

Submission  
No 27

**INQUIRY INTO 2025 INQUIRY INTO THE OPERATION OF  
THE APPROVED CHARITABLE ORGANISATIONS UNDER  
THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT 1979**

**Organisation:** SAFE Rehoming

**Date Received:** 31 October 2025

---



'Every animal deserves a chance to  
live a happy life'

[www.saferehoming.com.au](http://www.saferehoming.com.au)  
[info@saferehoming.com.au](mailto:info@saferehoming.com.au)

---

31<sup>st</sup> October 2025

**SUBMISSION FOR 2025 Inquiry into the operation of the approved charitable organisations under  
the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979**

SAFE Rehoming is a registered animal welfare not-for-profit charity based in Northern Sydney, although we help animals and people with their animals from all over Greater Sydney. We have been operating since 2017 and have taken over 2000 animals in to care as of this submission. As a recognised rehoming organisation, we report our animal numbers annually to the Office of Local Government (OLG) and we report our finances to the Australian Charity and Not-for-profit Commission (ACNC) annually as well. We are a very small organisation with limited resources, largely run by volunteer hours, barring one part time paid position.

**Terms of reference responses**

**(a) the matters contained in the annual reports of the approved charitable organisations,  
including their financial statements**

Unfortunately at the time of writing this submission, nor the RSPCA NSW or AWL NSW have publicised their 2025 annual reports. It's hard to understand how these organisations have not been able to produce these in a timely manner with a combined employee expense figure of almost \$50 million.

In any case, looking over the RSPCA's submitted financial report, it is SAFE's belief that the reporting on this by both organisations for an extended period is entirely inadequate. The reports on the income and expenses are extremely vague and the way it's reported is difficult to understand for the general public.

Charities that not only get donations from the general public as a trusted organisation, but also receive funding from the NSW Government must be held to account for what those funds are spent on. While the government funding is provided for programs reviewed and approved by the NSW Government, undertaken by the RSPCA, much of the donations sent by the general public are spent under vague categories such as '*Administration Expenses*' for over \$6,000,000 and '*Salaries and wages expenses*' at over \$40,000,000 with no breakdown or understanding of how those wages are broken down.

At SAFE, a tiny organisation in comparison to these organisations, releases very detailed financial reports for our members and the public to view, so that every dollar can be accounted for and we have a provision in our constitution for members to request further information if they wish. It's hard to understand how an organisation that brings in so much funding cannot produce a clearer understanding of the way its funds are spent. And in fact in reading the report for this submission, I am struggling to understand whether RSPCA have actually made a loss or surplus in the financial year 2025. As someone who compiles their own versions of these reports for their own organisation, if I can struggle to understand it, what chance does someone with less experience in reviewing this type of information have making head nor tail of it?

Having a standardised way for these organisations to report their finances should be part of what qualifies them to be approved and receive grants funds through the NSW Government. As a smaller organisation which is a registered rehoming organisation through the OLG, we would have no problem reporting in a standardised, transparent and detailed manner. These organisations are many times larger than SAFE and should have no problem doing this.

To clarify, I am not alleging or concerned that there is fraud occurring in these organisations as I am aware they are independently audited as part of their end of financial year processes. My focus is on transparency on how these funds are spent and whether the spending would line up with the public's understanding of how these organisations are spending the money that has been donated in good faith to help animals.

**(b) the exercise by the approved charitable organisations of their compliance and enforcement functions under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979**

These organisations proposit to stand up for animals under The Act, however RSCPA in particular describe, their core mission as: "*preventing cruelty, providing veterinary care, and promoting community outreach.*". This core mission seemed to be in direct contradiction to their decision to close to stray animals which members of the public would bring in to them for rehoming.

While I concede that the RSPCA itself is not a pound operation and therefore under the provisions in the Companion Animal Act 1998 is not allowed to take in stray animals, their refusal to take these animals in is antithetical to their mission. The Companion Animal Act 1998 needs revision on the way this works but with the pound system overwhelmed and small organisations have run out of space and funds, organisations like RSPCA and AWL NSW must be utilised to their greatest extent to help these animals.

Providing an avenue for this type of welfare for stray and unowned pets would be beneficial not just to these animals and the general public trying to help them but also go a long way to help alleviate the predation of native wildlife.

**(c) any other related matters.**

Coming off the back of the previous point, while I would love for the RSCPA and AWL NSW to take in more needy animals off the streets, I would also like them both to have more accountability on what then happens to those animals after they have come into care. The outcome of these animals must

meet the community's expectations, however if the community is not aware of what the outcomes are, the accountability is not possible.

Given the 2025 annual reports are not available at the time of writing this submission from either organisation, I cannot comment on this year's report. Looking at the last two years reports from both organisations, I am pleased to see that RSPCA in particular are reporting more comprehensive numbers with some detail. However seeing terms like '*fractious feline*' used in the euthanasia rates and seeing over 800 cats euthanised for behavioural reasons on top of the aforementioned category, this is a concerningly higher number. On top of this there are more cats euthanised for '*Organisational*' reasons.

SAFE, as a recognised rehoming organisation, we are required to report our animal numbers at the end of each financial year to the OLG. We are also required to explain every single animal that is euthanased for medical, behavioural and other reasons. Are these organisations also required to do this? Once again, these organisations need to meet community standards, but unless these organisations are releasing what they are doing out in the public, they cannot be held to account.

SAFE would also take the stance that we would not have a problem with all these figures that are reported to the OLG being made entirely public, in fact SAFE puts these figures directly into our annual reports. While these organisations are reporting more figures and being slightly more concise, they are still reporting their figures in ways that look good on their annual reports and for the general public is likely confusing to understand.

Would the community that supports the RSPCA approve of the reasons they decided to euthanase animals which may be able to be rehabilitated, especially young kittens who generally have a good prognosis with rehabilitation? How are these animals determined to be not rehomingable? What is the difference between a cat that is euthanased for 'behavioural reasons' or a 'fractious cat'?

Much like the finances, every organisation, the big ones we are talking about here and the small ones like SAFE, should have their raw numbers all published for the public to view in a clear and easy to understand way, including the explanation about why an animal, particularly behavioural euthanasia should be included for the public's consumption. This will give the public the best information to be able to understand whether each organisation meets their expectations when it comes to their ethical decisions and therefore inform them before they decide to donate their hard earned money.

### **Conclusion**

At SAFE we strive to show transparency and aim to exceed community standards. We are a small organisation primarily run by volunteers, if we can do this, why can these multi-million dollar organisations, who receive millions of dollars in donations and even more millions of dollars from government grants, do the same?

Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions, comments or feedback.

Best regards,  
Tim Crossman  
President  
SAFE Rehoming