

Prasad Gopalan

Global Sector Manager, Agribusiness and Forestry International Finance Corporation pgopalan@ifc.org

Mary Porter Peschka Director.

ESG Sustainability Advice & Solutions Department International Finance Corporation <u>mpeschka@ifc.org</u>

September 15,2022

Re: International Financial Corporation (IFC) proposed review of its policies re the commercial agribusiness and livestock sectors

Dear Prasad Gopalan and Mary Porter Peschka,

We are writing on behalf of the **Asia for Animals Coalition**, representing local and international animal protection and conservation organizations, in close collaboration with Animals Australia, Compassion in World Farming, Eurogroup for Animals, FOUR PAWS International, World Animal Protection, the World Federation for Animals and many other animal protection organizations from around the world.

The undersigned organizations welcome IFC's intention to review its policies in the commercial agribusiness and livestock sectors.

We believe that:

- IFC should give greater consideration to ensuring that livestock operations that it funds are genuinely in line with its Good Practice Note (GPN) on *Improving Animal Welfare in Livestock Operations*.
- IFC should stop funding industrial livestock production (including farmed aquatic animals) as this has a detrimental impact on animal welfare, human health, food security, the environment, biodiversity including wildlife, small-scale farmers, and the lives of Indigenous peoples.
- IFC should increase its support for regenerative agriculture such as agroecology; livestock can play a vital role in such farming.

What is meant by 'industrial livestock production'?

This form of livestock production can be characterized by one or more of the following:

- Housing animals in cages or crates that are so narrow that the animal cannot turn round or housing them at very high stocking densities in groups;
- Farming systems which do not enable animals to engage in their core species-specific natural behaviors as identified by scientific research;
- Keeping animals in barren environments without enrichment materials;

- Using routine mutilations (this is the veterinary term) such as tail docking of pigs and beak trimming of hens to make animals 'fit' into inappropriate systems rather than using systems that respond to animals' behavioral needs;
- Genetic selection for fast growth or high yields where this results in compromised welfare such as ill-health or pain;
- The use of human-edible cereals and soy to form a substantial part of animal feed;
- The routine preventive use of antimicrobials;
- Failing to pay due attention to the preservation and conservation of locally existing species that already fit in local contexts and local communities.

Animal Welfare

Achieving good standards of animal welfare is an ethical imperative that is recognised by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The FAO stresses "A paradigm shift has become urgent. Animals are to be addressed as living beings to take care of and valorize, not only as a source of commodities to exploit".¹

Meeting good standards of animal welfare will also deliver improved animal health which can result in enhanced productivity, decreased on-farm use of antimicrobials and reduced risks of disease including zoonoses.

The IFC's GPN on animal welfare sets out several key welfare risks and mitigation actions for addressing these risks.² These can be summarized as below:

Welfare Risk 1: "Limitations on space in individual stalls restricting the movement of animals." **Mitigation 1**: "Increasing the space allowance for each animal (e.g. individual to group housing)" and "allowing animals space to stand, stretch, turn around, sit, and/or lie down comfortably at the same time."

Welfare Risk 2: "High stocking densities in groups increasing the potential for disease transmission and injurious contact with others."

Mitigation 2: "Stocking densities should be low enough to prevent excessive temperatures and humidity; competition, stress, aggression, and abnormal behavior; and to enable good litter management."

Welfare Risk 3: "Barren/unchanging environments leading to behavioral problems." Mitigation 3: "Providing environmental enrichment (e.g., straw for pigs to manipulate, nest boxes for hens) to stimulate positive emotional states."

Welfare Risk 4: "Feeding diets that do not satisfy hunger." Mitigation 4: "Adding bulk to high energy diets to help satisfy appetite."

Welfare Risk 5: "Injurious husbandry procedures that cause pain." Mitigation 5: "Alternatives should be used to routine management practices that cause pain (e.g., dehorning/disbudding, branding, castration, tail-docking, beak-trimming), or effective pain relief should be provided."

Welfare Risk 6: "Breeding for production traits that heighten anatomical or metabolic disorders." Mitigation 6: "Re-aligning production-orientated genetic selection to include welfare traits."

https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/c39e4771-d5ae-441a-9942-dfa4add8b679/IFC+Good+Practice+Note+Animal+Welfare+2014.pdf?MOD=AJ PERES&CVID=kGxNx5m, p.13

¹ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 15.01.2020. <u>Sustainable Livestock Technical Network Newsletter - Focus on animal</u> <u>welfare</u>. Newsletter No 108

Looking at the information on IFC's website regarding its funding of livestock operations in recent years, IFC appears to be giving insufficient weight to its own GPN. The information on IFC's website is not detailed, but it appears that IFC has been funding operations that use individual crates for sows that are too narrow to enable them to turn round, high stocking densities, mutilations and animals bred for production traits that lead to anatomical or metabolic disorders. They also seem to have been funding operations that provide insufficient enrichment and diets that do not satisfy hunger.

We urge IFC to only fund operations that meet the animal standards set out in its GPN.

IFC should stop funding industrial livestock production

Industrial livestock production is a key driver of a wide range of the problems confronting today's world.

1. Small-scale livestock producers

Industrial animal agriculture out-competes small-scale livestock producers, thereby undermining their livelihoods. In 2018, the then Director-General of the FAO said that small-scale livestock farmers must not be "pushed aside by expanding large capital-intensive operations."³

2. High use of antimicrobials in industrial animal agriculture undermines the medicines needed to treat serious human disease

Globally, around 70% of all antimicrobials are used in farm animals, mainly to prevent disease and to promote growth⁴. Antimicrobials are regularly used in industrial livestock systems to prevent the diseases that would otherwise be inevitable when animals are confined in poor conditions.⁵ Overuse of antimicrobials in industrial farming contributes significantly to antimicrobial resistance.⁶

3. Industrial animal agriculture entails high disease and pandemic risks

The crowded, stressful conditions of industrial livestock production play an important part in the emergence, spread and amplification of pathogens including zoonoses.^{7,8} A 2022 study states: *"Large pig and poultry farms are where the genetic reassortment needed to source pandemic influenza strains may most likely occur"*.⁹

A 2022 report by IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) states that the: "global trend in large scale industrial production of pigs, poultry and farmed-wildlife species is coincident with pandemic emergence of highly pathogenic human or zoonotic influenzas, and coronaviruses".¹⁰ It adds: "A certain way to reduce risk of zoonosis and emerging infectious diseases globally ... is to reduce dependence on intensive animal-based food production systems".

4. Industrial livestock production is a major source of air pollutants

Pollutants such as ammonia and particulate matter arise both directly from manure production on farms and indirectly from the nitrogen fertilizers used to grow feed crops for animals.¹¹ Air pollution is a serious problem for human health as it contributes to bronchitis, asthma, lung cancer and congestive heart failure. In some countries – including Denmark and the UK – agriculture is responsible for a larger proportion of the health problems arising from air pollution than transport or energy generation.¹²

³ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 20.01.2018. <u>More than meat: Shaping the future of livestock</u>

⁴ Boeckel, T.P. *et al.*, 2019. Global trends in antimicrobial resistance in animals in low- and middle-income countries. *Science* 365, 1266. <u>DOI:</u> 10.1126/science.aaw1944

⁵ O'Neill, J., (Chair), 2014. <u>Antimicrobial Resistance: Tackling a crisis for the health and wealth of nations</u>

⁶ World Health Organization, 2011. <u>http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2011/whd_20110406/en</u>

⁷ Otte, J. *et al.*, 2007. Industrial Livestock Production and Global Health Risks. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative Research Report.

⁸ Council for Agriculture, Science and Technology, 2005. Global Risks of Infectious Animal Diseases. Issue Paper 28

⁹ Bernstein, A.S. *et al.*, 2022. The costs and benefits of primary prevention of zoonotic pandemics. *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabl4183, doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abl4183 ¹⁰ UCN, 2022. Situation analysis on the roles and risks of wildlife in the emergence of human infectious diseases

¹¹ Warner, J.X. *et al.*, 2017. Increased atmospheric ammonia over the world's major agricultural areas detected from space, Geophys. Res. Lett., 44, 2875–2884, doi:10.1002/2016GL072305

¹² Brandt, J. *et al.*, 2011. Assessment of Health-Cost Externalities of Air Pollution at the National Level using the EVA Model System. Center for Energy, Environment and Health Report series

5. Undermining food security

Globally, 40% of crop calories are used to feed animals.¹³ In countries where most livestock farming is industrial, the proportion is much higher. Nearly two-thirds of EU cereals and 67% of U.S. cereals are used as animal feed.^{14,15} Most feed grain – 69% - is used in the pig and poultry sectors which in much of the world are highly industrialized.¹⁶

Animals convert these cereals very inefficiently into meat and milk. For every 100 calories of human-edible cereals fed to animals, just 17-30 calories enter the human food chain as meat or milk.^{17,18} For every 100 grams of protein in human-edible cereals fed to animals, just 43 grams of protein enter the human food chain as meat or milk.¹⁹ Some studies calculate that for meat, the conversion efficiency is even poorer than indicated by the above studies.^{20,21} The FAO has said that further use of cereals as animal feed could threaten food security by reducing the grain available for human consumption.²² If the grain used as animal feed were instead used for direct human consumption, an extra 3.5 billion people could be fed each year.^{23,24}

6. Soy and deforestation

77% of global soy production is used as animal feed, mainly in the intensive pig and poultry sectors.²⁵ The soybean meal used per unit of meat produced is much higher in pigs and poultry than in ruminants. While 206g of soy are used to produce 1 kg of beef, 415g and 956g are used to produce 1 kg of pork and poultry respectively.²⁶

The production of soy for animal feed is a key factor driving deforestation which leads to massive losses of biodiversity and wildlife habitats and to the release of stored carbon into the atmosphere. The expansion of farmland into forests and other wildlife habitats results in ecosystem disruption which leads to increased risk of pathogen spillover²⁷ and so to viruses being transmitted from wild animals to people.²⁸

7. Land-grabbing

Demand for soy for feed also leads to land-grabbing, including the expropriation of the land of indigenous communities and peasant farmers. This can lead to them being forced to migrate to other areas to seek work.

8. Environmental degradation

¹³ Pradhan, P. *et al.*, 2013. Embodied crop calories in animal products. <u>Environ. Res. Lett</u>. 8 044044

¹⁴ European Commission, undated. Cereals, oilseeds, protein crops and rice.

https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/plants-and-plant-products/plant-products/cereals en. Accessed 22 June 2021

¹⁵ Cassidy, ES *et al.*, 2013. Redefining agricultural yields: from tonnes to people nourished per hectare. University of Minnesota. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 8, 034015

¹⁶ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Environmental Performance of animal feeds supply chains. <u>http://www.fao.org/3/a-i8254e.pdf</u> Accessed 30 December 2020

¹⁷ Lundqvist, J., de Fraiture, C. and Molden, D., 2008. Saving Water: From Field to Fork – Curbing Losses and Wastage in the Food Chain. SIWI Policy Brief. <u>http://www.siwi.org/documents/Resources/Policy_Briefs/PB_From_Filed_to_Fork_2008.pdf</u>

¹⁸ Nellemann, C *et al.*, 2009. The environmental food crisis – The environment's role in averting future food crises. A UNEP rapid response assessment. United Nations Environment Programme, GRID-Arendal, <u>www.unep.org/pdf/foodcrisis lores.pdf</u>

¹⁹ Berners-Lee M, Watson, R, Kennelly, C, Hewitt, CN, Current global food production is sufficient to meet human nutritional needs in 2050 provided there is radical societal adaptation (2018). Elem Sci Anth, 6: 52

²⁰ Cassidy ES *et al.*, 2013. *Op. Cit.*

²¹ Citibank, 2018. Feeding the future

²² Gerber, P *et al.*, 2013. Tackling climate change through livestock – A global assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

²³ Nellemann, C *et al.*, 2009. The environmental food crisis - The environment's role in averting future food crises. A UNEP rapid response assessment. United Nations Environment Programme, GRID-Arendal, <u>www.unep.org/pdf/foodcrisis_lores.pdf</u>

²⁴ Cassidy, ES *et al.*, 2013. *Op. Cit.*

²⁵ Ritchie, H and Roser, M, 2021. Forests and Deforestation. <u>https://ourworldindata.org/soy</u>

²⁶ Kuepper, B and Stravens, M, 2022. <u>Mapping the European soy supply chain</u>

²⁷ Gigg, R *et al.*, 2020. Zoonotic host diversity increases in human-dominated ecosystems. *Nature* **584**, 398–402 <u>https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2562-8</u>

²⁸ Jones, B. *et al.*, 2013. Zoonosis emergence linked to agricultural intensification and environmental change. PNAS <u>https://www.pnas.org/content/110/21/8399</u>

While serious environmental harms occur in the vicinity of industrial livestock operations, greater environmental problems arise from feed production. Industrial livestock's huge demand for cereals has fueled the intensification of crop production. This, with its use of monocultures and agro-chemicals, has led to soil degradation,^{29,30} biodiversity loss,³¹ overuse and pollution of water,³² and air pollution.³³ The role of feed production in determining livestock's water use is recognised by the FAO which states: "Often, over 90 percent of the water consumption in livestock is associated with feed production".³⁴ Hoekstra (2020) states "The water footprint of feed contributes 98 per cent to the water footprint of meat and dairy."³⁵

The problems of using cereals and soy as feed are highlighted in the World Bank Group's guide Investing in Sustainable Livestock. This states that feed production for intensive livestock systems is increasingly sourced from "high-input intensity grain and legume monocultures and supplied from international markets. This can result in remote impacts on natural resources in feed-exporting regions, as well as competition for resources between the production of livestock feed and human-edible food."

9. Climate change

Industrial animal agriculture is responsible for significant greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change states "Producing animal-sourced food (e.g. meat and dairy) emits larger amounts of GHGs than growing crops, especially in intensive, industrial livestock systems".³⁶

Manure management in industrial pig and poultry operations can involve substantial emissions of methane and nitrous oxide.^{37,38} However, most GHG emissions in pig and poultry production generally arise from the production of cereals and soy for feed, including associated land use change. This entails the following GHG emissions:

- The manufacture of the fertilizers used to grow cereals involves the use of substantial quantities of fossil fuels. It is a very energy-intensive process that entails the emission of large amounts of CO₂³⁹;
- The application of these fertilizers to the land involves sizeable emissions of nitrous oxide,⁴⁰ the most aggressive GHG;
- Soy production is a key driver of deforestation which results in the release of huge quantities of stored carbon.^{41,42}

IFC should increase its support for regenerative agriculture

In order to avoid the above problems, we need to move to sustainable agricultural practices such as regenerative agriculture, agroecology, agroforestry, organic farming, silvo-pastoral systems, low-intensive permanent grassland, and mixed crop and livestock systems. Such systems are prime

²⁹ Edmondson, JL *et al.*, 2014. Urban cultivation in allotments maintains soil qualities adversely affected by conventional agriculture. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **51**, 880–889.

³⁰ Tsiafouli, MA et al., 2015. Intensive agriculture reduces soil biodiversity across Europe. Global Change Biology **21**, 973–985

³¹ World Health Organization and Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2015. Connecting global priorities: biodiversity and human health.

³² Mekonnen, M and Hoekstra, A, 2012. A global assessment of the water footprint of farm animal products. *Ecosystems*, doi: 10.1007/s10021-011-9517-8

³³ Lelieveld, J et al., 2015. The contribution of outdoor air pollution sources to premature mortality on a global scale. Nature, **525**

³⁴ FAO, 2019. Water use in livestock production systems and supply chains – Guidelines for assessment (Version 1). Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP) Partnership. Rome. <u>http://www.fao.org/partnerships/leap/publications/en/</u>

³⁵ Hoekstra, AJ, 2020. <u>The water footprint of modern consumer society</u>. Routledge

³⁶ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2019. Climate Change and Land Use

³⁷ US Environmental Protection Agency, 2022. Inventory of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and sinks: 1990-2020

³⁸ Philippe, F-X & Nicks, B, 2015. Review on greenhouse gas emissions from pig houses: Production of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide by animals and manure. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, **199**, 10-25

³⁹ Gerber, PJ, Steinfeld, H, Henderson, B, Mottet, A, Opio, C, Dijkman, J, Falcucci, A and Tempio, G, 2013. Tackling climate change through livestock – A global assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome

⁴⁰ Tian, H, Xu, R, Canadell, JG *et al.*, 2020. A comprehensive quantification of global nitrous oxide sources and sinks. *Nature* 586, 248–256. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2780-0

⁴¹ Escobar, N, Tizado, EJ *et al.*, 2020. Spatially-explicit footprints of agricultural commodities: Mapping carbon emissions embodied in Brazil's soy exports, *Global Environmental Change* **62**. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102067

⁴² Sandström, V et al., 2018. The role of trade in the greenhouse gas footprints of EU diets. Global Food Security **19**, 48-55

examples of the nature-based solutions advocated by the *Joint Nature Statement* published by the multinational development banks at the COP26 climate conference.

Nature-based forms of food production are guided by the principle of working with, rather than against, nature. Regenerative agriculture can minimize the use of chemical pesticides and fertilizers, while at the same time often enhancing productivity. It achieves this by supporting – and harnessing – natural processes.⁴³ Regenerative agriculture aims not just to minimize negative impacts, but to be a positive force by producing food while at the same time enhancing soil quality, conserving water and restoring biodiversity.

Animals have a vital role to play in nature-friendly farming. We need to restore the link between animals and the land in integrated crop-livestock systems where their manure can build soil fertility and structure rather than being a pollutant (as is the case with the excessive amounts of manure produced by industrial animal agriculture). A Dutch study suggests that the amount of manure produced on a farm must be no greater than is needed to support crop production on the farm or nearby farms.⁴⁴

Good grassland systems for raising cattle and sheep do not feed grain to the animals and minimize the use of chemical fertilizers.⁴⁵ The animals are fed on grass and crop residues, supplemented by root crops grown on the farm. Soil fertility and the nutritional quality of the grass are built through animal manure, the ability of the roots of grasses to collect minerals from deep in the soil and the inclusion in the grass of herbs, wildflowers and protein-rich legumes such as clover.

Globally most pigs and poultry are farmed industrially, consuming huge amounts of cereals and soy which they convert very inefficiently into meat and milk. This is unsustainable – and unnecessary. Some ground-breaking farmers are now raising pigs and poultry on pasture. Pigs and poultry are nature's great foragers and recyclers. Some should be kept outdoors where much of their diet can come from pasture and foraging, by-products and food waste such as bakery products that are no longer suitable for human consumption. In this way animals are converting food waste and by-products into nutritious food, so recycling nutrients into the food system.⁴⁶ Already, some innovative farmers are able to provide 70% of their pigs' feed in these ways.⁴⁷

Conclusion

- We welcome IFC's intention to review its policies in the agribusiness and livestock sectors. We would be happy to offer technical assistance with this review, particularly regarding animal welfare.
- We urge IFC to only fund livestock operations that are genuinely in line with its Good Practice Note on animal welfare. For example, the proposed housing for gestating sows should provide ample space, ease of movement and effective environmental enrichment.
- IFC should end its support for industrial livestock production as this is a key driver of antimicrobial resistance, disease including zoonoses and, through its high demand for cereals and soy as feed, of food insecurity, deforestation, biodiversity loss and soil degradation as well as overuse and pollution of water.
- IFC should increase its support for nature-based farming such as regenerative agriculture. Animals can play a key role in such farming.

Sent on behalf of AfA's Core Member Organizations:

1. Anima Society for the Protection of Animals (Macau)

⁴³ Poux, X and Aubert, P-M, 2018. <u>An agroecological Europe in 2050: multifunctional agriculture for healthy eating</u>

⁴⁴ Koerkamp, PWGG *et al.*, 2021. A Regenerative Agricultural System at Scale: an outline of required outcomes for the Netherlands. European Conference on Agricultural Engineering AgEng 2021

⁴⁵ <u>https://www.pastureforlife.org/</u>

⁴⁶ de Boer, IJM and van Ittersum, MK, 2018. <u>Circularity in Agricultural Production</u>. Wageningen University

⁴⁷ Rabobank, 8.3.2019. Smart Farmer: A waste-free vision for pig farming.

https://www.rabobank.com/en/raboworld/articles/smart-farmer-a-waste-free-vision-for-pig-farming.html Accessed 10 June 2022

- 2. Animal Concerns Research & Education Society
- 3. Animal Guardians
- 4. Animal People Forum
- 5. Animal Protection Denmark
- 6. Animal Rescue Cambodia
- 7. Animals Asia Foundation
- 8. Big Cat Rescue
- 9. Blue Cross of India
- 10. Change for Animals Foundation
- 11. Federation of Indian Animal Protection Organisations
- 12. FOUR PAWS International
- 13. International Animal Rescue
- 14. Jane Goodall Institute Nepal
- 15. Philippine Animal Welfare Society
- 16. Sarawak Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
- 17. Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Hong Kong
- 18. VShine Animal Protection Association
- 19. World Animal Protection



Please respond to David Neale, Asia for Animals Coalition, % Animals Asia Foundation, Room 1501, Tung Hip Commercial Building, 244-252 Des Voeux Road Central, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong info@asiaforanimals.com

With support from AfA's Network Member Organizations:

- 1. ACTAsia
- 2. Action for Dolphins (AFD)

- 3. Action for Primates (AfP)
- 4. Advocating Wild

- 5. All Life In A Viable Environment (ALIVE)
- 6. Alliance for Earth, Life, Liberty & Advocacy (AELLA)
- 7. American Anti-Vivisection Society
- 8. Animal & Biodiversity Programme at the Global Research Network Think Tank (Animal & Biodiversity Programme at the GRN Think Tank)
- 9. Animal Friends Croatia (AFC)
- 10. Animal Friends Jogja (AFJ)
- 11. Animal Kingdom Foundation (AKF)
- 12. Animal Nepal
- 13. Animal Projects & Environmental Education (APE Malaysia)
- 14. Animal Rescue Organization Pakistan (ARO)
- 15. Animal Rights Center Japan (ARC)
- 16. Animal Welfare And Anti Harassment Society
- 17. AnimalConcepts
- 18. Animals Australia
- 19. Animals Don't Speak Human (ADSH)
- 20. Aquatic Life Institute (ALI)
- 21. Bali Animal Welfare Association (BAWA)
- 22. Bali Monkey Aid Network (MAIN)
- 23. Brighter Green
- 24. British Hen Welfare Trust (BHWT)
- 25. Captured in Africa Foundation (CIAF)
- 26. Cat Beach Sanctuary Penang (CBS)
- 27. Catalyst
- 28. Catholic Concern for Animals (CCA)
- 29. Cattitude Trust Chennai
- 30. China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation (CBCGDF)
- 31. Coalition For Cruelty Free Africa
- 32. Collective Fashion Justice (CFJ)
- 33. Compassion in World Farming
- 34. Compassion Unlimited Plus Action (CUPA)
- 35. Compassion Works International (CWI)
- 36. Corbett Foundation
- 37. Djurskyddet Sverige (Animal Welfare Sweden)
- 38. Earth Island Institute Asia Pacific (EII-AP)
- 39. Elephanatics
- 40. Elephants in Japan (EIJ)
- 41. Elephation
- 42. English Budgie
- 43. Environment Films
- 44. Eurogroup for Animals
- 45. Fish Welfare Initiative (FWI)
- 46. FLIGHT
- 47. Franciscan Order Hong Kong (OFM)
- 48. Fundación para el Asesoramiento y Acción en Defensa de los Animales (FAADA)
- 49. Future 4 Wildlife

- 50. Global Action in the Interest of Animals (GAIA)
- 51. Global Animal Welfare
- 52. Global Sanctuary for Elephants (GSE)
- 53. Green Rev Institute
- 54. GREY2K USA Worldwide
- 55. Greyhound Compassion
- 56. Help Animals
- 57. Help Animals India
- 58. Himalayan Animal Rescue Trust (HART)
- 59. Hollow Paws
- 60. Humane Animal Society (HAS)
- 61. Humane League Japan (THL Japan)
- 62. In Defense of Animals USA
- 63. In Defense of Animals, India (IDA)
- 64. International Otter Survival Fund (IOSF)
- 65. International Timez
- 66. Israeli Primate Sanctuary Foundation (IPSF)
- 67. Jakarta Animal Aid Network (JAAN)
- 68. Japan Anti-Vivisection Association (JAVA)
- 69. JBF Trust India
- 70. Karuna Society for Animals & Nature
- 71. Kolkata Animal Welfare Indian Foundation (KAWIF)
- 72. Kurdistan Organization for Animal Rights Protection (KOARP)
- 73. Laboratoire d'écologie et environnement -Université de Bejaia - Algeria
- 74. Lady Freethinker (LFT)
- 75. Landmark Foundation (LMF)
- 76. Lawrence Anthony Earth Organization (LAEO)
- 77. Lifelong Animal Protection (LAP)
- 78. Moving Animals
- 79. Neotropical Primate Conservation (NPC)
- 80. Nepal Animal Welfare and Research Center (NAWRC)
- 81. OneKind
- 82. One Voice
- 83. One World Actors Animal Rescues (OWAP)
- 84. ONG Sante Animale Afrique (SAA)
- 85. Orangutan Aid
- 86. Orca Rescues Foundation (ORF)
- 87. PACK Taiwan (PACK)
- 88. Pan African Sanctuary Alliance (PASA)
- 89. Performing Animal Welfare Society (PAWS)
- 90. PETA Asia 亚洲善待动物组织 (PETA Asia)
- 91. Plants and Animals Welfare Society (PAWS Asia)
- 92. Plataforma ALTO
- 93. Proyecto ALA Animales Latino América (Proyecto ALA)
- 94. Put an End to Animal Cruelty and Exploitation (PEACE)

- 95. Rhino & Elephant Defenders (RED)
- 96. Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RNZSPCA)
- 97. Sahabat Alam Malaysia (Friends of the Earth Malaysia) (SAM)
- 98. Samayu
- 99. Sanctuary for Health & Reconnection to Animals & Nature (SHARAN)
- 100. Save Animals Initiative Sanctuary Trust (SAI)
- 101. Save Animals Value Environment Jammu and Kashmir (SAVE)
- 102. Save The Asian Elephants (STAE)
- 103. Save the Dogs and Other Animals
- 104.Sea First Foundation (SF)
- 105. Sheldrick Wildlife Trust (SWT)
- 106. Showing Animals Respect and Kindness (SHARK)
- 107. Sinergia Animal
- 108. Society for Animal Welfare and Management (SAWM)
- 109. Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Selangor (SPCA Selangor)
- 110. Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Singapore (SPCA Singapore)
- 111. Society for the Protection of Animals, Ljubimci (SPAL)
- 112. Society for Travelers Respecting Animal Welfare (STRAW)

- 113. Soi Dog Foundation
- 114. Sống Thuần Chay (STC)
- 115.Stray Relief and Animal Welfare (STRAW India)
- 116.Stripes and Green Earth Foundation (SAGE Foundation)
- 117. Taiwan Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals 台灣防止虐待動物協 會 (TSPCA)
- 118. Tree of Compassion
- 119. Vervet Monkey Foundation
- 120. Voice for Dogs Abroad (VFDA)
- 121. Voice for Zoo Animals
- 122. Voice of Animal Nepal (VOAN)
- 123. We Animals Media (WAM)
- 124. Wild & Free Rehabilitation & Release (W&F)
- 125. Wild Futures
- 126. Wild Welfare
- 127. Wildlife Alliance
- 128. Wildlife Friends Foundation Thailand (WFFT)
- 129. Wildlife Rescue and Rehabilitation Centre (WRRC)
- 130. Winsome Constance Kindness Trust (WCKT)
- 131. World Federation for Animals (WFA)
- 132.Zoocheck









