

Submission to the Productivity Commission: Philanthropy inquiry

Krystal Ha

Introduction

My main motivation for donating to charity is that I want to do as much good as I can. Because of that motivation, I care about which charities have the most impact. When I know the charity I'm giving to is highly effective and endorsed by organisations I trust, it gives me the confidence to donate more.

I think government policies that focus on impact and increase confidence that impact is being achieved are the key to achieving the goals of this inquiry.

I would like to raise with the Inquiry:

1. The need to realign DGR status with the values of today's Australians (2.ii, 3.ii, 5, 6)
2. Allowing Public Benevolent Institutions to properly support their communities (2.iii, 3.i)
3. The way in which DGR-status charities shaping Government policy can make democracy work better for communities (3.i, 5, 6.iii)

I have donated to effective charities, and work to support local philanthropic and community groups. I'd like to do more of this over time. I think the changes I recommend in this submission would make it easier for me to be involved, and also help other Australians to donate more and participate more in their communities. The changes could almost dramatically increase the good we achieve through this work.

Issue One: DGR status

Animal welfare and global catastrophic risk reduction should be DGR classes

As I see it, the most important issue is that DGR status needs to be broadened to include things that young people today care about – specifically reducing global catastrophic risks and supporting the well-being of animals.

I want to engage with my community around the reduction of catastrophic disaster risks, but currently, the community organisation around these kinds of risks seems limited to things like my local volunteer fire brigade. I of course support the work of the local fire brigade, but it's not a fit for my skills and interests. If organisations working on reducing the risk of catastrophic disasters had DGR status they would be better able to find ways for me to connect with my peers and volunteer to do good. I know, post-COVID and given the war in Ukraine, that a lot of my peers are really worried about worse future pandemics and the need to reduce the risk of a nuclear war. These are modern concerns, but DGR regulation hasn't kept up.

In the same way, my peers and I care deeply about the welfare of animals. While the animal charities I support can be "charities" under the Charities Act, they can't get DGR status under the Tax Act. I understand that this is because DGR status is limited to things like the short-term direct care and rehabilitation of lost or mistreated animals. While any animal

suffering is a tragedy, it's obvious to me that it would be far more effective to give DGR status to charities that are seeking to prevent animals from needing this kind of direct care in the first place. Everyone knows prevention is better than cure, so why should the law incentivise treatment over prevention?

I really think the exclusion of these two cause areas from DGR status hurts our ability to do good. These causes are recognised by sophisticated charity evaluators as being high-impact and allowed to accept tax-deductible donations internationally, but excluded here in Australia. If Government wants to increase donations to charities and increase the ability of charities to build social connections, it needs to give DGR status to these high-impact cause areas that today's Australians are so passionate about.

[Issue Two: PBIs and community building](#)

The Charities Act should be amended to resolve confusion about PBIs, including “dominant purpose”

The way Public Benevolent Institutions are regulated is outdated and should be absorbed into the Charities Act. The Law Council of Australia and the ACNC are regularly debating the meaning of the cases from the 1930s and 1940s that define how PBIs can operate. This is not helpful for organisations, communities, or their ability to do charity in an impactful way. The legal conversation has lost track of the policy intent.

An obvious example of this lack of focus on outcomes is the dispute over the meaning of “dominant purpose”. Without re-stating legal arguments, the ACNC seems to think that a charity that is a PBI has to have its PBI-purpose as its “overriding” purpose, and therefore it can't also have other purposes from the Charities Act. The Law Council thinks this reading is a misunderstanding of the meaning of “dominant purpose” and that having a purpose from the Charities Act shouldn't disqualify a PBI.

This is just one example, and who is “right” doesn't matter. What matters is that having critical definitions about how a charity can do its business buried in arcane case law that doesn't have a clear reading and isn't aligned with the Government's policy intent is not efficient or effective.

In the case of “dominant purpose”, it's clear that Government policy has no concern with a charity pursuing multiple purposes. This is clear because the Charities Act allows a charity to have multiple purposes. This is common sense – no public policy purpose is served by requiring separate organisations for separate charitable purposes (indeed, the administrative inefficiencies that it creates are contrary to good public policy). And this has real-world implications for how PBIs can engage in fundraising, do impactful work, and support their communities.

“Dominant purpose” is just one example of common law that is no longer helpful. There is also confusion around other phrases like “direct relief”.

The Productivity Commission should recommend amendments to the Charities Act to override the common law and create a new charity type that is not mutually exclusive with

other charity types. The precise details can be resolved by ACNC-led consultation and Government decision.

Issue Three: Policy Advocacy

The Role of Charities in Shaping Public Policy

In many cases, and particularly in the area of averting catastrophic risks, engaging with the government on policy is a crucial component of achieving better outcomes for the world.

For example, while there is a valuable role for non-government organisations like the International Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons to play in reducing nuclear risk, at the end of the day, it is governments that possess the nuclear weapons stockpiles, set the rules about the acquisition of fissionable material and nuclear technology, and ratify international treaties.

Charities have real value to add to these conversations, including investing resources in policy analysis, accessing global talent, and progressing the public policy conversations. In many ways, the activity of the not-for-profit sector on a topic reduces the burden on governments. Historically, many important policy ideas that have shaped modern society have emerged from outside of government - like the 40-hour work week or approaches to tobacco safety.

While charities are allowed to participate in policy discussions, many charities that focus on policy change as a primary means of achieving their goals are excluded from DGR status. This exclusion should be reconsidered, as charities that work to prevent catastrophic disasters or promote animal welfare through policy change have a valuable role to play in the public policy conversation.

Conclusion

The Role of Charities in Shaping Public Policy

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.

I trust this information and perspective has been valuable to the Productivity Commission.