

Dear Productivity Commission,

My name is Conor Rogers, a long time donator to charities that are able to make the most impact in improving the lives of both human and non-human animals. Having delved into your draft report, I am particularly drawn to the proposed expansion of Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) status to charities committed to preventing harm.

Your draft report's assertion that the current DGR system necessitates an overhaul, with a simpler system fostering fairer and more consistent outcomes, resonates with me (Draft Recommendation 6.1). The proposed inclusion of animal welfare charities under the DGR status is a wonderful move that I welcome full heartedly. The current exclusion of such charities that do not provide direct care or rehabilitation has hindered their ability to attract significant donations or apply for grants requiring DGR status. By removing these barriers, all donors to this cause will be encouraged rather than disadvantaged for prioritising preventative activities over immediate care needs.

This will level the playing field for all animal charities, enabling more funding to be directed towards **high-impact activities**. These would aim to improve the lives of **billions of animals**, particularly those currently enduring the worst conditions in factory farms around the world.

In response to terms of reference 3.ii, I found the discussion of impact evaluation to be somewhat surprising. Many achievable options do not need to mandate standardised measures or metrics of charity effectiveness. Highly impactful interventions often yield **10 or 100 times** more than average interventions. However, research shows that donors often underestimate this difference, believing that impactful charitable programs are only 1.5 times better than average ones.

I encourage the Productivity Commission to review the following articles that support this argument: '**Don't Feed the Zombies**' by Kevin Star in the Stanford Social Innovation Review, and '**How much do solutions to social problems differ in their effectiveness? A collection of all the studies we could find**' by Benjamin Todd.

Given the evidence, the government should pilot different approaches to encouraging the for-purpose sector to focus on increasing its impact.

In conclusion, your draft report paints an exciting picture of a reformed for-purpose sector in Australia. I hope that my feedback contributes to finalising a report that truly amplifies the impact of philanthropy in our society.

Regards,
Conor Rogers