Dear Productivity Commission,

My name is Danielle Loreck. I am a 27-year-old queer woman currently working in the IT sector.

I am writing to you today in response to your recent inquiry on philanthropic giving. As someone who has worked for several small not-for-profits, I have witnessed the struggle to generate enough revenue to continue providing the vital community services and advocacy they offer. Furthermore, I am deeply concerned about how the current Deductible Gift Recipient (DGR) regime unfairly privileges certain groups over others.

The report's finding that the DGR system needs reform resonates with me. I agree with the draft recommendation 6.1, which argues for a simpler, fairer system. Granting DGR status to charities undertaking advocacy activities as proposed by the report will make a significant difference in tackling pressing societal problems. However, I would like to suggest that the final report clarifies that the proposed expansion of DGR is not limited only to advocacy activities themselves, but also extends to other supporting work like policy development or community engagement.

I am particularly pleased with the proposal to expand DGR status to animal welfare charities. This move is crucial, as many animal welfare charities that focus on advocacy and policy work at a larger scale are currently disadvantaged due to their inability to attract significant donations or apply for grants requiring DGR status. Extending DGR status will significantly increase their effectiveness and impact.

Given the popularity of animal charities amongst Australian donors, expanding DGR eligibility will not only have a positive impact but also help charities reach new communities. It will open up new fundraising channels like workplace giving, corporate fundraising, and various third-party fundraising and crowd-funding platforms.

In addition, the proposed reforms will provide a boost to NFPs that cannot easily access DGR status today "because they provide a broad range of support to a group of people or community, and therefore do not neatly fit into one DGR endorsement category (as is required under current policy settings)" (Future foundations for giving — Overview, pg 16). I'm excited that this change would allow for greater NFP support of vulnerable groups such as LGBTIQA+ people and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

Finally, I am aware that incumbent for-profit organisations may seek to oppose this change. They may utilise any possible loopholes in the final report to argue against the granting of DGR status. Therefore, it is important that the Productivity Commission pre-empts such oppositions and expands its recommendations accordingly.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. I am looking forward to seeing these changes implemented for the betterment of our society.

Regards, Danielle Loreck