

Myth v. Fact

Myth: The current tax laws encourage all Americans to make charitable donations to causes they support.

Fact: About 90% of Americans have little tax incentive to make charitable gifts. This is in sharp contrast to the tax benefits given to the wealthiest Americans, which can be worth as much as 74% of the donation.

Myth: Private foundations do not need new rules because they are already required to spend 5 percent on charities annually.

Fact: While private foundations are required to spend 5 percent each year, there is no requirement for this spending actually to go to charities. Indeed, under current law, the entire 5 percent could be spent on administrative costs of the foundation, including for salaries and travel expenses of family members. In addition, the 5 percent could go to a donor-advised fund (DAF), where it awaits future advice from the foundation and may not be spent for many years—there's currently no time limit.

Myth: These proposals punish small family foundations by forbidding a foundation from paying compensation or travel expenses of a family member.

Fact: Our reform proposals still permit the reasonable compensation and foundation related travel expenses of family members, but just not as part of meeting the payout requirement. When compensation and travel expenses of family members count toward the payout requirement, this often results in less money going to charities. Ultimately, these payments to insiders should not be treated as the equivalent of a grant to a charity. Reforms are needed to ensure that the rules are effectively fulfilling their intended purpose – making sure funds are going towards charitable use.

Myth: Donor-advised funds (DAFs) give billions of dollars to charity each year, so the growth in DAFs must mean that more money is going to charities.

Fact: There is no evidence that the growth of DAFs has led to more charitable giving. Rather, the evidence suggests that DAFs mainly replace direct giving to working charities. According to Giving USA, charitable giving by individuals has remained remarkably constant for the past 40 years at approximately 2% of disposable income. But as DAFs have grown, a greater percentage of those donations are going into DAFs. From 2016-2017 – the most recent full data set available – [contributions](#) to DAFs grew by more than 23 percent, while outright contributions to charities, which includes contributions from DAFs, grew only 6.6 percent. This picture is troublesome, especially as DAF assets have been growing each year at double digit rates tax free, while charities are shutting down.

Initiative to →Accelerate Charitable Giving

Myth: DAFs do not need new rules because they pay out at significantly higher rates than private foundations, often paying out as much as 20 percent on an annual basis.

Fact: This 20 percent number is very misleading. While some DAF sponsors have high payout rates, nearly one in four DAF sponsors distribute less than 5 percent of their assets. Further, the 20 percent figure uses a [methodology](#) that overstates the actual payout. Additionally, this payout rate is an average across accounts, saying nothing about what happens at the account level. For example, a DAF sponsor could achieve a 20 percent payout if it had five funds with the same value, and one fund paid out 100 percent while the other four paid nothing. Lastly, the 20 percent payout figure includes amounts distributed to other DAFs. According to a 2017 Economist magazine [analysis](#) of three of the biggest DAF providers, their largest recipient of DAF distributions was another DAF sponsor. These DAF-to-DAF transfers boost payout rates without providing any benefit to working charities.

Myth: These DAF proposals will unduly pressure donors to give before they have had time for thoughtful reflection.

Fact: Our proposal has two options: One option allows fifteen years for payout, which provides ample time for donors to engage in thoughtful reflection about the distribution of DAF funds. However, if a donor wants more than 15 years to distribute their DAF contribution, the proposal's second option provides that donors can choose more time for distribution by foregoing the income tax deduction until the donated funds are distributed to a charity. Under this second option, donors still benefit from the relief of the tax on the capital gains and receive estate tax benefits at the time of the donation to the DAF.

Myth: These proposals would disincentivize donors from giving via DAFs.

Fact: These proposals maintain what donors most value about DAFs – including significant up-front tax benefits – while also encouraging distributions to charities within a reasonable period of time. Under our proposals, donors will continue to benefit from the relief of the tax on the capital gains and receive estate tax benefits for DAF donations. They can also choose whether the income tax deduction is aligned with the distribution from the DAF or is allowed immediately upon contribution to the DAF, so long as the DAF is committed to distribution of the contribution and earnings within 15 years.

Myth: These proposals prevent DAFs from serving as rainy day funds for charities.

Fact: With a 15-year payout term or with the aligned benefit rule – which allow for DAF funds to be set aside for an indefinite period of time – our proposals leave ample opportunity for DAFs to serve as rainy day funds. The problem with current law is that the funds may never get to charities.

Initiative to →Accelerate Charitable Giving

Myth: DAFs increased their giving during the current economic and health crisis, thus proving that DAF reform is not necessary.

Fact: We commend all who have stepped up to provide crucial support to charities, especially during these challenging times. However, the fact that more money is flowing through DAFs does not mean that DAFs are increasing their overall giving relative to the amount that they have under management. The latest publicly available [data](#) shows that more than \$140 billion remain in DAFs – billions of dollars that sit on the sidelines without any assurances of reaching the public.

Myth: DAFs are a charitable giving tool commonly used by all Americans, thereby “democratizing giving.”

Fact: DAFs are predominantly used by the wealthiest Americans. The average DAF donor is a member of the wealthiest one-tenth of one percent of Americans, according to a report by the [Institute of Policy Studies](#). The report also shows that the average donor has an income of more than \$1 million. Additionally, the [average size](#) of a DAF is over \$160,000. Contrary to the myth, DAFs are primarily used by wealthier Americans to achieve tax benefits while still maintaining effective control of the donated assets.

Myth: The proposed reforms threaten donor privacy.

Fact: Our proposals do not change existing privacy protections. Donors can continue to make anonymous donations through DAFs.

Myth: Other proposals – such as a mandated annual 10 percent payout requirement for DAFs and private foundations for the next three years – are more viable solutions to accelerating funding to charities.

Fact: These other proposals are short-term solutions to a long-term problem. Our proposals provide more permanent solutions to our broken system to ensure money gets to charities – and not just to intermediary organizations – in a more timely fashion.