

Sinergia Animal Follow-Up Questions, Part Two (2018)

Can you provide estimated expenses and your fundraising goal for 2019 if you have it?

[Spreadsheet is here.](#)

Of your corporate commitments secured in 2018, are there any individual commitments that you expect affected more than 5 million layer hens?

No, not yet. We are just starting and we are not focusing on the largest companies yet (such as supermarket chains), because we are still trying to build momentum with coffee shop chains, food manufacturers, and fast food chains. I would expect our largest commitments to affect around 50,000 to 100,000 hens per year individually. Also, the companies in the countries where we are operating have smaller supply chains than the companies in the U.S., Brazil and India, because their populations/consumer markets are also smaller.

How many staff received our culture survey? (We'd like to calculate the response rate.)

Two (out of three) received and completed it. The third one has not completed it because when ACE sent us the survey, she had just started with us.

[If applicable] To what extent have you changed your strategy or your work in light of the relative successes you've experienced in the three countries where you operate? E.g., what are you changing (if anything) as a result of what you learned about the relative difficulty of getting commitments in Colombia vs. Argentina? Also, to what extent have analyses of your relative successes influenced your decisions about expanding to additional countries?

We faced challenges in finding a reliable part-time consultant with enough experience to deal with companies in Colombia. For this reason, the CEO took this responsibility and role. That was

a change of plans, but it gave us great results, as most of our commitments come from Colombia. Colombia is also an easier country because 30% of the national production is already cage-free. This is a temporary solution and we know we need to build a proper corporate outreach team in Colombia and we will do so when there is more funding to secure full-time campaigners.

In Chile and Argentina, we are improving our strategy. We came to the conclusion that our campaigns are not strong as they need to be, because companies are very resistant and around 98% of production is made in cages in both countries. So next year, we will do everything we can to double our budget for these two countries, have full-time consultants and more funds to make our campaigns more impactful in terms of social media, online petitions, direct actions, and media coverage. We also feel our campaigners need to be more prepared and knowledgeable, so we are currently investing much more time in training and meetings/talks. And we are also taking more time to talk to other grassroots organizations for them to join the movement and campaign with us.

We decided to expand to Thailand and Indonesia in Southeast Asia because we feel we were successful as the pioneers in cage-free campaigning in these three Latin American countries (Chile, Argentina and Colombia) and our talks with other groups and our own analysis suggest Thailand and Indonesia are promising markets, with responsive companies and a good number of multinational chains that already have policies in the U.S., Europe and Latin America. So, these policies could be expanded to Asia. These two countries were also chosen because they have the largest numbers of hens in the region.

In Thailand, around 40% of the national production is said to be cage-free, so we expect to be able to get very good results in our first year of work (like we did in Colombia, which has a similar production pattern). Also, two of the largest egg producers in Thailand already have cage-free pledges.

In Indonesia, we expect companies to be more resistant, like they are being in Chile and Argentina, so a larger share of the budget will be for Indonesia and we will do fewer campaigns in the first year (compared to the number of campaigns we launched in Argentina and Chile) to be sure they are impactful enough.

Given that the corporate pledges are not legally binding, how can we be sure that they meaningfully support improvements in farmed animal welfare?

That is something we are strongly concerned about and we want to make sure these reforms in corporate supply chains will be real and verifiable. Our current strategy is:

- We make clear to companies that we want annual reports
- We tell them we want to be able to visit their cage-free suppliers

- We strongly recommend certifications and independent audits

We have to wait a bit to see how this will evolve, as we are in the very initial stage of this work and the main goal now is to secure a good number of commitments. But, in the future, when implementation deadlines are closer, we will surely use public campaigns if needed when companies are not being transparent and committed enough about meeting their pledges. We also hope that when the market changes significantly, we will be able to push for legislation to ban the systems that are being phased out by companies.

There are many more farmed fish than other species of farmed animals. Has Sinergia considered allocating more of their resources towards farmed fish advocacy?

Our organization was founded just one year ago and we have to be very focused in areas/species we can secure funding and for which there is great momentum (a lot of examples to follow) from other countries and organizations, to be able to deliver effective results and outcomes. Currently, laying hens are the species we focus the most for these two reasons, and also because they represent a very significant share of animals being farmed for food.

In the future, if we are able to secure funds and have proper resources to expand to other species, we would surely consider farmed fish. Especially because we are working in Chile, the world's second largest producer of farmed salmon. We are also deeply concerned about the problems related to trash-fishing in Peru.

How does the effectiveness of different programs vary in each country in which Sinergia works? Can you describe your strategy for choosing which countries to work in and which programs to pursue there?

We currently have just one program: cage-free corporate campaigns. As explained above, its effectiveness has varied in different countries. We are adapting to be better in the countries where we have been less effective.

Our strategy to choose Argentina, Chile, and Colombia was based on several criteria:

- Number of animals: We wanted to work against battery cages in egg production because science shows animals suffer a lot in these systems and egg production is responsible for a very large share of animals being farmed.
- Funding: We were able to secure funding to carry out this work effectively.
- Momentum: There is good momentum already in other Latin American countries (Brazil and Mexico).

- Legal possibility: These three countries are democracies, where we can safely run market campaigns.
- Neglected but important countries: Argentina, Chile and Colombia have the largest numbers of hens in Latin America after Mexico and Brazil.
 - Mexico and Brazil were not considered a priority because many other powerful NGOs already carry out cage-free campaigns there.
 - No other NGO was doing corporate (pressure) campaigning in these three countries.

About Thailand and Indonesia in Southeast Asia:

- Number of animals: Same response as the one given for Latin America.
- Funding: Same response as the one given for Latin America.
- Momentum: There are commitments coming from Japan and Taiwan, so momentum is building. Also, two producers already committed in Thailand.
- Legal possibility: Very experienced lawyers and campaigners from other international NGOs, who have experience in corporate/pressure campaigns, were already consulted in both countries. Thailand is a bit more sensitive, but with the proper care and legal support, it seems like we will be able to operate safely and effectively there.
- Neglected but important countries: Indonesia and Thailand are the first and the third largest producers of eggs in SE Asia.
 - No other NGO was doing corporate (pressure) campaigning in these two countries.
 - Malaysia, the second largest producer, was not chosen because Thailand looks more promising to start.