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Dear friends,

Catalyst and Trag Foundation are pleased to present to you the 2016 Annual Report on the State of Philanthropy in Serbia. As in previous years, the report presents the data for the entire year and, wherever possible, indicates the trends in giving for certain indicators over the years. We hope that this data will be both useful and of interest to you as added information on the development of philanthropic trends in our country.

The data in this report shows that there were not any significant changes compared to 2015. The total number of recorded instances of giving was 3,270, slightly higher than last year. 2016’s total estimated value of giving is 21.2 million EUR, given for wide range of themes, recipients and final beneficiaries, which is 4.9% lower than in 2015.

In 2016, mass individual giving by citizens continued to be the most active donor type, even increasing their percentage of the total donated sum. The corporate sector strengthened its activities, which reflected in an increased number of recorded instances. However, the corporate sector’s share of the overall estimated value of giving slightly decreased from last year. 2016 was also characterized by an increase in giving that result from a mixed type of donors and by a decrease in the total donated sum of both individuals and the diaspora.

Healthcare, support to marginalized groups and poverty reduction remained the most frequent themes of giving. Yet, we note that there was a higher percentage of philanthropy in 2016 focused towards education, primarily in scholarships. 2016 was marked by an equalization of interest in the key beneficiary groups and an increased interest in some of the previously less represented beneficiary groups. Investments in the state remained almost at the same level as in 2015 in relation to number of instances, while the donated amount was slightly decreased. The most significant and maybe the most positive change in comparison with 2015 is the continued slight increase in the number of donations directed to non-profit organizations and a significant increase in value of donations directed to the nonprofit sector. Although this increase was triggered by the successful campaigns of four non-profit organizations, it reflected an increased trust in nonprofit organizations by donors. Finally, in 2016 the trend of a slight increase of donations with potentially long-term effects continued, consequently the number of one-off instances decreased.

Generally speaking, although the year 2016 was the first year without an increase in giving, this change suggested that it could be a matter of stagnation, rather than a negative trend in the development of philanthropy. However, there is still great room for improvement particularly with regard to increased cooperation between actors, especially when strategic investments are concerned, and those who donate for similar themes, as well as in transparency and strengthening cooperation with the media.

Therefore, Catalyst Balkans will, in cooperation with Trag Foundation and other organizations engaged in the field of philanthropy, continue to closely monitor and report trends in philanthropy development both in Serbia and the region. We believe that measuring philanthropy and presenting data, trends and positive examples may contribute to positive shifts in various forms of giving and consequently help realize the potential of philanthropy.
Finally, a note on methodology: this report was prepared using the GivingBalkans database, which was developed by Catalyst in 2013, and which we continue to upgrade. It is with great pleasure that we note that our database is currently the most reliable data source\(^1\) on voluntary donations in Serbia, as well as in the region. In the absence of official data, for the data processed by GivingBalkans, Catalyst used alternative methods of gathering data, primarily media reports and other available data sources\(^2\). This methodology\(^3\) has certain limitations, one of which is that the media does not always record all donations given for charitable purposes. However, we believe that our research provides insight into the most important aspects of voluntary giving because the figures obtained, although not comprehensive, do provide the minimal relevant indicators that can be used as indicators of the degree of philanthropy development in the country.

The data in this report was collected by monitoring electronic, print and online media on the local, regional and national levels in Serbia from January 1 through December 31, 2016. Over this period, 12,924 entries related to voluntary giving by all types of donors were processed, of which 3,270 were unique recorded instances. The total number of entries differ from the number of unique donations, because several media reported on the same donation. This year a significantly higher number of instances of donation were reported directly to Catalyst by either companies and nonprofit organizations.

We would like to thank all of you who helped us to prepare this report: those of you who took part in philanthropy, those who have donated funds and time, and those whose contributions have facilitated the further development of our methodology in collecting data. We would also like to thank all the companies and organizations that shared data with us that was not available through the media. Finally, we would like to thank the Catalyst Balkans and Trag Foundation employees who assisted with data entry and the processing of data and whose efforts helped greatly in completing this report.

Our best regards until the 2017 report is published,

Catalyst Balkans and Trag Foundation

---

1 Although a potentially more reliable data source would be the Tax Office (because there are certain tax benefits for legal entities in Serbia), it was not possible to obtain data related to corporate sector donations for several reasons. According to the Law on Corporate Income Tax of the Republic of Serbia (Article 15), the right to tax relief in Serbia is granted if donations for public benefit causes stipulated by law are recognized as expenditures in the amount up to maximal 5% of the total income. Since the amounts are deducted as expenditures, and legal entities submit Profit and Loss Account to the tax administration instead of balance sheet, from the forms at disposal to the Tax Administration it is not possible to obtain data on donations of legal entities disaggregated by specific purpose.

2 Reports of organizations that received donations, and companies’ reports on donations.

3 Detailed information on methodology is provided in Section 2.1.
## Terminology Used in Report

For easier understanding of the report, herein below are short descriptions of the terminology used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instance</strong></td>
<td>Unique verified event/examples of collecting donations. May contain several donations (for example, an instance could be a campaign in which individuals collect cash for someone’s medical treatment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td>Persons and/or legal entities donating cash, time, services, goods. They are divided into types of donors to facilitate the monitoring of trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Individual</td>
<td>Large number of citizens who could not be identified by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Cases in which it is not possible to classify the donors, i.e. several type of donors were involved in the instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>The donors can be identified as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sector</td>
<td>Includes companies (with over 50 employees), corporate foundations and small and medium sized enterprises (less than 50 employees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foundations</td>
<td>Foundations established by private individuals or combination of both private and legal entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>A case of unique giving, without compensation (in money, goods, services or time) being given in return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrapolation</td>
<td>A statistical method that uses the percentage of known data to calculate data that would be valid if 100% of data was known. Extrapolation provides an estimate, and not absolute values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Giving for good cause, i.e. voluntary giving of money, goods, time, or services in order to help the needy and advance social welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Target groups that benefit from a donation. For example, if a school is the recipient of a donation, the beneficiaries are the children attending the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes for giving</td>
<td>Themes or purposes for which donations are given, such as health, education, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipients of Donations</td>
<td>Private and/or legal entities receiving donation from a donor. In most cases this donation is then passed on others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sector</td>
<td>The term corporate sector includes companies (with over 50 employees), corporate foundations and small and medium size enterprises (with less than 50 employees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Donations</td>
<td>Indicates how donation has been used, for example for capital investment, the purchase of equipment, for rendering of services, provision of material and consumer goods and the like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbol</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Increase as compared with the previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Decrease as compared with the previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>No change as compared with the previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≈</td>
<td>Change is 1% or less as compared to the previous year and is thus statistically negligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

GENERAL OVERVIEW

A general overview of available philanthropy data indicated that in 2016 there were no significant changes in the field of philanthropy compared to 2015.

The data for 2016 show that slightly over 21 million EUR was given for philanthropic purposes which is approximately 4.9% less than in 2015. The total number of instances for various themes moderately increased, while the average donation per citizen in Serbia slightly decreased compared to the previous year.

Although the total value of donations and the average donation per citizen slightly decreased, the fluctuations of less than 5% indicate that it was a matter of stagnation rather than significant negative trend.

PHILANTHROPY IN 2016

In the next section, we provide a brief overview of some of the most important indicators that together paint a picture of philanthropy in Serbia.

MOST ACTIVE DONORS

In 2016, mass individual donors continued to be the most active donor category by percentage of recorded instances. The corporate sector remained the second most active donor type, while individual persons ranked third with a drop in the number of instances compared to 2015. A comparison with 2015 shows a drop in the percentage of instances of participation of mass individuals, but at the same time, shows an increase in the percentage of instances/donations from the corporate sector, as well as an increase in the percentage of instances of mixed donors.

VALUE OF DONATIONS BY TYPE OF DONOR

When we rank donors according to recorded value of their donations, the corporate sector continued to be rated first, followed by mass individual category.

As compared to 2015, there was a slight drop in the corporate sector investments, and the significant drop in individual donor investments, while at the same, the value of donations by mass individual and mixed donors increased.
**TOP 4 THEMES FOR GIVING**

- Healthcare: 30.2%
- Support To Marginalized Groups: 26.8%
- Poverty Reduction: 12.9%
- Education: 9.1%

**TOP 4 RECIPIENTS OF DONATIONS (by # of instances)**

- Individuals / Families: 44.8%
- Institutions: 30.7%
- Nonprofit Organizations: 18.0%
- Local / National Governments: 3.1%

**TOP 4 RECIPIENTS OF DONATIONS (by Value of Donation)**

- Institutions: 32.9%
- Nonprofit Organizations: 31.4%
- Individuals / Families: 12.8%
- Local / National Governments: 20.8%

**KEY THEMES FOR DONATIONS**

The four key themes that saw continued support included health, support to marginalized groups, poverty reduction, and education with over three-fourths (79.0%) of the total instances directed to these four themes. As compared to the previous year, no significant changes were found in the range of themes benefiting from donations.

Although the ranking of themes by number of instances has remained the same for four years, we have seen an ongoing slight drop in interest in healthcare, as well as a slight increase in interest in education. Support to marginalized groups has remained at the same level.

**USE OF DONATIONS**

Although the highest percentage of instances in Serbia is directed to one-off support (materials and consumables, assistance to the medical treatment of individuals, and humanitarian aid), a positive change in comparison with 2015 is reflected in the slight drop in number of these instances, combined with a slight increase in support that may produce long-term effects (equipment, capital investments, research, raising awareness and the like).

The corporate sector is still in the lead in terms of the provision of long-term support.

**RECIPIENT ENTITIES**

The ranking of the types of recipient entities by percentage of recorded instances did not change when compared to 2015. Moreover, the percentage of recorded instances directed to individuals, institutions, and local or national governments remained almost the same as in 2015. A positive development was recorded in the slight increase in the percentage of instances directed to nonprofit organizations. Over 93% of recorded instances were directed to aforementioned three types of recipients.

When the value of donations is considered (in relation to the recorded sum), the ranking remains the same as in 2015: institutions were in the lead, followed by nonprofit organizations and individuals/families.

Although the percentage of donations in cash directed to institutions has decreased, definitely the biggest change has been recorded by a jump in the percentage of donations in cash directed to nonprofit organizations of 15.8%. Although this positive change came as the result of successful campaigns of four nonprofit organizations, it reflects increased trust in nonprofit recipients of donations. It, by all means, remains to be seen whether this change will turn into a trend.
Data also showed a continuing trend of an increased number of organizations that the media recognizes as having received multiple donations.

THE STATE AS RECIPIENT

After last year’s increase in both percentage of instances and the percentage of donated cash directed to local and national governments, as well as state institutions, the data for 2016 shows stagnation in percentage of instances, as well as the drop in the percentage of donated cash.

FINAL BENEFICIARIES

When we examined the categories of final beneficiaries, we observed that 2016 brought changes in ranking of categories of final beneficiaries, as well as some equalization in the percentage of instances.

At the top of the list are people with disabilities, followed by people with health issues and people from specific local communities. However, it is of interesting to mention that the percentages of instances directed to these beneficiary groups are very close.

Although slightly over 50% of instances are directed to these three groups of beneficiaries, the range of beneficiaries remains wide: all groups of beneficiaries identified in 2015 are still present.
Key Characteristics of Philanthropy in Serbia in 2016:

★ After several years of continued increase in number of instances and value of donations, as well as average donation per citizen, there was a drop in value of donations and average donation per citizen in 2016. There was also a very moderate increase in the number of instances.

★ When examining types of donors, mass individual giving continued to show increases in both the number of instances and value of donations. The corporate sector stands out with a continuous increase in the percentage of instances and remains in the lead for the value of donations. The significant drop in the value of donations by individuals stands out in 2016, as does an increase in the value of donations by mixed donors. Corporate foundations remained to play major role in 2016.

★ When we examine the role of the diaspora in giving, we see that the percentage of instances is somewhat less than last year, but that the value of donations has decreased from over 17% to 2.7% of overall giving.

★ The nonprofit sector is slowly but steadily strengthening its role: a greater level of funding is being invested in these organizations, more organizations are partnering with the corporate sector in announcing and implementing competitions/calls for applications, receiving multiple donations, and are being mentioned by name in media. The biggest change in 2016 is the jump in the value of donations, primarily due to successful campaigns of four nonprofit organizations.

★ When we examine themes for giving, we see an encouraging increase in the percentage of instances directed to education. Although healthcare, support to marginalized groups, and poverty reduction are better rated than education, the drop in the percentage of instances directed to healthcare and almost the same interest for the other two themes may indicate a more uniform distribution in the future.

★ Support for the state (institutions and local and national governments) in relation to the percentage of instances remains similar to last year, although a drop in the value of donations was registered. In spite of the drop, the total percentage of the value of donations for the state still exceeds half of the total value of donations.

★ While the key final beneficiary groups remained unchanged, the distribution of percentage of instances in 2016 indicates an equalization: the percentages of instances directed to these three groups vary between 16.3% and 17.3%. But a continual increase in the percentage of instances directed to other groups of beneficiaries is a positive trend, which shows better recognition of other beneficiary groups.

★ Finally, the transparency of the data slightly decreased: 34.2% compared to 35.8% in 2015. However, the increase in the percentage of reports in both web and electronic media is encouraging.

Overall we can conclude that after several year of continual progress, the development and changes compared to 2015 show a both a certain degree of stagnation in the field of philanthropy, but an improvement in relation to nonprofit organizations.
There were 3,270 recorded instances of philanthropy in Serbia in 2016, which is only 52 instances more than in 2015.

There were an average number of 272 instances per month, which is a negligible increase compared to 2015. The average number of instances per month does not reflect the expected seasonal distribution with ups and downs throughout the year as in previous years. From the expected distribution, only the increased number of instances in December remained. The available data, however, does not offer the reason for this change.
The geographic distribution of giving in 2016 did not bring any significant changes. The below graph shows the percentages of donations directed to certain regions.

The trend of donations being most frequently sent to Belgrade region (26.7%) continued. Vojvodina and Southern and Eastern Serbia have slight increase in percentage of donations (1.5% and 2.2% respectively), while Šumadija and Western Serbia recorded slight drop of 1.5%.

The differences in percentages are, however, too small to indicate to any significant trend.

2.9% of donations were directed either on a broad national level, or covered several regions.

The number of donations directed to over 320 different local communities across 138 municipalities increased in 2016. Besides Belgrade, the municipalities that led in receiving donations were Novi Sad, Nis, Novi Pazar, Vranje, and Zrenjanin.

In 2016, the donors directed 3.9% of donations outside of Serbia to Bosnia and Herzegovina (both Republic of Srpska and Federation), Kosovo, Montenegro, and Macedonia, compared to 2015’s figure of 2%. Interestingly, a number of recorded donations were directed to Iraq, Kenya, Rwanda, Canada, Greece, Italy and the USA for various causes.

Looking at the geographic distribution over the past three years, we see that it remained relatively stable in spite of fluctuations: Belgrade remained the region with the majority of instances, Vojvodina has been relatively stable with the percentage varying between 23–25%, and Southern and Eastern Serbia remained between 14–17%. Although the drop in the percentage of donations directed to several regions stands out, it is not to the extent that would signal a major change.

### TRENDS IN GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION (% of instances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vojvodina</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Eastern Serbia</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šumadija and Western Serbia</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several regions</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Serbia</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF GIVING BY REGION
(\% of Instances)

- 25.0\% Vojvodina
- 26.7\% Belgrade
- 22.8\% Šumadija and Western Serbia
- 18.9\% Southern and Eastern Serbia
- 3.7\% Outside of Serbia
- 2.9\% Several regions

Kosovo’s designation in this map is without prejudice to position on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independance.
Kosovo’s designation in this map is without prejudice to position on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independance.
Of the 3,270 donations (calls, instances, reports and similar) indexed, 34.2% had a monetary value associated with them, which is a slight decrease from 35.8% in 2015. The total value of donations reported upon by the media and which could be verified using other sources is slightly over 9.683 million EUR.

Since only somewhat more than one third of recorded data contained the actual value of the donations, we used extrapolation to make a cautious estimate that the value of donations for charitable purposes in Serbia in 2016 was slightly over 21 million EUR. The graph below shows the recorded and verified value of donations in Euros, as well as estimated value based on extrapolation from the recorded sums. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that the total value of donations was higher, even higher that the estimated sum quoted herein.

There are two ways to examine the donations provided by various types of donors: by the number of instances and by the recorded value of donations.

By the number of instances, the data on donor types shows that the most numerous are still those provided by the mass individual category (i.e. donations during campaigns and responses to appeals for support/aid), followed by giving by corporate sector and individuals. Participation by other types of donors combined is less than 14% of instances.

However, the picture changes once we rank donors by percentage of their recorded donated sum. In this case the corporate sector takes the lead, followed by mass individual, mixed donors and private foundations. Other types of donors provided less than 1% of the total recorded amount.

---

1 The sums were recorded in different currencies. The sum thus represents annual median exchange rate for different currencies.

2 Like in previous years, the sums shown include donations in cash, and it is difficult to estimate the value of donations in goods and services. Neither donors, nor recipients exhibited significant readiness to share information on donated sums. Consequently, increased efforts should be made to have higher percentage of more concrete data.
Looking back at the three most active types of donors over the last three years: mass individual, corporate sector and individual, we notice that despite the drop in number of instances the mass individual type remained the most active (with the largest number of instances) with the increasing participation of the corporate sector, while the participation of individuals slightly fluctuated. With respect to the recorded donated sum, in 2016 we see that the corporate sector continued to invest more funds, while the donations given by mass individual category increased, but we also observed a significant drop in donations given by individuals. The decrease in the donated sum by the corporate sector may be explained by higher investments by mixed donors for even 12.6%, in which the corporate sector is included.

DONATIONS BY TYPE OF DONORS
(% of instances, vs. % of recorded sum)
### Key Trends in Types of Donors - 2014 to 2016

#### % of Instances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Individual</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sector</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % of Recorded Sum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Individual</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sector</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2016, there were 3,270 unique instances of charitable giving, only 52 instances more than in 2015, which shows almost the same level of activities.

If we analyze geographic distribution of giving, we do not see any significant changes in comparison with 2015. Belgrade still remains the region, which received majority of donations (26.7%), followed by Vojvodina (25%). A slight increase in percentage of donations directed to outside of Serbia, as well as donations directed to outside of the Western Balkans region, are both seen as positive changes.

In 2016, the most active donor types were mass individual (36.8%), followed by the corporate sector (31.7%) and individuals (17.7%).

If we look into value of donations, the picture changes: the corporate sector takes the lead with a 45.4% share in the total recorded sum, followed by mass individual with a share of 25.2% and mixed donors at 19.5%. The share of individuals dropped significantly compared to 2015.

If we analyze giving by diaspora, the percentage of instances was slightly lower than last year (14.7%), while the recorded value of donations dropped to only 2.7%, which is almost 14% less than in 2015. It remains to be seen whether this is a trend, or merely a one-year fluctuation.

On the whole, mass individual donors continue to have the strongest presence with increased participation in the total value of donations. The presence of the corporate sector (companies, corporate foundations and small and medium enterprises) is on a continual increase, while the total value of donations fluctuates.

One of the first recorded instances of citizens of Serbia engaging more significantly in philanthropic activities in countries outside of the Western Balkans region was the example of Milica Radović, a young woman from Belgrade, who not only donated 400 EUR in cash, but also volunteered at the primary school on the island of Rusinga in Kenya and collected 1,870 EUR through an online campaign to help the primary school. The donated sum was used for installing a new water supply pipeline in the school, school uniforms and purchasing a six-month supply of food.

MasterCard Company and the bookstore chain Delfi organized a campaign that lasted through September 2016 in which from each purchase, in either Delfi stores, or online paid by Master or Maestro cards the companies donated one meal for pupils in primary school in Rwanda. The collected funds were given through the UN World Food Program.
LONG-TERM DEDICATION TO GIVING

Hido Muratović, whose long-term dedication to giving was highlighted in our 2015 Annual Report, received the 2016 VIRTUS Award for Individual Contribution to Philanthropy. Mr. Muratović initiated several instances in 2016 to support his vulnerable fellow citizens. Among his many activities, we can certainly highlight his campaign to raise funds to provide electricity supply to the house of 82-year-old Stanka Bakračević in Tušimlja village on Golija mountain.

Dragan Čirić is dedicated to supporting BELhospice, the organization that offers support to people in the terminal phases of diseases. This year, Dragan ran for over 12 hours to contribute and collect donations for the construction of the first hospice in Serbia.

Among many individual initiatives, worth mentioning by all means is the initiative of Gani Pnisija of Pančevo, who provided day-to-day transportation to school and back home to a girl with disability and facilitated her regular attending classes. Gani Pnisija engaged a local taxi service to that purpose because Pančevo public transportation is not accessible for persons with disabilities.

DONATIONS FROM THE DIASPORA

In 2016, the diaspora continued to support primarily socially vulnerable individuals and families, or to provide donations for medical treatment. Typical examples are: an anonymous donor from Germany, who together with her grandchildren, donated cash to support parentless children from safe house in Vranje, as well as anonymous family from Sydney who donates monthly scholarship to a boy from poor family in Djonlije village.

Several larger donations were directed to either capital investments and purchasing of equipment. We can certainly highlight some: Anka Erne from USA donated through Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation a set of medical instruments to the Maxillofacial Surgery Department of the Faculty of Stomatology in Belgrade; Djordje Petković gave a large donation to support the overall reconstruction works on the school in Dec village near Simanovci; Mladen Ljajić’s donation facilitated asphalting works on the road to Gobata village nearby Nova Varos; and the Association of Serbs from Switzerland “Stvar srca” (Matter of Heart) donated a significant sum for the renewal and furnishing of the playground in primary school “Miodrag Matić” in Uzice.

INNOVATIVE WAYS OF GIVING

A very interesting example of awarding donations comes from Belgrade Nikola Tesla Museum and Samsung Serbia Company. They organized essay writing competitions on the life, work and achievements of the famous scientist Nikola Tesla for primary schools in Serbia. Samsung Company renewed and equipped digital classroom in the winning school “Mihajlo Pupin” of Zemun through the donation of 30 tablets, electronic board, printer, an air-conditioner and electronic accessories.

The Association “Bašta mašta” realized for the third time in a row its homegrown concept of the “Izadji mi na teglu” campaign. The association organized a competition in the form of a travelling caravan travelling, going from town to town and making “ajvar” in each town. The caravan lasted 50 days from September through October where 2,000 participants from 20 towns prepared 4,500 jars of “ajvar” and then distributed the jars of “ajvar” to those in need in their towns. In addition, Roda Company, the general sponsor of this instance contributed to the success of this instance by donating 1,000 jars of “ajvar” to the orphanage in Zvečanska Street in Belgrade.
1.3.3 Profiles of the Most Common Types of Donors

**CORPORATE SECTOR**

**TOP THREE RECIPIENT ENTITIES**
- Institutions: 41.7%
- Nonprofit organizations: 24.3%
- Individuals/Families: 18.5%

**TOP THREE THEMES FOR GIVING**
- Healthcare: 23.2%
- Education: 22.7%
- Support to Marginalized Groups: 16.1%

**TOP THREE FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS**
- Local Communities: 27.9%
- People with Health Issues: 13.3%
- People with Disabilities: 8.8%

**MASS INDIVIDUAL**

**TOP THREE RECIPIENT ENTITIES**
- Individuals/Families: 45.3%
- Institutions: 24.5%
- Nonprofit Organizations: 24.5%

**TOP THREE THEMES FOR GIVING**
- Healthcare: 40.3%
- Support to Marginalized Groups: 28.5%
- Poverty Reduction: 9.9%

**TOP THREE FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS**
- People with Health Issues: 27.7%
- Economically Vulnerable: 22.0%
- People with Disabilities: 10.6%
EXAMPLES OF CORPORATE SECTOR DONATIONS

A large number of companies donated funds in response to a call for applications by the Fund for Young Talents to support young and talented students and provide scholarships for the best students. The companies that responded to the call of the Fund for Young Talents in 2016 among other are: Telekom Srbija, Dunav Osiguranje, Hotel Moskva, Srpska Banka, ADOC d.o.o. Beograd and other.

Vojvodjanska banka marked the International Day of People with Disabilities with the donation of 60 computers to schools for the deaf and hearing impaired, the Association of Deaf People in Serbia, as well as the organizations of deaf people across Serbia. The computers were donated to enhance communication skills and day-to-day activities of our fellow citizens with impaired hearing. It is worth mentioning that Vojvodjanska banka was the first bank in Serbia that facilitated the communication of people with impaired hearing by introducing sign language into their offices.

UNICEF, in cooperation with the Ministry of Health, launched a program for enhancing early childhood development, under which IKEA Company furnished pediatric offices in the Health Unit „Jajinci“- Health Center „Voždovac“.

Among small and medium enterprises in 2016, Yumis d.o.o. stands out for supporting a series of donations directed to local communities ranging from support to sport associations for the renewal of sport halls and supply of sports equipment, to support to the University of Nis in their research projects, as well as support to scouts and various cultural events. Yumis also donated in-kind goods to the Association of Single Mothers, NURDOR, and health centers, homes for elderly people and associations of people with disabilities. This company has been very active in the field of education by organizing programs of professional practice in the field of sales, marketing, finance, and environmental protection for high school students and college students. Yumis d.o.o. Company was the recipient of VIRTUS Award in the category for small and medium enterprises.
The four key themes to which donations were directed in 2016 continued to be health, support to marginalized groups, poverty reduction and education.

The ranking of themes by number of instances remains the same as in previous years, with health in the lead and education rounding out the bottom four. The differences in percentages are minimal and do not suggest significant changes in donors’ interest in themes.

The range of themes remained very broad and includes culture, sport cultural heritage, economic development, religious activities, public infrastructure, science, and environment, assistance in emergencies, animal welfare and seasonal giving.

We will highlight two positive trends in 2016:

To begin with, there is slight, but continual increase in the percentage of instances directed to education.

Then, the percentage of instances for all themes other than the top four also continued to show a slight increase: in 2013 it was less than 10%, and 21% in 2016, which consequently shows slow but steady interest of the donors in other less represented themes.

CAUSE RELATED MARKETING

The trend of so called “cause related marketing”, i.e. donating a part of a company’s income from the sale of products, continued in 2016.

Komercijalna banka supported Fund B92’s campaign “Together for Babies” by donating cash allocated from transactions of Komercijalna banka credit cards. Whenever a client used a credit card to pay for a product or service, the Bank donated one dinar from her own funds into the Fund B92 for this instance free from any additional costs for the clients.

Rosa Company supported the opening of five parenthood schools where over 2000 babies and their parents received professional help in the first days of their parenthood. The funds were collected by allocating one dinar from each 1,5 l bottle of Rosa water sold.

Public Enterprise „Parking Service” continued with their instance “Students’ Parking Place”: the funds collected from the payments for parking on “Students’ Parking Place” were used for purchasing of equipment needed by schools in Belgrade.

In support of the International Children Day, McDonald’s restaurants donated to Pediatric Clinic in Tirsova in Belgrade 10 dinars from each Happy Meal sold in their restaurants during November 2016. The funds collected in the restaurants’ donation boxes were added to the aforementioned sum, and the overall funds were used to purchase medicinal equipment for the clinic in Tirsova.

P&G Company donated one dinar from the sale of Fairy dishwashing detergent to the Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation to provide a “slava” meal for the poorest families in Serbia. This campaign facilitated the purchase of 1,000 meals for the most socially vulnerable categories of our fellow citizens.

1.4 For What Purpose Are Donations Made in Serbia?
1.4.1 What Themes Are Important to Donors in Serbia?

The four key themes to which donations were directed in 2016 continued to be health, support to marginalized groups, poverty reduction and education.

The ranking of themes by number of instances remains the same as in previous years, with health in the lead and education rounding out the bottom four. The differences in percentages are minimal and do not suggest significant changes in donors' interest in themes.

The range of themes remained very broad and includes culture, sport cultural heritage, economic development, religious activities, public infrastructure, science, and environment, assistance in emergencies, animal welfare and seasonal giving.

We will highlight two positive trends in 2016:

To begin with, there is slight, but continual increase in the percentage of instances directed to education.

Then, the percentage of instances for all themes other than the top four also continued to show a slight increase: in 2013 it was less than 10%, and 21% in 2016, which consequently shows slow but steady interest of the donors in other less represented themes.
KEY THEMES OF GIVING (% of Instances)

- Health: 30.2% (2015), 34.8% (2014), 32.6% (2016)
- Support to marginalized groups: 26.8% (2015), 24.3% (2014), 26.8% (2016)
- Poverty reduction: 21.0% (2014), 12.9% (2015), 13.6% (2016)
- Education: 9.1% (2014), 9.1% (2015), 9.1% (2016)

BREAKDOWN OF OTHER THEMES (by % of Instances)

- Less than 0.5%
  - Science
  - Heritage
  - Community Development

- from 0.5 to 1%
  - Environment
  - Economic Development
  - Public Infrastructure
  - Religious Activities
  - Animal Welfare

- from 1 to 3%
  - Assistance in Emergencies
  - Sport
  - Culture and Arts

- Over 5%
  - Seasonal giving

# OF INSTANCES DIRECTED TO TOP 4 THEMES (by % of Instances)

**2014**
- Health: 34.8%
- Support to marginalized groups: 24.3%
- Smanjenje siromaštva: 20.1%
- Obrazovanje: 6.3%

**2015**
- Health: 32.6%
- Support to marginalized groups: 26.2%
- Smanjenje siromaštva: 13.6%
- Obrazovanje: 7.6%

**2016**
- Health: 30.2%
- Support to marginalized groups: 26.8%
- Smanjenje siromaštva: 12.9%
- Obrazovanje: 9.1%
The data on how donations have been used facilitates deeper insight into whether they are provided as one-off support (humanitarian assistance), or are intended to assist in pursuing longer-term solutions to specific problems.

In line with the methodology and recorded data, we divide the use of donations into three categories: long-term support, one-off support and donations for unknown purposes. An overview of donation categories is presented in the graph below.

**KEY POINTS:**

- The four key themes supported were: health, support to marginalized groups, poverty reduction, and education. The instances directed to these themes add up to 79%, more than three-fourths of recorded instances.
- The ranking of themes did not change in comparison with 2015. Nevertheless, changes in percentage of instances of giving indicate that interest in health continues to decrease and that education as a theme is still increasing slightly after a large drop between 2011 and 2013.
- The range of themes continues to be very broad in 2016, although lacking direct support to social entrepreneurship, which disappeared from the list.

**1.4.2 Use of Donations**

The data on how donations have been used facilitates deeper insight into whether they are provided as one-off support (humanitarian assistance), or are intended to assist in pursuing longer-term solutions to specific problems.

In line with the methodology and recorded data, we divide the use of donations into three categories: long-term support, one-off support and donations for unknown purposes. An overview of donation categories is presented in the graph below.

**USE OF DONATIONS (by % of Instances)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Support</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Off Support</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Long-term donations include: capital investments, equipment, investments in services, scholarships (investments in personnel development), research and development, and raising awareness. One-off donations include: humanitarian assistance, seasonal givings, medical treatment for individuals /families, material and consumable goods. The purpose of giving is not always possible to determine. For example, the available data shows that certain institution/organization received a donation, but do not state what for the donation was intended.*
LONG-TERM SUPPORT

In 2016, Delta Foundation, made a significant investment through its building of the Kragujevac Center for Sport and Rehabilitation of People with Disabilities. The 660m² center contains four apartment units, a rehabilitation block, gym, and a multi-purpose hall for seminars, trainings, as well as athletics paths, terrain for orientation training of people with impaired sight and a bowling room.

The Public Enterprise “Elektroprivreda Srbije” (EPS) launched “Uključi se u život” (Get into Life) campaign through which the company equipped and opened seven sensory rooms across Serbia. The sensory rooms are therapeutic rooms for children and adults with sensory integration disorders. EPS also invested into personnel development by providing the training to the staff to work with children and adults in sensory rooms.

Philip Morris through its “Pokreni se za posao” program continued to provide strategic, long-term support to economic development. In cooperation with Eneka Association, they implemented an open competition and the winners received financial and mentoring support to start up or expand their own businesses. Among this year's winners are Amela and Damir Ljajić who received support to expand their denim manufacturing company in Novi Pazar.

Erste banka together with Dokukino Foundation continued with their “Club Superste” program for mentoring and financial support to individuals who want to start up socially responsible business or initiatives with social impact.

KEY POINTS:

- The highest percentage of instances in Serbia remains directed to one-off support. The corporate sector continues to be more oriented to strategic investments than other type of donors: over 50% of instances of the corporate sector has potential for long-term solutions.

- Like in previous years, the most common long-term investments are by far instances of the purchase of equipment, followed by capital investments, and this year we have recorded an increase in investments in scholarships.

- The most frequent one-off donations are for consumable goods, health treatment, and humanitarian assistance.

- When we examine the changes, we see an encouraging slight increase in long-term, while the one-off donations show a slight drop. Although these changes are relatively small, we believe that continuity of changes over past four years is important.
Recipient entities (often also referred to as partners) show how donors choose to channel their donations, thus indirectly revealing whom they trust.

In 2016, the principal recipients were, as in previous years, individuals/families, followed by institutions, nonprofit organizations (associations and foundations), and local and national governments. The Other category included religious communities, several different recipients, as well as unknown recipients.

In 2016 we have not seen any major changes in relation to percentage of number of instances directed to other types of recipients, except for the slight increase in percentage of instances directed to nonprofit organizations, however the more significant change compared to last year occurred in view of distribution of funds, i.e. percentage of recorded sum directed to various types of recipients. The support to institutions dropped significantly for 18.7%; support to local and national governments has increased for 9.8%. The most surprising is, however, the jump for even 15.8% of the recorded sum directed to nonprofit organizations. Although this increase is the result of larger amounts directed to campaigns initiated by four nonprofit organizations, this jump is still an encouraging signal.

Recipient entities/partners generally distribute donations to final beneficiaries, i.e. use them to the benefit of certain final beneficiary groups.
The ranking of donation recipients in Serbia remains unchanged: individual/families are in the lead with 44.8% of instances, followed by institutions with 30.7% and nonprofit organizations with 18.0%.

Viewing from the prospective of the value of donations (recorded sum) the ranking did not change in comparison with 2015: institutions are in the lead (32.9%), closely followed by nonprofit organizations (31.4%), local/national governments and finally individuals/families. A large increase in percentage of value of donations directed to nonprofit organizations due to the success of four campaigns of nonprofit organizations, makes a significant change.

If we combine the data for institutions and local/national governments with both categories under control of the state, we reach the conclusion that 33.8% by number of instances and 53.7% by value of donations were, in fact, donated to the state. Compared to 2015, the percentage of instances remained at the same level but the value of donations decreased.

Nonprofit organizations remained in third position by number of instances, and as of 2015 when their rank improved to second position by value of donations, they remained second ranked but this year with by far higher percentage. The private foundations remain to be important actors both in view of number of instance and in their ability to attract the attention of the donors.

The number of organizations whom donors trust and who receive multiple donations continues to increase.
NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS IN 2016

The category of nonprofit organizations consists of local civil society associations, foreign organizations, such as UNICEF, and private foundations.

Over previous years, the percentage of instances of giving to nonprofit organizations slightly increased to reach 18.0% this year. In view of the value of donations there is a huge jump in 2016 primarily thanks to the successful campaigns of NURDOR and “Srbi za Srbe” (Serbs for Serbs) organizations, and “Budi human” (“Be Human”) and “Podrži život” (Support Life) foundations.

The very positive trend of an increased number of organizations and foundations receiving multiple donations from both companies and individuals continued in 2016. That, by all means, shows building trust in organizations that successfully realize their activities and promote their work.

In 2016, the majority of donations directed to nonprofit organizations were mass individual donations, then the corporate sector, i.e. primarily from the companies and, to a smaller extent, from small and medium enterprises.

The themes that are most frequently supported by nonprofit organizations are support to marginalized groups, and to a smaller extent health, poverty reduction, culture and arts, animal care, and other. In view of final beneficiary groups the range is very broad and includes above all people with disabilities, people with health issues, economically vulnerable, and certain population from local communities. The donors, however, supported the work of nonprofit organizations with other final beneficiary groups including children and youth at risk, women and children victims of violence, people from other countries, migrants, victims of trafficking, elderly population, etc.

Organizations that received multiple donations in 2016 are NURDOR, BELhospice, Banka hrane Beograd (Food Bank Belgrade), Centar za interakciju mladih (Svratšte) (Drop-in Center), Sigurna kuća (Safe House), Udruženje žena obolelih od raka dojke (“Budimo zajedno”) (Association of Women with Breast Cancer), etc. It is worth noting that significant donations were given to support diaspora organization Srbi za Srbe (Serbs for Serbs), and to humanitarian organization “Majka devet Jugovica” in Kosovo.

Among private foundations the most frequently mentioned are Budi Human-Aleksandar Šapić, Support Life, Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation, Novak Djoković Foundation, Nataša Kovačević Foundation, etc.

In 2016, we would like to highlight, besides the aforementioned organizations, the work of Novi Sad-based Čepom do osmeha (A Cap for a Smile) association that received significant attention by joining a humanitarian environmental campaign for collecting plastic bottle caps to support people with disabilities. Also successful in a similar mission is the Čep za hedikep organization. The focus of both associations is on children with disabilities and ways to enhance their inclusion in education. Collected plastic caps helped the association to award much needed equipment for 12 children across Serbia through a selection process. The association also established strategic cooperation with NIS a.d.: NIS Company not only donated a vehicle, but also allowed for cap collection donation boxes to be placed in all NIS branch offices, which facilitated the participation of a large number of NIS employees in this campaign.
PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN NONPROFIT AND CORPORATE SECTOR

In terms of partnership between nonprofit and the corporate sector it is of particular importance to establish a long-term cooperation. Telekom Srbija and NADEL (National Children’s Hotline) work together for almost 11 years, to provide support to children. NADEL for its part provides telephone counseling service to children and to give them the opportunity to have their voice heard, while Telekom supports NADEL’s work through both a cash grant in through the provision of equipment, telephone services, maintenance and technical support, as well as media support. In 2016, Telekom, besides its support to NADEL, assisted in establishing a parents call center – ROLIN. For its contribution, Telecom received the 2016 VIRTUS Award for Long-Term Partnership.

A very interesting example of partnership comes from Boost Team d.o.o., a Novi Sad-based company, which designs and prints T-shirts, and two nonprofit organizations – DEBRA Association that assists people with Bullous Epidermolysis, and Association “Život” (Life) that assists children with Batten Disease. Boost Team designed T-shirts for both associations, as well as promotional packages for Life Association. The T-shirts had logos of both associations and their messages printed and the Boost Team advertised the associations on the company’s site with the slogan “We make T-shirts that can help others”. Anyone wanting to help could chose to buy either T-shirt, or to select one of the three suggested promotional packages. The company who decided to buy ten T-shirts had an option to have company’s logo printed either on the T-shirt, or promotional package, and/or on the associations’ websites. Regardless of the success in the sale of these t-shirts, the associations received regular monthly support of 70,000 dinars during the campaign. Boost Team worked with DEBRA Association from January until June 2016 and with Association Life from April until the end of 2016. The partners plan to continue to work together in 2017.
1.5.2 Who Benefits from Donations?

When we looked into the final beneficiaries in 2016, the four key groups that emerge likewise in 2015 are: people with health issues, economically vulnerable, people with disabilities, and population from specific local communities.

**KEY FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS (by % of Instances)**

- 17.3% People with Disabilities
- 17.2% People with Health Issues
- 16.3% Population from Specific Local Communities
- 13.9% Economically Vulnerable
- 35.4% Other Groups

**FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS (percentage of instances)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>from 0 to 1%</th>
<th>from 1 to 2%</th>
<th>from 2 to 4%</th>
<th>from 4 to 5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Homeless people</td>
<td>• Women and children</td>
<td>• Elderly population</td>
<td>• Single parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ethnic minority population</td>
<td>victims of violence</td>
<td>• Children and youth</td>
<td>• Children without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Religious communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• at risk</td>
<td>parental care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refugees and displaced</td>
<td></td>
<td>• General population</td>
<td>• Mothers and babies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persons</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Talented children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People in need of</td>
<td></td>
<td>• and youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palliative care</td>
<td></td>
<td>• People from other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Women and children</td>
<td></td>
<td>countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victims of trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS (by % of Instances)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with Health Issues</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Vulnerable</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population from Specific Local Communities</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The top four final beneficiary groups (people with disabilities, people with health issues, population from specific local communities, and economically vulnerable) comprised 64.7% of overall number of instances of giving in 2016.

Although the percentage of instances benefiting beneficiary groups under "other" category slightly increased in 2016, thus confirming the trend of gradual increase in interest for other, less represented beneficiary groups.

An ongoing drop in the percentage of instances benefiting people with health issues continued in 2016. At the same time, the percentage of instances for the benefit of people with disabilities has continuously increased. The donors interest in economically vulnerable and population from specific local communities remained almost at the same level as last year.

The range of beneficiary groups practically remained the same as last year.

**SUPPORT TO REFUGEES**

The citizens of Serbia, the corporate sector and, above all, nonprofit organizations continued to provide support to refugees coming to and passing through Serbia.

In 2016, the **Info Park**, a joint initiative of Fund B92 and Trag Foundation, marked a year anniversary of providing assistance and support to refugees. The Info Park, although moved to different location as of the end of 2016, remained to be a unique point of providing information and assistance, as well as support and education to refugees. In 2016 Info Park was supported by AXA Company, Corporate Foundation C&A and many other foundations and individuals by their donations in food, clothing, footwear, and by providing logistic and other services and information to refugees.

**Miksalište**, initiated by Mikser House and the Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation continued to operate in 2016. The latter two organizations received the “European Citizenship Award 2016”, which is being awarded to prominent organizations and initiatives that had a positive impact on the community by applying in practice the values of European democracy. This year, Miksalište was supported by a range of companies including Carnex, Coca Cola, DM Drogerie markt, and Metro.

Besides the aforementioned, there were also other organizations that were recorded as supporting refugees. In one example, **Lions Clubs from four towns** provided significant humanitarian aid. The **Volunteering Center Vojvodina** organized workshops “Heklica, ne granica” to knit caps, gloves and scarves for refugees passing through Serbia and neighboring countries. **Youth Center CK13** made a party for citizens who brought clothing, footwear, food and other consumable goods for refugees. Marking 13 years of Wikipedia and three years of the “1001 Arabic Words” project (a free on-line Arabic-Serbian Glossary prepared by the volunteers of Faculty of Philology in Belgrade), **Vikimedia Association** organized a “Delicatessen Monday” at the Cultural Center Grad, where a Libyan chief prepared the meal and overall funds thus collected went to the refugees.
Likewise, over previous years, it is evident that donors prefer to provide cash donations, followed by donations of in-kind goods, mixed donations (cash and in-kind), then volunteer time and pro-bono.

**KEY POINTS:**

- In 2016, cash donations were the most frequent (83.9%), and in-kind goods appeared in a far smaller percentage (9.6%).

- When comparing the most active types of donors (mass individuals and corporate sector), we see that the corporate sector donated cash in a slightly lesser percentage (70.1%), and donated a higher percentage of in-kind goods or pro-bono services. As in past years over 87% of mass individual was donated in cash.

- Although this year there was a higher percentage of media reporting on volunteering instances, we still believe that it does not reflect the real picture, i.e. and the percentage of instances where individuals donate their time and even pro-bono services is higher, because of media hesitation to report on volunteering.
The trend of corporate volunteering is on a continual increase. Companies that have these activities as a part of their strategies, encourage their employees to participate and to talk to others about their experiences. This year, we have noticed an increase in media reporting on these type of activities.

An interesting example of volunteering is the campaign "Velika četvorka zajedno za decu Doma ‘Drinka Pavlović’ (Big Four Together for Children from Drinka Pavlović Home)". This initiative gathered over 50 employees from Price Waterhouse Coopers, Ernst & Young, KPMG and Deloitte companies who have, by donating their time, helped to renew and rearrange the Home for Children without Parental Care “Drinka Pavlović”.

**OTHER WAYS TO DONATE**

Apart from the traditional direct cash and in-kind donations, we would like to highlight an interesting example of donations of pro-bono service. "Prevodilačko srce" (Translator’s Heart) is a group of people led by the idea to assist the most needed by providing free of charge translations of medical documentation. Translation of medical documentation is often very expensive and, as a rule translation fees top up already high medical treatment bills, therefore the assistance in free translations is valuable for those in need. The group of over 450 translators from the region and diaspora all of whom with adequate formal education, currently provide translation services in 30 languages. Besides, “Prevodilačko srce” provides certified translations as well. The Association, also, managed to establish cooperation with doctors from Italian town Reggio Calabria where the doctors-specialists in “Medicina Solidale” provide free medical examination to patients. Italian doctors also provide clarification and interpretation of medical terminology, and to patients from Serbia they recommend referenced institutions in Italia, as well as assist patients’ families and companions in finding accommodation and similar.

**KNOWLEDGE AS DONATION**

This year, Microblading Academy d.o.o. of Belgrade provided professional training to 100 women, victims of family violence in the special micro blading eyebrow tattoo artistry, thus providing an opportunity for their employment and economic independence.

There is another interesting example: in 2016, KPMG launched a program of two-month long paid internships for 72 students in the final years of relevant faculties. The value of KPMG investment into this program was over 80,000 EUR.

**CORPORATE VOLUNTEERING**

The trend of corporate volunteering is on a continual increase. Companies that have these activities as a part of their strategies, encourage their employees to participate and to talk to others about their experiences. This year, we have noticed an increase in media reporting on these type of activities.

An interesting example of volunteering is the campaign "Velika četvorka zajedno za decu Doma ‘Drinka Pavlović’ (Big Four Together for Children from Drinka Pavlović Home)". This initiative gathered over 50 employees from Price Waterhouse Coopers, Ernst & Young, KPMG and Deloitte companies who have, by donating their time, helped to renew and rearrange the Home for Children without Parental Care “Drinka Pavlović”.
1.6.2 | Ways of Fundraising

For easier analysis, the ways of fundraising have been divided into four main categories: campaigns/appeals, direct donations (cases in which donors selected the final beneficiary), giving during events and, finally, calls for applications.

The available data shows that direct donations were the most frequent way of giving, followed by giving during events, campaigns, and finally donations awarded in response to calls for applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Fundraising</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct donations</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns/appeals</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Applications</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2016, a larger number of companies organized calls for applications and we are highlighting the three examples showing three different approaches.

The concept of “Zajedno jedni za druge” (Together for Each Other) was to invite registered civil society associations, institutions and local governments to apply with their projects in the fields of social responsibility, environment and sustainability, culture, science and sports. This call for applications was specific because the donations were not in cash, but in products, furnishing and designing of space. DM Drogerie markt Company supported 14 projects of civil society associations, educational, social and health institutions implemented in nine towns across Serbia.

NIS a.d. announced the “Zajednici zajedno” (Together to Community) competition for financial support for the projects in the field of sports, culture, environment, science and support to socially vulnerable groups in Belgrade, Novi Sad, Pančevo, Zrenjanin, Niš, Čačak, Kikinda and Municipalities of Novi Bečej, Kanjiža, Žitište and Srbobran. Eligible to compete were registered nonprofit organizations, local community offices and municipalities, as well as public institutions operating in the field of education, culture, social and health care, physical culture, and pupils and student welfare. Under this competition, the NIS Company supported 106 projects in the total value of 110.5 million dinars.

The competition announced by Beiersdorf d.o.o. Beograd Company under its brand “NIVEA” had different concept. For the competition under the title “Gde nam rastu deca” (Where Our Children Grow) it was the citizens that suggested town lacking children playgrounds, or where the existing playgrounds were ruined or out of use. The towns which received the majority of votes on the Facebook page @GdeNamRastiDeca won playgrounds. The average value of an NIVEA children playground is about 35,000 EUR and the amount represents both the investment of the company and the municipality that allocated certain funds for spatial planning. In 2016, NIVEA supported the construction of playgrounds in Priboj, Novi Pazar, Kostolac, Sid, and Arandjelovac.
SUCCESSFUL CAMPAIGNS

At the initiative of Dr. Dušan Milisavljević, Blic Foundation launched very successful campaign „Svako dete da se glasno raduje!” to fundraise for screening apparatus for early diagnosing of hearing disorders in newborn babies in a total of 58 maternity hospitals in Serbia.

The second example comes from the nonprofit sector. NURDOR (the National Association of Parents of Children with Cancer) together with EXIT Foundation initiated a campaign to build new chemo-oncological department in Niš. The campaign, which lasted throughout the year, was supported by significant number of organizations, companies and individuals. The first phase was completed in December 2016 and the value of donations was over 350,000 EUR.

There is an example of a different type of campaign coming from the corporate sector: In 2016, Hemofarm and Hemofarm Foundation launched „Najvažniji poziv u životu“ (The Most Important Call in Life) campaign, by which they have successfully managed to bring to public attention the issues that people waiting for transplantation of organs face. Thanks to the campaign, June 6 was declared as the National Donors Day. The documentary “The Most Important Call in Life”, filmed as a part of the campaign, brought powerful testimonies of people waiting for organ transplantations and sent a message that not only the laws need to be amended, but also organ donation should be accepted as voluntary act of solidarity. For this campaign Hemofarm and Hemofarm Foundation received main VIRTUS Award for the Contribution on National Level in 2016.
1.6.3 | Media coverage

Although the majority of the reports of donations were published in the print media compared to 2015, the trend of continuous increase of number of the reports published in web (5%) and electronic media (2.5%) is noted.

With regard to the territorial coverage, the majority of reports were recorded in national and then local media. The level of reporting in the regional media was almost half the percentage shown in 2015. The majority of reports were published in daily media.
It is also noteworthy that in 2016 some reports on donations in Serbia were printed in the foreign media, i.e. in the media of other countries in the region, something that happened for the first time in 2015. Although in smaller percentage, the foreign media continue to print reports primarily on donations in relation to migrant Radio Televizija Srbije, RTV Studio B and Radio Beograd stand out as the electronic media that presented the largest number of reports. In the print media field, Blic remained ranked first to be followed by Vesti Frankfurt, Dnevnik and Večernje novosti. The web media that printed the most reports were Blic.rs, Kurir.rs, and Novosti.rs.

In the analysis of media coverage, it is interesting to look at the placement of and the time allocated to the reports, because both indicate the importance given to philanthropy.

The data from 2016 shows that with regard to the placement chosen for the report, in the print media only 11.8% were placed on one of the first five pages, which is for about 2% less than in previous year. The next 17.8% were found between the fifth and tenth pages, while over two thirds of reports were placed after page ten. The situation is similar with the electronic media: even 81.1% of reports were broadcast before 19:00, and only less than one fifth of reports were broadcast during prime time, which shows also slight decrease in comparison with 2015.

A similar result is found concerning the duration of reports: “small” (less than one-fourth of a page) reports characterized slightly over 66% of all reports and over 96% of reports in the electronic media lasted less than three minutes.

This suggests that philanthropy as a theme is still not viewed as important, and that majority of media consider philanthropy a side topic. Reports were often scanty or incomplete making it very difficult to understand who had made the donation, for what purpose or to which type of beneficiary.

Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that, compared to the rest of the region, the media in Serbia remain the most active where reporting on philanthropy is concerned. In addition, the media in Serbia also remain the most active in undertaking very active role in launching campaigns and instances and organizing events, while the foundations established by the media continue to be very active. As a consequence, the media appears both in the role of donor, and in the role of intermediary, thereby contributing to strengthening philanthropy.

In spite of slight decrease in transparency in relation to donated sums (in 2016 the percentage of reports with recorded sums is 34.2%, which is for 1.6% less than last year), the media in Serbia are still among more transparent in the region.

**KEY POINTS:**

- Although the majority of reports on philanthropy was published by the print media (45.1%), the trend of increased number of reports published by the web (34.8%) and electronic media (20.1%) continued in 2016.

- The national media with over 79.3% of reports, continued to hold the lead in the number of reports, with the local and regional media trailing far behind with approximately 7–8 %.

- The data on the time and the spot devoted to reports in the media, although not as good as in last year, points to the fact that philanthropy is still considered a side topic, in addition, published reports were generally incomplete in terms of providing details on donation.

- On the other hand, the media in Serbia remained to be the most active in the region where the number of reports are concerned. They often took on an active role by establishing their own foundations, and/or initiating campaigns independently or together with other actors.

- Finally, the percentage of media reports indicating the value of donations was 34.2 %, which is slightly less than in 2015.
2 | Annexes

2.1 | Annex 1: Methodology

The methodology for this report was inevitably conditioned by the viable options for collecting data. Research on this topic worldwide shows that the only completely reliable source of information on level of giving for charitable purposes is collected by tax authorities. For many reasons it was not possible to use this source of information in any of Western Balkans countries.

As mentioned previously, Catalyst has opted for alternative ways of collecting data, using primarily media data as well as other available data sources. Concretely, the data used as the basis for this report was gathered by monitoring the electronic, printed and on-line media on the local, regional and national levels in the period from January 1 through December 31, 2016.

There are three key limitations to this methodology. First, this method does not provide comprehensive data because the media does not report on all charitable instances and giving. Second, media reports often do not provide all data of importance in following the development of philanthropy (most often the media does not publish the amount donated and/or collected). Third, there is a potential limitation in the credibility of data published by the media.

The first limitation cannot be overcome at this time. Where the second and third limitations are concerned, Catalyst seeks to overcome them by cross-analyzing various media, and then conducting additional research, for example by checking the reporting by companies’ and nonprofit organizations (if available to the public). The acknowledged limitations notwithstanding, we feel that there are two facts that justify our analysis:

— Our figure, although not comprehensive, provides a minimum value of relevant indicators. If, for example, we discuss the number of charitable instances, we can state with certainty that the number that we show is the minimal number of instances that have taken place and that the actual figure is certain to be higher. The same is true for cash amounts, actors and the like. Hence, this data may be used as indicators of the minimal degree of philanthropy development in a specific country.

— Continued observation will show a rise and/or drop in numbers and change in data related to our selected indicators. Therefore, continued monitoring over years will point out trends in philanthropy development as well as trends in media reporting on the subject.

Catalyst will continue to enhance this methodology. Catalyst also plans to establish contacts with state authorities (tax authorities, and other offices with relevant statistical data) to discuss the importance of this data and explore ways of increasing the number of reliable data sources. Under current conditions, we are of the opinion that the methodology allows for preliminary insight into philanthropy in Serbia.

---

4 Various media report on the same donations, and by comparing data from several media reports, we are able to obtain more accurate and thorough data.
2.1.1 Factors and Indicators Showing the Degree of Philanthropy Development

It is difficult to estimate the degree of philanthropy development in an environment in which precise data is not collected and continuous monitoring is not done. Catalyst has thus created an initial list of factors that may help elucidate various aspects of giving: instances/initiatives for charitable giving; methods of collecting cash donations; the themes of giving; donation recipients and beneficiaries; donors; actors; and media coverage.

In order to use the data collected for comparative analysis (both across the countries and within a certain country over multiple years) and given the factors identified above, it was necessary to define quantitative and qualitative indicators for each factor. The indicators we used are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Instances of charitable giving | • Number of instances of charitable giving in one-year period;  
• Geographic distribution (% of instances per region in relation to the total number of instances);  
• % of instances of cash donations in relation to the total number of instances;  
• % of instances of in-kind donations/services in relation to the total number of instances. |
| Methods of collecting cash donations | • Different groups (types) of methods of fundraising for donations in cash;  
• % of representation of different types of methods;  
• Emergence of new methods for fundraising/donations in cash. |
| Purpose of charitable giving instances | • Theme or Purpose of the support;  
• Number (in %) of instances per purpose;  
• Emergence of new themes;  
• Use of donations per theme. |
| Donation recipients and beneficiaries | • Types of donation recipients;  
• Number of instances involving recipients in the state sector (% in relation to the total number);  
• Number of instances involving recipients in the civil sector (% in relation to the total number);  
• Number of instances involving recipients from other groups (% in relation to the total number);  
• Types of beneficiaries;  
• Number of instances directed to different groups of beneficiaries (% in relation to the total number of instances);  
• Emergence and number of new beneficiary groups. |
| Donors | • Number of instances per type of donor (% in relation to the total number of instances);  
• Number of instances per different recipients and per type of donor;  
• Number of instances per theme and per type of donor;  
• Number of instances per beneficiary groups and per type of donor. |
| Value of donations for charitable purposes | • Total value of charitable donations;  
• % of instances with a recorded sum of donation;  
• % of donated amount per type of donor;  
• % of donated amount per type of recipient;  
• % of donated amount per theme. |
| Actors | • Type and number of different actors;  
• Emergence of new actors. |
| Media | • Total number of media reports;  
• Number (in %) of media reports per media type;  
• Number (in %) per territorial coverage (national, regional, local);  
• Number of reports treated as substantial per media type (printed, electronic). |

It is likely that during preparation of the research, which we hope will continue for several years, some of the factors we analyze will change or come into sharper focus, and it is possible that new factors may emerge. For the time being, we believe that the factors listed above offer a solid starting point in determining the state of charitable giving in each of the countries that we monitor.

5 While these two categories may seem the same, they very often differ in practice. Donation recipients are usually registered legal entities (such as institutions, nonprofit organizations, local governments, etc.) that seek support for a particular purpose. Recipients may also be individuals or families. Beneficiaries on the other hand, may be various groups for whose benefit the support is requested. For example, if the recipient of a donation recipient is a local hospital, the beneficiaries are people of that local community. If the donation recipient is a school, the beneficiaries are children/youth of a certain age who attend that school. If the donation recipient is a nonprofit organization that works with people with disabilities, the beneficiaries are people with disabilities, etc. Insights into the recipients of donations shows public perception of who “deserves” support and whom they trust. The range of beneficiaries show which groups are considered to be vulnerable (in any way) by the public and over time will indicate how much public awareness of the issue has changed.

6 Under actors we understand not only donors, but also those who appeal for assistance and those who, in any way, take part/participate in philanthropy. As a rule of thumb, an increase in the number of actors leads is understood to advance public awareness of the importance and role of charitable giving in the society.
2.2 Annex 2: Changes in the Legal-Fiscal Framework

This overview has been derived from the publication “Tax regulations of importance to development of philanthropy in South-East European countries”, prepared by Dr. Dragan Golubović for the needs of the SIGN Network. In this annex we only provide information related to Serbia. The full publication is available at:

http://www.sign-network.org/activities/advocacy-for-policy-changes

SUMMARIZED OVERVIEW OF OPEN TAX BENEFIT ISSUES IN SERBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW ON PROFIT TAX FOR LEGAL ENTITIES/ LAW ON PROPERTY FOR LEGAL ENTITIES</th>
<th>LAW ON PERSONAL INCOME TAX:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law on Profit Tax:</strong></td>
<td>• The Law does not stipulate for tax benefits for donations of individuals/tax-payers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Narrowly defined and exhausting list of general benefit purposes and uses in the Law on Profit Tax (not harmonized with status-legal regulations for CSOs);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An amendment to the Law in 2012 partially shifted focus from the nature of activities for public benefit to status-legal forms in which those activities are performed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some tax offices only acknowledge donations in cash.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law on Property Tax:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• According to the Ministry of finance’s interpretation of the Law, CSOs must submit an application/request for tax relief for each gift from an individual donor which is higher than 100.000 RSD in the calendar year;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Law does not stipulate the tax status of donations which are transferred in the next tax period;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Law does not explicitly define the status of so-called institutional grants;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some tax offices tax the part of the donation used to cover administrative expenses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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