



Charity before
the elections

How does the number of charitable foundations change in the pre-election period?

First of all, it should be noted that **pre-election charity became a notable phenomenon during the last election campaign.** *"We never saw such a scale of charity before. There used to be more concerts, public events. That's probably happening due to COVID-19 pandemic,"* says a representative of a charitable foundation from Western Ukraine. Indeed, on one hand, concerts and public events are not welcomed due to the growing incidence of coronavirus across the country, as they may cause the disease spread. On the other hand, society's demand for charitable assistance has grown due to a pandemic. It would be expedient to anticipate that more charitable foundations are set up on the eve of the election. However, the opinions of the survey participants on this matter dissented.

Most experts say that the number of charitable foundations is indeed growing rapidly during the pre-election period. *"I believe it's rising. The candidates or parties want to draw extra attention and set up a sort of 'charitable foundations,'"* a representative of a charity from the South shares. *"It is growing. Because Facebook has multiple demonstration activities, and that's ads. The scale of charity is increasing, new foundations are there which nobody ever heard of,"* her colleague from Western Ukraine concurs.

At the same time, experts emphasize that the **charitable foundations created specifically for the elections can be called 'pseudo-charitable,'** as they are focused on attracting the votes rather than on rendering selfless assistance.

"I personally believe that these are new foundations under certain politicians that are set up. They do it to bribe voters," a representative of a charitable foundation from Kyiv shares. *"During this period, political persons pander to the society, do charitable deeds, but they do so to buy voters, to garner political gains later on,"* her colleague from Central Ukraine agrees.

According to experts, such charitable foundations are not necessarily newly created, but get traction only before the elections. *"There are charitable foundations that only operate in the pre-election period. Aiming to raise public attention to certain candidates. When the elections are over, they're gone. In-between the elections, they only exist on paper,"* says a representative of a small Western Ukrainian charitable foundation. This practice seems to be quite common.

"There are charitable foundations in our city that only do something on the eve of elections. Nobody ever hears anything about them in other times. And that's not just during a single election cycle. A half of candidates to mayor have their charitable foundations that operate in the pre-election period," an expert from Central Ukraine concurs.

Thus, the **number of charitable foundations does not increase significantly on paper, but the number of active foundations and initiatives does grow.** *"When it comes to the pre-election period, they do not get the foundations registered as legal entities during this time. They are set up much in advance. That's charitable initiatives rather than foundations that spur on the eve of elections – these are occasional initiatives that help here and there,"* sums up a representative of a large national-level foundation.

The organizational forms/ways of these initiatives can vary, says a representative of a charity from the East: *“The number of legal entities does not grow up, but the number of charitable initiatives does. Various political forces establish special entities such as NGOs or charities having the same or similar names. And they use these charitable organizations to run their pseudo-charitable activities.”*

Only several experts do not notice a significant change in the number of charitable foundations or simply do not consider the newly-created entities to be charitable organizations. *“The number of foundations does not change. Electoral cycle is a regular part of social life. The number of charities increases in times of social upheaval, not during the elections,”* a representative of a charitable foundation from Eastern Ukraine is sure.

Is the activity of charitable foundations in the pre-election period growing?

Naturally, the foundations that are set up or intensify their activities on the eve of elections are actively working throughout the entire pre-election cycle. But what is happening at this time to regular charitable foundations? Do they change their scope of activity? Experts also dissented in their answers to this question.

Larger and smaller foundations –
do not observe increased activity of regular charities

Medium-sized –
activity is intensified as more money is raised from the benefactors

Several experts –
charitable activities drop in intensity

A half of the survey participants **do not notice any increase in the activity of regular charitable foundations** in the pre-election period. *“The foundations that demonstrate stable performance over many years do not change their activity scope,”* a representative of a large charitable foundation from Western Ukraine is sure. *“It is only inherent to specific charities. The others continue business as usual,”* her colleague from a small foundation in Central Ukraine agrees. It is noteworthy that this position is mostly shared by representatives of larger charitable foundations (that have a high organizational culture and normally have little dependence on domestic fundraising) and smaller foundations (that are often less publicized and therefore of less interest to the politicians).

Charity before the elections

On the other hand, another half of the experts (more often representatives of medium-sized charitable foundations) claim that **the elections stimulate the activity of many charitable foundations**. This is primarily due to the fact that during this period, they manage to raise more funds from politicians to implement their own initiatives. *“The foundations that are genuinely charitable can have excess of money gained from the candidates, benefactors – from those who want to make their activities visible here and now. In this case, such foundations may become more active, too. That is especially true for the education sector (furniture, procurement of education materials, etc.), healthcare (financial assistance to seek treatment), cultural projects (festivals). That is, their activities get more intense,”* explains a representative of a charitable foundation from Western Ukraine.

Such funding can be raised both at the request of the foundation and on the initiative of a politician who seeks opportunities for publicity. *“Charitable foundations appeal to parties more often, because they understand that at this time, they can raise some funds for their statutory activities. We do not apply, though,”* a representative of a small foundation from Kyiv shared her experience. *“Numerous charitable foundations currently cooperate with the politicians. I can’t say that it’s bad. Though that ‘s all about the publicity for politicians, but if the beneficiaries benefit from it, that’s good. Many politicians have their charitable foundations and offer cooperation with famous foundations,”* adds her colleague from Western Ukraine.

At the same time, several charitable experts believe that the trend of growing charity during the election campaign is gradually waning. *“I do not observe any increase. That only happened in 2011-2012,”* says the head of a small East Ukrainian charitable foundation. *“I can share the example of our charity – we received more offers from the candidates when the majoritarian election system was used. More candidates contacted us and offered their help then,”* a representative of a charity from the South recalls.

“This year, I do not observe any pre-election increase in such an activity. But it can be assumed that that’s due to COVID-19 rather than because our parties became more responsible and stopped using such tricks. Cause it’s how it happened this year,” sums up a representative of a large charity from Kyiv.

How to tell a ‘pre-election foundation’ from a regular one?

Most experts clearly divide charitable foundations into “pre-election” and regular/permanent ones. But is it easy to tell one from another? The survey participants list the obvious criteria such as:

- political affiliation,
- relation to the name of a candidate or a party,
- active publicity component,
- activity only in the pre-election period,
- lack of a permanent vision, mission and values,
- unsystematic activities,

- receiving money from the only source,
- opaque activities.

* The foundations established by the politicians that run stable activities are not considered.

However, today there are many funds that are funded by politicians and at the same time operate constantly. *"I know that people who do good deeds do them even without the elections. It is also true for the politicians and public officials. I wouldn't say that they got more active on the eve of the elections,"* says a representative of a charity from Kyiv. And politicians themselves have become more cautious and are looking for more sophisticated ways to improve their reputation. *"It's hard to say, especially now. Things were different 10 years ago. These used to be 'personal' foundations – the Dubnevykh Brothers Foundation, Ihor Palytsia Foundation, etc. It was quite evident back then – they became more active before the elections, they were affiliated with a particular person, they tried to be visible, so it was clear they aim for something specific. And now... When it comes to the foundations that you expect should help and present a candidate as a good person, such foundations may not have that person's name in their title, they can use certain strategic approaches in their activities. They can be set up 4 years before the elections, run regular charitable activities and do not promote their candidate, but in the pre-election period, highlight that this candidate has been a good person,"* the representative of a charity from Western Ukraine elaborates. *"It depends on the skills of people who use such publicity. Let's put it this way. Indeed, if the PR managers who use a charity to promote their candidate are qualified enough, it would be hard to distinguish. But still it's possible to tell politically-affiliated charity from a regular one,"* her colleague from Eastern Ukraine is sure.

According to the interviewed experts, today it is possible to distinguish a 'pre-election' foundation from a regular one based on a number of indicators.



Key difference is the essence and the values of the foundations. *"Genuine charities have their values, mission, vision. Being independent from politics is important to them. The only mission of the 'pre-election' foundations is to improve someone's reputation,"* a representative of one of the largest charities in Ukraine assures. Therefore, 'pre-election' foundations do not focus on specific areas – instead, they attempt to address various requests that they receive. *"A regular charity usually focuses on one direction of activities, while 'pre-election' foundations work with urgent issues in many areas. They do not bind to specific area. A charity that works in the traces cannot afford dispersing efforts for multiple areas. But those would do anything – they construct a playground, they help hospitals, etc. – depending on what they are asked to do,"* tells a representative of a small charity in Western Ukraine.



Equally important are **systemic and stable operation, availability of a strategy** of activities and development.

"To tell one from another, one should look at what a charity is doing, how long it has been active – was it set up right before the elections or earlier; does it only engage in voter cheating or has some development programs."
Regular charities, including our foundation, do not increase in activity right before the election. We follow our long-term strategy. Our program aims at developing instead of "putting out fires", sums up a representative of a large charity from Kyiv.

Charity before the elections

"Regular charities have a strategy and run stable systemic activities. It has not only specific directions of activities, donors, etc., but also stable operations that can be tracked monthly, quarterly, annually. While 'pre-election' charities get traction before the elections and then go into hiding to become more active again on the eve of the next elections," their colleague from the South points out.



Significant differences between the two types of funds also exist in the sources and their transparency. *"Such charities are usually funded by one or two persons. They do not enjoy systemic trust by larger donors,"* tells an expert from Western Ukraine.

"First that you should look at is when a charity was registered, when it started [stable] operation, how transparent is it, how accountable is the charity and where it gets money from. If a foundation is only funded by one person... or by three-four companies owned by a candidate – well, everything is clear with it. Indeed, many foundations actually seek funding from multiple sources," adds her colleague from a large national-level foundation.

It is easy to identify that a charity is of 'pre-election' nature even when a little-known foundation suddenly receives a lot of money before the elections. *"It usually takes time for a charity or an NGO to make it to the big leagues. During the first year, these are usually small donations, contributions. So, one can tell if a charity receives a significant donation soon after being established,"* a representative of a charitable foundation from Kyiv shares his observations.



At the same time, it should be taken into account that some well-known regular and effective charities in Ukraine are funded by a certain private company or a politician. But in this case, it is important that the charity has an **independent management**. *"You should look at the management. Otherwise, if a political campaign or a private company affiliated with a candidate have shared management with a charity, it begs the question why they need this charity?"*, a representative of a charitable foundation from Western Ukraine asks. *"In 'pre-election' foundations, the staff is affiliated with a certain political force. For example, a party secretary is appointed the head of a charity,"* clarifies her colleague from Eastern Ukraine.



'Pre-election' charitable foundations are normally focused on a specific audience – economically vulnerable groups, persons entitled to vote. *"Most often, these are about social vulnerabilities – children, pensioners. They run the projects for two purposes – on one hand, to get publicity, and on the other hand, to task people to vote for a certain politician,"* says a representative of a charity foundation from Odesa oblast.

"If they can't make any publicity out of it, they would refuse assistance. Children with cancer do not vote, so why would they need them?", her colleague from Central Ukraine asks a rhetorical question.



After all, they have little connection with the **beneficiaries**. First, this is due to the fact that the 'pre-election' charity attempts for the maximum coverage of the audience, and not for the quality of contact. *"The regular foundations usually have their target audience that they engage with systemically. These foundations are well-known to their audiences and are cognizant of their beneficiaries. While the foundations established for specific political motives ... try to cover the groups that they can provide financial assistance to – for instance, the pensioners. They mostly work with the voters,"* says a representative of a charity that operates throughout the country. In addition, the 'pre-election' foundations prioritize the outcomes over the beneficiaries themselves.

"That's not who is in need or who was helped that matters. It is the candidate who offers help. They do not share the stories of people whom they helped to," adds a representative of a charity from Rivne oblast.



When it comes to PR and awareness raising, most foundations try to cover their activities, but only the 'pre-election' foundations **resort to paid methods of publicity. They often focus on a candidate or a political force.** *"That is a specific public figure who will be promoted. They will use visual materials with logos of a political force, disguised slogans... But that's all about a well-organized political campaign that engages with a charity. When the campaign is unskilled, it will use open statements that will reveal political motives behind charitable activities – like, 'a candidate did...', 'thanks to candidate A.,...'. It will use the brand, logos all around – not only on merchandise and outdoor ads, but also some stickers on charitable gifts, items, etc.,"* explains a representative of a charity from Eastern Ukraine. In addition, such charitable foundations **try to accompany the candidate in his/her contacts with the media.**

Finally, such foundations are often **less transparent and less accountable.**

What charitable activities do 'pre-election' charitable foundations run and how effective are they?

According to the majority of surveyed experts, 'pre-election' charitable foundations focus mostly on several types of assistance:

- humanitarian aid – food kits, medicines, toys,
- constructing playground and sportsgrounds, arrangement of public spaces, parks,
- organization of festivals,
- assistance to orphanages, schools, kindergartens,
- assistance in counteracting COVID-19 (a feature of the latest campaign),
- environmental activities, education and cultural initiatives (mentioned by several

Charity before the elections

All these types of assistance pursue one purpose – to have the greatest possible coverage of beneficiaries at the lowest possible cost.

"They provide food to people in need. They pay visits to the orphanages. They do isolated activities on education, culture, and environment. It gives mass coverage and helps gain attention. This is a very clear and plain message that they can easily promote among future votes. A quick win," a representative of a charity from Lviv explains how these foundations operate.

Therefore, this **assistance is mostly not expensive**. *"Some small gifts that do not provide solutions to any problems. They are just for publicity. I never observed how they constructed a hospital or brought some equipment there. What I did observe was how they were waiting near the exits from the hospitals to disseminate a nalgene package to the elderly. These packages were had visuals of political campaigning on them,"* a representative of a charitable foundation from the South illustrates an example of such assistance.

It begs a natural question – how effective such assistance is? Most representatives of charitable foundations say that **this is not about efficiency**, and give an array of proofs.

Why is the assistance offered by 'pre-election' foundations not effective?



First, one-time assistance **does not solve social problems**, but only temporarily mitigates their manifestations. *"The foundations established by the politicians are not effective as they do not provide solutions to social problems, do not work systemically. For example, there are people with diseases who are constantly in need of the medicines to survive. If they do not receive systemic support – daily, monthly – but only once per 4 years, what efficiency are we talking about?"*, a representative of a charity from Southern Ukraine asks a rhetorical question. In addition, such assistance does not prevent the problem from exacerbating in the future. *"It gives short-time outcomes that have no impact on the future. That's like we give a fish instead of teaching to catch a fish,"* sums up a representative of a charitable foundation from Dnipropetrovsk oblast.



Secondly, pre-election charity does not entail **follow-up of the beneficiary**, or monitoring what happens after the assistance was rendered.



Third, it is often **poorly planned** because it focuses on the media effect rather than on real needs of the beneficiaries. *"I'll use the same example of a playground to make myself clear – they construct it in a spot easiest for them, with prefabricated elements and without further support. For example, they can set it up in a neighborhood with only pensioners living. It is poorly planned, it's only for publicity."*

"If it is visible, the political purpose is achieved, but the charitable purpose is not," a representative of a charity from Kyiv explains a problem.



Another strong argument is that such assistance is often of poor quality, as its purpose is to ensure visibility during the pre-election period.



Finally, this kind of help is **ambiguous in terms of ethics**. *"It is totally ineffective. It is only for publicity," "I take it negatively. The assistance should be systemic rather than in waves. It looks like voter bribing," "This is toxic, and this is not Okay. This is political campaigning and voter bribery,"* concur the representatives of charitable foundations. The assistance that encourages people to vote for a candidate or a party not only looks like bribery, but also creates corruption risks for the country. *"It simply looks like a bribe, because the voter is bribed. The politicians who spent money expect to get something in exchange, and even make profit of it,"* a representative of a charitable foundation from Central Ukraine is sure. *"That's evil. They manipulate the elderly women and their poor financial situation so badly that the people are ready to sell their vote for some simple food. How will the young people live in this country?"*, her colleague from Kyiv does not hide her sadness.

At the same time, not all the representatives of charitable foundations are that black-and-white in their judgements.

About every third representative of charitable foundations are sure – **some help is better than no help**.

"When they do good deeds, that's good, even if it has something to do with election campaigning. It is still charity," says a representative of a large charitable foundation from Kyiv. *"I see it on a more positive side. This is the help to those in need. Let it be,"* her colleague from one of Lviv-based charitable foundations supports her.

In fact, in Ukrainian reality of limited budget funding, any source of funding is good. *"It's quite effective. They did meet a lot of the needs of a hospital that would remain unmet otherwise. They helped a lot. But for two candidates, we would not make it during the coronavirus pandemic, without the masks, protective means, gowns. They invest a lot of money,"* explains a representative from Western Ukraine.

In addition, the surveyed experts who are less critical in their opinions appreciate the effectiveness of pre-election charity if it aims at saving lives and health. After all, the truth, as always, is somewhere in the middle. *"The pre-election charity normally pursues wide coverage and has short-term effect,"* says a representative of a famous charitable foundation, *"If it is offered in a professional way, it can be quite effective. When a candidate hands out to pensioners the food packages that will be gone in three, that's definitely short-term and no effect. But when a candidate procures, say, an expensive equipment for a healthcare facility, it indeed has a long-term effect."*

Therefore, the pre-election charity can be effective if it aims to achieve a lasting effect and addresses real needs of society.

How does pre-election charity affect the work of regular foundations and the charitable sector at large?

It would seem that everyone has the right to do what they see fit. After all, the charitable foundations should not care what their peers do. Not everything is so simple, though.

Charity before the elections

The main problem is that pre-election charity **can undermine trust in charitable foundations** that operate on a permanent basis.

People may think that charitable assistance is a selfish motive, so they will be suspicious of all foundations. *"People have prejudices against the regular charities, as they suspect them of seeking profits,"* admits a representative of a charitable foundation from Dnipropetrovsk oblast, *"After the elections are over, we sometimes hear: 'Well, we know your charity. It's just money laundering',"* her colleague from Kyiv adds.

In addition, in the run-up to elections, people get used to having their needs met here and now, quickly and in a way they want. While the regular charitable foundations work on a different principle and is often limited in resources and opportunities. *"What is key is that it causes distrust in regular charities. They paint everyone with the same brush – both the 'one-day' foundations and the regular ones. Likewise, the beneficiaries expect some individual financial assistance here and now from the regular charitable foundations,"* says a representative of a charitable foundation from Kyiv.

"It shadows the activities of the charities. A regular charity cannot have so much money for its operation like a charity that aims for quick wins and enters the market having received serious funding. And the people start to compare the quality and scope of charitable assistance offered by both short-term and regular foundations," her colleague adds.

In fact, pre-election charity contributes to frustration in all the foundations. "People have much stronger feelings when they lose rather than receive something. Therefore, when after the elections all these short-term foundations and their assistance are gone, people lose trust," a representative of a well-known charitable foundation from Kyiv explains. Somewhat less often, the interviewed experts highlighted other negative effects of pre-election charity for regular charitable foundations, such as:



Difficulties in working with the media.

"This period is tough for the foundations and for communications. It's hard to place our ads, mass media are entirely focused on the elections and other topics recede in the background," says a representative of a national-level charity.



Devaluation of the foundations that causes burnouts among the staff.

"The pre-election foundations have more resources. And it happens that some regular foundation worked hard to develop a community of benefactors, a database of those whom it regularly helps, keeps operating without interruption and advocating for an issue. And suddenly another foundation that is simply rich comes out of a blue and simply seizes the clients. Well yes, it does influence. Sometimes it may cause burnouts among staff, devaluation of their activities. And that's also the devaluation of the topic/problem that they work with," complains a representative of the Western Ukrainian branch of a large charitable foundation.



Demotivation of donors.

"When we publish a call for donations, they say us – go to the candidates, they help everyone. They have money, why do you ask donations from average people? But if a candidate helped once, s/he won't help for the second or fifth time," shares a representative of a small charity foundation from Rivne oblast.

Sometimes the politicians try to involve regular charitable foundations in their election campaign. However, such proposals carry many risks for charities. 'Pre-election' foundations and candidates are trying to somehow promote themselves on the background of charitable foundations that already have some established reputation.

"The politicians want to show how cute they are as they cooperate with existing charities. Roughly speaking, they simply use regular charities and their resources. It is not good for their reputation, because 'if you are with them [specific politicians], you are against the others. And that means political affiliation,'" explains a representative of a large charitable foundation from Southern Ukraine.

Some politicians do not care about the reputation of the foundations they work with and inadvertently manipulate information. *"I will share our example. In an information entry, the name of our foundation was mentioned alongside with a name of a candidate and his activity. That was high-profile, and huge reputation harm [for us], we were screwed. We were 'attached' to this politician, they started blaming us that we allegedly supported him. We did not initiate this publication, and it was inappropriate on the side of the journalists to frame it this way,"* says a representative of a reputable charity from Eastern Ukraine.

The problem is also that sometimes the foundations can become hostages of the situation. *"There's another issue... When we publish our calls for donations, a candidate says, 'I'll help you,' and s/he covers our needs. Our needs may be quite small, much smaller than the millions they spend on political campaigning. But I as a head of a charity have no moral right to refuse from this money. They come to us, take photos and videos with us... I can't refuse, because they offered help. But the people who see these shots in the media conclude that I am campaigning in favor of this candidate. That's a hard-nosed question,"* shares a representative of a charitable foundation that cares for sick children.

At the same time, about a third of the survey participants believe that the impact of pre-election charity on the regular foundations is minimal, especially if the latter managed to earn their own reputation. *"Currently, they do not actually make any difference, because the established foundations have already got their reputation, run stable activities, have transparent reports, websites with all necessary information, are present in social networks,"* says a representative of a charitable foundation from the South.

If we look at the problem more broadly, we can single out other risks for the charitable sector associated with pre-election assistance.



First of all, it is about **devaluing and distorting the perception of charity** as such and expectations from it. *"It distorts public opinion on what a charitable foundation is, what it can and should do. It devalues the charity, narrows it down to delivering food to homes,"* says the head of a charitable foundation from Kharkiv.



Manifestations of pre-election charity **undermine the culture of charitable giving**. *"When a foundation operates on a permanent basis, it shapes the culture of charitable giving. The reporting, photo reports, systemic activities,"* warns a representative of a small charitable foundation from Kyiv. *"And when the culture of charitable giving is damaged, people stop trusting. People say, 'That's just publicity based on charity. These foundations will forget about us after the elections,'"* supports her colleague from Western Ukraine.



Yet another aspect of the negative impact of pre-election charity on the sector is **the involvement of charitable organizations, foundations, and leaders in political activities**. It withdraws blood from the movement and harms its reputation. *"A lot of civic activists go into politics now, but not everyone is ready to be a politician. They are pulled to politics, unfortunately,"* complains a representative of a charitable foundation from Kyiv. *"These campaigning organizations take the best leaders from us, because there's always a temptation to leave the civic sector for political career,"* adds her colleague from Lviv.

How and why do permanent charitable foundations get involved in election activities?

Most survey participants claimed that their foundations were in no way involved in election campaigns. *"I can't say for others. We were never involved. We have a clear policy – we never cooperate with political, terrorist and faith-based forces,"* says a representative of a well-known charitable foundation from Lviv. First, such activity is prohibited by law, and second, it entails a number of risks: from the loss of some donors (both domestic and foreign) to the loss of reputation. *"The charitable foundations risk losing support of international donors, because they strictly monitor all the politically affiliated organizations,"* a representative of a charitable foundation from the South shares.

"The charities that aim to play the long game try to escape politics. Because everything changes so quickly in our country. When a party will lose support, we won't get away of it," a representative of a charitable foundation from Central Ukraine elaborates on the opinion of her colleague.

The very charity community often condemns such practices. *"The charitable organizations that respect themselves believe it is bad manners,"* explains a representative of one of the largest charitable foundations in Ukraine. *"The idea behind the foundations is that they should be out of politics. Their job is to address social issues irrespective of which political forces are in office,"* says a representative of a charitable foundation from Kyiv. *"We have a code of ethics of our staff specifying that our foundation does not support any political force,"* continues his colleague from the East.

Participation in election campaigns often takes the form of advisory support. *"For all the charities, the social capital, trust and reputation are their main assets. Therefore, they do not engage with politics. I remember the cases when the charitable foundations were affiliated with the election campaigns, but that was due to personal relations with the foundations of the candidates. They rather manage the funds than help them directly,"* adds a representative of a charitable foundation from Western Ukraine.

However, about a third of the experts surveyed noted such practices in the charity sector. *"Certain foundations in Odesa do cooperate with the politicians. Some activists even intentionally come to the members of councils saying, 'The elections are coming, please, help us with money',"* adds her colleague from the South. And every tenth survey respondent claimed they were ready to engage in such activities. *"We raise money for a child, so we come to everyone, including the politicians. We are ready to organize joint actions with them,"* says a representative of one of the charitable foundations located in Western Ukraine. In this case, it is mostly a matter of permission to publish information about the support provided to the charitable foundation, less often, of information support in the elections.

Most representatives of charitable foundations do not disregard the possibility of cooperation with the politicians. *"For sure. Well, the politicians are also human beings. Our people say that the politicians are creeps. Being engaged in politics is a lowly craft. For sure, some of them are creeps, but they are everywhere,"* considers a representative of a charitable foundation from the Dnipro. *"[Cooperation is] possible. It depends on a person who seeks cooperation. If a person has moral values, why not?"*, a colleague from Zakarpattia consents. However, it is desirable that it does not take place on the eve of elections. *"Cooperation is quite possible. Why not? But we have to be sure that it is not the pre-election period and that the politicians do not use our foundation for their own purposes,"* emphasizes a representative of a charitable foundation from the South.

Experts have expressed similar views on cooperation with charitable foundations set up by the politicians. Mostly because some of them are known for their active work, and some work sustainably and have a good reputation. *"[Cooperation is] possible in theory. If an organization has a vision, mission, charity strategy, regular staff, etc.,"* says a representative of a charity from Western Ukraine. *"Yes, [cooperation is] possible on the conditions of clear transparency, accountability, proper management, communications, if a politician does not interfere with decisions made by a foundation,"* adds her colleague.

In general, most experts sigh with relief when the pre-election period ends and the charity sector is able to work systematically again with the usual challenges, understandable problems, for the sake of new victories and achievements.

Charitable foundations are ready to cooperate with the politicians, but not during the run-up to the elections.



Charity before
the elections