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Foreword

Dear friends,

Catalyst Balkans and Trag Foundation are pleased to present to you the 2015 Annual Report on the State of Philanthropy in Serbia. Just as 2014 was marked by floods, 2015 was marked by a refugee crisis, resulting from a massive influx of refugees from Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and other countries who passed through Serbia in their efforts to escape war-torn countries and seek asylum in other countries.

Although the level of giving directed to this population was significantly lower than the giving directed to flood relief in 2014, the response to the refugee crisis demonstrated the solidarity of Serbian citizens with people of other religions and nationalities. Individuals in communities through which the refugees passed, nonprofit organizations, foundations and the corporate sector all offered their support. We can therefore be proud of the way we responded as a society to this challenge.

At the same time, we can be proud of the fact that the overall level of giving in Serbia has increased in comparison to 2014, both in terms of the number of instances of giving and the value of donations. Estimations suggest that in 2015 the number of instances of giving exceeded 3,000, with over 22 million EUR donated for a wide range of themes, recipients and beneficiary groups.

As in previous years, the report presents data for 2015 and, wherever possible, indicates the trends in giving for certain indicators. We hope that this data will be both useful and of interest to you as additional information on the levels of giving and on the development of philanthropy in Serbia.

Finally, something about how the report was prepared: it 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 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 then other available data sources. This methodology 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 minimal relevant indicators that can be used as indicators of the degree of philanthropy development in the country.

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 to the public benefit causes stipulated by law are recognized as expenditures in the amount up to a maximum of 5% of total income. Since the amounts are deducted as expenditures, and legal entities submit Profit and Loss Accounts to the Tax Administration instead of balance sheets, from the forms currently used by the Tax Administration, it is not possible to obtain data on the donations of legal entities disaggregated by specific purpose.

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

3 Detailed information on our methodology is provided in Section 3.1
The data in this report was collected by monitoring the electronic, print and on-line media on the local, regional and national levels in Serbia from January 1 through December 31, 2015. Over this period, 8,551 entries related to voluntary giving by all types of donors were processed, of which 3,218 were unique recorded instances. The total number of entries differs from the number of unique donations because several media reported on the same donation. In addition, this year more entries were received directly from companies and nonprofit organizations.

Generally speaking, the positive trends of 2014 continued, including a larger number of instances and higher value of donations. 2015 was also marked by somewhat higher investments in education, a slow but steady increase in the nonprofit sector as the beneficiary institution, no decrease in the range of themes and final beneficiary groups and an increase in the transparency of donated sums.

In spite of these positive trends, there is still great room for improvement, particularly with regard to strategic investments, increased cooperation between sectors, the inclusion of new actors such as academia, as well as in strengthening strategic cooperation with the media in the promotion of giving. In cooperation with Trag Foundation and other organizations engaged in the field of philanthropy, Catalyst will continue to closely monitor and report on shifts and trends in philanthropy 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.

We would like to thank all of you who have helped us 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 both our method and methodology in collecting the data. We would also like to thank all of 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 2016 report is published,

Catalyst Balkans and Trag Foundation
Terminology Used in Report

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instance</strong></th>
<th>Unique verified events/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).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Large number of individuals who could not be identified by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td>Cases in which it is not possible to classify the donors, i.e. several types of donors were involved in the instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td>The donors can be identified as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td>Includes companies (with over 50 employees), corporate foundations and small and medium sized enterprises (with less than 50 employees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td>Foundations established by private individuals or a combination of both private and legal entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donation</strong></td>
<td>A case of unique giving, without compensation (in money, goods, services or time) being given in return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrapolation</strong></td>
<td>A statistical method that uses the percentage of known data to calculate data that would be valid if 100% of the data was known. Extrapolation provides an estimate and not absolute values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philanthropy</strong></td>
<td>Giving for a good cause, i.e. the voluntary giving of money, goods, time, or services in order to help the needy and advance social welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Beneficiaries</strong></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><strong>Themes for Giving</strong></td>
<td>Themes or purposes for which donations are given, such as health, education, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recipients of Donations</strong></td>
<td>Private and/or legal entities receiving a donation from a donor. In most cases this donation is then passed on to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Sector</strong></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><strong>Use of Donations</strong></td>
<td>Indicates how a donation has been used, for example for capital investment, the purchase of equipment, for the rendering of services, provision of material and consumer goods and the like.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Symbol</strong></th>
<th><strong>Meaning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
GENERAL OVERVIEW

A general overview of philanthropy data between 2014 and 2015 definitely highlights three positive shifts.

The available data show that over 22 million EUR was given for philanthropic purposes in Serbia in 2015.

The number of instances also increased from 154 (in 2014) to 268 (in 2015) per month.

The average donation per citizen in Serbia also increased from 2.59 Euros in 2014 to 3.14 Euros in 2015.

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.

PHILANTHROPY IN 2015

MOST ACTIVE DONORS

In 2015, mass individual giving continued to be the most active donor category by percentage of recorded instances, the corporate sector increased their activity and became the second most active donor type, while individual persons ranked third.

A comparison with 2014 shows a drop in the percentage of instances of the participation of mass individuals, but at the same time, shows an increase in the percentage of instances of donations from the corporate sector.

VALUE OF DONATIONS BY TYPE OF DONOR

When we rank donors according to recorded value of their donations, the picture changes. The corporate sector is then rated first, followed by individuals and then the mass individual category.

As compared with 2014, the value of donations increased across all major donor types.
KEY THEMES FOR DONATIONS

The four key themes that saw continued support included healthcare, support to marginalized groups, poverty reduction and education, with over three-fourths (78.1%) of the total instances directed to these themes. 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 three years, we have seen an ongoing slight drop in interest in healthcare and poverty reduction, as well as increased 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 (humanitarian aid, assistance for the medical treatment of individuals, most frequently children, and material and consumables necessary for the work of institutions and organizations), a positive change in comparison with 2014 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 2014. While experiencing a slight drop in numbers, individuals/families are still in the lead, followed by institutions, which saw a slight increase, and finally nonprofit organizations, with approximately the same percentage of instances. Over 92% of recorded instances were directed to the aforementioned three types of recipients. In addition to these recipients, we can identify local/national governments as donation recipients.

When the value of donations is considered (in relation to the recorded sum), institutions were in the lead, followed by nonprofit organizations, and individuals/families dropped to third place.

In comparison with previous years, both interest in and the amounts of cash directed to individuals decreased. Although the percentage of donations in cash to nonprofit organizations has decreased in comparison with 2014, the absolute amount of cash they received was higher.

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

State recipients included local and/or national government as well as institutions.

After last year’s drop both in the percentage of instances and in the percentage of donated cash per recorded sum of donations, the data for 2015 shows that both indicators are on the increase: there was a slight increase of 3.5% in the number of instances and an increase of 12% in the value of donations.

FINAL BENEFICIARIES

When we examined the categories of final beneficiaries, we observed that people with health issues, although still ranked at the top of the list, have seen a further drop in instances. On the other hand, beneficiaries from specific local communities “jumped” into second place, as well as persons with disabilities who saw an increase of percentage of instances.

Although a significant percentage of instances was directed to these three groups of beneficiaries, the range of beneficiaries remained very wide: all groups of beneficiaries identified in 2014 are still present.
Key Characteristics of Philanthropy in Serbia in 2015:

★ In spite of the economic crisis and a drop in GDP per capita in the period from 2013 to 2015, both the number of instances and value of donations have increased.

★ When examining types of donors, the corporate sector stands out with continuous increase in donations, as well as with more frequent strategic investments and giving through open competitions. Compared to 2014, the role of corporate foundations has increased.

★ When we examine the diaspora, we see that the percentage of instances remained almost the same as last year – close to 18% -although the value of donations increased significantly, from approximately 5.3% to slightly over 17%. This will require further observation to determine whether it represents a trend, or merely a one-year fluctuation.

★ 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 the media.

★ Related to themes of giving, an encouraging trend is the increase in the percentage of instances of donations for education. Although donations for health and poverty reduction remained far ahead of education, a decrease in the percentage of instances for these two themes may indicate that a shift toward a more even distribution is likely to continue. Support to marginalized groups remained at the same level, which is also a positive trend.

★ Support for the state (institutions and local and national government) is, after the drop recorded in 2014, on the increase both in terms of percentage of instances and, even more so, in terms of the value of donations. These facts continue to provide a strong argument in discussions with state representatives on the importance of establishing significant tax benefits and revising the complicated procedures required for their implementation.

★ While the group of key final beneficiary groups remained unchanged with a large number of instances of giving directed to them. It is likewise positive that not a single beneficiary group “disappeared” from the list. It is also noteworthy that over 5% of instances were intended for refugees, and that the percentage of instances of giving for women victims of violence has been slightly, but constantly, increasing since 2013.

★ Finally, the transparency of the data is better in 2015 than in 2014. The percentage of media reports indicating the value of a donation increased from 30.8% in 2014 to 35.8% in 2015.

Overall, we can conclude that developments and changes in 2015 are of a positive nature as compared with 2014.
There were 3,218 recorded instances of philanthropy in Serbia in 2015.

In this regard, the first trend to be highlighted is the increase in the number of recorded instances in comparison with 2014. A statistical overview shows that there were an average of 268 instances per month, which represents a huge jump from the 154 recorded in 2014. The number of instances per month shows an expected seasonal distribution, with an increase in April and May, a drop over the summer holidays, an increase again in the fall and the largest number of instances in December.
1.2 Geographic Distribution of Giving

The trend of donations being most frequently sent to the Belgrade region (28.8%) continued in 2015. Belgrade was followed in terms of percentage by Sumadija and Western Serbia (24.3%), Vojvodina (23.5%). The difference between the latter two regions is too small to indicate any significant trend.

The percentage of instances for Southern and Eastern Serbia decreased in comparison with 2014, returning to the level of previous years. Therefore, it can be concluded that last year’s jump in the percentage of instances for that region was directly related to the floods. Although the quoted percentage did not include instances directly related to flood, it appears that it was the floods that attracted more donors. Unfortunately, as this region is the poorest, this attention was short-lived.

4.5% of donations in 2015 were directed either on a board national level or covered several of the regions, which have been grouped together in the category Throughout Serbia, 2.2% were sent Outside of Serbia: to Bosnia and Herzegovina (both Republic Srpska and the Bosnian Federation), Kosovo, Montenegro, Macedonia, and, surprisingly, one donation apiece was recorded as going to Albania, Ukraine and the USA).

Donations were directed to over 250 different local communities across 130 municipalities. Besides Belgrade, the municipalities that led in receiving donations were Novi Sad, Vranje, Novi Pazar, Zrenjanin and Niš.

Looking at the geographic distribution by region over the past three years, we see that 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 have remained in the range of 14-17%. The only significant change recorded in 2015 was in Šumadija and Western Serbia, but it remains to be seen whether this represents an ongoing trend. The percentage of instances in the categories Throughout Serbia and Outside of Serbia vary, but not to an extent that would signal ongoing trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>34.9 %</td>
<td>27.8 %</td>
<td>28.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vojvodina</td>
<td>25.1 %</td>
<td>24.8 %</td>
<td>23.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern and Eastern Serbia</td>
<td>14.8 %</td>
<td>21.3 %</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šumadija and Western Serbia</td>
<td>18.8 %</td>
<td>18.0 %</td>
<td>24.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout Serbia</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
<td>4.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Serbia</td>
<td>3.0 %</td>
<td>1.7 %</td>
<td>2.2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF GIVING BY REGION
(% of Instances)

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 Independence.
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF GIVING, BY RECIPIENT MUNICIPALITY (% of Instances)

- Novi Sad: 218 instances
- Vranje: 121 instances
- Belgrade: 110 instances
- Niš: 893 instances
- Novi Pazar: 76 instances
- Valjevo: 66 instances
- Čačak: 61 instances
- Subotica: 108 instances

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.
2 Overview of the Key Indicators Related to Philanthropy in Serbia

2.1 Donors

2.1.1 Value of Donations

Of the 3,218 donations (calls, instances, reports and similar) indexed, 35.8% of them had a monetary value associated with them, which is a slight increase compared to the 30.8% recorded in 2014. The total value of donations reported upon by the media, and which could be verified using other sources, is slightly over 10.645 million Euros. Only somewhat more than one third of recorded data contained the actual value of the donations. However, using extrapolation a cautious estimate can be made that the value of donations for charitable purposes in Serbia in 2015 was at least 22.323 million Euros. The graph below shows the recorded and verified value of donations in Euros, as well as the estimated value based on extrapolation from the recorded sums.

With regard to the aforementioned values, it is important to note that they include primarily donations in cash, since the estimated value of in-kind donations and pro-bono services is more difficult to extrapolate. Similarly, although the number of stakeholders willing to share data on the value of donations is increasing, it remains difficult to obtain a higher percentage of specific data. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that the total value of donations was significantly higher, even higher than the estimated sum quoted herein.

2.1.2 Donations by Type of Donors

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

If we look into donations by the number of instances, the data 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 individuals (individual giving where the donor can be identified) and then companies. Participation by other types of donors is less than 15% 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 individuals, mass individual and private foundations. Other types of donors provided less than 12% of the total recorded amount.

---

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

2 Neither donors nor recipients exhibited significant readiness to share information on donated sums. Consequently, increased efforts should be made to educate all stakeholders about the importance of transparency regarding donated sums.
Looking back at three types of donors in the last three years: mass individuals, the corporate sector and individuals, we notice that despite some fluctuations, the mass individual donor remained the most active (with the largest number of instances), and that there was increasing participation by both individuals and the corporate sector. With respect to the recorded donated sum, we see that the corporate sector continued to invest more funds, while the value of donations given by mass individual category and individuals fluctuated.

The changes visible in the percentage of instances and the recorded value of donations are not such as to suggest a clear conclusion or trend, but do confirm an ongoing increase in donations from the corporate sector.

**DONATIONS BY TYPE OF DONORS**
(% of instances vs. % of recorded sum)
In 2015, giving from the diaspora increased. Some of the more active diaspora organizations include Srbi za Srbe (Serbs for Serbs), Udruženje srpskih penzionera iz Ciriha (Association of Serbian Pensioners from Zurich), Kolo srpskih sestara (Circle of Serbian Sisters) and several organizations in Canada. These organizations mainly collected aid for individuals and families.

However, this year was marked by significant donations from individuals from the diaspora, significant both in amount and in their strategic orientation. One of the biggest donors was Mr. Milomir Glavčić, who received a VIRTUS award for his contribution. Among his many donations, we can certainly highlight the donation of a 500,000 Euros which facilitated the purchase of an MRI machine in Kraljevo. Marija and Milos Trojančević, a married couple, likewise donated equipment worth over 100,000 Swiss Francs to the Gornji Milanovac Hospital.

Bearing in mind that donations for culture and art are scarce, we would also like to highlight the example of Mr. Dragan Dugalić, an artist living between New York and Belgrade, who donated 10,000 USD to five independent cultural associations/institutions (Seeicult, Remont, Led Art, Matrijaršija Kolektiv, and Internet Society Serbia).
LONG-TERM DEDICATION TO GIVING

When considering long-term dedication to giving in 2015, we must by all means mention the ongoing efforts of Mr. Hido Muratović of Novi Pazar. Mr. Muratović has supported Sandžak families both with cash and in-kind donations over years. Besides investing his own funds, Mr. Muratović actively encourages other donors to give.

Another example that must be highlighted is the Ljilja and Mika Mijatov Humanitarian Fund. The Fund was established in 2006, on Mr Mijatov’s initiative and with his funds, to honor the memory of his late wife and daughter. The Fund awards scholarships each year to the six most successful students in Zrenjanin. Radio Zrenjanin and the Žarko Zrenjanin Town Library later also joined the Fund.

INNOVATIVE WAYS OF GIVING

A very interesting example of awarding donations comes from Erste Bank a.d. Novi Sad. During 2015, Erste Bank, in cooperation with Dokukino, ran both the Centrifuga and Club Superste programs. Centrifuga funds both registered and informal organizations to help them achieve their entrepreneurial, scientific or artistic ideas. Club Superste focuses on individuals with leadership abilities and innovative ideas that may contribute to development of community or society.

In 2015, both programs offered open calls for applications with several stages to the decision-making process. Following submission, applications were presented on the superste.net platform, where the audience/citizens were asked to vote for their favorite projects. Those applications that received the most votes were provided with mentors with relevant expertise to enhance their knowledge in various fields such as planning, branding, project management, fundraising, presentation skills, etc. This involved two levels of support: a project clinic that offered the possibility to ask concrete questions over a longer period of time, and personal contact with mentors. A two-day event called the “Ideodrome” was also organized. During the first day, organizations were given a chance to pose questions to mentors during sessions and lectures and receive advice. The second day of “Ideodrome” was reserved for organizations to present their ideas to a jury, which made the final decision regarding a donation.

In total, the programs supported 10 projects and 10 individuals and two projects received special awards from the public. The total amount of direct support was slightly over 60,000 Euros. What makes this program particularly innovative is its significant investment in enhancing organizations’ and individuals’ knowledge which, regardless of whether they received support or not from these programs, served as a “springboard” for many in seeking and receiving support from other donors.
2.1.3 Profiles of the Most Common Types of Donors

### CORPORATE SECTOR

**TOP 3 RECIPIENT ENTITIES**
- Institutions: 51.0%
- Individuals / Families: 22.3%
- Nonprofit Organizations: 14.9%

**TOP 3 THEMES FOR GIVING**
- Healthcare: 25.9%
- Education: 23.8%
- Support to Marginalized Groups: 14.8%

**TOP 3 FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS**
- People from Specific Communities: 33.0%
- People with Health Issues: 12.9%
- People with Disabilities: 8.2%

### MASS INDIVIDUAL

**TOP 3 RECIPIENT ENTITIES**
- Institutions: 49.2%
- Individuals / Families: 23.9%
- Nonprofit Organizations: 19.8%

**TOP 3 THEMES FOR GIVING**
- Poverty Reduction: 43.4%
- Support to Marg. Groups: 25.5%
- Economically Vulnerable: 11.9%

**TOP 3 FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS**
- People with Health Issues: 32.5%
- People with Disabilities: 20.4%
- Economically Vulnerable: 12.2%
EXAMPLES OF CORPORATE SECTOR DONATIONS

An example of dedication to a long term approach to resolving the issue of economically vulnerable residents comes from the Delhaize company which, in cooperation with a Food Bank, initiated a campaign called “Pomažemo da imaju i oni koji nemaju” (Let's Help Those That Don't Have to Have). Bearing in mind that over 26% of Serbia's citizens live below the poverty line, through this campaign, Delhaize (owners of the Maxi and Tempo supermarket chains) provided daily donations of over 1,800 kg of vegetables and fruit, equivalent to 40 tons of food per month.

Zdravlje Actavis, Leskovac is an example of how companies invest in the community in which they work. Over the course of 2015, the company provided two vehicles to the Leskovac General Hospital, donated a mammogram to the Health Center and invested over 20,000 Euros in the construction of a skate-park in Leskovac's Dubočica settlement. The Actavis company additionally supported a series of smaller scale activities, such as a carnival and the Life Festival.

Hemofarm Foundation stands out as an example of corporate sector giving through corporate foundations. Through the “Svim srcem” (With the Whole Heart) campaign, the Hemofarm Foundation donated numerous valuable diagnostic and patient care devices and equipments to several health institutes in Serbia including the Clinical Center Serbia, the Clinical Centers in Kragujevac and Niš, the Institute for Cardio-Vascular Diseases in Belgrade, the Institute for Pulmonary Diseases of Vojvodina, the Clinical Center Dr. Dragiša Mišović, and the University Children's Clinic Dr. Vukan Ćupić.

Nordeus d.o.o. stood out among small and medium size enterprises in 2015. In addition to other donations, through the Fund B92 campaign entitled “Bitka za porodilišta” (Battle for Maternity Wards), Nordeus donated equipment worth over 270,000 Euros to the Clinical Centers in Niš and Vranje. Nordeus d.o.o. received the 2015 special VIRTUS award for small and medium size enterprises.

Although smaller in terms of the value of the donation, but by all means an example of excellence is Giros Plus in Belgrade (another small and medium size enterprise) through their “Utorak je dan za giros” (Tuesday Is Giros Day). This enterprise has been a member of the Donors Circle for Svratiste (Children’s Drop-In Center) for two years and has repeatedly donated its products to children who either live or work on the street. Giros d.o.o. also received the 2015 special VIRTUS award for small and medium size enterprises.

A nice example of giving to fellow-residents comes from the Grujić Bakery in Ub whose owners decided to donate their products to Ub residents older than 70, pregnant women, Roma living in Ub and to the members of Ub’s Cultural Association and Football Club.

The Arena 2 Bakery from Subotica has a little different approach: during the whole year, the bakery has been donating free meals for 90 pupils and students of Žarko Zrenjanin Primary and Secondary School from Subotica.
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 2015. The companies MOL, Jana and DM have all maintained cause-related marketing campaigns that they initiated last year.

There are some distinguished new instances. Diopta, an optical shop, organized two instances. In one, the proceeds of a one-day sale of glasses were donated to assist with the medical treatment of a 12-year-old girl. In the second instance, 10% of each product sold over a weekend was donated to the Eye Clinic of the Clinical Center Serbia.

The wholesale and retail trading company Gomex d.o.o. Zrenjanin organized two similar instances. In one, 10% of the proceeds of each Gillette and Head & Shoulders product sold was donated to the Podrži život (Support Life) Foundation for the medical treatment of children. The other action was even more interesting: over the period of one month, 10% of each product sold from among four brands (Blend-a-med toothpaste, Head & Shoulders shampoo, Pampers diapers and Always sanitary pads) was donated to the Vojvodina SOS Network Against Violence Against Women, a network of five organizations that provide SOS telephone services to women and children victims of violence and are members of the network.

KEY POINTS:

● The overall value of donations increased by almost 21.8% from 2014 to 2015.

● In 2015, the most active donor types were mass individual (41.7%), followed by the corporate sector (26.8%) and individuals (19.3%). However, it is important to note that the rise in instances of giving by the corporate sector is partially the result of the greater engagement of corporate foundations.

● If we look into the value of donations, the picture changes: the corporate sector takes the lead with a 51.6% share in the total recorded amount, followed by individuals with a share of 16.4%, and citizens with the almost equal share of 15.2%. The participation of private foundations and mixed donors has decreased compared to 2014.

● If we analyze giving by the diaspora, the percentage of instances was similar to last year’s percentage, almost 18%, while the recorded value of donations increased significantly, from approximately 5.3% to slightly over 17%. It remains to be seen whether this is a trend or merely a one-year fluctuation.

● On the whole, mass individual donors continued to have the strongest presence, while the engagement of the corporate sector (companies, corporate foundations and small and medium enterprises) increased.
2.2 For What Purpose Are Donations Made in Serbia?

2.2.1 What Themes Are Important to Donors in Serbia?

The four key themes to which donations were directed in 2015 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.

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

This year, the percentage of instances for all themes other than the top 4 was slightly higher than usual at 20%. One of the reasons for this was certainly due to the refugee crisis, namely support for management of this emergency. Although we have separated out this type of giving, it is worth noting that mass individuals and the corporate sector in Serbia exhibited exceptional solidarity and provided cash and in-kind donations for refugees in spite of a very difficult economic situation. We believe furthermore that the assistance was significantly higher than what was recorded by the media or what was possible to verify using other sources.

### TRENDS IN KEY THEMES FOR GIVING - 2013 to 2015 (by % of Instances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Healthcare</th>
<th>Support to Marginalized Groups</th>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BREAKDOWN OF OTHER THEMES (by % of Instances)

- **Less than 0.5%**
  - Economic Development
  - Religious Activities
  - Science
  - Social Entrepreneurship

- **0.5 - 1%**
  - Animal Welfare
  - Community Development
  - Environment
  - Public Infrastructure
  - Heritage

- **1 - 3%**
  - Culture and Arts
  - Sport

- **More than 5%**
  - Emergency Management
  - Seasonal Giving
KEY POINTS:

- The four key themes supported were: support to marginalized groups, health, education, and poverty reduction. The instances directed to these themes add up to 80%, more than three-fourths of recorded instances.

- In comparison to the previous year, social entrepreneurship emerged as a new theme, while media support did not register on the list.

- The ranking of themes by number of instances did not change in comparison with 2014. Nevertheless, changes in percentage of instances 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. Changes worth noting are the slight increase in percentage of instances of giving for marginalized groups and the significant drop (of over 6%) in instances of giving for poverty reduction.

2.2.2 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.
TRENDS IN USE OF DONATIONS – 2013 to 2015 (by % of Instances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Support</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Off Support</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LONG-TERM SUPPORT

When we examine strategic investments in Serbia, the most frequent continue to be investments in equipment and/or the reconstruction of buildings.

However, in 2015, the Delta Foundation stood out as an example of another way to make strategic investments with long-term results.

Delta Foundation, in cooperation with Trag Foundation, created the program Zasad za budućnost (Seedlings For the Future) that awarded grants to six organizations in total value of 60,000 Euros.

The program is strategic in many ways: it stimulates agricultural production, offers the possibility to assist marginalized groups in trading in these products, and facilitates the generation of stable and sustainable income for organizations working with these groups.

Lastly, the Zasad za budućnost is a long-term program which will continue in 2016. Delta Foundation received a VIRTUS award for 2015.

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.

- The most common long-term investments by far are instances of the purchase of equipment, followed by capital investments and, surprisingly this year, scholarships, and finally services.

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

- When we examine changes in the period from 2013 to 2015, we see that the level of long-term investment has “returned” to its 2013 level (after a drop in 2014), while one-off investments show a slight drop. This change may be explained by the fact that 2014 was “the year of floods”. Even though in last year’s report we separated out instances of flood relief, a certain number of the one-off instances were most probably related to the floods.
Recipient entities (often also referred to as partners) show how donors choose to channel their donations, thus indirectly revealing whom they trust\(^3\).

In 2015, the principal recipients were, as in previous years, individuals / families, followed by institutions and nonprofit organizations (associations and foundations). The Other category included religious communities and unknown recipients.

---

3 Donation recipients/partners generally further distribute support to beneficiaries, that is, they use them for the benefit of particular target groups.
### TRENDS IN TYPE OF RECIPIENT ENTITIES - 2013 to 2015
(by % of Recorded Sum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Recipient</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals / Families</td>
<td>9.7 %</td>
<td>21.9 %</td>
<td>10.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>44.3 %</td>
<td>30.5 %</td>
<td>51.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>13.7 %</td>
<td>21.0 %</td>
<td>15.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local / National Governments</td>
<td>29.2 %</td>
<td>20.1 %</td>
<td>11.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### KEY POINTS:

- In 2015, the top three types of recipient entities by % of instances were individuals / families (45.0%), institutions (31.2%), and finally nonprofit organizations (16.3%).

- Viewing it from the perspective of the value of donations, the leading position goes to institutions, followed by nonprofit organizations, individuals/families, and local / national governments.

- If we combine the data for institutions and local / national governments, with both categories under the control of the state, we reach the conclusion that 33.9% by number of instances and 62.6% by value of donations were, in fact, donated the state.

- When reflecting on the last three years (for which we have data), we notice that the percentage of instances directed to each of the four main types of recipient entities has not changed significantly. Fluctuations are below 5%, which suggests no significant changes or trends. In other words, it appears that donors are relatively stable in their selection of recipients.

- When we look for trends in the percentage of value of donations, we see that 2014 was an exception and that the breakdown by percentage, with minor fluctuations, has returned to its 2013 level. The exceptions to this is the category local and national governments where the data for the past three years shows an ongoing decrease in the value of donations.

- Over the same three-year period, non-profit organizations, remained in third position by # of instances and third by value of donations, except in 2015 when they improved and moved to second position. The key role here appears to have been played by private foundations, which, since 2013, show an increase both in activities and in their ability to attract the attention of donors.

- It is likewise important to note that the number/percentage of organizations that have received donations from multiple sources has increased each year.
The category of nonprofit organizations consists of local civil society associations, foreign organizations, such as UNICEF, and private foundations.

The percentage of instances of giving to nonprofit organizations slightly increased in 2015, after a constant decrease over the previous years. Nevertheless, the fluctuations in percentages over the past three years have been relatively small, varying between between 15 and 17%.

The percentage of the recorded value of donations to nonprofit organizations decreased from 21% in 2014 to 15.1% in 2015. However, if we look into absolute figures and bear in mind that the overall value of donations has increased, the amount of cash donations received by nonprofit organizations is a bit higher than in 2014.

The very positive trend of an increased number of organizations and foundations receiving multiple donations from various donors continued in 2015. Organizations that received multiple donations in 2015 are NURDOR, Svratište za decu (Drop-In Center), BelHospice, Banatska asocijacija paraplegičara (Banat Association of Persons with Paraplegia), Banka hrane (Food Bank), Sigurna kuća (Safe House) Belgrade, Beli štap (White Stick), Plavi krug (Blue Circle) – Association of Diabetes Patients, Debra (Association of Persons with Epidermolysis Bullosa), Special Olympics Serbia, etc.

Among private foundations, the most frequently mentioned are Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation, Support Life Foundation, Novak Djoković Foundation, New Belgrade Humanitarian Foundation and the recently established Nataša Kovačević Foundation.

This year, the largest number of donations to nonprofit organizations came from the corporate sector, followed by mass individual donations. The percentage of donations from small and medium sized enterprises to nonprofit organizations is increasing, something which represents another positive trend.

The themes that are most frequently supported by nonprofit organizations are support to marginalized groups, health, poverty reduction, animal welfare, but also education, sports, culture, community development. In 2015, nonprofit organizations were supported to assist with emergency management of the refugee crisis.

The range of final beneficiary groups for which organizations received support remained very broad. It included primarily adults and children with disabilities (both physical and learning disabilities), people with health issues, people from specific communities, as well as economically vulnerable people. Other notable beneficiary groups included children/youth at risk and children without parental care. Moreover, the number of instances of giving in support of women victims of violence has continued to increase. By the end of the year, refugees were very well represented as a beneficiary group.
In terms of fundraising and cooperation with donors, it seems that the BelHospice organization was one of the most successful in 2015. Program PULS was initiated in 2015 together with GlaxosmithKline Ltd. Company. Through the program, company employees are allowed to spend six months of their working time in BelHospice. The results of this partnership in 2015 included the development of a strategic plan to initiate a capital campaign for construction of the first ever hospice in Serbia, as well as a strategy for implementation of palliative care in towns throughout Serbia through the establishment of satellite programs similar to the BelHospice Center.

Another successful BelHospice instance in 2015 was the annual charity gala and auction held at the Crowne Plaza Hotel during which the organization collected the record-breaking amount of approximately 75,000 Euros for the construction of the first hospice. BelHospice also organized a series of smaller-scale fundraising events such as participation in the Belgrade Marathon, a tennis tournament and an evening with the music Vasil Hadžimanov.
2.3.2 Who Benefits from Donations?

When we looked into the final beneficiaries in 2015, the four key groups that emerged were people (adults, youth and children) with health issues, the economically vulnerable, people with disabilities and people from specific local communities.

KEY FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS
(by % of Instances)

- Economically Vulnerable
- People with Disabilities
- People From Specific Communities
- People with Health Issues
- Other Groups

TRENDS IN KEY FINAL BENEFICIARY GROUPS
– 2013 to 2015 (by % of Instances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with Health Issues</td>
<td>30.7 %</td>
<td>29.1 %</td>
<td>21.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Vulnerable</td>
<td>20.4 %</td>
<td>17.4 %</td>
<td>13.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>9.8 %</td>
<td>12.9 %</td>
<td>15.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from Specific Communities</td>
<td>5.8 %</td>
<td>11.4 %</td>
<td>17.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY POINTS:

● The top 4 final beneficiary groups (people with health issues, economically vulnerable, people from specific communities, and people with disabilities) comprised 67% of the overall number of instances of giving in 2015.

● Although the percentage of instances benefitting the other the 12 beneficiary groups increased in 2015, the total of these groups amounts to a bit less than 1/3 of all instances.

● Over the past three years we have seen an ongoing drop in the percentage of instances benefiting people with health issues and economically vulnerable people. At the same time, the percentages of instances for the benefit of people from a specific community and for people with disabilities has continuously increased.

● Finally, it is worth noting that the percentage of instances intended for women and children victims of violence, while not significant, has been steadily increasing.

SUPPORT TO REFUGEES

As reflected in the above-mentioned data, a wide range of beneficiary groups were supported in 2015 and donors assisted children and youth and the adult population in almost equal measure.

In 2015, we must by all means highlight the assistance provided to refugees not only because this is a new beneficiary group, but because the support provided demonstrated in an extraordinary way the solidarity of Serbian citizens with an extremely vulnerable category of people who were only passing through Serbia. In addition, support to refugees motivated various types of donors: from ordinary citizens to the corporate sector to nonprofit organizations, which, either independently or in collaboration, assisted large numbers of people.

The Imlek, Bambi, Knjaz Miloš, Carnex, Coca-Cola HBC, Jaffa, Podravka, Color Press Group, Crvenka, MCG Group, Lomax d.o.o., Dexy Co, Veterni, Delta Holding companies, and many others, donated their products to refugees.

Telenor Serbia established several wireless internet zones in areas where refugees were accommodated. Microsoft Serbia donated software designed to facilitate efficient collection, storage and distribution of aid collected by the Serbian Red Cross and Beko Balkans Serbia donated washing machines to the Miksalište refugee assistance center.
Proctor and Gamble donated 50,000 USD to the Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation to equip six mobile units with equipment and personnel. These mobile units provided medical examinations, distributed aid and gave temporary accommodation to refugees and their families. In addition to offering tangible assistance, the advantage of mobile units was that they were able to provide assistance in the different places in Serbia through which refugees passed on their way to Belgrade or to a border with another country.

Nonprofit organizations formed an informal coalition, which grew into an organization called Refugee Aid Serbia. The coalition consisted of several organizations (Mikser House, ADRA Serbia, Keep Babies Safe, Ped Medic, Divac Foundation, Catalyst, GivingBack Serbia) and the number of organizations involved increased with the persistence of the refugee crisis. These organizations gathered a large number of volunteers who helped in collecting and distributing food, drink, footwear and clothes, getting in touch with families, and in providing information and practical assistance with transportation to the borders.

Among the nonprofit initiatives we must mention the InfoPark, a joint initiative of Fund B92 and Trag Foundation. The InfoPark operates in Belgrade, Dimitrovgrad, and Preševo with the main idea of providing information and assistance during the stay of refugees in these towns, as well as practical support in reaching other shelters in Serbia and the borders with neighboring countries. Individuals like Sanjin Pejaković, who collected in-cash donations from his colleagues in Sweden, used InfoPark to channel aid to those in need, as did Dusan Masic from London who donated cell-phone chargers. Trag Foundation received over 8,400 Euros in donations from Delta Holding, DIAGEO and numerous individuals and used these funds to supply and distribute needed goods.

Large numbers of citizens made both in-cash and in-kind donations and some put their flats at the disposal of refugees to make their stay more comfortable given low, winter temperatures. Among individuals we must highlight are Gordan Paunović and his wife Susanne Simon-Paunović who, in addition to providing direct assistance, played a large role in creating and organizing events that gathered all those who were ready to help.
2.4 How Is Giving Done in Serbia?

2.4.1 What Is Donated?

It is evident that donors prefer to provide cash donations, followed by donations of in-kind goods, mixed donations (cash and in-kind), and pro-bono services.

The percentage of instances involving volunteering remained small.

WHAT IS DONATED? (by % of Instances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Donation</th>
<th>% of Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind goods/materials</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and in-kind</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-bono services</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer time</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER WAYS TO DONATE

Apart from the traditional direct cash and in-kind donations, in 2015 we noted several interesting examples of donations of pro-bono services or other types of donations.

Eurobank EFG demonstrated through several instances other ways of supporting good causes. This company purchased books from the NURDOR organization and donated those books to the Home for Children without Parental Care Dragutin Filipovic Jusa and the Home for Children and Youth with Development Disorders in Sremcica. The bank also signed an agreement with the Lice Ulice organization which permitted the sale of the Lice Ulice magazine in all of the bank’s branch offices. Income from sales of the magazine was directed to the homeless.

Credit Agricole Bank and its employees continued their “Usvojimo školu” (Let’s Adopt a School) program. In 2015, 120 bank employees ran in the Belgrade Marathon, with the bank contributing 5€ for each kilometer the employees ran, resulting in a donation of 3,000 Euros to the Dušan Dugalić School for Children with Development Disorders.

UNICEF, in cooperation with the Banking Association of Serbia initiated a direct debit action which in a very simple way stimulated individuals to become regular donors: they fill-in an authorization form for a given amount of cash to be transferred at regular intervals and free from any bank charges to the UNICEF account.
KNOWLEDGE AS A DONATION

In 2015, several companies donated knowledge. Over 6000 students attended lectures and were mentored by Coca-Cola employees in the fields of management, marketing, finance, human resources and logistics.

The second interesting example came from VIP Mobile whose employees held seven free five-day VIP digital workshops for the elderly in five Serbian towns and that drew over 150 pensioners.

KEY POINTS:

- Cash donations were the most frequent (83.1%) and in-kind goods appeared in a far smaller percentage (12.5%).

- 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 (72.0%) and donated a higher percentage of in-kind goods or materials (22.3%). As in past years, over 85% of mass individual was donated in cash.

- The small percentage of volunteering instances does not reflect the real picture because of the media’s hesitation to report on volunteering (it is less attractive than concrete donations) and because companies fail to report on their often frequent volunteering instances, because volunteering activities are seen as part of their employee strategy. We believe that the percentage should be similar to that of pro-bono services.
2.4.2 Ways of Fundraising

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

The available data shows that direct donations were the most frequent way of giving, followed by campaigns/appeals, events and, finally, calls for applications.

![WAYS OF FUNDRAISING (by % of Instances)](image)

**TRENDS IN WAYS OF FUNDRAISING – 2013 to 2015 (by % of Instances)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Donations</td>
<td>48.3 %</td>
<td>45.1 %</td>
<td>43.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigns / Appeals</td>
<td>14.0 %</td>
<td>23.9 %</td>
<td>29.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>37.6 %</td>
<td>30.2 %</td>
<td>23.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Applications</td>
<td>0.1 %</td>
<td>0.8 %</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALLS FOR APPLICATIONS - A WAY TO DONATE

The use of competitive calls for applications as a method for donating significantly increased in 2015, with a larger number of companies organizing calls for applications in partnership with nonprofit foundations.

For example, through the “Zajednici zajedno” (“Together to Community”) competition, the NIS company and Trag Foundation awarded over 150 donations to small local organizations for development of their communities.

The Carlsberg company, in cooperation with the Dundjerski Foundation, awarded donations to organizations from Vojvodina for the preservation of cultural heritage and environmental protection.

UniCredit Bank, in cooperation with the Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation, held a competition called “Ideas for a Better Tomorrow” through which it supported seven projects of nonprofit organizations and small enterprises for the development of social entrepreneurship or development or expansion of their current activities.

NURDOR CAMPAIGN

In 2015, NURDOR partnered with a team of two energetic college students who initiated an extremely interesting campaign involving the participation of a large number of Serbian individuals. The campaign, called “Kilometar kose” (“Kilometer of Hair”) collected hair to produce wigs for children with cancer who had suffered hair loss after chemotherapy.

This very specific and unusual campaign not only achieved its immediate goal but will certainly contribute to the organization’s visibility and attract new donors who will most likely support NURDOR in other ways and in other campaigns.

KEY POINTS:

- Despite showing a continuous slight decrease, direct donations remain the most represented method of giving – close to half of the total number of instances.

- Campaigns / Appeals, as well as events vary more over the years. However, since 2013 we have observed an increase in the number of campaigns and a continuing decrease in the number of events.

- Competitions also show a continuous slight increase. Competitions are mainly announced by the corporate sector. The assumption is also that the number of competitions is actually higher, but their occurrence has not been well-reported, particularly where foundations are concerned, because the media rarely recognizes this sort of competition as philanthropy.
2.4.3 Media Coverage

As shown in the graphs below, almost half of the reports of donations were published in the print media (52.6%), followed by the web media (29.8%). The smallest percentage was published in the electronic media. In comparison with 2014, we observe increased reporting in electronic and web media.

With regard to territorial coverage, the majority of reports were recorded in national and then in local media. It is worth noting that there was an increased level of reporting in the regional media. The majority of reports were published in daily media.

It is also noteworthy that in 2015 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 has not happened before. Of the total number of media reports, slightly over 4% were reported by media registered in other countries.
Radio Television Serbia, RTV Studio B and Radio Novi Sad stand out as the electronic media that presented the largest number of reports. In the print media field, Blic clearly led in its coverage of giving, followed by Večernje novosti, Naše novine, and Kurir. The web media that printed the most reports were Blic.rs and B92.net.

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

The data from 2015 shows that with regard to the placement chosen for the report, in printed media, only 13.7% were placed on one of the first five pages. The next 13.2% 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: 78.7% of reports were broadcast before 19:00, and only one fifth of all reports were broadcast during prime time (after 19:00).

A similar result is found concerning the duration of reports: “small” (less than one fourth of a page) reports characterized 70% of all reports and over 77% 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 the majority of media consider philanthropy a side topic. Reports were often scanty or incomplete, making it was very difficult to understand who had made the donation, for what purpose or to which type of beneficiary (or, in other words, how the donation would be used).

Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that, compared to the rest of the region, the media in Serbia is extremely active where reporting on philanthropy is concerned and that Serbia has been leading for years in the total number of reports produced. In addition, the media in Serbia has taken a very active role: most of the media does not merely report on philanthropy. Some media outlets have established their own foundations (Fund B92, Blic, Večernje novosti). Others quite regularly organize their own campaigns and events, or actively cooperate with other actors. As a consequence, the media appears both in the role of donor and in the role of intermediary, thereby contributing directly to strengthening philanthropy.

Finally, the data of the past three years demonstrates that the media has become more transparent in relation to its presentation of sums: while small, there has been a continuous increase in the percentage of reports in which the sum of the donation is recorded - from 28.4% in 2013 to 35.8% in 2015.

**KEY POINTS:**

- The majority of reports on philanthropy were published in printed media (52.6%), followed by the web media (29.8%), while the electronic media remained far behind the other two in the number of reports broadcast.
- The national media, with over 70% of reports, continued to hold the lead in the number of reports, with the local and regional media trailing far behind with approximately 10%.
- The data on the time and spot devoted to reports in the media points to the fact that philanthropy is still considered a side topic. In addition, published reports were generally incomplete in terms of providing details of the donation.
- On the other hand, the media in Serbia was the most active in the region where the number of reports is 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 reports which indicated the sum of the donation has seen a constant, though slight, increase over the past three years: from 28.4% in 2013 to 35.8% in 2015.
3 Annexes

3.1 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, 2015.

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\(^4\), 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.
3.1.1 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of charitable giving</td>
<td>- Number of instances of charitable giving in one-year period;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Geographic distribution (% of instances per region in relation to the total number of instances);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of instances of cash donations in relation to the total number of instances;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of instances of in-kind donations/services in relation to the total number of instances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of collecting cash donations</td>
<td>- Different groups (types) of methods of fundraising for donations in cash;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of representation of different types of methods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergence of new methods for fundraising/donations in cash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of charitable giving instances</td>
<td>- Theme or Purpose of the support;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number (in %) of instances per purpose;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergence of new themes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of donations per theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation recipients and beneficiaries</td>
<td>- Types of donation recipients;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of instances involving recipients in the state sector (% in relation to the total number);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of instances involving recipients in the civil sector (% in relation to the total number);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of instances involving recipients from other groups (% in relation to the total number);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Types of beneficiaries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of instances directed to different groups of beneficiaries (% in relation to the total number of instances);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergence and number of new beneficiary groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>- Number of instances per type of donor (% in relation to the total number of instances);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of instances per different recipients and per type of donor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of instances per theme and per type of donor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of instances per beneficiary groups and per type of donor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of donations for charitable purposes</td>
<td>- Total value of charitable donations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of instances with a recorded sum of donation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of donated amount per type of donor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of donated amount per type of recipient;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of donated amount per theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>- Type and number of different actors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergence of new actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>- Total number of media reports;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number (in %) of media reports per media type;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number (in %) per territorial coverage (national, regional, local);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of reports treated as substantial per media type (printed, electronic).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
3.2 Annex 2: Changes in the Legal-Fiscal Framework

Over the course of 2015, there were no changes in the legal-fiscal framework for giving in Serbia. Consequently, we only provide herein a summarized overview of remaining tax issues. 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 Golubovic 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><strong>The Law does not stipulate for tax benefits for donations of individuals/tax-payers.</strong></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>
Research Conducted By:

catalyst

Catalyst Balkans
Seat: Milet Jakšića 1
Offices: Makedonska 21
Belgrade, Serbia
www.catalystbalkans.org