

Follow-Up Questions for New Harvest (2017)

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

We received \$109,980 in restricted donations in 2016. We will receive \$323,503.34 in restricted donations in 2017 (These are already received or contractually agreed upon already. There could theoretically be more.)

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 don't have any routine revenue generating activities, however all fees for speaking engagements go to New Harvest by default. In 2017 we earned \$15,800 so far in speaking as a program service.

Does New Harvest have a strategic plan, and if so, are you willing to share it with us?

This is the best stand-in:

New Harvest has three goals.

The very long-term goal is a world where the livestock industry looks like the brewing industry. Animal products like meat, milk, and eggs, are brewed in stainless steel tanks. Every brewery (from that of a homebrewer to a massive multinational brewery) makes unique products with its own special recipes and methods and it's all built on the same, basic, open technology. These products are addressing the issues of animal agriculture.

The medium-term goal is the creation of public, open, research that asks and answers fundamental scientific questions related to cellular agriculture. This is already underway with several projects in our portfolio. We've already created and shared exciting protocols and cell cultures along the way. The first project should be complete by May 2018.

The short-term goal is creating a viable, well-supported scientific community whose members are well equipped to go on to start or join cellular agriculture laboratories in industry or academia.

Our strategic priorities are to 1) advance crucial, neglected science in cellular agriculture, 2) establish open, accessible research tools, protocols, processes, and publications, and 3) cultivate and expanding the cellular agriculture talent pool.

We notice that all three New Harvest staff members and most (if not all) of your fellows are women. Is that just a coincidence? Do you make a conscious effort to provide opportunities for scientists from underrepresented groups? (Are women underrepresented in cellular

agriculture?) When you hire staff or recruit fellows, do you consider their identities and/or backgrounds, and in what way?

Our demographics are coincidental. Identities and backgrounds do not factor into our decision making process.

It looks from the information you sent like the Shuttleworth Foundation is your largest donor at present. Is that correct?

This is correct in one sense. They have pledged the most money towards New Harvest, but not all of it will come through the New Harvest bank account. So yes they are the largest donor, but maybe not necessarily according to our financials. (For instance, they could potentially give money directly to a researcher we are supporting rather than to us)

Does New Harvest have any formal policies in place to prevent harassment or discrimination?

No, we have not formalized these policies yet. However for our Fellows, we have stated that they must defer to their Universities' policies and procedures.

What, if anything, can New Harvest do to ensure that consumers will embrace cultured meat?

Our approach is to be as open as possible about this developing technology as it happens, so that it will not experience backlash or "scandals" after the product hits the market. Our annual conference is one of our biggest initiatives towards welcoming the general public - non scientists, consumers, etc., - to get a sense for what cultured meat is, and to collect information about attitudes and questions that arise at this event. Ultimately, we can not ensure that consumers will embrace cultured meat.

Some reports, such as the Open Philanthropy Project's [Animal Product Alternatives](#) report and [Van der Weele & Tramper \(2014\)](#) suggest it is unlikely that cultured meats will ever be cost-competitive with conventional meat. Factors like the minimum costs of growth medium are cited as supporting evidence. Is New Harvest concerned about this possibility?

While it is possible that cultured meat may never reach cost competitiveness, I would say this makes the research we are supporting worthless. I like to liken the situation to biofuels - biofuels aren't cost competitive [today](#), for many reasons but one largely being that they compete with an artificially-priced commodity: fossil fuels. While we aren't using biofuels everyday, in the event of a catastrophe or growing fuel prices, that technology is on the back burner and ready to be mobilized into action. I think the same of cultured meat. Also, we haven't done enough research in the area to suggest that cost competitiveness is an impossible task. It's difficult, no doubt, but we don't yet know for sure that it's impossible.

Some might suggest that technological progress will come eventually, and what matters most in the long run is whether we've achieved the social change necessary to use those new technologies to help animals. Why is New Harvest working to advance technology rather than to shift public attitudes?

The main reason we're working on advancing technology is because it's a highly neglected area. There are several groups working towards the shift in attitudes. I think we're uniquely situated to advance the public, academic research. Not only is it neglected in the nonprofit world, it's also neglected in terms of regular research funding. I want New Harvest to inspire science funders to get involved. We're only a ~\$1million/yr org! This could definitely be well over \$10 million/year if we wanted to make real progress in the lab.

Why doesn't New Harvest invest some of its resources into plant-based foods as well as cultured foods, when (a) plant-based foods may be easier to develop and (b) the further development of plant-based foods seems like it could relieve the need for better cultured food options?

Similar to the answer above, we don't feel that the plant-based food world is as neglected. I think it still could use more help (from the likes of GFI, for instance), but we want to stay focused on cultured meat, which is very broad science itself, and very unique. If we stretched into plant sciences I think our Research Fellow collaborative structure would need to be remodeled, and I don't think we're the right size to make a move like that. I also like that we are focusing on cultured meat, with extensions into cellular agriculture in general. Placing cultured meat on the continuum of algae-based foods, and cell-cultured foods/enzymes/materials is the continuum we'd like to be on for reasons of uptake, attracting new scientific talent, etc.

Does New Harvest directly support work on developing products other than those that could decrease animal product consumption (e.g., promoting yeast-based vanillas or flower fragrances)? Why or why not?

We only are involved with groups like these with regard to our conference, and again, to place cultured meat on that continuum of new, exciting products, many of which already exist today. We believe it normalizes the technology, places it in a "tech" landscape more than a "non-profit" one, which assists with uptake and reaching a new audience of consumers rather than activists.