

# STRENGTHENING COLLECTIVE IMPACT IN SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

Key insights on philanthropy support ecosystems and multi-stakeholder partnerships across seven countries in South and Southeast Asia—India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka

JUNE 2025



W I N G S  
ELEVATING PHILANTHROPY



Co-funded by  
the European Union

# About the report

This report is the outcome of a study conducted by Sattva Consulting from October 2024 to December 2024, with support from [WINGS' #LiftUpPhilanthropy Fund](#). It summarises key insights on philanthropy support ecosystems, with a particular focus on multi-stakeholder partnerships, in seven South and South-east Asian countries—India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

## Disclaimer

This publication was co-funded by the European Union. The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of Sattva Consulting and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Any experts consulted and acknowledged in this report do not necessarily endorse its contents. All company and brand names, logos, and registered trademarks are property of their respective owners and used here are for identification purposes only. Use of these names, trademarks, and brands does not imply endorsement.

## Credits

Authors	Suvodeep Saha, Pooja S, Rachana Lankapalli, Dr. Aditi Hegde, Aman Sharma, Sahana VP
Support	Shreya Kaul, Vasundhara Singh, Palagati Lekhya Reddy, Akanksha Agarwal, Aarti Mohan
WINGS team	Jodel Dacara, Carla Pratesi o Innocenti, Eva Rehse
Editor	Jumana Farouky
Design and typesetting	Deeksha Pagar

This work is licensed under the Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareALike 4.0 International License:



**Attribution:** You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if any changes were made.

**NonCommercial:** You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

**ShareALike:** If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original.

Photo credit (front cover): David Wilson on Flickr (CC BY 2.0)

Photo credit (back cover): Nikhil on Pexels



# About Sattva



Sattva is a leading development consulting firm focused on building scalable solutions for sustainable social impact. With a team of over 400+ impact professionals operating out of offices in India, Southeast Asia, Europe, and North America, Sattva is one of the largest impact consulting organisations based in the Global South. At Sattva, we are committed to tackling extreme global poverty by effecting systemic change that goes to the root cause of societal inequity and material deprivation. To this end, Sattva works with stakeholders across the impact spectrum, including corporates, philanthropists, foundations, governments, development agencies, and social enterprises to help them achieve their social impact goals and maximise return on social investment through service offerings in the space of strategic advisory, program design, implementation, research, impact evaluation, and co-creation of sustainable models. Sattva works to realise inclusive development goals across thematic areas, including in education, skill development and livelihoods, healthcare, water and sanitation, digital and financial inclusion, and environment and climate action, among others.

To learn more, visit [www.sattva.co.in](http://www.sattva.co.in) or write to [impact@sattva.co.in](mailto:impact@sattva.co.in).

Follow Sattva on  [@\\_sattva](https://twitter.com/_sattva)  [@sattva-media-and-consulting-pvt-ltd](https://www.linkedin.com/company/sattva-media-and-consulting-pvt-ltd)  [@sattva.india](https://www.instagram.com/sattva.india)

# About WINGS



WINGS is a network of over 200 members consisting of philanthropy associations, networks, academic institutions, support organisations, and funders, across 60 countries, whose purpose is to strengthen, promote, and provide leadership on the development of philanthropy and social investment to ensure they reach their fullest potential as catalysts for social progress and contribute to a more effective and diverse civil society.

To learn more, visit [www.wingsweb.org](http://www.wingsweb.org) or write to [info@wingsweb.org](mailto:info@wingsweb.org).

Follow WINGS on  [@wings\\_info](https://twitter.com/@wings_info)  [@wings-elevatingphilanthropy](https://www.linkedin.com/company/wings-elevatingphilanthropy)  [@wingswebinfo](https://www.facebook.com/@wingswebinfo)

# Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b>	5
Overview of key concepts	
Scope of the study	
Research methodology	
Executive summary	
<b>India</b>	25
<b>Indonesia</b>	36
<b>Philippines</b>	45
<b>Malaysia</b>	54
<b>Bangladesh</b>	63
<b>Pakistan</b>	72
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	82
<b>Conclusion</b>	90
Gaps in support across countries	
Best practices	
The way forward	
<b>Annexures</b>	100





# INTRODUCTION

Overview of key concepts .....	6
Scope of the study .....	11
Research methodology .....	12
<b>Executive summary .....</b>	<b>15</b>



# Overview of key concepts

**This study revolves around a few key concepts:<sup>1</sup> philanthropy, philanthropy support ecosystem, philanthropy support organisation, and multi-stakeholder partnership. They are defined as follows:**

**Philanthropy** refers to the practice of giving time, money, experience, skills, and/or talent, all with the altruistic objective of improving human welfare. It includes individual giving by everyday donors and high-net-worth individuals (HNIs), or institutional giving through corporates, foundations, and other specialised institutions.

**Philanthropy support ecosystem (PSE)** refers to the community of interacting organisations, functions, and activities that assists and enables the achievement of philanthropy's potential by nurturing its capacity, capabilities, connection, and credibility.

**Philanthropy Support Organisations (PSOs)** provide a variety of services to support and strengthen philanthropy in a region or around a theme. PSOs usually do not directly fund or implement philanthropic programmes themselves, but rather provide services to support those that do. They provide resources, knowledge, advocacy, technical support, and capacity build-

ing services, among others. They focus on enabling funders, philanthropic organisations, government bodies, civil society organisations, and other actors to achieve greater social impact. They serve as intermediaries, conveners, and knowledge experts to enhance the efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of philanthropic efforts.

**Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs)** are collaborative initiatives co-created by three or more actors—including philanthropic organisations/ funders, private sector entities, government, civil society organisations, community-based organisations, social enterprises, and PSOs such as research institutions/think tanks, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), media, technology partners, or intermediaries—to achieve shared goals and address complex systemic challenges. These initiatives leverage the unique strengths, resources, and expertise of each stakeholder.

While philanthropic organisations and funders play a crucial role in enabling MSPs, their involvement is not always guaranteed. Many partnerships are primarily driven by government and private sector actors, with philanthropy engaging in varying capacities depending on the context, sector, and strategic alignment of interests.



<sup>1</sup> WINGS. (2021). [Understanding the Meaning of Terms: Definitions and Taxonomy.](#)

**Types of stakeholders involved in MSPs:** The following table shows the types of PSOs<sup>2</sup> in the context of multi-stakeholder partnerships. PSOs have been investigated as per the roles they play in MSPs and in enabling them. Organisations often take on multiple roles within the ecosystem, and the types below reflect their functions rather than distinct entity types.

Types of PSOs	Role in MSPs
<b>Research Institution/ Think Tank</b>	Conducts research and provides evidence-based insights to guide MSP strategies and decision-making.
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>	Assesses MSP effectiveness, tracks progress against envisioned outcomes, provides feedback for impact, and produces impact reports.
<b>Philanthropy Media</b>	Produces content on philanthropy and social impact to educate. Also highlights the role and impact of MSPs, raising awareness and driving stakeholder engagement.
<b>Capacity-Building Organisation</b>	Strengthens skills and resources through training and workshops for greater impact.
<b>Accelerator/Incubator</b>	Offers resources and mentorship to help early-stage social enterprises and philanthropic initiatives, including MSPs, to grow.
<b>Ecosystem Convener<sup>3</sup></b>	Facilitates stakeholder connections to foster collaboration, cross-organisational partnerships, and networking within the ecosystem. Their role often includes setting up convenings/platforms, thematic associations, philanthropy networks, and other activities that bring stakeholders together to collaborate, share learnings, and form and sustain MSPs.
<b>Advocacy Organisation</b>	Influences policy and public opinion through campaigns, lobbying, and sensitisation.
<b>Technology Partner</b>	Supplies tech solutions for project/MSP operations, including donor management, reporting, data collection, and visualisation.
<b>Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform</b>	Connects funders with grant recipients and manages grant processes. Supports CSOs/MSPs as they raise funding for their initiatives.
<b>Philanthropy Advisory</b>	Provides consulting services to stakeholders to develop effective giving strategies, helping them identify impactful causes and maximise the effectiveness of their philanthropy. They often play the role of anchor/ backbone organisation within MSPs.
<b>Accountability &amp; Standards Organisation</b>	Sets and monitors guidelines for transparency and ethical practices in the ecosystem.

<sup>2</sup> This table lists the types of PSOs relevant in the context of MSPs. Readers may refer to [WINGS' taxonomy](#) for an exhaustive list of the different types of PSOs.

<sup>3</sup> Includes philanthropy networks, thematic associations, and other platforms that convene stakeholders and enable MSPs through networking, capability building, advocacy, etc.




Within MSPs, PSOs such as philanthropy advisory or ecosystem convener organisations often serve as **backbone or anchor organisations**. These backbone organisations play a critical role in fostering co-creation, shared decision-making, and mutual accountability. Beyond coordination, backbone organisations continuously adapt to evolving needs, guiding vision and strategy, aligning stakeholder actions, establishing shared measurement frameworks, and mobilising resources. They also drive cross-sector collaboration, promote data-driven decision-making, build capacity, shape public policy, and cultivate long-term sustainability through continuous learning and engagement. Their contributions extend far beyond operational management, ensuring that partnerships remain dynamic, impactful, and responsive to emerging challenges.

The table below outlines the key stakeholders within the philanthropic ecosystem involved in MSPs, other than PSOs, which have been covered earlier.

Stakeholder	Definition	Role in MSPs
<b>Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)</b>	Entities representing citizens' interests, organised around ethical, cultural, political, or philanthropic values. Includes non-governmental organisations (NGOs), non-profit organisations (NPOs), citizen groups, etc.	Implement programmes, advocate for marginalised groups, drive community engagement, and provide on-ground insights for co-created solutions.
<b>Community Based Organisations (CBOs)</b>	Grassroots organisations formed by local community members to address immediate, localised needs and challenges.	Drive last-mile engagement and programme delivery, contribute local knowledge, foster trust within communities, and ensure solutions are culturally appropriate and community-owned.
<b>Government</b>	Public institutions at local, regional, and national levels that create and enforce policies, provide public services, and regulate various sectors.	Bring legitimacy, scale, policy alignment, and financial resources to MSPs, ensuring broader systemic impact.
<b>Funders/ Philanthropic Organisations</b>	Entities providing financial or in-kind resources to support social impact initiatives. Includes global foundations, multilaterals, bilaterals, domestic foundations, and UHNIs/HNIs.	Offer funding, thought leadership, and strategic guidance, catalysing partnerships and enabling the design, implementation, and scaling of impactful MSP initiatives.
<b>Private Sector/ Corporates</b>	For-profit businesses ranging from small enterprises to multinational corporations. Includes both corporate social responsibility (CSR) grantmaking teams and corporate foundations that implement programmes.	Contribute innovation, investment, and market-driven approaches to achieve sustainable outcomes, often aligning CSR priorities with MSP objectives.
<b>Social Enterprises</b>	Hybrid organisations that use business principles to achieve social or environmental goals, reinvesting profits into their mission.	Provide innovative, scalable solutions to societal challenges, often bridging gaps between traditional non-profit and for-profit approaches.


The diagram below illustrates the various **stakeholders commonly involved in MSPs**.



**Classification of MSPs:** MSPs can be classified based on two defining characteristics–

- **The outcomes they wish to achieve:** The three key types of outcomes that MSPs work towards are: influencing stakeholders, creating public goods, and strengthening practice.
- **The degree of openness in their design:**
  - Open MSP: An open, ever-widening group built on strong non-commercial value with no financial commitment required.
  - Closed MSP: A closed, selective group of members with diverse expertise, requiring stringent financial commitment and offering both non-commercial and potential commercial value.

Based on these defining characteristics, **there are six different types of multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs).**<sup>4</sup>



4 This taxonomy has been developed by Sattva to study multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs). Sattva's taxonomy categorises MSPs based on openness in design and focus outcomes, emphasising internal structure and function, while [The Partnering Initiative's \(TPI\)](#) classification maps MSPs by country and sector, highlighting regional and sectoral positioning. The research incorporates both these frameworks to offer a complementary view, capturing both operational intent and the broader ecosystem context.

The following table provides an overview of how MSPs help achieve exponential impact compared to an individual organisation.

Focus outcome	What can an MSP enable?	Differentiation over an individual organisation
Influencing stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Amplify advocacy by convening diverse organisations to align and support key asks.</li> <li>◆ Balance power dynamics among stakeholders for equitable negotiations.</li> <li>◆ Build public trust and credibility to enhance stakeholder engagement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Greater leverage than individual organisations due to the diversity and collective influence of stakeholders.</li> <li>◆ Multiplying advocacy power and credibility enables greater traction with decision makers.</li> <li>◆ Peer learning fosters refined strategies.</li> </ul>
Creating public goods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Co-create public goods by integrating diverse expertise, values, and influence.</li> <li>◆ Establish shared vocabularies, frameworks, and avoid duplication of efforts.</li> <li>◆ Promote equitable adoption and reshape industry norms for inclusivity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Individual organisations have ingrained biases and limited resources.</li> <li>◆ Co-creation addresses these biases through integrated perspectives, enabling broader adoption and more holistic solutions.</li> <li>◆ MSPs reduce redundancy and amplify impact.</li> </ul>
Strengthening practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Develop scalable solutions through pooled resources and expertise.</li> <li>◆ Generate robust evidence to inform decisions and improve practice.</li> <li>◆ Enhance state capabilities to tackle multifaceted, systemic issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Individual organisations lack the capacity to address large-scale, complex challenges independently.</li> <li>◆ MSPs pool capabilities and create pathways to scale faster.</li> <li>◆ Foster a broader body of knowledge to drive best practices across the ecosystem.</li> </ul>



# Scope of the study

This study examines philanthropic support ecosystems (PSEs) in seven countries across South and Southeast Asia—India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

## The key areas of focus include:

### Current status of PSEs

*Evaluating their capacity, capability, connection, credibility, and diversity.*

### Role in enabling MSPs


*Assessing PSE contributions to effective and impactful multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) for addressing development challenges, while identifying gaps and opportunities to strengthen PSEs.*

### Support and recommendations

*Determining the support needed from philanthropy support organisations (PSOs) and providing actionable recommendations to enhance PSEs for coordinated and impactful MSPs.*

India and Indonesia are the focus of in-depth analysis due to the maturity and dynamism of their PSEs out of the selected seven countries. India's robust philanthropic landscape drives innovation and regional leadership, while Indonesia, though in earlier stages of development, is steadily building supportive infrastructure.<sup>5</sup> These contexts offer valuable insights into the evolution and functioning of PSEs.

In the remaining five countries, the study employed a tailored approach, adjusting the scope of mapping and methodologies based on the availability of data and the capacity of PSOs and MSPs.



<sup>5</sup> AVPN. (2019). [Social Investment Landscape in Indonesia](#).

# Research methodology

The mapping of the PSEs across the seven countries is based on taxonomy developed by WINGS and Sattva,<sup>6</sup> and an adaptable methodology tailored to study PSEs<sup>7</sup> in the context of MSPs. The tool to assess the strengths of a PSE<sup>8</sup> served as a guide to analyse the findings and lay down recommendations for strengthening the PSEs to better enable MSPs.

PSEs were evaluated across the 4Cs—Capacity, Capability, Connection, Credibility—and 1D—Diversity.

Below is a breakdown of the categories and indicators analysed:

Category	Indicators analysed for the study
<b>Capacity</b> refers to generating financial, human, and infrastructure resources to develop philanthropy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Density of PSOs by function served</li><li>b. Investment in strengthening PSE and enabling cross-organisational partnerships</li><li>c. Geographic spread of PSOs in terms of regions served</li></ul>
<b>Capability</b> refers to building skills, knowledge, and expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Number of PSO knowledge-sharing platforms available within the PSE</li><li>b. Availability of skilled personnel and leadership in the PSE</li></ul>
<b>Connection</b> refers to building relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Number of MSPs within the PSE</li><li>b. Number of PSOs who are part of MSPs within the PSE</li><li>c. Number of structured spaces that exist to enable cross-organisational partnerships</li></ul>
<b>Credibility</b> refers to building reputation, recognition, and influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Impact demonstrated by PSOs as a part of various initiatives and how their services are perceived in the ecosystem</li><li>b. Frequency and extent to which PSOs are involved in the ecosystem's initiatives</li></ul>
<b>Diversity</b> refers to diversity of stakeholders and approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Diversity among PSE stakeholder types in the ecosystem</li><li>b. Co-existence of diverse approaches on philanthropy in the PSE</li></ul>

<sup>6</sup> WINGS. (2021). [Understanding the Meaning of Terms: Definitions and Taxonomy.](#)

<sup>7</sup> WINGS. (2021). [How to Build the Philanthropy Support Ecosystem \(PSE\) Working it out Together: Engaging Philanthropy Actors in Mapping and Strengthening their own Ecosystem.](#)

<sup>8</sup> WINGS. (2021). [How to Assess the Strengths of the Philanthropy Support Ecosystem \(PSE\).](#)

Further, MSPs in each country were studied as per Sattva's framework, covering the following categories:

Category	Indicators analysed for the study
<b>Overview</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Year established</li> <li>b. Life stage (inception, active, nearing completion, closed)</li> <li>c. Value proposition</li> <li>d. Focus goals and MSP type as per Sattva's taxonomy</li> <li>e. Type of organisation that founded the MSP</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Details and Reach</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Funding amount directed across years of operations</li> <li>b. Forms of support provided to partners beyond funding</li> <li>c. Geographic reach, including focus on marginalised areas</li> </ul>
<b>Impact Achieved and Monitoring Mechanisms</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms</li> <li>b. Key outputs and impact since inception</li> <li>c. Progress vs intended outcomes</li> <li>d. Evidence generation focus and practices</li> </ul>
<b>Stakeholder Composition</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Stakeholder types and roles, including funder types</li> <li>b. Names of PSOs involved and roles</li> <li>c. Presence of backbone PSO</li> <li>d. Strategies for the MSP to connect with the larger ecosystem, including engagement with ecosystem conveners and other PSOs beyond the immediate scope of the MSP</li> </ul>
<b>Beneficiaries and Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Primary target beneficiaries</li> <li>b. Leadership gender and racial/ethnic identity</li> <li>c. Registration status of the MSP</li> </ul>
<b>Governance and Membership Structures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Internal collaboration mechanisms and key drivers of effective collaboration</li> <li>b. Openness to onboarding new partners and membership model</li> <li>c. Governance structure: description (e.g., steering committee, secretariat-led)</li> <li>d. Grantmaking process: dropdown (e.g., consensus-based, donor-driven)</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges, Learnings, and Opportunities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Key barriers in the PSE hindering effective MSPs</li> <li>b. Successful roles that member PSOs are currently fulfilling within the MSP</li> <li>c. Opportunities for PSOs to support the MSP and overall whitespaces in MSPs in the philanthropic sector of the country</li> </ul>



**The study employed a mixed-methods approach, combining secondary research and primary consultations** to ensure a comprehensive understanding of PSEs in the region. Snowball sampling was used to ensure diverse representation of MSPs across countries.

The methodological steps are outlined below:

**1. Desk research:**

- A structured literature review was conducted, analysing reports, publications, and websites of key stakeholders in philanthropy and of the MSPs.
- Key frameworks guided the analysis, including WINGS' taxonomy for PSOs and Sattva's framework for analysing MSPs.

**2. Stakeholder consultations:**

- Thirty-six in-depth interviews were conducted with representatives from philanthropy advisory organisations, ecosystem conveners, PSOs, MSPs, CSOs, and funding organisations across the seven countries.

The list of stakeholders consulted is provided in [Annexure 2](#) and the list of MSPs studied can be found in [Annexure 3](#).

**The study faced several limitations that impacted its scope and findings:**

- **Data gaps:** Lack of a centralised database and inconsistent financial and membership data limited cross-country comparisons.
- **Representation bias:** Snowball sampling may have overrepresented well-connected MSPs and PSOs, missing smaller or less visible actors.
- **Geographic skew:** Stronger data emerged from India and Indonesia; rural and early-stage actors in other countries were underrepresented.
- **Limited longitudinal insights:** The study offers a snapshot in time, without longitudinal insights into MSP evolution or impact.
- **Contextual differences:** Political, regulatory, and socio-economic diversity across countries complicated direct comparisons despite the 4Cs framework.

Future research efforts, such as conducting primary consultations, could address the gaps identified, particularly in terms of data and representation of emerging PSOs and MSP initiatives.



Photo credit: Dennis Schmidt on Unsplash

## Executive summary

**This report, developed by Sattva and funded by WINGS' #LiftUpPhilanthropy Fund, maps the philanthropy support ecosystems (PSEs), with a particular focus on multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs), in seven South and Southeast Asian countries—India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka**

It aims to break silos, bridge knowledge gaps in the philanthropic ecosystem, and foster multi-stakeholder collaboration to address urgent development issues and drive meaningful change. With a particular focus on India and Indonesia, the study evaluates the current state of PSEs through the lens of the 4Cs—Capacity, Capability,

Connection, Credibility—and 1D—Diversity. It also deep dives into the landscape of MSPs and the role of philanthropy support organisations (PSOs) in enabling them.


The study mapped 147 MSPs across seven countries and covered 13 sectors, notably climate, education, health, agriculture, and food security, among others. MSPs also focus on multiple sectors as well as the intersectionalities of key issues they currently work on, such as the climate, health, and education nexus.<sup>9</sup> Data on philanthropic capital mobilised by these partnerships during the time of the study was only available in India, where approximately USD 280 million was directed.

<sup>9</sup> Philanthropy Asia Alliance. (2024). [Partnerships for Impact: Philanthropy Asia Summit 2024 insights report](#).

## Key insights on PSEs across the region

India and Indonesia have the most mature PSEs, with relatively stronger support infrastructure, capabilities of organisations, well established networks, diversity of stakeholders, and experience to enable multi-stakeholder partnerships. In contrast, the PSEs in the other five countries are still in earlier stages of development, though many are evolving rapidly and showing growing momentum.

Sattva's analysis of the MSPs across 7 countries reveals that while programming and funding approaches vary by context, identifying and replicating effective practices from across the region is key to driving effective collective action.



**FIGURE 1.1:** Maturity of PSEs in the context of enabling MSPs across seven countries <sup>10, 11</sup>

**10** In this analysis, the PSEs have been scored on a scale of 1 to 5 across the 4 Cs and Diversity, reflecting their level of maturity. A score of 1 indicates a nascent stage, while a score of 5 represents an ideal stage. Based on the research, the aggregate scores are as follows—India: 3.6, Indonesia: 2.5, Philippines: 1.5, Malaysia: 1.4, Bangladesh: 1.3, Pakistan: 1.2, Sri Lanka: 1.2. Detailed scoring is available in [Annexure 1](#). While this figure provides a regional perspective, there were data limitations in the scope of analysis across countries. India and Indonesia were examined in greater depth, while analysis of the other five countries relied on broader secondary data, limiting direct comparability and depth of insights.

**11** WINGS. (2021). [How to Assess the Strengths of the Philanthropy Support Ecosystem \(PSE\)](#).





## CAPACITY

The ability to generate financial, human, and infrastructure resources to support partnerships.

*India demonstrates relatively stronger capacity, with a growing philanthropic ecosystem, a higher density of support organisations, and institutional infrastructure. Indonesia shows moderate capacity, with opportunities to deepen investment and expand PSO networks. In contrast, the remaining countries are in earlier stages of development, where foundational investments in philanthropy support organisations and multi-stakeholder collaboration infrastructure can help unlock greater potential.*

- Overall, across the seven countries there has been a **steady rise in the number of civil society organisations (CSOs) over the last three years**, along with the development of platforms and databases that facilitate their discovery. However, **none of the countries have dedicated databases of PSOs**. While this study attempts to identify key PSOs across the region, further research is required to evaluate their effectiveness within the ecosystem.
- **India and Indonesia have shown growth in domestic philanthropy**, with selected domestic funders actively involved in MSPs. In contrast, **Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and Pakistan face significant reliance on foreign aid** and lack structured, long-term funding mechanisms.
- Regional disparities are common across most philanthropic ecosystems, with **urban areas receiving better support than rural ones**, particularly in Malaysia and the Philippines.



## CAPABILITY

The skills, knowledge, and expertise to enable and sustain collaboration.

*India reflects a relatively high level of capability, with platforms for peer learning and a growing pool of experienced leaders across sectors. Indonesia has emerging capability, supported by select knowledge-sharing spaces and trained professionals in the social sector. Other countries are steadily building capacity in this area, with ongoing efforts to institutionalise learning and leadership development tailored to collaborative approaches.*

- **India and Indonesia are leading in research**, knowledge-sharing, and data-driven programming, while Sri Lanka and the Philippines struggle particularly with limited local research capabilities.
- **India, Indonesia, and Bangladesh have been building strong talent pipelines through fellowships and university courses** on social development. On the other hand, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, and the Philippines struggle with skilled talent shortages, both in metro areas and, more significantly, in underserved regions.
- In all countries, there is an opportunity **to enhance PSOs' capabilities in monitoring and evaluation, technology adoption, and philanthropic advisory services**, as well as sensitising the ecosystem on PSOs playing the role of backbone organisations in anchoring effective MSPs.
- Lastly, there is a growing need for **interdisciplinary expertise, especially among future leaders in areas like impact measurement and climate resilience**, highlighting the need for targeted training and leadership development across the region.



## CONNECTION

The strength of relationships, networks, and cross-organisational partnerships.

*India's philanthropic landscape is marked by a strong orientation towards collaboration, with several active PSOs offering support services and structured spaces that enable partnerships. Indonesia is seeing promising developments in this area, with expanding networks and increasing cross-sector engagement. In the rest of the region, ecosystems are beginning to foster more deliberate collaboration, with potential to deepen and formalise existing networks and often leveraging global network, such as AVPN or Asia Philanthropy Circle.*

- While countries like **India, Indonesia, and Malaysia have established platforms that bring stakeholders together to enable long-term, sustainable collaborations**, often in the form of MSPs, countries such as Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and the Philippines lack sufficient platforms and forums to bring local actors together.
- **India has the highest number of MSPs across the region.** In order to strengthen cross-organisational collaboration in the region, there is a need to build more evidence and advocate for the benefits of MSPs across all ecosystem actors in other countries.



## CREDIBILITY

The ability to build trust, reputation, recognition, and influence across sectors.

*Credibility remains a common area of growth for PSOs across all countries. While many actors have earned trust within their immediate circles, and immediate group of stakeholders, broader recognition and cross-sector legitimacy are still emerging. Strengthening credibility through consistent communication, transparency, and demonstration of value will be key to positioning PSOs and philanthropic actors as trusted enablers of collective action.*

- **Centralised widely accepted standards for assessing CSOs' and PSOs' credibility is needed across the region, especially for smaller organisations**, except in Pakistan, where a unified accreditation system enhances trust. While some perspectives suggest it may also serve as a means of control, accredited organisations in Pakistan reportedly have a 50% higher likelihood of securing funding.<sup>12</sup> In the Philippines, the Philippine Council for NGO Certification (PCNC) also exists but it is yet to get widespread acceptance.

<sup>12</sup> Naushin M. Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy. (Virtual interview, November 2024)

# Key insights on Diversity and MSPs

01

India hosts the highest number of multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) among the seven countries studied, reflecting a relatively diverse landscape of stakeholders, programmatic focus areas, and funding approaches—followed by Bangladesh, Indonesia, and Sri Lanka.

This is driven by the growing ambition of stakeholders to achieve aspirational impact goals, and the proven impact of existing MSPs, which has encouraged further adoption of the MSP approach. In FY 2023-24, this was reflected in **approximately USD 280 million in philanthropic capital directed toward MSPs in India**. In contrast, the **other countries have fewer MSPs**, relying more on direct implementation models rather than engaging in structured, multi-stakeholder collaboration.




FIGURE 1.2: Number of different types of MSPs across seven countries (N=147)

## 02 | Across all the seven countries, alliances/networks and programmes are most prominent.

Alliances/networks are popular as they allow organisations to come together for a common agenda without financial commitments, making them especially relevant in emerging sectors where collective action is needed. **Given the limited domestic funding mobilised for large-scale programmes across the region, alliances offer a practical way for stakeholders to align efforts and advocate for social change.**

Programmes focused on on-ground implementation and evidence generation take longer to establish due to the financial commitments required from donors. They are typically launched to address urgent national priorities or systemic challenges in a structured, planned manner.

## 03 | MSPs target the region's most pressing needs, overall tackling a wide range of social challenges across various sectors.

In India, the MSPs studied span twelve sectors, mostly with a multisectoral focus. Similarly, many MSPs in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Pakistan also address multisectoral issues.

In Indonesia, climate and agriculture/food security dominate, while urban development is the key focus in Bangladesh; Malaysia prioritises health, whereas Sri Lanka focuses on social protection and disaster management.




FIGURE 1.3: Focus sectors of MSPs across seven countries (N=147)

# 04

**While most MSPs comprise a diverse range of stakeholders, only 48% of them collaborate with the government, and only about 41% engage with private sector actors—key stakeholders essential for addressing systemic problems at scale.**

The majority (80%) of MSPs include at least one philanthropic funder and/or civil society organisation, and their limited engagement with government and private sector actors hampers their ability to drive systemic change. Given the greater dependency on foreign funding sources, there is a need to reduce dependency on foreign funders and more actively tap into domestic sources of funding.

**Public-private-philanthropy partnerships (PPPPs),<sup>13</sup>** such as the Brigada Pagbasa Partners Network (BPPN)<sup>14</sup> in the Philippines, **are among the most effective approaches for aligning government, private sector, and philanthropic efforts** to drive systemic change by influencing policy, fostering innovation, and scaling impactful interventions. BPPN brings the Philippine Department of Education together with the World Vision Development Foundation, Angat Buhay Foundation, Philippine Business for Education (PBE), and the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP) to assist 10 million Filipino learners in reading at their appropriate level.



**FIGURE 1.4:** Number of MSPs with different kinds of stakeholders (N=116)

<sup>13</sup> Public-private-philanthropy partnerships (PPPPs) are long-term, multi-stakeholder collaborations where governments, businesses, and philanthropic entities align and leverage their unique resources to drive social, economic, and environmental transformation.

<sup>14</sup> Philippine Business for Education (PBE). (2024). [Biz groups, civil society commit to boost literacy through Brigada Pagbasa Partners Network.](#)



## 05

**Notable funding approaches in MSPs include innovative finance, which secures funding from diverse sources, and outcomes-based financing, which links funding to measurable results.**

**Innovative finance mechanisms use philanthropic capital to attract private investment, balance financial returns with social impact, de-risk funding, and enable high-impact initiatives.** For instance:

- ◆ The REVIVE Alliance<sup>15</sup> with over 250 corporate partners and over 350 social organisations in its network, is an innovative finance platform providing 200,000 workers and micro entrepreneurs across India, with access to affordable capital through finance, social protection, and capability building support.
- ◆ In Indonesia, the Scaling Up Nutrition<sup>16</sup> initiative integrates public sector allocations, international development assistance, and private sector contributions including SBN Indonesia, which has 16 members, to enhance the financial sustainability of families, reduce malnutrition, and help people realise their right to food and nutrition.

**On the other hand, outcomes-based financing mechanisms such as the Skill Impact Bond<sup>17</sup> redefine funding approaches by shifting the focus from activities to measurable outcomes.** The Skill Impact Bond, led by the National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC) with the Michael & Susan Dell Foundation (MSDF) as a risk investor, brings together private sector capital to improve employment outcomes. Training providers receive upfront funding and are repaid by outcome funders only when independently verified job placement and retention targets are met—shifting the focus from traditional training and certification to measurable impact. So far, the initiative has enrolled over 34,000 individuals, 74% of them women, across 18 states. As one of India's first development impact bonds, it also drives knowledge exchange, data generation, and the adoption of outcomes-based financing within the impact ecosystem.

## 06

**Regional conveners like the Asian Venture Philanthropy Network (AVPN), Asia Philanthropy Circle (APC), and Philanthropy Asia Alliance (PAA) play a key role in enabling MSPs across diverse sectors and countries.**

By facilitating cross-sector collaboration, especially in countries with nascent philanthropic ecosystems, and aligning resources with regional needs, these conveners also enhance the impact and effectiveness of existing MSPs in addressing global challenges.

<sup>15</sup> REVIVE Alliance. (2024). [REVIVE Alliance - A Learning Report](#).

<sup>16</sup> Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN). (2024). [SUN Countries: Indonesia](#).

<sup>17</sup> National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC). (2024). [Skill Impact Bond](#).

# Key insights on roles played by PSOs within MSPs

01

In MSPs where PSOs are present—particularly philanthropy advisory organisations or ecosystem conveners—they often play the role of anchor or backbone organisation. However, most of the MSPs are without PSOs.

Across the seven countries, only ~13% of MSPs have PSOs playing the role of backbone organisations, with India leading at 37%, followed by Indonesia at 27%.




FIGURE 1.5: Presence of PSOs in MSPs across seven countries (N=116)

02

Most MSPs today receive dedicated PSO support in research. However, there is a need for enhanced support in areas such as M&E, media, and tech enablement to strengthen their overall impact and streamline operations.




FIGURE 1.6: Roles of PSOs across MSPs in different countries (N=116)

- **Research institutions / think tanks are the most common PSOs in MSPs across all seven countries,** primarily contributing to policy decisions, data-driven programming, and evidence generation for impact. Interestingly, in Bangladesh, MSPs engage only with research organisations, and do not collaborate with any other types of PSOs. This may be due to the mainstream nature of research in government-supported initiatives or the strong policy influence rooted in the country's history of activism and social movements. However, there is insufficient data to fully corroborate these reasons.
- **M&E partners are absent in the MSPs studied in Indonesia, the Philippines, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka, outlining the need for the same.**
- Media partners are not represented in MSPs in Malaysia, Sri Lanka, or Bangladesh.
- Grantmaking intermediaries are part of MSPs in all countries except Bangladesh and the Philippines, hinting at donors' preference for directly funding implementers in these two countries.
- Tech partners are not involved in MSPs in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, or the Philippines.

**Bridging these PSO capability gaps—whether by enhancing capacities of existing PSOs, strengthening collaboration among PSOs, or establishing new PSOs—can strengthen the overall support ecosystem and improve its effectiveness in orchestrating multi-stakeholder partnerships.**

In the following sections of the report, there are country-wide analyses, followed by an exploration of white spaces in support across countries, best practices in the ecosystem, guiding principles for enabling MSPs, and actionable recommendations. These insights aim to strengthen collaboration, enhance PSO capacity, and promote effective MSP development.



# INDIA

The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in India	26
Introduction to MSPs in India	29
Role of PSOs within MSPs	35





# The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in India

India's philanthropic ecosystem is a rich blend of traditional giving and modern institutional approaches, driven by CSOs, high-net-worth individuals, and multinational donors. The integration of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)<sup>18</sup> since 2014 has transformed philanthropy from compliance-focused to a strategic force fostering innovation. Platforms like the Social Stock Exchange (SSE) offer non-profits and social enterprises transparent access to capital, aligned with measurable impact. Additionally, tech-driven philanthropy is enabling data-driven, scalable solutions, while community-led initiatives ensure local relevance. This dynamic ecosystem exemplifies resilience and innovation in addressing India's diverse social challenges.

**The capacity of India's philanthropic ecosystem has grown manifold in the past few decades, in terms of the total financial, ecosystem infrastructure, and human resources available.** Just in the last five years, social sector spending in the country has grown at the rate of 13% annually, reaching INR 23 lakh crore (USD 280 billion) in

FY 2023, equivalent to 8.3% of GDP. Public spending dominates the sector, contributing 95% of the total expenditure.<sup>19</sup> As of 2023, private domestic philanthropy in India constituted INR 63,000 crore (USD 7.5 billion), with family philanthropy (HNI and UHNI) making up 49% and being the fastest-growing segment, while CSR accounted for 46% and retail giving comprised 5%.<sup>20</sup> India's growth in funding opportunities is driven by increasing contributions along with a growing number of contributors.

**In parallel, the civil society ecosystem has expanded significantly, with approximately 3.3 million CSOs** employing over 18 million people as of 2024—reflecting the growth of the philanthropic landscape.<sup>21</sup> **As the sector matures, there is a noticeable shift towards strengthening PSOs** focussed on research, capacity building, M&E, and grantmaking intermediary work, all aimed at enhancing the efficiency and impact of philanthropic efforts across the country. PSOs are increasingly serving as enablers of innovation and scale by bridging gaps and aligning diverse stakeholders.

<sup>18</sup> The Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA) introduced CSR as a mandatory compliance for certain companies under the Companies Act, 2013. Companies are legally mandated to allocate 2% of their net profits towards CSR initiatives, making it a regulated and compliance-driven form of giving rather than purely voluntary philanthropy. Thus, it plays a significant role in shaping MSPs, particularly in sectors aligned to the Companies Act, 2013, like education, healthcare, and rural development. Companies often engage in structured partnerships with NGOs, social enterprises, and government initiatives, making Indian MSPs more likely to involve corporate funding compared to other countries where corporate giving is largely voluntary.

<sup>19</sup> Bain & Company. (2024). [India Philanthropy Report 2024](#).

<sup>20</sup> India Data Insights. (n.d.). [India Data Insights](#).

<sup>21</sup> Karmakar, A. D. (2025, April 1). [Indian government's attacks on nonprofits may portend what lies ahead in US](#). ScheerPost.



The table below outlines 40 active PSOs in India, with some of them playing multiple roles.

Types of PSOs	Names of PSOs <sup>22, 23</sup>
<b>Research Institution/ Think Tank</b>	Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), Centre for Policy Research, Centre for Civil Society
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>	IDinsights, Convegenius Insights, Educational Initiatives, Trivium, Sambodhi, Sattva Consulting, Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL India)
<b>Philanthropy Media</b>	India Development Review, Studio Subu, The Philanthropist (by GivingPi)
<b>Capacity-Building Organisation</b>	SAMHiTA, Atma, Dhvani Foundation, India Leaders for Social Sector (ILSS)
<b>Accelerator/Incubator</b>	Social Alpha, The Nudge Institute, Villgro
<b>Ecosystem Convener</b>	CSRBOX, Dasra, Indian School of Development Management (ISDM), EdelGive Foundation, AMCHAM India
<b>Advocacy Organisation</b>	Centre for Advocacy and Research (CFAR), India Philanthropy Initiative, Centre for Policy Research
<b>Technology Partners</b>	Dhwani Rural Information Systems
<b>Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform</b>	GiveIndia, National Foundation for India, Charities Aid Foundation India, Ketto, Milaap, Donatekart, Danamojo, Giving Tuesday India
<b>Philanthropy Advisory</b>	The Bridgespan Group, FSG, Dalberg, Sattva Consulting, Dasra
<b>Accountability &amp; Standards Organisation</b>	GiveIndia

<sup>22</sup> WINGS. (2021). [Impact of the PSE in India, Kenya & Russia: Country case studies.](#)

<sup>23</sup> WINGS. (2022). [Cultures of Giving Country Profile: India.](#)

In terms of **capability**, Indian PSOs contribute significantly to knowledge and data generation within the PSE, leveraging research, impact assessments, and data-driven insights to inform strategies and decision-making. Knowledge-building efforts have seen a rise, with the entry of PSOs such as the Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy (CSIP) and the Bridgespan Group. Experts also shared that the amount of research undertaken in the ecosystem has increased, both in terms of knowledge produced and the outlets through which it is publicised. In fact, **Indian media has published the highest number of articles per year on the SDGs.**<sup>24</sup> Further, the Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), under NITI Aayog, has been set up to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation ecosystem in India, validating the growing recognition of evidence generation as a vital component of development planning and implementation.

**The availability of skilled talent and leadership in the philanthropic sector is gradually increasing, driven by the growth of social enterprises and the influx of professionals transitioning from corporate to development sectors.** This is attributed to several factors, primarily greater recognition of development sector experience by business schools and mainstream employers, and the establishment of academic institutions such as the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Azim Premji University, Indian School of Development Management (ISDM), and Ashoka University, and fellowships such as the Gandhi Fellowship and Teach for India. However, challenges exist in attracting talent to underserved regions. Further, the development sector's evolution has increased the need for professionals with diverse skills, making it challenging to meet the requirements for driving meaningful impact.

**There is growing recognition within India's philanthropic ecosystem that building robust connections is pivotal for fostering collaboration, facilitating knowledge sharing, and driving collective action for greater social impact.** These connections are forged through partnerships among diverse actors, including CSOs, private entities, funders, and government bodies. Initiatives like Accelerate Indian Philanthropy, a peer network for philanthropists, exemplify efforts to support strategic giving. However, exclusive networking platforms for CSOs remain limited, with most being funder-led. **PSOs play a vital role in catalysing MSPs in the country through structured forums** such as CSRBOX's India CSR Summit, Dasra Philanthropy Week, and the Sattva Knowledge Institute's Annual Summit, which enable stakeholders to exchange learnings, align objectives, and explore synergies.

**PSOs are recognised as credible partners of broader civil society, government, and both international and domestic philanthropic institutions,** supported by growing investment in their services and towards multi-stakeholder initiatives. Efforts to mainstream and generate evidence on PSO impact have bolstered the **credibility** and trust of the overall philanthropic sector. Practitioners have noted that the engagement of private sector players through networks and PSOs has also strengthened this credibility. Organisations such as GiveIndia and initiatives such as the India Partner Network enhance trust by providing reliable NGO databases. However, there is a gap in standardising and accrediting PSO activities, and stakeholders could benefit from exploring ways to improve these processes for greater consistency and effectiveness.

In terms of **diversity**, India's philanthropic ecosystem is marked by diversity in both stakeholders and approaches. It includes a wide range of PSOs—advocacy platforms, citizen engagement groups, consulting firms, and M&E specialists—that enhance sector expertise. Thematic areas like education, health, livelihoods, and climate are addressed through both traditional and intersectional approaches, reflecting innovation and the interconnected nature of social issues.

---

<sup>24</sup> Bain & Company. (2019). [India Philanthropy Report](#).


# Introduction to MSPs in India

As part of this study, Sattva reviewed 58 MSPs in India and analysed 27 in depth to better understand their impact in the country and the role of PSOs in supporting these partnerships. **The key insights from the analysis are summarised below:**

**01** India's MSP ecosystem has matured significantly, with an increase in capital invested,<sup>25</sup> and collaboration emerging as a core principle for addressing complex social challenges. In FY 2023-24 alone, approximately USD 280 million of philanthropic capital was directed towards MSPs in India.


Today, there is more awareness than ever about collective approaches to programming in the philanthropic sector and its support ecosystem.

MSPs have become pivotal in driving collective action to address diverse social issues and have taken various forms, ranging from networks and alliances to on-the-ground programs and public platforms, reflecting their versatility in tackling cross-sectoral challenges.



**FIGURE 2.1:** Growth in capital invested in MSPs

**02** The past four years have particularly highlighted the importance of MSPs, not just through the sheer growth in capital invested but also the exponential growth in the number of MSP initiatives that have been launched.



While the COVID-19 pandemic served as a catalyst for uniting stakeholders, MSPs have addressed both immediate crises and long-term social challenges, with Indian philanthropists and social-sector leaders now more committed than ever to driving multi-stakeholder initiatives.

**FIGURE 2.2:** Growth in number of MSPs over the years (N=58)


<sup>25</sup> The Bridgespan Group. (2024). [The Growing Momentum Behind Philanthropic Collaboratives in India.](#)



# 03

MSPs in India assume a wide variety of roles—24 of them operate as alliances/networks which are focused on collective learning and advocacy with an ever-widening group of stakeholders, while 17 are programmes that aim to strengthen practices on the ground.

The prevalence of alliances can be attributed to the advantages of their open and flexible structure, which allows organisations to join without financial commitments, focusing instead on shared learning and alignment on common goals.




**FIGURE 2.3:** Classification of MSPs across their target outcomes and openness in design (N=58)

Figure 2.3 also represents the **openness of most MSPs to welcoming new partners**. It suggests that, while diverse expertise is often considered crucial in on-ground programmes aimed at strengthening practice, stakeholders inherently value collaboration from the get-go, especially without strict financial commitments.

# 04

Influencing stakeholders is the primary focus outcome of Indian MSPs, followed by strengthening practice and creating public goods.<sup>26</sup>

Aligning stakeholders around a shared agenda drives long-term change more effectively than intensive implementation, fostering accountability and ownership.



**FIGURE 2.4:** Focus outcomes that MSPs aim to achieve (N=27)


For instance, the **10to19 Dasra Adolescents Collaborative** focuses on influencing stakeholders through thought leadership, emphasising the importance of data collection and documentation by sharing insights and learnings on issues facing adolescents in India. By bringing together civil society organisations, experts, funders, and government it aims to deepen understanding of the breadth of issues and leverage the findings to create relevant and practical solutions for the community.

<sup>26</sup> Please note that while figure 2.3 classifies MSPs by their primary focus outcome, figure 2.4 presents the aggregate view of all the focus outcomes that MSPs address.

# 05

**MSPs in India focus heavily on multisectoral initiatives, along with sectors like health, social protection, agriculture, and women’s empowerment—highlighting an integrated approach to addressing social developmental needs.**

There are fewer initiatives on skilling, rural transformation, and capacity building, as these areas, while transformative, often yield delayed outcomes and require sustained investment.



**FIGURE 2.5:** Sector focus across Indian MSPs (N=58)

For example, the **Coalition for Food and Nutrition Security (CFNS)** is an alliance that enables member organisations to collaborate and achieve a common vision of sustainable food and nutrition security for all. Its members span the country and its seven-member governing board includes representatives from the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), the government of India, and the government of Manipur. Through its decade-long journey,, the Coalition has facilitated multiple cross-group collaborations, dialogues between subject matter experts, policy leaders and agencies, and successfully transformed the leadership agenda of action.

On the other hand, **Saamuhika Shakti** is a programme where multiple implementing organisations have joined hands to enable informal waste pickers in Bengaluru to have greater agency to lead secure and dignified lives. It offers vocational training, life skills, and financial literacy programs to create alternative livelihoods and entrepreneurship opportunities along with ensuring access to government schemes like housing and loans.



## 06

Funders play a key role in establishing MSPs, offering catalytic investment and leadership needed for their success. However, only a few MSPs have been established by CSOs.



FIGURE 2.6: Founder(s) of the MSPs (N=27)

There are exceptions, such as the Punjab Education Collective, initiated by a CSO with state government support, which highlights the opportunity for more inclusive collaboration while designing and launching MSPs.

## 07

Global foundations are most prominent, involved in 18 of 27 Indian MSPs, and with 15 MSPs having more than one global foundation.

This highlights the critical role that global foundations play not just in establishing MSPs, but also in adding credibility and onboarding other stakeholders. Some global foundations support multiple MSPs, including the Gates Foundation, Michael & Susan Dell Foundation, British Asian Trust, and Children's Investment Fund Foundation.




FIGURE 2.7: Types of stakeholders in MSPs (N=27)

08

**Private sector entities provide financial support to only 16 out of 27 MSPs studied, with even lesser participation from domestic UHNIs/HNIs.**

Corporates are often less involved in MSPs because M&E assessment systems in these MSPs are complex and unclear from the outset. Additionally, the timelines for achieving outcomes often don't align with their annual investment and reporting cycles, making it difficult to track and justify their participation. **As domestic philanthropy in India—especially from UHNIs and HNIs—evolves, there is a growing preference for loose alliances without financial commitments, with their role and impact in MSPs still emerging.** For instance, Rohini Nilekani Philanthropies and Ashraya Hastha Trust, have recently played a key role in launching the India Mental Health Alliance (IMHA) as funding partners.


09

**Civil society organisations are present in 23 MSPs, while the government is engaged in 11 MSPs, often advising these initiatives to achieve shared goals.**

The Aspirational Bharat Collaborative, anchored by NITI Aayog and Piramal Foundation, works closely with district administration to drive transformative change in India's 150+ most-backward districts. By fostering hyper-local collaboration and enabling last-mile convergence, it works to improve health, education, and livelihoods, targeting the bottom 100+ million population to support India's vision of becoming a developed nation by 2047. It is a great example of how MSPs with civil society, government, and local stakeholders effectively address critical hyper-local challenges like maternal and infant mortality, education gaps, and low income levels.

# Role of PSOs within MSPs

**01** | 15 out of 27 Indian MSPs have PSOs as their members, with 10 of them serving as backbone organisations.



Given the active role of Indian PSOs in the region, there is significant potential to enhance MSP impact by engaging more of them in this backbone role.

**FIGURE 2.8:** Presence of PSOs in MSPs (N=27)

**02** | Other than backbone PSOs, Indian MSPs collaborate primarily with PSOs offering research capabilities.

Some MSPs also engage tech partners, fundraising intermediaries, media/communications partners, and M&E partners to support their initiatives. The trend of using specialised PSOs for support functions is still developing, as most MSPs continue to rely on more mainstream actors, such as CSOs, to carry out these functions.

**Indian PSOs have been key to MSPs, offering backbone support, strategic guidance, and strong governance.** To enhance their impact, M&E-focused PSOs need to adapt to MSPs' multisectoral nature, while all PSOs should expand their reach and visibility to better serve the philanthropic ecosystem. Additionally, stronger advocacy for data-driven programming in MSPs will enable them to play a more transformative role in India's philanthropy landscape.



**FIGURE 2.9:** Types of PSOs present in MSPs (N=27)



# INDONESIA

The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Indonesia	..... 37
Introduction to MSPs in Indonesia	..... 40
Role of PSOs within MSPs	..... 44



Photo credit: Muhammad Azzam on Unsplash



# The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Indonesia

**Indonesian philanthropy blends traditional practices with institutional approaches, but inadequate regulations and weak evaluation mechanisms hinder its potential.**

Communal giving practices, such as ‘gotong royong’—a core Javanese and Indonesian tradition of mutual aid—and zakat—the concept of mandatory almsgiving in Islam—thrive alongside growing institutional philanthropy. **For seven years in a row, Indonesia has ranked first on the World Giving Index,**<sup>27</sup> reflecting a strong culture of giving. Indonesians also place a high degree of trust in social institutions, going as high as 93% for donations channelled through religious institutions and places of worship.<sup>28</sup>

**However, accurately charting the increase in philanthropic spending by various stakeholders is difficult due to limited access to data**

as many organisations do not routinely publish or publicly share annual reports. Additionally, individual philanthropic contributions—excluding those from affluent families—are often untracked, as they tend to be more personal and community-centered rather than formalised, making them challenging to monitor.<sup>29</sup> It is also important to note that between 2021 and 2023, funds collected by 48 philanthropic organisations fluctuated significantly, with USD 192 million raised in 2021,

increasing to USD 210 million in 2022, and declining to USD 143 million in 2023. This highlights the need for strategies to stabilise philanthropic funding.

**High-net-worth individuals, domestic foundations, and international donors play pivotal roles, complemented by an increasing focus on CSR, mandated by law since 2007.**

Social and environmental responsibility has been mandated in particular for businesses in the natural resource industry/extractive businesses.<sup>30</sup> However, it is likely that regulations impacting philanthropic organisations in the country may have had a discouraging effect on the growth of Indonesian philanthropy as over half the respondents in a study of 48 Indonesian NGOs found the country’s philanthropy regulations inadequate, particularly for fundraising and resource collection.<sup>31</sup> For instance, Indonesian philanthropic organizations must register with the Ministry of Home Affairs to send or receive international donations, which are restricted to countries with diplomatic ties, while also submitting detailed activity descriptions that create administrative burdens. Additionally, as per Law No. 17 of 2013 on Societal Organizations, authorities have discretion to impose additional reporting requirements or sanctions if an organisation is deemed to be obstructing national security or public order.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Charities Aid Foundation (CAF). (2024). [World Giving Index Report](#).

<sup>28</sup> Filantropi Indonesia. (2024). [Indonesia Philanthropy Outlook](#).

<sup>29</sup> Alliance Magazine. (2020). [Philanthropy in Indonesia: Summary Report](#).

<sup>30</sup> KneOpen. (2024). [Corporate Social Responsibility in Mining Companies: Regulation and Business Role in Indonesia](#).

<sup>31</sup> Filantropi Indonesia. (2024). [Indonesia Philanthropy Outlook](#).

<sup>32</sup> Sitorus, S., & Abidin, H. (2022). [The 2022 Global Philanthropy Environment Index: Indonesia](#). Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy.

The **capacity** of Indonesia's philanthropic ecosystem has grown manifold since the 1980s, in terms of investment in large-scale philanthropic ventures, streamlining existing channels of giving, and increasing government support. There are 48,886 organisations with legal entity status currently registered at the Ministry of Law and Human Rights. However, these numbers do not reflect the organisation type.<sup>33</sup> This growth is particularly important as international donations have declined following Indonesia's classification as a low- or middle-income country (LMIC) in 2006, which reduced the inflow of foreign aid by as much as 30%.<sup>34</sup> Technology is increasingly being leveraged to enable crowd-funding solutions and expand public participation in giving. This is being done through donation platforms like Kitabisa and Dompot Dhuafa. It also reflects Indonesia's shift towards self-reliance and its growing focus on domestic philanthropic initiatives.

The table below lists 30 PSOs in Indonesia.<sup>35</sup> However, it is challenging to assess their level of involvement and activity within the PSE due to the lack of publicly available data.

Types of PSOs	Names of PSOs
Research Institution/ Think Tank	Knowledge Sector Initiative (KSI), SMERU Research Institute, Centre for Indonesian Policy Studies (CIPS), Centre for Health Determinants Analysis, Public Interest Research and Advocacy Centre (PIRAC)
Monitoring & Evaluation	Panagora Group, MDF Indonesia
Philanthropy Media	CSR Magazine
Capacity-Building Organisation	NICE Indonesia, CIRCLE Indonesia, Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Indonesia
Accelerator/Incubator	-
Ecosystem Convener	Filantropi Indonesia, Indonesia NGO Council
Advocacy Organisation	Vulnerable Consumer Advocacy Institute, Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy (ELSAM), LindungiHutan
Technology Partners	TechSoup Indonesia
Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform	Penabulu Foundation (Secretariat SGP Indonesia), DevelopmentAid, Kitabisa, WeCare, Sharing Happiness, BenihBaik, SolusiPeduli, Dompot Dhuafa
Philanthropy Advisory	Centre for Asian Philanthropy and Society (CAPS), A+ CSR Indonesia, Filantropi Indonesia
Accountability & Standards Organisation	Social Investment Indonesia, Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA)

<sup>33</sup> International Center for Not-For-Profit Law. (2024). [Civic Freedom Monitor, Indonesia](#).

<sup>34</sup> ASEAN. (2020). [Joint media statement of the 10th Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership \(RCEP\) Inter-sessional Ministerial Meeting](#).

<sup>35</sup> Please note that this list of PSOs is not exhaustive.

**Indonesian PSOs, such as Filantropi Indonesia, have significantly contributed to enhancing capability by conducting studies on funding trends, sectoral challenges, and best practices.** These efforts have been instrumental in integrating Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) into Indonesia's philanthropic discourse, fostering alignment with global development priorities. However, there remains a critical need to establish robust mechanisms for comprehensive data collection on philanthropic organisations and to strengthen the evaluation and documentation of program outcomes and impacts. These measures are essential for improving the effectiveness and accountability of Indonesia's philanthropic support organisations. Government ministries like the Ministry of National Development Planning (also referred to as Bappenas) and Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries work closely with PSOs and MSPs, providing guidance, and in some cases, financial support.

**In Indonesia, the availability of skilled talent and leadership for PSOs is gradually improving, but challenges persist in attracting talent to underserved regions and ensuring the right mix of interdisciplinary expertise to address complex issues.** A study on human resource management (HRM) and leadership regeneration in Indonesian NGOs found that NGO directors at all levels reported capacity building of staff as the highest priority, even above the need for funding.<sup>36</sup> Academic programs at Universitas Gadjah Mada and the University of Indonesia are helping create pathways for professionals to transition into philanthropy and social impact roles, but staff calibre and capacity continues to be an area which requires investment.

**Organisations such as Filantropi Indonesia and the Indonesia NGO Council play a central role in enabling connections by actively organising forums,** workshops, and collective initiatives aimed at strengthening networks across sectors. Regional platforms such as the Asia Philanthropy Circle and ventures like KO-NEKSI also enable strategic connections.

**The existing information about actors in the PSE in Indonesia is inadequate and sparse;** hence, grant-making institutions and PSOs report finding it challenging to find work partners who are **credible** and accountable.


---

<sup>36</sup> KSI-Indonesia. (2020). Trends, Challenges and Strategies in Human Resource Management and Leadership Regeneration: Findings from Mixed Methods Research on NGOs in Indonesia Tuti Alawiyah.

# Introduction to MSPs in Indonesia

For this study, Sattva analysed 14 MSPs in Indonesia to understand their impact and the role of PSOs in supporting these partnerships. Insights from the analysis are shared below:

**01** In Indonesia, MSPs in the form of alliances/networks are particularly prominent, playing a key role in bridging connectivity gaps caused by the country’s geographic disparities as a vast archipelago.




**FIGURE 3.1:** Classification of MSPs across their target outcomes and openness in design (N=14)

The Climate Change Philanthropy Cluster, for instance, focuses on influencing stakeholders across the country through various channels, including a forum for discussion, regular brainstorming activities, and dialogues. The Cluster also organises annual initiatives and campaigns focused on themes such as plastic waste reduction and other cross-sector priorities.



## 02

As a result, influencing stakeholders has become the primary focus of MSPs in Indonesia.



This emphasis is driven by the need to bridge geographic disparities among actors, the relatively lower financial commitments to MSPs, and the emerging stage of the country's philanthropic ecosystem.

FIGURE 3.2: Focus outcomes that MSPs aim to achieve (N=14)

## 03

Across Indonesian MSPs, climate and health are key priorities.




Climate attracts significant focus due to Indonesia's vulnerability to disasters and the environmental impact of its extractive industries. A 2024 Filantropi Indonesia study on the Indonesian philanthropic landscape also found that 69% of surveyed CSOs address climate change through their existing programmes.<sup>37</sup>

FIGURE 3.3: Sector focus across Indonesian MSPs (N=14)

<sup>37</sup> Filantropi Indonesia. (2024). [Indonesia Philanthropy Outlook](#).

## 04 The establishment of MSPs in Indonesia lacks a clear pattern.



The increase in the number of MSPs established after 2022 indicates a resurgence in their relevance, driven by post-pandemic recovery efforts and shifting priorities to climate response. Fluctuations in their numbers can also be attributed to leadership transitions, which often influence national and regional development agendas, posing concerns for philanthropic actors.

FIGURE 3.4: Growth in number of MSPs over the years (N=14)

Additionally, a landscape study by Filantropi Indonesia highlights that institutions have allocated over USD 75 million to philanthropic programmes aligned with achieving priority SDGs.<sup>38</sup>

Key MSPs in Indonesia include:

- **Indonesia Forest and Climate Support Project, a programme which aims to reduce carbon emissions in Indonesia's land-use sector** by integrating forest and peatland conservation with low-emission development strategies (LEDS). This is achieved through partnerships with district governments, local communities, and NGOs to promote policies and livelihoods that reduce deforestation and ensure sustainable forest management.
- **Scaling Up Nutrition Indonesia, an alliance that enables member organisations to collaborate and deploy a multisector, multi-actor strategy to reduce stunting across the country.** Its key contributions include the development of new legislation, financial planning tools, and an integrated nutrition action plan, which have fostered alignment across ministries and agencies behind a common plan and a results framework designed to address malnutrition.

## 05 Indonesian MSPs are primarily established by philanthropic funders.




FIGURE 3.5: Founder(s) of the MSPs (N=14)

This points to their strategic influence but reveals a gap in including field leaders and PSOs in early leadership. Bridging this gap ensures solutions are grounded in real-world needs and will diversify decision-making.

<sup>38</sup> Filantropi Indonesia. (2024). [Indonesia Philanthropy Outlook](#).

06

Six out of 14 MSPs in Indonesia are funded by global foundations and 6 are funded by multilateral/bilateral institutions.




FIGURE 3.6: Types of stakeholders in MSPs (N=14)

Organisations funding more than one MSP include Ford Foundation, UNDP, and the Global Environment Facility. The absence of funding organisations in two MSPs is because they are alliances which bring together organisations for knowledge sharing and learning without any financial commitments.

07

CSOs have the strongest representation in MSPs, while government engagement is seen in 6 out of 14 MSPs and private sector involvement is notably low, with only 3 out of 14 MSPs engaging businesses.

Given the heavy reliance on international donors for funding, **strengthening engagement with corporate philanthropy and UHNIs/HNIs within Indonesia is crucial** for long-term sustainability, especially given the country's rapid economic growth.

# Role of PSOs within MSPs

01

Six out of 14 MSPs in Indonesia have PSOs as their members, with 4 MSPs having Filantropi Indonesia playing the role of backbone organisation.



FIGURE 3.7: Presence of PSOs in MSPs (N=14)

02

The involvement of specialised PSOs is limited in Indonesian MSPs.

Moving forward, it will be crucial to engage and develop PSOs with strong monitoring and evaluation capabilities to enhance the credibility of MSP initiatives.

The SDG Venture Scaler is a great example of MSPs bringing together diverse PSOs which in turn support growth-stage enterprises in climate action, education, and health.

Overall, PSOs play an important role in enabling knowledge sharing, capacity building, advocacy, and policy influence in the Indonesian philanthropic ecosystem today, with the need to deepen their involvement and impact.



FIGURE 3.8: Types of PSOs present in MSPs (N=14)



# PHILIPPINES

The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in the Philippines	46
Introduction to MSPs in the Philippines	49
Role of PSOs within MSPs	53



Photo credit: Kim Villanueva on Pexels



# The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in the Philippines

**Philanthropy in the Philippines is deeply influenced by the cultural value of ‘bayanihan’ or community unity for social welfare and disaster response.**<sup>39</sup> This tradition, coupled with modern initiatives, creates a dynamic environment focused on addressing socio-economic disparities. Ranked 30th globally in generosity by the Charities Aid Foundation’s World Giving Index, the Philippines saw the second-highest growth in volunteering and donations between 2022 and 2023.

**Despite advancements, the country faces significant challenges in poverty, inequality, and access to basic services.** While ranked 19th in the 2022 Global Gender Gap Report, it is the third most vulnerable country to climate change, affecting biodiversity, food security, and public health.<sup>40</sup>

**In terms of capacity, the Philippines has around 80,000 registered NGOs, but without clear differentiation between those that are development-focused and the others** understanding the PSE is challenging. Domestic philanthropy is expect-

ed to grow as foreign funding declines, and strategic philanthropic investments will be crucial for long-term post-COVID development.<sup>41</sup> Regulatory reforms, including streamlined registration and better tax incentives, could encourage corporate philanthropy and enhance PSO formalisation.<sup>42</sup>

**The Philippine philanthropic ecosystem includes around 164,473 social enterprises focused on employment generation and poverty reduction.**<sup>43</sup> However, their growth is limited by a lack of government support and policy frameworks. Corporate philanthropy is becoming a key contributor, particularly in healthcare, education, and disaster resilience.

**Resource centralisation in urban areas deepens disparities, leaving rural regions underserved in critical areas such as poverty<sup>44</sup> and education.**<sup>45</sup> Limited funding and inadequate support structures hinder the scalability and impact of philanthropic initiatives.

<sup>39</sup> The Mixed Culture. (2013, Sept. 25). [The Bayanihan Spirit](#).

<sup>40</sup> NICCDIES. (2017). [Climate Change Impacts](#).

<sup>41</sup> Give2Asia. (2022). [Philippines](#).

<sup>42</sup> Oman, J. The Association of Foundations (AF). (Virtual Interview, November 2024)

<sup>43</sup> British Council. (2017). [Reaching the Farthest First: The State of Social Enterprise in the Philippines](#).

<sup>44</sup> IFAD. (n.d.). [Philippines](#).

<sup>45</sup> Journal of Economics, Management & Agricultural Development. (2020). [Rural-Urban Education Inequality in the Philippines Using Decomposition Analysis](#).

The table below highlights 25 PSOs in the Philippines,<sup>46</sup> with a strong presence of research institutions, capacity-building organisations, and grantmaking intermediaries. However, there are notable gaps in the availability of PSOs offering technology and advisory support.

Types of PSOs	Names of PSOs
Research Institution/ Think Tank	Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC), Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration, Venture for Fundraising
Monitoring & Evaluation	IDinsight, Société Générale de Surveillance (SGS)
Philanthropy Media	-
Capacity-Building Organisation	Positive Action Foundation Philippines Inc. (PAFPI), Philippine Social Enterprise Network (PhilSEN)
Accelerator/Incubator	Unlock Impact Ventures Inc., Launchgarage, xChange, Ideaspace Foundation
Ecosystem Convener	Association of Foundations (AF), Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP), Caucus of Development NGOs, Philippine Council for NGO Certification
Advocacy Organisation	-
Technology Partners	Light Of Hope PH, Aedes.ai
Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform	Startup Innovations Portal, The Spark Project, The Philippines Foundation, Philippine International Aid, Gava Gives, Bayanihan Foundation
Philanthropy Advisory	Association of Foundations (AF)
Accountability & Standards Organisation	Philippine Council for NGO Certification (PCNC)

<sup>46</sup> Please note that this list of PSOs is not exhaustive.

**Although PSOs are vital in addressing social issues, *capability* gaps persist within them.** In 2018, only 5,423 social workers were registered in the country, though this number excludes those in other sectors and NGOs. Despite a well-planned social service system, there is a shortage of skilled professionals,<sup>47</sup> especially in rural areas. Also, the lack of localised research and structured methodologies hinders evidence-based policymaking.

**In terms of *connections*, few organisations, such as the Association of Foundations (AF) and PhilSEN, enable cross-sectoral initiatives and engage over 200 NGOs and corporates.** More structured platforms are needed for continuous resource sharing. MSPs, led by the private sector and NGOs, show potential for impactful partnerships, as seen in the response to Typhoon Haiyan. MSPs like Zero Extreme Poverty Philippines 2030 leverage diverse stakeholders, from CSOs to academic institutions corporate entities. The Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP), the largest business-led NGO in the country, has leveraged its 52-year history to implement a Collective Impact Strategy. It has made significant contributions through initiatives such as the Hunger Project, Water Alliance, and United to End TB, addressing key social challenges.

**PSOs in the Philippines play a key role in poverty alleviation, disaster recovery, and education, gaining public trust and *credibility*,** which rose from 37% in 2019 to 70% in 2021.<sup>48</sup> However, smaller PSOs face challenges in maintaining transparency due to limited resources. While initiatives like the Ayala Foundation's CENTEX Education Program<sup>49</sup> show impact, systematic tracking remains inconsistent.

**Transparency varies, with some PSOs following Philippine Council for NGO Certification (PCNC) standards.<sup>50</sup>** A national framework is needed to build trust, especially with grassroots organisations. NGOs also require accreditation from relevant government bodies to operate in specific sectors.

---

<sup>47</sup> UNICEF. (2019). [The Social Service Workforce In The East Asia And Pacific Region: Multi-country Review](#).

<sup>48</sup> Give2Asia. (2022). [Philippines Market Profile](#).

<sup>49</sup> Ayala Foundation. (2020). [Annual Report](#).

<sup>50</sup> Philippine Council For NGO Certification (PCNC). (n.d.). [Accreditation](#).




# Introduction to MSPs in the Philippines

For this study, Sattva analysed 13 MSPs in the Philippines to understand their impact and the role of PSOs in supporting these partnerships. Insights from the analysis are shared below:

**01** The majority of MSPs in the Philippines are programmes designed to strengthen practices on the ground, followed by some alliances/networks.

The prevalence of programmes indicates a strong commitment to enabling change at the ground level.



**FIGURE 4.1:** Classification of MSPs across their target outcomes and openness in design (N=13)


**Brigada Pagbasa Partners Network is one such programme, which aims to assist 10 million Filipino learners in reading at their appropriate level.** Since its inception in 2019, it has evolved into a comprehensive network of private sector players and CSOs with the goal of coordinating resources, identifying areas of convergence, training volunteers, and implementing more data-driven, impactful, and sustainable literacy initiatives.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Philippine Business for Education (PBE). (2024). [Biz groups, civil society commit to boost literacy through Brigada Pagbasa Partners Network.](#)

## 02

## Influencing stakeholders and strengthening practices are the most preferred outcomes for MSPs in the Philippines.

This is particularly relevant as philanthropic investments in the country continue to grow, creating opportunities to enhance collaboration and impact.<sup>52</sup>



**FIGURE 4.2:** Focus outcomes that MSPs aim to achieve (N=13)

Key MSPs in the Philippines involve diverse stakeholders and approaches to advance their mission:

- **Networks like PaNaGaT, a coalition of fisherfolk organisations, supports collaborative research and development of the weaving sector** in the Philippines, enhancing livelihoods through sustainable fisheries and indigenous knowledge. This highlights the importance of culturally sensitive, community-based approaches in MSPs.
- **Kain Tayo Pilipinas (KTP) unites the private sector, academia, and civil society to combat malnutrition.** Their model of shared measurement metrics and collaborative action exemplifies how diverse sectors can coalesce to address food insecurity effectively.
- The **Investing in Women (IW) MSP**, supported by the Australian government, advances women's economic empowerment in Southeast Asia by **influencing businesses and communities through positive examples of gender equality** to build public support for women's economic participation.<sup>53</sup>


<sup>52</sup> Charities Aid Foundation (CAF). (2024). [World Giving Index Report](#).

<sup>53</sup> Investing in Women. (n.d.). [Who Are We](#).

## 03

**Among the MSPs studied, the focus leans heavily on multisectoral initiatives, followed by education and social protection,** reflecting an integrated approach to addressing foundational needs.

However, there is a growing need for funding initiatives that support rural and urban development in line with the country's economic growth and evolving priorities.



**FIGURE 4.3:** Sector focus across Filipino MSPs (N=13)

## 04

**Philanthropic funders have been pivotal in establishing MSPs in the Philippines, with a significant proportion initiated by a single funder.**




**FIGURE 4.4:** Founder(s) of the MSPs (N=13)

Local funding institutions, including endowed institutions and debt-swap mechanisms—where debt is converted into a local fund supporting larger coalitions—have played a role in sustaining these MSP initiatives. However, sustainability remains a challenge, as demonstrating tangible outcomes takes time, making it difficult to showcase immediate impact.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Oman, J. The Association of Foundations (AF). (Virtual Interview, November 2024)

05

MSPs in the Philippines are funded by global foundations, iNGOs, multilaterals and bilaterals, and interestingly, also the government.



**FIGURE 4.5:** Types of stakeholders in MSPs (N=13)

Government-funded initiatives, often in collaboration with multilaterals, are typically aligned with national priorities and anchored by the Department of Social Welfare and Development.

06

CSOs, CBOs, and social enterprises are also represented in MSPs. There is an opportunity to further engage private sector players given the country's rapid economic growth.

# Role of PSOs within MSPs

**01** Only 3 out of 13 MSPs studied in the Philippines have PSOs as members, with none of them having PSOs in the role of a backbone organisation.



FIGURE 4.6: Presence of PSOs in MSPs (N=13)

**02** In the Philippines, MSPs depend heavily on CSOs for on-ground implementation as well as support functions. Engagement with PSOs is limited—only 3 out of 13 MSPs involve them, mainly for research and media/communications support.





FIGURE 4.7: Types of PSOs present in MSPs (N=13)





# MALAYSIA

The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Malaysia	55
Introduction to MSPs in Malaysia	58
Role of PSOs within MSPs	62





# The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Malaysia

Malaysia's philanthropic ecosystem reflects its cultural diversity and commitment to addressing social challenges. It combines religious giving, especially Islamic philanthropy, with secular efforts supported by NGOs, CSR initiatives, and international partnerships. This blend fosters resilience in tackling unique social and environmental issues. Mechanisms like zakat provide targeted support for the Muslim community, while tax incentives encourage philanthropy across all religions.<sup>55</sup> Secular and community-led initiatives further enhance societal welfare.

However, the sector faces challenges such as fragmentation, funding constraints, and inconsistent CSR contributions. The lack of mandated corporate philanthropy, unlike international practices, limits financial potential. Additionally, transparency gaps and resource concentration in specific regions deepen inequalities in community support. Organisations like Impact Malaysia and Ibupreneur exemplify this approach, integrating business models with social impact. Key collaborations with groups like the Asia Philan-

thropy Circle and Asian Venture Philanthropy Network strengthen local capacity through cross-border giving and shared learning.<sup>56,57</sup>

The capacity of Malaysia's philanthropic ecosystem has expanded significantly in recent decades, with over 80,000 registered NGOs nationwide. Notably, 20% were founded in the past decade, reflecting rising civic engagement and new initiatives to address evolving social needs. However, distribution remains uneven: Selangor hosts 19,863 NGOs—the highest number in the country—while Wilayah Persekutuan Labuan has just 270, underscoring regional resource imbalances.<sup>58</sup> This disparity highlights regional imbalances in access to resources and support.

In 2022, Malaysia's leading corporate donor allocated only 1.81% of profits to philanthropy, with the second-largest contributor dedicating 0.71%.<sup>59</sup> Nonetheless, social entrepreneurship has become a national priority, with a target of 10,000 social enterprises by 2030.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Myeg. (2017). [Types of Zakat in Malaysia That You Need to Know](#).

<sup>56</sup> Kasim, M.; Berma, M; Nga, J.; and Hasan, S. (2017). [Philanthropy and the Third Sector in Malaysia: Overview, Extent, Activities, and Impacts](#).

<sup>57</sup> Abu Hussin, M.F. (2018). [The Roles of Non-State Actors in Eradicating Poverty in Malaysia](#).

<sup>58</sup> Abiddin, N.Z.; Ibrahim, I; and Abdul Aziz, S.A. (2022). [Non-Governmental Organisations \(NGOs\) and Their Part towards Sustainable Community Development](#).

<sup>59</sup> Wikiimpact. (2023). [Bursa Top 20 Companies](#).

<sup>60</sup> Komuniti Tukang Jahit. (2024). [Social Enterprise 101: Your Guide to Impactful Business in Malaysia](#).

The table below lists 24 PSOs in the Malaysian PSE.<sup>61</sup>

Types of PSOs	Names of PSOs
<b>Research Institution/ Think Tank</b>	University of Malaya, University Sains Malaysia, Universiti Teknologi MARA
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>	Malaysian Evaluation Society
<b>Philanthropy Media</b>	Malaysian Media Foundation
<b>Capacity-Building Organisation</b>	Green Growth Asia Foundation, URBANICE Malaysia, Impact Malaysia
<b>Accelerator/Incubator</b>	Biji-biji Initiative
<b>Ecosystem Convener</b>	Agensi Inovasi Malaysia (AIM), NGOHub, Mereka Ecosystem
<b>Advocacy Organisation</b>	Malaysian CSO-SDG Alliance, Malaysian Healthcare Students Alliance, Malaysian Health Coalition
<b>Technology Partners</b>	TechSoup Malaysia
<b>Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform</b>	The Giving Bank, SimplyGiving, Charity Right (all three are crowdfunding platforms), NAMA Foundation
<b>Philanthropy Advisory</b>	Malaysian Collective Impact Initiative, Malaysia Entrepreneurs and Philanthropists Association, Philanthropy Initiative of Malaysia
<b>Accountability &amp; Standards Organisation</b>	Malaysian Accounting Standard Board (MASB)

<sup>61</sup> Please note that this list of PSOs is not exhaustive.

In terms of **capability**, Malaysia's philanthropic organisations face ongoing challenges in building and retaining skilled human resources. Staffing shortages are common, with employees often handling multiple roles due to limited funding.<sup>62</sup> This issue is acute in specialised fields like elderly care, where skilled volunteers are in short supply. A 2022 study found 73% of NGOs cited funding constraints as their main challenge, affecting their ability to attract and retain talent.<sup>63</sup> While knowledge generation and evidence-based decision-making are gaining traction, with platforms like NGOhub providing technical resources and organisations like Yayasan Hasanah promoting accountability, gaps in training and leadership development remain. Targeted initiatives are essential to improve operational efficiency and adaptability across the sector.

**Connections** are a cornerstone of Malaysia's philanthropic ecosystem, driven by initiatives that foster partnerships among NGOs, corporates, and government entities.<sup>64</sup> Platforms such as the AVPN Conference convene stakeholders from across Asia regularly, facilitating dialogue and collaboration to scale social impact. Similarly, the Hasanah Forum provides a space for diverse actors to share best practices and develop collective strategies to address pressing social and environmental issues. New funding models, such as the Malaysia-UN SDG Trust Fund, exemplify the potential for cross-sectoral collaboration. By integrating zakat funds with voluntary giving, this initiative addresses poverty and emergency relief at scale. Programs like the Global Muslim Philanthropy Fund for Children further illustrate how blended finance approaches can create systemic change by uniting religious and secular philanthropic efforts.<sup>65</sup> These collaborative models underscore the ecosystem's capacity to address complex social challenges through collective action.

The **credibility** of Malaysia's philanthropic ecosystem hinges on robust monitoring and evaluation practices, diversified funding strategies, and transparent reporting frameworks. Despite these achievements, transparency remains inconsistent across the sector. The lack of standardised reporting practices undermines trust and limits the ability of philanthropic organisations to attract significant investments. Addressing these gaps through unified reporting standards and enhanced monitoring frameworks can further solidify the sector's credibility and increase its capacity to drive meaningful change.

---

<sup>62</sup> Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH). (2021). [Defining Boundaries: Towards an Identity of The Malaysian Third Sector.](#)

<sup>63</sup> Asia Philanthropy Circle. (2022). [Supporting the Third Sector in Malaysia.](#)

<sup>64</sup> Nafi, S.N.M; Jaganathan, M; Abidin, M.A.Z. (2021). [Public-Private Partnership and Social Innovation in Malaysia.](#)

<sup>65</sup> UNICEF. (2019). [UNICEF and the Islamic Development Bank launch first global Muslim philanthropy fund for children.](#)


# Introduction to MSPs in Malaysia

For this study, Sattva analysed 14 MSPs in Malaysia to understand their impact and the role of PSOs in supporting these partnerships. Insights from the analysis are shared below:

01

Five of the MSPs studied operate as programmes, and alliances/networks are also popular.

The prevalence of MSPs operating as programmes in Malaysia is due to funding preferences, with donors prioritising on-ground implementation and strengthening practice.




**FIGURE 5.1:** Classification of MSPs across their target outcomes and openness in design (N=14)



## 02

MSPs in Malaysia largely focus on strengthening practice through direct or indirect programme implementation, or influencing stakeholders through collective action.

This speaks to the balanced nature of the MSP ecosystem in Malaysia, where stakeholders prioritise tangible, short-term outcomes alongside long-term policy action.



**FIGURE 5.2:** Focus outcomes that MSPs aim to achieve (N=14)

The Malaysian Collective Impact Initiative (MCII), for instance, is a **consortium with a focus on all three outcomes. It brings together corporates, NGOs, government agencies, and community groups to address systemic challenges in education.** Focused on improving educational outcomes, it operates on the principle of collective impact, where stakeholders align resources, share expertise, and work towards common goals through evidence-based interventions. MCII's network includes over 130 schools, directly reaching 1,200 teachers, 6,000 students, and 5,500 families, demonstrating its extensive reach and transformative potential. Through capacity building for educators and sustainable solutions, MCII aims to create lasting improvements in Malaysia's education system.

# 03

**Health is a priority focus area of MSPs in Malaysia. Multisectoral initiatives are the second most prominent, with most focused on education and climate.** None of the MSPs studied focus on rural transformation, income generation, women's empowerment, NGO capacity building, or disaster management, although elements of these are part of the programme design of existing MSPs.



**FIGURE 5.3:** Sector focus across Malaysian MSPs (N=14)

For instance, the **Malaysia Greening Education Partnership (MyGEP)**, a United Nations-anchored **programme, integrates sustainability and climate education into Malaysia's education system.** It focuses on four key areas: Greening Schools, to achieve green accreditation and train teachers; Greening Curriculum, to embed climate education across all learning levels; Greening Teacher Training, to build climate-smart education systems; and Greening Communities, to empower youth and mobilise communities for climate action. MyGEP fosters environmental awareness and resilience, aligning education with Malaysia's sustainability goals and global climate commitments.

**On the other hand, Global Sadaqah is a platform focused on Islamic philanthropy, leveraging the principles of sadaqah (charitable giving) to drive social impact.** It connects donors, corporations, and NGOs globally, enabling them to collaborate on projects that address pressing socio-economic challenges. The platform emphasises transparency and accountability, ensuring donors have clear insights into how their contributions are utilised. By facilitating partnerships between Islamic financial institutions, corporate entities, and non-profits, Global Sadaqah promotes innovative solutions such as waqf-based initiatives and zakat management systems. **Its efforts support a wide range of causes, including poverty alleviation, education, healthcare, and disaster relief,** making it a critical enabler of collective action within the Islamic philanthropic ecosystem.

## 04 | Philanthropic funders play a foundational role in nearly all MSPs, both in terms of investment as well as leadership.

However, the success of MSPs often hinges on the insights offered by implementers and community members. Creating a more inclusive ecosystem to enable leadership from these other entities is one pathway for the sustainability of MSPs in Malaysia.



FIGURE 5.4: Founder(s) of the MSPs (N=14)

## 05 | In Malaysia, 11 out of 14 MSPs receive funding primarily from the private sector, with Islamic banks playing a significant role.

Multilateral and bilateral agencies support six MSPs, while the national government funds four. Additionally, global foundations contribute to three MSPs, and iNGOs fund one. This indicates a diverse and well-established funding ecosystem for MSPs in Malaysia. However, the **opportunity for UHNIs/HNIs to support MSPs remains largely untapped.**




FIGURE 5.5: Types of stakeholders in MSPs (N=14)

## 06 | CSOs and CBOs are the most prominent philanthropic actors, followed by social enterprises.

# Role of PSOs within MSPs

## 01 In Malaysia, three out of 14 MSPs include PSOs as members.

One such PSO is the Mereka Ecosystem, which plays the backbone organisation role within the Biji-biji Initiative.




FIGURE 5.6: Presence of PSOs in MSPs (N=14)

## 02 The majority of MSPs in Malaysia are characterised by a diverse PSO composition, with prominent involvement from grantmaking intermediaries/platforms and research institutions.

However, stronger engagement of backbone organisations is needed to anchor Malaysian MSPs, alongside leveraging PSOs for M&E, tech, and media support.

Organisations like Agensi Inovasi Malaysia, Green Growth Asia Foundation, and URBANICE Malaysia play a key role in driving collective impact within Malaysia's MSPs. These PSOs each bring specialised expertise to the table. However, **the evolving needs of MSPs may be better served by leveraging backbone organisations.** These organisations can support MSPs by onboarding PSOs with the necessary capabilities and by bringing together diverse stakeholders—including government, community groups, and PSOs—to work towards shared goals.




FIGURE 5.7: Types of PSOs present in MSPs (N=14)





# BANGLADESH

The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Bangladesh	64
Introduction to MSPs in Bangladesh	67
Role of PSOs within MSPs	71



Photo credit: Refat Ul Islam on Unsplash



# The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Bangladesh

**Philanthropy in Bangladesh has evolved significantly, shaped by cultural traditions, socio-economic challenges, and the emergence of influential NGOs.** Historically, charitable practices in Bangladesh were deeply rooted in religious and cultural norms, with concepts like waqf (endowment) playing a pivotal role in social welfare. These traditional forms of giving established a foundation for a philanthropic culture focused on addressing community needs.

**The non-profit sector has been central to the country's social and economic transformation, progressing through three key phases:** Post-War Relief and Rehabilitation in the 1970s, led by organisations like BRAC and CARE Bangladesh to address immediate needs after the Liberation War; Social Transformation in the 1980s, marked by innovations like Grameen Bank's microfinance model; and Service Delivery and Advocacy from the 1990s to the present, focusing on scaling initiatives in education, health, disaster management, and rights-based approaches. Together, these phases highlight the dynamic evolution of philanthropy in Bangladesh.

**In terms of capacity, Bangladesh's philanthropic ecosystem has grown significantly, with organisations diversifying into key sectors such as agriculture, education, and health to address the nation's development needs.** Few countries have witnessed the dramatic growth of CSOs as much as

Bangladesh, which currently has a total of 26,000 CSOs registered with the NGO Affairs Bureau.<sup>66</sup>

**Historically, bilateral development funding from affluent countries has been the primary source for financing projects,** with Japan leading at USD 71.2 billion (2000-2020), followed by the UK (USD 44.8 billion) and the US (USD 31.9 billion). In the past five years, multilateral donors like the EU, UN, and IDA have contributed nearly 50% of total funding, with key sectors funded including agriculture, WASH, education, transport, energy, and mining, reflecting a strategic focus on sustainable development.<sup>67</sup> Government initiatives, such as the Coastal Embankment Improvement Project (CEIP) and Rural Electrification and Renewable Energy Development Project (REPD), receive financial support from the World Bank or the Asian Development Bank. However, as a middle-income country, Bangladesh's scope for private philanthropy remains limited, with family philanthropy still largely unorganised.

**The philanthropic ecosystem in Bangladesh is shifting towards sustainable development and climate resilience,<sup>68</sup> with organisations such as the Bangladesh Climate Change Trust Fund mobilising domestic resources to tackle climate change.** This also reflects a shift towards local funding mechanisms. These developments highlight a dynamic and evolving sector, with a diverse range of organisations and thematic focuses.

<sup>66</sup> Asian Development Bank. (2008). [Overview of NGOs and civil society: Bangladesh.](#)

<sup>67</sup> LightCastle Partners. (2021). [Bangladesh Donor Funding Outlook Report.](#)

<sup>68</sup> World Bank. (2023). [Framework for Implementing Green Growth in Bangladesh.](#)

The table below outlines 20 key PSOs in Bangladesh. There is a dearth of PSOs focused on providing tech and media support.

Types of PSOs	Names of PSOs
<b>Research Institution/ Think Tank</b>	Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS), Centre for Policy Dialogue Bangladesh, Centre for Asian Philanthropy and Society, Krishi Gobeshona Foundation
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>	Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL South Asia), Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) Bangladesh, EnCompass LLC, RTM International
<b>Philanthropy Media</b>	-
<b>Capacity-Building Organisation</b>	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), BRAC Institute of Governance and Development (BIGD), Grameen Foundation, Bangladesh Environment and Development Society (BEDS)
<b>Accelerator/Incubator</b>	Grameen Telecom Trust's Social Business Incubator
<b>Ecosystem Convener</b>	The Foundation for Charitable Activities in Bangladesh (FCAB), Palli Karma-Sahayak Foundation (PKSF), Impact Hub Dhaka, Global Compact Network Bangladesh (GCNB)
<b>Advocacy Organisation</b>	Ain o Salish Kendra (ASK)
<b>Technology Partners</b>	-
<b>Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform</b>	Manusher Jonno Foundation (MJF)
<b>Philanthropy Advisory</b>	LightCastle Partners
<b>Accountability &amp; Standards Organisation</b>	-

In terms of **capability**, PSOs in Bangladesh play key roles in capacity building, policy advocacy, and research. Organisations like BRAC and Grameen Foundation drive poverty alleviation through microfinance and education, while Bangladesh Environment and Development Society (BEDS) and International Centre for Climate Change and Development (ICCCAD) focus on climate resilience. Collaborations and international partnerships strengthen their capabilities. Research institutions such as Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) and Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) provide insights into critical areas like poverty, education, and climate, informing policies and strategies. **However, there is a need to enhance expertise in data analytics, impact measurement, and foster cross-sector collaboration to maximise the ecosystem's impact.**

Structured forums such as the Bangladesh CSR Summit, sector-specific meetings like Bangladesh Health Watch, and regional conferences like the South Asia Regional Conference on Philanthropy facilitate **connections** and knowledge-sharing in the philanthropic sector. However, these platforms are often one-time events, lacking mechanisms for sustained collaboration. While issue-based collaborations, such as those focused on the Rohingya crisis, are gaining momentum, they are yet to progress into co-funding initiatives. Multilateral and bilateral organisations, due to their size and structure, are often less inclined to engage directly. The ecosystem, therefore, needs stronger platforms for ongoing cross-sector collaboration to fully maximise the potential of PSOs. Strengthening these platforms and fostering formal interactions between philanthropy, the private sector, and government could enhance alignment, synergies, and access to global resources.

Advocacy bodies like Transparency International Bangladesh promote accountability and **credibility**, but the absence of standardised accreditation and transparent monitoring processes limits their effectiveness. Strengthening these mechanisms could boost the ecosystem's credibility, ensuring PSOs are seen as reliable agents of change. Clear accountability measures and reporting frameworks would better align PSOs' efforts with development goals and enhance confidence among funders and partners.<sup>69</sup>


---

<sup>69</sup> Transparency International. (2014). [Bangladesh National Integrity System Assessment](#).

# Introduction to MSPs in Bangladesh

For this study, Sattva analysed 19 MSPs in Bangladesh to understand their impact and the role of PSOs in supporting these partnerships. Insights from the analysis are shared below:

**01** In Bangladesh, MSPs typically operate as structured, goal-driven programmes, prioritising on-ground implementation. They tend to have a closed design, limiting flexibility in onboarding new partners.



**FIGURE 6.1:** Classification of MSPs across their target outcomes and openness in design (N=19)

The limited focus on establishing alliances/networks or platforms throws light on the need for the same, to enable better resource-sharing and collective action addressing cross-sectoral challenges more effectively. It is important to note that the concept of MSPs is not prevalent in Bangladesh, with **local implementing partners often viewing these programmes primarily as opportunities for their own sustainability, rather than collective action.** This dynamic is further driven by the limited involvement of domestic corporates in philanthropy.



## 02

Given the strong on-ground programming focus, strengthening practice has emerged as the primary focus of MSPs in Bangladesh.




FIGURE 6.2: Focus outcomes that MSPs aim to achieve (N=19)

## 03

Urban development, followed by agriculture/food security and climate are the top focus sectors of Bangladeshi MSPs.



FIGURE 6.3: Sector focus across Bangladeshi MSPs (N=19)


**Urban development-focused MSPs include:**

- **Coastal Embankment Improvement Project (CEIP)** which aims to **enhance coastal resilience by up-grading embankments** to protect against tidal flooding and storm surges. It is led by the Bangladesh Water Development Board, with support from the World Bank and other partners.<sup>70</sup>
- **Sustainable Enterprise Project** focuses on promoting **environmentally sustainable practices among small and medium-sized enterprises**. This initiative is implemented by the government in partnership with the World Bank. It aims to foster economic development while ensuring environmental sustainability.
- **Rural Electrification and Renewable Energy Development Project (REPD)** seeks to expand **access to electricity in rural areas through renewable energy solutions**. It is implemented by the government, with assistance from the World Bank and other international funding partners.

**Climate-focused MSPs include the Bangladesh Climate Change Trust Fund (BCCTF), which operates under the Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change. It works to enhance Bangladesh’s capacity to adapt to and mitigate climate change impacts.** By funding various climate adaptation projects, it supports the integration of climate-resilient practices across different sectors, such as agriculture and urban development. Through capacity-building initiatives and the creation of guidelines for local governments, the BCCTF strengthens climate change adaptation practices, ensuring more sustainable and informed decision-making across communities.

## 04 | The funding landscape for MSPs in Bangladesh indicates that the majority are established by a group of funders.

However, the limited participation of implementation organisations and PSOs in the early stages of MSPs signals a need for a more participative philanthropic ecosystem.



**FIGURE 6.4:** Founder(s) of the MSPs (N=19)

<sup>70</sup> World Bank. (2023). [Coastal Embankment Improvement Project - Phase I \(CEIP-I\)](#).

## 05

**Multilateral and bilateral agencies are the primary funders of MSPs in Bangladesh, supporting 16 out of 19 MSPs. Among them, five receive funding from the World Bank, as credit-based financing that is to be repaid.**

Owing to the country's philanthropic ecosystem being in its early stages, there is a heavy reliance on external funding for large-scale programmes. To ensure long-term sustainability, it is essential to diversify funding sources and **strengthen domestic financing mechanisms**.




FIGURE 6.5: Types of stakeholders in MSPs (N=19)

## 06

**The Bangladeshi government funds six MSPs, thus, playing a key role in development efforts.**

However, increasing domestic philanthropic contributions and mobilising local resources can help reduce the reliance on the government. Bangladesh's MSP landscape is largely government-led, making it vulnerable due to its heavy reliance on external funding and the limited role of PSOs. Coupled with weak contributions from domestic philanthropy and the private sector, this calls for a more diversified approach to resource mobilization. **Expanding domestic philanthropy and increasing private sector participation**—both within MSPs and in building a robust support ecosystem of specialised PSOs—will be critical for long-term sustainability and reducing dependence on external aid.

## 07

**MSPs in Bangladesh are largely composed of CSOs and CBOs, however, private sector involvement is limited, presenting an opportunity to leverage its resources, expertise, and innovation for greater impact and sustainability in MSPs.**

# Role of PSOs within MSPs

---

## 01 | None of the 19 MSPs in Bangladesh include PSOs as members.

This lack of participation of PSOs in MSPs is largely driven by the preferences of the government and multi-lateral funders, who tend to restrict PSO involvement in these initiatives and rely on CSOs and CBOs solely.

**Strengthening MSPs in Bangladesh requires advocacy within the funder community and capability-building of local PSOs to take on active roles as conveners, thought partners, and experts.** While the country's philanthropic ecosystem has significant growth potential, there is a need for a stronger domestic philanthropy ecosystem to build a self-sufficient philanthropy support ecosystem consisting of PSOs.



A Pakistani police officer in uniform stands in front of a historic building with intricate Islamic architecture. The officer is wearing a tan uniform with a yellow turban and a dark green dhoti. He is looking to the right. The background features a large, ornate building with arched windows and colorful tilework.

# PAKISTAN

The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Pakistan	..... 73
Introduction to MSPs in Pakistan	..... 76
Role of PSOs within MSPs	..... 81



# The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Pakistan

**Pakistan's philanthropy ecosystem is dynamic, underpinned by a presence of donors and implementing networks, with involvement from both domestic and international stakeholders.**

Key contributors include NGOs, government agencies, and corporate entities, which focus on sectors like education, healthcare, and disaster relief. While the sector's roots lie in cultural and religious practices, its direction today is shaped by increasing awareness of social and environmental issues.<sup>71</sup>

**The philanthropy sector in Pakistan has become more organised and accountable,** with a growing focus on community-driven initiatives.

Research studies and subsequent efforts in the country promoted the concept of community philanthropy, shifting the sector's approach from traditional charity to strategic, community-focused investments.<sup>72</sup> This shift has emphasised social investment as a key strategy for local development. As a result, there has been a strengthening of the philanthropic sector, with increased investments that contribute to sustainable development in key areas.

**The capacity of Pakistan's philanthropic ecosystem covers a vast expanse of sectors including gender and healthcare, with 334 actively operational civil society organisations**

**(CSOs) in the key cities of Lahore, Karachi, Islamabad, and Peshawar.**<sup>73</sup> In terms of funding, corporate contributions to strengthening the PSE amounted to USD 857 million,<sup>74</sup> while private donations totalled USD 84.5 million.<sup>75</sup>

**A study conducted by the Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy reports that 98% of Pakistanis donate and contribute around PKR 240 billion (more than USD 2 billion) annually to charity. The challenge rests in institutionalising the act of making charitable donations,**<sup>76</sup> since most donations in Pakistan are made by individuals and not organisations, therefore, requiring a more impact-oriented approach to philanthropy. To address the challenge of limited institutionalisation and enhance the capacity of philanthropic organisations in Pakistan, efforts are underway to develop new budget guidelines that integrate sustainable development concerns, aiming to facilitate a greater flow of funds into the sector.<sup>77</sup>

PSOs in Pakistan are **diverse**, ranging from knowledge and research institutions to capacity-building entities and advocacy organisations. While there are many academic and research organisations present, aimed at driving evidence-based approaches, there is also a growing presence of grantmaking platforms, technology providers, and ecosystem promoters.

<sup>71</sup> Stanford Social Innovation Review. (2018). [Philanthropy in Pakistan](#).

<sup>72</sup> The Aga Khan Development Network. (2017). [The Aga Khan Development Network](#).

<sup>73</sup> Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy. (2023). [Annual Report](#).

<sup>74</sup> Corporate Philanthropy Survey. (2023). [Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy Homepage](#).

<sup>75</sup> National Study. (2014). [Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy Homepage](#).

<sup>76</sup> The Express Tribune. (2018). [Pakistan one of the most charitable nations in the world, reveals new study](#).

<sup>77</sup> UNDP. (2018). [Financing the 2030 Agenda](#).

The table below illustrates 12 PSOs in Pakistan and the roles they play in the PSE.

Types of PSOs	Names of PSOs
Research Institution/ Think Tank	Idara-e-Taleem-o-Aagahi, Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS), Centre for Sustainable Development
Monitoring & Evaluation	-
Philanthropy Media	-
Capacity-Building Organisation	Alkhidmat Foundation
Accelerator/Incubator	-
Ecosystem Convener	Aga Khan Development Network, Pakistan Banks Association (PBA), Care International Pakistan (CIP)
Advocacy Organisation	The Citizens Foundation (TCF)
Technology Partners	ICT Forum Pakistan
Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform	Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund (PPAF)
Philanthropy Advisory	Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy
Accountability & Standards Organisation	Sahil

In terms of **capability**, academic and research institutions in Pakistan, such as the **Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy (PCP)**, are playing a vital role in building the philanthropic ecosystem's capability by producing and sharing sector-relevant resources. PCP's annual philanthropy forum facilitates research, dialogue, and networking among stakeholders. In addition to knowledge-sharing, key stakeholders have reported that a critical challenge is finding skilled personnel for the sector. To address this, initiatives for dialogue, institutional training, and **university courses like those at LUMS and SZABIST in collaborative philanthropy and ethical business practices** are equipping the next generation with the skills needed for impactful social change.<sup>78</sup>

Pakistan's PSOs are crucial in fostering **connections** by organising events like PCP's Social Enterprise Conference and providing support to local NGOs through CIVICUS. However, **the sector lacks a unified platform to address regulatory challenges**, as it faces multiple layers of regulations. While Pakistan Institute of Development Economics (PIDE) conferences and the Doing Good Index (DGI)<sup>79</sup> facilitate cross-sectoral engagement, a single-window platform for NGOs to navigate regulations would further enhance collaboration and drive innovation within the philanthropic ecosystem.

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) in Pakistan, such as the Punjab Education Foundation's Assisted Schools Program,<sup>80</sup> have demonstrated how government and private sector collaborations can drive social impact, particularly in poverty and social welfare. However, for long-term success, transparency and accountability are crucial. **There exists a gap in structured forums where NGOs can directly engage with decision makers to discuss sector-specific challenges.**

**The PCP has made progress in ensuring NGO credibility and offering tax incentives for public service engagement.** However, the foreign funding approval process remains a barrier for international donors. PCP's certification process, in alignment with the Federal Board of Revenue, includes eligibility checks, assessments, and evaluations by an independent panel. Certified NGOs are 50% more likely to secure funding, highlighting the importance of transparency and accreditation in fostering trust and sustainability in Pakistan's philanthropic sector.

---

<sup>78</sup> Arsalan, K. and Mahmood, N. Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy. (Virtual interview, November 2024)

<sup>79</sup> Centre for Asian Philanthropy and Society. (2022). [Doing Good Index \(2022\)](#).


<sup>80</sup> Anwar, M. N.; Khizar, A.; and Haq, R. (2018). [An Analysis of Foundation-Assisted Schools Program of Punjab as a Mechanism Influencing Pupil Cohort](#). Bulletin of Education and Research, 40(2), 1-12.

# Introduction to MSPs in Pakistan

For this study, Sattva analysed 14 MSPs in Pakistan to understand their impact and the role of PSOs in supporting these partnerships. Insights from the analysis are shared below:

## 01 Platforms are the most prevalent form of MSPs in Pakistan.

Driven by an increasing focus on research-based advocacy, open and flexible platforms are the preferred mode for public-private-philanthropy sector engagement in Pakistan.



**FIGURE 7.1:** Classification of MSPs across their target outcomes and openness in design (N=14)

## 02 Pakistan has consistently seen the establishment of one or two MSPs per year, with a surge in 2005, likely driven by philanthropic efforts in response to the Kashmir earthquake.<sup>81</sup>




FIGURE 7.2: Growth in number of MSPs over the years (N=14)

## 03 MSPs in Pakistan take a holistic approach, with a strong focus on all three areas—balancing public goods creation, influencing stakeholders, and strengthening practice across the 14 MSPs.




FIGURE 7.3: Focus outcomes that MSPs aim to achieve (N=14)

The **Pak Rural Development Program (PRDP)**, for example, strengthens practices and influences stakeholders by building collaborative networks, empowering local communities, sharing knowledge and research, measuring impact, building capacity, and influencing policy. Through these efforts, PRDP ensures that its initiatives are effective, sustainable, and aligned with the needs of vulnerable populations.

<sup>81</sup> WINGS. (2023). [The power of philanthropy in times of disaster.](#)



# 04

MSPs in Pakistan are primarily multisectoral in nature, with focus on education and agriculture/food security.




FIGURE 7.4: Sector focus across Pakistani MSPs (N=14)

**Prominent MSPs in Pakistan include the Punjab Education Support Programme, a programme focused on increasing school enrolment and improving literacy and numeracy outcomes for marginalised girls and children** in Punjab, Pakistan. It targets 6 million primary and 4 million secondary students in government schools, as well as around 2.2 million children in schools supported by the Punjab Education Foundation, with a focus on ensuring 50% of the beneficiaries are girls. Key partners include the Education Development Trust, Oxford Policy Management, The Citizens Foundation, World Bank Group, and several other organisations.

**On the other hand, Pakistan Water Partnership (PWP) is an alliance of organisations focused on improving water management through Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM).** It collaborates with UNESCO, WHO, and UNDP, along with local NGOs, academic institutions, and government bodies, to enhance water management policies, share knowledge, and advocate for water resources management at grassroots, provincial, and national levels. PWP is registered as a corporate entity under Pakistan's Companies Ordinance 1984 and includes a wide range of stakeholders, including government bodies, the private sector, NGOs, women and youth groups, and civil society, all of whom are affected by or involved in water use and management.

05

Of the 14 MSPs studied, a group of funders and practitioners is the most common founding team, though some MSPs have been founded by a single funder or a group of funders.




FIGURE 7.5: Founder(s) of the MSPs (N=14)

06

Out of the 14 MSPs in Pakistan, seven are funded by multilateral and bilateral agencies.

This includes the World Bank, Asian Development Bank (ADB), and Food and Agriculture Organization. Given that funding from the World Bank and ADB is provided as credit with interest, there is a need to explore more sustainable financing options for MSPs.

Additionally, the sector heavily relies on foreign funding, with global foundations supporting four MSPs and international NGOs involved in five. To enhance long-term sustainability, it is crucial to minimise dependency on external sources and diversify funding sources.




FIGURE 7.6: Types of stakeholders in MSPs (N=14)

07

Only six out of 14 MSPs receive private sector support, and there is no participation from UHNIs/HNIs, highlighting an opportunity to engage the domestic philanthropic ecosystem more effectively.

08

Although 11 Pakistani MSPs have government stakeholders engaged, with two of them funded by the government, the relationship between philanthropy and government is often marked by ambivalence, yet examples of collaboration have proven effective at the site of contributions through local networks of NGOs.

One such example is the Pakistan Coalition for Education (PCE) in the province of Punjab, where the state government, faced with failing state schools, sought the assistance of several NGOs to run them. This indicates that while government funding supports social initiatives, philanthropy plays a crucial role in supplementing these efforts, and the role of PSOs in particular cannot be undermined.<sup>82</sup>

Key MSPs—such as the Pak Rural Development Program, MenEngage, Pakistan Water Partnership, and Punjab Education Support Programme—address gaps in marginalised communities by strengthening local capacity in poverty reduction, gender equality, education, and resource management. **These MSPs prioritise grassroots engagement and community-driven models with support from local CSOs and CBOs**, ensuring culturally relevant, sustainable interventions that bridge national policy with local implementation, ultimately strengthening systems for effective development.

<sup>82</sup> WINGS. (2018). [The Global Landscape of Philanthropy](#).

# Role of PSOs within MSPs

01

Two out of the 14 Pakistani MSPs have PSOs as their members.



FIGURE 7.7: Presence of PSOs in MSPs (N=14)

02

The PSOs within these two MSPs are research institutions, tech partners, media partners, M&E partners, and funding intermediaries. However, none of these MSPs have any PSOs as their backbone organisation.




FIGURE 7.8: Types of PSOs present in MSPs (N=14)



# Sri Lanka

The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Sri Lanka	83
Introduction to MSPs in Sri Lanka	85
Role of PSOs within MSPs	89



Photo credit: gemmajam on Unsplash



# The philanthropy landscape and support ecosystem in Sri Lanka

Charity and philanthropy in Sri Lanka are deeply embedded in the country's multi-ethnic and multi-religious traditions. While Buddhist practices such as *dāna* (generosity) emphasise spiritual merit and community well-being, similar values are equally upheld in Hinduism, Christianity, and Islam, shaping individual, household, and community-level giving. The current landscape of the philanthropic ecosystem in Sri Lanka is burgeoning and diverse, addressing a wide range of thematic focus areas, particularly rooted in their history of tackling disaster relief alongside.<sup>83</sup> After 2009, following the conclusion of the Sri Lankan Civil War, the government heavily invested in infrastructure development, while parallel efforts focused on fostering social integration through dispute resolution and reconciliation processes.<sup>84</sup> Over the last three decades, philanthropic organisations have become a significant and active force in Sri Lanka's civil society, particularly in development and peacebuilding, including efforts of multilateral organisations like the United Nations, UNICEF, and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), who play key roles in reconciliation efforts.

In terms of **capacity**, Sri Lanka currently hosts 619 active NGOs,<sup>85</sup> with many concentrated in

the western province—a region marked by post-war recovery and home to some of the country's most marginalised communities.<sup>86</sup> On the funding front, domestic philanthropy remains limited due to the ongoing economic crisis, leading to a significant reliance on foreign aid. A few philanthropic support organisations are presently working to enhance the efforts of NGOs in the country.

Sri Lanka's philanthropic ecosystem faces **capability gaps, with limited skilled personnel, low sector compensation, and few training or fellowship opportunities**. Knowledge-sharing platforms are scarce, with only a handful of NGO secretariat-led consortiums enabling collaboration.

**Connections within the ecosystem are fragmented, with weak cross-sector and regional coordination.** However, there are some MSPs such as the Scaling Up Nutrition Business Network, SheSays network, and Biodiversity Sri Lanka alliance, which unite experts from diverse sectors to address challenges such as elderly care, disaster relief, and gender. Partnerships involving the private sector, for example that amongst Hayleys, Eastern University of Sri Lanka, and World Vision, also demonstrate the value of cross-organisational collaboration.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>83</sup> Sarvodaya. (n.d.). [Philosophy and Approach](#).

<sup>84</sup> SSRN. (2022). [Role of NGOs in Post-War Reconciliation Process in Sri Lanka: UN, UNICEF, UNDP, ICRC](#).

<sup>85</sup> National Secretariat for Non-Governmental Organizations. (2024). [Registered Active NGOs](#).

<sup>86</sup> Asanka, W. and Chaya, D. Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka. (Virtual conversation, November 2024)

<sup>87</sup> World Bank. (1991). [Nongovernmental Organisations and the World Bank](#).

Sri Lanka's philanthropic ecosystem faces a **credibility** gap between smaller local NGOs and larger international organisations. Regional NGOs often operate within trust-based frameworks and have limited resources for accreditation and reporting, while larger organisations like Oxfam and World Vision adhere to standardised practices, including third-party assessments, to reinforce their credibility. Strengthening trust and capacity in smaller NGOs can bridge this gap, enhancing the overall credibility of the ecosystem and improving its effectiveness in addressing social challenges.

The table below provides a list of 22 PSOs, with the majority focused on research, capacity-building, and advocacy. The ecosystem lacks M&E, technology and media support, and grantmaking intermediaries.


Types of PSOs	Names of PSOs
Research Institution/ Think Tank	Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka (IPS), Verité Research, Lakshman Kadirgamar Institute (LKI), The Pathfinder Foundation, Adayaalam Centre for Policy Research (ACPR), Sri Lanka Association for Social Development (SLASD)
Monitoring & Evaluation	Sri Lanka Evaluation Association (SLEVA)
Philanthropy Media	Sri Lanka Development Journalist Forum (SDJF)
Capacity-Building Organisation	Sri Lanka Centre for Development Facilitation (SLCDFS), Rule of Law Collaborative's Think Tank Capacity Building Workshops, The Lanka Jathika Sarvodaya Shramadana Sangamaya (Sarvodaya)
Accelerator/Incubator	Lanka Social Ventures (LSV)
Ecosystem Convener	Lanka Jathika Sarvodaya Shramadana Sangamaya (Sarvodaya), Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust (NTT), Asia Foundation (Sri Lanka Office)
Advocacy Organisation	The Ceylon Chamber of Commerce, The Mines Advisory Group (MAG), Family Planning Association of Sri Lanka, People's Action for Free and Fair Elections, Centre for Monitoring Election Violence (CMEV), Campaign for Free and Fair Elections (CaFFE), National Fisheries Solidarity Movement (NAFSO)
Technology Partners	-
Grantmaking Intermediary/Platform	Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust (NTT)
Philanthropy Advisory	-
Accountability & Standards Organisation	-

# Introduction to MSPs in Sri Lanka

For this study, Sattva analysed 15 MSPs in Sri Lanka to understand their impact and the role of PSOs in supporting these partnerships. Insights from the analysis are shared below:

01

The evaluation of 15 MSPs in Sri Lanka reveals a dominant focus on implementation, with the majority of MSPs being programmes. This reflects the nascency of the country’s philanthropic ecosystem, where immediate outcomes are prioritised due to unavailability of support structures.




**FIGURE 8.1:** Classification of MSPs across their target outcomes and openness in design (N=15)

This implementation-heavy approach is also driven by the significant role of multilateral organisations addressing urgent priorities, contrasting with India, where local actors often take ownership of social challenges. As Sri Lanka’s ecosystem evolves, there is potential for a more balanced approach that not only focuses on implementation but also prioritises influencing key stakeholders, advocating for systemic change, generating evidence, and creating public goods to drive sustainable, long-term impact.

## 02

Most of the MSPs studied focus on strengthening practice as per their mandates, emphasising operational effectiveness, capacity building, and on-ground implementation. This can also be interpreted as the ecosystem prioritising foundational work to improve the efficiency of philanthropic organisations within the country.




**FIGURE 8.2:** Focus outcomes that MSPs aim to achieve (N=15)

For instance, the **SUN Business Network promotes strategies to combat malnutrition, by improving on-ground operations and fostering innovation.** The **School Meals Programme enhances** health, attendance, and educational outcomes while ensuring efficient nutrition management in schools. Similarly, the **Lanka Microfinance Practitioners' Association (LMPA) advances financial inclusion by standardising microfinance services,** building capacity, and encouraging sustainable economic practices. Together, these initiatives strengthen operational frameworks and improve service delivery across sectors.



# 03

MSPs in Sri Lanka primarily focus on disaster management, followed by social protection, health, agriculture/food security, and climate, reflecting the country's geographical positioning and climate vulnerabilities.



**FIGURE 8.3:** Sector focus across Sri Lankan MSPs (N=15)

Disaster management focused MSPs, such as the Sri Lanka Preparedness Partnership (SLPP) enhances disaster risk management by uniting the government, humanitarian organisations, and the private sector. Similarly, the Kelani River Multi-Stakeholder Partnership (KRMP) targets sustainable river basin management to mitigate disaster risks stemming from environmental degradation and pollution. Complementing these efforts, the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) provides a comprehensive framework that integrates disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change adaptation (CCA), and climate mitigation, while outlining strategies for prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery to build a resilient nation.

## 04 Most MSPs in Sri Lanka have been set up by a single funder, with some initiatives also involving a mix of funders and practitioners.



FIGURE 8.4: Founder(s) of the MSPs (N=15)

## 05 Nine out of 15 MSPs in Sri Lanka are funded by multilateral/bilateral agencies.

This includes the International Finance Corporation (IFC), Australian Aid, the World Bank, UNICEF and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Given that funding support from the World Bank and Asian Development Bank comes as credit with interest, reducing reliance on such financing is crucial.




FIGURE 8.5: Types of stakeholders in MSPs (N=15)

## 06 The private sector supports seven of these MSPs, with limited involvement from UHNIs/HNIs. Sri Lankan MSPs primarily involve CSOs, CBOs, and government bodies, emphasising local engagement and some public-sector backing.

# Role of PSOs within MSPs

01

Three out of 15 MSPs in Sri Lanka have PSOs as members. However, none of them have PSOs playing the role of backbone organisation.




FIGURE 8.6: Presence of PSOs in MSPs (N=15)

02

Engagement from PSOs in MSPs remains limited, primarily involving research institutions and funding intermediaries.

The absence of PSOs with expertise in technology, media, and M&E highlights potential gaps in leveraging digital tools, storytelling, and data-driven insights. Integrating these capabilities could enhance the effectiveness and impact of the Sri Lankan MSP ecosystem.




FIGURE 8.7: Types of PSOs present in MSPs (N=15)





# CONCLUSION

---

Gaps in Support Across Countries	.....	91
<b>Best Practices</b>	.....	<b>93</b>
<b>The Way Forward</b>	.....	<b>95</b>



# Gaps in support across countries

## Across India and Indonesia

1. **PSOs specialising in key areas such as technology, media, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and academia are often underutilised within existing MSPs.** This underrepresentation stems from a combination of limited demand for their expertise, insufficient funding to integrate their roles effectively, and a lack of recognition of their strategic value in driving systemic outcomes.
2. **MSPs are primarily shaped by international funders—global foundations and multilaterals, with objectives and design following a top-down approach rather than a co-creation, bottom-up model,** attributed not to lack of intention but rather the absence of established precedents for such approaches. **PSOs need to play a key intermediary role in facilitating this transition by drawing on past experiences and developing a repository of co-creation strategies to inform and guide future MSPs.** Additionally, ensuring equitable power sharing is critical to fostering inclusive and effective collaborations, where all stakeholders have a voice in decision-making and contribute to the partnership's success.
3. **Lastly, the difficulty in showcasing measurable outcomes in the regional context as a result of the PSO's involvement** does not position them well to play an enabling role in orchestrating MSPs, with the exception of certain philanthropic advisory PSOs that may have internal impact assessment mechanisms and organisational-level funding for these MSPs. The absence of evidence limits a clear understanding of their role. Conducting rigorous studies and establishing a repository to track PSOs' work across various MSPs would provide valuable insights, help identify best practices, and clarify their strategic value, ultimately enhancing their role in enabling MSPs.

## Across countries with PSEs in early stages of development (Malaysia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh)

1. **Engagement is mostly limited to events, with little follow-up and few PSOs to lead ongoing discussions.** There are no dedicated PSO-led channels or platforms for structured, ongoing dialogue and collaborative problem-solving.
  - **Example:** In Bangladesh, while one-off conferences, forums, and workshops occur, such as the South Asia Regional Conference<sup>88</sup> and the National Dialogue on Philanthropy,<sup>89</sup> these engagements are short term rather than part of an established, continuous dialogue.
2. Given the nascency of the PSE, financial resources available towards setting up MSPs and institutional building of PSOs are insufficient.
3. **Bureaucratic hurdles, such as restrictive policies, complicated certification processes,** funding barriers, and inconsistent regulations challenge credibility and operational ease. The CSR mandates and reporting requirements, for example, make it harder for budgets to be allotted for support services rather than programmatic expenditure.

---

<sup>88</sup> Roadmap to Zero. (2022). [South Asia Regional Conference](#).

<sup>89</sup> Anticipation Hub. (2023). [National Dialogue on Philanthropy, Bangladesh](#).

## Further, the following barriers agnostic of PSE maturity have emerged

1. **Only 9% (11 out of 116) of MSPs across the seven countries have participation from domestic funders including UHNIs and HNIs.**
2. **Less than 22% of MSPs conduct regular monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of their initiatives, resulting in gaps in accountability and evidence-based practices.** Inefficient M&E systems and poor data-sharing mechanisms hinder tracking of the dynamic, cross-sectoral, and long-term impact of MSPs.
3. **Specialised PSOs, such as those in media, M&E, and tech, receive less funding compared to large CSOs** that play multiple roles, leading to an unmet demand for support capabilities across countries. This gap in funding then leads to MSPs leveraging independent consultants instead of specialised PSOs, as a stop-gap solution.
  - **Example:** In Bangladesh, funding is skewed towards large, well-established organisations like BRAC and Grameen, while smaller or regionally-focused CSOs struggle for financial and operational support.
4. **There is a lack of centralised forums or digital platforms for sharing best practices, learnings, and data** within the philanthropic ecosystem.
5. **A lack of investment in human resource training limits PSOs' capabilities** in areas like partnership-building, co-creation, and subject matter expertise. This is further exacerbated in areas where there is shortage of talent.
  - **Examples:** Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust in Sri Lanka shared that grassroots PSOs faced difficulties securing global funding due to their limited technical capacity in grant writing. Donors often favour larger organisations with proven track records, with minimal efforts towards “localising” funding for smaller, resource-strapped PSOs. Similarly, the Institute of Policy Studies in Sri Lanka highlighted how job insecurity within the social sector discourages young talent, exacerbating the lack of skilled personnel for a thriving PSE.
6. **PSOs are mainly concentrated in cities**, leaving rural areas and underserved communities overlooked.
  - **Example:** In Indonesia, the majority of philanthropic actors are concentrated in areas like West Java and East Java, leaving regions like Papua underserved.<sup>90</sup> The same is the case with Sri Lanka, as many organisations are located in the western part of the island nation.

These challenges highlight the need for PSEs **to strengthen their capacity, capability, connection, and credibility** to enable more impactful multi-stakeholder responses.

---

<sup>90</sup> Filantropi Indonesia. (2024). [Indonesia Philanthropy Outlook](#).

## For Strengthening the Enabling Philanthropic Ecosystem

*The following factors create an environment that enables MSPs to emerge and function effectively.*

### 1 **Legal, Regulatory, and Governance Support:**

- **Transparent certification processes build trust and attract funding for MSPs.**

For example, Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy (PCP)'s certification of CSOs boosts funding opportunities by 50%, by offering tax incentives and access to procurement channels, thereby strengthening organisational credibility.<sup>91</sup>

- **Legal and policy frameworks** that incentivise cross-sector collaboration and cross-organisational partnerships, such as tax benefits, policy incentives, and streamlined regulatory approvals, strengthen the ecosystem.

**2 Capacity Building for CSOs: Enhancing the capabilities of CSOs strengthens their contributions to MSPs, ensuring they are not only better equipped to complement backbone organisations but also more attuned to community priorities. Meaningful engagement with target communities—facilitated by CSOs—ensures that MSPs are not just aligned with, but driven by community needs.** In Bangladesh, MSPs like the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement and organisations like BRAC play a crucial role in fostering this approach by conducting thematic workshops on program implementation and advocacy. By

empowering CSOs to amplify community voices, these efforts help MSPs emerge from the communities they aim to serve, fostering greater ownership, sustainability, and impact.

### 3 **Cultural and Contextual Integration: Incorporating culturally embedded traditions in initiatives fosters participation and trust, bridging modern and traditional practices.**

For instance, Indonesia leverages gotong royong and the Philippines leverages bayanihan to align philanthropic efforts with local values. Additionally Pakistan, Malaysia, and Indonesia too leverage zakat, with Sri Lanka following the Buddhist tradition of charity. Designing for diversity and embracing plurality with mutual respect amplifies these culturally sensitive approaches.

**4 Alignment with Global Development Agendas: Embedding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) into MSPs ensures alignment with global priorities and attracts support from philanthropic funders and governments.** In Indonesia, MSPs incorporate SDGs into their strategies, thereby enabling efforts to address interconnected challenges targeting critical areas such as poverty alleviation, education, and climate action, ensuring measurable contributions to global development targets.

<sup>91</sup> Naushin M. Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy. (Virtual interview, November 2024)

# For Designing and Operationalising MSPs

*Below are the good practices to ensure that MSPs function efficiently, achieve impact, and sustain momentum.*



## Onboarding Strong Backbone Organisations

- **PSOs, as backbone organisations in MSPs, are indispensable in ensuring effective coordination, capacity building, and strategic alignment to achieve collective impact beyond what individual partners can accomplish alone.** For example, In India, 19 out of 27 MSPs have specialised PSOs, while Filantropi Indonesia anchors four out of 14 Indonesian MSPs.
- These backbone organisations must monitor and balance clarity in purpose and roles, structured governance and operations, sustained momentum, and stakeholder excitement to ensure engagement and progress.



## Defining a Clear Purpose and Strategy

- MSP stakeholders must align on the big picture and minimum scope, recognising that clarity is a journey, not a destination.
- There are no shortcuts in MSPs—it is important to focus on the process as much as the envisioned outcome, ensuring sustained engagement and long-term success.



## Inclusive Stakeholder Engagement and Leadership Development

- **Engage diverse stakeholders** early to build the most comprehensive and balanced understanding of the problem.
- **Invisible leadership** is the secret sauce—creating space for shared leadership rather than centralised control.
- **Leadership development** is crucial—identifying and nurturing dedicated leaders in the long term, with targeted capacity building to lead MSPs and PSOs



## Setting Measurable Goals and Adaptive Learning Mechanisms

- **Clear, actionable goals and measurable results enhance accountability.** Example: Pakistan's Rural Development Programme and Sustainable Development Solutions Network track literacy rates and SDG progress monthly to ensure effectiveness.
- Continuous **learning and adaptation** are essential, ensuring interventions remain relevant through **real-time feedback** loops. Example: Sri Lanka's SUN Business Network, with their E-learning tutorials,<sup>92</sup> and Biodiversity Sri Lanka<sup>93</sup> utilises mobile technology and community monitoring systems to enable dynamic adjustments as per on ground realities, making these MSPs more resilient to disruptions.



## Robust Governance and Decision-Making Structures

- Transparent, structured governance amongst partner organisations in MSPs, with regular engagement (monthly or quarterly meetings) fosters strong collaboration and ensures outcome focus. Example: Over 45% of MSPs in India and Indonesia follow **structured governance** routines with representatives from anchor organisations to track progress and take any decisions.



## Financial Innovations and Sustainability

- **MSPs leveraging outcomes-based funding models and innovative financing sources are more sustainable, as they drive a stronger focus on outcomes,** efficiency, and long-term sustainability. In Bangladesh, a blended approach—combining government funding with private contributions—has strengthened health and education MSPs, such as those anchored by Grameen Bank. By reducing dependency on single funding streams, these models enhance accountability, adaptability, and the overall effectiveness of MSPs.


<sup>92</sup> Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2023). [FAO e-learning: major achievements for 2023](#).

<sup>93</sup> Biodiversity Sri Lanka. (n.d.). [Website](#).




# The way forward


Given that **India** has one of the most mature PSEs in South and Southeast Asia, characterised by a substantial number of active PSOs and MSPs, the **focus should now shift towards enhancing the impact and scalability of existing multi-stakeholder partnerships**. Achieving this requires addressing current gaps in PSO capabilities, securing greater government and private sector support, and guiding MSPs to be better targeted to needs in newer areas.



India's mature PSE creates strong conditions to scale and deepen the impact of MSPs. **Strengthening PSO capacities, building shared infrastructure and research, guiding MSPs to newer and cross-sector areas, and supporting narrative-building** can enable more inclusive, effective multi-stakeholder action.



Given **Indonesia's** robust philanthropic culture and strong alignment with the SDGs, as demonstrated by active PSOs and MSPs addressing diverse priorities, **the next step is to amplify the depth and reach of these efforts.** To achieve this, stakeholders must focus on bridging regional disparities, fostering cross-sector collaborations in MSPs, and embedding innovative, data-driven approaches into the MSP ecosystem.



Indonesia's strong philanthropic culture and alignment with the SDGs offer a solid foundation to deepen impact.

**The next step is to amplify reach by bridging regional disparities, strengthening PSOs' M&E capabilities, and embedding cross-sector, data-driven collaboration across platforms.**



Given the significant role **domestic funders** can play in MSPs across the region, particularly in **India and Indonesia**, it is worthwhile to note the following roles that UHNIs, HNIs, and Family Foundations can play in MSPs.

*Easiest and most common entry point*

### Impact Donor

- Provides low-risk, flexible funding to strengthen the institutional capacity of trusted organisations engaged in credible MSPs.
- Funds research and impact measurement initiatives to build a strong evidence base demonstrating the effectiveness of MSPs.



### Guardian Angel

- Provides unrestricted funding, mentorship, and strategic guidance to early-stage MSPs.
- Uses personal influence to connect emerging MSPs with influential networks and help unlock resources.



### Impact Investor

- Co-invests with institutional funders and development finance institutions to de-risk and scale up MSP interventions.
- Uses philanthropic capital strategically to demonstrate proof of concept of MSPs and catalyse additional funding.



### Catalytic Donor

- Funds high-risk, innovative MSPs and engages closely with the organisations to test pilot programmes/ approaches.




### System Influencer

- Engages with governments to shape regulatory frameworks and institutionalise MSPs at a systemic level.
- Serves as high-level convener, orchestrating cross-sector collaboration to drive system-wide change through MSPs.


**TATA TRUSTS**

*High risk,  
high involvement*

For countries where the PSE is in a nascent stage (**The Philippines, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka**), focus should be on **building out the support ecosystem**. In the short term, existing PSOs or CSOs should be identified to serve as backbone organisations and provide supporting services within MSPs, influencing both domestic and international philanthropic actors to mobilise resources for bridging knowledge gaps and convening stakeholders to determine priorities within the philanthropic ecosystem. In the long term, existing PSOs should be strengthened and newer PSOs for complementary capabilities should be established.



In countries where the PSE is still emerging, the focus must be on **strengthening the support ecosystem—by bridging knowledge gaps, creating collaboration platforms, and building PSO capabilities** to enable a more effective and inclusive philanthropic environment.





**While these recommendations offer some perspective and direction, it is necessary to acknowledge that various action steps can be undertaken by different stakeholders to strengthen the PSE in South and Southeast Asia.** The ultimate goal is to inspire collaborative thinking and collective action across all actors. The responsibility extends beyond PSOs, philanthropic funders, private sector, and large global philanthropic players; every stakeholder, including smaller actors like CSOs, have a role to play. Local actors, in particular, can use these recommendations as a starting point to better align their work to the needs of the philanthropic ecosystem of the country and carve out their priorities.

**As the next steps, WINGS may undertake the following:**

- **Identify anchor PSOs within the seven countries**, prioritising those with nascent PSEs, to drive the recommended actions through **forming country-specific working groups**.
- **Engage international and domestic philanthropic actors** to take ownership of specific action steps, such as **convening stakeholders regionally, curating knowledge**, and providing guidance to support the emergence of regional PSOs and MSPs.
- Provide local actors with **strategic guidance through knowledge exchanges** and share best practices from experience in shaping PSEs and enabling multi-stakeholder responses in other countries.

The WINGS and Sattva teams remain available to provide guidance and support to organisations working to bolster the philanthropic ecosystem, as needed.

# Annexures

## Annexure 1: Scoring of PSEs across 4Cs and Diversity

Each indicator has been scored from 1 to 5 based on a range of potential scenarios. The following table shows an example of scoring the indicator Diversity among PSE stakeholder types in the ecosystem.

Nascent	Emerging	Tipping Point	Gaining momentum	Ideal
Critical PSE stakeholder types are missing from or working against the ecosystem (e.g. Government)	A few PSE stakeholders are missing from the ecosystem, who are not critical to the maintenance of the local ecosystem and are concentrated in either rural or urban areas	Most PSE stakeholder types are present in the ecosystem, but some are more active and contribute more than others, and are concentrated in either rural or urban areas	Most PSE stakeholder types are present in the ecosystem, in both urban and rural areas, and contribute to philanthropy to a similar extent	Most PSE stakeholder types are active in philanthropy to a similar extent and interact with one another, in both urban and rural areas

The following table shows the rating of PSEs across all indicators under the 4Cs and Diversity.

Category and key indicators analysed	India	Indonesia	Philippines	Malaysia	Bangladesh	Pakistan	Sri Lanka
Country average	3.6	2.5	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.2

Capacity	3.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
(a) Density of PSOs by function served	4	2	2	1	1	1	1
(b) Investment in strengthening PSE and enabling cross-organisational partnerships	3	3	2	1	1	1	1
(c) Geographic spread of PSOs in terms of regions served	3	2	2	1	1	1	1

Capability	4.0	3.0	1.5	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
(a) Number of PSO knowledge-sharing platforms available within the PSE	4	3	1	2	1	1	1
(b) Availability of skilled personnel and leadership in the PSE	4	3	2	2	1	1	1

Connection	4.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.0
(a) Number of MSPs within the PSE	4	2	1	1	2	1	1
(b) Number of PSOs who are a part of MSPs within the PSE	4	2	1	1	1	1	1
(c) Number of structured spaces that exist to enable cross-organisational partnerships	5	2	1	1	1	1	1

Credibility	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
(a) The impact demonstrated by PSOs as part of various initiatives and how their services are perceived in the ecosystem	3	3	1	1	1	1	1
(b) Frequency and extent to which PSOs are involved in the ecosystem's initiatives	2	3	1	1	1	1	1

Diversity	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
(a) Diversity among PSE stakeholder types in the ecosystem	4	3	2	2	2	2	2
(b) Co-existence of diverse approaches on philanthropy in the PSE	4	3	2	2	2	2	2

## Annexure 2: List of stakeholders interviewed

Country	Respondent name	Designation	Organisation/MSP Initiative
Bangladesh	Abdallah Naeefy	Country Manager, Bangladesh	Porticus
India	Jasmer Dhingra	Director - Programs (India), IDH	Regenerative Production Landscape Collaborative
India	N M Prusty	Vice Chair	Coalition for Food and Nutrition Security
India	Arjun Bahadur	Principal, Sattva	Saamuhika Shakti
India	Diwakar Sharma	Program Director, Piramal Foundation	Aspirational Districts Collaborative
India	Jinny Uppal	Director and Head	Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy, Ashoka University
India	Lavisha Arora	Senior Programme Manager, Climate and Finance	Shakti Sustainable Energy Foundation (on Greening of Finance by Women)
India	Antara Bose	Corporate and Philanthropic Engagement Coordinator	Shakti Sustainable Energy Foundation (on Greening of Finance by Women)
India	Nisha Dhawan	Vice President, Impact and Influence	EMpower
India	Parnasha Banerjee	Director	Dasra (on NFSSM Alliance and ClimateRISE Alliance)
India	Nandika Kumari	Associate Director	Dasra (on 10to19 Adolescents Collaborative)

Country	Respondent name	Designation	Organisation/MSP Initiative
India	Suveera Venkatesh	Team Lead	Dasra (on 10to19 Adolescents Collaborative)
India	Gauri Sanghi	Manager	Dasra (on 10to19 Adolescents Collaborative and ClimateRISE Alliance)
India	Rahul Kulshreshtha	Manager	Office of the Principal Scientific Advisor to the Government of India (for Manthan)
India	Smarnita Shetty	Co-Founder and CEO	India Development Review
India	Sushant Pathak	Senior Program Manager Lead	Quest Alliance (on 10to19 Dasra Adolescents Collaborative)
India	Simranpreet Singh Oberoi	Co-Founder and CEO, Sanjhi Sikhiya	Punjab Education Collective
India	Priti Sridhar	CEO, Mariwala Health Initiative	Alliance for Suicide Prevention
India	Saisha M	Grant Manager, Mariwala Health Initiative	Alliance for Suicide Prevention
Indonesia	Dinda Sonaloka Asghar	Program and Communication Manager	Filantropi Indonesia (covering perspectives on five philanthropy clusters)
Indonesia	Ika Setyowati Sutedjo	Partnership and Membership Officer	Filantropi Indonesia
Indonesia	Indah Nawang Wulan	Program and Documentation Officer	Filantropi Indonesia
Indonesia	Fenny Ng	Country Head, Singapore	Tanoto Foundation
Indonesia	Angginta Ayu	Strategic Planning and Partnership	Tanoto Foundation
Indonesia	Celia Siura	Chief Operating Officer	Common Seas Indonesia
Malaysia	Jehan Omar	Senior Manager, Malaysia	AVPN
Multiple	Charles Tan	Chief Executive Officer	The Majority Trust
Multiple	Dr. Annollette Walsh	Director of Research	Centre for Asian Philanthropy and Society
Multiple	Ly Tran	Director, APAC Network	Myriad Alliance
Multiple	Sikai Chen	Chief Operating Officer	Tri-Sector Associates
Multiple	Sue Toomey	Chief Executive Officer	Asia Community Foundation
Multiple	Sumitra Pasupathy	Independent Consultant	-
Multiple	Yash Divadkar	Associate Director	Philanthropy Asia Alliance (by Temasek Trust)
Multiple	Jessica Loo	Associate Director	Philanthropy Asia Alliance (by Temasek Trust)
Pakistan	Kashfi Arsalan	Senior Programme Officer	Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy
Pakistan	Naushin Mahmood	Senior Programme Manager	Pakistan Centre for Philanthropy
Philippines	Oman Jiao	Executive Director	Association of Foundations
Sri Lanka	Asanka Wijesinghe	Research Fellow	Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka
Sri Lanka	Asith DeSilva	Senior Manager, Social Innovation	Dialog Axiata
Sri Lanka	Chaya Dissanayake	Research Officer	Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka
Sri Lanka	Kaushalya Ariyathilaka	Managers, Programs and Grants	Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust
Sri Lanka	Sundaralingam Susikaran	Manager, Finance and Administration	Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust



## Annexure 3: List of MSPs studied

#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>India</b>		
1	Bharat EdTech Initiative	<a href="#">Link</a>
2	Karnataka Model School Pathways Program (KMSPP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
3	Urban Collective Action Network (U-CAN)	<a href="#">Link</a>
4	Regenerative Production Landscape (RPL) Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
5	Saamuhika Shakti	<a href="#">Link</a>
6	The Coalition for Food and Nutrition Security	<a href="#">Link</a>
7	Alliance for Global Good—Gender Equity and Equality	<a href="#">Link</a>
8	Alliance for Saving Mothers and Newborns (ASMAN)	<a href="#">Link</a>
9	Revitalising Rainfed Agriculture Network (RRAN)	<a href="#">Link</a>
10	Common Ground Initiative	<a href="#">Link</a>
11	10to19 Dasra Adolescents Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
12	Alliance for Suicide Prevention	<a href="#">Link</a>
13	ClimateRISE Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
14	Godavari initiative	<a href="#">Link</a>
15	India Gender Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
16	India Philanthropy Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
17	Manthan	<a href="#">Link</a>
18	Punjab Education Collective	<a href="#">Link</a>
19	The National Faecal Sludge and Septage Management Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
20	Migrants Resilience Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
21	Greening of Finance by Women	<a href="#">Link</a>
22	Aspirational Bharat Collaborative (Aspirational Districts Collaborative)	<a href="#">Link</a>
23	Skill Impact Bond (SIB)	<a href="#">Link</a>
24	The Access Alliance—Advancing Women Entrepreneurship (AWE-India Network)	<a href="#">Link</a>
25	The Grow Fund	<a href="#">Link</a>
26	Growing Livelihood Opportunities for Women (GLOW)	<a href="#">Link</a>
27	ACT	<a href="#">Link</a>
28	Anamaya, The Tribal Health Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
29	BIWAL initiative	<a href="#">Link</a>
30	Catalyst Now	<a href="#">Link</a>

#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>India</b>		
31	Coalition for Women Empowerment and The Influencers	<a href="#">Link</a>
32	CoAST India	<a href="#">Link</a>
33	COVIDActionCollab	<a href="#">Link</a>
34	Future of Impact Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
35	Future Right Skills Network	<a href="#">Link</a>
36	GivingPi	<a href="#">Link</a>
37	Impact Pi (PI India)	<a href="#">Link</a>
38	India Climate Collaborative (ICC)	<a href="#">Link</a>
39	India Sanitation Coalition	<a href="#">Link</a>
40	Life Skills Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
41	Maharashtra Village Social Transformation Foundation	<a href="#">Link</a>
42	Project Sampoorna	<a href="#">Link</a>
43	Project Swayamshree	<a href="#">Link</a>
44	Responsible Coalition for Resilient Communities (RCRC)	<a href="#">Link</a>
45	Rebuild India Fund	<a href="#">Link</a>
46	REACH India / Remote Geographies Education Alliance for Children	<a href="#">Link</a>
47	REVIVE Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
48	Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO)	<a href="#">Link</a>
49	Roundtable on Responsible Soy Association (RTRS)	<a href="#">Link</a>
50	Social Compact	<a href="#">Link</a>
51	Swashakt: Empowering Indian Women's Collectives	<a href="#">Link</a>
52	The Collaborators for Transforming Education at EdelGive	<a href="#">Link</a>
53	The India Protectors Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
54	Transform NEEV Collective	<a href="#">Link</a>
55	Women + Water Collaborative	<a href="#">Link</a>
56	WomenLead India Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
57	Women's Collective (WC)	<a href="#">Link</a>
58	Indian Mental Health Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>

#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>Indonesia</b>		
1	Joint Commitment of the Indonesian Humanitarian Development Alliance / Aliansi Pembangunan Kemanusiaan Indonesia (AP-KI)	<a href="#">Link</a>
2	Scaling Up Nutrition Indonesia	<a href="#">Link</a>
3	Philanthropy (Filantropi) for Health Cluster	<a href="#">Link</a>
4	Philanthropy (Filantropi) for Education Cluster	<a href="#">Link</a>
5	Philanthropy (Filantropi) for Climate Change Cluster	<a href="#">Link</a>
6	Coalition for Health Access for Vulnerable Groups	<a href="#">Link</a>
7	Global Mangrove Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
8	The Indonesia Multi-Donor Fund Facility for Disaster Recovery	<a href="#">Link</a>
9	SDG Venture Scaler	<a href="#">Link</a>
10	Indonesian Forestry and Climate Support (IFACS)	<a href="#">Link</a>
11	Sustainable Cities Initiative (SCI)	<a href="#">Link</a>
12	Multistakeholder Platform for Sustainable Fisheries	<a href="#">Link</a>
13	Indonesia Business Council for Sustainable Development (IBCSD)	<a href="#">Link</a>
14	KONEKSI	<a href="#">Link</a>

#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>Philippines</b>		
1	Zero Extreme Poverty Philippines 2030 (ZEP2030)	<a href="#">Link</a>
2	Kain Tayo Pilipinas	<a href="#">Link</a>
3	Basic Education Development Plan 2030	<a href="#">Link</a>
4	Brigada Pagbasa Partners Network	<a href="#">Link</a>
5	Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society	<a href="#">Link</a>
6	Asian Coalition for Housing Rights	<a href="#">Link</a>
7	The Pangingsda Natin Gawing Tama (PaNaGaT) Network	<a href="#">Link</a>
8	Woven Network	<a href="#">Link</a>
9	Freedom from Debt Coalition	<a href="#">Link</a>
10	Philippine Women's Economic Network	<a href="#">Link</a>
11	The Ashoka Support Network	<a href="#">Link</a>
12	Investing in Women (IW)	<a href="#">Link</a>
13	Water Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
14	Philippine Disaster Resilience Foundation Cluster System	<a href="#">Link</a>
15	The National Nutrition Council	<a href="#">Link</a>

#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>Malaysia</b>		
1	Malaysian CSO-SDG Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
2	Nutrition Month Malaysia	<a href="#">Link</a>
3	Malaysia SDG Cities	<a href="#">Link</a>
4	GlobalSadaqah	<a href="#">Link</a>
5	Social Outcome Fund and Social Impact Exchange	<a href="#">Link</a>
6	Malaysian Healthcare Students Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>
7	Malaysian Health Coalition	<a href="#">Link</a>
8	Smart Sanitation for Water Settlements	<a href="#">Link</a>
9	Selangor Saring Precision Screening	<a href="#">Link</a>
10	Water-Food- Energy- Nexus Bluetech for Integrated Seafarming Pilot Project for Lankawi	<a href="#">Link</a>
11	MyKasih Food Aid Programme	<a href="#">Link</a>
12	Biji-biji Initiative	<a href="#">Link</a>
13	Malaysia Greening Education Partnership Roadmap 2030 (MyGEP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
14	Malaysian Collective Impact Initiative (MCII)	<a href="#">Link</a>

#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>Sri Lanka</b>		
1	Biodiversity Sri Lanka (BSL)	<a href="#">Link</a>
2	SheWorks Sri Lanka Partnership	<a href="#">Link</a>
3	Water Supply and Sanitation Improvement Project (WaSSIP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
4	Joint Programme for Peace (JPP) in Sri Lanka	<a href="#">Link</a>
5	Kelani River Multi-Stakeholder Partnership (KRMP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
6	School Meals Programme	<a href="#">Link</a>
7	SUN Business Network Sri Lanka	<a href="#">Link</a>
8	Immediate Lifesaving and Protection Support to the Most Vulnerable Affected by the Sri Lankan Economic Crisis Project	<a href="#">Link</a>
9	Lanka Microfinance Practitioners' Association	<a href="#">Link</a>
10	Lien Collaborative for Palliative Care	<a href="#">Link</a>
11	Mother and Child-Friendly Seal Initiative	<a href="#">Link</a>
12	National Action Plan for Disaster Reduction in Sri Lanka	<a href="#">Link</a>
13	Sri Lanka Preparedness Partnership (SLPP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
14	Lanka Organic Agriculture Movement	<a href="#">Link</a>
15	Rainforest Alliance	<a href="#">Link</a>



#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>Bangladesh</b>		
1	Bangladesh Water Multi-Stakeholder Partnership (BWMSP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
2	Emergency Capacity Building Project	<a href="#">Link</a>
3	Sustainable Aquaculture in Mangrove Ecosystems	<a href="#">Link</a>
4	Ultra-Poor Graduation (UPG) Initiative	<a href="#">Link</a>
5	National Agricultural Technology Program (NATP)- 2	<a href="#">Link</a>
6	Integrated Agricultural Productivity Project (IAPP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
7	Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (CDMP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
8	Local Government Initiative on Climate Change (LoGIC)	<a href="#">Link</a>
9	The Health, Nutrition, and Population Sector Program (HNPS)	<a href="#">Link</a>
10	Social Protection programme	<a href="#">Link</a>
11	Coastal Embankment Improvement Project (CEIP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
12	WASH Alliance Bangladesh	<a href="#">Link</a>
13	The Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction Project (UPPR)	<a href="#">Link</a>
14	The Bangladesh Climate Change Trust Fund (BCCTF)	<a href="#">Link</a>
15	The National Social Security Strategy (NSSS)	<a href="#">Link</a>
16	The Sustainable Enterprise Project	<a href="#">Link</a>
17	The Rural Electrification and Renewable Energy Project (REPD)	<a href="#">Link</a>
18	The Strengthening Public Financial Management (SPFM) Program	<a href="#">Link</a>
19	The Urban Health Initiative (UHI)	<a href="#">Link</a>
20	Oporajita	<a href="#">Link</a>

#	Name of MSP	Reference
<b>Pakistan</b>		
1	Pakistan Digital Agriculture Consortium	<a href="#">Link</a>
2	MenEngage Alliance Pakistan	<a href="#">Link</a>
3	The Punjab Education Sector Programme (PESP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
4	National Immunization Support Project (NISP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
5	Pakistan Water Partnership (PWP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
6	Pakistan Coalition for Education (PCE)	<a href="#">Link</a>
7	Integrated Social Protection Development Program (ISPDP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
8	Sustainable Development Solutions Network	<a href="#">Link</a>
9	Global Compact Network Pakistan	<a href="#">Link</a>
10	Pakistan Humanitarian Forum	<a href="#">Link</a>
11	Pak Rural Development Program (PRDP)	<a href="#">Link</a>
12	Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN)	<a href="#">Link</a>
13	Pakistan Agricultural Coalition	<a href="#">Link</a>
14	Alliance for Affordable Internet	<a href="#">Link</a>



