Annex IV: Country Information

Each of the reports is based on a combination of data derived from the following sources:

- Interviews with 2 respondents-HRAW leaders or informed observers of NGO landscape from a particular country. In total 21 interviews were held during February, March, April 2010 with respondents from 10 countries. Each interview was recorded and transcribed without attribution;
- Research of literature, publications and reports on the NGO sustainability, situation in the area of human rights, accountability and watchdog as well as about funding of NGOs;
- Web-search of sites of HRAWs and donor organizations relevant to the subject of the study.

At the beginning of each report we provide a summary of key human rights, accountability and watchdog issues that are relevant for a given country. These are based on various reports of international and domestic organizations that monitor the situation. The list of issues provides a context for the need of activities performed by the HRAWs. The list of selected HRAWs with their short description comes next and provides the reader with a sense of who are the major HRAW NGO actors in a given country. Lists are not exhaustive, but to some degree representative.

The next section in a country report looks at the sustainability situation of HRAWs and presents the key challenges and issues that these organizations face. The information in this section is based mostly on the analysis of conducted interviews.

The final section deals with the funding sources, both existing and potential ones and analyzes them from the perspective of HRAWs.

Given a very heterogeneous and to some extent incomplete information, it was not possible to formulate conclusions for each country, however for some countries we offer summary of findings and conclusions, especially when the available data allowed us to do so.

Each report also includes the list of resources and publications used, a list of HRAW web addresses and list of respondents without identification.

8.1 Romania

1. Human Rights, Accountability and Watchdog Context

There were reports that police and gendarmes mistreated and harassed detainees and Roma in Romania. Prison conditions remained poor. The judiciary lacked impartiality and was sometimes subject to political influence. A restrictive religion law continued to limit freedom of religion. Property restitution remained extremely slow, and the government failed to take effective action to return Greek Catholic churches confiscated by the former communist government in 1948. Government corruption remained a widespread problem. There were continued reports of violence and discrimination against women as well as child abuse. Persons were trafficked for labor, sexual exploitation, and forced begging. Neglect of and inadequate assistance for persons with disabilities was also reported. Extensive discrimination and occasional violence against Roma continued to be a problem. Gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender
persons continued to suffer societal discrimination. Discrimination against persons with HIV/AIDS, particularly children, remained a problem.¹

There were further allegations that Romania was involved in the US-led secret detention and renditions programme, despite continued denials of any involvement by the government and the findings of a Senate commission of inquiry. There were reports of ill-treatment, excessive use of force and the unlawful use of firearms by law enforcement officials. Discrimination against Roma and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people persisted. A progress report on Romania was published by the European Commission (EC) in July 2009. This urged the Romanian authorities to start reforms of the judicial system and to strengthen measures to tackle corruption, particularly at local government level.²

There were several examples of CSOs that attempted to monitor state performance and to hold the state accountable and some of them had a positive impact. More than two thirds of the persons interviewed during the stakeholder consultations, considered that civil society had a limited role in holding state accountable. Romanian civil society activities in holding private corporations accountable are very limited. There are a few examples of CSOs which monitored and opposed the activities and irresponsible behaviour of private corporations. However, even though successful, their impact remains isolated.³

2. Key Human Rights, Accountability and Watchdog NGOs

- Resource Center for Public Participation (CERE). CeRe's mission is to support NGOs and public institutions in acquiring the principles and applying methods of public participation. In CeRe's vision, NGOs, citizens and public institutions assume responsibility for public participation and use their rights associated to this participation.⁴

- The Euroregional Center for Democracy (CED) is a non-governmental and non-profit organization, that promotes democracy and stability in Central and South-Eastern Europe. CED is located in Timisoara, a city in the Western part of Romania. Timisoara represents an ideal learning location for a laboratory seeking to devise programs of great importance for the future of democracy and regional stability. This multi-ethnic and multi-cultural space encourages dialogue between individuals and institutions that promote democratic values.⁵

- Romanian Academic Society (SAR). Established as a think tank in 1996, SAR aims to further the ideas of freedom, democracy and good governance in Eastern Europe. It seeks to raise public awareness level of policy issues, contribute through research and advocacy to informed policy formulation and assist administrative reform through performance assessment. They believe that countries can do more or less out of their European accession process and their goal is to help improve their performance in this process so that integration brings a maximum of benefits.⁶

- Accept Romania. A non-formal group named - Bucharest Acceptance Group was founded in 1994, with the aim to promote an open and reasonable dialogue on the complex topic of same-sex relationships. ACCEPT (Bucharest Acceptance Group) was officially registered as a human rights

³ CSI Country Report: Romania, 2006
⁴ http://www.CeRe.ro/eng
⁵ http://www.regionalnet.org/en/
⁶ http://www.sar.org.ro
non-governmental organization in 1996 and, in 1997, ACCEPT launched a national and international campaign to repeal Article 200 from the Romanian Penal Code, which was incriminating same-sex relationships. Their activities include: lobby, advocacy, activism; collecting and disseminating information on homosexuality, the gay community in Romania, health and AIDS/HIV prevention; media monitoring; strengthening the gay movement and the gay community; direct action and grass-root activism; social and cultural activities.\(^7\)

- Institute for Public Policy (IPP) is a Romanian non-governmental organization whose aim is to support an increased quality of the processes related to the development of public policies in Romania. It is committed to advancing high quality policies in the following main areas: transparency of the legislative process, reform of the local government system, fight against corruption and promotion of integrity at all local government levels, organization and operation of election systems and processes, funding of political parties, promoting the rights of the disabled, which made of IPP one of the most respected and experienced think-tank in Romania. Together with its departments which coordinate programs and activities of the Institute, specialised divisions were created in the last years to offer professional services to partners and clients, such as public authorities or private entities, that are interested in the Institute’ fields of excellence.\(^8\)

- Romani CRISS (Romani Center for Social Intervention and Studies) is a Romanian non-government organization which seeks to protect the rights of the country’s Romani minority and to prevent discrimination against the Roma. It also conducts a series of projects in order to improve the situation of the Roma in education and health care. Romani CRISS was founded in 1993.\(^9\)

- Alternative Sociale Association (ASA) is a non-governmental, apolitical, and non-profit organization initiated in 1997 by a group of students at the Social Work Faculty of "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University in Iasi. Alternative Sociale Association works to protect and promote human rights through prevention activities, assistance, training, research and advocacy.\(^10\)

- The Association for the Defense of Human Rights in Romania – the Helsinki Committee (APADOR-CH) is a non-governmental not-for-profit organization, established in 1990. APADOR-CH wants to be an influential and principled factor of reference, in dialogue with the state authorities and in cooperation with the civil society, an active participant in changing the society and its institutions towards a democratic culture, based on the respect of human rights. The mission of APADOR-CH is to raise the level of awareness on and respect of human rights and rule of law.\(^11\)

- Transparency International Romania (TI-Ro) is a non-governmental organization whose primary objective is to prevent and fight corruption on a national and international level, mainly through researching, documenting, informing, educating and raising the awareness level of the public. TI Romania was founded in 1999 through the remarkable endeavours of a group of citizens with a high degree of civic responsibility, and a number of organizations concerned with reducing corruption in Romania. They laid the foundation to the structure and objectives of this organization. That same year, Transparency International Romania was accredited as a national branch of the Transparency International network - a global coalition dedicated to fighting corruption.\(^12\)

\(^7\) http://accept-romania.ro/en/
\(^8\) http://www.ipp.ro/eng/
\(^9\) http://www.romanicriss.org
\(^10\) http://www.alternativesociale.ro
\(^11\) http://www.apador.org/en
\(^12\) http://www.transparency.org.ro/
Asociatia Pro Democratia (APD) is a non-governmental, non-profit and non-party affiliated organization established in 1990. APD currently has 31 clubs with more than 1,000 members and volunteers who participate in implementing the projects. The mission of Asociatia Pro Democratia is to strengthen democracy at national and international level by encouraging civic participation. The main fields of interest of APD are: strengthening the relation between the electorate and its elected representatives, observing the correctness of the electoral process, civic education; citizens' participation in the process of public policies drafting, the transparency of public institutions and their control by the civil society; protecting human rights.13

Center for Legal Resources is a non-governmental, non-profit organization, established in 1998 by the Open Society Foundation (nowadays Soros Foundation), which actively advocates for the establishment and operation of a legal and institutional framework that safeguards the observance of human rights and equal opportunities, free access to fair justice, and which contributes to the capitalisation of its legal expertise for the general public interest. Their programmes are focused on two strategic areas: promotion of rule of law and respect of human rights.14

Save the Children Romania is a national democratic movement, unaffiliated politically or religiously, based on the voluntary involvement of its members. It was established in 1990 and currently has branches in 14 countries, over 6,000 members and benefits from the voluntary activity of over 800 people, mostly youngsters. Save the Children Romania is an active member of the International Save the Children Alliance – an international movement, which supports child rights, as well as of important national and international bodies and networks. Save the Children Romania fights for children's rights. They influence public opinion and support children at risk. They influence legislation and policies in the benefit of children. They are working together with children and young people to achieve change and lasting improvements for children.15

3. Situation of the HRAW NGOs and their Sustainability

Similarly as in other countries studied, it is the view of the respondents as well as available reports, that the situation of HRAW NGOs in Romania in 2010 is difficult, especially as far their sustainability is concerned. The biggest challenge is access to a funding which is often EU funding:

“Our life (HRAW) compared to those NGOs operating in social, environmental field, education to some extent, differs because they are in the position of having an easier access to the European structural funds, since they are very easily in the position of establishing partnerships with public authorities”16.

13 http://www.apd.ro/cinesuntem.php
14 http://crj.liveasp.ro/english/Home.aspx
15 http://www.savethechildren.net/romania_en
16 Interview with HRAW NGO director, March 16, 2010
A significant factor in the HRAW development was the accession to EU in 2007, which has marked a significant change in position of these organizations as far their importance, voice and resources is but also as far their adaptation is concerned.

“After the EU enlargement the most suffering NGOs in Romania are the human rights NGOs – from two points of view, one is financial viability because they were funded mainly by American donors and they left once we became an EU member. So more or less the NGOs were attached to one type of funding or one funder, they didn’t have a vision and didn’t diversify the funding. They almost collapsed. And the second thing was the issue of legitimacy, because once we got in the EU, the foreign donors supposed we are a democratic country but it was not like that”. 17

After the EU accession the problems in the human rights or accountability areas remained, but the interest in the work of HRAWs declined – media were not anymore interested in these issues and for HRAW NGOs it was more difficult to stay important and visible actors, which they enjoyed before the EU accession when their voice was heard by the EU.

As in many other CEE countries one can hear criticism on the way how the EU structural funds are administered, especially towards NGOs, which seems to be along the conflict of interest the main hurdle for accessing them:

“We are not eligible for almost any administrative costs in order to make our organization survive. With those limited options there are almost no costs for administrative tasks related to the organization. It becomes clear to me that we cannot actually survive if we rely only on structural funds, it is impossible, not to mention that also the transfer of installments is extremely slow, you sign a contract and then the installment comes in more than one year. You have to survive between signing the contract and actually delivering the activity, therefore you need to have diverse sources of funding” 18

The channelling of EU funds through national governments to NGOs meant also a big challenge of HRAW NGOs as it conflicted with their mission. Those who were able to go through the administrative hurdles see also a more fundamental issue in using them:

“We find it difficult in many occasions to criticise the government one day and on the next to enter a partnership for the sake of receiving European structural funds. For us it is a matter of incompatibility with regard to the way we operate”. 19

There are views that HRAWs who use the EU funds experienced a shift in their activities towards training or awareness raising instead of the watchdog or advocacy.

“.....many NGOs that used to act in the watchdog or human rights field, are now operating as training providers in these areas because here are the funds. I mean, you can use structural funds to offer trainings to provide different kinds of services to vulnerable groups in the area of human rights but you cannot fund watchdog or advocacy activities per se.....so I can see a shifting in their strategie, many of the used to be very good watchdogs, now they are very good training providers.” 20

17 Interview with respondent – NGO funding organization representative, February 24, 2010
18 Interview with HRAW NGO director, March 16, 2010
19 Interview with HRAW NGO director, March 16, 2010
20 Interview with HRAW NGO respondent – March 2, 2010
The relative decline of the role of HRAWs in the society is reflected also by the USAID NGO Sustainability Report in 2008 which states that:

“...There is a widespread perception that advocacy campaigns are less effective than they used to be prior to Romania’s EU accession. In the absence of EU pre-accession leverage, public authorities are less open to dialogue with NGOs. There are also fewer supporters at the political level for NGO advocacy initiatives. At the regional and local levels, advocacy initiatives have been less visible and successful”.21

So the sustainability of HRAWs in Romania is not related only to the changing conditions regarding their funding, but also to their legitimacy and perceived importance in the country’s socio-political context. There were examples of strengthened pressure of government towards its most vocal critics. In 2008, Parliament adopted legislation with the potential to repress critical NGOs. The law forbids NGOs from using names that might be confused with official institutions (even if legally registered under this name), and a court complaint is enough to initiate a procedure to close them down. Two active watchdogs, Institute for Public Policy (IPP) and Romanian Academic Society (SAR), are potential targets.22

One of the strategies that is mentioned and sometimes used in the region as a good practice in adaptation of the HRAW NGOs to new situation is building of constituency – supporters, sympathisers, etc – which is in Romania perceived as challenging:

‘‘...we have always dealt with politicians, public administration in general, and now when comes to the situation of planning our sustainability, we are wondering who can pay for our services. ...we are quite uncertain who can pay in terms of fees on which we could base our sustainability plan”.23

The idea that the government may purchase the activities of the HRAWs and fund them through public funds does have some attractiveness and merit, especially when comparing the situation with umbrella NGO associations based in Brussels where the European Comission funds their presence to be able to engage with them in policy dialogue. In Romania there is even an example of National Parliament which has established a funding mechanism for NGOs to support their participation in the parliamentary process, which operates on yearly calls for proposals and is of „couple of hundred thousand euros”. Allegedly similar mechanism is contemplated by the government as well.

It seems, based on this survey, that for some HRAW NGOs in the region receiving of public funding is not a plausible strategy, for others, it seems, some government funding would be acceptable.

The service perspective means also a re-conceptualisation of the social role of HRAWs. In the nineties the HRAWs were perceived as actors that not only responded to actions of governments, but which identified new issues or abandoned issues by public sector proactively and were taking unilateral action through posing questions in the media, organised protests, petitions, marches, or drafted policies to which the government typically had to respond. In the nineties, NGOs were not looking at their mission through transactional lenses – today it becomes more natural. Looking back to nineties, one could easy identify the clients (the EU or American donor agencies or private foundations interested in promoting democratic changes in the CEE) as well as service providers (NGOs which were their grantees). However, it would be difficult to present those relationships as transactional relationships as the NGOs that received foreign funding were not in a service relationship, but in a donor-grantee relationship with a different dynamics as well as limitations. Nevertheless, there is also criticism towards the donors that provided funding to HRAWs

21 USAID: NGO Sustainability Index 2008
22 Nations in Transit 2009 (Freedom House)
23 Interview with HRAW NGO director, March 16, 2010
to implement various activities in the watchdog or human rights area but did not help them to think further in terms of developing services to become self-sustainable.

Respondents mentioned the lack of capacity for strategic planning as an internal obstacle for HRAWs. There is a concern, that the organizations do not sufficiently work with their boards and are too much staff driven which keeps them report-bound and project-bound without a more spatiuous and strategic perspective. So the lack of strategic deliberation shall not be only attributed to their funding stress, but partly caused also by their closedness and inward orientation and tendency to maintain the current practice.

In terms of opportunities that HRAWs may explore, respondents suggest the following:

- Active cooperation with watchdog and human rights NGOs from other countries: that could make their watchdog work more powerful and help them to see the future and make better plans.

- Preparation for the next programming period (EU Structural Funds). During the first programming period NGOs were not active and also not powerful enough to influence the shape of the operational programs, so that also HRAWs could find their place there. For example work towards a domestic intermediary organization that could re-grant the EU Structural funds for HRAWs. In these terms the government would have to be convinced that watchdog and advocacy is important for Romania.

- Organising a joint action to improve the situation in the financial management and administrative requirements of EU funds. HRAWs complain a lot, however, no joint action towards changing this situation has been intiated so far.

- Start to experiment with membership and constituency-based fundraising even though most of it cannot provide important funding resources. It brings NGOs closer to their constituency, it makes people more accountable and it raises their involvement in watchdog and advocacy.

- Maintain relationships with existing international donors to continue the advocacy and watchdog work.

4. Funding Sources for HRAW NGOs

At the moment the majority of the funds that HRAW NGOs use come from foreign sources such as the CEE Trust for Civil Society, Open Society Institute, Balkan Trust For Democracy or Black Sea Trust who still fund human rights, advocacy and watchdog activities and partnerships between Romanian NGOs and other NGOs from neighboring countries.

HRAW NGOs report also foreign, mostly public funding, coming from various agencies that focus on particular issues, e.g. racism, public health, transparency, anti-discrimination, etc. and offer NGOs from various countries including Romania opportunities to apply for funding through various thematic programs or calls for proposals. For example European Commission programs such as Youth in Action or Europe for Citizens, or the Fundamental Rights Agency, European Roma Rights Center, European Network Against Racism (ENAR), Stability Pact – Anticorruption Initiative24, OSCE, etc.

There is also some funding provided from bilateral assistance (MATRA KAP), or directly from Embassies such as of Switzerland, Netherlands, U.K. Canada.

There are also several domestic sources relevant for HRAWs:

---

24 http://www.stabilitypact.org
In the area of *domestic public funding* for HRAWs an important source (not by size, but by the fact of existence) seems to be the Agency for Government Strategies, which besides other activities (studies and analysis of social issues and government policies, public information campaigns, etc.) issues calls for projects where also NGOs may apply and compete for grants to implement projects addressing public policies that the government finds important such as transparency or civic engagement.

Another source also relevant for HRAWs is the Romanian Chamber of Deputies (Lower Chamber of the Romanian Parliament) that launched a “Partnership with Civil Society” program in 2006, which issues a yearly call for participation of the civil society in the legislation process. However, due to the reduction in public spending the funding of the program has been recently (March 2010) suspended. The budget of the program for 2009 was 115,000 EUR (500,000 RON) and provided grants to NGOs to initiate consultations with citizens, communities and other groupings on issues relevant to parliamentary debate, parliamentary practice and mechanisms.

Similar instruments in other countries of the region are rarely seen. Specific impact of these two instruments on the funding of HRAWs would require further research.

The NGO Fund of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and EEA Financial Mechanism provides funding through various calls for proposals to support democracy promotion, anti-corruption or support to vulnerable groups. The NGO Fund is administered by the Civil Society Development Foundation – an intermediary foundation. This source is considered by HRAWs as useful and prepares further calls for proposals.

EU Structural funds are perceived as an obvious and important source for HRAWs, however, their use is restricted due to their orientation (training, education, administrative capacity development, human resource management and no watchdog or advocacy work) and administrative hurdles (necessity to be in partnership with public institutions, very long – up to a year - delays in reimbursement of expenditures, etc.)

As the USAID reports, in April 2008, the first call for proposals for EU Structural Funds was launched, but for most NGOs it was still very difficult to access these funds because of technical and financial requirements. For most of the programs funded under Structural Funds, NGOs have to cover the project expenses out of their own budgets and then obtain reimbursement from the public authorities. The lack of advance payments is one of the main obstacles for NGOs in accessing these funds. NGOs’ lack of financial resources discourages them from submitting project proposals. Some HRAWs have been able to tap funding from the Operational Program for Administrative Capacity Development or Sectoral Operational Program for Human Resources Development.

In terms of domestic private funding the situation has been developing until 2008 quite promising due to economic growth, but the financial crisis has curbed the overall optimistic expectations. Nevertheless, both individual support and corporate support are in Romania available and HRAWs may need to concentrate more on tapping of resources that are here available, however, without overestimating their potential.

Based on our interviews, but also based on previous research reports from period before the financial crisis, individuals’ support to HRAWs has been very limited. One obvious challenge is that the causes presented by HRAWs are not perceived as urgent or needed compared to some other charitable causes. Another challenge is the tendency of individual donors to provide one-time support. As Roxana Sofica and Alina Porumb mention in their report from 2008 that studied the private giving in Romania, obtaining one

---

25 Agenția pentru Strategii Guvernamentale [www.publicinfo.ro](http://www.publicinfo.ro)
27 Interviews with HRAW respondents (February, March, 2010)
28 USAID 2008 NGO Sustainability Index
time support for causes with visible and non-controversial social benefits – e.g. Supporting children, health – has been proved possible and successful, the challenge still remains to ensure repeated donations and long-term continuity of this support. Top supported fields in Romania (2007) include: religion (46%), social services (34%), humanitarian (12%), health (10%). Education, arts and culture, environmental protection and human rights protection receive support from a minority of donors – somewhere between 1-3% of donors each.  

The individual giving culture in terms of payment form is still in the basic stages, when most of operations are performed in cash. The more advanced fundraising methods are less frequently used. Most of donations are still reported in the 2007 opinion poll to be made in cash (by 91% of donors), followed by bank orders (made by 15% of donors), buying charitable products (10%), SMS donation (8%), phone donation (7%), paying event admission fees (5%), on-line payment (3%), payroll donation (3%), post order (2%).

The study, based on qualitative research methods, informs, that the behavior of individual donors might be closely linked with what the fundraising organizations do to attract and maintain relationship with them.

“While several international CSOs come with their experience abroad, for others reaching out to private donors and especially individuals is a steep learning curve. Working effectively with large number of donors requires effective donor recruitment and management systems, many times built and maintained with professional support. It also requires visionary CSO governance and management, which identifies this niche of raising resources and decides to invest its resources in this direction. Currently, only few Romanian CSOs have took what it may appear as yet as a ‘leap of faith’. When they do raise money from individuals, the fundraising methods used are rather basic (e.g. donation boxes) that don’t give space for the CSO to know who made a donation and further develop a long term relationship.”

The 2% tax assignment is another relevant source for HRAWs, which lies between individual public and private funding. It seems that given a relatively low profile and practice among the HRAWs to address individual donors, also their 2% fundraising profile is rather low. The fact that it generates for recipients relatively low amounts makes this source to be considered as relatively slow and ineffective given the amount of resources and efforts that needs to invested in developing fundraising communication and relationships. Respondents suggest that even if this source may not provide significant income for HRAWs, HRAWs shall be more active in using it as it may help them to communicated more intensively with individuals and the public as such. The data on 2% tax mentioned in the report (Porumb-Sofica, 2008) on for 2005-2007 show an increase in the use of this mechanism and the amounts generated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of contributors</td>
<td>145,084</td>
<td>568,735</td>
<td>1,030,968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid. page 2. (Data from the Romanian Ministry of Finance published by ARC on the site www.doiasuta.ro; the campaign years 2005-2007 relate to fiscal years 2004-2006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of tax payers</th>
<th>2.15%</th>
<th>8.50%</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount designated (EUR)</td>
<td>1,215,612</td>
<td>5,017,442</td>
<td>7,650,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average amount per designation (EUR)</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corporate giving in Romania has also decreased as a result of the financial crisis. The HRAWs are not the typical recipients of corporate giving, which focuses mostly on issues of health, environment or children or post-disaster giving which perhaps also suggests stronger integration of the corporate giving programs and corporate social responsibility objectives.

There are two basic mechanisms that corporate donors may use – sponsorship and donations. As the Porumb-Sofica report informs, sponsorship mechanism is easier when compared to donation mechanism and is also preferable from the fiscal perspective, so most of the corporate giving practice is focused on sponsorship.

The fiscal incentives for sponsorship were introduced by the Fiscal Code that introduced 1% (and then 2%) from individual taxes. The incentives are favorable to profitable, large turnover companies. Thus, a company may deduct from owed profit taxes an amount up to 20% of the owed profit tax and 0.3% of the annual turnover for its sponsorships. There are no tax benefits for corporate donations however. NGOs may also sell advertising services to companies with the differentiation between advertising and sponsorship contracts laying in the fact that for sponsorship the supported organization may only make public the logo and name of the company, but cannot promote a specific company product (possible to do under advertising contracts through which advertising space is sold)33.

There is a variety of perceived motivation of corporate giving in Romania by our respondents view and by other research. The perspective of HRAWs towards corporate giving is that their motivation is rather dominated by political interests and indirectly by business interests, than by the charitable interests. While this may be also complemented by other motivation as Porumb–Sofica present - ranging from strengthening positioning with employees and clients in a context of increased competition for both and expected failure of traditional advertising towards more human (particularly emotional) motivations of owners and employees. Visibility of the cause, project or partner CSO are noted as important motivation for corporate involvement.

“We have a real problem with the business community in Romania because those who are visible and who would like to get close to the area of politics and public administration have a very strong political interest. If they support an organization such as IPP, which is very critical of the government, to them it’s like they are somehow lobbying, playing cards with those in power in politics. They don’t donate because their own conscience makes them donate and I am trying to avoid this situation. I am sure that in other countries the economic community got mature which is not the case in Romania.”34

Own income as an option has not been mentioned as significant source, however, HRAWs also use such income to complement their budget. The income is derived mostly from training or technical assistance. As it is mentioned above, services to political parties or public authorities represent a one possible strategy for

---

33 Ibid.
34 Interview with HRAW NGO Representative, February 16, 2010
HRAWs. Sometimes it is a forced adaptation by the nature of the available funding; sometimes it might be also a conscious strategic decision, especially by think-tanks and organizations involved in awareness raising or research. However, for the direct watchdog and advocacy work, the own income does not seem to be an option.

8.2 Romania: Sources

A. List of HRAWs (web contacts)

- The Romanian Environmental Partnership Foundation (Fundatia pentru Parteneriat), http://www.repf.ro/indexen.htm
- CeRe (Resource Center for Public Participation), http://www.CeRe.ro/ENG/aboutcere
- The Euroregional Center for Democracy (CED), http://www.regionalnet.org/en/
- ACCEPT (Bucharest Acceptance Group), http://accept-romania.ro/en/
- Romani CRISS, http://www.romanicriss.org
- The Advocacy Academy Association (AAA), www.advocacy.ro
- Public Policy Centre, http://www.cenpo.ro (web only in RO)
- Asociatia Pro Democratia (APD), http://www.apd.ro/cinesuntem.php
- Save the Children Romania, www.savethechildren.net/romania_en/index.html

B. Respondents

- Interview with respondent from the NGO donor organization, February 24, 2010
- Interview with respondent from the HRAW NGO, March 2, 2010
- Interview with respondent from the HRAW NGO, March 16, 2010

C. Literature and Resources

1) Human Rights Report 2009: Romania (US Dpt. of State, Bureau of Democracy,