

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5 August 2017 11:46 AM

To: frcgt

Subject: Submission to TAX DEDUCTIBLE GIFT RECIPIENT REFORM OPPORTUNITIES

Submission to TAX DEDUCTIBLE GIFT RECIPIENT REFORM OPPORTUNITIES

Sorry for late submission, I understand they closed yesterday

I only became aware of this today

Our comment is simple

In our case 100% of our funds are spent protecting rainforest and the animals we represent

We find the most cost efficient way of protecting the environment to purchase land and to protect it from illegal activity. That is much more cost effective than remediating land by a factor of around 50 to 1.

It is unclear to us whether that fits the definition of environmental remediation

Every charity is so different and it appears a blanket rule like this could have unintended consequences.

So we object to such an arbitrary measure

Maybe a more suitable measure if in fact one is needed is that a certain percentage of funds be devoted to positive environmental outcomes.

Either way the regulatory burden would be huge.

We therefore object to the clause

Tony Gilding  
President

█

# TAX DEDUCTIBLE GIFT RECIPIENT REFORM OPPORTUNITIES

15 June 2017 | Discussion Paper

## Consultation question

12. Stakeholders' views are sought on requiring environmental organisations to commit no less than 25 per cent of their annual expenditure from their public fund to environmental remediation, and whether a higher limit, such as 50 per cent, should be considered? In particular, what are the potential benefits and the potential regulatory burden? How could the proposal be implemented to minimise the regulatory burden?

--

Tony Gilding

President

**Borneo Orangutan Survival Australia**

[www.orangutans.com.au](http://www.orangutans.com.au)

