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.

1. Expanding DGR status to the high impact cause areas that align with the values of modern Australians *(2.ii, 3.ii, 5, 6)*
2. The benefits of rigorous charity evaluation *(3.ii, 6.iii)*

**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 the 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.

**Charity evaluation is a practical change that could make a big difference**

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.

**Government must lead the way**

In addition to the above arguments, if the Australian Government wants to double philanthropic giving and increase impact, it should lead from the front.

Australia’s Overseas Direct Aid as a proportion of Gross National Income (GNI)—the official measure of development assistance—is expected to remain at the 2021–22 level of 0.20%.

This continues to place Australia well below the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) country average of 0.32%.

In 2020 Australia ranked 21 out of 29 OECD DAC countries on the generosity of its aid, measured by the ODA-to-GNI ratio. On current estimates, Australia’s ODA-to-GNI ratio is expected to tail off to 0.17% by 2025–26.

The UN’s ODA target is to spend 0.7 per cent of GNI on ODA every year. If the Australian Government wants to double giving by its citizens, it should show that it means business by doubling its own giving and focusing on using evidence to double the impact of the giving that it does do.

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