

Follow-Up Questions for Animal Equality (2017)

How many pay-per-view video views will Animal Equality have in 2017?

Our pay-per-view goal is to have 35,000 total viewers.

What is the open rate for your newsletters?

Regular: The open rate is 10%; the click through rate is 0.7%. (Open rate not only depends on the sender information, time, and subject lines but also on the number of inactive subscribers in the list. Since we have a very large number of subscribers from online petitions and some are from a few years ago, the open rate is lower than it will be once we remove some of the inactive subscribers.)

Love Veg: The open rate is 17.2%; the click through rate is 0.8%.

Who is involved in developing the region-level two-year plans?

Animal Equality's country two-year plans are developed in coordination with the country Executive Director, in-country key staff, program directors, and President and Vice-President.

What additional responsibilities, if any, come with board membership?

Animal Equality's board members have the responsibility to ensure the organization's future by following sound, ethical, and legal governance and financial management policies, as well as by making sure Animal Equality has adequate resources to advance its mission.

We notice that all of Animal Equality's board members currently also serve in other roles at Animal Equality. Has that always been the case? Why or why not?

Not all of Animal Equality's board of directors serve in another role at Animal Equality. Jorge de Diego, a longtime animal activist and former investigator and campaigner, is an active member of Animal Equality's board of directors in the United States and does not serve in another capacity in the organization.

Animal Equality's board of directors were chosen for their strategic vision, dedication to the organization's mission, and extensive knowledge of animal protection. As we grow and mature as an organization, we continue the search for additional board talent.

Are staff members or other stakeholders (e.g., volunteers) involved in the strategic planning process? (If so, how?)

Yes; most of our staff members were involved in the creation of the strategic plan, especially in the area of internal analysis. We also consulted several volunteers for counsel on specific matters including organizational structure, business processes, etc. In addition, Animal Equality hired a specialized consultancy company to guide the process. All Executive Directors from the U.S., United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, Mexico, Venezuela, India, and program directors were an integral part of the process and also contributed feedback to the final draft. The country Executive Directors and program directors also review and update of this strategic plan every six months.

A [page on your website](#), “the what we do page” found by clicking on “Campaigns” in the menu bar is showing as “page not found.” How long has it been like that?

The links were created by mistake when we built the website’s menu. They have already been fixed:

- <http://www.animalequality.net/what-we-do>
- <http://www.animalequality.net/the-animals>

Animal Equality is currently in the final stages of launching its new corporate website and a complete overhaul of the current site with new content, design, information architecture and technology. We estimate that we will have the U.K. and U.S. versions published by mid-November and the other 6 country-specific websites shortly thereafter. Here is sneak peak at the [new design](#) and [site map](#). (Please note that this home page design does not include actual content and many of the photos are placeholders.)

Animal Equality is currently hiring two additional programmers and an additional graphic designer with the focus of having a much improved web presence and running A/B tests, SEO analyses, and other key improvements.

Why does a significant portion of Animal Equality’s outreach focus on dietary change rather than directly shifting public attitudes?

From ACE’s 2016 Review of Animal Equality:

"Critics argue that a strong focus on dietary change isn't supported by historical examples or other empirical evidence.^{22, 23, 24} Some argue that successful social movements have focused their rhetoric on the institution they opposed rather than on individual behavior supporting that institution.²⁵ Critics also believe it is difficult to build a mass movement when the perceived criteria for acceptance in the movement is a lifestyle change, and that a consumer focus provokes less moral outrage than focusing on the institution, thus missing an important driver of activism and subsequent social change.

Animal Equality feels that their work addresses both behavioral and attitudinal change, but a focus on dietary change in some of their programs, such as leafleting, is more likely than other approaches to lead to immediate behavior change that directly spares animals. If people simply change their attitudes with respect to farmed animals, that might not lead to actual impact for animals. After all, many people currently care about animals, but relatively few are vegetarian or vegan.²⁶ It might actually be easier to change individuals' attitudes after convincing them to change their diets, since they will no longer need to reconcile their compassion towards farmed animals with eating them.

In general, however, Animal Equality's approach seems more focused on incremental change than on building a mass movement, which may be the real underlying difference between the two sides."

During our few first years as an organization, we dedicated thousands of hours focusing on the institution of animal exploitation and its ideological underpinnings—speciesism. We carried out hundreds of protests—some of them attracting over 500 activists and drawing even more onlookers. We also carried out non-violent direct actions and applied civil

disobedience tactics against the meat industry. We carried out a dozen of open rescues—our first one back in 2007. We chained ourselves to the entrance of a slaughterhouse, disrupted butcher shops and fisheries, and protested in front of restaurants. Meanwhile, we dedicated very few efforts to individual dietary change. The results of that approach were far from optimal and that is why Animal Equality currently has a multipronged approach—individual and institutional.

Animal Equality addresses both the dietary changes required to move away from animal exploitation as well as the institution of animal exploitation that we want to abolish. We seek changes at an individual level and at a system level. Our outreach efforts have a focus on dietary change, but we also dedicate significant efforts to influence public opinion about animal exploitation and its industries. As part of our updated strategic thinking, we are commencing to focus additional efforts and resources toward system-level changes rather than individual changes.

Animal Equality believes that undercover investigations can be some of the most effective tactics that contribute to the “moral outrage” against the meat industry. A video depicting factory farmers mutilating and/or beating to death innocent and defenseless animals can be of the most influential materials and it is no surprise that the meat industry tries to criminalize these exposés.

As such, Animal Equality has carried out over 70 undercover investigations in 13 countries over the past decade, exposing animal abuse in over 700 animal agricultural facilities. An example of how our investigative work affects not only particular companies but also the meat industry as a whole is that the Spanish meat industry association had to issue a press release trying to distance themselves from evidence published by Animal Equality following one of our undercover investigations. The industry understood that our investigative footage negatively affected their image and that it swayed public opinion against them.

Animal Equality’s undercover investigations into factory farms and slaughterhouses have frequently been featured in local and national media in Spain, reaching millions of people and contributing to increased interest in the plight of animals. The Eurobarometer survey has shown the number of people in Spain who consider animal welfare to be important or very important has risen from 71% to 94% in the past ten years. The number of people who want to know more about the treatment of animals raised for food has also increased from 61% to 71%.

Some of Animal Equality’s activities (e.g., undercover investigations and protests) have the potential to backfire, either by leading to legislation targeting activists or by negatively affecting public opinion of activists. Has Animal Equality considered these possibilities?

From ACE’s 2016 Review of Animal Equality:

"Critics have argued that some tactics employed by animal advocates, including protests, risk turning public opinion against the animal advocacy movement.²⁷ While these activities make up a small proportion of Animal Equality’s work, they do organize and participate in protests and demonstrations. Investigations make up a larger part of Animal Equality’s work and have sometimes led to a slightly different type of backlash in which industry and government respond by attempting to pass laws that target advocates, such as ag-gag legislation in the United States.

Animal Equality argues that their work has not led to a significant backlash. In Spain, where they have been using both investigations and protests for 5-10 years, the number of people who think that animal welfare is important has risen in the past decade.²⁸ They find that both politicians and the public tend to respond favorably to investigations in particular.²⁹

While Animal Equality tries to maintain good relationships with media and governments, their activists have been the target of legal charges in the past. It's possible that they could encounter this sort of backlash again, particularly when conducting investigations in countries where they are not very experienced with the responses of local government."

We always take into consideration all possible risks and liabilities when conducting our protests, undercover investigations, or other any other work. We simply haven't seen any evidence that our work has had any negative effect on the public opinion of activists.

Our protests have never received negative coverage in the media. To the contrary, our protests have received overwhelmingly positive coverage in the media.

Our investigative work has received overwhelming support from the public, journalists, and politicians. We have collaborated with law enforcement authorities on several occasions to denounce animal abuse documented as part of our investigations. As a result of our investigative work, law enforcement has prosecuted those responsible and closed the facilities where the animal abuse took place.

We have collaborated with dozens of journalists and have been frequently asked to bring them with us into factory farms. We're approached by the media for materials, statements, and information regarding a wide range of animal protection topics. We have also collaborated with politicians in Germany, the U.K., Spain, Italy, Mexico, India, and the European Parliament and have held exhibitions of our investigations at the European Parliament. We will soon hold the first-ever farm animal exhibition in the Mexican Senate.

Furthermore, our undercover investigations have been an essential part of pro-animal legislation. It's important to note that this legislation has been drafted based on our investigative findings which provided legislative bodies with the evidence of the problem, helped garner public debate about the issue, and gathered support for the initiative.

German court has ruled that it is alright for activists to sneak into factory farms to take photos and record videos if there is a good reason to believe that authorities are not doing the proper inspections.

[Article](#) (in German)

Why did Animal Equality decide to launch a corporate outreach program when other charities already have successful corporate outreach programs?

Animal Equality launched its Corporate Outreach department in 2016 because we identified this strategy as a way to make substantial progress for farm animals in the countries where we were already working in for years, including Mexico¹, Brazil², Italy, Spain and India, and an

¹ Animal Equality Mexico has won three policies:

- 6/30: Pacific Star (major foodservice company and a key competitor to Sysco)

effective way to leverage and complement our investigations. As a result, our corporate outreach campaigns over the past year have resulted in 25 major companies changing their policies, benefiting over 12 million hens every year.

At the time that we launched our corporate campaigns, the only countries that had corporate outreach campaigns were in Mexico and Brazil, and they had only recently been launched. Our corporate outreach campaigns have helped— it has proved beneficial for multiple different groups to campaign against the same companies at the same time in the same country, as it adds more pressure on them. It also communicates to them that this topic is very important, increasing the likelihood of getting those victories quicker and increasing the speed at which we gain momentum. There are hundreds of companies (from retailers, food service companies, CPG, producers, etc.) that determine the life conditions of hundreds of millions of animals, and there were very few people working on this.

If there is a number of groups carrying out these type of campaigns, they will also be more successful at influencing the movement in favor of this strategy. We think there might be diminishing returns after a certain number of groups work in the same country. However, we don't believe this to be the case in the countries where we are working, as our presence there has been overwhelmingly beneficial.

In Mexico and Brazil, we carried out the first-ever investigations into the egg industry, not only educating tens of millions of people in those countries on the suffering associated with the production of eggs but also helping Animal Equality win 15 policies benefiting millions of hens per year. The coverage these investigations received has likely also benefited the corporate outreach work done by other organizations.

Animal Equality has also been campaigning in Italy, Spain, and India, countries where there was a need for this type of work. As a result, in Italy we have obtained an impressive number of victories very quickly—despite having only two staff dedicated to this type of work—affecting several millions of hens every year. In Spain, we have secured a policy with Huevos Guillén, the largest egg producer in the country, benefiting 5 million hens per year.

-
- 7/8: Pagasa (major CPG)
 - 9/8: Grupo Andersons (major restaurant group that owns Senor Frog's and Freshii)

² Animal Equality Brazil has obtained—in some cases jointly with other groups—twelve policies:

- 12/19: Brazilian Fast-Food Corporation (major restaurant group)
- 1/16: [International Meal Company](#) (major restaurant group)
- 2/21: [Barrilla](#) (pasta giant)
- 4/7: Bunge (top 3 mayo producer in Brazil)
- 4/25: Starbucks (one of the world's biggest brands)
- 4/28: [Casa do Pao de Queijo](#) (leading coffee shop and baked goods chain in country with 900+ locations)
- 6/30: BRF (one of the largest meat producers and packaged goods companies in the world and a key competitor to JBS)
- 7/12: Rei do Mate (major tea shop and bakery chain with 330 stores across Brazil)
- 8/22: JBS (world's largest meat producer)
- 9/1: TrendFoods (major restaurant group owning the brands China in Box and Gendai with 225 locations throughout the country)
- 9/28: Fogo de Chao (major restaurant chain)
- 9/29: Fran's Cafe (major bakery chain)

We think that Animal Equality should work where there is a significantly cost-effective opportunity to help animals. It has clearly been the case in all the countries where we have launched these campaigns, and more than 12 million hens will benefit every year from this decision.

Do you think that animal advocacy work may be more effective in some of the countries in which you work than in others (perhaps due to differences in the size of the animal agriculture industry in each country or differences in cultural receptivity)?

When we compare the effectiveness of our work among the different countries where we work, there are multiple variables to take into consideration. For example, the amount of suffering due to the consumption of animal products, how it compares to other countries including the number of animals, what the farming industry standards are, individual consumption, habits, public support, influence that it has in other countries, etc.

We are especially enthusiastic about the work we are doing in India, Mexico, and Brazil since these countries have an enormous number of farmed animals, their economies are growing and therefore, their meat consumption will likely increase leading to more animals being raised and to more suffering. The animal protection movement in these countries is still relatively young but there seems to be great interest among the population about the problem.

Animal Equality has become one of the leading forces in animal protection in Europe. In a globalized world, the work that we do in one country can have additional effects in other regions. For example, our investigation into foie gras farms in Spain resulted in India banning the importation of the product. Conversely, our investigation into chicken farms in India has resulted in extensive media coverage in Spain.

In addition, our campaign to ban the confinement of rabbits in cages can dramatically reduce the suffering of over 400 million rabbits and reduce the number of victims given the predicted increase in the production costs. Since many rabbit farms have small profit margins, many will have to close and this will likely result in a reduction in the supply.

In conclusion, we don't see our work in one country being more effective than our work in another country. Rather, we think that one campaign on a particular topic in one country at a certain moment can be more effective than another. Therefore, we aim to choose the right type of work for the right topic at the right time and place.

Does Animal Equality worry that focusing on banning some of the most extreme confinement practices could lead to complacency with other forms of suffering farmed animals endure or with meat consumption?

The study "The Impact Of Farm Animal Housing Restrictions on Egg Prices, Consumer Welfare, and Production in California" by Conner Mullally and Jayson L. Lusk concludes that the increase in production costs following the passage of Proposition 2 in California resulted in "both egg production and the number of egg-laying hens were about 35% lower than they would have been in the absence of the new regulations." Therefore we know that it not only has reduced the suffering of the animals raised for that purpose by modifying the conditions, but that it has also reduced the number of animals who would otherwise have been bred.

After the European Union banned the confinement of hens in battery cages (replaced in Spain for so-called enriched cages) the production costs increased and resulted in 22% fewer hens, sparing intense suffering for millions of hens.

According to the study “Impacts of Animal Well-Being and Welfare Media on Meat Demand” by Glynn T. Tonsor and Nicole J. Olynk, which studied how media attention to animal welfare, including the ballot initiatives that ban some of those practices, affected meat demand, it concludes: “long-run pork and poultry demand are hampered by increasing media attention.”

Mercy For Animals [carried out a study](#) with 1,600 participants that found those who read articles about corporate policy changes to eliminate battery cages or gestation crates were more likely to intend to reduce their consumption of animal products than participants who read the control articles.

Based on our current knowledge, we think that when consumers reject some forms of animal abuse, they are more inclined to continue expanding their consideration and attributing higher value to the interests of animals. We think that a society that opposes some forms of animal agriculture practices and sets minimum protections or increases the existing ones is a society in which it is easier to increase the consideration towards animals and further reduce animal suffering than one in which the worst abuses are standard practice and allowed by the law.

There are some who think that the scale of suffering in the wild is much greater than the scale of farmed animal suffering. What is Animal Equality doing to address wild animal suffering?

Animal Equality’s mission is to reduce as much suffering as possible no matter if the harm animals endure is caused directly by humans or not. Since suffering prevails in nature and affects a vast number of animals who are victims of a variety of serious harms (diseases, parasites, hunger, thirst, predation, weather hazards, etc); and since this problem is clearly neglected, Animal Equality considers that this is an important problem that we need to address.

Although the amount of suffering involved is a fundamental variable when analyzing a scenario and our current possibilities, we also take into consideration other variables such as the societal, economical, and political context, available resources, adversaries, and knowledge on the topic and possible interventions. These factors will influence how effective we can be. Given our very limited resources, we need to focus on a small number of issues in order to be most effective at them. We think that it is highly unlikely that a society that relies heavily in the consumption of animals and disregards the interests of those animals would appreciate the interests of animals in the wild (mainly fish, amphibians, and possibly insects) as the serious moral problem it is. We think that moving society away from the consumption of animal products and increasing the consideration and protections of animals raised for food is an important step to further extend that consideration and protection to other animals. All things considered, this is where Animal Equality can currently do the most good—though we continue to study the options to work more on this topic.

Animal Equality is currently drafting communication guidelines on this important topic so that our position is clearly articulated. Despite not actively working on the issue because of the aforementioned reason, we acknowledge the issue and regularly publish videos of humans

helping wild animals in need, as a way to promote the idea to hundreds of thousands of our followers that:

- Many wild animals suffer in nature;
- nature is not an idyllic nor net-positive scenario;
- humans can help wild animals in need and;
- doing so is a good action and should be encouraged and praised.

Our president Sharon Núñez and other leaders of the organization have publicly recognized the importance of this problem, we have expressed our concern about it, and we have shared and defended our views in public forums such as the Symposium on Effective Animal Altruism at MIT and the International Animal Rights conference in Luxembourg. As part of the on-boarding process, we share our position on this topic with new employees and will soon dedicate one of our required internal training sessions specifically to the problem of wild animal suffering with renowned expert on this topic, Oscar Horta, as guest speaker.

Why have the two leafleting studies that were completed in 2013 or 2014 not yet been published or otherwise disseminated? Do you have plans to publish them?

We will publish them before the end of October. We have contacted the researcher as we wanted to not only have the data of the number of people who decided to eliminate the consumption of animal products completely, but also of those who have decided to reduce their consumption, and some additional data not included in the original document.

If your organization receives any restricted donations, approximately how much did it receive in the past year? If your organization has any revenue-generating programs, it would be helpful for us to know what those programs are and how much revenue they generated in the past year.

Animal Equality's Shop in Europe: Total Sales (Jan–July): \$11,460 USD Investment: \$1,018 USD

Restricted donations: \$738,000

- 500,000 dollars for Corporate Outreach work in India, Italy, Spain, Mexico and Brazil (Received in July 2016 and July 2017)
- 20,000 dollars to carry out the Faunalytics study (Received in January 2017)
- 25,000 dollars for India and Mexico (Received in January 2017)
- 50,000 dollars for Brazil (Received in June 2017)
- 143,000 dollars for India (Received in June 2017)