attribution and control”  
– *The Financial Times*

**Introducing Education Savings Plans** by Henry Cobbe and Alexandra Grant

“Tax-free savings accounts should be set up for babies to pay for university fees, according to a centre-right think-tank”  
– *The Times*

**NICs: The End Should Be Nigh** by Michael Johnson

“[T]he Treasury will be forced to raid income tax receipts to ensure old-age payouts continue, according to the influential Centre for Policy Studies”  
– *The Daily Telegraph*

**There IS a Cost of Living Crisis** by Tim Morgan

“The cost of living crisis has been going on since Labour were still in power, a think tank says”  
– *The Sun*

**The Cost of Labour** by Adam Memon

“A report today from the Centre for Policy Studies calculates that Labour’s tax proposals could result in 306,500 fewer jobs over the following four years”  
– *The Daily Mail*

**Oil, Finance and Pensions** by Tim Morgan

“A report published today by a leading think-tank suggests that the Yes campaign has underestimated the financial risks of separation”  
– *The Independent*

**The Road from Serfdom** by Maurice Saatchi

“Ditch levy on small firms, says Lord Saatchi: Former Tory chairman says Cameron should abolish tax so companies can compete with larger businesses”  
– headline in *The Daily Mail*

**SuperEntrepreneurs – and how your country can get them** by Tino and Nima Sanandaji

“Britain has only produced 22 British billionaire entrepreneurs between 1996 and 2010 and the Centre for Policy Studies has blamed high tax and red tape for the lack of wealthy self-made Britons”

– *International Business Times*

**Retirement Savings Incentives** by Michael Johnson

“Pension tax breaks are 'ineffective' and 'inequitable', and should be replaced with a state handout of 50p for every £1 saved, according to ... Michael Johnson, an academic at think tank the Centre for Policy Studies”  
– *The Daily Telegraph*

**Why every serious environmentalist should favour fracking** by Richard and Elizabeth Muller

“A report published by the Centre for Policy Studies argues that fracking could help reduce the global death toll from air pollution, particularly in China, where heavy reliance on dirty coal-fired power stations contributes to an estimated 1.2 million premature deaths annually”

– *The Times*

**Double up on Heathrow** by Jock Lowe and Mark Bostock

“A report by the Centre of Policy Studies said ... that Heathrow's existing runways should be nearly doubled to 7,000 metres so that they each provide two, full-length, runways”

– *Reuters*

**Rail's Second Chance** by Tony Lodge

“Think-tank slams lack of competition on railways”

– headline in *The Independent*



## THE CENTRE FOR POLICY STUDIES

The Centre for Policy Studies is one of Britain's best-known and most respected think tanks. Independent from all political parties and pressure groups, it consistently advocates a distinctive case for smaller, less intrusive Government, with greater freedom and responsibility for individuals, families, business and the voluntary sector.

Through our Associate Membership scheme, we welcome supporters who take an interest in our work. Associate Membership is available for £100 a year. Becoming an Associate will entitle you to all CPS publications produced in a 12-month period; invitations to lectures and conferences; advance notice by e-mail of our publications, briefing papers and invitations to special events.

Please contact Jenny Nicholson for more details:

Jenny Nicholson  
Deputy Director, Events and Fundraising  
Centre for Policy Studies  
57 Tufton Street  
London SW1P 3QL  
020 7222 4488  
jenny@cps.org.uk

*The aim of the Centre for Policy Studies is to develop and promote policies that provide freedom and encouragement for individuals to pursue the aspirations they have for themselves and their families, within the security and obligations of a stable and law-abiding nation. The views expressed in our publications are, however, the sole responsibility of the authors. Contributions are chosen for their value in informing public debate and should not be taken as representing a corporate view of the CPS or of its Directors. The CPS values its independence and does not carry on activities with the intention of affecting public support for any registered political party or for candidates at election, or to influence voters in a referendum.*





## THE AUTHOR

William Norton is a non-practising solicitor. He is co-author of *The Case for Reducing Business Taxes* (CPS, 2006) and author of *Paying for the Credit Crunch* (TPA, 2009) and *Monument and Bank: Capitalism and the Anglo-Saxon Mind* (SAV, 2011). He was the technical adviser for *The Road from Serfdom* by Maurice Saatchi (CPS, 2014).

### ***Acknowledgment***

*The author would like to thank Frank Richard Smith for his advice and encouragement in the writing of this paper.*

ISBN 978-1-910627-02-0

© Centre for Policy Studies, January 2014