



2015 Landfill Communities Fund (LCF)

Project Applicant Survey

Overview

Published December 2015

1. Introduction

In 2015 we undertook a sector wide survey of project applicants with the following aims:

- gather information on project applicants experience of the Landfill Communities Fund (LCF);
- ascertain how easy or difficult project applicants found applying for and accessing LCF funding from Environmental Bodies (EBs) and Landfill Operators (LOs);
- investigate any barriers experienced by project applicants in accessing LCF funding; and
- gather information that will support the future regulation and development of the LCF.

2. Overview

The LCF Project Applicant survey was sent to project deliverers that had received LCF funds and completed one, or more projects, funded by the LCF, between 1 April 2013 and 31 March 2015. This represented a potential distribution list of 4,842 projects. Project deliverers were permitted to complete multiple surveys – one per each project completed, if they wished to.

The survey was completed using the online survey tool SurveyMonkey. It was launched on 10 August and ran until 13 September 2015. Across this period we received 1,002 responses to the survey. More than 350 respondents requested a reply to the feedback they gave in the survey and these were completed by 25 November 2015.

Members of the LCF Communications Forum were sent a draft copy of the survey for their comment and feedback. This resulted in several of the questions being revised based on the information and feedback we received. The survey included a total of 33 questions, however, as respondents were only directed to answer questions relevant to them the vast majority of respondents will have answered fewer questions.

We circulated the survey to project applicants via contact details held by ENTRUST, or via the funding EB. We worked closely with funding EBs to ensure maximum distribution of the survey to project applicants and we had an excellent response from the majority of funding EBs. The total distribution list was 4,842 – however, since distribution was dependent on funding EBs it is not possible to ascertain the total actually distributed. The survey was publicised through news items posted on our website and all staff included details of the survey within their corporate signature when issuing emails. We also tweeted details of the survey.

At the close of the survey we had received 1,002 responses to the survey.

3. Summary of the findings

For 56 per cent of respondents this was their first project with LCF funding. The vast majority (89 per cent) of project applicants only had one source of LCF funding for their project. A further 8.7 per cent had two funders, 1.7 per cent had three LCF funders and just 0.6 per cent had four or more LCF funders.

When asked about the biggest barrier to accessing LCF funding, just over 45 per cent said that they didn't experience any barriers to accessing LCF funding. Following this the largest hurdles were finding a Contributing Third Party (CTP), completing funding forms and the application process in general. Broadly, applicants' experience of the funder's application process was a positive one, although there was a significant minority who found the application process overly bureaucratic (17.7 per cent).

Three in five (60.5 per cent) projects claimed to have received funding from other organisations. When asked about how easy it was to access funding from the LCF compared to non-LCF funders, the majority (57 per cent) felt it was 'about the same'. Almost one quarter (24 per cent) felt that it was 'much harder to access funding from the LCF', whilst a slightly lower number (19 per cent) felt it was 'much easier to access funding from the LCF'.

Finally, project applicants reported a very strong sense of support for the LCF when asked to agree, or disagree with statements relating to the outcomes of their project and whether they would either recommend, or use LCF funding in the future. 90 per cent of respondents claimed that their project could not have happened without LCF funding and 51 per cent claimed that securing LCF funding helped them to secure other funding for the project. However, a notable 15 per cent agreed with the statement that 'The LCF is too bureaucratic'.

4. Feedback

Respondents were asked to give their feedback and comments about their experiences with the LCF. 692 comments were given and these were very positive about the scheme. Projects expressed praise for their funders and many took the time to tell us about the difference the funding has made to their local community – from village halls being brought back to life, bringing the community together, to war memorials, which have allowed old and young to come together to reflect as a community on the sacrifice made by our forefathers. There was also praise for what respondents felt was one of the few remaining sources of biodiversity funding.

More than 350 survey respondents asked for a reply to the feedback they gave. These were split into one third of queries, or comments about CTP, one third of queries or comments about the completion of forms (primarily funder's forms rather than ENTRUSTs) and the final third were general comments about the fund and the strong benefits the project applicants felt that the LCF delivered to their local communities or environment.

[A report showing the charted results is available on our website](#)