During 2014, Catalyst Balkans tracked media reports on domestic individual, corporate and diaspora philanthropy in Serbia. This brochure provides key statistics on the findings of this research.
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During 2014, Catalyst Balkans tracked media reports on domestic individual, corporate and diaspora philanthropy in Serbia. This brochure provides key statistics on the findings of this research.
The amount of donated funds is only negligibly higher than in 2013. However, given that large amounts were also donated for assistance for flood relief, it is reasonable to assume that, without the floods, the change recorded would be higher than the current 1.8%.

In 2014 the most active donors were mass individual donations (46.0%), followed by individuals (18.8%) and the corporate sector (companies, small and medium size enterprises and corporate foundations) at 18.0%.

If we look into donated amounts the picture changes significantly: the corporate sector then led with a 34.4% share of the total published amount, followed by mixed donors (through campaigns) with 22.3%, individuals with 13.0%, mass individual donations at 12.7% and private foundations with 10.9%.

When we analyze the diaspora, the percentage of instances is high (18.5%), while the published amount only amounts to approximately 5.3%.

These shifts show that individuals continue to take part in mass individual giving, although with smaller amounts most likely due to the prevailing economic conditions. At the same time, the corporate sector is less active, but donates larger amounts. If this trend continues, it will suggest more strategic investments by the corporate sector – more careful selection of actions but larger funds invested – which may bring about greater change.
### Profiles of the Most Common Types of Donors

#### TOP 3 RECIPIENT ENTITIES
- **Institutions**: 46.4%
- **Nonprofit Organizations**: 20.5%
- **Individuals / Families**: 18.7%

#### TOP 3 THEMES FOR GIVING
- **Support to Marg. Groups**: 24.4%
- **Education**: 22.6%
- **Healthcare**: 15.1%

#### TOP 3 FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS
- **Adults and Children From Local Communities**: 25.6%
- **Adults and Children With Disabilities**: 15.1%
- **Adults and Children With Health Issues**: 12.7%
An interesting example of dedication to long term giving comes from Imlek, which signed an agreement on cooperation with Svratište, a shelter for children. Over the whole year, Imlek supplied a certain quantity of products on monthly basis. This example demonstrates the trend toward greater investment into carefully selected activities.

An example of one-off support with long-term effects comes from the NIS company, which supported the development of an internet portal for people with visual disabilities that contained more than 2,500 audio-books.

Concern Bambi allocated one dinar for each Juhu product sold and donated the funds thus collected to local communities throughout Serbia.

In the context of the Love Heals campaign initiated by NURDOR, the Chemotherapy Pediatric Clinic and Clinical Center Nis received a valuable donation of equipment from the NIS company.

Finally, although 2014 was marked by the floods, it is also worth noting the efficient response of companies when the people of Uzice faced a shortage of water because of pollution of the water system. Companies such as CocaCola, Knjaz Miloš, Voda Voda, Heba, Minaqua, and Brzmin alleviated the water-shortage by donating bottled water.
MASS INDIVIDUAL
Profiles of the Most Common Types of Donors

TOP 3 RECIPIENT ENTITIES
- Individuals / Families: 55.5%
- Nonprofit Organizations: 22.0%
- Institutions: 17.2%

TOP 3 THEMES FOR GIVING
- Healthcare: 46.2%
- Poverty Reduction: 26.0%
- Support to Marg. Groups: 14.7%

TOP 3 FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS
- Adults and Children With Health Issues: 39.6%
- Adults and Children With Disabilities: 15.6%
- Economically Vulnerable Adults and Children: 13.6%
Hido Muratović of Novi Pazar has been a well-known donor for years. Over the years, he supported numerous families in Novi Pazar and its surroundings by donating cash and goods to facilitate their survival and providing assistance in the building of houses or obtaining books and gifts for children.

In 2014, some twenty people from Sandžak living in Switzerland bought a car for Hido so that he could easily reach those in need.

An interesting example of philanthropy was the result of an accidental meeting between Bujara Nedžepija and Srđan Trajković while queuing for documents. Srdjan, a wheel-chair user, helped Bujara communicate with local authorities. To thank him, Bujar donated an electric wheel-chair to the Vranje Association of People with Paraplegia.

While pupils and older students most frequently help their peers either to access medical treatment or improve their living conditions, there are also other types of examples.

The pupils of the Kralj Petar II school in Užice organized the sale of cookies and drinks, floral decorations and pictures they painted themselves to mark the school’s 130th anniversary. The funds they collected were donated to the school for the purchase of teaching equipment and devices.

The Youth Chamber of Niš organized a basketball tournament and donated the funds to the Sreten Mladenović Mika School for its reconstruction and the purchase of new equipment.
The data on how donations in certain themes have been used provide deeper insight into whether they are one-off (humanitarian-type) support or aim to provide a longer-term solution to problems.

In line with the methodology and published data, we divided the use of donations into three categories: long-term investments, one-off donations and donations for unknown purposes. Information on these categories is presented in the following graphs.

**LONG-TERM DEDICATION TO GIVING**

The most frequent strategic investments in Serbia are investments in equipment and/or the reconstruction of buildings.

As an example we would mention Microsoft which supplied equipment to the Petnica Science Center that provides informal, extracurricular science education to talented students and their teachers, thus simultaneously enhancing the development of science and research in Serbia.

The **TE-TO Sugar factory of Senta** donated significant funds to schools in several Vojvodina towns.

The **Hemofarm Foundation** donated equipment to the Belgrade Medical Faculty to enhance research in the field of cardiological diseases.
**KEY THEMES FOR GIVING**

**34.8%**

**HEALTHCARE**

**24.3%**

**SUPPORT TO MARGINALIZED GROUPS**

**20.1%**

**POVERTY REDUCTION**

**6.3%**

**EDUCATION**

**BREAKDOWN OF OTHER THEMES (% of Instances)**

- **below 0.5%**
  - Community Development
  - Economic Development
  - Environment
  - Public Infrastructure
  - Religious Activities
  - Science

- **from 0.5 - 1%**
  - Animal welfare
  - Assistance in Emergencies
  - Cultural Heritage

- **from 1 - 3%**
  - Culture and Art
  - Sport

- **over 5%**
  - Seasonal Giving

**CHANGES IN THE KEY THEMES FOR GIVING 2011 - 2014 (% of Instances)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Marg. Groups</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Reduction</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The state as recipient includes local and/or national authorities and institutions. If we combine the data for these recipients we observe a drop in comparison to 2013.

In terms of the percentage of instances involving the state as a recipient, a slight drop of 6.1% is noted in comparison to 2013. When we explore the percentage of donated funds based on published amount, the decrease exceeds 22% (from 73.4% in 2013 the amount dropped to 50.6% in 2014).
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BREAKDOWN OF OTHER FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS (by % of Instances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>from 0.5 - 1%</th>
<th>from 1 - 2%</th>
<th>from 2 - 5%</th>
<th>over 5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Parents</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>General Population</td>
<td>Children without Parental Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and Children Survivors of Violence</td>
<td>Talented Children and Youth</td>
<td>Children and Youth at Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Survivors of Trafficking</td>
<td>Mothers and Newborns</td>
<td>People from Other Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRENDS IN KEY FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS – 2011 to 2014 (by % of Instances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with Health Issues</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Vulnerable</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People With Disabilities</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from Specific Communities</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given that the value of the donation in Serbia was reported in only 35.8% of the instances, estimation about the total amount donated is made by extrapolation based on the known data. For more information, please find the full report at: www.catalystbalkans.org

Kosovo’s designation in this document is without prejudice to position on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

The 2014 Annual Report on the State of Philanthropy in Serbia is part of a broader initiative to promote and stimulate philanthropy in the region carried out by the Catalyst Foundation. The underlying research and this publication were created by Catalyst Foundation (Catalyst Balkans) and with the generous support of the C. S. Mott Foundation and Balkan Trust for Democracy (BTD).
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