

**Additional remarks including comments on Global Development Group  
Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade's public hearing for its  
inquiry into Australia's aid program**

I have some nervousness as I appear before you this morning.

I have read the terms of reference.

I have an interest in every one of the points mentioned.

I was involved in the distant past with setting up businesses in developing countries always using the services of Austrade, which of course developed into DFAT.

Again working with AusAID we saw the change to DFAT.

There are many very competent people in DFAT and I appreciate the organisation

My own organisation, **Global Development Group** funds projects to the value of over \$30M/year in developing countries, always in partnership with an in-country partner as required by our **OAGDS** (Overseas Aid Gift Deduction Scheme) participation.

GDG has 1 million direct beneficiaries and 4 million indirect beneficiaries.

We emphasise Child Protection – where I believe we have a very high standard.

We fully believe in, and initiate female empowerment. One project alone in Rwanda has 200,000 women in more than 9,000 self-help groups.

In Mt Kilimanjaro we have helped the women develop a milk industry and then were supplied DAP funds to use cow dung to produce biogas for cooking and lighting.

We very much appreciate the Australian embassy staff in each country we work in.

GDG is about the 7<sup>th</sup> largest member of **ACFID** (Australian Council for International Development). We are a signatory to the Code of Conduct and we complete self-assessment every year. GDG believes in a professional approach and our 20 Australian staff and 8 representatives have 22 bachelor degrees, 8 masters' degrees and 1 PhD.

**However, my submission is a little left field.**

We believe that it is essential that Australian Aid is seen to be honest, effective, reliable and professional. The reputation of Australian Aid is extremely important.

The public sector (non- government) provides 35% of Australian Aid and is very visible to people on the ground.

I am aware that The ACNC is only 5 years old and looks after over 48,000 charities with an economic contribution of 129B.

I believe that this inquiry should ensure that the 35% of aid monies that come from tax deductible funding is accountable.

My suggestion is that the minimum standard should be OAGDS. The accountability should be Administered by ACNC

ACNC is waiting for direction from Treasury  
Treasury is waiting for direction from parliament

I hope that this small submission opens another avenue of review for the inquiry. I know that there is a vocal section of the sector who want no accountability – but this increases the risk to the Australian Aid sector.

**Geoff Armstrong** BSc, MBA, AFAMI, CMC, MAICD, MASQ

Executive Director



Tax Agent  
41248004



Certified Principal Management Consultant



*an Australian NGO building better lives for the world's poorest people*