

General information			
Unit of intervention length	<u>Number of events</u>	a1	How the length of the intervention is measured. E.g. "days", "weeks", "number of events"
Estimated length of intervention, in intervention units (a1)	<u>30 events</u>	a2	Use unit defined in a1.

Expenditures (unit=US\$)	Pessimistic (<i>Highest</i>) Estimate	Realistic Estimate	Optimistic (<i>Lowest</i>) Estimate		
One-time expenses					<i>Expenditures that go towards things such as the recruitment of volunteers, the purchase of office supplies, consulting fees, etc.</i>
Cost of material resources	<u>3,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	b1	<i>Supplies, leases, consulting fees, etc.</i>
Cost of recruitment and training	<u>750</u>	<u>500</u>	<u>250</u>	b2	<i>Advertising, value of time spent interviewing, etc.</i>
Personnel cost	<u>600</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>100</u>	b3	<i>Salaries, etc. paid out during startup period</i>
Upfront costs	<u>4,350</u>	<u>2,750</u>	<u>1,350</u>	b4	=b1+b2+b3
Recurring expenses					<i>Expenditures that are expressed in the form of dollars per unit time or per event</i>
Material expenses per intervention unit	<u>300</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>100</u>	c1	<i>Supplies, travel, etc.</i>
Personnel cost per intervention unit	<u>400</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>50</u>	c2	<i>Salaries, training, etc.</i>
Maintenance costs per intervention unit	<u>700</u>	<u>350</u>	<u>150</u>	c3	=c1+c2
Expenditures total	<u>25,350</u>	<u>13,250</u>	<u>5,850</u>	d1	=b4+c3*a2

Results		Pessimistic (<i>Lowest</i>) Estimate	Realistic Estimate	Optimistic (<i>Highest</i>) Estimate	
Unit of suffering		<u>Years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted</u>			e1 <i>The unit by which the results of an intervention are measured. This may be "animal lives saved", "years or year equivalents of a factory farmed hen's life averted" (see V.2 and V.4 in evaluation guidelines), "years of farmed captivity averted", or something different.</i>
Direct suffering avoided per intervention unit		<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	f1 <i>Measured in terms of unit of e1, for all direct results of an intervention (e.g. directly negotiating for the release of an animal from a factory farm).</i>
Indirect suffering avoided					
	Number of people reached by campaign per intervention unit	<u>2,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	g1 <i>A person does not have to be directly contacted by a staff member in order to be "reached". They must merely encounter the campaign in some capacity, including living under a legal jurisdiction being targeted by a legislative campaign.</i>

Proportion of people contacted likely to adopt lifestyle change 1	<u>0.03, defined as "vegetarianism"</u>	<u>0.05, defined as "vegetarianism"</u>	<u>0.07, defined as "vegetarianism"</u>	g2.1 <i>The expected percentage of people reached by the campaign that adopt a specific change (coded as change "1") to their lifestyle which is anticipated to benefit animals (any lifestyle change that reduces a person's negative impact on animal welfare, either by completely abstaining from the use of certain animal products or by switching to more humane animal use infrastructures).</i>
Proportion of people contacted likely to adopt lifestyle change 2	<u>0.00, defined as "veganism"</u>	<u>0.02, defined as "veganism"</u>	<u>0.04, defined as "veganism"</u>	g2.2 <i>Same as for g2.1, but for lifestyle changed coded "2"</i>
[Insert the appropriate number of rows as necessary, for lifestyle changes 3, 4, etc.]				
Proportion of people contacted likely to adopt lifestyle change n	<u>0.04, defined as "conscientious omnivorism"</u>	<u>0.07, defined as "conscientious omnivorism"</u>	<u>0.10, defined as "conscientious omnivorism"</u>	g2.n <i>Same as for g2.1, but for lifestyle changed coded "n"</i>
Indirect suffering avoided per person contacted per event	<u>$0.03 * 52.7 + 0.00 * 59.52 + 0.04 * 24.8$</u> <u>=2.57</u>	<u>$0.05 * 52.7 + 0.02 * 59.52 + 0.07 * 24.8$</u> <u>=5.56</u>	<u>$0.07 * 52.7 + 0.04 * 59.52 + 0.10 * 24.8$</u> <u>=8.55</u>	g3 <i>Multiply g2.1, g2.2, ... , g2.n each by their respective "lifestyle multipliers"(see chart) and then sum the resulting products.</i>
Results total	<u>154,200</u>	<u>834,000</u>	<u>2,565,000</u>	h1 $=f1+g1*g3*a2$

Final Total: the proposed intervention has a calculated efficiency of h1/d1, for a campaign of length a2, with results being measured in the unit of e1

<p>Pessimistic:</p> <p><u>In this fictional case, the final total is: 154,200 years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted per \$25,350 spent, for a campaign with 30 events. This translates into 6 years of suffering averted per dollar spent.</u></p>	<p>Realistic:</p> <p><u>In this fictional case, the final total is: 834,000 years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted per \$13,250 spent, for a campaign with 30 events. This translates into 63 years of suffering averted per dollar spent.</u></p>	<p>Optimistic:</p> <p><u>In this fictional case, the final total is: 2,565,000 years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted per \$5,850 spent, for a campaign with 30 events. This translates into 438 years of suffering averted per dollar spent.</u></p>
--	---	--

[IMPORTANT: ALL VALUES FICTIONALIZED AND USED ONLY AS EXAMPLE OF METHODOLOGY]

Lifestyle multiplier chart: This chart is only valid for results measured in units of "years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted", with no distinction being made between different animals, and with wild-caught fish not being accounted for.			
Lifestyle	Mean years of retention (i.e. years before a person is expected to no longer follow an adopted lifestyle; based on ACE research)	Years suffering avoided per year (based on ACE evaluations)	LIFESTYLE MULTIPLIER: Total years of suffering avoided
<u>Veganism</u>	6.2	9.6	<u>59.52</u>
<u>Vegetarianism</u>	6.2	8.5	<u>52.7</u>
<u>Meatless 1x/week</u>	6.2	1.2	<u>7.44</u>
<u>Conscientious carnivore (avoids most or all factory farmed meat)</u>	6.2	4 (Assumption: non-factory farming techniques cause less than half the amount of suffering as factory farming techniques, then adjusted downward to account for confusing labeling)	<u>24.8</u>

For units of suffering (g1) other than the one shown in the chart above (e.g. to account for wild-caught fish, or to only count lives saved, a new lifestyle chart will be required. It should follow the following format (add as many rows as necessary):

Lifestyle	Mean years of retention (i.e. years before a person is expected to no longer follow an adopted lifestyle)	Units of suffering avoided per year	LIFESTYLE MULTIPLIER: Total units of suffering avoided

Optional “multiplier” section, which may be used to adjust expenditure / results analysis for unknowns and externalities. This is offered as an optional section due to the particularly speculative nature of these variables:

Cost Multipliers		Pessimistic <i>(Highest)</i> Estimate	Realistic Estimate	Optimistic <i>(Lowest)</i> Estimate	
Unanticipated costs		<u>1.6</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>1.4</u>	i1 <i>A number between 1.00 and 2.00, according to the following guidelines: A 1.00 would correspond to a campaign that does not expect any unanticipated costs, and a 2.00 to an exceptionally unorganized intervention with virtually nothing planned.</i>
Unanticipated revenue		<u>0.90</u>	<u>0.75</u>	<u>0.50</u>	i2 <i>A number between 0.00 and 1.00, where 0.50 represents an incredibly visible, popular intervention that is likely to attract large donations, and where 1.00 represents a poorly visible and/or unpopular intervention that is not likely to attract any donors at all. As a rough guideline, a 1.00 would correspond to a campaign not expect any donations at all, and a 0.50 is a campaign that expects to attract \$1 in donations for every \$2 spent (thus effectively halving expenditures).</i>

Results Multipliers		Pessimistic <i>(Lowest)</i> Estimate	Realistic Estimate	Optimistic <i>(Highest)</i> Estimate	
Negative backlash		<u>0.50</u>	<u>0.90</u>	<u>1.00</u>	j1 <i>A number between 0.00 and 1.00, according to the following guidelines: 0.00 for an intervention that is expected to alienate more people from the cause of animal welfare than it expects to positively effect, and 1.00 for an intervention that is expected to have no negative backlash.</i>

Social momentum				j2	A number between 1.00 and 1.50, where 1.00 represents campaigns where the target audience is very unlikely to spread ideas relating to animal welfare, and 1.50 for a campaign with a target audience that is very likely to spread those ideas.
	<u>1.05</u>	<u>1.15</u>	<u>1.40</u>		

Adjusted Final Total: the proposed intervention has a calculated efficiency of $(h1*j1*j2)/(d1*i1*i2)$, for a campaign of length a2, with results being measured in the unit of e1

Pessimistic:	Realistic:	Optimistic:
<u>In this fictional case, the final total is: 80,955 years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted per \$36,504 spent, for a campaign with 30 events. This translates into 2 years of suffering averted per dollar spent.</u>	<u>In this fictional case, the final total is: 863,190 years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted per \$14,906 spent, for a campaign with 30 events. This translates into 58 years of suffering averted per dollar spent.</u>	<u>In this fictional case, the final total is: 3,591,000 years of factory farm suffering or its equivalent averted per \$4,095 spent, for a campaign with 30 events. This translates into 877 years of suffering averted per dollar spent.</u>

[IMPORTANT: ALL VALUES FICTIONALIZED AND USED ONLY AS EXAMPLE OF METHODOLOGY]