

Q1) Does mandated CSR spending by all organizations within a particular country or market reduce the benefits an individual organization can expect to gain from its CSR programs?

Individual organizations can gain some benefits from their contributions towards CSR. It can help them be well recognized by people which can lead to sales increase, and therefore their profits will increase. Furthermore, public image of the participating organizations tends to be improved as good reputation is considered as one of the important factors in which consumers choose to evaluate companies and service providers

Q2)Do you think other countries should pass a law similar to Section 135 of the India Companies Act? Why or why not? If so, should the amount required for CSR spending be higher than two percent of average net profit?

Regarding if the other countries should have a law as the Indian section 135, sure, the other countries have to apply section 135 it benefits the society by solving social issues like, hunger, as well as improving the education and healthcare, reducing poverty that has been a huge issue nowadays, paying the society back to the support given by them, preserving the environment, and helping the governments to meet the needs of the citizens.

Although, it comes back to the company with good advantages by gaining the goodwill of the community, and fostering a good business practice, spending money of their net worth and getting it back as an advertisement, making a good and noble competition between the companies.

And about if %2 is enough, I think %2 is more than enough, to be clear, there are thousands of corporates in each country, if each corporate spent %2 of their net worth that will be a fortune and can help a lot.

There is no need to spend more than %2 if the net worth of a company is 100m then the donated cost is 2m for each company, imagine that there are thousands of them, so I see it more than enough to spend %2 of the net worth on CSR activities