

Productivity Commission Call to Action

Introduction

Communities built on philanthropy are bedrocks of social cohesion. Historically, institutions such as RSLs and Rotary Clubs were centres of community identity. They provided an outlet for generosity, a space for altruistic activity, and a place where people feel like they belonged.

Young Australia is much less engaged with these groups. Their place in our cultural identity has slipped significantly, and unless charity incentive structures are updated to align with what motivates younger Australians, we risk losing these kinds of institutions and the community value they create.

This is not to say that philanthropy no longer plays a role in modern Australia's community structure. It just comes in a different form. A key example of these new networks are effective altruism groups, which are now at the helm of the philanthropic community amongst young Australians, with representation in major universities and cities. Effective altruism is not alone in being connected to these demographics, "One for the World" groups are similar. While tax-deductible donations can be made to Rotary, they can't be made to their modern equivalents.

Crucial for understanding the changing shape of the altruistic community is their shifting causes of interest. Rather than an internal or local focus, these groups consider global impacts and are concerned with long-term and catastrophic risk prevention. They also challenge the restrictive moral circles which governed historic philanthropic communities, by focusing on causes like animal welfare, the environment, and preventing human extinction.

We need reforms that seize on these trends and make sure the effective altruism clubs of today can become the Rotary clubs of the future. Strengthening community in this way requires reforming philanthropy to align with the interests and values of younger Australians. Recognising these shifting priorities is the key to both increased charitable donations and increased social cohesion.

Structure and terms of references

In this Submission I raise three issues:

- 1) The availability of DGR status for high impact cause areas (Terms of reference 2.ii, 3.ii, 5, 6)
- 2) Removing arbitrary restrictions on Public Benevolent Institutions so they can better work across causes and support community groups (Terms of reference 2.iii, 3.i)
- 3) The potential good that could be achieved by Australian based charity evaluation (Terms of reference 3.ii, 6.iii)

Although I'm a member of the community, not a charity, my views are representative of many of my peers. Further, I think the Productivity Commission should weigh the views of community members. Community members aren't bound by constitutions to make particular kinds of

arguments and, ultimately, its members of the community like me that Government wants to donate more and be more involved in community organisations.

Animal Welfare as a whole should be a DGR class, not just short-term direct care of animals (Information request 4)

I am concerned about animal welfare, including in our agricultural sector. I know, both from public polling and from interactions with my friends, family and community, that this concern is widely shared by Australians and only growing.

I think the phrasing of the charitable purpose regarding animals in the *Charities Act* makes sense. “Preventing or relieving the suffering of animals” is a clear and laudable concept. However, the way that 4.1.6 of the *Tax Act* narrows that down to organisations whose principal activity is “*providing short-term direct care to animals (but not only native wildlife) that have been lost, mistreated or are without owners*” or “*rehabilitating orphaned, sick or injured animals (but not only native wildlife) that have been lost, mistreated or are without owners*” is obviously unreasonable.

The more impactful way to help animals is a holistic approach that seeks to prevent cruelty from occurring, pursues sensible regulation about how society at large treats animals, and also provides direct care to animals that fall through the cracks. Complex problems have complex solutions. Limiting DGR – a significant boost to the efficacy of charities who can access it – to only “bandaid solutions” limits the impact of the cause overall.

I sympathise with concerns that a dramatic expansion of DGR status could have impacts on the tax base. I think, if DGR is going to be expanded gradually, prioritisation should be based on where the most positive impact can be achieved per dollar, and with a view to aligning DGR status with the values of modern Australians.

Charity evaluators, in their work assessing the potential good that could be achieved by working on different causes, consistently agree that animal welfare is one of the most impactful ways to do good. As a proxy for interest in the community, Roy Morgan has found that the trend in vegetarian eating continues to grow, with 2.5 million people in Australia (over 12% of the population) now eating all or almost all vegetarian. About 1 Australian decides to go meat-free every 5 minutes. Obviously, not everyone who cares deeply about animal welfare is a vegetarian, but this indicates that a very significant portion of the Australian population is motivated by this concern. Despite how widespread this view is, the community is currently underserved by charity law. This limits the extent to which we can make tax-deductible donations and limits the positive impact we can achieve through our donations.

PBI rules should not hamper community building (Information request 6)

I support Effective Altruism Australia and the work they’re doing to help effective altruism groups in universities and major cities. These EA groups are getting people excited about doing good, helping them think about impactful donations, running reading groups, and giving advice about impactful careers. But Effective Altruism Australia’s status as a “Public Benevolent Institution” limits the work of its community builders to align with EAA’s work on global health and poverty and “incidental” topics.

For instance, EAA community builders probably can’t facilitate a reading group on animal

wellbeing because the wellbeing of animals isn't "incidental or ancillary" to global poverty. I find it hard to understand why the law would stop the peak body of effective altruism in Australia from properly supporting effective altruism clubs in universities. I understand that a charity shouldn't just be able to do anything, because that would open up the system to abuse, but supporting university clubs and city groups with the same philosophy and philanthropic goals is well within the normal operation of philanthropy. Given the Terms of Reference are framed around building social connection, it would seem a simple change for a big improvement to recommend to Government to remove narrow, PBI-specific rules around "dominant purpose" that prevent PBIs from doing work in their communities.

A change to allow PBIs to also pursue other charitable purposes would help me and my group be more involved in our community and find more ways to do good. I think effective altruism clubs and similar groups, like One For The World, have the potential to be life-long sources of connection for younger Australians. But we need regulatory changes now so that we and these organisations can grow together.

Charity evaluation is a practical change that could make a big difference (Information request 7)

There's a right balance between money spent on marketing and fundraising, operations, and charitable interventions themselves. I want to donate to charities that get that balance right. But currently, I have almost no information about the impact that most Australian charities achieve. Absent that information, it's difficult to know how best to direct my donations.

I worry that some well-known charities spend large proportions of their donations on building their brand, but may ultimately be having little positive impact on the issues that they purport to care about. When I buy a service for myself I can judge if it's good. But if I buy a service for someone in need, I don't get any feedback.

A robust charity evaluation system would allow donors to sort the "wheat from the chaff" and make donations to organisations having a significant positive impact on the world. It would also decrease cynicism around charity more generally and lead to a higher overall degree of trust and support for charity in the community.

Talking to my friends and family, they're often excited to learn about organisations like GiveWell, Animals Charity Evaluators, Giving Green, and Founders Pledge because of the robust, evidence-based assessments that they make of the actual impact of charities and their initiatives. The problem is that many people haven't heard of these evaluators, and they haven't evaluated many Australian charities.

I think an Australian Government funded or endorsed charity evaluator could transform philanthropy in Australia.

I understand that there might be some practical concerns with charity evaluation of this kind. A few specific observations could alleviate most of those concerns. Specifically:

- **Practicality.** While a decade ago the practicality of charity evaluation may have been in question, a range of charity evaluators are now operating and have developed mature models to conduct evaluation. The Australian Government now has several practical options to implement charity evaluation, including building off existing expertise in the field or contracting with a proven company.

- **Resourcing requirements.** Based on public materials, and converted to Australian dollars, Charity Navigator's budget is in the order of \$6m per year and GiveWell's is in the order of \$15m per year. ACNC reports that donations to Australian charities increased to \$12.7b dollars in 2022, and Government aspires to double giving. On that basis, Australia could have a well-resourced charity evaluator for roughly 0.1% of the value of the sector. Given overseas charity evaluators have the ability to make their users' donations orders of magnitude more impactful, this is a bargain.
- **Opt-in model.** If evaluation was opt-in, charities that don't think they have the resources to measure their impact, or otherwise have concerns about evaluation, could choose not to participate. This could facilitate a graduated rollout of evaluation.

Overall, charity evaluation is a mature field, affordable to do, and can greatly increase the good work done by philanthropy in Australia. In the same way governments should do evidence-based policy, it should help Australians to do evidence-based charity.

Conclusion

Australia has the potential to create a world-leading philanthropic sector. We already know that the most effective charities can have a substantially greater impact than the average charity, but currently, there are no mechanisms in place to incentivise impact or empower donors to choose the best charities based on their impact.

By implementing the recommendations outlined in this submission, Australia can become a global leader in philanthropy. This could reverse the brain drain and attract more impact-focused charities to Australia, further enhancing the country's ability to make a positive impact on the world.