

Follow-Up Questions for Compassion in World Farming USA (2017)

Initial Follow-Up / Received August 11, 2017

If your organization receives any restricted donations, approximately how much did it receive in the past year?

We received [\\$30,000 from the the Open Philanthropy Project \(OPP\)](#) to conduct animal welfare research on Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Colombia, and Chile. The research will provide us with a “lay of the land” of animal welfare work, corporate food producers and potential engagement opportunities in each country.

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.

We do not have any revenue-generating programs.

Please provide a list of board members and brief descriptions of their occupations or backgrounds (job titles/industries or links to LinkedIn are sufficient).

Lyn Devon: [New York City Fashion Designer](#)

Brooke Schooley: Currently [Opera Singer](#), previously a hedge fund advisor

Philip Lymbery: CEO Compassion in World Farming

Kathryn Flanders: Director of Operations Compassion in World Farming

Richard Brooks: Director of Communications Compassion in World Farming

Does the organization have a strategic plan? Can we see it? (We’re aware of [this](#) strategic plan for CIWF overall from 2013-2017, but would be interested if you have anything more recent and/or more U.S.-specific.)

CIWF USA is connected to the larger, international CIWF organization, headquartered in the U.K., which has offices and representatives in 12 countries. To provide greater context to CIWF USA, attached is the CIWF international strategic plan. However, it is important to note that CIWF USA will continue its focus on corporate policy change and public engagement. The international focus on advocating for better legislation or engaging the United Nations is primarily the work of the other countries where CIWF has a presence.

The focus of Compassion USA for the next five years will be:

- Achieving corporate commitments that improve the lives of one billion animals;

- Increasing corporate commitments for protein diversification, having at least 25% of protein from alternative sources;
- Tracking corporate compliance and holding companies accountable to their commitments;
- Engaging and educating the general public, via email, at least 4 videos per year reaching over 10,000 views each, maintaining and growing our “short list” of go-to journalists, and using Facebook ads to target those most likely to engage specifically on farm animal welfare, then implementing an email funnel to convert subscribers into monthly donors;
- Growing our email subscriber list to 200,000 supporters via petitions, opt-in forms, lead magnets (which offer a tool like our Compassionate Food Buying Guide in exchange for an email address), Facebook ads, and media coverage with either backlinks to our campaign pages or embedded YouTube videos;
- Doubling our income to become a 1.2 million dollar organization;
- Participating in our global growth of “voices of change,” in which we seek to grow to 10 million supporters across all CIWF offices;
- Researching and potentially expanding our work into Latin America.

Clarification / Received Oct 3, 2017

Do you work with volunteers and interns? Can you tell us about those programs, if so?

Yes, we had a research intern this summer. She helped us with market research related to public opinion and market trends related to fish and also plant-based products. We don't have a regular internship program where interns are with us year round. We use them more for special projects as they come up.

Apart from the recent Open Philanthropy grants, does much of your funding come from foundations, or are you funded mostly by individual donors?

At this time, excluding Open Philanthropy Project grants, our giving is roughly 75% foundations and 25% individuals.

In our call, you mentioned seven organizations that you collaborated with to decide on a broiler ask. (I believe this referred to the GAP standards, though I might be mistaken.) Could you list them?

Here is the [link](#) to the joint broiler ask and all the organizations that signed on.

Is it accurate to say that CIWF USA's mission and values (if not its plans) are much the same as those described in CIWF's global strategic plan?

Yes, our mission is the same for all of Compassion In World Farming, to end factory farming.

To what extent is CIWF USA's long-term planning done in concert with CIWF, and to what extent is it autonomous?

We have a collaborative relationship with CIWF in that we communicate with them about our goals and initiatives and receive feedback from them given their experience. Our long term planning is informed by and aligned with the international strategy. However, at the end of the day, CIWF USA makes the final call on what we will do and how it will be done in the U.S. For example, our international strategy includes influencing corporate policy, growing a social movement and influencing political policy. In the U.S., influencing political policy is far more difficult than, say, our Compassion office in Belgium or Poland. So, within that international strategy, our focus is changing corporate policy and growing the social movement. Does that make sense? So, yes, our long-term planning is done in concert with CIWF's international organization, but we have full autonomy to execute the plan as we see best for the U.S.

Critical Questions / Received Oct 3, 2017

There are many more farmed fish than other species of farmed animals. Has CIWF USA considered allocating more of its resources towards farmed fish advocacy?

Yes. CIWF HQ received a grant this year to conduct research into farmed fish and analyze both what legislation and corporate policy approaches are feasible. We are inputting into this. Depending on the outcomes and recommendations, and hopefully with increased income, we plan to work on fish in the coming years. Also, GAP received a grant to work on salmon standards, which we are also looking into. WE believe that in terms of number of animals and likelihood of success, salmon would be the likely area of focus for our USA office.

Does CIWF USA 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?

We don't have any evidence to date that companies have become more complacent regarding suffering of farmed animals due to their commitments to ban the most extreme confinement practices. In fact, we feel the institutional partnerships put animal welfare more at the center of the public eye and at the center of companies' brands. It makes animal welfare more central to company identity and core to their culture. It also requires companies to be more accountable. Without these public commitments, farmed animal issues could remain in the shadows and companies could exist without any accountability at all to the farmed animals.

We believe our job is to reduce suffering, and to continually do so. This is why we focus so heavily on the metrics of suffering and trying to understand if we can justify the improvements we

are pushing companies towards. The first question is does the improvement quantifiably reduce suffering? But we know that alone is not enough, as every year more and more animals are being consumed despite the improvements. Total suffering in this way could continue to increase if we don't tackle overall ever increasing meat consumption. As such, we have a new project where we will be recommending 'protein diversification' to food companies, in which we will ask companies to reduce protein purchases from animals, and increase protein purchase from plant based sources. This project will officially be launched in 2018, and it in a consultative status. We feel confident it will be well received by companies, as they are already asking for our help regarding how to diversify their protein purchase. Again we will aim to have clear metrics that indicate consumption/production is reducing.

Some would argue that working for welfare reforms is an implicit endorsement of the use of animals. How does CIWF USA respond to this concern?

The strength of our organization, an animal welfare organization, in the ecology of organizations pushing for change is that we specifically do not say if animals should or should not be used. We do say that when they are used, they must be treated in a way that meets their needs and wants. With this position we are able to reach across a broad spectrum of stakeholders and make progress. We find the place everyone can agree, and start making progress from there, one step at a time, measurably reducing suffering. We feel this role is useful in the arc of change.

What does CIWF USA do to highlight the problems with using animals for food? What does CIWF USA do to fight speciesism?

I think all of our work is focused on bringing front of mind the inherent problems with using animals for food. We ask companies and consumers alike to recognize farmed animals as sentient beings and act accordingly. In many of our approaches to companies we explicitly discuss how the physiology of a dog/cat is not different that a cow/pig. It's one of our best ways to reach people and get them to really think through the life of farmed animals carefully, and recognize that how we treat these animals is fundamentally an injustice.

Some contend that (i) slow growth broilers will lead to more birds being farmed and/or birds spending longer lives in factory farms to satisfy the same demand for meat, and (ii) this greater quantity of time spent by birds in factory farms will outweigh the reduced suffering due to improved health—such that, overall, the introduction of slow growth broilers is net negative in expectation. What is CIWF USA doing to ensure that the introduction of slow growth broilers happens in a way that is net positive for animals?

We have certainly shared that concern. As such, we have done extensive calculations to look at this problem, and it is one we have been concerned about. I am happy to share graphs and calculations ([one example attached](#)) that considered what extending the number of days might mean for total days of suffering. We worked with other organizations like Mercy for Animals, The

Humane League and HSUS to understand this in details over many months before we jointly agreed an ask to companies. The conclusion was that we should not focus on slower growth, but rather better welfare outcomes. As such we no longer ask companies for slower growth or a specific growth rate, but rather better welfare outcomes. These leaves the door open to breeders that if they can grow the birds faster and still meet improved welfare outcomes, we would support that, not least because it would mean putting fewer animals through the system. We do feel it is unlikely though that breeders can overcome the welfare outcomes associated with fast growth, as all scientific evidence to date suggests it is directly related to the fast growth. But the door is left open.