



# HBCA

HUMAN BEHAVIOUR CHANGE FOR ANIMALS

CRUELTY-FREE SHOPPING...



## CASE STUDY

### NATUREWATCH: ENABLING COMPASSIONATE CONSUMERS

**ORGANISATION** NATUREWATCH FOUNDATION

**COUNTRY** UK

**DATE SUBMITTED** 2 MAY 2017

**CONTACT** JOANNA RANDALL  
[JOANNA@NATUREWATCH.ORG](mailto:JOANNA@NATUREWATCH.ORG)

**KEYWORDS** ANIMAL TESTING; COSMETICS;  
HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTS;  
EXPERIMENTATION; ACTIVISM;  
SCIENCE; LEGISLATION;  
CONSUMER AWARENESS;  
CONSUMER PURCHASING TRENDS;  
COMPASSIONATE SHOPPING;  
CORPORATE ENGAGEMENT

#### Project Background

Naturewatch Foundation has campaigned for an end to animal testing for consumer products since the organisation was founded in 1991. Back then there was a lot of attention growing on cruelty free products, and companies like the Body Shop were making huge strides in the industry. Since the very beginning Naturewatch Foundation recognised the role of the consumer in creating change for animals at both the corporate and legislative levels. Naturewatch Foundation published the first Compassionate Shopping Guide in 1993 and in 2015 issued its 14th edition.

When it comes to consumer product testing on animals, change has been slow, but arguably one of the most successful animal welfare campaigns of the 21st century.

Valuable information is not easily accessible to those planning and involved with projects aiming to apply HBC theories and principles. Hence, HBCA is developing a resource that provides an overview of interventions and the lessons we can learn from them. If you have a case study to submit or any enquiries about this case study, please get in touch.

## DO YOU ASK THE SAME QUESTIONS?



PLEASE SUPPORT CRUELTY-FREE SHOPPING  
AND ONLY BUY FROM ENDORSED COMPANIES

*Our work seeks to create a country of compassionate shoppers, with legislative changes that support the consumer demand for cruelty free products and end the suffering of hundreds of thousands of animals around the world.*

*An example of a targeted corporate campaign led by Naturewatch Foundation is when The Body Shop – globally renowned for being a leading company in the cruelty-free movement of the 70s, 80s and 90s – was sold to L’Oreal in 2006. Because of Naturewatch Foundation’s strict endorsement criteria for cruelty-free companies, we were first off the mark to point out that buying from the Body Shop now meant caring consumers were putting money into the hands of animal testers. Ten years later, The Body Shop’s brand has arguably been damaged by their connection to L’Oreal. Other companies, such as Lush, have now taken over as leading figures in the cruelty-free marketplace. The Body Shop has seen massive dips in profit over the last decade and their future is now in question.*

*By promoting companies that place compassion over profit we continue to inspire change at both the consumer and the corporate level.*

## Welfare Concerns

Because there are no consistent reporting requirements for animal testing, no one truly knows how many animals are used for consumer product testing around the world. But we can assume at least 200,000 animals are still used in cosmetic testing outside the EU alone. It is still legal (and sometimes mandatory) to test cosmetics on animals in countries including Canada, the United States, South Korea, Turkey, Japan and China.

Conditions inside a laboratory cannot meet the needs of most animals used for consumer product safety testing. Due to the very purpose of the tests – to assess toxicity of chemicals that go into consumer products – the methods used are by nature invasive and usually extremely painful, leading to eventual death or euthanasia.

While there are many methods for chemical safety testing inflicted on animals, these can include:

- Skin sensitisation – where a substance is applied or injected into the skin of the animals and the area observed for reactions such as inflammation.
- Acute oral toxicity – where the animal is force-fed a substance via a feeding tube. The animal is then observed for reactions such as bleeding, seizures, diarrhoea, paralysis or death.
- Toxicokinetics – The animals is exposed to a substance and their blood drawn daily to measure the peak concentration of the substance in their blood.
- Developmental toxicity – A pregnant animal is exposed to the test substance while pregnant. The animal is killed prior to giving birth and the babies necropsied for signs of developmental abnormalities.

The EU, and other countries, have validated non-animal alternatives for chemical safety testing for cosmetic products. Yet many companies still choose to sell in countries where animals are routinely used to safety test products for the marketplace.

## Overview of Intervention

We know consumers don’t want to buy products that have been tested on animals – it’s not exactly a selling point for brands either, otherwise they wouldn’t spend so much time denying involvement in it!

Naturewatch Foundation has recognised that it really shouldn’t be left up to the consumer to have to research and think about profit flows, company structures, international legislation and imports or exports for every single product they buy - Naturewatch Foundation has therefore placed particular emphasis on doing this research on behalf of shoppers and compiling it in a neat guide that succinctly lists brands that are cruelty free and those which are not.

The Compassionate Shopping Guide lists genuinely cruelty-free brands, and Naturewatch Foundation runs targeted corporate campaigns to inspire action and raise awareness.

As part of the information we provide about cruelty-free alternative products, we make sure to highlight the quality of these products as part of the information we provide to compassionate shoppers. Brand loyalty is strong, so showing that cruelty-free alternatives are just as good – if not better – than cruel brands has been key to our public campaign messages. For example, last year we produced a campaign film that defies expectations about cruelty-free beauty, recruiting hair and makeup experts to put our endorsed cosmetic brands to the test.

Links to film and other material:

[http://naturewatch.org/files/uploads/FACTS\\_SHEET1.pdf](http://naturewatch.org/files/uploads/FACTS_SHEET1.pdf)

[http://naturewatch.org/files/uploads/instantprint\\_NWF\\_infograph\\_A3.jpg](http://naturewatch.org/files/uploads/instantprint_NWF_infograph_A3.jpg)

Watch Compassion Over Cruelty: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jcHd5Rkg2Cg&feature=youtu.be>



## Achievements

Thanks to relentless campaigning from many organisations and activists, there has been a string of bans on animal testing for cosmetic and household products introduced in the UK and EU over the last two decades.

- 1997 (UK) Ban on the use of animals to test cosmetic finished products.
- 1998 (UK) Ban on the use of animals to test cosmetic ingredients.
- 2004 (EU) Ban on the use of animals to test cosmetic finished products.
- 2009 (EU) Ban on the use of animals to test cosmetic ingredients in the EU. Also any finished cosmetic products that are tested anywhere in the world are banned from being sold within the EU.
- 2013 (EU) On 11 March 2013, a full marketing ban came into force, preventing any finished cosmetic products or cosmetic ingredients that have been tested anywhere in the world to be sold within the EU.
- 2015 (UK) Ban on the testing of finished household products on animals, and partial ban on testing household product ingredients.
- After the EU, a total of 35 other countries have stopped animal testing for cosmetics since 2013. The change in international legislation has been incredible to witness, knowing how long it took to get the ball rolling, and it was all thanks to consumer demand for change at the outset.

## Challenges

- Unfortunately many consumers think cosmetic testing is a thing of the past and no longer an issue as a result of the EU Cosmetics Regulation. Whilst this regulation was a tremendous achievement, it didn't solve the problem completely. Education of the public is therefore an ongoing activity.
- The existing legislation is confusing, and buying a 'cruelty-free' cosmetic product, from a 'cruelty-free' brand may still indirectly support animal testing if that brand is owned by a parent-company that tests other products, or owns other brands that test on animals, in countries where it is still legal, such as the USA, Canada or China. However, this is why the Compassionate Shopping Guide has been so successful as it enables consumers to avoid having to understand legal loopholes and instead just tells them what they can buy and what they should avoid. No Naturewatch Foundation endorsed cosmetic or household brand tests on animals, nor is owned by a company that tests, or has a

- sister company that tests on animals. And every company, and their subsidiaries, must have a fixed cut-off date animal testing policy. It means that the number of brands we endorse as an organisation is not as high as other charities running similar cruelty-free endorsement programmes, but with so many misleading statements being made by companies, we believe the consumer has a right to feel confident their money is not going to be used to fund animal testing at any point.
- In 2010 the Coalition Government pledged to end testing on animals for household products. The commitment was championed by a group of empathetic Ministers and MPs. However the 'ban' that eventually came into effect in 2015, under a different ministry, was watered down to ineffectiveness. While it banned the testing of finished household products on animals; in reality there hadn't been any finished product testing on animals since 2010. But the chemicals that go into those products could still be tested on animals due to a long list of loopholes in the policy.
- Also relating to household products, consumers don't even have a legal right to know what companies are commissioning animal tests in the UK. The Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 includes a clause (section 24) that makes it a criminal offence to name companies that commission animal testing, or detail the procedures that were used on animals to test ingredients.
- Knowing what worked with the cosmetic testing ban, we've decided to progress on consumer demand for cruelty-free household products in the next phase of our campaigning. Beginning with calling for a voluntary industry ban on testing chemicals that go into household cleaning products, we will show how shopping selectively, and engaging with corporates to help them lead the way to change, will bring about an end to household product ingredient testing faster than the government is ready to do.

## Sustainability

The trends of consumer purchasing continue to move in the right direction, since 2013 35 countries have introduced laws aimed at eliminating animal testing for cosmetics. A 2015 Neilson poll found that 'not tested on animals' was the most important packaging claim among over 1000 surveyed English-speaking adults (<http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2015/package-this-beauty-consumers-favor-cruelty-free-and-natural-product-claims.html>) 43% said they would be willing to pay

more for beauty products not tested on animals. A Humane Society International poll also found that, globally, the vast majority of people in countries where cosmetic testing on animals is still legal, would like it banned ([http://www.hsi.org/news/news/2016/01/global\\_cosmetics\\_polling\\_012716.html](http://www.hsi.org/news/news/2016/01/global_cosmetics_polling_012716.html)).

Even China, one of the largest animal testing countries in the world, has taken positive steps towards ending cosmetic testing on animals (in 2014), so cosmetics manufactured domestically do not need to be tested on animals anymore. This influencing power of China will assist the progress being made globally on this issue.

There is also a noticeable growth in alternative methods to animal testing, and an eagerness for the cosmetics industry itself to play a part in developing alternatives. Over 20 alternative test methods that were developed by the cosmetics industry have been validated by the OECD, and the European Cosmetics Trade Association has dedicated significant funding into alternatives research.

For household products, we are now also championing change at the industry level, hoping they will follow the path of the cosmetics industry in phasing out the use of animals for testing chemical ingredients in household products.

All of the above factors will contribute greatly towards cruelty free cosmetics and animal testing for products in general becoming a sustainable change.

### Lessons to Pass On

- We need to make the compassionate shopping process as simple as possible as the minute you start talking about the complexities of cosmetic testing most people shut down and the same is probably true of other issues.
- It begins and ends with the consumer. That's why organisations like Naturewatch Foundation did as much as we could at every stage of the campaign to put information – and power – into the hands of the consumer. With our Compassionate Shopping Guide and targeted corporate campaigns, we've been able to influence the mindset of the average cosmetic and household product shopper, which in turn has led to gradual change in how products are tested for the market.

- The overall tone of the animal experiments movement has had to change over the last four decades. As governments and industry take action on the issue it makes less sense to be antagonistic. Most NGOs working on this issue now employ scientific experts to work with companies and government agencies to develop alternatives to animal use
- Despite the change of tone, animal experiments are still a highly emotive issue amongst the UK public. The history of association with shocking investigations, extremist actions and a culture of secretiveness that pervades animal experiments, mean that there is still more that could be done to reflect the great achievements that have been made on this issue within campaign messaging.
- It is important to celebrate loudly when a company becomes endorsed as being genuinely cruelty free or when such a company generates high profits e.g. Lush in the UK. This indicates that demand for cruelty-free cosmetics is growing and by promoting these companies that place compassion over profit we continue to inspire change at both the consumer and the corporate level.
- We know that compassionate shoppers still want a quality product! So we promote the quality of products as well as their anti-animal testing credentials so that the wider benefits of buying cruelty free can be understood
- The global campaign to end consumer product testing on animals has a clear theory of change. Companies changed their practices following demand from consumers; and when corporate interests were no longer a barrier to legislative change, policy-makers followed suit, and consumers no longer have the option to buy cosmetics or finished household products tested on animals in the UK.
- Widening awareness about alternatives (both products and research methods) and targeted corporate campaigning with a constant hum for legislative change in the background, all led to a high level of demand from the general public for an end to animal testing for cosmetics – and we believe it will do the same for household products in the United Kingdom too. Ending cruel animal experiments for all consumer products will soon be a thing of the past.



# HBCA

HUMAN BEHAVIOUR CHANGE FOR ANIMALS