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.

9.1 Slovakia

1. Human Rights, Accountability and Watchdog Issues

According to the reports of foreign or international organizations watching over the human rights and governmental accountability Slovakia major issues include:\1

- Discrimination of Roma in access to housing, health and education including police mistreatment
- Corruption on various levels of government and political parties
- Concerns about the integrity of the judiciary
- Violence against women and children, discrimination against women and elderly

• Skinhead and neo-Nazi attacks (mostly racially motivated) on Roma and others, especially foreigners:

• Restrictive measures against minorities (hate provoking statements by politicians against ethnic-Hungarian minority, adoption of the restrictive state language law).

Slovakia is a multi-ethnic country in the Central Europe – 14% of population claimed other than Slovak nationality. The country is a member of the UN Human Rights Council. In May 2009 the UNHRC conducted the first Universal Periodic Review (UPR) for Slovakia. Several nations expressed concern about the status of the Roma minority, and an NGO shadow report detailed concerns about school segregation. On the discrimination of Roma the US State Department Human Rights Report for 2009 states that:

“Government and societal discrimination against Roma and individuals of non-European ethnicity was a common problem. Roma are the second largest ethnic minority with a population of 90,000 according to the 2001 census. Experts estimated that the Romani population is actually between 350,000 and 500,000. The discrepancy was attributed to Roma identifying themselves as Hungarians or Slovaks. Racially motivated attacks on minorities (Roma and others) were widely reported throughout the year, but investigation of attacks and law enforcement varied by jurisdiction. Roma were particularly singled out for violence, and police detained numerous individuals for attacks against Roma motivated by racial hatred. There were also reports that police mistreated Roma....Skinhead and neo-Nazi violence against Roma and other minorities continued to be a serious problem. The People Against Racism activists (LPR) reported that, although police were increasingly responsive in their efforts to monitor and control the skinhead movement, the problem persisted. Several non-Romani minorities as well as foreigners were also victims of racially motivated attacks.”

Also, new rules for using minority languages in Slovakia are very strict. Ethnic-Hungarian minority as discriminatory heavily criticized the 2009 amendment of the State Language Act. The law makes possible to fine up to 5,000 EUR those who use languages other than Slovak in public announcements and in the media. The controversy was mediated by the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, which resulted in recommendation to develop a set of implementation guidelines to clarify some of law's provisions, particularly in the sanctions area. The government passed the guidelines in December, and they were set to enter into effect on January 1, 2010.

Corruption continues to be one the most pressing social problems and a burden in the public governance. In various rankings (CPI, Nations in Transit score) of corruption it holds lowest ranks from among the new EU member states. According to Transparency International Corruption Perception Index 2009, Slovakia ranks 56, together with Latvia, leaving Bulgaria and Romania behind from the new EU member states. The Nations in Transit report for 2009 explains:

“While anticorruption measures adopted by the previous administration created generally favorable institutional conditions to combat corruption, the intensity of the government’s anticorruption behavior declined perceptibly since 2008. Several corruption and clientelism scandals broke out, and the cabinet was selective in calling involved officials to account. NGOs monitoring corruption

---

and transparency of public life reproached the incumbent administration for its nonsystemic approach and increasingly prevalent clientelism. The prime minister repeatedly attacked such groups, questioning the moral integrity of their representatives and accusing them of furthering the political interests of the opposition......some government officials engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. Among many widely reported cases of large-scale corruption and lack of transparency in public procurements, three resulted in the replacement of high-level government officials*. Recent report of Council of Europe on Slovakia’s performance in combating corruption, criticised Slovakia that it implemented only one of the sixteen recommendations made two years ago. The recommendations related to increasing the transparency of political party financing and to more complex measures in the Penal Code for prosecuting corruption.5

In terms of the judiciary, the situation has been slowly worsening over several years. There were concerns, particularly in the business sector, about the privatisation of justice. Some reported that court proceedings became a contest of vested interests and connections to the judicial powers.

“The law provides for an independent judiciary; however, in practice problems with corruption, official intimidation of judges, inefficiency, and a lack of accountability continued to undermine judicial independence. In some cases the judiciary was subject to high-level influence and pressure by the government. In some cases judges felt they faced attempts to influence decision making as well as intimidation via disciplinary actions from the minister of justice or the Judicial Council. In June former minister of justice Stefan Harabin was elected chairman of the Supreme Court. Several NGOs mounted a campaign against his election, citing his personal contacts with a person suspected of organized drug-related criminal activity. They also criticized his misuse of disciplinary actions as tools to intimidate and persecute judges. Over 12,000 persons signed the petition.

Several judges also filed a Constitutional Court claim against his election, which remained pending at year’s end."6

There was a number of restrictive changes in the laws related to the rights of citizens to participate in decision-making procedures that concerned the nature protection, environmental impact assessment and others. Also, the government in February 2008 withdrew a draft NGO law that sparked much public debate and generated significant press attention for its provisions that would effectively eliminate the legal basis for some watchdog organizations and curb activities of international NGOs in the country7.

2. Key Human Rights, Accountability and Watchdog NGOs

Slovakia’s HRAW NGOs played a significant role during the nineties in helping the country in its struggle with neo-autoritarianism. External foreign (public and private) funding helped them significantly. Relationship of the civil society with the state was quite sporadic and with many tensions and less cooperative than in neighboring countries, which also contributed to relative presence of HRAW NGOs in the Slovak civil society. Therefore, Slovakia is rich in variety of initiatives and NGOs that either continue from these times or connect to this experience.

---
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Below are listed some of the key HRAW NGOs that focus on the above mentioned issues through human rights advocacy, government accountability, public-interest lobbying and watchdog activities:

- Citizen, Democracy and Accountability\(^8\), established in 1991, organises activities for the protection of human dignity and human and civil rights. It calls the government for accountability and promotes anti-discrimination and women’s rights. It is involved in public campaigns, education activities, litigation and advocacy.

- Alliance Fair-Play\(^9\) is the most visible watchdog NGO in Slovakia whose goal is to push for ethical, transparent, professional and effective public administration and political representation. It has developed a unique freely accessible database of flows of public money to private hands (state subsides, privatisation, tax and custom remissions, grants, European funds, debtors to the public sector and other) and lists of public representatives (managements of state institutions, governments, elected positions, judiciary, self-governments, parliament, advisors to political leaders).

- Via Iuris Association\(^10\) tries to promote systemic changes in the following areas: public control of power and elimination of corruption including protecting those who reveal corruption behavior, pursuing consistency of ruling of the courts and elimination of arbitrariness in their ruling, especially when related to public participation in decision-making; supporting broad access to information and its preservation and protection from introduction of restrictive changes in the legislation and practice and other human and civil rights issues;

- Transparency International – Slovakia\(^11\) was founded in 1998 and combats corruption by increasing transparency and reducing bureaucracy. It works with many different, but relevant partners and uses variety of approaches with a goal to adopt and implement anti-corruption programs and increased transparency of the public sector.

- Advisory Center for Civil and Human Rights\(^12\) monitors harmonisation of domestic legislation with ratified conventions on human rights and fundamental freedoms, watches state institutions' activities regarding legislation with respect to fulfillment of obligations resulting from ratified conventions; creates conditions for a dialogue and co-operation of the non-governmental sector with the state bodies with special respect to enforcement of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Slovak Republic. It monitors and analyses respecting of civil and human rights and the impact of the valid legislation on rights of people in all institutions limiting freedom to move (in particular institutions for children and youth, institutions assigned for imprisonment and detention, medical institutions for long-term patients, senior homes, closed psychiatric departments).

- Forum Institute – Minority Research Institute\(^13\), founded in 1996, with a primary objective to carry out complex studies on the situation and culture of the national minorities in Slovakia, as well as document their written and other heritage. As a non-profit organization, the Institute operates as public and service institute. In 2009 it has initiated a roundtable of Hungarians in Slovakia as a representative coordinating forum for most important issues of life and position of Hungarian

---

\(^{8}\) http://www.oad.sk
\(^{9}\) http://www.fair-play.sk
\(^{10}\) http://www.viaiuris.sk
\(^{11}\) http://www.tis.sk
\(^{12}\) http://www.poradna-prava.sk
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community in Slovakia, which was particularly relevant in connection to the new State Language Law issue.

- Slovak Governance Institute (SGI)\(^{14}\) is a non-profit, non-partisan civic association. Its mission is to propose and promote solutions for good, accessible, transparent and effective public services for the citizens of Slovakia and other countries. As a part of its activities performs also watchdog role regarding the EU funding, employment policies and education reform.

- Milan Šimečka Foundation\(^ {15}\) is one of the oldest human rights NGOs in Slovakia, established in 1990, works in the fields of human rights education at various levels, holocaust documentation, and defends rights of Roma in education, housing and other areas.

- Friends of the Earth\(^ {16}\) is a civic association that continues to follow the objectives of the Center for Environmental Public Advocacy (CEPA). Its objectives include protecting the environment, promoting environmental, social and economic justice, pursuing the development of democracy and open civic society; supporting sustainable development of the regions and strengthening effective participation of citizens in decision-making processes linked with public interest issues.

- Institute of Public Affairs\(^ {17}\) (Slovak acronym IVO) is an independent non-governmental, nonprofit organization bringing together experts from many different areas of study. It was founded with the aim of promoting the values of an open society and a democratic political culture in public policy and decision-making. It analyses societal, political, economic, foreign-political, legal, cultural and other issues of public interest and to make the findings available to the public and contributes to expert dialogue, initiate discussion on important issues, and to actively participate in shaping public discourse

- People Against Racism\(^ {18}\) fights racism since 2003 by monitoring and campaigning for tolerant, open and multi-cultural society. It established a documentation-communication center for the fight against racism. It provides free legal advice and hotline for victims of racially motivated attacks.

- Charter 77 Foundation\(^ {19}\) provides free-free legal advisory services and advocacy to citizens and NGO’s. It is oldest human rights advocacy NGO in Slovakia. It reviews, comments and analyses the law-making process. It provides oversight of judiciary – “judiciary watchdog”, monitors and analyzes international treaties and agreements into legislative framework of the Slovak Law system.

- People in Peril\(^ {20}\), established in 1999, has a mission to provide effective support to those who suffer the consequences of natural catastrophes, conflicts and authoritarian regimes. It develops activities that support human rights and democracy in countries with authoritarian regimes. It also works as advocacy and assistance center for asylum seekers in Slovakia. It also tries to engage the Slovak public, media, and politicians on human rights issues, through education activities covering Cuba, Burma, North Korea, Iran, the Middle East and other regions.
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• Fenestra\textsuperscript{21} works in the area of prevention and elimination of domestic violence and provides practical assistance of the victims of domestic violence, while works as advocacy and watchdog NGO in this area (towards the Slovak government at various levels).

• Womens Lobby Slovakia\textsuperscript{22} coordinates Slovak women NGOs for the European Women Lobby. It tries to break the gender stereotypes in all areas of public and private life with the emphasis on education and work-life balance. It promotes equal opportunities principles and fights for the human rights of women in the area of reproduction rights.

• Aspekt \textsuperscript{23} is a feminist educational and publishing organization. It was founded in 1993 as an interest association of women to develop the discourse on equality and democracy and apply it to the lived realities of the people of feminine gender in Slovakia.

\section*{3. Situation of the HRAW NGOs and their Sustainability}

USAID rates the Slovakia in 2008 as a country where NGOs' sustainability is consolidated. According to this index, the country gets similar ranking as Estonia and with other Visegrad countries.\textsuperscript{24}

"NGOs continue in their efforts to defend their interests through campaigns, comments and petitions. The same groups of activists continue to lead the efforts, however, and the campaigns fail to generate new supporters…. Some types of NGOs, particularly watchdog and advocacy organizations, began to feel endangered in 2008. Only funds from domestic sources are available and these are insufficient to cover human resources needs in the sector."

It is the opinion of the authors of this report that the sustainability situation of HRAW NGOs in particular is getting worse and more difficult. The scope of the current HRAW NGOs in Slovakia is uncertain for the future, while the issues that they address have no tendency to disappear anytime soon.

There is still some foreign funding reported, however, as the HRAW NGOs community states, these are mostly EU funds in different forms and they are less and less relevant for their watchdog or human rights work.

The issue of sustainability of HRAW NGOs is reflected in a variety of research done in recent years in Slovakia\textsuperscript{25}. Despite these concerns, The Nations in Transit Report for 2009 says that the Slovakia's civil society remains vibrant.

"The non-governmental organization (NGO) sector has a well-developed infrastructure, training, and research base. The legal and regulatory environment is free of excessive state pressures, and taxation is favorable. Yet the Fico administration is less open toward NGOs than its predecessor, and the government is not receptive to policy advocacy groups and civic initiatives. The processes of re-etatization of various activities in the public sphere continued, while civic initiatives mobilized against certain governmental institutions and powerful financial groups. Owing to the Fico
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The worsening of the conditions has a paradoxical effect of strengthening these organizations and identifying new opportunities, however, at the costs of organizational and personal exhaustion.

The major challenge for HRAW NGOs is the tendency to professionalisation of their work. The volunteering in HRAW NGOs is considered as normal and good practice, but it is not enough after some time. These organizations believe that remaining in the volunteering model would prevent them from further improvement of their work.

Interviews with HRAW NGO representatives from Slovakia earlier in 2010 confirm the continuing challenge of working in a society that is barely sensitive to issues of human rights or good governance.

“...people have a lack of knowledge and longer term memory that would equip them against political manipulation and demagogery”.

Important external factor for HRAW NGO sustainability is the state of the political culture:

“....the government took a path of aggressive rhetorics against watchdog NGOs and questions their legitimacy, both constitutional and financial. These dangerous messages penetrated into the broad public and are used as arguments against us”.

The most challenging internal factors for HRAW NGOs sustainability are the capacity for organizational development including fundraising and development of professional skills and competencies. Those NGOs who have a good communications experience in-house and willingness to communicate more proactively about its work, for example its key staff has a previous journalist experience, are able to get a strong media presence, which seems to be an important prerequisite for approaching new, mostly private domestic donors. However, most of the HRAW NGOs compete for a limited space in the media and struggle with relative unattractiveness of issues they address. Therefore media attractive issues get more public attention, than those that are less attractive.

Nevertheless, the communication of HRAW NGOs can be considered as one of the possibilities for strengthening the domestic public buy-in in these issues and organizations, however, having in mind that it is a long-term process and will not bring resources to these NGOs immediately.

Much of this owes also to the self-perception of these NGOs as an “elite club that can not communicate more effectively due to the nature of their work”. Much of these communication outputs are outdated in their form, e.g. various monitoring reports that no-one reads. There are natural allies such as media but they seem to be over-flooded with initiatives, campaigns and petitions and get tired from them.

4. Overall funding situation in particular for HRAW NGOs

HRAW NGOs use different and individual strategies for securing resources for their work, especially after the departure of major foreign funding that was present in Slovakia for these activities during nineties.
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Funding of HRAW NGOs is project based, i.e. leaving very little capacity for internal development and strengthening of organizational capacity. This is not the choice of the HRAW NGOs, but a rational response to the funding market - there is no general support funding available for these organizations in recent years, which most consider as a barrier and obstacle.

Most of the funding of these organizations comes from foreign sources, either remainders of private foundations (CEE Trust, OSI) or from EU related sources (EC funded programs from Brussels, international networks). Also, some funding comes from the Norwegian funds and EU structural funds. Sometimes watchdog and advocacy NGOs end up in conflict of interests as they get funds from sources they advocate against. Very small funding comes from private donations from individuals and corporations.

There are also some specific limitations of HRAW NGOs in securing resources that are self-imposed in order to avoid a conflict of interest, when the watchdog or advocacy role is concerned. For example corporate funding is hard to accept in cases when public interest is defended against private corporations that find holes in the regulatory framework to achieve their commercial goals.

Another factor in ability of securing funding for HRAW NGOs relates to their specific focus on watchdog or human rights activities. NGOs, which have a broader portfolio of activities including education, research or analysis, have more and better opportunities for securing resources for their work – including possibilities of their self-financing. However, NGOs that want to focus only on watchdog activities, have their funding resources more limited and depend only on their donors – while the private sector is not at the moment the key donor for them – it is the public sector. With such strategy, it is possible that they will shrink their activities.

Some believe that this may lead to a situation when “HRAW NGOs will modify their activities and some of the watchdog activities will be done by the social networks and people will get organised through these new media. However, it will not replace the traditional NGOs”.

In this sense the 2% tax works as a mechanism that is technically anonymous provides a resource that also HRAW NGOs may use very well.

EU structural funds are not very relevant for HRAW NGOs. However, those that use these funds report many similar problems that are reported in other countries – delays in payments, excessive bureaucracy and irrational and erratic administrative and reporting requirements, formalism and cronyism (when administered in-country). The perception of the EU funding within the HRAW NGOs community is that these funds are inappropriate for NGO funding as such, not just for the HRAW NGOs.

“The main deficit of EU funds is as if the EU would think that NGOs are large organizations that work with large operating budgets and as such are able to wait for the delays in payments, without any pain. But that is something we cannot accept. Due to that many NGOs get to the very edge of bankruptcy”.

Paradoxically, the publicity related to these funds makes an impression as if there would be many different opportunities for various actors, including NGOs to use these funds. However, NGOs report that the details of their use, conditions attached to the contracts are designed asymetrically and discriminatory against NGOs. Furthermore, these contracts are changed during the life of project implementation retroactively.

“….then you find a sentence in the contract that you make yourself obliged to implement the project activities on time regardless whether the EU funds will be paid to you or not. So in fact, you should have other the funds ready at your account before you implement the project and you should be prepared that you will not see these money for five years, because you do not know whether they will send you the money or not”
The regulations and conditions attached to these funds are extremely complicated already at the EU level and they get more complicated once they reach the national level.

The matching requirements for the EU structural funds are also hard to meet by HRAW NGOs. Their reserves were spent to cover the delays in payments of previous EU funded projects, private funds share in funding of HRAW NGOs is limited and public funds are not accepted as eligible matching. Thus, they end up in a limbo.

The poor practice of handling the EU structural funds is reported also by the NGO Sustainability Index 2008 report of USAID:

“The combination of delayed reimbursement of funds and co-financing requirements restrains NGOs’ ability to receive EU funding. The requirements associated with EU funds are so inflexible that NGOs have difficulty managing them and find themselves being forced to increase their capacity. Additionally, EU funds have created a power imbalance in that the government can hold NGOs accountable, but NGOs are not able to hold the government accountable. For example, NGOs must satisfy a long list of requirements. The reporting processes for NGOs are very bureaucratic, and it is difficult to make changes to the budget or project activities. The approval procedure is long, and many activities and prices are out of date by the time of project approval. Some NGOs are actually suing the government because of these issues.”

The EU funding is considered as partly useful, however, only indirectly relevant (with the exception of the “Watchdog Fund” of the DG Justice, Freedom and Security established in 2005 as a temporary instrument to support the accountability and watchdog activities in the new EU members, which however seized to exist by now). There are also other programs that some of the HRAW NGOs in Slovakia use – for example the Life Long Learning Program, or Calls for proposals for combating discrimination and promoting equality of the DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, etc. In these schemes HRAW NGOs are expected to partner with other organizations from Europe. This international dimension, theoretically right, gets malformed in practice as many of these partnerships are primarily grant-driven and not program-driven.

Domestic public funding for the human rights and watchdog activities of Slovak NGOs takes place mostly as the co-funding to the European structural funds and other funds such as NGO Funds of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and the EEA grants which were administered by three domestic grant-making foundations (Socia Foundation, Open Society Fund and Ekopolis Foundation). Part of these grants was focused also for supporting disadvantage groups and human rights. Some of the HRAW NGOs have taken the opportunity and used these funds. The funding suffered also with very demanding administrative and reporting requirements that also the intermediaries translated to their recipients. Furthermore, as co-funding were not accepted public funds, which complicated the situation for recipients.

The percentage philanthropy is something that is reported for HRAW NGOs as useful, however not sufficient to cover their needs. The government has recently decreased the possibilities of corporations to provide their percentage tax, which is an additional challenge for HRAW NGO.

---

28 2008 NGO Sustainability Index, Slovakia, USAID
Corporate sources are perceived as not considering the human rights or watchdog activities as attractive enough for their needs that are often combining the public relations and marketing interests with public benefit support. There are cases from time to time of corporate support, however, these are exceptional cases.

Individual support for HRAW NGOs exists, but is limited and relatively insignificant compared to the other sources. However, those HRAW NGOs that have a stronger public communication do enjoy also more support from individuals than those that communicate less. There are no tax incentives for giving in the current tax system neither for individuals nor for corporations, which makes the fundraising more difficult. However individual giving remains as a strategic area for the HRAW NGOs. To tap this effectively may require more time and investments into the fundraising capacities of HRAW NGOs. Very effective in tapping of this potential are organizations working in the environmental protection such as Greenpeace or Forest protection Association Wolf that were able to build network of individual supporters that are regularly kept involved and informed.

Self-financing becomes one of the strategies of those HRAW NGOs that have products or services (research, analysis) that can be offered to various clients and to generate some income by which they can cover holes in their budgets. The negative aspect of self-financing in Slovakia is that it exploits the capacity of HRAW NGOs on activities that are not advancing their mission. The self-financing on the other hand, enhances the professionalism and effectiveness in organizations. Overall, it does not seem that the self-financing is not perceived as the optimal strategy for HRAW NGOs.

There are also independent grantmaking foundations in Slovakia that operate in areas such as environment, child development, social affairs or even human rights (OSF). Such foundations are in Slovakia (together with Czech republic and Poland) relatively developed and widespread compared to some other countries of the new EU member states). Some or all of them have in past supported also human rights and watchdog activities – when they were able to use the funding of foreign donors. After their departure, most of the domestic grant-making foundations generate their resources from the domestic donors (public and private) that are not interested in funding HRAW NGOs. Several years ago Pontis Foundation established a “Watchdog Fund” within its structure with the ambition to pool funds from different corporations in support of the watchdog activities. This effort ended with only one significant contributor and lack of interest from the corporate community.

As reported from other countries of the region, the HRAW NGOs do consider domestic grant-making foundations as a good source and institutional framework for their funding. They believe that domestic foundations can serve as effective intermediaries between donors (public or private) and recipients, by filtering unnecessary administrative burden as well as donor pressures on recipients by providing sufficient freedom and flexibility for the recipients and stay focused on the main goal of their activity. Such strategy has been used with the EEA and Norwegian funds; however, the experience shows that even in such arrangements the administrative burdens remain very high.

The government has recently approved changes in the Law on Hazardous Gaming and created a legal space for the concept of “charitable lottery” and explicitly defined conditions for setting up such initiative. The conditions are quite strict and demanding.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations
The funding situation for Slovak HRAW NGOs is not particularly critical, due to the various adaptations of still relatively heterogeneous community of HRAW NGOs. However, the discourse about their future is
rather pessimistic and sustainability of HRAW NGOs is contemplated with questionmarks.

There is not a unifying idea or vision regarding the funding of the non-profits in Slovakia. The role of public funds is implicitly considered as very relevant, at the same time the experience with public funds as reflected also in this report, does not show much optimism.

The future of the HRAW NGOs in Slovakia is open. As most-likely scenario, they will be slowly changing and accepting also other functions, while replacing part of their missing financial resources for watchdog and accountability work through social networks and volunteering. The state does not see at this point the need to be more engaged in supporting of the HRAW activities in Slovakia, nor is this perceived by the corporate sector. HRAW NGOs will continue their work for several years, partly due to gravity of their existing foreign funding, partly due to their adaptability and flexibility that will allow them to find opportunities in self-financing, international networks, EU programs.

9.2 Slovakia: Sources

A. List of HRAW NGOs

- Citizen, Democracy and Accountability
- Alliance Fair-Play
- Via Iuris Association
- Transparency International – Slovakia
- Advisory Center for Civil and Human Rights
- Forum Institute – Minority Research Institute
- Slovak Governance Institute (SGI)
- Milan Šimečka Foundation
- Friends of the Earth – CEPA
- Greenpeace Slovakia
- Institute of Public Affairs
- Pontis Foundation
- Center for Community Organizing
- Citizens in Action
- People Against Racism
- Charter 77 Foundation
- People in Peril
- Fenestra
- Womens Lobby Slovakia
- Možnosť volby
- Aspekt
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