



AUSTRALIAN
COUNCIL
FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

**Joint ACFID & ACC International Relief
Supplementary Submission into the Joint Standing
Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade's Inquiry
into Establishing a Modern Slavery Act**
with input from the ACFID Child Rights Community of Practice
September 2017

1. ABOUT ACFID

The Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) is the peak body for Australia's overseas development and humanitarian not-for-profit organisations. ACFID unites Australia's non-government organisations involved in international development and humanitarian action to strengthen their collective impact against poverty.

Our vision is of a world where all people are free from extreme poverty, injustice and inequality; where the earth's finite resources are managed sustainably; and Australia is compassionate and acting for a just and sustainable world. We believe that this vision can only be realised through the collective efforts of civil society, governments, business and individuals concerned for our common humanity.

Founded in 1965, ACFID currently has 126 Members and 18 Affiliates operating in more than 100 developing countries. The total revenue raised by ACFID's membership from all sources amounts to \$1.658 billion (2014–15), \$921 million of which is raised from 1.64 million Australians (2014–15). 80 per cent of funding for ACFID Members is from non-government sources. ACFID's members range between large Australian multi-sectoral organisations that are linked to international federations of NGOs, to agencies with specialised thematic expertise, and smaller community based groups, with a mix of secular and faith-based organisations. A list of ACFID Member Organisations is at **Annex A**.

ACFID's Members adhere to a Code of Conduct which is a voluntary, self-regulatory sector code of good practice that aims to improve international development outcomes and increase stakeholder trust by enhancing the transparency and accountability of signatory organisations.

The Code sets standards for practice rather than standards for results. It goes beyond the minimum standards required by government regulation and focuses on good practice. The Code is underpinned by a set of values and quality principles and speaks to the results we seek to achieve, the processes that support organisations to achieve those results, and the organisational systems that enable our Members' work.

The Code addresses areas such as fundraising, governance and financial reporting. Compliance includes triennial self-assessment, annual reporting and spot checks. All Members are subject to the independent complaints handling process governed by the Code of Conduct Committee (CCC) which is independent from the Governing Board of ACFID.

2. ABOUT THE ACFID CHILD RIGHTS COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

The Child Rights Community of Practice (CR CoP) is an Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) member-led and run working group. The overarching goal of the Child Rights Community of Practice is to promote the rights of children and child rights based approaches to development within the Australian international development sector.

The CR CoP currently has more than 60 members comprised of representatives from Australian international development agencies and child protection consultants. For the past three years, one of the key objectives of the CR CoP, and the focus of one of four of its sub-groups has been advocating for the rights of children in overseas residential care institutions. A full list of the participating agencies of the CR COP can be found at **Annex B**.

3. ABOUT ACC INTERNATIONAL RELIEF (ACCIR)

ACCIR is an Australian based International NGO which operates development and humanitarian response projects in 22 different countries. ACCIR is an ACFID member organisation and operates an Overseas Aid Fund under the Overseas Aid and Gift Deduction Scheme (OAGDS). ACCIR acts as the convenor for ACFID's Child Rights Community of Practice sub group on Residential Care and is also a co-chair of the ReThink Orphanages Network.

One of ACCIRs core thematic areas is care reform/deinstitutionalisation, which comes under ACCIR's Kinnected Program. Kinnected seeks to reduce the overuse of residential care in low and middle income countries and ensure that children's right to be raised in a family and connected to a community is respected and realised. ACCIR has Kinnected programs in 11 countries and engages in extensive donor education and advocacy work, both in Australia and globally.

ACCIR has provided technical support to 66 overseas residential care institutions undergoing transition or closure in various countries. It is through this aspect of our work that we have become aware of situations that constitute modern slavery taking place with respect to children in residential care overseas. Furthermore, it has highlighted the reality of foreign funding and orphanage volunteering, emanating from Australia and other key donor countries, acting as the primary drivers of the 'orphanage industry'.

4. TERMS OF THE INQUIRY

In this supplementary submission to the Parliamentary Inquiry into Establishing a Modern Slavery Act, ACFID & ACCIR will seek to address the third term of the inquiry as listed in the terms of reference:

- **Identifying international best practice employed by governments, companies, businesses and organisations to prevent modern slavery in domestic and global supply chains, with a view to strengthening Australian legislation.**

The submission will specifically look at best practice in the prevention of 'orphanage trafficking' and other related forms of exploitation, through ensuring Australian foreign aid funding, or funding from Australian charities, churches and business, does not act as a driver of demand.

5. BACKGROUND

'Orphanage trafficking' is an issue found at the nexus of foreign funding and institutional care. It is both a contributor to and consequence of the 'orphanage industry'; an industry that profits from the prolific and inappropriate institutionalisation of children in low and middle income countries. As such, this section will give a brief overview of the links between the proliferation of residential care institutions, foreign aid funding and voluntourism and the issue of 'orphanage trafficking' and modern slavery.

In countries such as Cambodia, Timor Leste, Uganda, Nepal, India and Myanmar, a significant proportion of the country's child welfare and child protection services, including alternative care, are privately funded by overseas donors. Whilst foreign aid funding is critical to the support of vulnerable

populations- including children, poorly regulated and misdirected it can also contribute to significant harm and lead to child exploitation. Recipient countries are particularly vulnerable to this when there is insufficient capacity within government to oversee and coordinate private services. This lack of capacity hampers efforts to ensure comprehensive child welfare and child protection systems are developed in line with each government's duties as State parties to the UNCRC. In this environment, decisions pertaining to the development of new privately funded service are largely determined by the interests of the overseas donors. As such services often emerge to meet 'donor demand' rather than in response to local needs or in line with government agendas. This is frequently the case with the ongoing proliferation of institutional care in low and middle income countries, despite a documented reduction in numbers of children legitimately requiring such services in some countries.¹

To bridge the deficit between supply and demand and to access the foreign aid funds that have been purposed for the support of 'orphans in orphanages', various forms of unethical and exploitative practices have emerged. These include:

- the inappropriate and unnecessary placement of children in institutional care;
- the harbouring of children in institutional care long-term with no respect for their rights or best interests;
- preventing family reunification and contact to uphold the 'orphan identity,' often falsely applied to these children, and retain funding; and
- provision of substandard and inadequate care and protection for children residing within institutions.

These practices at a minimum constitute a violation of several articles of the UNCRC and therefore the rights of children. They are also contrary to the international best practice framework for alternative care as detailed in the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care for Children (herby referred to as the 'UN Guidelines').

In more sinister cases, unscrupulous orphanage directors or recruiters resort to trafficking children into institutional care to gain access to the supply of foreign aid funds designated for 'orphans'. These funds are channelled through overseas charities, churches or through voluntourists and volunteers who visit residential care centres whilst overseas. Acts of 'orphanage trafficking' often include 'paper orphaning'² which is the false construction of children's identities as orphans³, through forged documentation or fabricated narratives.

Individual and institutional donors, including voluntourists, are in most cases unaware of the human rights breaches and exploitation their funds are fuelling. Rather, the situation presents as a perfect storm in which the combination of inconsistently applied charity sector regulations on the donor country side, insufficient government regulation and oversight on the recipient country side and the commodification of good intentions result in the exploitation of both child and donor.

Governments in numerous affected countries have taken steps as State parties to the UNCRC to reform their care systems and uphold and protect children's right to grow up in a family. Measures include the development of Alternative Care Policies, National Action Plans, Minimum Standards in Residential and Family-Based Care Policies, the revision of child protection laws and enacting moratorium ordinances on the establishment of new orphanages⁴. In Haiti and Nepal, 'orphanage

¹ MoSVY 2011, A study of Attitudes Towards Residential Care in Cambodia.

² van Doore, K 2016, Paper Orphans: Exploring Child Trafficking for the Purpose of Orphanages.

³ For the purposes of accessing community services, children are often classified as 'orphans' when only one parent has deceased. However, 'false construction of identity' and fabricated narratives refers to instances where claims are made that the children have no parent/s or suitable adult caregivers, when in fact these children have living parents or relatives who could provide care.

⁴ Nepal, Cambodia and Myanmar are three countries who have enacted moratorium ordinances on orphanages.

trafficking' has been recognised under domestic law falling under anti-trafficking legislation and cases have been brought before the courts for prosecution. Whilst these important legal and policy reforms are resulting in positive changes, efforts to deinstitutionalise care systems, protect children's rights and prevent exploitation are being undermined by the sheer volume of voluntourists and foreign aid funding that continues to be directed towards residential care- despite these legal and policies measures.

As such, ACFID and ACCIR believe it is incumbent on key donor countries to participate in efforts to prevent such child rights breaches and end 'orphanage trafficking'. This can be achieved by targeting donor countries' tourism and charity sectors to ensure the regulatory environment is attentive to this issue and consistently interprets and applies relevant regulations.

6. AUSTRALIA'S OBLIGATIONS

Australia, through ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), has assumed responsibility for putting into place the domestic laws and other measures necessary to protect, respect and fulfil the full scope of children's rights.

Whilst Australia's primary obligations under this convention are to children subject to Australian jurisdiction, joint responsibility exists to protect children outside of Australian jurisdiction who are subject to or at risk of human rights breaches where Australia 'aids or assists' in the breach and has 'knowledge of the circumstances of the breach'.⁵ This joint responsibility should extend to protecting children whose rights are being violated in the context of overseas residential care institutions where these human rights breaches (and trafficking acts) are being 'aided or assisted' by Australian registered charities, and/or for the purpose of accessing Australian foreign aid funding or for voluntourism.

With the links between the recruitment of children into overseas residential care institutions and Australian funding and voluntourism now well established,⁶ appropriate action should be considered by the Australian government to prevent Australia's ongoing complicity in these human rights and legal breaches. This could be achieved by curtailing the primary drivers of 'demand'; orphanage tourism and foreign aid funding. Such action would ensure that the efforts and funds of Australian volunteers, tourists and charities are supporting rather than undermining the efforts of foreign governments to reform their care sectors in line with their obligations under the UNCRC and supporting the 'UN Guidelines'.

To achieve this, ACFID and the ACCIR seek to make the following overarching recommendations for consideration:

1. The introduction of extra-territorial legislation banning the facilitation of orphanage tourism by Australian organisations, individuals, and companies.
2. The introduction of guidelines and regulations to curb the flow of Australian foreign aid funds to overseas residential care institutions contravening the articles of the UNCRC and/or operating contrary to the 'UN Guidelines'.

The remainder of this submission will focus on a detailed breakdown of recommendation 2 above. Opportunities to introduce minor provisions to various aspects of the existing charity sector's

⁵http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Legal_and_Constitutional_Affairs/Manus_Island/Report/c07

⁶ 2013 UNICEF Funding Stream Analysis noted the connections between RCIs in Cambodia and Australian donors.

regulatory framework will be identified with the purview of enhancing regulation and promoting higher standards of practice.

7. DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN GOOD AND POOR PRACTICE IN ALTERNATIVE CARE

Addressing Australian foreign aid funding as a driver of the ‘orphanage industry’ and ‘orphanage trafficking’ is a nuanced issue. A careful balance must be achieved between redirecting funding away from harmful practices and criminal activity without hampering countries’ care reform efforts, defunding alternative care services demonstrating good practice, or creating a situation that promotes unsafe reintegration practices. It is for these reasons that **the Australian Government should not consider instituting a categorical ban on funding overseas residential care.**

Rather, for charities whose purpose includes the provision of alternative care services, steps could be taken to enhance the regulatory and reporting frameworks already in existence –including for those operating overseas activities under the Australian Charities and Not-For Profit’s Commission (ACNC), those holding or seeking eligibility to the Overseas Aid Gift Deduction Scheme (OAGDS) and those holding or seeking eligibility to Public Benevolent Institutions (PBI) Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) categories.

Most of these regulatory mechanisms already contain provisions that would enable residential care practices to be viewed as ineligible activities, however, what is lacking is a common and uniform interpretation statement to support whole-of-government application of existing guidelines to ensure residential activities are *always* identified and subject to the same considerations in determining their eligibility.

Eligible purposes/activities should be those that contribute towards the progressive realisation of children’s rights as outlined in the UNCRC and work in accordance with the ‘UN Guidelines’ as the international guiding instrument outlining best practice in alternative care. Under this framework, eligible activities should include:

1. **Care reform efforts.** Programs and activities designed to contribute towards the deinstitutionalisation of social protection systems including child protection and care systems. This could include the scaling back of the use of residential care, the development of non-institutional services, funding stream reforms, social work force development, related capacity building and supporting the development of government policy and procedural frameworks.
2. **Transition or safe closure of existing residential care institutions.** Programs and activities designed to support existing residential care institutions through a safe transition or closure processes. This should include the advocacy efforts required to engage donors in the transition process.
3. **Reintegration.** Programs and activities designed to outwork the safe reintegration of children currently living in residential care and support to national structures to ensure continued support to families vunlenrable to unnesscary separation.
4. **Best practice in alternative care services.** Programs and activities operating in accordance with the UNCRC and the ‘UN Guidelines’ who provide alternative care services to children.

This could include any of the care options included in the continuum of care, including residential care, however must be guided by the three overarching principles: best interests of the child, suitability and necessity. Organisations operating or funding residential care should only be eligible when they can demonstrate robust gatekeeping measures, and have the technical capacity to conduct regular assessments and placement reviews to uphold the ‘measure of last resort... temporary and for the shortest duration possible’ clause the ‘UN Guidelines’ place on the use of institutional care.⁷

8. POTENTIAL RESULTS

Requiring organisations to demonstrate their programmatic and policy alignment with the UNCRC and the ‘UN Guidelines’ would prevent the ongoing funding of inappropriate residential care services, including those:

- operating unlawfully (unregistered, inappropriately registered);
- operating without adequate gatekeeping measures in place or suitable thresholds for entry into care;
- using institutional care as a default long-term care option;
- actively recruiting children into care (including trafficking);
- without reintegration policies and procedures;
- without adequate child-safe guarding policies and procedures in place; and
- who fail to meet the minimum standards of care.

It would also result in an overall reduction of funding being directed towards residential care and encourage the redirection of funds towards other alternative care services including family-based care. This reduction in available funding would reduce the incentive for organisations to institutionalise children and thus the incentive for ‘orphanage trafficking’. Requirements for more stringent program standards would reduce the likelihood of Australian foreign aid funds, or funds from Australian charities, churches and business fuelling the mis/over-use of residential care.

As funding and volunteering are inherently linked, particularly in the education and faith-based sectors, measures to curb the funding stream would also likely reduce the instances of Australian volunteers and voluntourists participating in orphanage tourism. This in turn would likely further reduce the risks of ‘orphanage trafficking’ and the likelihood of Australia’s ongoing complicity in this form of modern slavery.

9. OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHARITY SECTOR REFORMS

At present, Australian not-for profit organisations, including international aid agencies and charities, operate in a complex and convoluted regulatory environment. There are numerous government agencies that register and regulate not-for profits and/or the services they provide. However, with respect to those operating overseas, the main forms of assurance that charities adhere to professional practice standards on an ongoing basis and do not contribute towards unsustainable development practices or those that cause harm—include:

- Registration with the Australian Charities and Not-for-Profit Commission (ACNC);
- the Overseas Gift Deductible Scheme (OAGDS) currently administered by DFAT and;

⁷ Principle B.14 of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children.

- the Public Benevolent Institute Deductible Gift Recipient (PBI DGR) status, conferred by the ATO.

Minimal reforms targeting the ACNC's charity regulations and the ATO DGR endorsement processes (specifically PBI DGR and OAGDS eligibility as assessed by DFAT) would likely be sufficient to prevent Australian foreign aid funding from fuelling 'orphanage trafficking' and related exploitation. These potential reforms will be explored below.

9.1 Australian Charities and Not-for Profit Commission

Not for profit organisations seeking to be registered as 'charities' must do so with the Australian Charities and Not-for Profit Commission (ACNC). The criteria require organisations to meet the ACNC's 'governance standards' in order to be registered. This is a useful threshold for entry, however, it is important to bear in mind that they do not cover program standards or codes of conduct.

As well as identifying the organisation's charitable purposes, charities are required to disclose if they have beneficiaries or activities overseas, or send money overseas. Such organisations are requested to provide additional information pertaining to how their funds are directed and to whom and what activities. The ACNC Overseas aid and development factsheet further states that such organisations may 'also need to comply with a set of minimum standards called 'external conduct standards'⁸. These standards are yet to be developed and therefore whilst there is no current obligation, there is a clear opportunity to recommend specific inclusions to the ACNC to minimise the risk of Australian charities fuelling the 'orphanage industry'.⁹

ACNC Reform Opportunities & Recommendations

- One:** Include in the planned 'external conduct standards' child safeguarding standards (or policy requirements) applicable to all organisations operating or funding activities overseas.
- Two:** Include in the planned 'external conduct standards' programmatic standards pertaining to alternative care which require all registered charities conducting or funding alternative care activities for children to operate in accordance with the UNCRC and the 'UN Guidelines'. The ACFID Position Paper on Residential Care in International Development could be used towards this end. Adherence should be a compliance requirement tied to registration with provisions for organisations to be subject to remedial action and deregistration for non-compliance.
- Three:** Organisations who identify (using the existing mechanism) as having overseas beneficiaries, activities or who send funding overseas could be required to further clarify if their overseas beneficiaries include children in out of home care, or activities that include alternative care services. This could then be used to identify organisations for whom the alternative care standards as included in the 'external conduct standards' (outlined in recommendation two) need apply.

⁸ ACNC Factsheet- overseas aid and development charities,
http://www.acnc.gov.au/ACNC/FTS/Overseas_charities.aspx

⁹ *The not for profit overseas aid and development sector's peak body—the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) operates a Code of Conduct. All ACFID members must sign up to the Code of Conduct. The Code is a voluntary, self-regulatory code of good practice with a compliance regime. To learn more about ACFID's Code of Conduct visit their website: <https://acfid.asn.au/code-of-conduct>*

Four: Institute a 2-3-year ‘grandfathering process’ for existing registered charities to ensure adequate time is given to meet and demonstrate compliance with the ‘external conduct standards’. With respect to charities supporting overseas residential care institutions, this would safeguard against increased risks to children caused by any immediate withdrawal of funds or services. It would ensure organisations have time to secure the buy-in of their overseas partners and encourage residential care programs to transition, therefore contributing towards the country’s care reform efforts.

9.2 Deductible Gift Recipient Approved Organisations

There are two DGR categories which organisations directly operating or funding overseas activities can seek approval under. Charities registered with the ACNC with the sub type of Public Benevolent Institutions (PBI) can seek DGR endorsement from the ATO, who conducts an assessment for eligibility. Charities registered with the ACNC operating an Overseas Aid Fund can seek DGR approval under the Overseas Aid Gift Deduction Scheme (OAGDS). The OAGDS register is managed by the ATO however eligibility is assessed by DFAT with a final recommendation made to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

DGR concessions are a form of government contribution (by way of tax concessions) to approved charities. As such it is reasonable to expect DGR approved organisations to demonstrate compliance with appropriate governance and programmatic standards and, particularly, to be able to demonstrate that their work does not perpetuate harm, directly or indirectly, to children and other vulnerable groups.

Towards this stated goal, the OAGDS guidelines outline an important set of standards known as the ‘eligibility criteria’ comprising four criterions that must be met for organisations to be recommended for approval.¹⁰ Criterion 1 and 4 in the 2016 OAGDS guidelines create a clear case for OAGDS ineligibility for Australian charities funding or involved in residential care services operating contrary to the ‘UN Guidelines’, as demonstrated below.

9.2.1 OAGDS Guidelines & Eligibility

Criterion 1: The organisations deliver overseas aid activities.

The explanation of this criterion states that:

*‘Development activities improve the long-term well-being of individuals and communities in developing countries. Eligible development activities must demonstrate: fair distribution, be informed by local people; **and deliver sustained or lasting benefits**’¹¹*

Research and international child protection and child development experts agree that long-term use of residential care does not deliver sustained and lasting benefits, rather can cause detrimental long-term impacts on children, which often extend well into their adulthood¹². These include but are not limited to developmental delays, emotional and behavioural issues, attachment disorders, hyper vulnerability upon reintegration and social and life skills deficits.¹³ Organisations that allow volunteers

¹⁰ DFAT 2016, Overseas Aid Gift Deduction Scheme Guidelines.

¹¹ DFAT 2016, Overseas Aid Gift Deduction Scheme: Guidelines p. 9, February 2016.

¹² Dunn, A, Jareg, E, Web, D n.d, A Last Resort: The Growing concern about children in residential care, Save the Children, London.

¹³ Browe, K 2009, The Risk of Harm to Young Children in Institutional Care, Save the Children, London

and visitors access to residential care centres that they run or partner with risk further exacerbating the attachment disorders commonly experienced by children in residential care and contribute to their ongoing vulnerability.¹⁴

Explanatory notes under Criterion 1 further outline the basis by which activities are deemed ineligible stating that:

*‘Activities which do not demonstrate the principles of development activities or humanitarian activities will not satisfy this criterion. This may be because they discriminate, **do not meet locally identified needs**; create dependency; **do not lead to lasting benefits**; or **do harm**. Organisations undertaking such activities will not be recommended for approval under the OAGDS’¹⁵*

Over sixty years of global research into the effects of institutional care on children demonstrates the detrimental impacts on children’s development. Furthermore, in the majority of cases, children’s vulnerabilities are not overcome, rather vulnerabilities are delayed and in many cases exacerbated.¹⁶ Global statistics also demonstrate that 80% of children currently in residential care are not orphans or children who lack suitable adult caregivers.¹⁷ The vast majority of children in residential care are there for reasons such as poverty, disability or access to education.¹⁸ Residential care is an inappropriate response to these common ‘root causes’ of child vulnerability and when used unnecessarily can do significantly more harm than good. Therefore, residential care used in this manner does not meet locally identified needs, does not deliver lasting benefits and can cause significant harm. As such, under Criterion 1 of the OAGDS eligibility criteria, organisations engaged in long-term residential care programs contrary to the ‘UN Guidelines’ should not be considered eligible for OAGDS approval.

Criterion 4: The organisation has appropriate safeguards in place and manages risks associated with child protection and terrorism.

The explanation for Criterion 4 states that:

*‘The organisation will have a child protection policy and procedures in place that **promote child protection and child-safe practices**’¹⁹*

Child protection experts agree that neither the unnecessary and long-term use of residential care, nor allowing volunteers and tourists access to children in institutional care settings constitute practices that promote child protection and safeguarding. Children in residential care are exposed to a heightened risk of physical and sexual abuse and these risks are exacerbated by organisations who allow non-essential persons access to children in residential care centres through orphanage tourism and volunteering.²⁰

¹⁴ Guiney, T 2012, Orphanage Tourism in Cambodia: When residential care centres become tourist attractions, Pacific News, no. 38, July/August 2012.

¹⁵ DFAT 2016, Overseas Aid Gift Deduction Scheme: Guidelines p. 10, February 2016.

¹⁶ Myers, J 2006, *Child Protection in America: Past, present, and future*, Oxford University Press, New York, see also R Rollinson, *Residential Child Care in England 1948–1975: A history and report*, commissioned by the Irish Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse, 2009, available at: <http://www.childabusecommission.ie/rpt/pdfs/CICA-VOL5-08A.pdf>

¹⁷ We Are Lumos, <http://wearelumos.org/the-problem>

¹⁸ We are Lumos, <http://wearelumos.org/chart/reasons-institutionalisation-one-european-country>

¹⁹ DFAT 2016, Overseas Aid Gift Deduction Scheme: Guidelines p. 15, February 2016.

²⁰ Csaky, C 2009, *Keeping Children out of Harmful Institutions*, Save the Children, London. Resande, S 2013, *No Child’s Play: Respect for children’s rights at tourist destinations. Examples from Thailand, Cambodia and South Africa*, Fair Trade Centre, Cambodia & Thailand.

Child protection, as distinct from safeguarding, is concerned with protecting the full scope of children's rights. However, certain rights are automatically forfeited when a child is admitted into residential care, including their right to be raised in a family. Therefore, entry into residential care, where the suitability and necessity principles have not been met, constitute the violation of children's rights, often instituted by organisations claiming to protect them.

The OAGDS Frequently Asked Questions document further states that:

*'...OAGDS seeks to ensure that organisation applying for OAGDS have good governance structures in place and a **high standard of international development practice**, based on their track record'.²¹*

The long-term use of residential care is deemed an outdated and harmful practice in international development and child protection practice by major child protection organisations, sector experts, governments, academics and UNICEF. The only provision for residential care in the UNCRC and the 'UN Guidelines' is for last resort and temporary option when all other family and community-based options have been deemed as not in the individual child's best interests or have been comprehensively exhausted²². Australian organisations involved in long-term residential care, contravening the UNCRC and not supporting the 'UN Guidelines' (as the key international guiding instruments for determining best practice in alternative care, child rights and child protection) should therefore not be eligible for OAGDS approval based upon elements of Criterion 4.

9.2.2 2015 Review of the OAGDS Guidelines

In 2015 DFAT conducted a review of the OAGDS guidelines. The stated purpose of the review was to *'Make the OAGDS guidelines and processes clearer, simpler and more robust, while reflecting current international practice and standards'*²³

A report outlining the key findings of the review recognised *'The support of orphanages as a vexed issue'*²⁴ and acknowledged the feedback from several approved organisations questioning the appropriateness of allowing OAGDS approved organisations to engage in residential care as an eligible activity. Despite recognising the concerns raised and the stated objective of reflecting international best practice, the revised guidelines released in February 2016 failed to articulate a clear stance on residential care and removed all former references to the support of overseas residential care institutions as an ineligible activity. No clear guidance was given apart from directing organisations involved with children in institutions to have *'additional child safe practices'* in place.²⁵ By taking a child safeguarding rather than a child protection and rights perspective, the guidelines fall short of reflecting international practice and standards as they fail to consider the appropriate use of residential care or take measures to ensure children's rights and best interests are at the centre of decision making. It is these principles of suitability and necessity, rather than safeguarding, that are at the heart of best practice in alternative care and the global care reform agenda. As such it is these principles that must be demonstrated in approved OAGDS organisation's programs to ensure that Australian aid funding is not fuelling the 'orphanage industry' and 'orphanage trafficking'.

²¹ DFAT 2016, Overseas Aid Deduction Scheme: Frequently asked questions, p. 2, February 2016.

²² UN General Assembly 1998, Convention in the Rights of the Child. UN General Assembly 2009, The Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children.

²³ DFAT 2015, Review of the Overseas Gift Deduction Scheme, p. 3, August 2015.

²⁴ Ibid p.3

²⁵ Ibid p.15.

9.2.3 Issues related to the lack of regular review

The OAGDS guidelines fulfil two important functions apart from establishing the criteria used to assess an organisation's initial eligibility. Firstly, the guidelines outline a set of benchmarks for good practice which organisations are expected to maintain with the purview of 'creating an effective and capable community of international development NGOs'.²⁶ In meeting these standards, Australian organisations operating in the international development space demonstrate they have an appropriate level of expertise to deliver sustainable development benefits to overseas communities. This safeguards against good intentions being a sufficient qualifier, which as noted by ACFID, is critical if harm, dependency and the creation of 'an industry that demands the organisation's unnecessarily protracted interventions' is to be avoided.²⁷ Secondly, as stated in the OAGDS review, OAGDS approval acts as a vetting and endorsement of charities, which builds public confidence by '*assuring taxpayers their donations are going to support good overseas aid charities.*'²⁸

These are important post-approval functions and to deliver on their promise it is essential that charities take seriously their responsibilities requiring them to regularly review their practice; identify any significant changes since being granted OAGDS status, and/or; consider whether the guidance of approved activities has shifted. Any significant changes require declaration to ensure an entity remains eligible. The Annual Statement that must be provided by all charities to the ACNC provides and regular opportunity for charities to make these considerations and seek clarification or review if in doubt.

While the principle of primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with regulation does, and should, lie with the governing entities of charitable organisations, where 'systemic issues have been identified and/or certain risk thresholds amongst categories of DGR have been surpassed'²⁹ it is appropriate for there to be external reviews undertaken. Reviews should be avoid being punitive and focus first on remediation with penalty or deregistration imposed only where entities are unwilling or unable to remediate their practice or have been found to be acting in flagrant breach.

Due to the considerable concern around Australian groups inadvertently perpetuating the 'orphanage industry' and 'orphanage trafficking', through donations and grants, it would be reasonable to identify this practice as constituting a sufficient risk threshold pertaining to DGRs engagement with children in out of home care overseas. Organisations who surpass the risk threshold, such as those that identify as funding or directly running residential care (via annual statements), could be flagged for periodic review with the purview of ensuring DGR entities are not complicit in or acting in a way that fuels the 'orphanage industry' and associated 'orphanage trafficking' and modern slavery practices. To avoid creating loopholes, this measure should apply to all charities registered with the ACNC who conduct this work, regardless of what other status they hold.

Recommended Reforms to OAGDS DGRs

One: Develop an Interpretation Statement on OAGDS eligibility and Residential Care in line with the 'UN Guidelines'. ACFID's Position Paper on Residential Care in International Development,

²⁶ *ibid*

²⁷ ACFID 2017, ACFID Submission on Tax Deductible Gift Recipient Reform Opportunities Discussion Paper, July 2017.

²⁸ DFAT review op.cit p.

²⁹ ACFID 2017 op.cit.p.11

which outlines the sector’s stance on the appropriate use of residential care could be used as the basis for this statement.

- Two:** Ensure that the primary burden of ongoing compliance with DGR lies with the governing entity while providing regular opportunities for assessments of ongoing eligibility—such as through the Annual Statement process of the ACNC.
- Three:** Consider identifying ‘alternative care’ as a risk category for organisations operating or funding activities overseas, with a threshold set at the funding or provision of residential care. Organisations who surpass this risk threshold could subsequently be flagged for periodic review against the eligibility guidelines, including the proposed OAGDS supporting Interpretation Statement on Residential Care. A review should be undertaken with the first intention to support remediation of poor practice and with penalty or deregistration imposed for those unwilling or unable to act on remedial advice, or those found to be acting in flagrant breach.
- Four:** Consider instituting a ‘grace period’ for DGRs operating overseas activities contrary to the OAGDS guidelines. With respect to DGRs supporting institutional care overseas, a grace period would provide organisations with the opportunity to improve their practices and undergo safe transition where necessary. It would safeguard against any adverse effects caused by an immediate withdrawal of funds or services. This ‘grace period’ could align with the 12-month time frame suggested in the DGR Reform Opportunities Discussion Paper with respect to DGRs requirement to meet governance standards under the ACNC³⁰.

9.3 Public Benevolent Institutions DGR

A Public Benevolent Institution (PBI) is a type of charitable institution whose main purpose is to relieve poverty or distress, such as sickness, disability, destitution, suffering, misfortune or helplessness.³¹ Charities registering under the ACNC can select PBI as their charity sub type and apply to the ATO for PBI DGR status in order to access tax concessions including the ability to issue tax deductible receipts for all donations over \$2. The ATO is responsible for assessing a given PBIs’ DGR eligibility, including whether they meet the ‘in Australia condition’³².

Prior to the decision in the Hunger Project Case, the ATO held the view expressed in TR2003/5 that the ‘in Australia’ condition required the PBI DGR to be established and operated in Australia, with its purposes and beneficiaries also located in Australia.^{33 34} PBIs desiring to pursue relief of poverty or distress outside of Australia were required to establish an Overseas Aid Fund and seek DGR endorsement under OAGDS or partner with an already established Overseas Aid Fund DGR approved

³⁰ DGR discussion paper op. cit. p.5.

³¹ Australian Charities and Not-For-Profits Commission, *2016, Factsheet: Public benevolent institutions and the ACNC*, viewed 7/3/2016, http://www.acnc.gov.au/ACNC/FTS/Fact_PBI.aspx

³² Australian Taxation Office, *TR 2003/5 Income tax and fringe benefits tax: public benevolent institutions (This document is currently being reviewed as a consequence of the decision outlined in the Decision Impact Statement for Commissioner of Taxation v. Hunger Project Australia)*, viewed 7/3/2016, <http://law.ato.gov.au/atolaw/view.htm?docid=txr/tr20035/nat/ato/00001>, Paragraph 25 states: “For endorsement as a deductible gift recipient so that it can receive tax deductible gifts, the public benevolent institution must be ‘in Australia’. This involves a range of factors including establishment, control, maintenance and operation in Australia and the providing of public benevolence in Australia.”

³⁴ Australian Taxation Office NFP Advisory Group, *Discussion Paper: Current operation of the “in Australia” special condition for certain deductible gift recipients and income tax exempt entities*, Final August 2015

under the OAGDS guidelines. OAGDS approved DGRs however, were limited to engaging in 'development activities.'³⁵ Welfare activities, including the support of residential care institutions were explicitly listed as ineligible. Therefore, the risks associated with Australian foreign aid funding contributing to the inappropriate use of institutional care overseas and incentivising 'orphanage trafficking' were limited to non-compliance amongst OAGDS approved DGRs.

The Hunger Project Case decision³⁵ however, led the ATO to remove the requirement for PBI DGR purposes and beneficiaries to be located within Australia. The ATO subsequently changed their GiftPack guidance to reflect this new position.³⁶ In 2016 the ACNC released a Commissioners Interpretation Statement: Public Benevolent Institutes to further clarify the implications of the changes.³⁷

As a result, it is now possible for an Australian PBI DGR to use tax deductible donations to fund non-development activities in developing countries, which contradicts the established OAGDS guidelines and the objectives of the ATO framework for endorsing an Overseas Aid Fund DGR. It has also resulted in a discrepancy of standards between the two DGR types, with PBI DGR being viewed as a path of least resistance in terms of ease of approval and requirements to meet standards of practice. This is of concern with respect to the issue of Australia's involvement in the unnecessary proliferation of residential care in developing countries and 'orphanage trafficking', as organisations wishing to establish, fund or partner with long-term residential care institutions are now able to do so with relative ease under the new PBI DGR regulations. As such there is significant potential for this to result in an increase in Australian charities' involvement in the 'orphanage industry' unless provisions are put in place to increase the eligibility criteria and ongoing compliance standards for PBIs. ReThink Orphanages 2016 mapping report identified 22 organisations registered as PBIs under the ACNC contributing towards institutional care overseas³⁸.

This Commissioner's Interpretation Statement acknowledges the increased risks associated with charities operating overseas including a lack of experience in international development, financial misappropriation, abuse to children and other vulnerable people, and poor accountability and transparency;³⁹ the very risks the more rigorous OAGDS guidelines were developed to mitigate. In recognition of these increased risks, the ACNC Charities Commissioner's Interpretation Statement implied that organisations seeking to register with the ACNC as a PBI should expect the ACNC to inquire as to how they will address these risks⁴⁰. However, it falls short of providing a set of benchmarking standards to guide PBIs towards good practice.

Whilst we would welcome the inclusion of appropriate practice standards in the PBI registration and/or PBI DGR eligibility criteria, previously made recommendations pertaining to the ACNC's planned 'external conduct standards' in the ACNC section of this submission could be sufficient to address the risks inherent to PBI charities operating or funding activities overseas. However, should this recommendation be rejected, the inclusion of specific standards and compliance measures in the PBI DGR eligibility criteria should be further explored. This would ensure that PBI DGRs would be

³⁵ *ibid.* Paragraph 61 "The Commissioner's view on the meaning of "in Australia" for DGRs has been updated in GiftPack to remove the reference to 'purposes and beneficiaries' being in Australia. GiftPack now states: For funds, institutions and authorities to be in Australia, they must be established and operated in Australia."

³⁶ *Ibid* Paragraph 61 "The Commissioner's view on the meaning of "in Australia" for DGRs has been updated in GiftPack to remove the reference to 'purposes and beneficiaries' being in Australia. GiftPack now states: For funds, institutions and authorities to be in Australia, they must be established and operated in Australia."

³⁷ ACNC 2016, Commissioners Interpretation Statement: Public Benevolent Institutions, COS 2016/03.

³⁸ ReThink Orphanages *op.cit* p.12

³⁹ ACNC Commissioner's Statement *op. cit* p.11

⁴⁰ ACNC Commissioner's Statement, *op.cit.* p.11

expected to adhere to appropriate professional standards proportionate to the expectations placed on OAGDS approved DGRs. PBI DGRs would also be required to verify their ongoing eligibility through the Annual Statement made in support of their ACNC registration.

Recommended Reforms to PBI registration and PBI DGR eligibility

One: Support the recommendations in the ACNC section of this report to address the risks associated with PBI organisations operating overseas and increase standards of practice and accountability.

AND/ OR

Two: Develop standards of practice applicable to organisations seeking PBI registration and PBI DGR to address the risks outlined in the ACNC's Commissioner's Interpretation Statement. This would simultaneously address the risk of PBIs fuelling the 'orphanage industry' and incentivising 'orphanage trafficking' and other forms of modern slavery in overseas institutions.

Three: Ensure that ongoing eligibility with a standard of practice (if developed) is annually reported against in the Annual Statement charities make to the ACNC as part of their ongoing registration with the regulatory. This would only be of assistance with respect to PBI DGRs should recommendation two above be adopted.

Four: Institute a 'grandfathering process' for existing PBIs to ensure adequate time is given to meet and demonstrate compliance with any 'external conduct standards' or new standards of practice introduced. With respect to charities supporting overseas residential care institutions, this would safeguard against increased risks to children caused by any immediate withdrawal of funds or services. It would ensure organisations have time to secure the buy-in of their overseas partners and encourage residential care programs to transition, therefore contributing towards the country's care reform efforts.

9.4 AUSTRALIAN NGO COOPERATION PROGRAM AND DIRECT AID PROGRAM GRANTS

The Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) is an annual grants program and the primary mechanism through which DFAT partners with Australian NGOs to alleviate poverty and contribute towards sustainable development in overseas communities and countries. NGO partners must undergo a very rigorous assessment process and be accredited by DFAT to be eligible to receive ANCP funding. The ANCP funding criteria lists the support of institutions, including orphanages, in its list of ineligible activities. **As such there is no current risk associated with ANCP funding contributing towards the 'orphanage industry' or related trafficking and slavery like practices in institutions.**

Australia's Direct Aid Program (DAP) is a small grants program managed by Australia's overseas posts. It forms a part of Australia's development program and is funded out of the Australia Aid budget. Grants are made available to local community associations, individuals and NFP organisations operating in country of each respective post.

The DAP guidelines outline a set of broad principles and a selection criteria designed to guide DAP committees at post in their consideration of applications. Eligibility is further linked to Official

Development Assistance (ODA) classifications, as outlined in the OECD 'Is It ODA 2008 Factsheet'.⁴¹ In addition, the guidelines list in their assessment considerations, 'Whether the project involves children and if so, does the applicant have procedures in place to protect them'.⁴² There is however, no further guidance evident regarding what child safeguarding or protection standards DAP committees are expected to use in making that determination. A list of projects or project activities that are 'as a general rule not funded',⁴³ are included in the guidelines, however these make no mention of exclusions relating to funding residential care.

The high degree of discretion given to DAP committees at post coupled with a lack of guidance regarding the eligibility of residential care exposes the Australian Government and Aid Program to a degree of risk. As such it is recommended that the same exclusions applied to the ANCP program be similarly applied to the DAP program to create consistency and mitigate any risk of the Australian Aid Program's involvement in the inappropriate use of residential care and related child-rights and trafficking issues.

Recommended reforms to DAP Program:

One: ANCP ineligibility criteria be applied to the DAP program.

Two: Ensure DFAT personnel at post are well informed of the issues surrounding residential care, the 'orphanage industry' and orphanage tourism. Information could be widely disseminated or target posts located in high-risk countries. National guidelines and efforts towards deinstitutionalisation and progress towards establishment of continuum of alternative care models could be documented at relevant posts to inform such funding decisions and support national, CSO and INGO efforts toward deinstitutionalisation.

10. SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACT

The various recommendations outlined in this report could have a significant impact on curbing Australia's involvement in fuelling the 'orphanage industry' and in reducing the demand for children to be trafficked into institutional care. As a key donor and volunteer sending country, Australia can substantially affect a reduction in the over/misuse of residential care particularly in countries in the Pacific and South-East Asian region. Reducing the over/misuse of residential care will have a positive impact on this form of trafficking and modern slavery.

Using the current regulatory environment to work with Australian charities to ensure that they are not contributing to or exacerbating the 'orphanage industry' would likely capture the bulk of Australian foreign aid funding flowing to overseas residential care institutions. This would include funds emanating from sectors such as the Christian faith-based sector, which is anecdotally accepted as one of the largest sectors financially supporting overseas residential care institutions.

ACCI commissioned a set of research questions in the 2016 National Church Life Survey (NCLS) with the goal of quantifying the Christian faith-based sector's involvement in both financially supporting and volunteering within overseas residential care institutions. The commissioned questions were spread across two surveys: the NCLS Church Attenders Survey and the NCLS Operations Survey. The findings of the Church Attenders Survey revealed that 51% of church attendees in Australia financially support an overseas residential care institution. Of this 51%, 21% channel their support through their

⁴¹ Is it ODA Factsheet 2008.

⁴² <http://dfat.gov.au/people-to-people/direct-aid-program/Pages/dap-general-guidelines.aspx>.

⁴³ *ibid.*

local church. A further 34% channelled their support through an Australian charity and only 5% sent direct remittances to an overseas organisation.⁴⁴ The Operations survey findings indicated that 36% of churches support overseas residential care institutions, 90% of which constitutes financial support. The disaggregated data further revealed that 28% out of the 36% channelled funds collected for the support of an overseas residential care institution through an Australian charity. Only 10% indicated they sent direct remittances to an overseas organisation. This reveals that the Australian charities sector acts as the major conduit for funds emanating from the Christian faith based sector and therefore strengthens the argument for focused work with the charity sector to reform its practices. It is highly probable that a similar, conduit relationships exist between charities and schools/businesses raising funds purposed for overseas residential care institutions.

11. FINAL REMARKS

The Australian Parliament has demonstrated a commendable degree of global leadership with respect to combatting orphanage tourism and trafficking. Efforts to date have rightfully gained the attention of other key donor countries and led to an increased public awareness and consideration of the issue. By introducing further measures including world-first legislation banning the facilitation of orphanage tourism and charity sector reforms to address foreign funding as the primary driver, the Australian Government will successfully end Australia's ongoing complicity in this aspect of modern slavery. Furthermore, the Australian Government's bold measures will both encourage and provide a road map for other countries to consider and adopt similar reforms. This, if achieved amongst several donor countries, could signal the end of the 'orphanage industry' and the total eradication of 'orphanage trafficking'.

Rebecca Nhep*

CEO of International Programs, ACC International Relief

Convener, ACFID Child Rights Community of Practice Sub-Group on Residential Care

Co-Chair Rethink Orphanages

(03) 8516 9600

rebecca@accir.org.au

Joanna Pradela*

Director of Policy and Advocacy, Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)

(02) 6285 1816

jpradela@acfid.asn.au

**With thanks to the ACFID Child Rights Community of Practice for their substantial input.*

⁴⁴ ACCI, 2017 National Church Life Survey Commissioned Report - church attendees gave to multiple RCIs and/or through multiple means accounting for the total disaggregated figures exceeding the sum-total percentage.

ANNEX A. LIST OF ACFID MEMBERS



AUSTRALIAN
COUNCIL
FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

Full Members:

- ACC International Relief
- Act for Peace - NCCA
- ActionAid Australia
- Action on Poverty
- Adara Development Australia
- ADRA Australia
- Afghan Australian Development Organisation
- Anglican Aid
- Anglican Board of Mission - Australia Limited
- Anglican Overseas Aid
- Anglican Relief and Development Fund Australia
- Asia Pacific Journalism Centre
- Asian Aid Organisation
- Assisi Aid Projects
- Australasian Society for HIV, Viral Hepatitis and Sexual Health Medicine
- Australia for UNHCR
- Australia Hope International Inc.
- Australian Business Volunteers
- Australian Doctors for Africa
- Australian Doctors International
- Australian Himalayan Foundation
- Australian Lutheran World Service
- Australian Marist Solidarity Ltd
- Australian Medical Aid Foundation
- Australian Mercy
- Australian Red Cross
- Australian Respiratory Council
- AVI
- Beyond the Orphanage
- Birthing Kit Foundation (Australia)
- Brien Holden Vision Institute Foundation
- Bright Futures Child Aid and Development Fund (Australia)
- Burnet Institute
- Business for Millennium Development
- CARE Australia
- Caritas Australia
- CBM Australia
- ChildFund Australia
- CLAN (Caring and Living as Neighbours)
- Credit Union Foundation Australia
- Daughters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart Overseas Aid Fund
- Diaspora Action Australia
- Diplomacy Training Program
- Door of Hope Australia Inc.
- Edmund Rice Foundation (Australia)
- EDO NSW
- Engineers without Borders
- Every Home Global Concern
- Family Planning New South Wales
- Fairtrade Australia New Zealand
- Food Water Shelter
- Foresight (Overseas Aid and Prevention of Blindness)
- Fred Hollows Foundation, The
- Global Development Group
- Global Mission Partners
- Good Shepherd Services
- Good Return
- Grameen Foundation Australia
- Habitat for Humanity Australia
- Hagar Australia
- HealthServe Australia
- Heilala*

- Hope Global
 - Hunger Project Australia, The
 - International Children's Care (Australia)
 - International Needs Australia
 - International Nepal Fellowship (Aust) Ltd
 - International River Foundation
 - International Women's Development Agency
 - Interplast Australia & New Zealand
 - Islamic Relief Australia
 - KTF (Kokoda Track Foundation)
 - Kyeema Foundation
 - Lasallian Foundation
 - Leprosy Mission Australia, The
 - Live & Learn Environmental Education
 - Love Mercy Foundation
 - Mahboba's Promise Australia
 - Marie Stopes International Australia
 - Marist Mission Centre
 - Mary MacKillop International
 - Mary Ward International Australia
 - Mercy Works Ltd.
 - Mission World Aid Inc.
 - MIT Group Foundation
 - Motivation Australia
 - Murdoch Children's Research Institute
 - MAA (Muslim Aid Australia)
 - Nusa Tenggara Association Inc.
 - Oaktree Foundation
 - Opportunity International Australia
 - Our Rainbow House*
 - Oxfam Australia
 - Palmera Projects
 - Partner Housing Australasia*
 - Partners in Aid
 - Partners Relief and Development Australia
 - People with Disability Australia
 - PLAN International Australia
 - Quaker Service Australia
 - RedR Australia
 - Reledev Australia
 - RESULTS International (Australia)
 - Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists
 - Royal Australasian College of Surgeons
 - Salesian Missions
 - Salvation Army (NSW Property Trust)
 - Save the Children Australia
 - Service Fellowship International Inc.
 - School for Life Foundation
 - SeeBeyondBorders
 - Sight For All
 - So They Can
 - Sport Matters
 - Surf Aid International
 - Tamils Rehabilitation Organisation Australia
 - TEAR Australia
 - Transform Aid International (incorporating Baptist World Aid)
 - UNICEF Australia
 - Union Aid Abroad-APHEDA
 - UnitingWorld
 - WaterAid Australia
 - World Vision Australia
 - WWF-Australia
 - YWAM Medical Ships
- Affiliate Members:**
- Australian Federation of AIDS Organisations
 - Australian National University – School of Archaeology and Anthropology, College of Arts and Social Sciences
 - Charles Darwin University – Menzies School of Health Research
 - Deakin University – Alfred Deakin Research Institute
 - James Cook University – The Cairns Institute
 - La Trobe University – Institute of Human Security and Social Change
 - Murdoch University – School of Management and Governance
 - Queensland University of Technology – School of Public Health and Social Work
 - Refugee Council of Australia
 - RMIT – Centre for Global Research
 - Swinburne University of Technology Centre for Design Innovation
 - Transparency International Australia
 - University of Melbourne – School of Social and Political Sciences

- University of New South Wales-
International
- University of Queensland – Institute
for Social Science Research
- University of Sydney – Office of Global
Engagement
- University of the Sunshine Coast –
International Projects Group
- University of Technology, Sydney –
Institute for Sustainable Futures
- University of Western Australia –
School of Social Sciences

- Vision 2020
- Western Sydney University- School of
Social Sciences and Psychology

* Denotes Interim Full Member

** Denotes Interim Affiliate Member

ANNEX B. LIST OF CHILD RIGHTS COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE MEMBERS

Full Name	Position	Organization
Ragna Gilmour	COP Member	Quaker Service Australia
Claire Birks	COP Member	ChildFund Australia
Ms Sophie Gulliver	COP Member	CARE Australia
Anna Noonan	COP Member	Consultant
Esther Obdam	COP Member	The Fred Hollows Foundation
Clinton Tedja	COP Member	The Salvation Army NSW Property Trust
Bethany Hender	COP Member	Australian Council for International Development
Claire Achmad	COP Member	World Vision Australia
Emma Braithwaite	COP Member	Australian Red Cross
Mr Clinton Tedja	COP Member	The Salvation Army NSW Property Trust
Jackson Heilberg	COP Member	Australian Council for International Development Child Rights CoP
Ms Louise Villanti	COP Member	Save the Children Australia
Rebekah Kofoed	COP Member	ChildFund Australia
Ms Lee Sayer	COP Member	Habitat for Humanity Australia
Sophie Seck	COP Member	Australian Council for International Development
Meg Laufer	COP Member	Act for Peace
Melanie Sleep	COP Member	Plan International Australia
Mrs Mwiyeria Munyeki	COP Member	World Vision Australia
Ms Annie Douglas	COP Member	The Oaktree Foundation
Ms Ruth Dearnley	COP Member	Influence Global
Ms Julia Kendall	COP Member	The Fred Hollows Foundation
Ms Katherine Lim	COP Member	The Fred Hollows Foundation
Dr Nanditha Janajeevi Hettitantri	COP Member	ADARA Development Australia
Emily Ellis	COP Member	International Women's Development Agency
Ms Jo Thomson	COP Member	ChildFund Australia Learning4Development
Lisa Schultz	COP Member	Consultant
Ms Julie Wiltshire	COP Member	Consultant
Mr Philip Morris	COP Member	International Nepal Fellowship (Aust) Ltd
Ms Joanna Pradela	COP Member	Australian Council for International Development
Ms Karen Rasmussen	COP Member	Act for Peace
Ms Fiona Williams	COP Member	Save the Children Australia
Ms Katie Blok	COP Member	ACC International Relief
Rebecca Hunter	COP Member	Asian Aid Organisation
Ms Karen Flanagan, AM	COP Member	Save the Children Australia
Ms Anne Fitzpatrick	COP Member	Australian Lutheran World Service
Ms Tamara Domicelj	COP Member	Act for Peace

Victoria Mcdonough	COP Member	Australian Red Cross
Mrs Alana Goodwin	COP Member	The Salvation Army NSW Property Trust
Ms Siobhan Mccann	COP Member	Plan International Australia
Ms Uma Komalan, MA	COP Member	Oxfam Australia
Ms Uma Komalan, MA	COP Member	Oxfam Australia
Katie Blok	COP Member	ACC International Relief
Ms Belinda Lucas	COP Member	Learning4Development
Mrs Jan Bayliss	COP Member	Global Mission Partners
Jessica Waite	COP Member	International Women's Development Agency
Laura Healy	Convenor	The Fred Hollows Foundation
Manasi Kogekar	COP Member	ChildFund Australia
Mr Dan Skehan	COP Member	Transform Aid International
Ms Mel Harwin	COP Member	Transform Aid International
Ms Veronica Joseph	COP Member	Habitat for Humanity Australia
Ms Keri Chittenden	COP Member	So They Can
Ms Rebekah Kofoed	COP Member	UNICEF Australia
Mrs Rebecca Nhep	COP Member	ACC International Relief
Ms Mary-Ann Nicholas	COP Member	Burnet Institute
Ms Peta Thomas	COP Member	Global Development Group
Mrs Jessica Hill	COP Member	Interplast Australia & New Zealand
Ms Karla Pardo	COP Member	World Wide Fund for Nature Australia
Sophie Levins	COP Member	Habitat for Humanity Australia
Amy Lamoin	COP Member	UNICEF Australia
Sophie Shugg	COP Member	Plan International Australia
Ms Gaye Wealthy	COP Member	Plan International Australia
Ms Caitlin Barrett	COP Member	Love Mercy Foundation
Ms Cassi Jenkins	COP Member	Love Mercy Foundation
Mark Kavenagh	Convenor	ChildFund Australia
Ms Justine Aenishaenslin	COP Member	Transform Aid International
Catherine Middleton	COP Member	International Needs Australia
Mrs Jackie Robertson	COP Member	Transform Aid International
Noreen McGrath	COP Member	Interplast Australia & New Zealand
Keren Winterford	COP Member	Institute for Sustainable Futures
Melissa Stewart	COP Member	World Vision Australia
Kate Eversteyn	COP Member	Consultant
Ms Sandra Louise Thompson	COP Member	Consultant
Meg Northrope	COP Member	DFAT
Nick Brodie	COP Member	DFAT
Toni Hunt	COP Member	DFAT
Dilani Edirisuriya	COP Member	DFAT
Julia Hartelius	COP Member	Australian Red Cross
Ms Fadia Tasneem	COP Member	MAA International Inc.
Cath Napier	COP Member	Save the Children Australia
Geordie Fung	COP Member	The Oaktree Foundation

Ms Paula Fitzgerald	COP Member	RedR Australia
Ms Chrissy Galerakis	COP Member	Plan International Australia
Emily Dwyer, Youth Advisor	COP Member	Oxfam Australia
Robert Madsen	COP Member	AVI
Mrs Sarineh Manoukian	COP Member	The Fred Hollows Foundation
Alana George	COP Member	The Fred Hollows Foundation

- *Denotes non-ACFID member*