

Lush Lobbying Prize 2012

Research Paper

1. Executive Summary

The Lush Lobbying Prize aims to reward individuals and organisations involved in policy interventions promoting the use of alternatives to animal testing. The prize for lobbying “recognises that scientific innovation needs to go hand-in-hand with policy change to ensure that end-users of new testing approaches – industry and regulators – are receptive and responsive to the new methods.”

Key areas of activity

The first part of this paper summarises the current regulations and campaigning in Europe and the USA relating to the testing of animals for toxicity testing. It then looks at issues, obstacles and NGO (non-governmental organisation) action in five key areas:

- The European ban on cosmetics testing (3.1)
- REACH (3.4)
- China's animal testing policy, (4.1)
- The US Safe Cosmetics Act. (4.3)
- India and Brazil (4.5 and 4.6)

Lobbying and politicians

At section 5 the paper looks at lobbying generally, asking what makes effective lobbying?. At section 6 the paper looks at evidence of the activities of individual politicians in the UK and European Parliaments.

Conclusions and recommendations

Part of the remit for this report was to identify effective lobbying groups which may not have been directly nominated for the Prize. This paper proposes that the following three organisations should be considered for the short list for the Lobbying Prize in 2012.

- European Coalition to End Animal Experiments
- Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations
- Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine

Our research shows them to be effective lobbyists who have made, and continue to make, a difference towards ending animal testing.

Two of the NGOs (European Coalition to End Animal Experiments and Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations) are coalitions. This report has highlighted the effectiveness of working as a coalition in order to provide a more effective lobbying strategy and offering a consensus of opinion to policy makers (5.1).

The third NGO, Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, is not only conducting vital lobbying work in its home country of the USA, but through its position as Secretariat of the International Council on Animal Protection in OECD Programmes it also co-ordinates this coalition’s work “to incorporate alternative methods that can replace, reduce, and refine animal use in OECD guidelines and programs.”

2. Regulations and Campaigning on Animal Testing for Toxicity – Background and Summary

Animal testing is one of the major, and most controversial, animal protection issues of our time. Although public opinion may be divided over animal experiments for pharmaceutical research, polls repeatedly show a majority of the public oppose experiments on animals for testing cosmetics or household products.

Progress has been made on some issues, particularly in Europe where it is prohibited to test ingredients for cosmetics, and the final product, on animals and, from 2013, no animal tested cosmetics can be marketed in the EU (3.1).

This move has encouraged the speed at which non-animal testing methods have been developed, and accepted by regulatory authorities, and has led to campaigns in other parts of the world to follow suit.

The European Commission's own Institute for Health and Consumer Protection recognises that a looming deadline helps drive replacements to animal testing: "Necessity breeds invention, and the prospect of a complete ban on the use of animal testing in the EU cosmetics sector is a powerful driver for ambitious research and innovation across industry and academia" (3.2).

Cosmetic companies based outside the EU have recognised the need to ensure their products are 'cruelty-free' if they are to market them within the EU.

However, the cosmetics ban is under threat. Animal tests for three 'toxicological endpoints' have continued to be allowed until 2013 and attempts are being made to delay the prohibition of marketing animal-tested products even further under the claim that alternatives will not be available by the stated deadline, and possibly not for another 15 years or more (3.2).

As such, enforcing the 2013 marketing ban is seen by many NGOs as the main priority on a European level and a strong combination of lobbying politicians and regulators and working with cosmetics companies is being carried out by several organisations.

It is not just science that is important within that particular campaign. The cosmetics testing bans are mostly based on ethical objections to using animals for such products and therefore keeping this ethical debate alive has been crucial.

The situation outside Europe is mixed. The Safe Cosmetics Act in the USA could, if passed, lead to more animal experiments (4.3). China's requirement for cosmetics sold in the country to be animal tested has led to some major companies dropping long-held cruelty-free policies in a race to sell in this emerging market (4.1). NGO action is helping to address these problems, just as it is working in other emerging markets such as Brazil to entrench non-animal testing methods (4.6).

Despite the EU cosmetics testing ban, many of the ingredients in these products may be tested on animals through another piece of EU legislation, REACH - Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals. What has been dubbed 'the most complex legislation in the history of the EU will see millions of animals poisoned – up to 54 million by some estimates (3.5).

Within Europe, animal testing for cosmetics has mostly been carried out on mice, rats, guinea pigs, fish and rabbits.

Accurate figures on the numbers of animals used in testing cosmetics and ingredients are difficult to assess given that many substances used in cosmetics are also used for other purposes, or tested under other legislation such as chemical or worker safety, and therefore not necessarily included in statistics for cosmetics testing. In addition, there is a lack of available statistics for many countries, 79% of which don't appear to publish the number of animals used in testing¹.

Statistics for the EU show that 33,254 animals were used in cosmetics testing between 1998 and 2008².

The European Coalition to End Animal Experiments (ECEAE) has attempted to assess the numbers of animal used for cosmetic testing worldwide that may result in products being imported in the EU. Taking all factors into account, ECEAE estimate that up to 1,341,800 animals may be used in such testing over a ten year period³.

2.1 Opinion Polls

Opinion polls conducted on behalf of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection (BUAV) in 2001 and 2004 showed that 83% of women in the UK would be in favour of a Europe-wide ban on the sale of cosmetics that are tested on animals and 79% of people said they would be likely to swap to a brand that was not animal tested⁴.

Polls for other European countries reveal similar results⁵.

In the USA, a poll commissioned by Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) in 2011⁶ revealed that 72% of respondents agreed that testing cosmetics on animals is unethical; 78% agreed that the development of alternatives to animal testing for cosmetics testing is important; 61% said that cosmetics and personal care product companies should not be allowed to test products on animals. These numbers are up significantly from a 2003 Gallup Poll that found 38% of Americans would support a complete ban on product testing on animals.

Manufacturers have taken public concerns on board. Cruelty-free shopping guides such as the one produced by the Coalition for Consumer Information on Cosmetics, list hundreds of companies producing cosmetics without animal testing⁷.

1 Statistics. BUAV. <http://www.buav.org/humane-science/statistics/>. Accessed 16.8.12

2 Animal Defenders International's Submissions to the Impact Assessment 2013 Implementation Date Marketing Ban Cosmetics Directive. http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/animal_defenders_ia_2013_en.pdf. Accessed 13.8.12

3 Stakeholder Consultation on the 2013 Implementation date of the Marketing Ban - Cosmetics Directive. Submission by the European Coalition to End Animal Experiments. 2011. http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/eceae_ia_2013_1_en.pdf. Accessed 13.8.12

4 Media release: Argos becomes BUAV Approved. BUAV, 13.2.10. <http://www.buav.org/media/files/BUAV%20Argos%20Cruelty%20Free.pdf>

5 See section 2.1.5 of Stakeholder Consultation on the 2013 Implementation date of the Marketing Ban - Cosmetics Directive. Submission by the European Coalition to End Animal Experiments. 2011. http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/eceae_ia_2013_1_en.pdf

6 More Than a Makeup Trend: New Survey Shows 72 percent of Americans Oppose Testing Cosmetics Products on Animals. Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. <http://pcrm.org/research/animaltestalt/cosmetics/americans-oppose-testing-cosmetics-on-animals>. Accessed 13.8.12

7 See <http://www.leapingbunny.org/shopping.php>

2.2 21st Century Toxicology

The impacts of REACH and the seventh amendment to the Cosmetics Directive, alongside the “request for a new vision” by the Environmental Protection Agency in the USA, have “awakened toxicology”, as Thomas Hartung (Director for the Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing and formerly head of the European Center for the Validation of Alternative Methods) put it⁸.

The 2007 publication of the National Research Council’s ‘Toxicity Testing for the 21st Century: a vision and a strategy’ is said to have changed the system of regulatory toxicology more than the two decades of work in Europe on alternatives to animal testing and the 3Rs (reduce, replace, refine).

The NRC’s report has encouraged further debate within the scientific community and helped it recognise that the standard (animal-based) approach to chemical testing “has led to a testing system that is lengthy and costly and that uses many animals” as well as “many toxicants not being tested at all, despite potential human exposure to them”⁹.

Moving away from outdated animal tests is now key to moving toxicology into the 21st century. The aim is to “make toxicity testing quicker, less expensive, and more directly relevant to human exposures”¹⁰.

What is being called for is a new system of regulatory toxicology. A 2011 scientific paper on ‘Toxicity Testing in the 21st Century’ stated that “the approaches to quantitatively assessing the health risks of chemical exposure have not changed appreciably in the past 50 to 80 years”, the focus remaining on “expensive, low-throughput” animal experiments “of questionable relevance to predicting risks to humans at their typical low exposures”.¹¹

Hartung believes a strong combination of science and politics is required to move toxicology forward: “the political process is necessary to make the funding available so that the political will can be put into practice. The dimensions of the project call for a global programme. The groundwork for such an effort has been laid by increasing awareness of the shortcomings of current methods, as well as emerging technological opportunities and political demands.”¹²

HSI has probably been the most active NGO promoting the concept of 21st century toxicology. A particular example is HSI’s co-ordination of AXLR8, a European Commission-

8 Toxicology for the twenty-first century. Thomas Hartung. Nature 460, 208-212 (9 July 2009).
<https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B5MLpijOnQvdZjdJUffzMTJjUfK/edit>

9 Toxicity Testing in the 21st Century: A Vision and a Strategy. Report in Brief. National Academy of Sciences, 2007.
http://dels.nas.edu/resources/static-assets/materials-based-on-reports/reports-in-brief/Toxicity_Testing_final.pdf

10 Toxicity Testing in the 21st Century: A Vision and a Strategy. Report in Brief. National Academy of Sciences, 2007.
http://dels.nas.edu/resources/static-assets/materials-based-on-reports/reports-in-brief/Toxicity_Testing_final.pdf

11 Toxicity Testing in the 21st Century: Defining New Risk Assessment Approaches Based on Perturbation of Intracellular Toxicity Pathways. Bhattacharya S, Zhang Q, Carmichael PL, Boekelheide K, Andersen. ME (2011) PLoS ONE 6(6): e20887. <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0020887>

12 Toxicology for the twenty-first century. Thomas Hartung. Nature 460, 208-212 (9 July 2009).
<https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B5MLpijOnQvdZjdJUffzMTJjUfK/edit>

funded initiative “as part of growing international efforts to revolutionise chemical and drug safety testing with sophisticated ‘21st century’ cell- and computer-based methods.”¹³

In 2010, HSI’s sister-NGO, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), stated that it “believes that the timely implementation of the NRC vision warrants a large-scale ‘Human Toxicology Project’ [...] The HSUS spearheaded the formation of the Human Toxicology Project Consortium to help marshal the necessary will, funding, and research for this effort. Our sister organisation, the Humane Society International, is embarking on a related effort with European partners. The HSUS co-founded a website, AltTox.org, devoted exclusively to the scientific and policy issues central to advancing non-animal methods of toxicity testing.”¹⁴

2.3 Future obstacles and opportunities

A great deal of progress has been achieved over the past twenty years in helping change legislation to encourage non-animal testing methods. These changes not only meet the expectations and demands of a public audience concerned about animal protection but, given the unreliability of experiments on animals, provide safer methods of testing new products for the consumer market.

Excitement surrounding the 21st Century Toxicology initiatives continues and, if followed through, could provide a major breakthrough to future research without animals.

However, globally, some of this progress is under threat. Delays to the EU ban on marketing animal-tested cosmetics; the use of animals in the EU’s REACH chemical testing regulation; China’s requirement for animal testing of cosmetics; and a proposed ‘safer cosmetics’ law in the USA all inhibit, to a greater or larger extent, the decades of initiatives to protect animals.

13 EU Initiative to “AXLR8” Move to High-Tech, Animal-Free Methods For Chemical and Drug Testing. HSI, 15.4.10. http://www.hsi.org/world/europe/news/news/2010/04/axlr8_041510.html

14 An animal protection perspective on 21st century toxicology. Stephens ML. J Toxicol Environ Health B Crit Rev. 2010 Feb;13(2-4):291-8. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20574903>

3. Key Issues in Europe

3.1 European ban on cosmetic testing on animals

The testing of cosmetics and their ingredients on animals was banned in the UK in 1998. More recently, similar action has been taken throughout Europe.

The 1976 Cosmetics Directive (76/768/EEC) requires that every product placed on the market in Europe is safe to use. In 1993 it was amended (the 'sixth amendment') to ban the marketing of animal-tested cosmetics from 1998. However, in 1997 this was postponed until 2000. A further postponement delayed the ban until 2002¹⁵.

The Directive's seventh amendment, in 2003, again "establishes a prohibition to test finished cosmetic products and cosmetic ingredients on animals (testing ban), and a prohibition to market in the European Community, finished cosmetic products and ingredients included in cosmetic products which were tested on animals (marketing ban)."¹⁶

The testing ban on finished cosmetic products applies since 2004 and the testing ban on ingredients applies since 2009. The marketing ban prohibits the import and sale of products and ingredients tested on animals outside Europe after March 2009.

3.2 Cosmetics ban: Obstacles

The only exception to the marketing ban relates to animal testing for three 'toxicological endpoints': repeated dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity and toxicokinetics. A later deadline of March 2013 was set as these tests were considered harder to replace. This deadline could be extended if alternatives are not available by that time.

Humane Society International (HSI) state that the seventh amendment did not provide an opportunity to delay the marketing ban but that a later EC report "claim[s] that additional endpoints are included under the general heading 'repeat dose toxicity'. Carcinogenicity and skin sensitisation have never been, and are never treated by toxicologists or regulators as 'subsets' of repeat dose toxicity. The 2009 ban – which did not provide for a delay – has been delayed by changes in language, reporting and interpretation"¹⁷.

The EC commissioned scientific experts in five toxicological areas "to analyse the status and prospects of alternative methods" and to provide an estimated time necessary to achieve full replacement of animal testing. Although time frames of 5-15 years were given

15 Ending Animal Testing for Cosmetics. Presentation to European Parliament Intergroup on the Welfare and Conservation of Animals. Emily McIvor, HSI-Europe. 16.02.11. <http://www.animalwelfareintergroup.eu/meetings/>. Accessed 21.8.12

16 Ban on animal testing. http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/animal-testing/index_en.htm. Accessed 13.8.12

17 Ending Animal Testing for Cosmetics. Presentation to European Parliament Intergroup on the Welfare and Conservation of Animals. Emily McIvor, HSI-Europe. 16.02.11. <http://www.animalwelfareintergroup.eu/meetings/>. Accessed 21.8.12

for the replacement of some animal tests, the panel concluded that “for the systemic toxicological endpoints of repeated dose toxicity, carcinogenicity and reproductive toxicity, the time horizon for full replacement could not be estimated.”¹⁸

Some NGOs believe the delay is a result of “pressure from influential players in the cosmetics industry” wanting to introduce yet more new ingredients into cosmetic products¹⁹.

There has also been opposition to the marketing ban from at least two countries, most notably France, which in 2005, took two actions through the European Court of Justice to try and prevent the implementation of the marketing ban, claiming it violated the principle of legal certainty because its scope was not adequately defined and it “interferes with the right freely to pursue a trade or profession”. The Court rejected both actions²⁰.

China has also opposed the EU marketing ban, claiming that consumer safety is at risk if “appropriate alternative methods” of testing are not ready in time. It called the setting of a specific date for the ban “inappropriate”²¹.

The BUAV has concluded²²: “there are insufficient scientific grounds for any extension to the 2013 deadline. Extending the deadline will not significantly help the cosmetic industry. Any extension would instead remove the incentive to validate and accept the alternatives that already exist. This would be a highly retrograde step.”

The European Commission’s own Institute for Health and Consumer Protection recognises that a looming deadline helps drive replacements to animal testing: “Necessity breeds invention, and the prospect of a complete ban on the use of animal testing in the EU cosmetics sector is a powerful driver for ambitious research and innovation across industry and academia.”²³

Such a drive for finding non-animal testing methods seems to be having an impact in some non-European countries too. At the First International Symposium on Alternatives to Animal Experimentation for Cosmetics held in Beijing in April 2011, speakers from China, Japan and Korea stated, according to the ECEAE, that “the anticipation of the EU marketing ban in 2013 had prompted an acceleration of efforts to accept alternatives and provide an effective validation process.”²⁴

18 Alternative (non-animal) methods for cosmetics testing: current status and future prospects—2010. Sarah Adler et al. Arch Toxicol (2011) 85:367–485.

http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/final_report_at_en.pdf

19 Animal Tested Cosmetics: Is the End in Sight? Alistair Currie (PETA's Policy Advisor). Huffington Post, 27.4.12.

http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/alistair-currie/animal-tested-cosmetics-is-the-end-in-sight_b_1455529.html

20 France v Parliament and Council. Judgement of the Court 24 May 2005. In Case C-244/03. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:62003CJ0244:EN:PDF>. Accessed 17.8.12; France loses appeal against animal testing ban. Simon Pitman. Cosmeticsdesign.com, 25.5.05. <http://www.cosmeticsdesign.com/Formulation-Science/France-loses-appeal-against-animal-testing-ban>

21 Department of International Cooperation of the State Food and Drug Administration. 14 April 2011.

http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/china_ia_2013_en.pdf

22 Meeting the Deadline of the 2013 EU Marketing Ban: A Scientific Review of Non-Animal Tests for Cosmetics.

http://www.buav.org/_lib/userfiles/files/BUAV_ScienceReport-SCREEN.pdf

23 Cosmetics: pioneering the way towards animal free testing. Institute for Health and Consumer Protection. 18.7.12

http://ihcp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/our_activities/alt-animal-testing/alt_test_cosmetics/cosmetics-pioneering-the-way-towards-animal-free-testing Accessed 13.8.12

24 Stakeholder Consultation on the 2013 Implementation date of the Marketing Ban - Cosmetics Directive. Submission

3.3 Cosmetics ban: NGO Action

Enforcing the 2013 marketing ban is seen by many NGOs as the main priority on a European level.

Eurogroup for Animals, in response to an EC questionnaire on the 2013 marketing ban deadline, commented: “Our interest is not in creating new deadlines for the full introduction of the marketing ban, but in ensuring that the 2013 deadline remains in place regardless of the availability of alternative methods.”²⁵

The issue of cosmetic testing on animals, despite any perceived difficulties with substituting non-animal methods in some areas, has largely been one of ethical rather than scientific considerations. Dr Dan Lyons, Campaigns Director of Uncaged, told this report’s author (e-mail 13.8.12): “the current animal protection argument for maintaining the 2013 marketing ban specifically argues that this is an ethical issue, not a scientific one. Furthermore, it’s the ethically-motivated marketing ban deadline which is supposed to drive the alternatives investment, not the other way round”.

According to PETA: “The original impetus for the ban was public opinion against cosmetics testing on animals” and members of the European Parliament who were most active in pushing for the ban “made it clear that their support (and that of the Parliament) was based on an ethical position regarding the relative values of improved cosmetics and animal suffering. For them, the issue was not availability of alternatives but an evaluation of harm-benefit that favoured ending animal tests.”²⁶

An additional challenge to the ban on animal-tested cosmetics is REACH, the European regulation requiring testing (much of it on animals) to safety test chemicals, some of them also used in cosmetics (see below). Although the Cosmetics Directive prohibits animal testing of ingredients for cosmetics, some ingredients may still be tested under REACH if they are not used exclusively in cosmetics. It has been questioned how REACH can be compatible with a Europe-wide ban on animal testing of cosmetic products and ingredients²⁷.

3.4 REACH

REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals) is the European Community Regulation on chemicals and their safe use (EC 1907/2006) which entered into force in 2007. Its aim is “to improve the protection of human health and the environment through the better and earlier identification of the intrinsic properties of chemical substances.”²⁸

by the European Coalition to End Animal Experiments. 2011.

http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/eceae_ia_2013_1_en.pdf

25 Questions Impact Assessment: 2013 Implementation Date Marketing Ban Cosmetic Directive. Submission by Eurogroup for Animals.

http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/eurogroup_ia_2013_en.pdf

26 Implications of Postponement of the 2013 Deadline for Implementation of the 7th Amendment to the Cosmetics Directive. Alistair Currie, PETA. http://www.mediapeta.com/peta/PDF/AIC_Linz_poster.pdf. Accessed 13.8.12

27 Cosmetics industry criticised as EU set to admit delay in animal testing ban. Bibi van der Zee. Guardian, 31.12.10. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/dec/31/animal-testing-cosmetics-industry-europe>

28 REACH. European Commission 6.6.12 (last updated).

REACH requires manufacturers and importers to collate information on the properties of all chemicals sold in the EU in annual quantities of more than one tonne, and to register the information, along with toxicity data, in a central database run by the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) by 2018. The required test methods are described in OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) guidelines²⁹.

The first phase of REACH envisaged the registration of 30,000 chemical substances, but the total number of substances submitted by the 2008 deadline for registration was 143,000³⁰.

3.5 REACH: Obstacles

Many of the testing methods specified by REACH use animals. Toxicity tests usually involve the poisoning of guinea pigs, rabbits, fish, birds, rats and mice³¹.

The use of animals in testing to meet REACH requirements is huge. The Health and Safety Executive, the UK's Competent Authority for REACH, estimates that "for a single substance, with no pre-existing data, and no attempt to minimise animal testing, registration and subsequent fulfilment of the information gaps could require over 5,000 animals, assuming little or no avian testing."³²

Estimates on the total numbers of animals who could be used in testing have varied widely. In early impact assessments, the European Commission estimated that 9 million animals would be subjected to tests at a cost of €1.3 billion³³. (In 2006, the EC gave the number as 23 million animals if non-animal tests were not employed at all³⁴). A separate analysis put the number of animals as high as 54 million and the cost €9.5 billion³⁵, figures which were disputed by the European Chemicals Agency³⁶ but defended by the authors³⁷. Vigorous arguments have ensued about whether the real number of animals likely to be subjected to testing was deliberately covered up to aid progress of what has been dubbed 'the most complex legislation in the history of the European Union'³⁸.

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/chemicals/reach/reach_intro.htm Accessed 15.8.12

29 OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals. OECD. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/environment/oecd-guidelines-for-the-testing-of-chemicals_chem_guide_pkg-en. Accessed 16.8.12

30 REACH, animal testing, and the precautionary principle. Andre Menache & Candida Nastrucci. *Medicolegal and Bioethics*, August 2012, Volume 2012:2 Pages 13 – 29. <http://www.dovepress.com/reach-animal-testing-and-the-precautionary-principle-peer-reviewed-article-MB>. Accessed 16.8.12

31 REACH. <http://www.eceae.org/en/what-we-do/campaigns/reach>. ECEAE. Accessed 15.8.12

32 REACH - Minimisation of Animal Testing. Health and Safety Executive, January 2010. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/reach/resources/18animaltesting.pdf> Accessed 15.8.12. Accessed 15.8.12

33 REACH and animal testing. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/chemicals/reach/pdf/reach_animal_testing.pdf

34 REACH – the new EU chemicals law: An RSPCA information paper. <http://www.rspca.org.uk/ImageLocator/LocateAsset?asset=document&assetId=1232712121563&mode=prd>

35 Opinion: Chemical regulators have overreached. Thomas Hartung & Costanza Rovida. *Nature* 460, 1080-1081. <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v460/n7259/full/4601080a.html>

36 REACH and animal testing. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/chemicals/reach/pdf/reach_animal_testing.pdf. Accessed 15.8.12

37 That Which Must Not, Can Not Be ... A Reply to the EChA and EDF Responses to the REACH Analysis of Animal Use and Costs. Thomas Hartung & Costanza Rovida. *ALTEX* 26, 4/09. http://www.altex.ch/resources/Hartung_4_2009_ALTEX.pdf

38 Crucial data on REACH not disclosed. Natasha Gilbert. *Nature* 464, 1116-1117 (2010).

In July 2012, PETA submitted a complaint to the European ombudsman alleging that the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) “is failing to fulfil its mandated responsibilities by not properly investigating cases in which animal testing could be avoided under the rules of REACH”³⁹.

According to PETA, a 2011 ECHA report showed that tens of thousands of animals were used in tests that could have been avoided under REACH's own rules. “These tests included 135 skin-irritation studies conducted after a non-animal replacement had been validated and approved for use under REACH and 107 studies conducted without prior submission and approval of a testing proposal.” The NGO accused the agency of maladministration “in failing to take appropriate action to evaluate compliance of animal tests with REACH's requirements”.

3.6 REACH: Progress and NGO Action

There is no doubt that the lobbying conducted by NGOs helped to significantly reduce the number of animals used in testing for REACH. When the EU Commission presented its White Paper in 2001, animal tests and non-animal testing methods were not even mentioned. Over the years this became a major issue high up on the agenda of the EU⁴⁰.

Due to this lobbying a number of changes were made⁴¹:

- Mandatory sharing of animal test data: Companies registering the same chemical are obliged to share their data and, if animal testing is required by REACH, the tests will only be done by one of the registrants. Duplicate animal testing should thus be prevented.
- For some chemicals approval must be given by the ECHA before new animal tests can be performed. The public and NGOs have 45 days during which to comment, challenge the need for the tests, or suggest alternatives.
- Alternatives to animal testing are strongly promoted throughout the REACH text which stresses that animal testing must only be undertaken as a last resort.

The ECEAE is one NGO coalition that has been particularly active on REACH. Further details of its campaign are listed in Appendix 2 (2.4), but this includes having Expert Observer status at the ECHA, the body that is responsible for implementing REACH, and being a member of the International Council on Animal Protection in OECD Programmes, commenting on testing guidelines⁴².

<http://www.nature.com/news/2010/100421/full/4641116a.html>

39 PETA files complaint with European ombudsman over animal testing for REACH. 26 July 2012.

http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2012-07/pfte-pfc072612.php

40 REACH - cruel and unscientific mass animal testing. Ärzte gegen Tierversuche. <http://www.aerzte-gegen-tierversuche.de/en/resources/eu/205-reach-eu-chemicals-testing>. Accessed 29.8.12

41 REACH – the new EU chemicals law: An RSPCA information paper.

<http://www.rspca.org.uk/ImageLocator/LocateAsset?asset=document&assetId=1232712121563&mode=prd>. Accessed 15.8.12

42 What We're Doing. ECEAE. <http://www.eceae.org/en/what-we-do/campaigns/reach/what-were-doing-reach>. Accessed 15.8.12

4. Key Issues Outside Europe

4.1 China's animal testing policy

Despite Europe having the largest cosmetics market in the world, with retail sales worth €71.2 billion⁴³, China's growing cosmetics industry is seen as a commercial threat⁴⁴. According to the National Bureau of Statistics of China (NBS), retail sales of cosmetics reached 110.3 billion Yuan (€14 billion) in 2011, up nominally by 18.7% year-on-year⁴⁵. This emerging market causes difficulties not only for cosmetic manufacturers elsewhere who need to compete against Chinese companies but also with animal testing regulations.

China's State Food and Drug Administration (SFDA) requires animal toxicology test reports to be provided prior to licensing a new cosmetic ingredient⁴⁶. The SFDA has also opposed the 2013 EU marketing ban of animal tested cosmetics, claiming that consumer safety is at risk. In its submission to the European Commission's stakeholder consultation it stated: "We suggest that the implementation of a ban on animal testing methods should wait until appropriate alternative methods are fully developed and widely recognised. We also think that setting up a specific implementation date for the ban is inappropriate at this time."⁴⁷

Due to these requirements, some multi-national cosmetic companies which had not tested on animals for two decades, such as Avon, Estée Lauder and Mary Kay, dropped this policy in order to sell in China⁴⁸.

4.2 China animal testing policy: Progress & NGO Action:

In 2012, Urban Decay, long known for its strong stance against animal testing was lambasted for initially planning to submit to China's testing regime. Following pressure from various NGOs and customers, it quickly performed a u-turn and decided not to market in the country⁴⁹.

Due to pressure not only from NGOs but also companies which have avoided animal

43 The European Industry in the Global Perspective. Beauty and personal care – Retail sales prices in bn Euros. Value comparison of markets in 2011. Cosmetics Europe. <http://www.cosmeticseurope.eu/about-cosmetics-europe/facts-and-figures-colipa-the-european-cosmetic-cosmetics-association.html>. Accessed 16.8.12

44 Unitis 2011. Questions Impact Assessment 2013 Implementation Date Marketing Ban Cosmetics Directive. Unitis - European Organisation of Cosmetic Substances Industries and Services. http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/unitis_ia_2013_en.pdf Accessed 13.8.12

45 Li & Fung Research Centre 2011. China's cosmetics market, 2011. Li & Fung Research Centre, February 2012. http://www.funggroup.com/eng/knowledge/research/industry_series20.pdf. Accessed 14.8.12

46 Registration of New Cosmetic Ingredient with SFDA in China. Yunbo Shi, March 2012. Chemical Inspection and Regulation Service (CIRS). http://www.cirs-reach.com/china_chemical_regulation/SFDA_Registration_of_New_Cosmetic_Ingredient_in_China.html. Accessed 14.8.12

47 Department of International Cooperation of the State Food and Drug Administration. 14 April 2011. http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/at_responses/china_ia_2013_en.pdf

48 Avon, Mary Kay, Estée Lauder Paying for Tests on Animals. Michelle Kretzer, 16.2.12. <http://www.peta.org/b/thepetafiles/archive/2012/02/16/3-companies-booted-off-cruelty-free-list.aspx>

49 PETA Protest Leads Urban Decay to Boycott China, Win PETA Award. Abe Sauer. Brand Channel, 10.7.12. <http://www.brandchannel.com/home/post/2012/07/10/Urban-Decay-China-Animal-Boycott-071012.aspx>

testing for other markets, China has started recognising test results that use alternatives to animal testing.

March 2011 saw the first congress on alternatives to animal testing for cosmetics in China, supported by major cosmetics companies⁵⁰. The country's first non-animal testing method for cosmetics ingredients was also approved during 2012. PETA says that its funding allowed scientists at the Institute for In Vitro Sciences to travel to China to offer expertise and guidance in replacing animal-based tests⁵¹.

However, it may be some time before China no longer requires animal testing and the country's Chemical Inspection and Regulation Service advises: "In cases where animal testing is mandatory and no alternative method is available for getting a new ingredient approved in China, companies who cannot conduct those studies themselves due to company policies might try to ask third parties in China to conduct those studies and refer to those studies during the submission of toxicology data."⁵²

4.3 US Safe Cosmetics Act

Introduced to the United States Congress in 2010 (as H.R. 5786), then reintroduced in 2011 (as H.R. 2359, following changes made in response to concerns raised by some members of the small business community), the Safe Cosmetics Act aims to give the U.S. Food and Drug Administration "authority to ensure that personal care products are free of harmful ingredients and that ingredients are fully disclosed"⁵³.

Although it states its support for alternatives to animal testing (Section 622, "to minimise the use of animal testing of ingredients"; "require, where practicable, alternative testing methods that [...] do not involve the use of an animal to test the chemical substance"), animal protection NGOs have recognised that potentially it could lead to "significant increases" in animal tests to assess ingredients⁵⁴.

Despite the bill requiring the use of non-animal test methods "where practical", the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) suggests that "the bill could do more to reduce animal use. The legislation should include explicit support and funding for the development and implementation of modern methods."⁵⁵ PETA agrees, stating "we think that strong language must be added [...] that specifically prohibits tests on animals or

50 First congress on alternatives to animal testing in China. 8 March 2011. <http://www.premiumbeautynews.com/en/First-congress-on-alternatives-to.2812?checklang=1>

51 See Appendix 2 (2.9.1) - PETA's Work on Cosmetics Testing in China

52 Registration of New Cosmetic Ingredient with SFDA in China. Yunbo Shi, March 2012. Chemical Inspection and Regulation Service (CIRS). http://www.cirs-reach.com/china_chemical_regulation/SFDA_Registration_of_New_Cosmetic_Ingredient_in_China.html. Accessed 14.8.12

53 The Safe Cosmetics Act. The Campaign for Safe Cosmetics. <http://safecosmetics.org/section.php?id=74>. Accessed 16.8.12

54 Reform the Safe Cosmetics Act. PCRM. <http://pcrm.org/research/animaltestalt/cosmetics/reform-the-safe-cosmetics-act>. Accessed 16.8.12

55 Reform the Safe Cosmetics Act FAQ. <http://pcrm.org/research/animaltestalt/cosmetics/reform-the-safe-cosmetics-act-faq>. Accessed 16.8.12

it could very well lead to an increase in testing”⁵⁶.

The National Anti-Vivisection Society (the US NGO, not the UK one), was listed as a supporting organisation of the original version of the legislation,⁵⁷ however it did not respond to queries for this report.

4.4 Safe Cosmetics Act: Progress & NGO Action:

PETA insists that the bill “should be made consistent with the European Cosmetics Directive, which explicitly prohibits the testing of cosmetics on animals” as this would not only “provide greater protection to people and animals” but also “ensure that U.S. manufacturers will not be driven from the European market”⁵⁸.

Although the Safe Cosmetics Act was assigned to a congressional committee in June 2011 (which would consider it before possibly sending it on to the House or Senate as a whole), no further progress appears to have been made⁵⁹.

The Campaign for Safe Cosmetics told this report’s author (e-mail 17.8.12) that the bill authors were currently focused on getting co-sponsors for the bill and that “with Congress on summer recess and the presidential elections heating up [...] I’m not sure how fast the legislation will be moving through the House this fall.”

This may explain why there appears to be minimal public NGO activity on this legislation so far.

4.5 India

An “emerging urban elite” and “increasing female workforce” is said to be behind a forecast that India’s cosmetics market is set to double in value by 2014, from a current estimate of Rs100 billion (€15.6 billion), according to the Chambers of Commerce and Industry of India⁶⁰.

PETA India says that it is currently in discussions with various government bodies in the country to ban the use of animals in testing cosmetics, partly through its membership of sub committees of the Bureau of Indian Standards. Support has already been expressed from a number of government departments and a decision is expected to be made in September 2012⁶¹. The Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations, working with

56 Personal correspondence with Kathy Guillermo, Senior Vice President, Laboratory Investigations, PETA USA, 27.8.12

57 H.R.5786 - Safe Cosmetics Act of 2010. <http://www.opencongress.org/bill/111-h5786/show>. Open Congress. Accessed 16.8.12

58 Cosmetics Casualties. Shawna Flavell. PETA, 17.8.10. <http://www.peta.org/b/thepetafiles/archive/tags/The+Safe+Cosmetics+Act/default.aspx>

59 H.R. 2359--112th Congress: Safe Cosmetics Act of 2011. (2011). In GovTrack.us (database of federal legislation). Retrieved August 16, 2012, from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hr2359>

60 India market for cosmetics could double in value by 2014. Simon Pitman, 7.12.11. Cosmeticdesign.com. <http://www.cosmeticdesign.com/Market-Trends/India-market-for-cosmetics-could-double-in-value-by-2014>

61 Personal correspondence with Dr Chaitanya Koduri, Science Policy Adviser to PETA India. See appendix 2 (2.9.2) for more information

HSI, has also been active on this⁶².

4.6 Brazil

Brazil requires final cosmetic products to be tested on animals. HSI has been working with scientists there to establish non-animal testing methods⁶³.

“HSI’s Science Team is working with Brazilian authorities and companies in the cosmetics and other sectors to gain acceptance and use of proven non-animal methods and testing strategies and to update regulatory testing requirements to replace or reduce animal testing to the greatest possible extent.”

In November 2011, HSI co-sponsored a training course “to better familiarise government authorities and industry scientists with internationally recognised non-animal tests. The event was very successful as it gathered broad participation of Brazilian regulators, industry and university scientists. The cosmetics sector was particularly well-represented, and expressed its willingness to further explore regulatory aspects of cosmetics testing in Brazil.”

62 Personal correspondence with Arpan Sharma, FIAPO Chief Executive Officer, 17.8.12. See appendix 2 (2.5) for more information

63 HSI’s Work in Brazil to Promote Non-Animal Testing. HSI, 15.12.11.
http://www.hsi.org/news/news/2011/12/brazil_cosmetics_121511.html

5. Lobbying

“Lobbying is the process of seeking to shape the public policy agenda in order to influence government (and its institutions) and the legislative programme.”⁶⁴

Public policy is dictated and influenced by a range of bodies and individuals, from local government to the media, groups which are home to Key Decision Makers and Key Opinion Formers.

5.1 What is effective lobbying?

Clearly, each country has different political systems and governing operations, but some lobbying techniques are universal and just need adapting to meet conditions on the ground. Equally, “you will need to tailor your approach to accommodate the personal and political sensibilities of a wide range of politicians”, even within an individual political body⁶⁵.

There are several key factors to making lobbying effective:

Be credible: the message has to be based on evidence and withstand scrutiny and criticism.

Understand what you want and how to achieve it: Have a short-term and long-term strategy and fully understand what your objectives are.

Get involved at the earliest stage: This can be as early as political parties’ policy reviews or responding to government consultations on policy proposals. Research shows that one in five MEPs believe that lobbyists do not provide information in a timely enough manner⁶⁶.

Understand how policy is made at various levels (local, national, international): “it helps to ensure that you arrive with the right arguments at the right time.”⁶⁷

Prepare a list of key stakeholders: Keep this updated so you know who to lobby. Few people actually influence a decision, so strategic communication with them is far better than mass briefings to people with little influence.

64 Lobbying: The art of political persuasion. Lionel Zetter. Harriman House, 2011

65 A Common Sense Guide to Effective Lobbying on Capitol Hill. Pete Levitas. Antitrust, Vol. 21, No. 2, Spring 2007. The American Bar Association.

<http://www.dicksteinshapiro.com/files/Publication/f5fbc125-8854-4218-9572-1c9a669aa557/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/061e73e9-718e-4272-82d5-28c4bfdc491e/Spring07LevitasC%20and%20Washington-getting%20the%20right%20result.pdf>

66 Quoted in Robert Mack 2005. Lobbying effectively in Brussels and Washington – Getting the right result. Journal of Communication Management. Vol. 9, 4, 339-347. <http://web.efzg.hr/dok/MAR/mfuduric/Lobbing%20in%20Bruxelles%20and%20Washington-getting%20the%20right%20result.pdf>

67 A Guide to Effective Lobbying In Europe 2009. Burson-Marsteller, 2009. http://www.burson-marsteller.com/Innovation_and_insights/blogs_and_podcasts/BM_Blog/Lists/Posts/Post.aspx?ID=143

Establish relationships with Key Decision Makers and Key Opinion Formers: Being on relevant consultation lists ensures that government seeks your input at an early opportunity. This is known as ‘insider campaigning’. “This status as an insider will have been established through longevity, having developed a track record of being a trusted source of policy and opinion”⁶⁸. (Outsider campaigning “involves attempting to influence decision-makers through the participation of the general public in lobbying action.”⁶⁹)

Know your opponent’s arguments: Formulate what their strategy would be and what you need to put together a stronger case than theirs.

Use the media to impact both political and public opinion on your issue: A change in public opinion often leads to a corresponding change in political opinion rather than the other way around.

Form a coalition: This shows a common cause which can have a greater impact on policy makers, who crave consensus. Managing the differing key messages and ‘rivalries’ amongst coalition organisations can be difficult, so “ad hoc and temporary issue-specific coalitions can be just as influential as long-standing partnerships.”⁷⁰

(For further information on effective lobbying read *Lobbying: The art of political persuasion*,⁷¹ which covers UK administrations in detail as well as examining USA, Brussels, Asia, Arabian Gulf and Middle East; and The National Women’s Council of Ireland’s *A Guide to Effective Lobbying for Women’s Groups in Ireland*⁷² which covers the political situation in Ireland in detail as well as very useful information for lobbying generally.)

5.2 Survey on effective lobbying in Europe

In 2009, global public relations firm Burson-Marsteller published a survey on effective lobbying in Europe⁷³. This was based on over 500 interviews with politicians (both Members of national Parliaments and Members of the European Parliament) and senior officials from 15 European national governments and the European institutions.

One of the findings was that the healthcare & pharmaceuticals sector – one promoting the use of animal-tested products – is a major lobbyist within European politics and politicians listen to industry more than they do NGOs.

68 Lobbying: The art of political persuasion. Lionel Zetter. Harriman House, 2011

69 A Guide to Effective Lobbying for Women’s Groups in Ireland. The National Women’s Council of Ireland, 2006.
http://www.womensaid.ie/download/pdf/nwci_effective_lobbying_for_womens_groups_in_ireland.pdf

70 A Guide to Effective Lobbying In Europe 2009. Burson-Marsteller, 2009.
http://www.burson-marsteller.com/Innovation_and_insights/blogs_and_podcasts/BM_Blog/Lists/Posts/Post.aspx?ID=143

71 Lobbying: The art of political persuasion. Lionel Zetter. Harriman House, 2011

72 A Guide to Effective Lobbying for Women’s Groups in Ireland. The National Women’s Council of Ireland, 2006.
http://www.womensaid.ie/download/pdf/nwci_effective_lobbying_for_womens_groups_in_ireland.pdf

73 A Guide to Effective Lobbying In Europe 2009. Burson-Marsteller.
http://www.burson-marsteller.com/Innovation_and_insights/blogs_and_podcasts/BM_Blog/Lists/Posts/Post.aspx?ID=143

The survey looked at ‘major failings’ in NGO lobbying: “NGOs’ tendency to base positions on emotion rather than fact (57%) was the top-rated weakness, and in marked contrast to industry’s score on this point (25%). In general, the perception is that NGO lobbyists fail to understand the decision-making process to more or less the same degree as their industry counterparts. However, NGOs fare better than industry in understanding the workings of the EU (44% citing this as poor practice for NGOs, compared to 62% for industry).”

6. Individual Politicians – UK and Europe

6.1 UK Politicians

NGO lobbying of politicians is not only directed at those who can make a direct difference, such as government ministers, but also to those who can in turn influence governments and regulators.

Given that no NGO contacted for this report suggested names of any individual politicians, an attempt has been made here, briefly, to look at some ways of identifying those active on animal testing issues.

In the UK, backbench MPs are in a better position to display their support for a particular issue than Ministers. This is usually done through tabling Early Day Motions (EDMs) and Parliamentary Questions (PQs).

The only politician to be profiled in more detail for this report is Caroline Lucas, the Green Party MP in the UK Parliament – see Appendix 4.

6.2 UK Early Day Motions

EDMs, whilst rarely leading to Parliamentary debate, are useful for drawing “attention to specific events or campaigns, and demonstrating the extent of parliamentary support for a particular cause or point of view. [...] many attract a great deal of public interest and frequently receive media coverage.”⁷⁴

They are normally only tabled and signed by backbench MPs and following the 2010 general election, many Conservative MPs stated they would no longer sign EDMs as they believed the cost associated with the process is not worth the outcome⁷⁵.

Whilst the value of EDMs may be under increasing question, they are still recognised by NGOs as a worthwhile effort to obtain support and media interest in an issue and to gain recognition for their work.

An analysis of EDMs tabled since the last general election in the UK was carried out for this report (see Appendix 3, 3.1). This revealed that ten EDMs have been tabled on the issue of animal testing between the general election in 2010 and 20 August 2012, when this information was compiled. Only one relates specifically to animal testing of cosmetics and one regarding household cleaning products.

74 What are Early day motions? Parliament website. <http://www.parliament.uk/about/how/business/edms/>. Accessed 20.8.12

75 Personal correspondence with Captive Animals’ Protection Society

Caroline Lucas MP (Green, Brighton Pavilion) tabled most EDMs (three, including the only specific EDM on cosmetics testing). Adrian Sanders (Liberal Democrat, Torbay) tabled two, as did Mike Hancock (Liberal Democrat, Portsmouth South). The BUAV is the only NGO named in the EDMs, suggesting that it initiated them.

6.3 UK Parliamentary Questions

Information on Parliamentary Questions asked in the UK Parliament regarding animal testing was not obtained for this report due to the extensive time this would take. *Hansard*, the edited verbatim report of proceedings of both Houses of Parliament, cannot be searched by topic, only by date or MP/Lord.

However, the BUAV's website does contain information on Parliamentary Questions regarding cosmetics testing between the 2010 general election and April 2011; in addition PQs tabled by Caroline Lucas were also researched. See Appendix 3 (3.2) for the full list. Willie Bain MP (Labour, Glasgow North East) asked two questions relating to cosmetics testing on animals (one of which contained three separate questions). Caroline Lucas MP (Green, Brighton Pavilion), Naomi Long (Alliance, Belfast East) and Neil Parish (Conservative, Tiverton and Honiton) asked one each.

6.4 European Parliament Questions

Members of the European Parliament can table written questions as a way of obtaining information or scrutinising the actions of EU institutions and bodies.

Using the European Parliament's Parliamentary Questions database⁷⁶, written questions on the issue of animal testing were obtained for 2011 and 2012. Twenty eight questions about animal testing were asked; 22 of these specifically related to cosmetics and one about REACH. One of these questions did not appear supportive of the EU ban so is not included here.

The table listing all the questions can be seen in Appendix 3 (3.3). It shows that most MEPs only tabled one question regarding animal testing for cosmetics during 2011 and 2012. Those who tabled more were:

Sonia Alfano (Italy. Party: Italia dei Valori - Lista Di Pietro) – 4

Andreas Mölzer (Austria. Party: Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs) – 2

Ashley Fox (UK. Party: Conservative Party) – 2

⁷⁶ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>. Accessed 20.8.12

7. Conclusions and recommendations

The work of NGOs is mentioned throughout the report and in more detail in Appendix 2, referencing their activities to overcome the obstacles faced in the battle to end animal experiments. This report has largely had to rely on information from NGOs' websites or directly from the organisations, both of which may at times overplay their own involvement, or underplay that of others. In addition, it has relied on information available in English and therefore may have missed valuable work being carried out in other parts of the world. It makes no claims to include all of the NGOs involved or all of the most effective lobbying campaigns. By necessity it focuses more on European organisations, although work in India, China and Russia is covered.

Some campaigns by individual NGOs overlap and several NGOs may therefore take the credit for success on a particular issue. This is a major difficulty in determining which NGOs have been most effective. Whilst a particular NGO may take the credit, in reality it is likely to be due to the combined efforts of many NGOs and individuals, either in unison as a coalition, or through their individual input.

There are numerous NGOs worldwide campaigning on the issues highlighted in this report and only ten have been selected for analysis in Appendix 2:

Antidote Europe - France
 British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection – UK
 Ärzte gegen Tierversuche (Doctors Against Animal Experiments) - Germany
 European Coalition to End Animal Experiments
 Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations
 Humane Society International
 International Council on Animal Protection in OECD Programmes
 Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine – USA
 People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (work in China and India)
 VITA – Animal Rights Center - Russia

Others are listed in Appendix 1.

7.1 Recommendations for the short list

Part of the remit for this report was to identify effective lobbying groups which may not have been directly nominated for the Prize. This paper proposes that the following three organisations should be considered for the short list for the Lobbying Prize in 2012.

- European Coalition to End Animal Experiments
- Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations
- Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine

Our research shows them to be effective lobbyists who have made, and continue to make, a difference towards ending animal testing.

Two of the NGOs (European Coalition to End Animal Experiments and Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations) are coalitions. This report has highlighted the effectiveness of working as a coalition in order to provide a more effective lobbying strategy and offering a consensus of opinion to policy makers (8.1).

The third NGO, Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, is not only conducting vital lobbying work in its home country of the USA, but through its position as Secretariat of the International Council on Animal Protection in OECD Programmes it also co-ordinates this coalition's work "to incorporate alternative methods that can replace, reduce, and refine animal use in OECD guidelines and programs."

Short profiles of these three NGOs appear here with more extensive coverage in Appendix 2. websites):

7.2 European Coalition to End Animal Experiments (ECEAE)

The ECEAE works with MEPs and officials to ensure that animals in laboratories are high on the European political agenda. It is co-ordinated by the BUAV; therefore, some of the activities and achievements of both the ECEAE and BUAV overlap.

As a member of ICAPO (the International Council on Animal Protection in OECD Programmes), scientists at the ECEAE comment on testing guidelines that will be used by chemical companies wanting to register their substances under REACH.

The ECEAE currently has 19 member organisations and 5 observers with a range of legislative, scientific and political expertise.

ADDA – Spain

ANIMAL – Portugal

Animalia – Federation for the Protection of Animals – Finland

Ärzte gegen Tierversuche - Doctors Against Animal Experiments Germany –

BUAV – UK

Deutscher Tierschutzbund - the German Animal Welfare Federation – Germany

Djurens Rätt - Animal Rights Sweden – Sweden

Dyrevernalliansen - the Norwegian Animal Protection Alliance – Norway

EDEV – The Netherlands

Forsøgsdyrenes Værn – Denmark

GAIA – Global Action in the Interest of Animals – Belgium

Irish Anti-Vivisection Society – Ireland

Lega Anti Vivisezione – Italy

LSCV - Swiss League against vivisection – Switzerland

Menschen für Tierrechte - People for Animal Rights Germany – Germany

One Voice – France

Prijatelji životinja - Animal Friends Croatia – Croatia

Svoboda zvířat - Freedom for Animals – Czech Republic

VIVA! - Fundation Międzynarodowy Ruch Na Rzecz Zwierząt Viva! – Poland

In 2009, animal testing of cosmetics in the EU stopped "thanks largely to two decades of ECEAE campaigning."

The ECEAE's current 'No Cruel Cosmetics' campaign - www.nocruelcosmetics.org – is demanding that no more animals are made to suffer for new cosmetics sold in the EU. ECEAE also campaigns on REACH.⁷⁷
 Web: <http://www.eceae.org/>

7.3 Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations (FIAPO)

FIAPO's main aim is to help connect, and inform, animal protection organisations and activists across India. It also undertakes campaigns on which there is not significant work already going on in India.⁷⁸

In 2011 FIAPO published a detailed report on animal testing in India⁷⁹ and a report into toxicity testing⁸⁰. The first of these reports concludes:

“Indian scientists needed to know what was going around the world and where the world was heading to, at least with respect to Toxicity testing. This led us to conducting our first seminar series. This was done in collaboration with Humane Society International (HSI) and Indian Pharmacology Society (IPS) in two of the biggest institutions in the country, namely Indian Institute of Toxicology Research, Lucknow and National Institute of Nutrition, Hyderabad. Dr Thomas Hartung, Director, Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing and one of the pioneers in non-animal testing was the chief speaker at these events.”

One of the key things that FIAPO has initiated is reaching out and starting dialogue with various government bodies which regulate safety testing in the country. These bodies have the power to change the law and FIAPO is lobbying hard to make sure the animal welfare fraternity and the animals are heard. FIAPO is working to bring in a number of changes in the current existing laws with respect to pesticide testing, cosmetic testing and household chemical testing. These changes include using tests which either replace animals completely or bring in more animal friendly tests without replacing them completely.”

FIAPO's Chief Executive Officer Arpan Sharma told this report's author: “In our continuing partnership with Humane Society International (as part of the Be Cruelty Free campaign), we are lobbying with the various ministries, particularly Health and Family Welfare as well as the cosmetic industry. Among other things, this will involve our continuing work with the public by creating awareness and involving scientists and government officials including the regulators to promote cruelty free science and commerce.”⁸¹

In July 2012 FIAPO reported that it had been invited to be part of the committee that will draft legislation for bulk testing of chemicals⁸². “India had recently drafted a National Chemical Policy, which will initiate the safety assessment of 5000 chemicals through an Indian Chemical inventory.”

Web: www.fiapo.org/

⁷⁷ <http://www.eceae.org/en/what-we-do/campaigns/reach>

⁷⁸ <http://www.fiapo.org/about.php>

⁷⁹ Campaign Against Animal Experiments. Annual Report, 2011. <http://www.fiapo.org/downloads/animalexpt2011rep.pdf>

⁸⁰ Toxicity Testing in India. An Animal Welfare Perspective. FIAPO, 2011.

http://www.fiapo.org/downloads/Alokparna_FIAPO_2012_Toxicity_testing_in_India.pdf

⁸¹ (e-mail 17.8.12):

⁸² Ending Experimentation. Animal Matters, No 9: 20th July, 2012. <http://www.fiapo.org/newsletter.php>

7.4 Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine

Since 1985, PCRM has been advocating for preventive medicine, especially good nutrition, conducting clinical research, and advocating for higher ethical standards in research. Our membership includes 150,000 health care professionals and concerned citizens.

Animal Testing Campaign

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) coordinates the development of chemical testing protocols which are adopted by more than 30 of the world's industrialised countries. The OECD has validated four models to be used instead of animals: Corrositex, EpiDerm, CellSystem EST1000, and EpiSkin. PCRM is Secretariat of the International Council on Animal Protection at OECD ([ICAPO](#)), which was formed to incorporate alternative methods that can replace, reduce, and refine animal use in OECD guidelines and programs.

In 2012, PCRM began a survey of U.S. companies that produce cosmetics and personal care products. PCRM requests these companies certify that they do not use or commission animal tests for skin irritation and corrosion for any of their products or the ingredients in them, and reminds them that animal testing is not required by law for any cosmetics. If a company does use animal tests, PCRM experts will work with companies and advise them on how to integrate non-animal methods into their program in order to provide safer products for humans and to spare animals from suffering. Because of the large number of companies involved, the survey is ongoing.

Chemical testing campaign⁸³

Currently, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulates industrial chemicals through a statute called the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). In 2011, the U.S. Senate introduced a bill that would change TSCA dramatically, and would result in a large increase in the number of toxicity tests using animals conducted each year. PCRM is campaigning to ensure that this legislation becomes a launch pad for better methods—techniques that rely on modern cell-based tests instead of animals.

The Senate bill, the Safe Chemicals Act of 2011, S. 847, included landmark provisions that would reduce and eventually eliminate the use of animals over the long term, including: Read more about what PCRM is calling for in the fact sheet titled Notes on The Safe Chemicals Act of 2011 (S. 847)⁸⁴.

Web: <http://pcrm.org/>

83 <http://pcrm.org/research/animaltestalt/chemtesting>

84 <http://pcrm.org/research/animaltestalt/chemtesting>