



RECOMMENDATION STATUS	CHARITY	LAST REVIEWED	FOCUS AREA	MAIN PROGRAMS	ROOM FOR MORE FUNDING	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	UNDERSTANDING OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE	STRENGTH OF CULTURE AND STRATEGIC DIRECTION	ACE'S KNOWLEDGE OF CHARITY
TOP CHARITY		2017	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> <li>Investigations</li> <li>Online Outreach</li> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> <li>Legal Advocacy</li> </ul>	HIGH (> \$1M)	Animal Equality has conducted investigations for a fraction of what some other organizations spend on this task. They have a strong understanding of success and failure, and they set goals to increase their impact.	Animal Equality's presence in several countries makes communication and project management more difficult and means that they might not have the resources to take advantage of the outstanding opportunities in each country.	HIGH	AVERAGE	HIGH
TOP CHARITY		2017	New Food Tech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Science &amp; Technology</li> <li>International Outreach</li> <li>Innovation</li> <li>Communications</li> <li>Legal Advocacy</li> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> </ul>	HIGH (> \$1M)	Developing competitive alternatives to animal products could have a huge impact for farmed animals. We feel confident in GFI's leadership and strategic vision.	GFI was launched in 2016, so their track record is short and does not yet include some of the outcomes they most hope to accomplish.	AVERAGE	HIGH	AVERAGE
TOP CHARITY		2017	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> <li>Online Outreach</li> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> <li>Advocacy Research</li> </ul>	MODERATE (\$0.5M-\$1M)	THL makes particularly good efforts to assess their programs and make improvements, which has led to a strong track record of success. They also have an especially cohesive and democratic culture.	We would like to see THL engage more critically with issues such as prioritizing interventions. We are also somewhat concerned about their sustained high rate of expansion.	HIGH	HIGH	HIGHEST
STANDOUT CHARITY: General Interest		2017	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consumer Outreach</li> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> <li>Advocacy Research</li> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> </ul>	LOW (< \$0.5M) [*]	The ASF is engaged in corporate outreach work that could ultimately affect large numbers of animals. They actively look for ways to improve their materials and strategy. [*]	Though ASF has expanded their corporate outreach internationally and is expanding some of their programs to Poland, they primarily work in Germany, a medium-population country where the animal advocacy movement is well established, potentially limiting the amount of additional help ASF can provide. [*]	HIGH	[*]	AVERAGE
STANDOUT CHARITY: General Interest		2017	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> </ul>	MODERATE (\$0.5-\$1M)	CIWF USA is focused on improving their work and conducting research to be more effective. They have a unique, friendly, and collaborative approach to their corporate campaigns which complements the campaigns of other charities we recommend.	We have concerns that addressing the problems of factory farms without making an ideological case against using animals for food in general may have long-term effects of increasing complacency in the use of animals for food.	HIGH	AVERAGE	AVERAGE
STANDOUT CHARITY: Special Interest <i>We recommend Faunalytics for donors who are particularly interested in supporting research.</i>		2017	Animal Advocacy Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Client-Based Studies</li> <li>Research Library</li> <li>Advocacy Research</li> </ul>	LOW (< \$0.5M)	Faunalytics supports other organizations through their research. Advocacy research can be used by many different organizations, leading to a potentially large impact for animals.	Faunalytics' work is not entirely focused on the areas we think are most effective, such as industrial agriculture. Some of their client research is particularly niche and may not apply to a large number of animals.	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	HIGH
STANDOUT CHARITY: General Interest		2017	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal Advocacy</li> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> <li>Investigations</li> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> <li>Online Outreach</li> </ul>	MODERATE (\$0.5-\$1M)	France seems to have a relatively small animal advocacy movement, so there is a large potential for impact there. L214 has had impressive success in raising public awareness with their investigations.	Their flat management structure may cause issues as they are rapidly expanding. Some of their programs, such as conducting investigations and corporate outreach, have short track records.	AVERAGE	HIGH	LOW
STANDOUT CHARITY: Special Interest <i>We recommend NHRP for donors who are particularly interested in securing legal rights for animals.</i>		2017	Legal Rights For Animals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal Advocacy</li> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> </ul>	LOW (< \$0.5M)	NHRP's work to secure legal rights and personhood for animals could be the most promising avenue for improving the lives of nonhuman animals in our society.	We have substantial uncertainty as to whether NHRP's work will help achieve rights for animals, especially animals who (unlike chimpanzees) have well-studied and high-level cognitive abilities.	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE
STANDOUT CHARITY: General Interest		2017	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigations</li> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> <li>Consumer Outreach</li> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> <li>Online Outreach</li> </ul>	LOW (< \$0.5M) Note: Open Cages is currently undergoing a merger with Anima, which makes us particularly uncertain of their RFMF.	Open Cages has a focus on using evidence to maximize the impact of their work. Poland (and Eastern Europe as a whole) seems to be a relatively neglected region, so there is a large potential for impact there.	Open Cages is currently mostly a volunteer organization and will need to introduce more formal procedures to improve staff experience as they grow. Their corporate outreach work has a short track record.	HIGH	AVERAGE	LOW
STANDOUT CHARITY: General Interest		2016	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> <li>Corporate Outreach</li> <li>Legal Advocacy</li> <li>Online Outreach</li> </ul>	MODERATE (\$0.5-\$1M) [*]	ProVeg International seeks to maximize their impact through their corporate outreach work. For instance, they have worked with leaders in the meat industry to create and market vegetarian products. [*]	It is difficult to measure the impact that ProVeg's work has had for animals. Until recently, they have been working primarily in Germany, a medium-population country where the animal advocacy movement is well established, potentially limiting the amount of additional help they can provide. [*]	HIGH	[*]	LOW
STANDOUT CHARITY: Special Interest <i>We recommend Vegan Outreach for donors who are particularly interested in supporting grassroots outreach.</i>		2016	Farmed Animal Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grassroots Outreach</li> </ul>	LOW (< \$0.5M) [*]	Vegan Outreach has an exceptionally long track record (over ten years) of carrying out their leafleting program. They consider appropriate sources of information when planning changes to their interventions. [*]	Focusing on a single intervention without more information about its effectiveness can be risky. Vegan Outreach has not yet established a successful track record with any of their new programs. [*]	AVERAGE	[*]	AVERAGE

[\*] Our method for calculating room for more funding changed between our 2016 and 2017 evaluations. We think that our room for more funding estimates for those two years are still broadly comparable, but direct comparisons should be made with some caution—we think that the 2016 estimates are less likely to be accurately categorized than the 2017 estimates.

[\*] Our 2016 reviews may now be outdated.

[\*] Our 2016 reviews may now be outdated.

[\*] Our 2016 evaluations of culture cannot be used for comparison due to substantial methodological changes.