



Lush Prize for Lobbying - 2015

Research Paper

1 Executive Summary

The use of animals in laboratories is often entrenched by legal requirements or a regulatory reluctance to accept the scientific superiority of non-animal testing methods. Political lobbying is an essential part of the campaign to end animal testing.

The definition of the Lush Prize for Lobbying¹ is:

“Scientific innovation needs to go hand-in-hand with policy change to ensure that end-users of new testing approaches – industry and regulators – are receptive and responsive to the new methods.

Such change requires a multifaceted, global approach, including science-based lobbying at the national level or supra-national level to:

- *Entrench non-animal testing methods in national, EU or OECD programmes of test guidelines*
- *Revise existing guidelines to reflect best practices, including the removal of animal tests, or*
- *Achieve a mandatory requirement for non-animal testing in legislation, regulatory policies, testing guidance, etc.”*

This paper examines some of the key issues relating to animal testing in several countries that are of particular relevance to the Lush Prize, which focuses on toxicity testing for consumer products and ingredients. These key issues relate to cosmetics testing and chemical testing. Recent lobbying initiatives are discussed, as well as several recent successes. This is a crucial time for lobbying on these issues and important results have been achieved, such as the European Union (EU) ban on marketing animal testing cosmetics, which is making waves around the world.

Also included is a list of organisations around the world that are active in lobbying either locally, nationally or internationally, on animal experimentation.

In addition, the paper ends with a list of organisations that merit particular consideration for the Lush Prize because of their outstanding work in the field:

1 Humane Research Australia: For its political work in support of ending animal testing for cosmetics.
(HRA won the Public Awareness Prize in 2014)

2 Eurogroup for Animals: For their contribution to the acceptance of the need to replace animal tests and their policy papers on several areas of animal testing.

¹ Lobbying Prize. Lush Prize. www.lushprize.org/awards/lobbying-prize. Accessed 02.6.15

- 3 Animalia: For their work to increase the general public and decision-makers' awareness of animal protection issues and instigation of public debate on animal protection.
- 4 Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V.: For their campaign to put pressure on responsible authorities, politicians and companies, for example on the issues of dissection and Botox testing.
- 5 Humane Society International India: For their campaign which led to India's Drug Controller General to call for the last remaining animal tests to be eliminated from India's cosmetics standard and their Be Cruelty-Free campaign.
- 6 PETA India: For their major role in the successful campaign to ban the testing of cosmetics on animals in the country.
(PETA India won the Lobbying Prize in 2012 for its campaign to end animal testing of cosmetics)
- 7 Irish Anti-Vivisection Society (IAVS): For lobbying the Department of Health which has led to the reform of the most severe procedures, and acceptance and development of research and testing techniques not involving animals.
- 8 EQUIVITA Antivivisection Scientific Committee: For lobbying the Minister of Health to provide input to research on addictions and not let slip the ban on the animal testing of recreational drugs such as alcohol, drugs and tobacco (due in 2017).
- 9 Save Animals From Exploitation (SAFE): For their ongoing strategic lobbying which has been instrumental in New Zealand legislative reform.
(SAFE won the Public Awareness Prize in 2013)
- 10 NZ Anti-Vivisection Society: For their political work over the past three decades, including the presentation of petitions to Parliament, and submissions to government and regulatory authorities.
(NZAVS won the Lobbying Prize in 2014)
- 11 Djurrättsalliansen: For their campaign to end primate experiments and team of investigators from Djurrättsalliansen to go through the applications sent in to the seven ethical committees that approve the experiments with animals.
- 12 Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine: For their political lobbying on the Chemical Safety Improvement Act and role as Secretariat of the International Council on Animal Protection at OECD (ICAPO).
(ICAPO won the Lobbying Prize in 2013)
- 13 The American Anti-Vivisection Society: For their leadership role as Chair of the Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics (CCIC).

2 Introduction

Many scientists rely on animal experiments, and regulatory agencies mandate data collected from them because that is what tradition and laws dictate, ignoring the failure of animal tests to predict what is safe or effective in people, and failing to recognise the advances made in non-animal testing methodologies. However, a great deal of progress has been achieved over the past twenty years or so in changing legislation to encourage non-animal testing methods. These changes not only meet the expectations and demands of a public concerned about animal protection but, given the unreliability of experiments on animals, provide safer methods of testing new products for the consumer market.

Countries that require cosmetics to pass animal tests before being allowed on the market are being robustly challenged to implement effective non-animal testing methods and end animal use entirely. This is being done using a combination of public awareness and lobbying campaigns, as well as training of scientists and regulators. In 2013, the EU took the landmark step of banning the importation of all cosmetics tested on animals (anywhere in the world) after March 11th 2013. The marketing law was fully implemented, making the selling of animal-tested cosmetics in Europe illegal, even if the testing was carried out on animals outside. This was an incredible achievement that was a culmination of a vigorous and long-standing public campaign against animal-tested cosmetics. The EU Cosmetics Directive (76/768/EEC) has been described as “*a major balancing act between research and animal protection*” and a “*quantum leap forwards from the 1986 regulations*”². The European Parliament agreed on the principle that non-animal alternatives must be used wherever they are scientifically suitable.

In 2009, animal tests for cosmetics were made illegal in Europe, yet still products tested elsewhere could be imported. This landmark decision by the EU had repercussions around the world. Israel and India followed suit and introducing similar legislation. The sales ban made it ultimately clear that animal testing is unnecessary (and wrong), and cosmetics companies were forced to re-evaluate animal testing policies, if they wanted to sell products to the EU’s 500 million consumers. The ban also sparked a surge in investment in non-animal tests and a number of animal tests have now been completely replaced with superior, cheaper and more effective non-animal methods.

Both Israel and Norway have now officially banned animal testing for cosmetics. In Israel, a similar marketing ban was implemented in 2013 which prohibits the import, marketing and sale of any cosmetics, toiletries or detergents whose manufacturing process involves animal testing³, having first banned the use of animals to test personal care and household products in 2007. India became the first Asian nation to ban animal testing for cosmetics, with the Drug Controller General of India

² Experiments on animals: did the EU cave in to lobbyists? Peter Wedderburn, Telegraph, 9.9.10 <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/peterwedderburn/100053008/experiments-on-animals-did-the-eu-cave-in-to-lobbyists>

³ Import ban on animal-tested products goes into effect. Gabe Fisher, Times of Israel, 1.1.13. www.timesofisrael.com/import-ban-on-animal-tested-products-goes-into-effect

announcing during June 2013 that the testing of cosmetics and their ingredients on animals will no longer be permitted in the country. Campaigners from several Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) are now urging for a ban on the marketing of cosmetics or their ingredients tested on animals. In other words, legislation that is in line with the EU and Israel.

In Southeast Asia, cosmetics legislation adopted by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) mirrors EU law aside from the cosmetics testing ban. ASEAN Heads of Delegation are now considering updating their rules to match. In Vietnam, the government has ended the use of the cruel and controversial draize rabbit eye test for cosmetics - an acute toxicity test which involves the applying of substances into the eyes of conscious rabbits. In March 2015, a bill was launched in Korea that will ban animal testing of cosmetics where accepted non-animal alternatives are available.

In China, the authorities have now abolished the requirement for animal testing for most cosmetics manufactured in the country, including shampoo, make up, many skin care products and perfume. Cruelty-free companies can now seek to sell these products in the country without animal testing - as long as they finish (package) their products in China.

In Brazil, the Chamber of Deputies passed a bill requiring most cosmetics tests to be carried out without the use of animals⁴. In January 2014, São Paulo became the first region in Brazil to sign a bill prohibiting cosmetics testing on animals in the state.

In the United States, a federal bill was recently introduced in 2014 - The Humane Cosmetics Act. This bill aims to phase out the use of animal tests for cosmetics after one year, and end the sale of cosmetics tested on animals in other countries after three years. In addition, the Food and Drug Administration has been pressured to provide industry guidance on the use of alternatives to animal tests.

In New Zealand, during March 2015, the Government decided to ban animal tests for cosmetics and ingredients.

So, whilst companies can't sell animal-tested cosmetics in Europe, they can continue to test cosmetics on animals outside Europe and sell them in other markets. In other words, companies can still profit from cruelty to animals in many countries.

The use of animals in chemicals testing also remains high on the lobbying agenda for NGOs working on the issue of animal testing. In Europe, particularly cruel toxicity tests are now required under the 'Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals' (REACH) legislation, which involves the poisoning of guinea pigs, rabbits, fish, birds, rats and mice. Lobbying by NGOs has helped to significantly reduce the number of animals used in testing for REACH, yet scrutiny needs to be applied to limit animal use as much as possible.

⁴ www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/what-we-do/our-campaigns/ending-cruel-cosmetics/around-world

3 Lobbying

3.1 What is lobbying?

Lobbying is the act of attempting to influence decisions made by officials in the government, most often legislators or members of regulatory agencies⁵. It plays a vital role in creating change, and is often a consequence of public awareness campaigns.

NGOs opposed to animal testing are becoming increasingly skilled at lobbying at a variety of levels and are accepted by regulatory and legislative bodies as informed and reliable stakeholders. They have formed coalitions such as the International Council on Animal Protection in OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) Programmes, which was formed to incorporate alternative methods that can replace, reduce, and refine animal use. The European Coalition to End Animal Experiments (ECEAE) is an effective lobbying organisation that has a stakeholder seat on several committees relating to the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA). ECHA and the Member States evaluate information submitted by chemical companies to examine the quality of registration dossiers and the testing proposals and can order companies to carry out animal tests. PETA India also has an official seat on committees which has been instrumental in their lobbying to successfully ban cosmetics testing on animals.

4 Key Issues

4.1 Cosmetics

The European Union, consisting of 28 Member States, became the world's first set of countries to ban cosmetics tests on animals. In 2003, the European Parliament voted to ban animal testing for cosmetic purposes. The seventh amendment to the Cosmetics Directive (Directive 76/768/EEC) banned testing on animals in Europe from March 2009, and also banned the 'marketing' (i.e. import and sale) of products and ingredients tested on animals outside Europe after that date. A postponement of the 'marketing' ban was provided for three animal tests ('endpoints') - toxicokinetics, repeated dose, and reproductive toxicity until 2013, as it was considered at the time that these tests were more difficult to replace.

In March 2013, the EU banned the sale of finished cosmetics and cosmetics ingredients that have been tested on animals. This ban means that companies all over the world must replace animal tests for cosmetics if they want to sell cosmetics in Europe.

There is no doubt that the new Directive is an improvement and the cosmetics ban has been a driving force for the industry to develop and utilise humane tests for products. The legislation, however, imposes a general ban only on the use of great apes, such as chimpanzees and gorillas, in scientific tests however. The

⁵ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lobbying>

Commission wanted to extend this ban to include other primates such as macaques, but MEPs disagreed. Another proposed requirement, insisting on the sharing of data from animal experiments, was also removed, presumably for reasons of commercial advantage. The Directive sets out categories of pain, ranging from "mild" to "severe" - a classification system designed to prevent repeated suffering. The Directive obliges national authorities to carry out regular inspections of laboratories that use animals, with some of the visits being unannounced. Unfortunately, it is the NGOs who continue to reveal what happens inside laboratories, often through carrying out undercover investigations, rather than via Governmental bodies.

4.2 Household products - United Kingdom

Whilst there is no legal definition of a 'household product', most of us would understand the term to mean products such as disinfectants, washing powder, air fresheners, disinfectants, furniture polish, bleach, stain removers, glues and other cleaning products for baths, dishwashers, carpets, ovens and toilets. The UK public spend around £1 billion a year on household products, with supermarket shelves and kitchen cupboards dominated by products from multinational giants.

In the UK, animal tests for household products are usually carried out for the chemical ingredients that go into these products. Thousands of mice, rats, rabbits, guinea pigs and other animals suffer and die each year in the UK alone during poisoning tests of household product ingredients.

In 2010, the UK Coalition Government pledged to '*end the testing of household products on animals*'. In 2011, the Home Office Minister, Lynn Featherstone, announced the same. The Government has so far failed to honour their pledge. The proposed ban (that has not yet been implemented) only applies to finished products, which means the chemical ingredients will still be tested on animals to satisfy general chemicals legislation. In fact, the pledge has been watered down to the point that not a single animal test may be affected.

Several NGOs in the UK are currently calling on the UK Government to include ingredients in its definition of a 'household product'.

The UK Government also must follow the 2010 pledge with implementation and substantial progress with regards to other areas of safety testing, where thousands of animals continue to suffer. Other areas that must be addressed are the current cost-benefit analysis involved in the licensing of grants, and the need for new products to be constantly marketed.

In accordance with the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, a Project Licence is granted after the Secretary of State has weighed the likely adverse effects on the animals against any benefits likely to accrue as a result of the project.

With regards to safety testing, the relevant benefit has been taken by the Home Office to be the protection of humans, animals and the environment. Yet the benefits likely to accrue from using the specific product or substance should be weighed against the harms caused to the animals in safety testing, harm that is often

substantial. This principle has in fact already been applied in the case of cosmetics, where the use of animals in safety testing has been banned throughout Europe.

If this principle were to be applied, no animal testing would be allowed for substances with trivial purposes or little benefit to society such as household products.

In 2012, the revised UK animal testing legislation stated that no Project Licenses will be granted for the testing of household products on animals. However, the Home Office Minister (when asked during Parliamentary Questions) stated that there is no authoritative definition of 'household product' in UK or EU legislation. There is no mention of any restriction on ingredients for household products.

There is clearly a lack of political will to end the use of animal testing in the production and marketing of household products here in the UK.

4.3 EU Chemical Testing Programme

In October 2003, the European Commission presented its latest proposal for a new EU regulatory framework for the testing of chemicals. This is part of the EU's plan to test thousands of substances that have been in everyday use for many years and have been tested on animals before. Chemicals that were marketed prior to 1981 will now have to undergo extensive safety testing.

Its new formula has been termed 'REACH', or the 'Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals'. It was established to give industry greater responsibility for managing risks and providing information, thus shifting the burden of proof of safety from government to industry. REACH came into effect in 2007.

Under REACH, the European Commission plans to test at least 30,000 chemicals for their human and environmental safety. Chemical companies have up until 2018 to prove to the European Chemicals Agency that the chemicals they are manufacturing or importing are safe to use. Around 13 million animals will be poisoned and killed by cruel toxicity tests, including guinea pigs, rabbits, rats and mice. Thanks to campaign groups such as Cruelty Free International (formerly BUAV) and PETA, the number of animals killed has been reduced (it would have been between 38-45 million without their intervention). Still, it remains the biggest poisoning programme in European history.

REACH means millions of animals will still be poisoned to death in cruel, unnecessary tests. Some positive amendments in REACH have included mandatory data sharing (devised to avoid duplication of tests) and the promotion of non-animal test methods. Legal experts are challenging certain animal tests and to have them removed, saving still more lives.

NGOs such as BUAV and PETA are working hard to end specific tests under the REACH legislation, including providing expert advice to companies ordered to carry out cruel tests by European Chemicals Agency, under REACH.

4.4 Individual species

Several organisations, such as Soko Tierschutz in Germany and BUAV, have carried out groundbreaking lobbying work on the use of non-human primates and companion animals (i.e. dogs and cats) in experiments, animals who strike a particular chord with the general public.

4.4. 1 Primates

Members of the European Parliament and European citizens have identified a strong ethical, scientific and conservation case for phasing out the use of non-human primates in regulatory testing (required for products to be put on the market) and in academic/fundamental research. For example, in 2002 the European Parliament adopted this policy: *“the need for the continued use of non-human primates in research and testing should be critically evaluated in the light of scientific knowledge, with the intention of reducing and eventually ending their use”*⁶.

An end to the use of primates in research would likely receive widespread public support: 80% of respondents to the European Commission’s public consultation on the revision of Directive 86/609/EEC responded that the use of primates in laboratories is ‘not acceptable’⁷. The awareness of primate suffering in laboratories is high, particularly in Europe, thanks to several key undercover investigations such as those carried out by NGOs BUAV and Soko Tierschutz, and is a source of widespread concern. In 2007, 433 Members of the European Parliament – the majority – signed Written Declaration 40, calling for the Commission, the Council of Ministers and the Parliament to use the revision process of Directive 86/609/EEC to:

(a) make ending the use of apes and wild-caught monkeys in scientific experiments an urgent priority

(b) establish a timetable for replacing the use of all primates in scientific experiments with alternatives. Written Declaration 40/2007 had received unprecedented cross-party support, with every Member State represented. It included prominent Europeans, including former government ministers.

All primate species show high levels of intelligence, are dextrous, good at problem solving, behave cooperatively and have extensive social structures with components of culture. Rhesus macaque monkeys have proved themselves capable of learning rudimentary arithmetic, to think using symbols and have demonstrated ‘theory of mind’ – how to reason about what others think – a cognitive ability previously considered paramount to human beings.

The extensive undercover investigation with support from BUAV at Tübingen Max Planck Institute (MPI) for Biological Cybernetics in Germany by Soko Tierschutz was followed closely by some excellent political lobbying by the organisation on the ground in Germany. Extensive national and international media coverage followed, along with online actions and large scale demonstrations, including ones in Stuttgart and Tübingen involving thousands of people.

⁶ Report A5-0387/2002 adopted 13.11.2002

⁷ www.savetheprimates.org/primatiban/primatetestingreport/political-and-public-support-for-replacement-of-primate-tests

On a national level, representatives of the Green Party in Germany positioned themselves against invasive brain research on primates. On a local level it was backed by the Green mayor of Tübingen. Soko Tierschutz created more political pressure and media attention by focusing on the election campaign of the mayor, and also announced another big demonstration in Stuttgart, where the local government has its quarters. Soko Tierschutz attended a meeting with the animal welfare officer of Baden-Württemberg to discuss potential strategies for the future.

The Max Planck Institute Director, Prof. Nikos Logothetis, in 2015 made a public statement that he would discontinue the research on primates after the current licenses expire. This was a direct consequence of the work by Soko Tierschutz.

Soko Tierschutz is continuing the campaign and focusing on rescuing some of the primates still languishing inside Max Planck Institute. The NGO is now expecting two prime-time programmes concerning primate research and will continue outreach action to reach the general public.

4.4.2 Companion animals

Each year hundreds of cats and thousands of dogs are harmed in cruel animal experiments in the UK. The BUAV has carried out some groundbreaking work regarding their plight in laboratories. Their exposes, for example their 2013 investigation on the use of on four-week old puppies and eight-week old kittens in a UK laboratory (MSD Health Laboratory), and campaigns have raised awareness on the need to end their use in research. Their most recent 'Our Best Friends' campaign calls on the UK Government to end the use of dogs and cats in scientific research, just as it has done for Great Apes. In 2014, as part of the same campaign, BUAV recruited several high profile celebrities to lobby the UK government to make it mandatory for cats, dogs and other animals used in animal testing laboratories to be rehomed by the laboratories themselves.

5 NGOs Active in Lobbying on Animal Testing

5.1 Australia

5.1.1 Humane Research Australia (www.humaneresearch.org.au)

Humane Research Australia challenges the use of animals in research and teaching, and promotes the use of more humane and scientifically valid non-animal alternatives.

Campaigns include 'Ban Primate experiments (petition), Through the Looking Glass (with template letter to demand more transparency), Be Cruelty-Free Australia (in partnership with Humane Society International. Pledge, campaign Twitter, public consultation, products list), Happy Endings (in association with Beagle Freedom Australia, a network of groups and individuals who offer rehabilitation and sanctuary to ex-laboratory animals and they have a database of people who can take in ex-laboratory animals), Voices from the Labs (requesting testimonials from lab workers),

Xenotransplantation (asking people to write to Government to demand an end to it), Stopping the use of Pound Animals in Research (has campaigned against the use of pound dogs in veterinary teaching since 2006), Ban the Importation of Primates for Research (urging people to write to government to ban primate imports), Use of Calf serum (a campaign against so-called 'In Vitro' methods) and Say No to Dissection (run a 'Humane Education Loan Program' (HELP), which aims to provide educators and students with up to date alternatives to animal use in teaching. They also associate with Interniche and provide other resources for students).

Over the past twelve months Humane Research Australia have focused on:

- Through the Looking Glass - seeking transparency in animal research
- HRA recently launched the campaign Ban Primate Experiments which they believe should have a huge impact on not only primates but all animals used in experiments
- Be Cruelty Free Australia Campaign (a partnership between HRA and HSI) - In November 2014, Be Cruelty-Free Australia Worked with Liberal Senator Ruston and all co-sponsoring parties to achieve the passing of a cross-party Senate motion in support of ending animal testing for cosmetics. In September 2014, Be Cruelty-Free Australia made a detailed submission to the Australian Labour Party's Cosmetics and Animal Testing Policy Consultation, calling for a ban on the importation, manufacture, and sale of cosmetic products and ingredients tested on animals. In March 2014, Be Cruelty-Free Australia worked with the Australian Greens Party to help launch the End Cruel Cosmetics Bill.

5.1.2 Animal Liberation Victoria

(www.alv.org.au and www.animal-liberation.org.au)

Various animal protection issues: animal testing; duck shooting; zoos, circuses, rodeos; puppy farms; veganism.

5.1.3 Animals Australia

(www.animalsaustralia.org)

Various animal protection issues: animal testing; factory farming; greyhound racing. Promote a Pledge for people to sign saying they will not purchase animal tested products, contact companies such as P&G, donate to animal-friendly charities and avoid dissection.

5.1.4 Medical Advances Without Animals (MAWA)

(www.mawa-trust.org.au)

The aim of the Medical Advances Without Animals Trust (MAWA) is to advance medical science to improve human health and therapeutic outcomes without using animals or animal products.

5.1.5 Anti-Vivisection Union SA Inc

(www.arrc.org.au)

Out of date website but offers some information on hatching projects.

5.1.6 Choose Cruelty Free

(www.choosecrueltyfree.org.au)

Produces the Choose Cruelty Free List. They survey and accredit cruelty-free companies selling cosmetics, toiletries and household cleaning products to Australian consumers, online and/or retail.

5.1.7 Earth April International (EAI)

(<http://EarthApril.GoodEasy.info>)

Earth April is an ecological network.

5.2 Austria

5.2.1 Internationaler Bund der Tierversuchsgegner (Rights for Animals)

(www.tierversuchsgegner.at)

In May 2015, Internationaler Bund der Tierversuchsgegner urged supporters to contact the Austrian MEPs and urge them to you to support the concerns of the "Stop Vivisection" Citizens' Initiative.

5.2.2 Verein gegen Tierfabriken (Association against Animal Factories)

(https://www.vgt.at/index_en.php)

Verein gegen Tierfabriken reported on a 2015 poll on animal testing, and they make demands in EU legislation.

(www.vgt.at/actionalert/tierversuche/forderungen/20120515ForderungenTierversuche.pdf).

5.2.3 Save My Life

(www.savemylife.at)

Save my life act as mediators, offering a rehoming service for animals in labs.

5.3 Belgium

5.3.1 Eurogroup for Animals

(<http://eurogroupforanimals.org>)

Various animal protection issues: animal testing; farmed animals; wildlife; companion animals; EU & animal welfare.

Eurogroup feature latest news articles (e.g. <http://eurogroupforanimals.org/news/all-member-states-now-use-non-animal-methods-for-biotoxin-testing/> and <http://eurogroupforanimals.org/news/change-in-eu-chemicals-legislation-to-save-millions-of-lab-animals/>)

In the case of cosmetics and safety testing of chemicals and food, Eurogroup has contributed to the acceptance of the need to replace animal tests with non-animal alternatives.

Eurogroup produced policy papers on Endocrine disruptors, pesticides, cosmetics, nanotechnology, biotechnology, protection for lab animals, chemicals and alternatives.

5.3.2 GAIA - Voice of the Voiceless

(www.gaia.be/en)

Various animal protection issues: animal testing; factory farming; foie gras; fur trade. Member of ECEAE.

GAIA demands an ambitious policy in favour of alternative methods to animal experimentation, which would spare countless thousands of animals a lifetime of suffering in the name of science.

5.3.3 Bite Back

(www.biteback.org)

Various animal protection issues: animal testing; veganism; zoos; animal circuses. Held a Scientific Database on vivisection (www.dierproeveninformatie.nl).

5.4 Brazil

5.4.1 ANDA - Agência de Notícias dos Direitos dos Animais

(www.anda.jor.br).

AND feature articles and news on animal rights issues from around the world.

5.4.2 Brazilian Society of Alternative Methods to Animal Experiments (SBMAIt)

The Brazilian Industry Association of Toiletries, Perfumes and Cosmetics (ABIHPEC) in partnership with SBMAIt promote a discussion and alignment relative to the Brazilian regulatory environment and its future prospects.

5.5 China

5.5.1 Humane Society International

(www.hsi.org/world/china)

In 2013, the Be Cruelty Free campaign was launched in China with Chinese NGOs and academic scientists. HSI works with Chinese regulators to increase access to and acceptance of superior non-animal test methods. They launched a \$80,000 partnership with the Institute for In Vitro Sciences to provide Chinese scientists with hands-on training using advanced non-animal methods.

5.5.2 Chinese Animal Protection Network

(www.capn-online.info/en.php)

First Chinese network for animal protection, focussing on different animal issues

such as scientific research, lab animal rights, vegetarianism, networking of advocacy groups/individuals. Much work of CAPN is done in collaboration of Earth April International (EAI).

5.5.3 Capital Animal Welfare Association

CAWA works with HSI on the Be Cruelty Free campaign in China.

5.5.4 Animal Protection Network

(<http://dongbaowang.org/BCFChina>)

Be Cruelty Free partner.

5.6 Czech Republic

5.6.1 Svoboda zvířat (Freedom for Animals)

(www.svobodazvirat.cz)

Svoboda zvířat has been a member of ECEAE since 2006 and Cruelty Free International since 2012.

Svoboda zvířat grants the Humane Cosmetics Standard and the Humane Household Products Standard international certificates to Czech companies fulfilling given criteria.

Current campaigns include:

Project Fashion Victims

(www.pokusynazviratech.cz/obeti-krasy)

Aims to complete cessation of testing for cosmetics and household products on animals.

Paralyzing Beauty (www.pokusynazviratech.cz/obeti-krasy/botox.htm), to terminate botox testing on animals. They have leaflets which are offered for distribution and a protest letter to Ipsen.

Closest Relatives

(www.pokusynazviratech.cz/projekty/humanni-vzdelavani/122-258-materialy.htm)

which seeks to end experiments on primates. In June 2014, they protested Air France.

5.7 Denmark

5.7.1 Anima

(www.anima.dk)

Animal lead campaigns that establish dialogue. Among other things, they work to stop the use of monkeys in research. Also campaign against lams and Eukanuba to stop their animal research and for an end to animal testing for botox.

Anima supported the campaign regarding banning animal testing in cosmetics in the EU and carry out talks to schoolchildren and students about the issue.

5.8 Finland

5.8.1 Animalia

(www.animalia.fi)

Finland's largest animal protection organisation.

Animalia maintains a list of non-animal testing for cosmetics and actively communicate to increase the general public and decision-makers' awareness of animal protection issues and problems. They also instigate public debate on animal protection.

Animalia is working to promote non-animal methods in Finland and the EU. Animalia also fund the University of Tampere's Centre for Alternative Methods to animal testing.

ECEAE member.

5.9 France

5.9.1 ALARM : Association pour la Libération Animale de la Région Marseillaise

(<http://alarm-asso.fr>)

ALARM is a new pressure group against vivisection and especially against French laboratories using animals in Marseille which are expanding, and creating more breeding facilities (primate breeding centres, for example). ALARM have been doing global work against vivisection and promoting new scientific methods that are cruelty-free.

In February 2014, ALARM launched a petition for the campaign in 5 different languages

(www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/987/665/543).

5.9.2 STOP aux animaux dans les labos!

(www.international-campaigns.org/stop-animaux-labos)

STOP was launched in 2008 by a collective of abolitionist international campaigns. They run a 'Conscientious Objection' campaign against dissection.

5.9.3 One Voice

(www.one-voice.fr)

One Voice is asking people to campaign for companion animals to obtain a protection status.

5.9.4 The Anti-Vivisection Coalition France (CAV)

(<http://cav.asso.fr/en>)

CAV links to Antidote Europe, ECEAE, Dr Hadwen Trust, BUAV, Safer Medicines and PCRM.

5.9.5 Destination Enfer - Campaign for the Abolition of Vivisection

[\(www.destination-enfer.com/\)](http://www.destination-enfer.com/)

The main campaign is 'Destination Hell'. Destination-enfer produces information leaflets, demos and e-alerts.

5.9.6 Air Souffrance

www.airsouffrance.fr

A campaign group against the transportation of animals for use in labs.

5.10 Germany

5.10.1 SOKO Tierschutz

www.soko-tierschutz.org/de

Soko carried out extensive undercover investigation with BUAV at Tübingen Max Planck Institute (MPI) for Biological Cybernetics and organised several subsequent online actions, as well as demonstrations, including one in Stuttgart and Tübingen involving thousands of people. They received extensive national media coverage.

There has been only one previous investigation in the animal testing sector in Germany – at Covance labs in 2003 in Münster. Back then Friedrich Mülln, who is also the founder of SOKO Tierschutz, worked in the facility for over 4 months and documented serious abuse of monkeys used for toxicological research. During the Max Planck investigation, the investigator worked as part of the animal care staff for over half a year. Soko gathered around 100 hours of footage. The Tübingen demonstration gained over 1200 participants, and is the biggest animal rights demonstration in Germany for decades.

On a national level, representatives of the Green Party positioned themselves against invasive brain research on primates, and on a local level it was backed by the Green mayor of Tübingen. Soko created more political pressure and media attention by focusing on the election campaign of the mayor and also announced another big demonstration in Stuttgart, where the local government has its quarters. Soko organised info tables to further keep the topic on the agenda of the public and attended a meeting with the animal welfare officer of Baden-Württemberg in which possible strategies for the future, the Green Party and other political actors were discussed.

Soko is continuing the campaign and focusing on rescuing some of the primates.

5.10.2 Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (CAAT)

<http://cms.uni-konstanz.de/leist/caat-europe/>

Aims of CAAT-Europe:

- CAAT-EU brings together industry and academics to address the needs for human-relevant methods

- Use for strategic funds to fill gaps in the development and implementation of alternative methods
- Developing strategic projects with sponsors to promote humane science and 'new toxicology'
- Developing a joint education program between Johns Hopkins and the University of Konstanz
- Set up transatlantic consortia for international research projects on alternative methods
- Support ALTEX as the official journal of CAAT, EUSAAT, and t4

They want to gain visibility and give input as stakeholder in tox21c and 3R

5.10.3 LPT-Schließen

(www.lpt-schliessen.org)

In January 2015, around about 50 supporters gathered at Neuwiedenthal S-Bahn to protest against animal testing lab at LPT. LPT have also held lantern protests and a home demonstration. In April 2015, LPT organised a demonstration in Hamburg and regularly target companies involved with the laboratory.

5.10.4 Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V. (Doctors Against Animal Experiments)

(www.aerzte-gegen-tierversuche.de/en)

Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V. are a charitable organisation of several hundred doctors and scientists who work in the medical field. Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V. campaign to put pressure on responsible authorities, politicians and companies for example on the issue of dissection (www.aerzte-gegen-tierversuche.de/en/support/campaigns/1504-eastern-europe-projects_) and Botox testing.

Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V. run a petition to create a centre to validate the reasons for animal research (www.tierrechte.de/petition-kompetenzzentrum-statt-tierversuche).

Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V. toxicologists work to prevent animal testing under REACH by submitting scientific evidence.

Ärzte gegen Tierversuche e.V. initiate campaigns, influence legislation by political lobbying, run a school project, support Eastern European universities in replacing animal use in education and promote animal-free research by awarding prizes to name just a few of our activities on behalf of animals.

ECEAE member.

5.10.5 Bundesverband Tierschutz (Association of Animal Protection)

(www.bv-tierschutz.de)

Bundesverband Tierschutz hosted a panel discussion

(www.uraniam.de/programm/2015/z855/) and demonstration during world week for lab animals.

5.10.6 NOAH

(www.noah.de)

NOAH was founded to raise awareness on vivisection in the media and use unique visual advertising (photographic and video).

5.10.7 Menschen für Tierrechte

(www.tierrechte.de)

Menschen für Tierrechte have an online campaign against Botox (www.tierrechte.de/online-aktion-qfirma-merz-schluss-mit-den-qualvollen-botox-testsq). They advocate for a ban on experiments on monkeys as a first step to abolish all animal experiments.

Member of ECEAE.

5.10.8 Deutscher Tierschutzbund (German Animal Welfare Federation)

(www.tierschutzbund.de)

Founded in 1881 as the umbrella organisation of animal welfare societies in Germany. The staff of the German Animal Welfare Federation's Animal Welfare Academy in Munich provides the scientific basis for political lobbying. One of its major working areas is the abolition of animal experiments. In order to make a practical contribution to this goal, the Animal Welfare Academy runs its own cell culture laboratory performing non-animal methods research.

ECEAE member.

5.11 Hawaii

5.11.1 Animal Rights Hawai'i

No information available.

5.12 India

5.12.1 Humane Society International

(www.hsi.org/world/india)

Last year India introduced a nationwide ban on animal testing cosmetics for ingredients and final products, following a high profile campaign by BeCrueltyFree and others. Their campaign led to India's Drug Controller General to call for the last remaining animal tests to be eliminated from India's cosmetics standard. They got companies, politicians, celebrities and others to call on India to Be Cruelty-Free. Corporate partners include LUSH, Blue Cross, CPREEC and FIAPO.

5.12.2 PETA India

(www.petaindia.com)

After efforts by PETA India, Union Minister Maneka Gandhi and others, the India Ministry banned animal-tested cosmetics from being imported into India via a notification in The Gazette of India. PETA's lobbying and public awareness to help achieve ban on animal testing of cosmetics. PETA are now working to prevent

products animal tested elsewhere from being marketed in India.

5.12.3 Beauty without Cruelty (BWC)

(www.bwcindia.org)

BWC's 'Veg Shopper's Guide' consists of products — cosmetics, toilet preparations and even packaged foods free of animal ingredients and animal testing.

5.13 Ireland

5.13.1 Irish Anti-Vivisection Society (IAVS)

(www.irishantivivisection.org)

IAVS lobby the Department of Health, who licence vivisection in Ireland, for partial reform prohibiting the most severe procedures, decreasing the number and species of animals used and acceptance and development of research and testing techniques not involving animals.

IAVS's expert Policy Advisor, Dr Dan Lyons, has been appointed by the Minister for Health to the brand new statutory 'National Committee for the Protection of Animals Used for Scientific Purposes' whose function it is to advise the Irish Medicines Board (IMB) – the body that has now replaced the Department of Health as the regulator of animal experimentation.

IAVS urge people to ask the Department of Health and IMB to establish a participatory public consultation process on the operation of the harm/benefit assessment and dedicated Government funding for research into the replacement of animal tests and disease models.

IAVS have a petition to end primate experiments in Ireland, and an end to breeding them. Also a botox campaign - Botulinum toxin producers in Ireland, such as Ipsen and Merz, continue to perform animal LD50 tests, contradicting the spirit of laws supposed to ensure that an animal test shall not be permitted if a scientifically satisfactory non-animal method is available. However, in a positive development, Ipsen has recently confirmed to the group GAIA, who are IAVS' European Coalition (ECEAE) colleagues in Belgium, that it intends to end animal testing of their botulinum toxin products 'Azzalure' and 'Dysport' by the end of 2014. ECEAE member.

5.14 Israel

5.14.1 Behind Closed Doors

(www.invitro.org.il)

No information available.

5.14.2 Israeli Society for the Abolition of Vivisection Society (ISAV)

(www.isav.org.il)

ISAV have campaigned against animal experiments and breeding animals for labs in Israel. They have carried out investigations in cooperation with Let the Animals Live and Animal Log.

5.15 Italy

5.15.1 Fermare Green Hill

Leaders of campaign to successfully close Green Hill.

5.15.2 Stop Vivisection

(www.stopvivisection.net)

Stop Vivisection runs a transport campaign and organised actions in February and June 2015 to mark a week against animal transport.

5.15.3 Lega Anti Vivisezione (LAV) (Anti-Vivisection League)

(www.lav.it)

Various animal protection: animal testing; vegetarianism; animal circuses; zoos; hunting; fur.

Produces guide to cosmetics not animal tested.

In 1993, LAV obtained the first law in the world which recognises the right of conscientious objection to vivisection for researchers and students.

ECEAE member.

5.15.4 Essera Animali

(www.essereanimali.org)

Organise creative protests against animal exploitation.

5.15.5 Lega Internazionale Medici per l'Abolizione della Vivisezione (LIMAV)

(www.lav.it)

5.15.6 EQUIVITA Antivivisection Scientific Committee, Italy

(www.equivita.it/index.php/en)

EQUIVITA lobby the Minister of Health to provide input to research on addictions and not let slip the ban on the animal testing of recreational drugs such as alcohol, drugs and tobacco (due 2017). EQUIVITA supported the "Stop Vivisection" petition.

5.16 Japan

5.16.1 Japan Anti-Vivisection Association (JAVA)

(www.java-animal.org/english)

JAVA request that the research institutions and cosmetic companies stop animal testing and adopt humane alternative research methods that do not use animals.

JAVA are members of an Asian representative member of ICAPO (International Council on Animal Protection in OEC programmes) - composed of major animal protection groups around the world and has been working proactively to stop animal testing, and also is the only citizens' group being at the same time a supporting

member of the Japanese Society for Alternative to Animal Experiments.

5.17 Korea

5.17.1 Korea Animal Rights Advocates (KARA)

www.animalrightskorea.org leads to their facebook page (www.facebook.com/karakoreaanimalrights).

5.17.2 Korean Society for Animal Freedom / Korean Animal Welfare Association (www.benicetobunnies.org)

With Cruelty Free International, Korean Society for Animal Freedom asked the Korean government to phase out the testing of cosmetics on animals and after intense negotiations this was achieved. Korea announced that the testing of cosmetic products on animals in coming years will be prohibited, then it will consider a ban on the testing of cosmetic ingredients - which is the same procedure as adopted by the European Union.

5.18 Netherlands

5.18.1 Bite Back

(www.biteback.org)

Bite Back run a database (www.dierproeveninformatie.nl). The aim is to provide comprehensive information that matches their goals, open a whistleblower hotline, create a fund to stimulate research on animals, organise debates and information evenings.

5.18.2 Anti Dierproeven Coalitie (Anti Vivisection Coalition)

(www.stopdierproeven.org/nl)

AVC host regular demonstrations and stalls, and carried out an investigation into dog experiments at Maastricht University. AVC has also helped rehome animals no longer used by labs, including primates.

5.18.3 Proefdiervrij

(www.proefdiervrij.nl)

Proefdiervrij campaigns against animal testing for cosmetics, produces guide to cruelty-free cosmetics and funds non-animal medical research.

5.18.4 EDEV - Een DIER Een VRIEND

(www.edev.nl)

EDEV urges manufacturers to stop the cruel experiments on mice for Botox and calls for the EU to use replacement methods for the LD50 test for Botox. ECEAE member.

5.18.5 Respect Voor Dieren (Respect for Animals)

(www.respectvoordieren.nl)

Campaign against Air France-KLM transportation of animals to labs.

5.19 New Zealand

5.19.1 Save Animals From Exploitation (SAFE)

(www.safe.org.nz)

SAFE organised Cruelty Free Cosmetics week and is part of the Be Cruelty Free campaign.

Worked to get a NZ ban on cosmetics testing on animals. SAFE began working on the cosmetics campaign in 2011 and achieved a victory in March 2015. SAFE claim to be New Zealand's 'most proactive animal charity'. They undertake high profile campaigns and was a major contributor to the 'Party Pills' campaign, helping to achieve a world-first ban on the testing of recreational drugs on animals. They have spearheaded the campaign against cosmetics testing on animals since 2011, teaming up with Humane Society International in 2013 as well as coordinating cooperation across all political parties. A key component of SAFE's work is strategic lobbying, which this March 2015 resulted in a successful ban on cosmetics animal testing. Now efforts will turn to an import ban to bring New Zealand into line with the European Union.

SAFE encouraged people to lobby the Government by sending an e-card to PM John Key calling for a NZ ban, which soon attracted thousands of signatures.

In 2012 New Zealand's Animal Welfare Act (AWA), came under review, presenting SAFE with an opportunity to call for specific amendments to help animals, including a ban on cosmetics testing. They created a website (animalwelfare.org.nz), which made it easy for the public to support SAFE's submission and make their own. SAFE met with politicians, and recruited a top NZ lawyer to help write alternative legislation which was presented to the Government.

SAFE encouraged the public to make submissions during the public consultation period. Nearly 80% of submissions came via SAFE's animalwelfare.org.nz. Later the website became specifically aimed at cosmetics.

In 2013 SAFE teamed up with HSI and Lush, including working with Lush on in-store promotions. They collected petition signatures and handed in 15,600 signatures at Parliament in 2013 calling for a ban.

SAFE commissioned a poll that showed 89% of the public wanted a ban. This enabled SAFE to lobby the Government further. They took out national newspaper ads in conjunction with HSI and put up a 16 metre billboard in Wellington. SAFE recruited celebrities to speak out and enlisted the support of 28 NZ cosmetic companies.

SAFE held an annual cruelty free week encouraging the public to lobby the Government. Actions and promotions were held throughout, including a 'Cruelty Free

Kisses' demonstration February 2015. In 2015, in a rally outside Parliament SAFE joined up with other groups, representing more than 90,000 people who took action.

The Animal Welfare Amendment Bill (AWAB) was developed to increase the country's confidence in the laws protecting animals, announced amid a scandal around the treatment of pigs exposed by SAFE.

SAFE had three animal testing goals for the AWAB:

To ban the testing of cosmetics on animals.

To ban the testing of recreational drugs on animals.

To require the use of alternatives to animal tests where they are available.

The first was written into law in 2015, applying immediately. The Psychoactive Substances Act allowed for animal testing for recreational drugs. After extensive campaigning, the Labour Party joined SAFE in pressuring the Government for a ban, which was implemented.

Green Party MP Mojo Mathers, introduced an amendment to the bill stating that if an alternative to an animal test existed, it should be mandatory to use it. This amendment was voted down, but many parties expressed interest in the principles behind it.

For each of these amendments, SAFE engaged at every step of the process.

During the scoping process for the bill, SAFE identified cosmetics testing as a key issue. They engaged government advisors, as well as MPs within each political party.

When they declined to act on this issue, SAFE continued to mount pressure, encouraging the public to take action at key opportunities such as when Supplementary Order Papers were introduced. Thousands of people wrote to every political party asking for a ban on cosmetics testing on animals. This helped pressure the Labour Party into adopting policy to support a ban. SAFE then engaged the Select Committee. They presented a petition to add weight to our submission. MP Mojo Mathers continued to work internally to convince the Committee.

SAFE followed up with more e-cards, and multiple actions to get media attention. As the AWAB got closer to its final vote, SAFE increased pressure on the Government, and they finally agreed to include a cosmetics testing ban.

In the future, SAFE hopes to build on these relationships to achieve more victories for animals, including expanding the animal testing bans.

Green Party - SAFE provided suggestions for issues they could address and supported this with extensive legal advice, ensuring the amendments were robust and above any possible criticisms. SAFE also rallied public support for the amendments introduced by the Greens.

Labour Party - SAFE had long been pressuring the Labour Party to appoint an animal welfare spokesperson and develop policies. In 2013, they appointed an animal welfare spokesperson separate from agriculture. In 2014, the Labour Party developed their policy, which stated that cosmetics should not be tested on animals.

National Party - the last major party to accept any changes to animal testing legislation. SAFE is now leveraging this to encourage them to address animal testing issues faster in the future, as well as appointing an animal welfare spokesperson.

5.19.2 NZ Anti-Vivisection Society (NZAVS)

(www.nzavs.org.nz)

NZAVS focus on public education emphasising the scientific case against vivisection and the dangers to human health from animal experiments. Over the past three decades, NZAVS have presented petitions to Parliament, and worked on submissions to government and regulatory authorities. NZAVS campaign to prevent the use of animals for the safety testing of recreational drugs under the recently passed Psychoactive Substances Act.

5.20 Norway

5.20.1 Dyrevern Alliansen (The Norwegian Animal Protection Alliance)

(www.dyrevern.no/english)

Dyrevern Alliansen is primarily a political organisation, working with politicians and the industry to improve animal welfare. Dyrevern Alliansen collaborates with animal welfare and animal rights organisations. These organisations will be able to influence the authorities through Dyrevern Alliansen. Dyrevern Alliansen have a research fund – the Norwegian Animal Research Fund which aims to fund research that promotes the interests of animals. Between 2008-2012, more than 1 million NOK was given to many different projects. One of these has been very successful in developing alternatives to animal testing.

ECEAE member.

5.20.2 NOAH - for dyrs rettigheter (NOAH - for animal rights)

(www.dyrsrettigheter.no)

NOAH is the contact organisation for InterNICHE. NOAH liaises with and participates in various officially appointed consultative groups and committees related to animal welfare, and has one member on the Norwegian Council for Animal Ethics. They run the website www.kosmetikk.info.

5.21 Poland

5.21.1 VIVA! Poland

(www.notest.pl)

ECEAE member.

5.22 Portugal

5.22.1 ANIMAL Association

(www.animal.org.pt)

Founded in 1994 in Portugal, ANIMAL is a nationwide high-profile organisation which works on general EU animal protection issues.
ECEAE member.

5.23 Russia

5.23.1 VITA Animal Rights Centre

(www.vita.org.ru)

Several years of work resulted in universities in Russia abandoning animal experiments and confirming the benefits of alternatives. VITA negotiated with the directors of the institutes, at press conferences, and gave speeches in auditoriums. To date, 11 Russian universities have moved to humane education, which has saved the lives of tens of thousands of animals.

5.24 Serbia

5.24.1 Feniks (Phoenix, Society for the Protection of Animals and Development of Civic Consciousness)

(www.feniks.org.rs)

The activities of Feniks are based on legal protection and implementation of protective laws, education of fellow-citizens to raise public awareness and influence on relevant institutions that deal with different animals protection issues.
ECEAE member.

5.24.2 ORCA – Organization for Respect and Care for Animals

(www.orca.rs)

Through membership in ethical bodies, ORCA seeks to influence the application of ethical principles in making decisions on approval of experiments on animals and consistent implementation of the 3R rules regarding the use of experimental animals. ORCA has representatives in ethical advice to safeguard the welfare of experimental animals several faculties of the University of Belgrade and other scientific organisations.

5.25 Singapore

5.25.1 ACRES

(www.acres.org.sg)

Cruelty free pocket shopping guide.

5.26 South Africa

5.26.1 Beauty Without Cruelty

(www.bwcsa.co.za)

In December 2014, Beauty Without Cruelty launched a campaign to take legal action against any company found to be falsely using the logo, or falsely claiming to be endorsed. Beauty Without Cruelty runs a progressive educational programme, aimed at informing people about the suffering of animals and has initiated a number of campaigns, which focus on exposing animal abuse, specifically in the areas of vivisection in South Africa.

5.27 Spain

5.27.1 Asociación Defensa Derechos Animal (ADDA)

(www.addaong.org)

ECEAE member.

5.27.2 Igualdad Animal

(www.igualdadanimal.org)

In June 2013, Igualdad Animal gave a presentation in the European Parliament on the campaign 'Stop Vivisection'.

5.27.3 Animanaturalis

(www.animanaturalis.org/home/es)

Runs a dissection campaign.

In June 2013, Animanaturalis gave a presentation in the European Parliament on the campaign. 'Stop Vivisection'.

5.28 Sweden

5.28.1 Djurrättsalliansen

(www.djurrattsalliansen.se)

Runs a campaign to end primate experiments (www.stoppaprimatforsoken.nu) for a ban on the use of primates in experiments in Sweden and the EU.

A team of investigators from Djurrättsalliansen from all over Sweden go through the applications sent in to the seven ethical committees that approve the experiments with animals. A licence from the Board of Agriculture both for using and for breeding laboratory animals is needed and Djurrättsalliansen is also controlling that and have already found out about illegal experiments being carried out on ferrets.

This year it is their 10th year anniversary as an organisation and since the start in 2005 one of the main issues of the organisation has been animals used for experiments.

5.28.2 Djurens Rätt (Animal Rights Sweden)

(www.djurensratt.se)

Djurens Rätt is the largest animal rights organisation in Scandinavia, with a membership of about 35,000. Animal Rights Sweden is opposed to all experiments,

procedures, production methods and other uses of animals that cause them pain, suffering and distress. They are launching a campaign urging the government to increase funding for the development of alternatives to animal testing and to fund the upcoming 3R-center. They are therefore promoting a letter to the government asking for more funding of alternatives.
ECEAE member.

5.28.3 The Swedish Fund for Research Without Animal Experiments

(www.forskautandjurforsok.se/in-english)

Swedish Fund for Research Without Animal Experiments offer funding for projects in 2015. Over 500 applications have been awarded funding and a total of 29 million SEK has been used for funding research.

5.29 Switzerland

5.29.1 Ligue suisse contre la vivisection (LSCV)

(www.lscv.ch)

All legal methods, e.g. lobbying members of parliament and organising nationwide information and publicity campaigns, are used by Ligue to achieve the abolition of animal experimentation. They contribute financially to organisations who are involved in the development of such methods and who refuse using animals.

Ligue have a 'BIOTECH CAMPUS' campaign, to create a center of excellence dedicated to the development of new alternative methods.

Ligue takes legal action to prevent animal tests.

ECEAE member.

5.29.2 Zurcher Tierschutz Association (Zurich Animal Protection Association)

(www.zuerchertierschutz.ch)

Zurcher has a representative on the Zurich Animal Experiments Committee and the Federal Animal Experiments Committee.

5.30 United Kingdom

5.30.1 Cruelty Free International (formerly BUAV)

(<https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org>)

Key issues include: primates in research; cruelty-free cosmetics; animal testing of household products in UK; REACH; Freedom of information. Through undercover investigations, political lobbying, the promotion of cruelty free products, legal and science expertise, and media activities, the BUAV works to make the world a better place for animals. They work lawfully and professionally, building relationships with politicians, business leaders and other decision-makers. The BUAV also analyse legislation and sit on decision-making panels around the globe, to act as the voice for animals in laboratories. The BUAV is one of the world's leading authorities on animal testing issues, and acts as secretariat to the European Coalition to End Animal Experiments.

5.30.2 Dr Hadwen Trust (DHT)

(www.drhadwentrust.org)

DHT is the UK's leading non-animal medical research charity. They support and assist scientists to implement existing techniques and develop new ones which are more human-relevant and will replace animal experiments. They award grants to scientists in universities, hospitals and research organisations following a rigorous and independent peer-reviewed selection procedure.

5.30.3 National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS)

(www.navs.org.uk)

Animals in space research; freedom of information; World Day for Laboratory Animals; Good Charities Guide (charities funding non-animal medical research).

5.30.4 Animal Justice Project

(www.animaljusticeproject.com)

A new international organisation campaigning against vivisection, launched in March 2015 in both UK and USA. Animal Justice Project has campaigned against the use of animals in recreational drugs and warfare research. They have held two events which received extensive media coverage. They use the media to raise awareness on the plight of animals inside laboratories.

5.30.5 InterNICHE (International Network for Humane Education)

(www.interniche.org)

InterNICHE is an open and diverse network comprising students, teachers and animal campaigners. The network focuses on animal use and alternatives within biological science, medical and veterinary medical education.

5.30.6 Animal Aid

(www.animalaid.org.uk)

Animal Aid run vivisection campaigns focused on medical experiments (e.g. charities funding animal tests).

5.30.7 PETA

(www.peta.org.uk)

5.31 USA

5.31.1 Citizens for Alternatives to Animal Research and Experimentation (CAARE)

(www.caareusa.org)

CAARE is a national non-profit organization dedicated to promoting research and testing without using animals.

5.31.2 Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association
(www.hsvma.org)

5.31.3 Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics (CCIC)
(www.leapingbunny.org)

CCIC Leaping Bunny Program administers a cruelty-free standard and the internationally recognized Leaping Bunny Logo for companies producing cosmetic, personal care, and household products.

5.31.4 Humane Society International (HSI)
(www.hsi.org)

5.31.5 White Coat Project
(www.whitecoatwaste.com)

White Coat are 'the eyes and ears' of the American taxpayer inside the government's animal laboratories. They expose the waste, fraud and abuse.

5.31.6 Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM)
(www.pcrm.org)

PCRM is Secretariat of the International Council on Animal Protection at OECD (ICAPO), which was formed to incorporate alternative methods that can replace, reduce, and refine animal use in OECD guidelines and programs.

5.31.7 Beagle Freedom Project
(www.beaglefreedomproject.org)

Beagle Freedom Project commenced during 2010, and negotiates with laboratories to hand over animals for re-homing to suitable private homes. 120 dogs have so far been saved in 14 rescues.

5.31.8 Bunny Alliance
(www.thebunnyalliance.com)

5.31.9 Stop Animal Exploitation Now (SAEN)
(www.all-creatures.org/saen)

5.31.10 The New England Anti-Vivisection Society (NEAVS)
(www.neavs.org)

NEAVS is the U.S. Executive Office for Cruelty Free International and founding member of the Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics.

5.31.11 *The American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS)*

(www.aavs.org)

Key issues include: Ban Pound Seizure; End Animal Cloning; Compassionate Shopping.

In 2006, AAVS assumed the leadership role as Chair of the Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics (CCIC).

5.31.12 *Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (CAAT)*

(<http://caat.jhsph.edu/>)

The Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (CAAT) is part of the Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health, with a European branch (CAAT-Europe) located at the University of Konstanz, Germany (<http://cms.uni-konstanz.de/leist/caat-europe/>). They seek to effect change by working with scientists in industry, government, and academia to find new ways to replace animals with non-animal methods, reduce the numbers of animals necessary, or refine methods to make them less painful or stressful to the animals involved.

5.32 Coalitions

5.32.1 *The International Council on Animal Protection in OECD Programmes*

(www.icapo.org)

Since 2002, animal protection has had a formal voice at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), an influential international organisation that develops guidelines and programmes for the testing of chemicals. The OECD's testing-related activities historically have relied heavily on animal-based methods. The International Council on Animal Protection in OECD Programmes (ICAPO) works to fully incorporate alternative methods that can replace, reduce, and refine animal use in OECD activities, in the interest of animal protection, public health and sound science.

5.32.2 *European Coalition to End Animal Experiments (ECEAE)*

(www.eceae.org)

ECEAE is Europe's leading alliance campaigning on behalf of animals used in laboratories. Drawing on political, legislative and scientific expertise, as well as working with politicians, Commission officials and EU citizens, they campaign to end testing for the millions of animals in European laboratories.

5.33 Individuals

5.33.1 *Dr Andre Menache*

Veterinarian Dr Andre Menache has held various posts, including that of President of Doctors and Lawyers for Responsible Medicine (UK) and General Manager of the Federation of Animal Protection Societies in Israel. Today he provides scientific support to several grass roots organisations, such as Animal Aid and Animal Justice

Project in addition to his official position as Director of Antidote Europe, based in France.

5.33.2 Dr Andrew Knight

Ever since helping launch Australia's campaign against the live sheep trade to the Middle East in the early 1990s, Australian-British bioethicist Dr Andrew Knight has been advocating on behalf of animals. He is a European Veterinary Specialist in Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law, a Professor of Animal Welfare and Ethics at the University of Winchester, and a Senior Fellow of the UK Higher Education Academy. He serves on the Advisory Board of the *Animal Studies Journal*, and the Editorial Advisory Panel of the *Australian Animal Protection Law Journal*.

Excluding abstracts, Andrew has over 80 academic and 60 popular publications, and a series of YouTube videos, on animal issues. These explore animal cognitive abilities and resultant moral implications, animal experimentation and alternatives, animal use in biomedical education, the animal welfare standards of veterinarians, the contributions of animal agriculture to climate change, and vegetarian companion animal diets, as well as recounting his varied travel adventures. He has delivered over 110 presentations on animal issues at conferences and universities internationally. His studies on animal experimentation and educational animal use have attracted a series of conference awards, a PhD listed for academic excellence in 2010, and also formed the basis of his book, *The Costs and Benefits of Animal Experiments*, published within the Palgrave Macmillan Series on Animal Ethics (hardback 2011, paperback 2013). Andrew's key publications and speaking topics are provided at www.AndrewKnight.info.