



IUPUI

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Lilly Family School of Philanthropy

The 2022 Global Philanthropy Environment Index India

Experts: Divya Chopra and Ingrid Srinath

Institutional Affiliation: Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy, Ashoka University

Edited by the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy

QUICK FACTS

Legal forms of philanthropic organizations included in the law: Society, Trust, Section 8 Company (LLC)

Five main social issues addressed by these organizations: Education, Healthcare, Community and Economic Development, Environment, Rural Transformation

Average time established by law to register a philanthropic organization: 31–60 days

Average cost for registering a philanthropic organization: USD 15–USD 400

Time estimate for registering a philanthropic organization (PO): societies and trusts are registered by state authorities as having different requirements, therefore the time may vary from state to state. Approximate time taken for preparation of documents and registration of the organization with the statutory authority is 15 days for a trust, 30 days for a society, and 40 days for a Section 8 company. Estimated cost for registration of a PO is USD 15–400. Registration of a trust requires a payment fee of USD 15. Registration of a Society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860 involves a fee which is less than a dollar. Registration of a Section 8 company can require a fee up to USD 350–400 depending on the professional managing the registration process.

Government levels primarily regulating the incorporation of philanthropic organizations: Central/Federal Government, State Government

Registration of a trust or society is at the state level but to avail tax exemptions and deductions, the POs need to work with the Income Tax Department which is under the federal government.

Philanthropic Environment Scores:

Year	Ease of Operating a PO	Tax Incentives	Cross-Border Philanthropic Flows	Political Environment	Economic Environment	Socio-Cultural Environment	Overall Score
2022 GPEI	3.17	2.75	2.50	3.25	4.00	4.00	3.28
2018 GPEI	3.33	3.50	2.70	3.50	N.A.	3.00	3.21

Source: Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2022 *Global Philanthropy Environment Index*

Key Findings

I. Formation/Registration, Operations, Dissolution of a Philanthropic Organization (PO)

The three indicator questions in this section pertain to the laws and regulations governing philanthropic organizations (POs). The scoring questions for this category cover three aspects of regulations: (A) formation and registration; (B) operations; and (C) dissolution.

Question One: To what extent can individuals form and incorporate the organizations defined?

Score: 4.0

A group of individuals are free to form a PO as a trust, society, or a Section 8 company. There are no national laws governing trusts in India—however, a few states like Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu have their own Public Trusts Act. Societies in India are governed by the Societies Registration Act, 1860. These need to be registered with the respective state registrar of societies to be eligible for tax exemption. Section 8 companies, which encompass most POs, are to be registered under the Companies Act, 2013.

Question Two: To what extent are POs free to operate without excessive government interference?

Score: 2.5

It is easiest to operate a trust, as there are not many restrictions on the operations except that a trust cannot have operations beyond the state in which it is registered. There is no annual filing requirement, but its board of trustees must maintain the books and accounts. A society enjoys the flexibility of changing its objectives through its operations, but it is difficult to set up a national society. Societies need to annually file details such as the list of the names, addresses, and occupations of their managing committee members with the registrar of societies.

While a Section 8 company is free to operate nationally, operating it is difficult as a company cannot deviate from its core objectives. There is a requirement to comply with filing annual accounts and company returns with the Registrar of Companies (ROC). However, increasing regulatory action against organizations supporting human rights and democratic freedoms have a chilling effect on philanthropy who work in these causes.

Question Three: To what extent is there government discretion in shutting down POs?

Score: 3.0

While a trust is usually irrevocable in nature, a court's permission is required if a trust decides to merge with another trust having similar objectives. A society or a Section 8 company may be dissolved as per the by-laws of the society, however, upon dissolution and settlement of all debts and liabilities, the funds and property of the society must be given or transferred to some other society, preferably one with similar objectives. A PO may be involuntarily terminated only if its objectives are proven to be anti-national or against the public interest. However, requirements that

tax exemptions under the Finance Act, 2019 have expanded the powers of the government to withdraw tax exemptions granted to POs.

II. Domestic Tax and Fiscal Issues

The two questions in this section pertain to laws and regulations governing the fiscal constraints of giving and receiving donations domestically.

Question Four: To what extent is the tax system favorable to making charitable donations?

Score: 2.5

In the 2020 Union Budget, the Indian Government offered a new tax regime under which taxpayers have been given the option to migrate to lower tax brackets, provided the taxpayers do not claim any tax exemption—including tax exemption on donations to charitable organizations under Section 80G of the Income Tax Act. This will be a disincentive for individuals to make charitable donations to POs, given that they are offered lower tax rates in the alternate regime. Absence of estate duty and wealth tax mean that there are few other incentives for philanthropic contributions. The low ceiling (up to 10% of income) on the 50 percent exemption provided provides no incentive for high value contributions, especially from the very wealthy.

Question Five: To what extent is the tax system favorable to POs in receiving charitable donations?

Score: 3.0

The Finance Act, 2020 amended certain sections of the Income Tax Act and limited the validity of registration of all those POs claiming tax exemptions on their income under the Income Tax Act (Section 12AA) to only five years. The POs would need to renew their registrations every few years to continue to enjoy tax-exempt income. All POs, irrespective of their current registration status, need to apply afresh for approval or registration. This amendment will not just increase the administrative burden on POs, but may also lead to bureaucratic harassment. For now, the exercise of application for registration has been deferred to April 1, 2021 under the Taxation and Other Laws (Relaxation and Amendment of Certain Provisions) Bill, 2020.

III. Cross-Border Philanthropic Flows

The two questions in this section concern laws and regulations governing the fiscal constraints of giving and receiving cross-border donations. The scoring for these questions pertains to the donor and receiving entities.

Question Six: To what extent is the legal regulatory environment favorable to sending cross-border donations?

Score: 3.0

Since January 1, 2016, under the Reserve Bank of India's (RBI) Liberalised Remittance Scheme (LRS), all resident individuals, including minors, are allowed to freely remit up to USD 250,000 per

financial year (April–March). Under this LRS, resident individuals are free to make donations as part of outward remittances. The LRS is not available to corporates, partnership firms, Hindu Undivided Family (HUF), and trusts among others. The database is maintained by the RBI.

Question Seven: To what extent is the legal regulatory environment favorable to receiving cross-border donations?

Score: 2.0

A lot of regulatory changes have come into play through the Foreign Contribution Regulation Act (FCRA) amendment in 2020 that are likely to have an adverse impact on cross-border donations to India. The amendment has made the eligibility criteria for a PO registering under FCRA more stringent by raising the minimum spend requirement on core activities in the last 3 years from INR 10 million (USD 13,600) to INR 1.5 million (USD 20,400). The amendment prohibits sub-granting of foreign funds from an FCRA-registered PO to another PO, even if it is registered under FCRA. This will have a dampening effect on collaborative social impact work in India. Another cause of concern is the lowering of the cap on administrative expenses by a PO from 50 percent to 20 percent of foreign funds received during a fiscal year. Many more changes such as suspension in case of contravention and extended timeline for suspension of registration are likely to have serious repercussions for POs dependent on cross-border donations.

IV. Political Environment

The four indicator questions in the next three sections concern the political context, economic conditions, and socio-cultural characteristics that influence the environment for philanthropy.

Question Eight: To what extent is the political environment favorable for philanthropy?

Score: 3.0

There was a high level of synergy between the government and the POs in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. The POs worked as extensions of the government, as the government heavily relied on POs for the last-mile delivery of relief efforts. Despite this, the recent changes in policies governing the nonprofit sector in India (FCRA Amendment 2020, Finance Act, 2020, and the Companies (Corporate Social Responsibility Policy) Amendment Rules, 2020) are a reflection of the lack of trust in the sector. These changes will decide the future course of philanthropy in India. In the last nine years (2011–2019), 20,672 FCRA registration numbers (not necessarily FCRA-approved status of NGOs) have been canceled by the government. The main stated reasons for these cancellations have been greater FCRA scrutiny, POs’ failure to file annual FCRA returns, and to weed out duplicate registration numbers.

Question Nine: To what extent are public policies and practices favorable for philanthropy?

Score: 3.5

Governments at state and national levels are very open to public-private partnerships with philanthropists, both foreign and domestic. Government, both at state and national level, also makes a large number of grants available through many different schemes. However, there is no reporting on the overall grants that have gone to the nonprofit sector. These POs now need to mandatorily register on an online portal NGO-DARPAN, managed by NITI Aayog on behalf of the Indian government, and self-report the funding received.

India is the first country in the world to make corporate social responsibility (CSR) mandatory for companies over a certain threshold, a policy since 2014. This has resulted in a rapid increase in CSR funding made available to POs working in India. New CSR rules make compliance mandatory with financial penalties for non-compliance. However, over the past decade, regulations governing philanthropy and the nonprofit sector have grown increasingly stringent, especially with regard to international funding. Freedom House's Freedom in the World 2021 report downgraded India's rating from "Free" to "Partly Free," with restrictions on freedoms of expression and association being singled out for mention.

V. Economic Environment

Question Ten: To what extent is the economic context favorable for philanthropy?

Score: 4.0

With a nominal gross domestic product (GDP) of USD 2.9 trillion, India had the world's fifth largest economy in fiscal year (FY) 2020. The country has experienced rapid economic transformation in the three previous decades, with real GDP growth averaging 6.6 percent between 1990 and 2017, making India the fastest-growing economy in the Group of Twenty (G20). During this period of rapid growth, poverty rates in India dropped and GDP per capita, as well as other key social indicators, steadily improved. However, income inequality increased in the same period, with the share of pre-tax national income held by the top 1 percent rising from 12 percent in 1993 to 21 percent in 2011. The World Poverty Clock, a Vienna-based think tank, reported that approximately 5 percent of the country's population, or 70.6 million individuals, continued to live in extreme poverty, which is below the international poverty line of USD 1.90 a day in 2018. Moreover, India lagged behind its peers on key social development indices, ranking 129th amongst 189 countries in 2019 on the Human Development Index (HDI), a composite statistic of life expectancy, education and per-capita income indicators. India's HDI ranked the lowest amongst the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) nations. India also ranked a poor 112th on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Index in 2018, which ranks countries on 17 global goals across the dimensions of economic development, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and governance, recording a two-point drop since its inception in 2016.

There has been an increase in domestic formal philanthropy in India in recent years, with existing as well as new millionaires and billionaires setting up foundations and supporting different causes. However, there are no requirements for reporting such individual and corporate philanthropy, and

therefore no readily available source to provide a good estimate of its size and contribution. The EdelGive Hurun Philanthropy List is a ranking of the most generous individuals in India. The 2020 list includes cash and cash equivalents pledged with legally binding commitments for the 12 months between April 2019–March 2020 and the latest available CSR data filed with the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA). For 2020, the list features individuals who have donated INR 52 million (USD 680,000) or more during the period under review. 113 donors appeared on the 2020 list with an average donation of INR 1.1 billion (USD 14.5 million). Since the inception of the EdelGive Hurun India Philanthropy List in 2013, the number of entrants in the list has grown three times during the same period.

VI. Socio-Cultural Environment

Question Eleven: To what extent are socio-cultural values and practices favorable for philanthropy?

Score: 4.0

The act of giving is strongly embedded in Indian culture, be it formal giving to charitable and religious institutions or informal everyday giving to those in need. However, formal organizations continue to receive a small fraction of overall charitable giving: only 2 percent of households in India gave to secular organizations, as compared to 39 percent which gave to religious entities. The COVID-19 pandemic response efforts in India by all stakeholders—governments, corporations, POs, individuals—pointed to the generosity of the Indian masses that truly reflected the ethos of the giving culture in India. People from all corners came forward and made donations to those in need, such as cash donations, rations and sanitation kits, in-kind donations, and rescue support. Online crowdfunding platforms, supporting various relief efforts by POs on the ground, also raised huge amounts of donations by individuals and corporations.

VII. Future of Philanthropy

These questions are used to provide a general picture of the future of philanthropy in this country as well as recommendations to improve the philanthropic environment.

Current state of the philanthropic sector

India’s philanthropy landscape is changing rapidly and there are opportunities to change the policy and regulatory landscape to further enable stakeholders to deploy their capital more efficiently, while allowing more nonprofits to make the most use of that capital.

Three major recent events affecting the philanthropic landscape between January 2018 and December 2020

1. Social Stock Exchange (SSE): In 2019, the government of India proposed to set up the exchange to enable social sector organizations to access funding more easily. A working group was formed, and in June 2020, a report was released suggesting a way forward. The SSE working group suggested ways for both for-profit social enterprises and nonprofits to participate in the stock exchange. An important aspect of the SSE is to make more funding accessible to nonprofits by allowing them to list zero-coupon zero-principal bonds that could be used for development impact

bonds on the stock exchange. The SSE also allows alternative funding structures that will route commercial capital to POs. Overall, the SSE proposes to improve the monitoring and evaluation framework for the social impact sector, strengthening of the ecosystem, and making the regulatory environment more enabling, such as providing tax and fiscal incentives.

2. FCRA Amendment 2020: This amendment prohibits organizations receiving international funds from onward granting these to other organizations. The new policy permits a maximum of 20 percent of funds received from international sources to be spent on administrative expenses; requires all funds from international sources to be routed through a single bank; made the process of renewal of FCRA permissions more onerous; permits authorities to suspend registrations for 360 days (up from 180 days previously) to investigate charges of malfeasance against an organization; permits confiscation of assets created using international funds if the recipient organization wants to surrender their permission to receive international funds; requires biometric identity details from Indian members of governing bodies of recipient organizations; and bans a wider category of public servants from receiving international funds.
3. Finance Act, 2020: This law requires all existing POs to apply for registration under 12A and 80G tax exemptions; made registrations valid only for five years, after which the POs need to apply for renewal; and required all POs, including the ones already registered under 12A and 80G, to reapply.

Future development trends in the philanthropic landscape

In recent years, new organizational forms for undertaking philanthropic giving have emerged, with an emphasis on scale, efficiency, return on capital, and impact measurement. These organizational forms include venture philanthropy and impact investing, but also new technologies and platforms that have opened up for online giving and crowdfunding, such as GiveIndia, Ketto, and other online platforms. These platforms have been especially important as a tool for fundraising for disaster relief efforts, whether during earlier flooding in the South Indian states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu or the COVID-19 pandemic (Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2020).

Three key recommendations to improve the environment for philanthropy

- The FCRA Amendment 2020 has prohibited onward granting of foreign funding by FCRA-registered POs to other POs working in India, even if they are FCRA-registered. This will be a huge jolt to the collaborative social impact work happening in the country right now. This particular clause should be repealed.
- The disruption caused by the Finance Act, 2020, under which all POs claiming tax-exemptions need to reapply for registration, will create a lot of administrative burden and will have an immediate impact on the funding flows for these POs. Though implementation of this provision has been deferred due to disruptions caused by COVID-19, it needs to be permanently withdrawn.
- There should be more incentives for individual donors to make charitable contributions. This could be done by offering 100 percent tax deduction instead of 50 percent on total charitable contributions. The ceiling on the maximum deduction claimable, currently at 10 percent of income, should also be lifted.

VIII. Philanthropic Response to COVID-19

These questions are used to provide a general picture of the philanthropic response to the COVID-19 pandemic in this country and recommendations for improving cross-sectoral collaboration.

Areas where the nonprofit sector and philanthropy are playing a role in responding to COVID-19

Philanthropic organizations in India were the first-responders to the health and migrant crisis. POs supported the last-mile delivery of relief efforts— including ration and sanitation kits, providing cash transfers, and running awareness generation campaigns. In the initial phase of the national lockdown, POs also supported the government in contact tracing and rescue efforts. Philanthropists supported these efforts by financial and technical assistance. Many philanthropic foundations contributed huge sums to government-run relief funds and also supported their grantees through additional COVID-19 pandemic-specific funding.

Innovation and new trends in the nonprofit sector and philanthropy related to COVID-19 responses

Many philanthropic collaboratives and on-ground partnerships emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic response. The coordinated response between all stakeholders proved to be impactful. The nonprofit sector, after initial hiccups, is learning to embrace technology and embed technology in its programs.

Impact of COVID-19 on the philanthropic environment

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in an unprecedented triple crisis—health, economic, and social crisis—in India. The philanthropic response to the crisis was unmatched. All stakeholders, including the government, private corporations, high net worth individuals (HNIs), and communities followed an all hands on deck approach and contributed generously to the pandemic response efforts, not just in cash but also in-kind. Greater adoption of online forms of giving was also noticed. There has been greater recognition by the media and the general public of the role played by philanthropy and its value. Additionally, there is a growing recognition of the need to build resilience at the level of communities, organizations, and the broader ecosystem.

Anticipated impact of COVID-19 on the philanthropic environment in 2021

In March 2020, the Indian government declared a nationwide lockdown aimed at stemming the spread of the rapidly-growing COVID-19 pandemic. The lockdown triggered a sudden and complete loss of income for vulnerable populations including approximately 151 million daily and regular wage earners in nonagricultural sectors, along with a mass reverse migration of nearly 18 million temporary migrant laborers back to rural areas (Mohanty, 2020). Other groups that were disproportionately affected as a result of the lockdown included the homeless, elderly, Dalits, religious minorities, LGBTQ+ communities, gig economy workers, people with disabilities, sex workers, slum dwellers, and women subjected to domestic violence. As a result of the pandemic and resulting lockdown, most Indian POs were forced to halt their regular programs and activities. However, they geared into action to complement the government's COVID-19 response, with a survey by the Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy (CSIP) indicating that 75 percent of Indian POs had become actively engaged in such pandemic-related relief work (CSIP, 2020, p. 6). Their services included generating awareness about the importance of physical distancing and safe hygiene practices among

community members; delivering dry rations and hygiene kits to vulnerable populations; setting up COVID-19 screening, isolation, and quarantine facilities; offering mental health and domestic violence counseling; and managing government and other health care centers.

The pandemic and resulting lockdown significantly impacted the flow of philanthropy in India. For instance, although most Indian POs engaged in pandemic-related work received additional funding specific to COVID-19, approximately a third of organizations were forced to use their existing programmatic funding towards pandemic-related activities, leaving uncertainty around the future of their regular programs (CSIP, 2020, p. 6). POs dependent on CSR funding faced the most challenges, with corporations estimated to have directed approximately 52 percent of their CSR budgets to government-led and other pandemic relief efforts in FY 2021, which left only half of regular CSR funding remaining for non-pandemic-related projects (India Data Insights, 2020, p. 4). A report by CSIP reflected, “The suspension of programmes and the pivot to relief work has come at a cost of neglecting other challenging socio-economic issues. The NPOs fear that this disruption may undo years of efforts and progress made by these development organizations” (CSIP, 2020, p. 17). Making things worse, India’s GDP contracted by 7.3 percent in FY 2021, which in turn is expected to result in further reduced philanthropic spending, along with increasing poverty levels and regressing social development indicators (Kaul, 2021).

On March 27, 2020, just days after India’s COVID-19 pandemic lockdown, Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi set up the Prime Minister’s Citizen Assistance and Relief in Emergency Situations Fund (PM CARES Fund) for combating, containment, and other pandemic-related relief efforts against the virus outbreak. The government allowed for uncapped individual donations to PM CARES that were made fully income tax-exempt. It also allowed corporations to make uncapped contributions to the Fund to meet their CSR obligations, any excess of which could be offset in subsequent years. Finally, the government allowed for overseas contributions to PM CARES even though the Fund did not meet the prerequisite of being audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. Within a week, donations to PM CARES were reported to have reached over INR 65 billion (USD 930 million), and by July 2020, total contributions reached INR 106 billion (USD 1.5 billion) (Chitra, 2020). Private conglomerates committed the largest amount of money to PM CARES, with INR 18.3 billion. (US 260 million). The oil, gas, petroleum, and energy sectors, which are largely dominated by public sector undertakings (PSU), donated INR 16 billion (USD 230 million), while the banking and mining sectors were primarily dominated by the private and public sectors respectively (Marfatia, 2020).

Despite its successful fundraising efforts, PM CARES soon became rife with criticism and controversy. Some questioned the need for the Fund when the Prime Minister’s National Relief Fund (PMNRF) had existed in the country since 1948, with an unspent balance of USD 543 million (USD 543 million) in its corpus as of December 2019 (Jebaraj, 2020). Meanwhile, state governments, which bore the primary responsibility for implementing COVID-19 relief operations, had their own respective Chief Minister’s Relief Funds for COVID-19, which did not qualify for similar privileges as PM CARES and CSR funding. Moreover, with approximately 35 percent of CSR funding in India forecast to be allocated to PM CARES in FY 2021, some also alleged that the Fund was diverting money away from civil society organizations (Marfatia, 2020). One article observed, “While CSR funds that can be channeled towards nonprofits do remain, PM CARES has funneled away a large amount of capital away from nonprofits” (Marfatia, 2020). Finally, citizens filed petitions alleging that the government had withheld key information about the Fund such as the names of PM CARES’ donors and beneficiaries, along with amounts of money collected from donors and disbursed to

grantees. In response, the Prime Minister’s Office shared the Fund’s key expenditures, which, in turn, led to criticisms and concerns about vendor selection processes and the quality and distribution of items procured (BBC News, 2020; Venkat, 2020).

The Second Wave

After the first wave of COVID-19 abated in early 2021, a lifting of lockdown restrictions resulted in reduced social distancing practices and large gatherings despite low vaccination rates. By the second half of April, the country found itself in the grip of a deadly second wave of the pandemic, and by early May the country was reporting up to 400,000 new cases daily, or four times the number of cases recorded during its initial September 2020 peak. Hospitals and medical clinics across the country found themselves overwhelmed by COVID-19 patients, and reported acute shortages of beds, medication, and medical oxygen. With India accounting for more than half of global daily COVID-19 cases around the time, stories of the crisis captured significant international media attention (The New York Times, 2021). Donors from around the world sprang into action to address the crisis through fundraising platforms such as GiveIndia, which alone raised more than INR 2.4 billion (USD \$32 million) in the first three weeks of its second India COVID Response Fund (ICRF-2) from international foundations, Indian and global corporations, and ultra high net worth individuals, several of whom were based overseas (Shetty, 2021). Between GiveIndia and diaspora-focused organizations such as American India Foundation and Sewa International, as well as a few other US-based organizations, more than INR 6 billion (USD \$80 million) was raised as of May 2021 (Shetty, 2021).

A majority of the funding raised through such international donors was estimated to go to healthcare and immediate relief. For instance, GiveIndia was estimated to have ordered INR 1.41 billion (USD 19 million) worth of oxygen concentrators and cylinders alone (Shetty, 2021). A large share of CSR, retail, and philanthropic budgets for FY 2022 were also expected to go towards similar healthcare and immediate relief measures (Karamchandani & Marfatia, 2021).

An article by India Development Review (IDR) revealed, “According to an executive director of a nonprofit, this desire to fund oxygen equipment, especially by well-off individuals, harks back to the form of giving that prefers physical assets—hospitals, schools, and now oxygen concentrators and cylinders—because donors feel their money can be accounted for. They can see where it’s going, which acts as a proxy for impact.” However, despite the outpouring of donor support, a few metropolitan cities, where a majority of mainstream media attention had been focused, were believed to be receiving a disproportionate share of this funding for oxygen and healthcare. The IDR reflected, “International donor attention however has been entirely focused on the supply of oxygen in Delhi, and now to some extent, Bangalore. The rest of the country seems to have faded into the background despite 533 of India’s 700 districts showing a positivity rate of more than 10 percent, and 42 percent of districts reporting a positivity rate more than the national average of 21 percent... the entire aid that the government has received in the form of oxygen concentrators and cylinders (from overseas) for use countrywide is far less than what GiveIndia will receive and deploy in Delhi and Bangalore alone ... by funding GiveIndia, their initial focus will be restricted to two cities alone, at a time when the overwhelming need is elsewhere...” (Shetty, 2021).

There were also indications that the greatest need for philanthropic funding lay outside of the healthcare and oxygen crisis. For instance, a report by the Centre for Sustainable Employment (CSE) at Azim Premji University showed that between March and October 2020, the number of

individuals below the poverty line in India had increased by 230 million, or 77 percent, and that 90 percent of surveyed households had less to eat (Shetty, 2021). Although the government had provided free food rations to underserved populations in response to the pandemic's second wave, these were limited to the months of May and June 2021, and 71 percent of POs participating in a survey by IDR shared that the biggest demand that they had received was for food and rations in the communities that they worked with (Shetty, 2021).

POs' requests for vaccination awareness and support also outnumbered those for oxygen and medical supplies (Shetty, 2021). Meanwhile, a survey of 577 POs across the country by Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) in response to the second wave revealed that approximately 96 percent of organizations had offered immediate relief in the form of rations and food to needy and vulnerable households, many of which had lost their livelihoods and income. Personal hygiene materials and medical supplies were the next most common relief measure, provided by nearly 90 percent of these organizations, which also communicated government advisories and expert opinions on prevention, quarantine and treatment, and facilitated access to public health facilities and other services and benefits (Tandon, 2021).

Meanwhile, Indian POs continued to face multiple challenges in their day-to-day functioning. For instance, despite their crucial role in addressing the pandemic, nearly 82 percent of organizations reported not having received any new financial resources during its second wave, and 92 percent faced financial constraints in continuing to support their respective communities during the period (Tandon, 2021). POs also found it difficult to access the money coming into the country from overseas due to banking formalities and restrictions on sub-granting imposed by the 2020 amendment to the FCRA Act (Karamchandani & Marfatia, 2021). An article by the International Center for Not-For-Profit Law (ICNL) reflected, "The 2020 amendments restrict the ability of Indian CSOs to access resources, and therefore to associate, and have hampered their ability to serve their communities and carry out essential work...The Amendments are a disproportionate and unwarranted restriction on Indian civil society, and they have only served to debilitate the global, national, and local response to COVID-19" (ICNL, 2021, p. 1-3).

The future of several POs is also in question. Executives at The/Nudge Foundation, which is focused on sustainable poverty alleviation, reflected, "The reduced funding could likely lead to closures and job cuts—potentially even more than last year, as many NGOs have eaten into their reserves. This may have far-reaching consequences both because of the work NGOs do, and because the sector accounts for seven million jobs within the Indian economy" (ICNL, 2021, p. 1-3). Half of POs participating in a survey by PRIA also reported that they did not have any safety and protective gear for their own staff and volunteers, and that several individuals had been infected and fallen sick (Tandon, 2021). Another survey by The/Nudge Foundation showed that organizations were busy trying to support their own staff. "Apart from the virus itself, the mental health burden and feeling burnt out are huge concerns," The/Nudge Foundation concluded (Tandon, 2021).

The corporate sector faced a huge setback in revenue growth and profitability in 2020 and it was feared that this may severely impact the volume of corporate philanthropy in 2021. However, the Indian economy is showing signs of a fairly rapid recovery and the pandemic appears to gradually be controlled especially as vaccination gains momentum. Stock market indices are presently at record highs. If these trends hold, one could expect a rapid return to the high growth trends in philanthropy that were in evidence prior to the pandemic. The pandemic also saw a massive surge in individual giving by the general public. Various crowdfunding platforms reported increases

between 180 percent and 500 percent. While there may be some disaster fatigue presently, the disruption will have long-term positive impact on willingness to use online modes of giving. The pandemic also triggered philanthropy by wealthy individuals who had not previously been major philanthropists. This too is likely to grow the pool of philanthropic funding in the medium term. Some philanthropists have also revisited their practices with regard to the flexibility of their grantmaking, willingness to fund institutional investments in capacity building and diversification of causes they support. This will, to some degree, shift norms.

References

- Center for Social Impact and Philanthropy at Ashoka University. (2020). *The Impact of COVID-19 on India's Nonprofit Organizations: A Snapshot Report*. Available at: <https://csip.ashoka.edu.in/research-and-knowledge/#reports>
- Chitra, R. (2020). PM-CARES Corpus Crosses \$1 billion. *The Times of India*. Available at: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/pm-cares-corpus-crosses-1-billion/articleshow/75830605.cms>
- Freedom House. (2021). *Freedom in the World 2021: India*. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/country/india/freedom-world/2021>
- India Data Insights. (2020). *CSR COVID Response and Outlook for 20-21*. Sattva Consulting. Available at: <https://www.sattva.co.in/insight/covid-19-in-india-csr-outlook-for-2020-21/>
- Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2020). *2020. Global Philanthropy Tracker*. Available at: <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/24144>
- International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL). (2019). *India Philanthropy Law Report*. Available at: <https://www.icnl.org/wp-content/uploads/India-PLR-report-final-10-Dec-2019.pdf>
- International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL). (2021). *How India's FCRA Amendments Violate Free Association and Impede COVID-19 Pandemic Response*. Available at: <https://www.icnl.org/post/analysis/indias-2020-fcra-amendments-impact-on-association>
- Jebaraj, P. (2020). How different is the PM CARES Fund from the PM's National Relief Fund?. *The Hindu*. Available at: <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/coronavirus-how-different-is-the-pm-cares-fund-from-the-pms-national-relief-fund/article31546287.ece>
- Karamchandani, A., & Marfatia, A. (2021). 2nd Corona Wave: Could Investment Being Funnelled towards Medical Supplies Impact Funding for NGOs in the Long Run." *The Free Press Journal*. Available at: <https://www.freepressjournal.in/analysis/2nd-corona-wave-could-investment-being-funnelled-towards-medical-supplies-impact-funding-for-ngos-in-the-long-run-ask-ashish-karamchandani-ayesha-marfatia>
- Kaul, V. (2021). India's GDP Contracted by 7.3% in 2020-21, with Revival Postponed to 2022-23. *Mint*. Available at: <https://www.livemint.com/news/india/indias-gdp-contracted-by-7-3-in-2020-21-with-revival-postponed-to-202223-11622469188437.html>
- Marfatia, A. (2020). In Charts: How the PM-Cares Fund is Hurting India's NGOs. *Scroll.in*. Available at: <https://scroll.in/article/966746/in-charts-how-pm-cares-fund-is-hurting-non-profits-in-india>
- Mohanty, P. (2020). Coronavirus Lockdown 1: Who and How many Are Vulnerable to COVID-19 pandemic. *Business Today*. Available at: <https://www.businesstoday.in/current/economy-politics/coronavirus-covid-19-daily-wage-workers-vulnerable-landless-labourers-agricultural-workforce/story/399186.html>

- Pandey, G. (2020). Coronavirus: Secrecy surrounds India PM Narendra Modi's '\$1bn' Covid-19 fund. *BBC News*. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-53151308>
- Reserve Bank of India. (2021). *Frequently Asked Questions – Liberalised Remittance Scheme*. Available at: <https://m.rbi.org.in/Scripts/FAQView.aspx?Id=115>
- Shetty, S. (2021). Everyone is Funding Oxygen. This is a problem. *India Development Review*. Available at: <https://idronline.org/covid-19-donors-need-to-look-beyond-funding-oxygen/>
- Tandon, R. (2021). Rapid & Widespread Civil Society Response during Second Wave in India. *The Times of India*. Available at: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/blogs/voices/rapid-widespread-civil-society-response-during-second-wave-in-india/>
- The Companies Act, Bill No. 121-C of 2011. (2011). Available at: <https://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/CompaniesAct2013.pdf>
- The New York Times. (2021). What to Know about India's Coronavirus Crisis. *The New York Times*. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/article/india-coronavirus-cases-deaths.html>
- Venkat, V. (2020). Lack of Transparency over Modi's Covid-19 Relief Fund Hurts Indian Democracy. *Quartz India*. <https://qz.com/india/1902893/lack-of-transparency-in-modis-covid-19-pm-cares-fund-hurts-india/>