

## Chapter 1 : Revisiting philanthropy in Russia - Alliance magazine

*Created Date: 3/26/ AM.*

The criticality centers on our obligation to see the negative trend lines impacting many of our residents, and engage in new approaches to address those trends. We have the chance to reverse them now, before they become so embedded it will take decades to reverse. That urgency contrasts with the excitement we should feel around the opportunity to tackle these challenges with an almost ideal set of assets. Few regions of the country have the wealth creation, innovation, social responsibility and pioneering muscle needed to rewrite the playbook for a healthy community. That new playbook can chart how the public, private and philanthropic sectors partner in innovative ways to reverse trends in income inequality, education achievement, and the opportunity gap so many kids face, sometimes in unsheltered circumstances. Future generations will define us by the urgency, courage, and effectiveness, or lack thereof, we demonstrate in taking new approaches now. Long ago, charity emerged as a result of people who had done well wanting to give back and help others who had fallen through the cracks. Those cracks have turned into crevasses. It is clear, and empirically proven, that we cannot intervene our way out of the challenges facing our region that result in human suffering, especially for our kids. Mature, thoughtful and collaborative, but brave systems reinvention is our call to action across the spectrum of education, economic inclusion, health and basic needs. The Road Map Project is an example of reinvention by increasing collaboration between providers, parents, educators and activists working to double the number of students on track to graduate in south Seattle and South King County. A significant early win was helping to ensure all students eligible for the College Bound Scholarship registered for the program, which previously had low turnout. This early win raised awareness about the issue, highlighted the need for increased funding, and built relationships across school districts and providers. However, human suffering cannot always wait for systemic change; for some, we must continue to intervene in parallel. The old intervention-based playbook should be reflected on with the sobering analyses that have emerged. Harvard Professor Robert Putnam concludes that only one-third of the children in our country have any chance at a modest semblance of the American Dream. We have dissembled the critical developmental experiences for our kids, to the extent that an increasing number of them are left in the lurch. Communities of color are hit hardest. Effective Philanthropy, which can be the testing ground and catalyst for change, is defined by avoiding three classic philanthropic fumbles. It is not sufficient to say, "If I just give money to these three organizations, the high school dropout rate in Seattle will decline. Effective Philanthropy understands that collaboration will ultimately yield greater social returns for those who have fallen in the cracks. The Seattle region fast approaches a tipping point. Philanthropy can be a servant leader, in partnership with amazing companies, successful individuals and families, and public sector partners, to deploy our assets on the biggest disparities of our time, ensuring we tip in the right direction.

**Chapter 2 : Inside Higher Ed's News**

*Instead, Reinventing Philanthropy is a hard-nosed, critical analysis of the difficult issues that donors must address to make the most of their giving. It will make readers more thoughtful about their giving, and ultimately more effective.*

Peeling the onion of Russian philanthropy: Reading the paper, published in January, therefore helped me reacquaint myself with some of the actors, trends and challenges faced then, while also opening my eyes to new, or more fully realized, developments that have emerged since. It is heartening to see that so much is still being done at ground level by volunteers, donors and professionals to improve the lives of their fellow citizens. Too often it is easy to overlook this growing ecosystem of philanthropy and civic engagement in the face of headline news about state action – and to be fair, this has often been for good reason. A range of different types of giving I think the taxonomy of giving types is very helpful and gives a vivid feel for the nuance that exists within the sector. It helped to me to understand the different roles these actors play in pursuing their objectives. The particular character of community foundation development was notable in the years when we supported it and seems even more pronounced now. I was very interested in the work around impact investing and social entrepreneurship as this was a field which felt very much in its infancy, but with great dynamic potential, two or three years ago. It is hard to tell how much that potential has been realized since the piece is largely reliant on the thoughts of a single interviewee, but it certainly gives the impression that this is an area in which people are looking for new organizational forms to help achieve specific goals. I also found the analysis of the evolution of fundraising foundations compelling. The increasing engagement of these institutions in advocacy work around their areas of activity is a much welcomed development. It certainly feels like those organizations that have developed enormous expertise in their areas of activity should be pushing for systemic changes rather than simply filling gaps. One can only hope that successes in areas like palliative or hospice care can be replicated with other challenging social issues. Disappointing limitations on philanthropic activity Beyond the social sphere, the limitations on philanthropic activity remain disappointing, though it was encouraging to see the example of OVD-Info as a successful case of crowdfunding. We saw occasional examples of successful fundraising activity by organizations with a more explicit human rights orientation during our period of engagement, but these were sporadic and felt very much like an afterthought or a burden. We must no doubt accept considerable responsibility as donors for not encouraging partners to work more systematically on developing constituencies and associated donor bases. There was a much easier moment in which to pursue this, and now the challenge can only be dramatically more difficult. However, the examples of OVD-Info and FBK, specialized as they may be, should surely provide inspiration for like-minded organizations to pursue individual fundraising in a more methodical and widespread way. With the vast increase in individual middle-class giving noted in the paper, I hope some of these resources can be channelled to work aimed at preserving and promoting civic dignity. Philanthropy infrastructure worth exploring further I believe the paper could have delved further into the state of the philanthropic infrastructure since we devoted a lot of energy to it in Russia and other areas. While I am happy to see that CAF Russia and the Russian Donors Forum remain critical players, it might have been helpful to flesh out more about new actors, environments, or processes that are helping support and inform the sector. What are the key sources of information and research that philanthropic actors can draw on to help them make decisions? What kinds of sources of organizational or programmatic learning are there? How much is domestically sourced? Or, in contrast to the trend of blocking foreign financial flows, how much is philanthropic practice influenced or informed by international experience? More broadly, how much, if at all, is philanthropy in Russia connected to peers and trends globally? It feels like these constitute a related set of questions that might be worth exploring further. A hope for the future Overall, I found this to be a very useful starting point for refreshing my knowledge of the state of philanthropy in Russia and for drawing my attention to new developments. It is extremely encouraging to see that the growth in mass individual giving is a real phenomenon. It would be even more encouraging if we saw that growth having an impact across different realms of activity. It would be terribly unfortunate to see the growing distinction between acceptable and unacceptable organizations

reflected in an entrenched, albeit implicit, exclusion of social justice organizations from the benefits of the voluntary use of private funds for public good.

**Chapter 3 : Million Dollar Donors Report - Russia findings | Coutts**

*Reinventing Philanthropy The Seattle region faces a defining moment, writes Foundation President & CEO Tony Mestres in Seattle Business Magazine, and now is the time for philanthropy to direct its time and investment to sustainable prevention and systems reinvention.*

College students and recent graduates arrived to hear ideas about philanthropy that resonate with their own experiences. Long-time Lake Lecture attenders glanced around noticing all the young faces in the audience. From 11 to 80 years old, they all came together “ in all ” for one night to hear Scott Harrison, CEO and founder of charity: No matter what organization we represent, Scott Harrison made clear the key issues he believes are affecting charity and philanthropy in the 21st century. First of all, charity: As we teach in our Executive Certificate in Religious Fundraising course , clarity about mission and vision are crucial for engaging others in your work. It is easy to say yes to everything that comes your way, but in so doing, it is also easy to lose focus. For example, both during the lecture and on a radio show earlier that day, Scott was asked about the water crisis in Flint, Michigan. He agreed that more needs to be done to make major changes in that city; however, he was also clear that their mission is to bring clean and safe drinking water to people in developing countries. By staying on mission, charity: Another aspect of this new vision of charity involves transparency. When Scott started building his company, he discovered that almost half of Americans distrust charities. They did not believe charities were spending the money the way they claim they do. They did not believe the money was going directly to the mission. So, Scott took this as a challenge for charity: Donors can follow their money “ funded projects are viewed through photos and GPS markers. All of their financials are on the website for anyone to view. All of the operational costs are covered by private donors and, just in case anyone doubts this, the audit is right there on charity: Mission and transparency lead to storytelling. Right away he established his credibility by sharing his background: At the age of 18 he left this foundation to jump into the nightlife of New York City as a nightclub promoter. Eventually, however, he realized there had to be more to life, and he shared how this led him to experience the suffering of others around the world. And for all of us present in the room, we were captivated “ eager to come along on the journey with him. Beyond his own story, Scott told the story of hundreds of people waiting in line to have doctors fix their facial tumors. Scott told the story of children drinking brown, viscous water. And, while telling these stories, he convinced us through facts, stories, and images why clean water matters. Clean water can change everything “ access to education, income and health, especially for women and children. Why do millions of people give to charity: Because they have a compelling brand and captivating story. Of course, he is a master storyteller - crafting a narrative that is compelling to a wide range of audiences. And our Lake lecture was not the first time he has shared his story. Similarly, you are the only one who can tell your story. Each one of us has a compelling story for the work that we do and the ability to share it with others. If you were not present with us, you can listen to the Lake lecture here. Or you might want to listen again or share with a friend or colleague. We do not have to be beholden to charity: Scott Harrison constantly reminded us of that point. The fascinating aspect of faith, giving, and philanthropy is that the contexts, institutions, and practices are always changing even as the foundational principles often remain the same. Reinventing charity might actually look like refocusing on what we already know are core principles of the work that we are called to do: How can we take this challenge into our own work? Thank you for attending, inviting your friends, and engaging Scott with great questions and insights. View Lake Lecture Executive Certificate in Religious Fundraising All of our courses for are now open and ready for you to register! This four day intensive course offers a practical application project to help you use what you learn in your own context.

**Chapter 4 : Local mission, global vision : community foundations in the 21st century in SearchWorks catalo**

*RUSSIA. While saw a decline in the number and value of Russian million dollar donations, philanthropy remains important in the lives of wealthy Russian individuals and families, as well as in the corporate culture.*

Peeling the onion of Russian philanthropy: We have always strongly believed in the value of benchmarking our work in Russia against the global context. This report, written by Caroline Hartnell, gives us this rare opportunity. I am happy that this new report gives a reference that helps us to reflect on this process. I would like to reiterate some overarching themes that the report raises and that in my view determine the current state of Russian philanthropy in a broader sense. Philanthropy and the state The report rightly highlights relations between the state and the philanthropic sector as one of the key frames for the story of Russian philanthropy. The state actively shapes the narrative using both sticks and carrots. The Law on Foreign Agents is one major stick which has alienated and even put out of business dozens of human rights, gender and environmental NGOs and some others. At the same time state funding in the form of Presidential Grants has recently become a major funding stream to the sector. Not only have they provided funding to a large variety of NGOs on a fair and competitive basis. The role of the Foundation for Presidential Grants will most probably grow, and it is nothing but a blessing for the sector that the Foundation is led by people who have profound experience in grantmaking and enough political weight to protect its fair process from undue influences and corruption. Another angle for looking at state-philanthropy relations is the question of whether philanthropy should replace government in its social protection role. Healthcare, where many fundraising foundations are active, is a great example. On the other, the government claims that charities should not interfere as the state budget covers most of the needs. This dilemma is very central to the work of many charities, and reveals the reason why charities drift from direct assistance to advocacy and other system change work. At the same time it is obvious that the best strategy in the majority of cases is to build partnerships with the government around specific issues and use the resultant goodwill to achieve change. Progressive versus traditional philanthropy Progressive versus traditional philanthropy is another interesting lens to use for better understanding Russian philanthropy. The report states that in all sectors of the philanthropic space the traditional side prevails. It is of course true but it is not the whole truth. Indeed, for historical and political reasons Russian philanthropy mostly focuses on education, healthcare, support to vulnerable groups, culture, etc. In this it does not differ from the rest of the world where progressive causes such as human rights, gender issues, etc are always in a minority. Still I would argue that in the Russian context, where paternalistic attitudes are very widespread and most of the channels for democratic participation are blocked, any form of giving is a form of civic activism and agency, no matter what causes it supports. In addition, we do see that unpopular causes such as environment, human rights and anti-corruption are gaining more traction among the general public, and more people contribute to them than ever before. Up until this moment organizations in the business of growing giving like CAF have been mostly focused on getting people into this space, without much focus on what exactly they support – participation has been what mattered. As far as institutional philanthropy is concerned, the report duly notices that the progressive element is mostly associated with how things are done rather than what causes are supported. Why does individual giving keep growing? Mistrust in NGOs would be the most popular answer to the question about obstacles for growing giving in Russia. Russian society overall demonstrates a very low level of trust in any kind of institution, and NGOs are not relatively worse off than the police or the church, for instance. Still, there is no sufficient explanation of how, in this context of low trust, individual giving keeps growing. I believe the situation is rather simple. People may not trust NGOs in general and in fact may have very little idea of what NGOs are and how they are different from other institutions. Still the level of awareness of certain charities and issues has risen to the extent that people feel motivated and confident giving to them. This is a very serious sign of the success of the advocacy communication of many different charities, which has created a solid foundation for growing individual giving in Russia. I am talking about the generational shift in leadership. In the last five years the sector has seen a very strong inflow of new people who have left their careers in business, media or the public sector to work in

philanthropy. These people have no baggage, no experience of failure; they are fast and often digitally minded and they tend to reinvent the wheel because they have never seen wheels before. At the same time, these new people are the ones who are successful in reaching out to younger audiences and raising funds for causes that are considered unpopular. This tension between generations and styles may be unnerving on a personal level, but I believe there is a great value in disruption and the challenge it provides. Any philanthropic sector should be disrupted and challenged, the Russian one included. I am very much looking forward to more comments on this report from Russian and international readers.

### Chapter 5 : Dmitry Zimin: Russian for Philanthropy - Carnegie Medal of Philanthropy

*Reinventing Philanthropy: A Framework for More Effective Giving [Eric Friedman] on calendrierdelascience.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. If you had to choose between saving one person's life or lifting a hundred from extreme poverty, which would you pick?*

We create and hold these things in common. And, as we hold them, our economies, our societies and our democracies are transforming. The yin-yang dance The funny thing is, Michael Edwards seems to think that the commons and business are at odds. The facts say otherwise. Who are the top funders of Wikipedia? Who funds the creative commons? The commons is clearly on the philanthrocapitalist menu. In his essay ""The Magic Cauldron", Eric S Raymond offered a taxonomy of open- source business models that still left the code in the commons: His point was this: The entrepreneur Jim Fruchterman, committed to bringing books to the blind, generates revenue from online services while staying staunchly not-for-profit. And, intent on transforming the economics of software with an always-free, easy-to-use version of Linux, Mark Shuttleworth set up not a charity but a business. In stark contrast to Edwards, these folks do not see public and private benefit in a zero- sum pitched battle: There may be times of conflict, but it is a conflict of interdependence and, ultimately, mutual benefit. Open-sourcing philanthropy At the end of his essay - and in his accompanying book, Just Another Emperor: My instincts tell me that Wikipedia, open source and peer-production may hold part of the answer. The world of the commons has used openness, participation and community to create real and hopefully lasting public goods. Why not apply these same principles to improving education, creating low-cost housing or evolving our democracy? True, using open-source principles to address a wide variety of social needs would require a new kind of foundation. In fact, it would require a whole wave of foundations built from the ground up around the values of openness and participation, and sitting happily on the fuzzy edges between public and private benefit. It would require us to open-source philanthropy. And, who knows, maybe some of the so-called philanthrocapitalists might even be willing to help. We encourage anyone to comment, please consult the.

**Chapter 6 : Reinventing Philanthropy**

*Given the growing isolation of Russia in general and the philanthropic sector in particular, it is important to use every chance to reconnect with developments outside Russia and to raise awareness among the global philanthropic community of the rapid, complex and very exciting progress that Russia's philanthropy and giving culture is.*

History Introduction From a standing start at the fall of the Soviet Union, contemporary Russian philanthropy has made great strides and continues to grow in both scale and maturity. Corporate philanthropy has become commonplace and many high-net-worth individuals and families see philanthropy as a key purpose for their wealth. Some families also regard it as an important factor in wealth succession and in creating a lasting legacy. While the data we have gathered does not convey the full scale of Russian philanthropy, it does underline the fact that giving has become integral to how wealthy Russians apply their wealth and how corporations express social responsibility. While saw a significant increase in the number of million dollar donations, witnessed a decline, as illustrated in our analysis. This decline may be explained by a number of factors, including a weakening economy, less financial stability and the devaluation of the rouble. The comparison also suffered from the high base level of , which was boosted by increased giving in the wake of some large-scale natural disasters, such as floods in the far east of Russia. In addition, CAF Russia depends largely on responses to a survey, given the lack of publicly available data on Russian philanthropy. Despite the challenges posed by the political and economic climate and the apparent associated decline in donations, we take heart from the marked increase in the number of foundations, as wealthy individuals or families look to establish their philanthropy for the longer term. Some are also creating endowments or hiring professional staff. Significant not only as the first in its field, it was also one of the first Russian foundations to have an endowment. Since the establishment of the Vladimir Potanin Foundation , the number of Russian foundations of all types – corporate and private – has grown steadily. As is the case the world-over, governments can play a key role in enabling or inhibiting philanthropy. Recognising the important role of private giving, the government has begun to help pave the way for a more enabling environment for philanthropy to grow and flourish. For example, in , the Endowment Law was passed, making the income earned from endowments tax free. And in January , tax incentives were introduced for individual donors, a provision that came into play in when the tax declaration for began. More recently, it is becoming apparent that the political and economic situation is affecting Russian philanthropy and most notably the work of foundations. An increased wariness by the Russian government towards the West, anti-offshore legislation, sanctions and legislation aimed at controlling international contributions to Russian non-governmental organisations NGOs [1] have all contributed to the new environment. This has particularly affected philanthropists that have established foundations registered outside of Russia. In some cases, founders have responded by moving their resources to Russia. For others, such as the Dynasty Foundation, the changing context has resulted in the founder deciding to close the foundation. As illustrated by our findings, there is little doubt that corporate giving in Russia represents a major proportion of the philanthropic landscape. What is distinctive about corporate philanthropy in Russia is that large companies established in what were originally relatively uninhabited or remote areas have played a pivotal role in developing the local area. As with philanthropy from individuals or private foundations, much corporate philanthropy in Russia has emerged in a piecemeal and ad hoc manner. But at the turn of the century, Russian companies began to embrace the notion of corporate social responsibility in part influenced by their Western counterparts and developed more focused and sophisticated philanthropic programmes. This likely means that the funds will be granted in smaller amounts to a number of final beneficiary institutions in the future and shows a continued trend towards greater institutionalisation of giving. Finally, celebrities and other opinion leaders have started playing an important role in the Russian philanthropic sector, contributing not just money but their ability to influence public opinion and mobilise support to causes they care about. As with other philanthropists, some establish foundations and also proactively fundraise. Natalya Vodyanova, who founded the Naked Heart Foundation , is one such example. The Dmitry Zimin Dynasty Foundation was labeled a foreign agent in May and as a result the founder made a

decision to close his foundation. The future Trends for the future There are a number of trends that will shape the future landscape for million dollar donations in Russia. Developing more strategic philanthropy For many new donors, the early stages of a philanthropy journey often involve giving in a more emotive or piecemeal fashion. Indeed, some philanthropists will choose to continue to be reactive and relatively ad hoc in their approach, as it may be more desirable or appropriate given what they want to achieve. However, over time others may develop more purpose and focus in their mission and objectives, and look to make a more lasting difference with their philanthropy. In foundations continued reviewing and reshaping their strategies to ensure they remained relevant to the changing environment and the needs of their grantees and beneficiaries. This is a sign of the increasing maturity of foundations and the increasing importance founders are placing on maximising the results of their philanthropy. Institutionalising philanthropy As the number of wealthy individuals or families that engage with philanthropy grows, it is inevitable that they will consider institutionalising their philanthropy through the establishment of philanthropic foundations in Russia. They may also hire professional staff and establish effective boards. Establishing endowments Many major philanthropists are likely to endow the foundations they establish to sustain and develop their philanthropy. The developing situation in Russia may result in endowments being held within the country. Raising the profile of philanthropy As philanthropists gain confidence in their work, some will also choose to proactively talk about it and the causes or organisations they support. This may be driven by a number of factors, including a desire for the general public to better understand philanthropy and what it can accomplish, greater transparency, a desire to encourage their peers to give, or a wish to enhance their own reputation. Creating a lasting legacy The relative youth of Russian philanthropists means that in many respects they are at the beginning of their philanthropy journey. Nevertheless, creating a lasting legacy features prominently in their minds. As wealthy families begin to focus on succession planning and the inter-generational transfer of wealth, philanthropy will often feature in this process. While philanthropy in Russia is not without its challenges given the domestic context, building on progress to date, Russian philanthropists have a significant opportunity to grow and strengthen their work in a way that could make a real and lasting difference to culture and society at home and abroad. History The tradition of giving in Russia Before the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, there was a well-established tradition of giving. This tradition has re-emerged in a new guise since the fall of communism. Historically, many Russians gave to charity, mainly through the Church, which was the principal instrument of charitable activity until the 18th century. It built and supported hospitals, orphanages and shelters for the homeless. The Crown also set an example of charitable giving. From the time of Catherine the Great, the royal family often paid for the establishment of educational and healthcare institutions. Examples include the First Moscow City Hospital set up by Prince Golitsin in 1764, and the State Hermitage based on the collection of Catherine the Great, which opened to the public in 1764. By 1800, the institutions of Empress Maria alone included more than such organisations. Between the Revolution and the fall of Communism in 1991, some 70 years, Russian philanthropy disappeared. The state was expected to meet all needs and philanthropy was neither recognised nor encouraged. But following the break-up of the Soviet Union, philanthropy re-emerged in Russia in the late 1990s and early 2000s. In the early 2000s, the first Western philanthropists and development agencies appeared in Russia. Soros was responsible for greatly influencing public perception of what an individual philanthropist could achieve. However, as was the case with pre-revolutionary philanthropy, giving by Russians in the 2000s was largely piecemeal and done on an ad hoc basis. After the financial crisis of 2008, corporate philanthropy emerged with the first organised grants programme. Other companies began to follow with larger initiatives. In 2008, Vladimir Potanin created the first Russian private foundation. Since then, the number of Russian foundations of all types – community, family and private – has grown steadily. Many of these are created by the media or by celebrities, often as an emotional response to an urgent need; for example, funding the costs of surgery for deprived children. Not only have such funds raised significant resources, they have also played a key role in building a culture of charitable giving and philanthropy in Russia.

### Chapter 7 : Russia Philanthropy Discussion | Coutts Million Dollar Donor Report

*Reinventing charity might actually look like refocusing on what we already know are core principles of the work that we are called to do: focusing on clarity of mission, transparency, community, and telling our story.*

Russian for Philanthropy Medalists Physics classroom in Moscow public school. A Russian, a scientist, a businessman, and a philanthropist. As a donor, he is exceptional, not simply because of the millions of dollars he has given away to science and education-based projects, but because he is a trailblazer. He created the first family philanthropy in post-Soviet Russia. He had the insight to recognize the positive impact that this could have in Russia, particularly in the realm of science, and the ambition and wealth to make it a reality. Instead, he retired from his successful telecommunications company, Vimpelcom, Ltd, and used his money to found the Dynasty Foundation. All at once, science in Russia had a major benefactor keen to fund young people engaged in research that could change the world for the better. During its 13 years of existence, the Dynasty Foundation had an incredible impact on both the academic and philanthropic worlds of Russia, by fostering talented people. Starting in , the Foundation helped provide stipends to university students and young physicists. Zimin was inspired by his early scientific background, lecturing in electrodynamics. Soon it was supporting students and experts doing groundbreaking work, while also increasing interest in science with the general population. They launched their own science program, hosted contests, created a prize for non-fiction literature, and began publishing books, including a Russian language version of the popular Bill Bryson book, A Short History of Almost Everything. Author Bill Bryson, the best-selling author of travel books, talks to a fan at a book signing. For example, we supported one of the greatest modern-day mathematicians, Vladimir Arnold. He was an extraordinary scientist, a teacher and promoter of mathematics. Memorable donations include some of the lifelong grants we made to people who are now seen as icons. For example, he published a problem book called 5 to 15, which I would strongly recommend to all children. It contains problems for children to guess the solutions to. We initiated an all-Russia contest to solve problems based on this book, which was extremely exciting. Sadly, it could not last. And while Dmitry did not hesitate in proclaiming this inaccurate, he also did not want to cast a bad light on all the success of the Foundation, so Dynasty decided to close down.

### Chapter 8 : Philanthropy in Russia: an insider's view - Alliance magazine

*Get informed employee perspectives before designing anything. Melendez and her team took an organic, grassroots approach to design, putting all employees at the center of her strategy.*

### Chapter 9 : Philanthropy on the commons | openDemocracy

*WELCOME TO NEVADA WOMEN'S PHILANTHROPY. Building A Powerful Association Of Community Investors. Nevada Women's Philanthropy (NWP) is a member-driven, pooled-fund, large impact grant-making organization established to address the needs of the greater Las Vegas community.*