National Commission of Audit (NCA)

Submission to the Treasury and the Department of Finance

This submission addresses key issues outlined in the terms of reference for the NCA and the implications of the work of the NCA for the charities and not-for-profit sector.

November 2013

Contents Page

Introduction 3

About CCA 3

Context: not-for-profit sector (civil society) 4

Overview of key issues 5

1. Support for the National Commission of Audit 5

2. The role and scope of national government 5

2a. The regulatory environment 5

2b. Increasing the role of civil society 7

3. Efficiency and effectiveness of government expenditure 8

3a. The need to streamline Commonwealth government operations 8

3b. Performance management 9

3c. Performance reporting and accountability 10

3d. Risk management 12

3e. Timing and length of contracts 13

Conclusion 14

Introduction

This submission briefly outlines a number of significant issues for Australia's not-for-profit sector in response to the terms of reference of the National Commission of Audit (NCA). It has been prepared with Community Council for Australia (CCA) members (see listing of members in *Appendix 1*) as well as other organisations working in and with the not-for-profit sector. It is important to note that this submission does not over-ride any policy positions that may be outlined in individual submissions from CCA members. CCA has focused this submission primarily on the scope of government, and the efficiency and effectiveness of government expenditure – two key terms of reference for the NCA.

A significant level of Commonwealth government activity is focused on the provision of services through contracting and engagement with not-for-profit organisations. The achievement of improved outcomes and increased value from government expenditure in areas like health, welfare, employment, housing, emergency management, the environment, education, animal welfare, arts, sport and recreation, aged care, international development, etc. is critically dependent on the way government contracts and invests in the not-for-profit sector. CCA believes there is considerable scope to make real savings, while also achieving increased community value from government expenditure by adopting a less bureaucratic government-centric approach in these areas.

While this submission does not specify individual program savings in each of these areas of Commonwealth government expenditure, CCA believes the NCA would benefit greatly from having direct conversations with representatives of the not-for-profit sector. Many not-for-profit organisations are readily able to identify potential government savings that may also increase program effectiveness and impact. Peak bodies are often well positioned to identify potential savings. Engagement with peak bodies across major expenditure areas is strongly supported.

CCA appreciates this opportunity to provide input into the work of the NCA and hopes this submission will be given due consideration. CCA is more than willing to engage in further discussion about any issue raised in this submission.

About CCA

CCA is an independent, non-political member-based organisation dedicated to building thriving communities by enhancing the extraordinary work and effort undertaken within the not-for-profit sector in Australia. CCA seeks to change the way governments, communities and the not-for-profit sector relate to one another. This includes establishing a regulatory environment that works for community organisations and not against them.

The mission of CCA is to lead by being an effective voice on common and shared issues affecting the contribution, performance and viability of not-for-profit organisations in Australia through:

- providing thought and action leadership
- influencing and shaping sector policy agendas
- informing, educating, and assisting organisations in the sector to deal with change and build sustainable futures
- working in partnership with governments, business, and the broader Australian community.

Context: not-for-profit sector (civil society)

The not-for-profit (NFP) sector contributes over $43 billion to GDP per annum, encompasses over 600,000 organisations ranging in size from large to very small, and is estimated to employ over one million staff (or eight per cent of all employees in Australia). Current turnover exceeds approximately $100 billion annually. Over the last decade, the growth in the NFP sector is second only to the mining industry and employment growth has outstripped any other industry.

These figures only tell a small part of the story. The real value of the NFP sector is in the often unattributed contribution to the quality of life we all experience in Australia. NFPs are at the heart of our communities and are what makes us resilient as a society.

The importance of the NFP sector is now being recognised around the world with almost every government putting in place measures to drive enhancements for the sector. Smaller government and bigger community is a common theme, driven in part by savings, but also by a commitment to greater civic engagement and productivity within the NFP sector.

The recent history of the NFP sector is framed by very significant growth, but there are a number of new issues emerging suggesting the rate of growth will slow. The level of individual giving has not increased at the same level as prior to the global financial crisis in 2008, and the revenue available to governments is effectively falling in real terms against a backdrop of increasing demands and higher community expectations.

There have been numerous reports and recommendations relating to the NFP sector over the last decade, but it is only in recent times that governments have begun to enact some of these recommendations and embark on a long overdue process of reform and enhancement. In Australia there are a number of initiatives seeking to increase productivity across the not-for-profit sector. These include efforts to promote social enterprise; reduce compliance costs for NFP organisations; encourage a diversification of financing options to build a more sustainable funding base; streamline and refine the regulation of NFPs and charities; develop a clearer definition of charities; establish less bureaucratic reporting requirements while building community transparency; and improve relationships between governments and the NFP sector.

The Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC) is now operational. The establishment of the ACNC is the first time the NFP sector has had an independent regulator dedicated to serving their needs. It is a positive step towards reducing red tape and enhancing the role of the sector. While many of these initiatives are in their infancy, it is clear that the NFP productivity agenda has begun and some of the initial savings are starting to be realised.

In the context of recent changes, the NFP sector is slowly but surely finding its voice, building its power and seeking real reform that will provide substantial savings to government and tangible benefits to the community.

Given the size of the sector and its critical role in our community, and given governments are estimated to invest over $30 billion per annum in the sector, the NCA is in a strong position to advise the Commonwealth government on ways to achieve significant and sustainable economic and social benefits. Smarter investment in strengthening our communities and our NFPs, as outlined in this submission, will provide real savings and a positive dividend to governments and the community.

Overview of key issues

1. Support for the National Commission of Audit

CCA strongly supports the policy goal of ensuring government operations and expenditure creates public value. In doing so, CCA further recognizes the importance of providing transparency and accountability while promoting efficiency and effective achievement of outcomes.

To this end, CCA supports the primary objectives of the National Commission of Audit, specifically:

- ***Ensure taxpayers are receiving value-for-money from each dollar spent;***
- ***Eliminate wasteful spending;***
- ***Identify areas of unnecessary duplication between the activities of the Commonwealth and other levels of government;***
- ***Identify areas or programs where Commonwealth involvement is inappropriate, no longer needed, or blurs lines of accountability; and***
- ***Improve the overall efficiency and effectiveness with which government services and policy advice are delivered.*** *(NCA Terms of Reference Pg. 1)*

2. The role and scope of national government (NCA – Terms of Reference)

2a. The regulatory environment

CCA believes the Commonwealth government has a very important role to play in establishing a nationally consistent regulatory environment that enhances the work of the not-for-profit sector by reducing duplication, red tape and compliance costs.

It was the Productivity Commission report into the *Contribution of the Not-for-profit Sector* in 2010 that first really documented what most people in the sector have been aware of for years – there is a tremendous amount of waste involved in complying with all the regulatory bodies seeking to impose their own requirements on civil society organisations. Many of these requirements are generated by governments seeking duplicate information.

CCA and most of the not-for-profit sector have supported the Commonwealth taking a lead role in this space and developing a single national charities passport administered by an independent and responsive regulator – the Australian Charities and Not-for-Profit Commission (ACNC) - as one way of reducing the compliance burden. At present if a charity wants to gain any kind of concession from a local, state or Commonwealth agency it needs to demonstrate its bona fides as a charity and each has different requirements. A charity passport with one number (aligned to ABN etc.) listed on the publicly searchable ACNC national register would end the seemingly continuous requirement for more and more information that nobody really uses.

Below is an example of the compliance matrix involved in registering to undertake a national (or online) fundraiser. This table provides an overview of what is currently required for each state and territory as part of the application process to obtain a national fundraising license.

	ACT	NSW	SA	TAS	VIC	QLD	WA
Advertising requirements for a public notice						X	
Amount intended to raise in jurisdiction	X						X
Appeal manager details					X		
Auditors details	X	X	X			X	X
Bank account details		X			X	X	X
All Directors details (name, position and address)			X		X	X	
All Directors signatures					X		
Certified copies of supporting documents						X	X
Copies of supporting documents (not certified)	X	X			X		
Covering letter							X
Dates required for the licence				X			
Fundraising activities to be undertaken	X		X				X
Third party fundraising provider details			X		X		
Police check					X		X
State address if intending to fundraise in that state		X			X		
Statement of purpose			X	X	X	X	X

In many ways, this is just the tip of the iceberg as each state and territory requires different validation for information, varying levels of detail and additional requirements for each application. Some of the applications involve payment for obtaining required information. For example: the West Australian application requires police checks; and a public notice advertisement is required as part of the Queensland application process.

If these requirements were imposed on any area of business, you could expect a massive outcry about unnecessary red tape, the restraint of trade and the impediments to building a productive Australia created by an antiquated federated approach to regulation. Yet, this is just one example of the ridiculous compliance costs imposed on not-for-profit organisations.

Consequently, most not-for-profit organisations want the Commonwealth government to take a lead on reducing this regulatory burden created through failing to have one nationally agreed set of requirements for all not-for-profit organisations.

2b. Increasing the role of civil society

Many CCA members wanted this submission to address what they see as inefficiencies in specific areas of government program expenditure and compliance. Given the breadth of CCA membership and issues covered (health, welfare, housing, employment, indigenous, arts, sports, recreation, animal welfare, environment, emergency management, etc.) this is not possible in the scope of this submission. It is important however, to note that not-for-profit organisations could often deliver better outcomes more efficiently and effectively if they were given more scope to develop and implement their own proven and or innovative responses to government policy goals and program objectives.

It is questionable whether the Commonwealth government should automatically or autocratically take the lead role in program development. Often programs are going to be more effective if governments take what might be perceived as a greater risk and allow communities and their civil organisations to be active partners in addressing local issues or achieving other government policy objectives.

Some of the issues around the efficiency and effectiveness of government programs are addressed in other areas of this submission, but these issues also go to the heart of what the real role of the Commonwealth government should and could be in addressing community concerns and meeting policy and program objectives.

CCA hope the NCA will take account of the largely untapped policy and program development resource that resides in our not-for-profit organisations. These are the organisations most strongly linked to their communities, and most likely to be able to anticipate program outcomes.

CCA believes that when considering the role of the Commonwealth government, it is important to focus on how best to achieve the priority policy goals. The default position should not be having government officials develop or prescribe program inputs and objectives. Adopting a less government centric approach in developing program objectives, mechanisms or delivery methods may provide a real opportunity to more effectively and efficiently achieve government policy goals.

3. Efficiency and effectiveness of government expenditure (NCA – Terms of Reference)

3a. The need to streamline Commonwealth government operations

There is a dog's breakfast of approaches to the contracting of not-for-profit organisations across Commonwealth agencies. It seems each agency has its own rationale, its own set of mandatory components and priority principles for their particular procurement practices, contract management and reporting requirements. Even within some agencies there are high levels of inconsistency in approaches and processes.

The Productivity Commission has highlighted the failure of Australian governments to adopt a more measured, efficient and outcome focused approach to the outsourcing of services, contracting and funding of not-for-profit organisations. While there are many important findings in the Productivity Commission Report into the Contribution of the Not-for-Profit Sector, the following two recommendations are particularly pertinent when considering the issues related to the work of the NCA:

> ***Australian governments should urgently review and streamline their tendering, contracting, reporting and acquittal requirements in the provision of services to reduce compliance costs. This should seek to ensure that the compliance burden associated with these requirements is proportionate to the funding provided and risk involved. Further, to reduce the current need to verify the provider's corporate or financial health on multiple occasions, even within the same agency, reviews should include consideration of:***
>
> - ***development of Master Agreements that are fit-for-purpose, at least at a whole-of-agency level***
> - ***use of pre-qualifying panels of service providers.***
>
> *(Recommendation 12.7 Contribution of the Not-for-Profit Sector, Productivity Commission, 2010)*
>
> ***The Department of Finance and Deregulation should develop a common set of core principles to underpin all government service agreements and contracts in the human services area. This should be done in consultation with relevant government departments and agencies and service providers.***
>
> *(Recommendation 12.8 Contribution of the Not-for-Profit Sector, Productivity Commission, 2010)*

The trend towards increasing compliance and micro-management of not-for-profit organisations as a way of deflecting risk is not only counter-productive to innovation and effectiveness, but also displays a woeful lack of understanding about the importance of real risk management practices. As pointed out in a recent Commonwealth Financial Accountability Review (CFAR) Paper:

> ***'… over time there has been a shift in emphasis towards controls and compliance at the expense of flexibility and performance. There has been a tendency to respond to perceived risks and failure with more rules and tighter controls ... the framework should encourage users to focus on achieving results, not complying with rules. '***
>
> *(CFAR Discussion Paper, March 2012, Executive Summary, pg. 2)*

There is very limited evidence to suggest that more detailed contracts containing more conditions, increased compliance and reporting requirements, more frequent reporting and shorter contract periods reduce risk or improve outcomes. In fact, there are many areas of government contracting where longer contracts and less compliance may be a much better way to manage risk, including in critical areas such as indigenous health and wellbeing programs and services.

The achievement of important government priorities and policy objectives is not risk free. Compliance driven avoidance of risk is a good way to ensure program and policy ineffectiveness.

Perhaps of equal importance is that in many areas of government activity there is a lack of understanding about the actual risks involved in the services being funded, the organisations being funded to accept those risks, and the best ways to manage these risks.

This current confusion over risks (discussed later in more detail) is one aspect of a larger problem. Governments should be focused on delivering sustained change rather than investing tax payer funds into inadequate responses that continue to have little or no real impact on the critical issues in Australian communities.

The push for increased engagement at a local level and greater control in how to address local issues is currently driving reform in the way many governments around the world are approaching social and community issues. As highlighted in the Commonwealth Financial Accountability Review Paper:

> ***'Changes are occurring in the way government meets citizen expectations and policy challenges. Increasingly, the government collaborates with other jurisdictions and parties in designing and delivering services. Over time this is likely to include greater participation by citizens in service design and delivery as a means of developing more effective and personalised policies and programs. This will challenge historical concepts of accountability and transparency and bureaucratic control.'***
>
> *(Chapter 3, The Case For change, pg. 17)*

Coalition governments have previously adopted an approach that involved more direct funding of service providers and their peak bodies in addressing a number of social, health and welfare programs. CCA supports this approach provided it involves active engagement with the not-for-profit sector and the communities they serve; that it draws upon evidence to support decision making rather than relying upon the centralized wisdom that resides within various government agencies; and that it involves clear accountabilities and transparent processes.

A quick review of emerging literature in this area suggests that direct engagement with community and civil society by governments is now considered best practice in developing government programs and services around the world.

3b. Performance management

The major problem with most performance monitoring currently undertaken is that it is often disconnected from policy goals. The experience of not-for-profit organisations is that the compliance and reporting requirements for many of the contracts and funding grants they receive are not directly related to the actual policy goal under which the relevant program operates.

For example, the government policy goal might be to increase retention of Indigenous students in schools; the funded program may be a home visiting program within Indigenous communities; what is measured might be expenditure on social workers conducting home visits. Whether the home visits actually increase retention is not measured. (In practice, there are a number of programs that have been found to significantly increase indigenous retention in schools, such as the promotion of inter-community sporting competitions where participation is dependent on students having attended school. Despite their effectiveness, programs like these often have to get separate support from outside agencies because they do not exclusively focus on school retention.)

In such 'outcome blind' performance management systems even the best policy goals can be lost in translation by government agencies because those responsible for the policy area focus on inputs and outputs within specific programs, rather than achieving the desired policy outcomes.

Not-for-profit organisations exist for and are driven by purpose. They seek to achieve positive sustainable outcomes for the communities they serve, but with most government funding, not-for-profit organisations are rarely allocated the tools, time or resources needed to provide the kind of performance reporting that might inform better programs and services in support of government policy.

Another barrier to good performance management is the culture of secrecy around information in many Commonwealth agencies which is often defended as being politically useful – *'if we do not know what is wrong we cannot be held accountable'*. It appears it is sometimes better not to know than to know that a program is not working. Yet, in terms of delivering on policy and program goals, greater transparency is critical to ensure the money being spent is providing value to the community.

If the NCA is committed to ensuring government money is well spent, it may have to support greater investment to ensure appropriate performance management systems are in place. This includes ensuring governments have the capacity to accept and encourage reporting of failures so that non-performing organisations or programs can be improved and drive better government performance.

3c. Performance reporting and accountability

The focus in any discussion about government reporting and accountability needs to be on the achievement of policy goals, not inputs and outputs determined by officials with limited understanding of the area, the communities involved, or the specific services being provided.

Performance management is really about accountability because we know that what gets measured and reported gets done. As the 2012 Commonwealth Financial Accountability Review Paper stated:

> ***It is preferable to have fewer, more meaningful indicators that focus on what matters.***
> *(Chapter 7, Improving performance, pg. 50)*

Measurement of what matters (the policy goals and objectives) is good, but measurement of inputs and activity are often pointless in terms of improving the performance of government funded programs. This is why better, not more, reporting of performance is so important.

> ***'Even where good evaluation and review exists, this information is not readily available to inform government decision making, especially on cross-portfolio matters…. There is no point to evaluation if results are not used.***
> *(Chapter 7, Improving performance pgs. 52 and 53)*

The fact that real performance measures are often not available within Commonwealth government agencies is unacceptable. Of even more concern is that where this information exists, it is not more widely available to inform better investment and better administration of government programs and services.

In practice, it seems that even where there is useful performance data, it is not always referred to in determining future funding arrangements. Each new procurement process is treated as a stand-alone activity, operating largely in a vacuum with little use of past performance data to inform future contracting. This is particularly true where the performance information traverses a number of areas and government agencies.

In most Commonwealth government agencies there is clearly a lack of reference to the kinds of performance management and monitoring that we might expect to be central to decision making for both business investment and development of not-for-profit organisations. All too often the fundamental elements that drive performance, including whether the organisation and its leadership team have a record of achievement, are simply not factored into either the performance management and reporting processes, or the risk management framework.

It is important to acknowledge that simply being able to demonstrate compliance with rules is not necessarily consistent with better performance management or monitoring. As with other investments, governments need to be able to say on what basis they are choosing to allocate funds to a particular organisation, and the rationale for funding decisions needs to be a lot more than how pretty each submission was or how many 'buzz words' were included.

If we want to get better at meeting government policy goals, we need to get better at both measuring and reporting performance. Wherever possible, performance measurement and reporting should provide comparable (over time and over programs) indicators of actual performance, not just activity.

Governments invest billions of dollars of public money in purchasing services to achieve policy goals. It is not unreasonable to expect the outcomes of government investment to be reported transparently to the community which has a real stake in the policy outcomes.

In the not-for-profit sector, it seems that more (often irrelevant or unhelpful) information is being collected and less is actually being reported or used. This is a situation that leads to enormous frustration within the organisations being asked to provide information to government agencies. Many not-for-profit organisations have repeatedly raised concerns about the level of detail being requested in areas related to inputs and outputs, while no data on outcomes is collected.

Despite the lack of real performance information, government agencies remain reluctant to provide the tools, time or resources necessary to enable not-for-profit organisations to collect outcome and impact data. For example, knowing how many beds have been used overnight in a residential drug treatment agency does not tell you if you are actually reducing drug related problems. To follow up clients of drug treatment agencies requires a real investment in applying sound research approaches. Many not-for-profit agencies lack the resources to undertake these kinds of measures. This information however, is critical to knowing whether the investment in a particular treatment program is beneficial or effective in achieving policy aims.

Ideally a percentage of all government allocated funding would be directed towards real performance measurement including following up on clients or users of services. This approach is clearly the exception rather than normal practice, even in very high expenditure areas such as health. Consequently, government agencies go on funding programs and services without knowing their real outcomes, their actual impact on the users of the services, on the community, or whether they are in fact contributing to government policy priorities.

Performance reporting is critical to performance management. You cannot have one without the other. Transparent performance reporting will drive real improvements in performance, but not unless governments actually commit to collecting and making public this level of outcome and impact reporting.

This is a challenge that CCA hopes the NCA will not only acknowledge, but also be prepared to recommend greater investment in. The bottom line is that the NFP sector needs less compliance, but increased actual performance measurement and accountability.

3d. Risk management

There are real questions to be asked about the capacity of Commonwealth procurement officers to understand the complexity of risk management, particularly in the context of the need for risk taking as part of good contract management.

When we think about whether to invest in a business we tend to think in terms of levels of risk against possible return. It is generally understood that the nature of the people involved in the management of a company, the level of expertise, competence and experience, the past track record of the management team, the past track record of the company, the existing level of capitalization, who else has invested, the proposed business plan, cash flows, potential competitors, market share, etc. are all factored into judging the risk and likely return.

There is no evidence that risk management frameworks are being applied in the way governments choose to invest in, fund, contract or grant money to not-for-profit organisations. It is much more likely that there will be some form of tender process in which relatively inexperienced government officers will make a decision based on predetermined criteria relating almost exclusively to descriptions of the work to be undertaken – not the organisations that might undertake the work or their previous track record.

What is of even more of a concern is that such tender processes often operate with little or no real engagement with prospective tenderers. There is little real risk analysis and the process operates in a vacuum with no reference to organizational history, content knowledge, performance information or real market analysis. As recommended by the Productivity Commission:

> ***When entering into service agreements and contracts for the delivery of services, government agencies should develop an explicit risk management framework in consultation with providers through the use of appropriately trained staff. This should include:***
>
> - ***allocating risk to the party best able to bear the risk,***
> - ***establishing agreed protocols for managing risk over the life of the contract.***
>
> *(Recommendation 12.6 Contribution of the Not-for-Profit Sector, Productivity Commission, 2010)*

The Commonwealth Financial Accountability Review Paper acknowledges that implementing this approach requires culture change:

> ***Leaders must also support innovation by fostering creativity and ideas – a culture of risk aversion may prevail if innovation is not rewarded. … Risk management is not about eliminating all risks.***
> *(Chapter 8, Engaging with risk, pg. 60)*

3e. Timing and length of contracts

One of the major obstacles to good management of government programs and services is the issue of capacity to work to timelines that allow real change to be both achieved and measured.

In areas such as human service delivery, it is inconceivable that there is any place for a twelve month contract. Simply establishing a program or services, employing staff, obtaining appropriate accommodation, communications, transport and other infrastructure requires time and resources. Yet some government agencies expect not-for-profit organisations to be able to turn program delivery on and off like a tap.

The issue of timing becomes critical when talking about planning and budgeting, staffing, infrastructure, capacity building, performance measurement and outcome improvements.

While there is a place for shorter term pilot programs and one-off grants, these should be the exception, not the norm. There should be a three year minimum for most ongoing contracts for services provided by not-for-profit organisations that involve the employment of staff. As part of this approach, there should also be a minimum six monthly notice period to enable staff entitlements and infrastructure leasing to be properly managed.

If there is one short-term easy to implement strategy that could significantly reduce risk and improve performance, it is adopting a more realistic approach to the length of contracts and timing of notices for the renewal or cessation of program funding. Such a measure should be a very high priority for the NCA.

Conclusion

CCA could have given many anecdotal examples about dysfunctional program management by government agencies. The reality is that despite numerous attempts to improve these processes over the years, there are some government agencies where the culture and practice of government contracting with not-for-profit organisations is counter-productive to the achievement of government policy.

Perhaps of equal concern is that concepts such as performance management, performance reporting and risk management have been deconstructed and reassembled in forms that disguise their original purpose.

Contrary to the perception of some government officials, there are many charities and not-for-profit organisations that not only have the skills and expertise to develop, implement and evaluate programs, but these organisations also have a real understanding of what might best achieve government policy objectives. Unfortunately these skills and capacities are rarely exploited by government despite the potential for real savings and improved effectivenss.

CCA strongly supports the need for the NCA to push for real reform in the ongoing engagement between not-for-profit organisations and Commonwealth agencies. The level of counter-productive compliance activity and lack of performance based management is not only an example of government inefficiency and waste, but is also having a negative impact on not-for-profit organisations, governments and the broader community. It cannot continue.

Current Membership – Community Council for Australia

Attachment 1

Organisation

Access Australia's National Infertility Network Ltd.

Access Community Group

Alcohol and Other Drugs Council of Australia

Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drugs Association ACT

ANEX

Associations Forum Pty Ltd

Australian Council for International Development

Australian Healthcare and Hospitals Association

Australian Indigenous Leadership Centre

Australian Institute of Superannuation Trustees

Australian Major Performing Arts Group

Australian Women Donors

Church Communities Australia

Connecting Up Australia

Consumers Health Forum of Australia

Drug Arm

Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education

Foundation for Young Australians

Fundraising Institute of Australia

Goodstart Early Learning

Good Beginnings Australia

HammondCare

HETA Incorporated

Hillsong Church

Illawarra Retirement Trust

Lifeline Australia

r)

Maroba Lodge Ltd

Melbourne Citymission

Missions Interlink

Mission Australia

Musica Viva Australia

Opportunity International Australia

Philanthropy Australia

Principals Australia Institute

Pro Bono Australia

RSPCA Australia

SARRAH

Save the Children

St John Ambulance Australia

Social Ventures Australia

Surf Lifesaving Australia

The ANZCA Foundation

The Australian Charities Fund

The Benevolent Society

The Big Issue

The Centre for Social Impact

The Smith Family

The Ted Noffs Foundation

Variety Australia

Volunteering Australia Inc

Wesley Mission

Wesley Mission Victoria

WorkVentures Ltd

World Vision Australia

YMCA Australia

Workplace Giving Australia

Youth Off The Streets

YWCA Australia