



International Conference

DEVELOPMENT AND DEMOCRACY

Thinking Ahead for Sustainable
Development

“The projects that do best on GlobalGiving are the organizations that clearly benefit people,” maintains Mari Kuraishi



Mari Kuraishi, Co-Founder and President of GlobalGiving

GlobalGiving as an NGO provides a new and modern model of fundraising that fits perfectly into

the digital age. Could you explain how exactly this model works and describe the pillars on which it stands?

We founded GlobalGiving in 2001 before crowdfunding really existed, with the desire to do international development differently. Both my co-founder and I worked at the World Bank so we had deep experience with the way development was done in the world of official aid. We felt that the problem with official multilateral aid was that resources tended to flow to organizations that were established, could handle large amounts of money and perhaps had a good relationship with some of their governments. That meant that organizations that were smaller and wanted to test new ideas that were not proven and that were not necessarily always in a position to have a good relationship with the government, usually got fewer resources. As a result, the field of development has had fewer innova-

tions than it might have had. So we wanted to create a platform that could do exactly that; send money to any organization in the world, regardless of size, that was doing good work that could potentially increase the scope for innovation, and, ultimately, make communities better. That was the reason we created GlobalGiving—not because we felt there was some great new world to be explored in crowdfunding. Instead, crowdfunding became a way to accomplish the goal of pushing ownership of the development agenda back into the communities where it belonged, and opening up space for innovation. In other words, we wanted to do international development better, which meant we had to do it differently. So that’s how we stumbled onto crowdfunding. We started by saying “let’s support smaller organizations, let’s see if we can support organizations that are first and foremost grounded in community”. We then said, “Well, who can support these organizations?” the answer seemed to

lie in the generosity and capacity of the US philanthropic community—where 70% (out of US\$358 billion in 2014) is contributed by individuals. It seemed like a natural place to go. And that's how we ended up in the business of giving small donations from individuals. In addition, what might not be so visible for a person who comes to GlobalGiving.org is that even though we do get a lot of money from individuals, a lot of resources that flow through GlobalGiving actually come from companies that engage in corporate social responsibility, whether it's through employee giving, corporate philanthropy, or cause-related marketing. And that is a substantial amount of the money that goes through GlobalGiving. And finally, because we are passionate about doing development better, we have used our position as a fundraising platform to incentivise behaviour from community groups on the ground to do things differently, to constantly improve how they are working, so that they can be rewarded with better access to financial resources when those gains are documented.

How did you come up with idea of GlobalGiving?

Denis and I were in charge of business innovation as well as corporate strategy (at the World Bank). One of the challenges we were asked to tackle was that while the Bank did a lot of business and was really respected, it was not known for innovations—could we change that? We experimented with

the idea of crowdsourcing innovation—initially from staff, and eventually from the development community at large. These experiments were called the Development Marketplaces. That experience of crowdsourcing opened our eyes to the extremely large number of great organizations doing great work—not one of which we were able to work with directly at the World Bank. That's when we decided to leave the Bank and invent a way to support these organizations.

Over the years you had to be flexible in order to adjust to new challenges and situations. Was there a specific situation that led to a breakthrough in your way of thinking?

There were many things that caused us to do things differently. When we first started out we did not know very much about philanthropy. We knew a lot about organizations doing great work in the field because we came from the World Bank, but we did not know anything about how to get donors to give money to these projects. We built a site and nobody came. And we realized, people don't get up in the morning wondering how they can support AIDS orphans in South Africa. That's what we were thinking about, but that's not the first thing that most people think about. So that forced our first pivot. We asked ourselves, when do people think about giving? Which is when we got the idea to reach out to companies who support their employees' generosity. So that was one insight and it has turned into a

significant part of work that we do here, we have worked with more than 100 companies to support their corporate social responsibility activity. We had a different insight when the tsunami hit Southeast Asia in 2004. Suddenly, for the first time since our founding, people were organically searching for things like "how to help fisherman in Sri Lanka after the tsunami" and we were coming up as one the results. We realized that after disasters far greater numbers of people go online looking for these opportunities. So disaster work is a lot of the work we do today as well. Finally, on a completely different note, after we were founded 9/11 happened in the US which changed the regulatory environment for us drastically. Before that there were no criminal penalties associated with international grant making. After 9/11, laws came into force in the US that completely changed the way we had to carry out upfront due diligence on every organization that is on our site, to ensure that we were not unintentionally sending money to organizations even indirectly connected to money-laundering or terrorist activities.

GlobalGiving is pursuing a many-to-many approach. On your website we can see wide range of countries, NGOs and grassroots projects. What do you think motivates people to donate and support different projects?

There are different motivations for everybody. Some people may have served in the Peace Corps in Burkina Faso. So when they think of giving they think of Burkina Faso. Other people might be attracted to do something related to animals because they care about animals, they are animal lovers. In addition many people give, at least in the US, because someone asks them to, a friend or family member. And others give because it's a thing that we do towards the end of the year, and it's accepted that if you have enough money you should be giving it away. These people systematically think about what are the things that are meaningful to them, and which organizations are doing the best work.

GlobalGiving is a mission driven crowdfunding platform. Therefore,



a certain amount of transparency and trust of donors is necessary to fulfil the promise. How do you ensure that?

We require every organization to report on what they are doing every 90 days and this report gets pushed out to every donor to the project. If you do not report after 90 days, you cannot continue to be on the site. So that is our minimum. We also ask every organization whether they are seeking to improve the work they do on the ground. When they can show us they do, this generates points for the organization which in turn translates into how visibly they are displayed on GlobalGiving.org. This part is not obvious to the donor but the result of us using that ranking mechanism to figure out which organization should show up higher on our page means that someone who is browsing the site—say, for projects in India, or projects supporting women—will automatically see the organizations that are the most transparent and engaged in the highest impact behaviours. So it is implicit, not explicit, and it designs and frames the experience for a donor.

In your previous interviews you have also mentioned the importance of feedback in general. How does GlobalGiving gather feedback from projects that donors fund? How do you ensure accountability on the part of NGOs?

In addition to the reporting and ranking mechanism we send people to the field. There are thousands of projects

on the site and we visit about 10% of the projects in a given year. These visits are done by our staff but we also have fellowships for people who travel the field. We recruit people every year to see if they want to travel on our behalf, and these people come to GlobalGiving for 2 weeks of training and before we send them to the field. Many of these people are graduate students or people just out of school who are looking for the opportunity to travel. We also ask our partners in the field to go and visit other projects.

Even though GlobalGiving presents a great opportunity for NGOs to raise money to support their projects, how would you advise them to get support from funders besides that? How can they raise funds for development projects? Could you give us an example?

We don't believe that we should be an exclusive source of funding for any organization. There are organizations that are very well placed to get funding from major foundations or official aid agencies, whether it is the UN, EU, or the Ford Foundation. There are many organizations that do exactly those things that fit in the funding priorities of major funders. I think that the difficulty comes when organizations end up having to change what they do in order to fit into these funding priorities. That's not good news for anybody—nor for the funder nor the implementing organization. I think there are a number of crowdfunding platforms in the developing world e.g. organizations like Givelndia, HelpArgentina, ConexionColombia.

These crowdfunding platforms are national and I think they are definitely worth exploring. Then there is Kiva which extends loans to microfinance institutions. There are also crowdfunding sites that are thematically restricted, like Watsi. We also know that community foundations in some countries are quite powerful. And then there are the forprofit crowdfunding sites. Sites like Kickstarter and Indiegogo make sense if you have a particular campaign in mind. But they are not designed for people who want an ongoing fundraising platform.

What do you think is characteristic for fundraising focused specifically on development projects? Are there any differences that distinguish this type of fundraising? Are there any examples that come to mind?

From my point of view, the projects that do best on GlobalGiving are the organizations that clearly benefit people, whether it's kids, the elderly or people who have disabilities. If you can tell a clear story about how a donation can be used to change people's lives, they will actually do a lot better than a project that cannot make that connection to people—say, building an opera house. Even better is if you can make that a story about a particular person, rather than a category of people. If you are helping former sex-workers in India and you can drill down to a person, there is a story. That's the source of the human connection. We are wired to care about other people.

“The situation in Ukraine is similar in many areas, however not identical to the situation in Slovakia after 1998,” claims Ivan Mikloš

Which factors, in your opinion, prevent development in Ukraine to the largest extent? Which reforms are crucial in terms of the current political and economic situation?

On the one hand, in the last year and a half since the Maidan revolution, more reforms and positive changes

have been made than in the previous 20 years. On the other hand, the reform process could be much faster and would be more sustainable if there was strong leadership, effective communication and strong reform ownership in Ukraine. I can see and feel significant deficiency in all these areas, which is reflected in the lack of political unity

in implementing reforms, eliminating corruption and cronyism, slow development in macroeconomic stabilization and structural reforms. This is accompanied by an escalation of dissatisfaction and frustration of citizens on the one hand, and a rise of populism and demagoguery on the other.



Ivan Mikloš, Member of National Council of the SR

Key steps are the intensification of the fight against corruption, diminishing the role of the state in the economy, improving law enforcement, liberalization, deregulation and privatization. Moreover, tax reform is also crucial.

To what extent can the Slovak transition experience be helpful to Ukraine? Are there any similarities or differences in terms of economic transition?

The situation in Ukraine is similar in many areas, however not identical to the situation in Slovakia after 1998. We also dealt with a high level of corruption, a strong and unstructured public sector, minimal inflow of foreign

investment, a regulated energy sector, a high government deficit and a banking sector in a bad and unsustainable condition.

The significant difference is that we were fortunate enough not to be at war. However, war in Eastern Ukraine is not a reason for slowing down or softening reforms. Because of all the aforementioned facts, Slovak transition experiences are indeed relevant for Ukraine. The main finding of our transition is that if reforms are processed comprehensively, resolutely and quickly enough, they can bring positive results in quite a short period of time.

What is important when promoting unpopular reforms? How it is possible convince civil society and citizens to accept such reforms, especially in a country with ongoing armed conflict?

The most important thing as previously mentioned is strong leadership, ownership and communication. Leadership means that political leaders must pursue reforms despite their complexity and political unpopularity. They must be convinced of the importance and necessity of the reforms and they must be able to persuade people.

Ownership of the reforms means that reforms are enforced, not because of external pressure (IMF, EU or financial markets), but because they are necessary to improve the quality of life of the people in the country.

Communication means constant and intensive explanation of the meaning, content and importance of these reforms and fighting against populists and demagogues who seek to abuse unpopular, but necessary reforms for their own political or other gain.

In the countries with ongoing armed conflict, need for strong leadership and communication is even more important than under normal conditions.

How can we strengthen democratic and liberal values and promote fair competition in Ukraine? What role should state provide in this context?

One unavoidable precondition for successful economic transformation is increasing the level of economic freedom. This means a smaller and more effective state, which should carry out only functions that the state can and has to provide effectively. However, these functions should be carried out as effectively as possible. In this regard, economic policy should be based on the principles of free and fair competition, fight against corruption, law enforcement, property rights, deregulation, liberalization and privatization. A factor of great importance, in addition to the communication of political leaders, is also the work of NGOs and think-tanks, as well as quality of schools and education.

“IT sector in Africa will continue to be employed to solve longstanding socio-economic problems,” envisages James Ndiga

iHub provides a platform for technology innovations and startups emerging in developing countries. What are the current trends in this area?

Several trends can be identified. First of all, global technology companies are expanding operations in our country. For instance, IBM opened its first Africa research center in Kenya—a \$100 million facility creating an African version of its Watson supercomputer, dubbed

Project Lucy. Also SAP announced it will invest \$500 million by 2020 to introduce some of its newest technologies to the continent. Secondly, Venture Capital funding is constantly increasing as well. On the top of that, there has been a noticeable increase in social enterprises and innovations. Rather than leaving societal needs to the government or business sectors, innovators are finding what is not working and solving the problem by changing the system,

spreading the solution, and persuading entire societies to take new leaps. This has also led to more market research which is helping social entrepreneurs to present ideas that are user-friendly, understandable, ethical, and engage widespread support in order to maximize the number of local people that will stand up, seize their idea, and implement it. An increase can also be seen in emerging potential markets, i.e.

energy, tourism, smart cities, wearable and clean technologies.

What can we expect in future development? What challenges do you think the technology sector will face?

One of the current issues that will be more prominent in the future is growing state ICT competition. Following Kenya's lead, there are growing expectations on African governments to flesh out ICT plans and infrastructure. Countries such as Rwanda, Nigeria, and Ghana are already up to the pressure, conscious of the success of Silicon Savannah. I think that the IT sector in Africa will continue to be employed to solve longstanding socio-economic problems. Aid-agency grants previously going to NGOs are already being diverted to social-venture focused African technology organizations. On the corporate side, a directive for IBM's Lucy Project is solving many of "Africa's grand challenges"—many of which have been related to the development sector. Cracking the continent's longstanding problems will increasingly become a commercial technology opportunity. Moreover, there is also a growing global impact of African technology solutions. For instance, M-PESA has become a case study for global digital payments. U.S. political campaigns used Ushahidi in the last presidential election. Africa's solar powered; BRCK Wi-Fi device is being used in Internet dead spots in Wisconsin. Video on demand site iROKO partners, which was created to solve monetization and distribution problems for Nigerian movies, is now being eyed by Netflix to sell U.S. digital goods in Africa. Most of Africa's technology applications are developed as solutions to local problems, but this is creating unforeseen opportunities for other markets and will continue to do so. I think it's only a matter of time before one of Africa's commercially oriented startups scales a revenue generating platform to large numbers of people and creates the continent's first big acquisition, IPO (Initial Public Offer), and first Mark Zuckerberg type sensation.

On the other hand, a relative lack of angel community and capital resources has led successful ventures to seek greater rewards in more international

locales. Africa also has to deal with a large population of poor citizens and a volatile economy. The startup ecosystem needs more success stories as well as a serious first wave of founders that reinvest in and support their community. One of the challenges we also need to overcome is conservative attitudes. People are too comfortable maintaining the status quo and doing things the way they are used to.

How would you evaluate the effect of technology and innovation on development in your country? How are these new trends shaping development?

Innovation spaces have increasingly been at the center stage of economic development. Notably through rapid technological advancement, facilitating speedy access of ideas and experiences, financial aid, collaborations and prompt exchange of information. Usage and investment in ICT has been a fundamental enabler in linking communities, facilitating businesses and empowering communities both socially and economically. Increasing access to information and communication services in rural and underserved areas has also been crucial in accelerating development as they form part of the innovation ecosystem. Kenya as a country is leveraging these facts and is investing heavily in ICT. This can be seen in the innovations that are springing up from the innovation spaces, with the Government playing a key role, and, at the forefront Kenya ICT Board.

The ICT sector in Kenya contributes 12% to GDP and towards the growth and development of the country. This represents a marked improvement since the same sector contributed an average of 3.7% to GDP, according to reports released by the World Bank in 2010. This growth can be attributed to the robust telecommunications infrastructure, a rise of ICT Hubs, and high capacity international gateways. The country has also made remarkable progress by putting in place an ICT policy framework and implementation strategy, with measurable outcomes and time frames as part of the vision 2030 plan.

The continued growth in mobile and internet subscriptions is a clear indi-

cation that Internet penetration will continue to rise, offering more competitive innovative products and services that cater for the needs of the growing population in the country. Many of such innovations are happening in the innovation spaces.

In conjunction with the rapidly growing number of mobile and Internet connections the number of science courses and IT students graduating each year continues to increase. This number has increased each year in both public and private universities. Innovation spaces, where entrepreneurs congregate to bounce ideas around, network, work, learn, program, and design in order to turn their ideas into actions, seem to offer an ideal environment to nurture such fresh Kenyan graduates. This is achieved through encouraging cohesion, co-working and entrepreneurship spirit.



James Ndiga, iHub Nairobi

This growth is further illuminated through Kenya's current reputation as an ICT investor's paradise. Given the number of multinational companies that are setting up offices in the country, e.g. GSMA, IBM, Qualcomm, Google, Gumtree, Nokia, among others. With additional telecommunication standards set by the CCK, Kenya has a vision of becoming the "silicon valley savanna" in Africa.

These innovation spaces have been used as a conduit to encourage and spur innovation by transforming the

ideas of the graduates and young entrepreneurs into real products.

Emerging training institutions complement public and private universities' education systems by exposing students to the market needs other than just passing exams e.g. Emobilis, Moringa School, Andela and Nairobiits bring a lot of practical training and hands on training and involvement to projects.

At last, the Kenya Open Data Initiative received great governmental support to provide access to and utilization of open datasets by the population. Technology tools have also been built to synthesize and visualize the data in simple formats in order to improve access to this government information. Although there has not been substantial documentation of the level of use of these datasets or of technology appli-

cations built using this data, we are witnessing a significant improvement in terms of the number of initiatives coming to utilize the data. These initiatives include Code4Kenya, an outreach initiative supporting intermediaries to work with government datasets to develop applications and services that make data more accessible and that improve governance, as well as independently created open data applications.

You are outreach program coordinator, which means you are involved in courting local and international investors to invest in technology ideas and companies. What is your experience? In what projects do investors tend to invest and how are you trying to encourage them?

Increase in VC funding – The value of VC investment fueling Africa's startups is quickly moving from the millions to billions. Adding analysis to data provided by CrunchBase, we were able to confirm more than \$400 million in VC funding for African startups in 2014 and project at least \$1 billion in VC investment in Africa's tech startups for the period 2012–2018.

Investment is project based and there are various criteria that investors use to determine which project to invest in. Some check revenue model, scalability, market relevance and many more factors.

“Learning is the key to tackling the whole topic of global citizenship education”, thinks Rilli Lappalainen



Rilli Lappalainen, Secretary General of Kehys

What are the EU priorities for the post 2015 development agenda? What role does education play?

The European Union traditionally has focused on food security, gender, health etc. in its development work and is still

committed to the 0.7% target by 2030. However, achieving this in reality will be a huge challenge.

Education is usually simply mentioned as a term without being further examined in the EU council conclusions. Traditionally, it has been mainly understood in a formal education to get as many as possible children mainly to attend school. Another aspect is to teach skilled workers in order to enter the business sector.

The challenge for the EU will be how it will implement these goals. The EU has a strategy for sustainable development but this has recently been covered by the EU 2020 strategy, which greatly focuses on growth and job creation.

The EU must update its strategy on sustainable development and make a clear plan on how it will implement all SDG goals. The EU already has expertise in all thematic areas but what is missing is the mechanism for working in a coherent way to achieve these goals. Accountability and transparency mechanisms need to be built.

What is the EUs attitude towards GCE? Are the efforts to implement GCE adequate in developed countries?

So far the EC hasn't even talked about global citizenship education. The whole concept or wording is still new for them. It is indeed an issue to get all EU institutions on board.

Traditionally development education and awareness raising have represented a very small or even non-existent part of development in developing countries.

After agreeing the SDGs there is a need for deeper discussion with the EC, the EP and member states in order to consider how to tackle this in Europe and also with partners in the global south. Now

is the time to reshape the traditional way of working and to try to narrow the division between north and south. SDGs are going to be implemented in every country in the world. Traditional development work is still needed but hopefully in an updated version. Global citizenship is very much needed in every country of the world. This can be the tool to help people to take more responsibility for their own lives and environment.

How can we deal with the problem of measurement of GCE? Is it possible to make GCE more evidence-based? What is your experience with this issue?

Little research has been carried out up to date. I see global citizenship and its measurement also as a part of global citizenship itself. Learning is the key to tackling the whole topic of global citizenship education. The UN statistical committee and also UNESCO are currently working with indicators for all SDGs and it will be interesting to see the results. In the DEEEP 4 project we published a research publication about monitoring global citizenship education. This covers some examples. The further we go and the more evidence from different projects and programmes we get, I am sure that we will then have more tools to measure the impact of global citizenship.

“In many cases the interests of Poland and Eastern Partnership countries may simply vary,” says Katarzyna Jarecka-Stępień

What are the specifics of development cooperation in EaP countries?

*For many years, the guiding Polish development policy in the countries of the Eastern Partnership has been to support them in the process of economic, social, and institutional modernisation and transformation, as well as supporting them on their way toward closer integration with the European Union. According to the **Priorities of Polish Foreign Policy 2012–2016**, Polish actions in the international arena are a reflection of those values which are the foundation of our statehood: democracy, rule of law, respect for human rights and solidarity. In the light of the document, Poland is committed to openness and solidarity with the East and wants to assist the region in political and economic transformation. These activities are implemented and supported through a cooperation policy for development with the framework set forth in the Act on Development Cooperation adopted in 2011. Polish Official Development Assistance (ODA) is mostly granted through multilateral channels (primarily by the contribution to the EU budget, contributions to the European Development Fund (EDF), and support for specialised aid organisa-*

tions, programmes, and international funds). Bilateral activities are based on competitions for development projects published every year by the MFA, directed mainly to the third sector, as well as a separate programme for Polish foreign missions (“small grants project”). A significant volume of bilateral aid is transferred to the Eastern Partnership countries, and the “Polish Aid” programme itself is complementary to its four thematic platforms. Efforts initiated by Poland are aimed at the further deepening of areas which, thanks to the experiences of political, economic, and social transformation and integration with the European Union, are crucial to smooth and sustainable development of the region. So far, all EaP countries have been considered as priorities for Polish aid. The aim of Polish aid activities in the EaP countries is to support the processes of change toward sustainable and stable functioning of democratic systems, strengthening of local and central administrative structures, respect for human rights and the deepening of system transformation. In the area of economic development, an important role is played by system reforms, with particular emphasis on the development of agriculture and rural areas, an increase in economic competitiveness.



Katarzyna Jarecka-Stępień, Department of European Studies, Krakow University of Economics

The majority of the projects concern supporting the agricultural sector in market economy conditions, supporting sustainable economic development (especially small and medium-sized



Katarzyna Jarecka-Stepień

enterprises) and the planning and management of economic development processes. In addition, support is spent on activities and special economic zones to attract foreign investment and to privatise the economy. An equally important role in the implementation of the programme of Polish aid in EaP is played by educational initiatives which promote knowledge of the free market economy and activation of rural communities.

Which policy areas suffer the most by policy incoherence in V4 countries regarding development objectives for EaP region? What are the main factors that prevent policy coherence?

Despite the fact that the EaP countries are key recipients of Polish development aid, many factors make it difficult to develop a policy coherence for development. This is often due to the fact that in many cases the interests of Poland and Eastern Partnership countries may simply vary. There are signs that even

proximity alone results in the fact that we become connected in various areas of life that are not necessarily in harmony with the objectives of Polish development policy, including the pursuit of economic and social development and the development of democratic institutions in these countries.

In the case of Polish development policy, differences arising from conflicts of interest may appear in at least some areas. The following may be identified: migration policy and its associated visa policy and the management of passenger traffic between Poland (EU) and its eastern neighbours, agricultural policy, and environmental and energy policy. An important area of growing divergence in the implementation of the PCD is trade and investment policy and the associated transport policy.

Major factors limiting actions toward policy coherence for development in Poland include a lack of strategy for its implementation, lack of specific institutional and sectoral mechanisms of PCD, and lack of tools for monitoring implementation. At the same time, we should be aware that the lack of consensus on Polish foreign policy among the major political parties – in this particular region – is not conducive to the coherence of Polish policy for development in the context of Eastern policy. The lack of consensus in the basic principles of Eastern policy apparent in the Polish political arena does not facilitate the process of formulating goals and interests to the whole region and, consequently, is not conducive to the implementation of the objectives of PCD.

To what extent do differing economic interests of the v4 countries interfere with development goals for the EaP region?

The Eastern European region is of particular importance from the point of view of PCD for at least two reasons. Firstly, the countries of Eastern Europe are among the priority recipi-

ents of Polish development assistance. Secondly, motives that guide Poland in relation to this area are, on the one hand, to a large extent related to the implementation of traditionally understood interests of the state, on the other hand they are the realisation of the interests of countries (or communities) to which this policy is addressed. The lack of consensus and convergence of actions taken in the economic sphere by v4 countries has a very adverse effect on the EaP member states. This negative impact can be seen particularly in sectors, which are sensitive to economic development, such as energy, investments, and environmental protection. That discrepancy is manifested, among other things, in contradictory political decisions whether competing in the international arena contributes to the weakening of the development objectives of the EaP, and thus hampers economic growth and poverty reduction. At the same time, the lack of cooperation on the regional level, lack of coherent actions and a set common direction of impact reduces the level of stable development and security of the donor countries, which in turn contributes to a crisis of public confidence in those countries.

Cooperation at the regional level is particularly important due to the fact that often the chosen direction of political activities is dictated by the primacy of the European Union. In many areas relevant to the Eastern Partnership countries, the Union has exclusive competence and its level of ability to influence the region remains very high. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that Member States have an impact on EU policy in every field, because it results from the decision making process within the Community. At the same time there are areas such as development policy or migration, which – although subject to coordination at the EU level – to a large extent depend on the decisions of individual EU members, including Poland.

The conference was co-funded by the Official Development Assistance of the Slovak Republic – SlovakAid, the European Commission, the United Nations Development Programme and the International Visegrad Fund.

