

CEELBAS / BEARR
NGO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

CEELBAS / BEARR Conference 15th June 2009

Backwards or Forwards? Challenges facing NGOs in Russia

BEARR and CEELBAS: a trail-blazing collaboration

Dr Robin Aizlewood, Director of CEELBAS, introduced the second conference to be held jointly with BEARR. The partnership developed over the past 2 years has had a great impact on collaboration and exchange of knowledge between academics and practitioners, he said. The CEELBAS/BEARR programme has been a trail-blazer, and we must ensure that we exploit opportunities for even greater gain over the coming years.

THE POLITICAL SCENE IN RUSSIA IN MID-2009

Professor Richard Sakwa, University of Kent

Prof Sakwa also endorsed the benefits of interaction between academics and practitioners. His theme was the duality that characterises Russian political life. Russia is both an authoritarian state and a flourishing democracy. On the one hand is the “normative state”, the formal constitutional order that embodies an intention to be open and pluralistic, and to work within the framework of the law. It is reflected in the pedantic regulation of NGOs. On the other hand is the political practice of the administrative regime. This is the shadowy, arbitrary system populated by factions with access to influence. It goes round, above and below the constitution, undermining the normative system and stifling it. The dual state is an apparent contradiction, but it is a model that contains its own creative internal tensions and dynamism, and is capable of evolution.

A hybrid state

Sakwa believes that the transformation of Russian society that began 20 years ago is still incomplete. The changes provoked by Gorbachev and the West were resisted by internal elites – but not totally. There are endless discussions and high-level debates about what is needed, and Russia is currently a genuine hybrid state, combining features of both authoritarian and democratic systems. The way this works in practice is illustrated by the heavy-handed raid on Memorial, which was challenged in different courts until a just outcome was reached. The key point is that these structures and processes are dynamic – they can change.

Civil society – Russia has only one of three essential features

Sakwa helpfully pinned down the slippery term “civil society”. “Civil society” is sometimes used to mean only civic and social associations. It is also used to mean a certain type of state – the normative state. The third common understanding of “civil

society” is of the public sphere where the first two, civic associations and the state, work together in practice. In its ideal form, this is a sphere of openness and debate. In fact all three features are needed to create true civil society, and Russia only possesses the first of these – that is, flourishing civic and social associations. Whether these are state-sponsored, western-financed or domestic, the numbers have grown enormously. New NGOs that are taking a positive role in social policy show great courage and commitment, and are not just a middle-class phenomenon. But the public sphere within which they interact with government holds them back. The Russian state still intervenes massively and consistently, partly out of fear that NGOs could harbour revolutionary “colour technologies”. Nevertheless, these grass-roots developments reflect a genuine breakthrough in social participation and optimism over the last three or four years.

CIVIL SOCIETY IN RUSSIA TODAY

Elena Panfilova, General Director, Transparency International, Russia

Panfilova, an academic turned practitioner who was recently appointed to the Presidential Council on Civil Society and Human Rights, shared Sakwa’s optimism that some elements of civil society are emerging. The real evidence of this is not the numbers of NGOs registered (often cited by the government as proof of the existence of civil society) but the fact that more people realise that the first step is to come together with others to tackle a cause. In the anti-corruption area in which Panfilova is active, grass-roots civil movements are emerging that do not even register as NGOs but still put pressure on local authorities.

Too late for the government to control

These movements have developed enough momentum that it is now too late for the government to suppress them except through direct violence. Similarly, the government cannot control the activity of bloggers on the internet. According to Panfilova, everyone blogs in Russia, including journalists who add material not broadcast through the official channels. Everyone knew about the recent unrest in Vladivostock, not through the official media but through internet blogs.

The five keys to reducing corruption

Transparency International has been researching corruption since 1999, and in doing so, Panfilova has reflected, like Sakwa, on the nature of government in Russia. Is it an authoritarian democracy, or a manipulative or semi-manipulative democracy? Her analysis is that current political structures have evolved to preserve the access of elites to sources of illicit enrichment, in particular to the shower of easy money generated by oil and gas. To the extent that this entails corruption, the rights of citizens to, inter alia, education, travel and freedom of speech are violated. Five basic elements need to be in place to prevent this:

1. A real market economy
2. Free media
3. Genuine rule of law
4. True political competition

5. The will and ability to associate with others to solve a problem

Discussion chaired by Dr Christopher Gerry (BEARR and CEELBAS)

Pete Duncan of UCL wondered whether the impetus for civil society might diminish as Russia comes out of recession – many do not believe that the government (and corrupt practices) had no role in the financial crisis but Putin’s achievement has been to make people feel good. Panfilova disagreed with this – she thought that the sense of well-being was a generational phenomenon, not to be attributed to Putin. Apart from some slipping back in 1999, many people now know what it means to live well, and they are determined not to lose that. More people, freed from doing multiple jobs just to survive, now have the time to reflect on what can be done. In response to Anna Bailey of UCL, Panfilova did not estimate the role of trade unions to be strong – they are hampered by tension between government-sponsored and independent organisations.

A question from Charles Buxton (INTRAC) about whether there are any non-corrupt alternatives to privatisation as a model for transfer away from public ownership prompted a more detailed discussion about the nature of corruption in Russia. Panfilova thought that it is mostly institutional extortion and Sakwa agreed that it is largely venal – extortion for services that should be delivered anyway. In the short term, succumbing to such demands can speed things up, but in the long term it becomes dysfunctional. Such corruption can be reduced by creating the five conditions outlined by Panfilova. Sakwa distinguished this low-level corruption from the “meta-corruption” of a whole society. He believes that this does not apply to Russia. Although the government is sometimes characterised as a kleptocratic clique, it does have modernising goals. Unlike the ‘Leninist Liberals’ who believe the whole system should be overthrown, Sakwa noted the positive effects of patriotism in making people want to engage to improve society. He also noted that per capita income in Russia is approaching \$12,000 – the level often regarded as a trigger for demands for more sophisticated forms of democracy.

Questions from Ann Lewis (BEARR), Victoria Hudson (Birmingham), Denis Krivosheev (Saferworld), Robert Scallon (BEARR) and Janet Abbott (The Promise) led to a discussion on the situation in the regions and in other states, particularly the North Caucasus. Sakwa felt that “Chechnyasation” has created a sham state – all the creative space generated by a dual state has disappeared there, and there is a risk that this process could blow back into Russia. Each Russian region has its own political constellation, and while most Governors belong to United Russia, many are not afraid to criticise the government. Both Sakwa and Panfilova believed that it is important to establish the idea that civil society in Russia has a national identity; that NGOs are not defined only in opposition to the government; and that anti-corruption campaigns are perceived as campaigns for a strong country. Lobbying of the Duma has not yet developed into an open and active process.

LAWS, REGULATIONS AND TAXES

Daria Miloslavskaya, Director, International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law, Russia

Miloslavskaya outlined the constellation of NGOs that has emerged in Russia: GONGOs, BINGOs, MANGOs and PENGOS – respectively government, business, mafia and personal NGOs. Many were set up for a single purpose and are now awaiting liquidation. Of nearly a quarter of a million NGOs registered with the Justice Ministry, it is believed that almost one third are dormant.

Legislative instability and arbitrary implementation are the problems

NGOs are governed by a web of legislation. First there is a hierarchy of framework legislation starting with the general provisions of the Constitution of the Russian Federation, the Civil Code and the Tax Code (the latter two to be amended), and moving through the increasingly particular provisions of 30 further Federal Laws on Not-for-Profit organisations, on Charitable Activities, on Public Associations, and others. There is specific tax and fiscal legislation, and legislation on foreign funding of NGOs. In practice, Miloslavskaya believes that, after some familiarisation, the legislation and associated reporting requirements are not too difficult to comply with.

There are two real problems: first, inconsistent implementation. The Ministry of Justice has 77 departments throughout Russia, which are inefficient, ineffective, and do not follow the letter of the law. The hundreds of Informational Letters that the Ministry of Justice sends out to the regional departments remain a state secret (in contrast to the Finance Ministry equivalents, which are published in legal journals). This lack of transparency, combined with the constant revision of legislation, creates the second problem: a lack of stability.

Inconsistency of implementation is evident in the administration's approach to registration and incorporation. A list of proscribed founders of NGOs is used to exclude foreign nationals whose stay is deemed 'undesirable' in the aftermath of the Orange Revolution. Other grounds for refusal include threats to Russia's unique character and cultural heritage. There is no agreed definition of what this means, allowing officials to take a personal view, and resulting in uneven levels of professionalism.

Reporting requirements are, however, less onerous than they appear. All NGOs have to report all funds received from foreign sources and to detail how these funds are allocated or used. In 2007, in the aftermath of the introduction of this requirement, half the queries received by the Lawyers for Civil Society organisation were connected with reporting on foreign funding. In 2009, the rate is only one in fifteen. NGOs are coping – and have also realised that the Justice Ministry will, in most cases, rubber-stamp the forms without further examination. Foreign grant makers do not have to comply with these reporting requirements unless they have a branch, office or affiliate in Russia – a little over 250 foreign organisations fall into this category.

Changes to ease the burden?

A working group is examining three possible changes to make life easier for smaller NGOs:

- exemption from formal reporting for domestic NGOs that receive no foreign funding and do not have foreign founders, with annual revenue of less than \$100,000;
- 3-year rather than annual mandatory audit by government ;
- mistakes in registration to be met by a 3-month suspension of process until corrected, rather than denial of registration.

***“I object categorically to foreign funding of political activity in the Russian Federation. Not a single self-respecting country allows that and neither will we.”
Putin, May 2006.***

At present, any grants given to Russian NGOs by foreign organisations that are not on the government’s approved list are considered taxable income. A decree in June 2008 reduced the list of approved foreign organisations, with effect from January 2009. However, a further decree this year allowed for ministries other than the Finance Ministry to propose foreign organisations for the approved list. According to Miloslavskaya, the proposals have not yet been submitted to the government and it is not clear why.

Donations are tax-exempt

Although NGOs can opt to pay a simple tax rate of 6% on all income, another approach is to ensure that income is channelled through donation agreements, and is therefore tax-exempt. BEARR has circulated Miloslavskaya’s explanation and template for such agreements to conference participants, but Miloslavskaya suggested, in response to a question from Michael Rasell (Lincoln) that companies making donations should have a good lawyer to draft the donation agreement. In general, any income that an NGO earns from trading activities is taxed as if it were a commercial organisation.

Discussion chaired by Robert Scallon (BEARR)

The following points were made by the speakers in response to questions from Daryl Ann Hardman (BEARR); Olga Alexeeva (CAF); Anna Bailey (UCL); Katy Harris (Look East Wild Earth); Philip Michaelson (BEARR); Ann Lewis (BEARR) and Ross Maclaren (CS Mott Foundation):

- the Finance Ministry has not pursued any NGO for mistakes caused by bad legislation that will be amended, such as the taxation of volunteers’ expenses as if they were employees;
- a well-managed NGO should not need more than two hours (or at most a day) to fill in the reporting forms;
- Russian organisations can donate to countries in the “near-abroad”, such as Belarus, provided the donation complies with that country’s legislation;
- the term “Non-Commercial Organisation” is used in Russia rather than “NGO”, but it is recognised that definitions are a problem (an NCO that is a school could be a state organisation, for example). Public Associations exist as a particular type of NGO. It is hoped to address the problems of definition before legislation is amended;

- getting the views of NGOs to the government before legislation is changed will depend on political will, and increasing public awareness of what NGOs do. Public opinion on NGOs has become more positive since Medvedev's meetings of the Presidential Council on Civil Society;
- amendments to NGO law are not intended to close down the sector – the government has other means to do that if it wished. Ambiguity in the Russian language and the legislation means there is scope for implementing law both negatively and positively;
- codes of conduct and registers of conflicts of interest are not understood as means of promoting transparency.

NGO FUNDING FROM RUSSIAN SOURCES

1. Government, local government and other official sources

Elena Topoleva, ASI, Moscow

Introducing Elena Topoleva, Daryl Ann Hardman recalled that 2009 is the fifteenth anniversary of the creation of ASI, the first post-Soviet organisation to collect information on the third sector.

Nearly one third of NGOs receive state funding

Information on the third sector in Russia has increased since the Higher School of Economics established a government-funded research centre. Their statistics show that 12% of NGOs are purely voluntary and have no funding at all; half of all NGOs have income of less than £10,000, and 30% of NGOs receive funding from the state budget: either from federal funds (6%); regional funds (11%) or municipal funds (13%). Although only 4% of NGOs declare foreign funding, almost 10% receive funding from Russian foundations which may be partly funded by foreign money.

Federal grants consist of Grants of the Public Chamber or “The President’s Grants”, which are disseminated through different institutions each year and awarded through competitions (although it helps to have contacts in the disbursing institutions, and more goes to Moscow than to the regions). The President’s Grants peaked at £30m in 2008, and fell to £24m in 2009. ASI’s “Tak Prosto” campaign to encourage volunteering was partly funded through a President’s grant in 2008. NGOs are having difficulty with the government’s attempt to direct 2009 grants solely to people in need as a result of the economic crisis.

Regional grants are much more variable and depend on local laws. Some have been cut because of the crisis, while others might be limited to support for veterans or the disabled. In Novosibirsk, however, grants are still being awarded for educational projects run by NGOs.

Municipal grants can be quite generous and wide-ranging in big cities such as St Petersburg and Ekaterinburg.

Government Foundations have been established by various ministries. They include the Russian Children in Need Fund (Ministry of Health and Social Development); the Russian Healthcare Foundation; and the National Charitable Foundation. The last, which also distributes President's Grants and benefits from having Putin on its board, has the largest budget – about £10m in 2009.

2. Foundations, private and business donors **Olga Alexeeva, Head of CAF Global Trustees**

The first cooperatives formed in 1986 started the modern era of philanthropy in Russia. The most significant developments have been since 2001, when private giving became separate from corporate giving: there are now nearly 100 wealthy private foundations. 2002 saw the beginning of an explosive growth in middle-class giving: one CAF programme alone raised \$4.5m in 2008.

Major national companies usually have a charity policy, and 80% of giving is directed to the town where they are based and where they have inherited responsibility for the Soviet infrastructure, especially in one-industry towns. Large companies may be susceptible to Kremlin “racket” – pressure to donate to a particular cause.

Local companies are more likely to be privately owned and therefore behave more like individuals, donating to local populist causes.

High net-worth individuals and the middle class also support populist causes (children, orphanages) and value honesty over effectiveness. They often by-pass existing NGOs and prefer informal channels, such as friends. They are motivated by their personal values and group influence (less often by religion), and planned giving is not yet established. NGOs themselves do not understand how to launch appeals to the general public in the name of beneficiaries, rather than for the promotion of their own organisation – in cases where the end-beneficiaries have been promoted, it has been possible to raise large sums.

The ultra-wealthy are different. Overwhelmingly young (80% aged 30-45), many have leaped from poverty to riches with such speed that there is no cultural gap between them and the people they want to help. They are in the spotlight and are concerned for their reputation; the presumption of guilt, especially viewed from abroad, rankles. Their philanthropy is a means of presenting and explaining themselves to the outside world. From conservative beginnings – the donation of gifts – many have become innovative in their style of giving, and an elite group has emerged that emphasises results. A reluctance to give up control is evident in their approach to their own private foundations and in a tendency to go it alone and build their own orphanage, theatre or hospital. None of this benefits established NGOs.

What has benefited NGOs, ironically, is the financial crisis, because they are seen as a cheaper alternative to state provision. Companies have cut their community budgets, but the ultra-wealthy still give, albeit more slowly, and the middle class, while once again

worrying about survival, are now used to giving and will continue to do so, in order to keep up appearances, for as long as they can.

3. NGO funding from international and foreign national programmes, trusts and foundations

Anna Sevortian, Deputy Director, Centre for the Development of Democracy and Civil Society, Moscow.

Sevortian outlined four themes in NGOs' current experience of foreign funding:

1. the need to downplay human rights and democracy agendas in projects;
2. greater competition for funding because better ideas are being generated – a good thing but it makes NGOs feel vulnerable;
3. closure of the Ford Foundation and doubt over whether Open Russia will meet its obligations has created a sense of fire-fighting and made it difficult to plan ahead;
4. overall decrease in international funding available.

The crisis is in our minds

Sevortian believes that what is perceived as a crisis contains opportunities, and many NGOs are already revising their strategies. Although they may feel they are between a rock and a hard place, with a risk of being accused of spying if they accept foreign government money, and a risk of losing their independence if they accept Russian government money, many have recognised that they need to be more imaginative in responding to donors' reduced offerings. There is still hope that Western funding will increase again, mainly from the EU (Eastern Partnerships) and the World Bank.

Discussion chaired by Daryl Ann Hardman (BEARR)

Speakers made the following points in response to questions from Megan Bick (BEARR); Anna Bailey (UCL); Sarah Dennis (St Gregory's Foundation); Alison Payne (The Promise); and Ross Maclaren (CS Mott Foundation):

- there are about 50 community foundations in Russia; the most successful are the ones which have local donors and where the managers have strong local links. Some are just grant-givers while others act as community bridge-builders. Some areas have partnerships of community foundations;
- although the state runs anti-alcohol campaigns, it is difficult to get broad public support for them. Alcohol is privately tolerated, in contrast with drugs, which are seen as a relatively new and 'foreign' threat, and are being addressed by NGOs such as NAN. The public will only give money if instant happiness and a miracle are promised. This is difficult where a problem has complex solutions, but Russian NGOs can learn from Western counterparts how to present on behalf of their beneficiaries, breaking the goals down into small, achievable steps (little miracles) and telling the stories well;
- there is an organisation that provides distance learning for NGOs in fundraising. ASI does the same in PR;

- BEARR and ASI are starting to publish information on donors and grant-givers on the BEARR web site. The Russian Donor's Forum also has a database, but many of the listed foundations are private and do not give grants to other NGOs.

NGO FUNDING FROM THE UK

1. Russian diaspora

Elena Ragozhina, Editor, New Style Magazine

Ragozhina, a former economics lecturer and banker, has lived in London for nine years. A friend of the late Jill Braithwaite, one of BEARR's founders, she became a director of Dima's Dream, the charity set up by Mary Dudley. Ragozhina described her surprise when she discovered how much an expatriate woman was doing for Russian children, while Russians in London did nothing.

Moving country changes your mentality and your life

Now running Russian Media House, Ragozhina is interested in the way that moving to a new country not only changes your life, but also your mentality. 'New Style', a luxury magazine for Russians in London, reflects this idea. Russian society in the UK is different from the diaspora in the US and Israel. In the UK, it is dominated by business people (many of whom have businesses in Russia) and students.

Trust and networking are the keys

Certain ideas persist, even among the predominantly wealthy and middle class Russians in the UK. One is that the state should provide for the needy. The other is that charities are not trustworthy organisations. Ragozhina believes that this is the right time to educate Russians in the UK. Her approach is to run annual charity events and to network – finding and involving people in some cause or activity can open doors to understanding, and starts to build trust. Her magazine plays an important part in this process.

2. The British Government

Anna Sevortian

The UK Government's grant-giving is part of its contribution to the Millennium Goal of halving poverty by 2015. Funding is channelled through the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the Department for International Development, and the British Council.

Full details of the various programmes are now available on BEARR's web site. In brief:

- FCO runs the Strategic Programme Fund for Human Rights and Democracy (£1.9m for the development of democratic institutions) and jointly with DfID a £2.4m programme for conflict prevention, media and civil society (S Caucasus);
- The British Council promotes active citizenship and dialogue between communities, with emphasis on migration and anti-terrorism;

- DfID runs a number of programmes, including the Civil Society Challenge fund, which gives relatively large grants of up to £0.5m for up to five years.

3. Corporate giving

Brook Horowitz, Director, International Business Leaders Forum

There has been much progress since the Prince of Wales set up the IBLF in 1990 to promote a more human form of capitalism and to improve corporate responsibility. Most large companies now have a Corporate Social Responsibility Department or team. Their role has never been to consider development issues, but rather to be involved in social development as a function of the company's growth (in other words, how to increase the wealth of the poorest people so that they will be able to buy the company's products.)

CSR practitioners have had to become even more hard-nosed since the crisis; there is no reason for a company to commit resources to involvement in anything that does not improve its markets. CSR managers have 'products' to sell too, and have learned that emotional campaigns on health, disability or the environment, which appeal to individuals, mean little to companies.

At present, companies are prepared to give money to support the following programmes in Russia:

- financial literacy: banks are concerned about recovering their loans, and about competing on a level playing field with sharks and cowboys mis-selling credit;
- anti-corruption: the CEOs of multinationals in particular are concerned about their liability for the actions of Russian employees under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

Horowitz thinks that there is some scope for NGOs to interest companies that have "health" as part of their brand in prevention campaigns, particularly as the Russian government has tended to focus on cures. Alliances could be created with medical or pharmaceutical companies. While recognising the contradictions of Diageo promoting moderate drinking or Nestle campaigning against obesity, such programmes are beneficial to society.

Structure the 'miracles' in business speak

The IBLF is helped in its aim of increasing corporate giving by the fact that it receives money from government sources (EU, FCO, USAID) and therefore has an official stamp of approval. The Russian Finance Ministry is about to approve the IBLF's financial literacy campaign, and that too should encourage more corporate support. But apart from this, Horowitz stressed that NGOs asking companies for money must learn to describe the hoped-for results in business speak – the miracles must be ones that can be achieved in a short time-frame.

Discussion chaired by Megan Bick (BEARR)

With contributions from Olga Alexeeva (CAF); Sarah Dennis (St Gregory's Foundation); David Maidment (Railway Children); Charles Buxton (INTRAC) and Robert Scallon (BEARR), the following points emerged:

- there are different perceptions about what multinationals actually do when they are active in Russia. Alexeeva thought that their regional offices in particular would support local populist causes. (Horowitz pointed out that they would still look for a benefit such as employee participation.) At a higher level, multinationals have to be careful not to forget their head office corporate responsibility agenda, and not to succumb to Kremlin 'racket';
- Ragozhina doubted that the diaspora in the UK would support anti-alcohol or environmental campaigns;
- a number of British philanthropists exist who have the same 'DIY' approach as Russians, by-passing existing NGOs in support of a cause;
- multinationals should introduce higher standards in employment opportunities and access for the disabled. Helped by Perspektiva, Johnson & Johnson became the first company to change its policies in Russia after recognising that it was not abiding by its own standards there;
- too little research is being done in Russia into the link between street children and alcoholism and drugs;
- the 'image library' of charitable help needs to be extended beyond painting children's homes and funding operations;
- despite training to improve NGOs' analytical and research skills, lack of professionalism is still a problem. Could companies currently working at low capacity be persuaded to offer help, as a corporate volunteering exercise?
- there are no tax breaks for companies making donations, while individuals only get tax relief on donations to state organisations.

Concluding discussion chaired by Dr Christopher Gerry

Opening the final discussion, Dr Gerry noted that the day's principal theme had been one of navigation. In answer to the question, "Backwards or Forwards?" speakers had also introduced the ideas of up, down, round, sideways, and zig-zag. The evidence suggests a qualified "forwards". NGOs have found their way round state constraints, and economic growth has given people the security and the time to look up and start to think about education, health, and other social issues. In doing so, acceptance of NGOs and civil society is starting to become embedded.

Legitimacy, acceptance and sustainability

Gerry noted that NGOs have achieved three key things. They have attained legal recognition; it is accepted that they have a role in the social contract between state and society; and, for some causes more than others, sources of funding have increased. However, despite the growth in private foundations and middle-class giving, is there a risk that we have under-estimated the impact of the financial crisis? NGOs must become more imaginative in selling themselves and creating partnerships, and in gaining support for successful outcomes that are not necessarily miracles. Support for networking and sharing of best practices is still needed.

Brook Horowitz thought that the process of creating civil society in Russia is itself a miracle. It is shown in the enthusiasm and energy of people, who may themselves be poor, that can be seen in NGO meetings.

Ann Lewis suspected that NGOs still do not have enough researched material on which to base their strategies. The gap between researchers and potential users still exists, and the attempts being made by BEARR and CEELBAS to bridge the gap need to be replicated more widely. David Maidment thought that in some areas, research conducted in other countries could be valid in Russia, and Jo Lucas (Kastanja) pointed to the PhD programme in social work that she is setting up in Georgia and Ukraine. Charles Buxton said that the US University in Bishkek has set up a centre for social research, although INTRAC had struggled to establish relationships with academics in Central Asia. Chris Gerry said that most academic development work now features collaboration between the researchers and the community that the work is expected to benefit, and calls for funding stipulate that academics work with non-academics. This had been the original spur to CEELBAS's work with BEARR.

Ann Lewis also asked whether the translation problems discussed earlier in the conference could be overcome by using the American term 'not-for-profit'. This elicited a list of terms or established jargon that other participants, English- or Russian-speaking, had found impossible to translate into Russian: cross-sector partnerships; restorative justice; even integrity! But as independent consultant Jenny Wildblood pointed out, when we don't fully understand what we mean by "third sector" in the UK, and our government cannot define it, how can we begin to translate it into Russian?

Nicola Ramsden
BEARR Trustee

Various additional materials relevant to the conference are available on the BEARR website (www.bearr.org)

Extensive research on grant-givers was carried out in preparation for the conference by Anna Sevortian and by Maria Olshanskaya of ASI. This material is now available in the section on "Funding sources" on the website.

Three conference participants used PowerPoint presentations. The slides of these are available as follows:

Daria Miloslavskaya: Russian Not-for-Profit Legislation
http://www.bearr.org/en/Miloslavskaya/conf_June_2009/Law

Olga Alexeeva: Russian Donors: Opportunities and Challenges
http://www.bearr.org/en/Alexeeva/conf_June_2009/Russian_donors

Elena Topoleva: State Funding for NGOs

http://www.bearr.org/en/Topoleva/conf_June_2009/State_NGO_Funding

In addition Daria Miloslavskaya kindly provided several lengthy background papers:

Laws and Other Provisions covering NGOs in Russia

http://www.bearr.org/en/NGO_Laws/June_2009

NGO Legislation; Changes June 2009

<http://www.bearr.org/en/node/1943>

How to make a Donation in Russia

http://www.bearr.org/en/Russia/donations/June_2009