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## Overview of the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Population 2016*</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>GDP Per Capita* (US $)</th>
<th>Official Language</th>
<th>Most Represented Religion**</th>
<th>Number of Registered POs</th>
<th>Registration Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2,926,348</td>
<td>Tirana</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>Sunni Muslim (57%) Roman Catholic (10%)</td>
<td>2,427 (1)</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>3,516,816</td>
<td>Sarajevo</td>
<td>4,708</td>
<td>Bosnian Croatian Serbian</td>
<td>Sunni Muslim (45%) Serb Orthodox Christian (36 %)</td>
<td>12,189 (1)</td>
<td>Central State Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>4,213,265</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>Croatian and other minority languages</td>
<td>Catholic (86.3%)</td>
<td>52,450 (2)</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>1,816,200</td>
<td>Pristina</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>Albanian Serbian</td>
<td>Muslim (95.6%)</td>
<td>8,537 (3)</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td>2,081,206</td>
<td>Skopje</td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>Orthodox Christian (65%)</td>
<td>4,156 (1)</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>628,615</td>
<td>Podgorica</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>Montenegrin Serbian Bosnian Albanian Croatian</td>
<td>Orthodox (Serbian or Montenegrin) (72%)</td>
<td>3,300 (1)</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>7,057,412</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>Orthodox Christian (85%)</td>
<td>23,394 (2)</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current US $. World Bank 2016  
(1) Balkan Civil Society Development Network, 2015. (Year 2014)  
(2) Croatia Office for Cooperation with NGOs, 2016. (Year 2014)  
(3) Kosovar Civil Society Foundation (KCSF)/ Balkan Civil Society Development Network (BCSDN), 2015. (Year 2015)
The Global Philanthropy Environment Index “Balkan Countries” region includes Croatia and the countries of the Western Balkans: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia. All of these economies are also part of the United Nations Southern Europe Region. The region is a complex mosaic of several ethnic groups and languages, combining large proportions of Christian Orthodox and Muslim populations, together with other minor religious representations (Roman Catholic and Protestants). The countries with majority Muslim populations are Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Albania. The region is no stranger to religious/ethnic conflicts. Past conflicts between Muslims, Roman Catholics and Orthodox Christians linger below a surface of fragile peace, and new threats to inter-ethnic relations are always present. In 2016, Conflict Barometer reported conflicts between the opposition and the government in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), violent protests in Kosovo by the opposition parties, and tensions in BiH, when the Serbian entity decided to hold a referendum over its day of independence (Bosnian Serbs / Republic of Srpska).

The levels of educational attainment in countries in the region are diverse. There are countries with around 20 percent of their population age 25+ at least completing tertiary education such as Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia. There are also countries like Albania and BiH where less than 15 percent of the adult population has tertiary education completed. Nevertheless, Albania together with Croatia and Montenegro are the countries with the highest percentage of population with at least some secondary education.

Being a region that has seen several wars in the recent past, the Balkan countries have made progress towards transitioning to democratic societies and modernizing their economic infrastructure, as reported by the Bertelsmann Stiftung’s Transformation Index (2016). However, these are still countries with defective democracies and some with rather functioning economies, where the progress made in key freedoms, rule of law and democratic governance are not yet sustainable or irreversible.

The Syrian refugee crisis has affected the countries in the region and the dynamics of their relations with European countries. The most affected countries in the region are Macedonia, Croatia and Serbia, three bridge countries that became the route of refugee waves mainly towards Germany between 2014 and 2016. Even after Europe’s closure of the corridor through the Balkans in March 2016, narrower flows of migrants still pass through Serbia (UNHCR, 2018) and because of the strict control imposed to the country’s northern borders, many refugees remain in the country for longer periods. This has led to a “280 percent increase in the number of refugees present in the country between March 2016 and February 2017” (Serbia International Rescue Committee. 2017). In the process, Balkan countries have become indispensable partners to control the inflow of refugees, and promote stability in the region.

Of the seven countries, only Croatia is member of the European Union (EU); however, the rest of these countries are either confirmed as candidates for future membership (Macedonia, Montenegro, Albania, and Serbia), or considered potential candidates for membership (Kosovo and BiH). The accession criteria to join the EU requires a functioning market economy and competitive capacity, stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law and human rights, respect for and protection of minorities, and administrative and institutional capacity to implement the common rights and obligations of EU member states. Kosovo is the last in the queue to join since EU states Spain, Cyprus, Romania, Greece and Slovakia do not recognize Kosovo’s independence from Serbia in 2008. However, Kosovo has been taking steps towards joining the European Union by signing the
Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) with the EU and continuing conversations to reach important agreements for normalizing the relations between Kosovo and Serbia. Bosnia and Herzegovina is already part of the SAA with the EU and formally applied for EU membership in February 2016.

The prospect of accession has represented a significant catalyst for reform in the Balkan countries, while receiving technical and financial support for the implementation of reforms. Experts of the Balkans in Europe Policy Advisory Group (BiEPAG) consider that the EU’s ability to export democracy through its enlargement policy is failing to live up to its promise to deliver democracy to those countries engaged in the process of joining the Union, and risks of autocratic regimes are rising in the region. Additionally, the slowdown of the EU Enlargement process has allowed other countries like Turkey, Russia and the Gulf States, to intensify their presence in the Western Balkans with a mixed impact on the region.

**Summary Report**

In a region with the backdrop of variable levels of political and economic stability and a civil society sector still oriented towards foreign donations as the primary source of revenue, there is great potential for the emergence and further development of the nascent domestic philanthropy ecosystem in each country. However, there is an imbalanced legal and regulatory framework on paper and an inconsistent application of even the most progressive frameworks for philanthropy organizations in practice. With growing corporate and individual philanthropy in each economy over the past several years, the importance of philanthropy organizations advocating for improved frameworks and their implementation has begun to rise on the prioritization of these organizations’ advocacy agendas.

While philanthropy organizations are generally free throughout the region to form and function with little restriction from the government, except to ensure that anti-constitutional actions or overtly political purposes are not a part of a nonprofit’s intended purpose, the test of whether philanthropic freedom really functions is in how giving and receiving is actually regulated and/or fostered. Although several countries of the region have laws and regulations on the books for providing corporate and/or individual tax exemptions for giving, and some countries even have a developed public benefit designation freeing those philanthropy organizations from paying VAT, in practice these frameworks are cumbersome to navigate, time-consuming to realize, and confusing for all but the most experienced philanthropy stakeholders. The steady and incremental growth of domestic philanthropy can then not be attributed to the existence or application of improved tax treatments, but rather as a result of the efforts of philanthropy organizations to conduct improved outreach among their individual and corporate donor pools and of an increased awareness of corporate citizenship among companies.

As such, while philanthropic freedom broadly exists, as philanthropy organizations increasingly orient themselves to domestic sources of philanthropic flows, the demand for an improved enabling environment will increase, and economies within this region will be expected to see improvements in their overall ranking on philanthropy environment.
The non-governmental sector in the region still has strong ties with international NGOs, and a high number of local organizations—especially large-size organizations—are foreign funded. Domestically, mass individual giving is the most active donor type in the region, while corporate giving is also increasing. The recent report published by Catalyst Balkans (2017) about the Current state of Philanthropy in the Western Balkans (not including Croatia), shows that mass individual (large number of citizens who could not be identified by name) and individual donations (donors that can be identified as individuals) are on average 52 percent of total giving in the region, while corporate donations represent 29 percent. The countries with estimated lower levels of corporate giving (lower than 16%) are Albania, Kosovo, and Macedonia showing that the private sector in those countries is not engaged enough in philanthropic activities. In countries like Albania, Bosnia, Montenegro and more specifically Serbia where the value of donations of the corporate sector reached 45.5 percent in 2016, the private sector is more actively involved in philanthropy.

In the region, giving is very much related to humanitarian causes and human rights. Country reports show that philanthropy in the region supports mainly health-related causes, human rights, and basic needs. Healthcare is likely to remain a primary cause for donations in several countries, while support for marginalized groups and poverty reduction remain as the other top causes. These match the results of the Catalyst Balkans report showing large proportions of giving going to health, support to marginalized groups and poverty reduction. Education is the least supported cause through philanthropic giving.

The average ratio of NGOs to population is one organization for every 397 people; however, there are significant differences between countries. Albania and Macedonia have the highest ratios (1,206 and 501 respectively); followed by Serbia (302); BiH (289); Kosovo (213); Montenegro (190); and Croatia (80). According to the Balkan Civil Society Development Network’s Report (2016), there is
a possibility that in some countries these numbers are inflated and that the number of active NGOs is significantly lower. Giving also varies between countries. The estimated amount of giving is significantly higher in Croatia and Serbia than in the rest of the Balkan countries.

With the exception of Croatia where the primary beneficiaries of donations are non-governmental organizations, NGOs are not the focus of giving in the Balkan countries; rather, individuals and families are the main beneficiaries of philanthropic giving. This may be the product of several causes. Some experts mention low levels of awareness of the role of philanthropic organizations and lack of trust due to low levels of transparency and accountability of non-government organizations, while others mention that the modest philanthropic tradition and the perception of philanthropy as a means to help those in need rather than a vehicle to solve important social issues that require a longer-term approach are also plausible explanations. Additionally, there is the issue of foreign NGOs and the levels of skepticism about their ability to connect with local problems.

In general, philanthropic organizations still lack the tools and methodologies required for effective fundraising, which involves higher levels of professionalization and institutional capacity. While large organizations are, for most part, professionalized and receive strong foreign and government support, local small organizations are still financially vulnerable, especially community based organizations, which are less professionalized and lack the capacities to tap local sources of funding. Besides, the lack of strong local funding mechanisms (grant makers with enough economic power) together with their lack of solid relations with foreign donors make these organizations less financially secure, especially those dealing with politically sensitive issues, such as human rights and social activism.

Capacity building is key for philanthropic organizations in the region. The Global Philanthropy Environment Index country report for Montenegro expands on areas for capacity building that can be applied to the whole region: "...fundraising, project cycle management--with particular emphasis on management of the EU funds and the EU application procedures--strategic planning, advocacy, establishment and development of networks and coalitions, CSR, and communication with businesses. Becoming an EU member could provide a positive push for a strengthened civil society. Technical support to cross-sectoral cooperation should improve the institutional framework and provide conditions for full implementation of the national Strategy for Development of NGOs" (Jankovic, 2018).

2. Philanthropic organizations operate freely

Registering a philanthropic organization using any of the legally recognized forms (association foundation, endowment, society, etc.), is protected by the countries’ legal frameworks that guarantee the fundamental freedoms of association, expression and peaceful assembly. In all countries, the registration process is clear and can be accomplished in a reasonable timeframe. The average time reported by the experts was between 5 and 30 days and the registration process is almost always free. The amount of financial resources required depend on each country, but in general, costs of registration are affordable for almost all types of philanthropic organizations. The costs associated with registering a foundation vary widely, from Serbia, where the cost can exceed US $30,000, to Albania and BiH where costs typically fall around US $1,200, to Montenegro where there is no fee for establishing a foundation. In general, organizations can also function without registration but that prevents their eligibility for tax exemption or access to public funds.
In terms of operation, philanthropic organizations are allowed to work without government interference and can engage in any kind of lawful activities without constraints. Political, extremist, and violence inciting activities and the violation of basic human rights are explicitly prohibited. Freedom of expression and access to information are guaranteed by law; therefore, communication with the media, networking, using technology as means of communication, and cooperation with other organizations are unrestricted both within and across borders in most countries. However, in countries like Serbia, where political stability is currently under threat, the access to media and the normal operation of POs involved in human rights and social activism is diminished.

Reporting procedures are clear, but slightly different depending on the country. In Macedonia, regardless of size or type of organization, philanthropic organizations have to obey the same financial reporting and accounting standards as any other legal entity, while in Albania, BiH, Croatia, and Kosovo, the reporting requirements depend on the size (income or expenditures) of the organization.

**Figure 2. Scores on Ease of Operating Philanthropic Organizations, by Economy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Ease of Operating a PO</th>
<th>Form a PO</th>
<th>Operate a PO</th>
<th>Dissolve a PO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2018 Global Philanthropy Environment Index*
Dissolving a philanthropic organization can be a voluntary act, decided by its members and notified to the competent government office. Involuntary termination only occurs in cases of flagrant violation of the law, extinction or bankruptcy and, except from Serbia, the decision can be appealed. The causes for involuntary termination are not always clearly defined in the law and sometimes are subject to interpretation. Between 2014 and 2016, there were cases of verbal threats to certain organizations that were critical to the government; however, involuntary dissolutions are not common.

3. Tax incentives for individual donors are lacking in some countries

Corporations receive tax deductions for donations to NGOs engaged in certain types of public benefit activities. Although the procedures established in the law are clear, the major challenge faced in some countries is determining whether the use of a donation is considered to be for public benefit, which creates problems of implementation and consistency in the application of the law. In Macedonia and Serbia, the character of “public benefit” is determined according to each particular project and donation, rather than being based on the character of the recipient organization; therefore, there is not such a thing as a permanent public benefit status. Instead, philanthropic organizations must apply for tax deduction for each received donation. However, while in Macedonia organizations are required to apply regardless of the amount of money received, in Serbia gifts below US $900, given by a single donor, are automatically exempt from income taxes. Additionally, the law prescribes excessive administrative requirements for both the donor and the recipient of the donation, which may disincentivize donations.

In BiH, the list of public benefit activities is narrowly constructed in the Legal Entity Tax Law and Income Tax Law, and there is some discrepancy in the eligible causes between both laws. Similarly, in Montenegro, the Personal Income Tax Law does not recognize in-kind contributions, but the Corporate Income Tax Law recognizes goods and services as donations. This situation contrasts with Albania, where tax-exempt activities are all “activities for the good and in the interest of public”. In Albania, this is considered an improvement to the now abolished “Public Benefit Status,” which included only three areas (education, health care, and economic development).

Figure 3. Scores on Tax Incentives, by Economy
Not all countries in the region provide tax incentives for individual donations. In Albania and Serbia, individual giving does not qualify for tax exemption, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina, citizens who are not entrepreneurs cannot claim tax deductions. Other countries like Croatia, Kosovo and Montenegro, provide a more favorable environment for individual giving.

The requirements for application for tax-exempt status are different in each country, depending on what the internal laws define as public benefit purposes, but in general, it is straightforward process. In cases when organizations are engaged in income generating activities not related to their purposes, they must pay taxes. In Serbia, some organizations have been required to pay income tax on income used for administrative or overhead purposes, as the local tax authority determined that such costs were not considered to be in the public benefit.

In general, there are no restrictions on raising funds locally or internationally or for accepting donations. Nevertheless, in Kosovo the Law on the Prevention of Money Laundering and Financing of Terrorism requires that organizations ask for special permission to accept any contribution in excess of €1,000 from a single source in a single day, or disburse currency in excess of €5,000 in a single day to any single recipient.

4. Need of simplified procedures for cross-border philanthropy

A favorable environment for cross-border donations contributes to regional actions aimed towards development, stabilization and sustainability. The legal environment for cross-border donations in the region does not impose restrictions in the amounts sent and recipient organizations and/or target countries; however, tax incentives fall short in some of the countries in the region and legislation on money laundering and counter-terrorism requires sophisticated reporting procedures on transactions over certain amounts, depending on each country’s laws. Recommendations of the Regional Conference: “Philanthropy in the Western Balkans and Turkey: Investment for the Future” report (2015), point to the simplification of the procedures for philanthropic actions across borders.
Individual and corporate donors not always get the same benefits when donating across borders as they would for giving to domestic charities. In some countries, cross-border donations can be sent without additional costs or need for approval (i.e. Montenegro, Croatia); other countries (i.e. Macedonia) require that the donor pays the transaction fees. However, while Croatia does not provide tax benefits for donations abroad, in Macedonia, donations made abroad to support humanitarian disasters and catastrophes are tax deductible. Meanwhile, in countries such as Albania, cross-border donations do not qualify for tax exemptions.

Receiving cross-border charitable donations (monetary or in-kind) has very few restrictions and no government approval is required, especially if there exists a funding agreement that allows foreign agencies to financially support local organizations. In Albania, the tax treatment for corporate foreign donations is the same as for domestic donations only when donors are registered within the country and there is a funding agreement. In several countries, charitable cross-border donations (money or in-kind) can be received without additional costs (fees or taxes) while in other countries in-kind donations are subject to Value Added Tax (VAT). One of the challenges in receiving cross-border
donations is that in almost all EU countries donations to non-EU countries are not tax deductible; hence, donations to Western Balkan countries are not deductible.

5. Inter-sectoral collaborations grow in stable political environments

The relations between the non-governmental sector and the government in most Balkan countries seem to be occurring in an environment of growing political tensions and difficulties to engage philanthropic organizations in productive dialogues. For now, Kosovo seems to be the exception. In 2013, the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Kosovo established the Strategy for Cooperation with Civil Society 2013-2017, and then in 2016, signed a Memorandum of Understanding to cooperate in all activities related to a better enabling environment for philanthropy. In the past, governments in the region have developed similar strategic frameworks and structures of cooperation to strengthen and institutionalize the relations with the non-governmental sector. The strategies have included the constitution of councils, consultative bodies, signed agreements, government offices, national foundations, advisory groups, and national policies. However, the impact of these strategies has been minimized amid growing political tensions that have reduced public consultation, therefore limiting the participation of non-governmental organizations in the development of important public policies.

Figure 5. Scores on Political Environment, by Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Political Environment</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Public Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Hercegovina</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2018 *Global Philanthropy Environment Index*
In Kosovo, philanthropy has had a key role in the development of the democratic state, but the recognition of this role does not translate to similar practices across countries. In particular, Kosovo, aspiring to be an integrated European nation, has actively made efforts to build a democratic regime through the recognition and appreciation of the role and work of civil society in building democracy. While this is the situation in Kosovo, other Balkan countries report low recognition of the work of the philanthropic organizations, low levels of support, poor mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation, and the occurrence of positive encouragement to participate in public issues only when governments feel pressured by the requirements of the EU integration process or by international stakeholders.

In consequence, the efforts to promote a culture of giving and show transparency in the distribution of government funds vary among countries in the region. Similarly, the capacity to regulate the non-governmental sector and ensure transparency and accountability is also dissimilar, leading to lack of reliable data to measure the performance of the sector. Catalyst Balkans, an organization that collects, analyzes and publishes data on philanthropic giving in the region, reports little availability of comparable information to show the size, scope, origin and impact of philanthropic donations. Additionally tax reporting, commonly utilized as a reliable source to measure giving, is not completely useful. It is difficult, or even impossible, to measure individual giving using tax returns since some countries in the region do not provide individual tax incentives; besides, public data and/or unified registries are not always existent.

6. Philanthropy as a response to humanitarian disasters

The philanthropic tradition in the Balkan countries is founded on core values of humanity, solidarity, altruism and generosity. The diverse religious groups who live in the region share similar philanthropic roots linked to the creation and expansion of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman philanthropy was characterized by endowments in the hands of economic elites that were used to support social institutions and deliver basic social services. As years passed, the responsibility for public welfare and social services was centralized in the state. This partially explains the late development of local philanthropic organizations and helps describe why the profound philanthropic values of the Balkan society do not immediately translate into giving through institutionalized forms of philanthropy; instead, citizens choose to directly assist individuals and families.

Humanitarian programs have been important components of philanthropic initiatives since the nineties, when numerous international humanitarian organizations came to the region to alleviate the effects of the economic and refugee crises, consequently contributing to shape the current philanthropic landscape. As some of the country experts have pointed out, citizens mainly experience philanthropy as humanitarian activities and actions that are organized to assist socially vulnerable populations, but not as a vehicle to solving important societal issues that demand a long-term approach.
Most of the local NGOs created immediately after this initial period were supported by foreign funds and also linked to projects initiated by international organizations. In most of the countries, the legal framework for the creation of non-governmental organizations was developed in the nineties, which explains the low levels of institutionalization of the sector and the still lack of public confidence and understanding of the role of these organizations in social development. Furthermore, the strong presence of international NGOs partially setting the development agenda and influencing the focus of local NGOs on programs that do not necessarily responded to specific local needs (in the eyes of the locals) may have conflicted with the intentions of local NGOs to build public trust and support. Coupled with that, is the persistent need to increase transparency in order to build people’s trust and the need to strengthen civil society to facilitate the emergence of an independent philanthropic sector.

7. The future of philanthropy

This section summarizes the main trends of philanthropic development in the region:

Corporate/Individual philanthropy: Individual philanthropy is expected to grow as more initiatives are put into place to support people in need, health issues, and extreme poverty, while the business sector will continue to be source of large donations. There is an increasing trend, evidenced in Albania and Serbia, of private businesses engaging in philanthropic activity, which is expected to continue.

Vehicles for donating/fundraising: Campaigns, crowdfunding, and cause-related marketing will be increasingly used as professionalization increases and the philanthropy community explores effective and innovative ways to expand support. Social media may become a viable platform for promoting good causes and generating individual support. Traditional media, on the other hand is expected to play a proactive role in identifying issues and promoting good practices of philanthropy, especially individual philanthropy.
Cross-sectoral collaborations: In countries like Albania, with more happening between State institutions and private businesses in terms of private-public-partnerships that support philanthropic results, the State’s awareness of philanthropy will increase. The future also seems to promise an increase in cooperation between philanthropic organizations and the private sector, following the existing successful cases of cooperation between these two sectors.

Youth-led Philanthropy: Youth-led philanthropy may become a trend in some Western Balkan countries. Although the participation of young populations in philanthropy is still low, there are several initiatives to support youth-led projects in the region. In Serbia, the Ana and Vlade Divac Foundation works with youth activists and civil society organizations (CSOs) in municipalities across the country to promote youth-led community development solutions. The Foundation has received funds to expand its model to other countries in the region. USAID reports that the Foundation currently “trains youth in fundraising and local philanthropy; helps youth and youth-led CSOs develop the skills for partnering with local governments and the private sector; works with youth-led CSOs to promote and support youth initiatives; sponsors public debates to discuss youth-related issues and solutions; and supports innovative advocacy efforts that produce youth-favorable local resource mobilization.” FRIDA, HIV Young Leaders Fund, and MTV Staying Alive Grant, are youth-led funds strengthening the participation and leadership of young key populations in the region. It is a long road though, since the development of youth participation needs still to be strengthened in the region.
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