



Towards a mandatory European Cruelty Free Standard – Right to know, right to choose!

Policy paper to be presented, amended and voted during the General Assembly 2010, Bratislava.

Brought in by Giovani Verdi



"The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated."

"To my mind, the life of a lamb is no less precious than that of a human being."

Mahatma Gandhi

"I am not interested to know whether vivisection produces results that are profitable to the human race or doesn't...The pain which it inflicts upon unconsenting animals is the basis of my enmity toward it, and it is to me sufficient justification of the enmity without looking further."

Mark Twain

Most people are unaware that 50 to 100 million vertebrate animals are used annually across the world and still endure painful experiments to test cosmetics, toiletries, pesticides, medications, food additives, packing materials, and air freshener, or their chemical ingredients, household products and their ingredients. This includes tests for skin or eye irritation, skin sensitisation (allergy), toxicity (poisoning), mutagenicity (genetic damage), teratogenicity (birth defects), carcinogenicity (causing cancer), embryonic or foetal genetic damage and toxicokinetics (to study the absorption, metabolism, distribution and excretion of the substance).

Following several European opinion researches, (such as the British BUAV), more than 80% of people said they would be likely to swap to a brand that was not animal tested if they discovered that their existing brand was tested on animals.

We strongly encourage thus the civil community call to have access to a clear, fair, uniform information about cruel free companies list and about companies that manipulate consumers into purchasing products with mere final product claims — with a deceptive "not tested on animals" claim. We unequivocally condemn this dishonest behaviour and we wish a possible moratorium

32 for companies that label their final products as not tested on animals, while all testing is done at
33 the ingredient level.

34
35

36 **THE CRUEL FREE STANDARDS AND LABELS,VOLUNTARY SIGNING UP FROM THE** 37 **COMPANIES**

38 In 1996 an international coalition of animal protection groups from Europe and North America,
39 launched the world's only internationally recognised scheme that enables consumers to easily
40 identify and purchase cruelty free products.

41 This scheme is better known as:

42

43 1. The Humane Cosmetics Standard (HCS)

44 A company approved by the HCS, or Leaping Bunny scheme no longer conducts or
45 commissions animal testing for its cosmetics and toiletries products.

46 2. The Humane Household Products Standard (HHPs)

47 A company approved by the HHPs, or Leaping Bunny scheme no longer conducts or
48 commissions animal testing for its household products.

49 Household products include a whole range of items including bleach, washing-up liquid, laundry
50 detergent, furniture polish and air freshener.

51

52 No one of this labels is actually mandatory by the European Framework. It means it's up to a
53 Company to respond to the public's call for ethical business practices and ethical products.
54 That's why we need to go further the voluntary labelling system towards a mandatory cruel free
55 labelling that enables consumers to easily identify and purchase cruel free products.

56

57 Offering ethical products will enable us to attract the ever growing ethical consumer market,
58 while also helping to make a brighter future for laboratory animals.

59

60

61

62 **LIGHTS AND SHADOWS OF EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK**

63

64 In February 2003, the EU agreed a Europe-wide ban on cosmetics animal testing .Specifically,
65 this amendment establishes a prohibition against the testing of finished cosmetics products and
66 cosmetic ingredients on animals (the "testing ban"), and a prohibition to sell in the EU finished
67 cosmetic products and ingredients included in cosmetic products that were tested on animals
68 (the "sales ban"). But it won't come into effect in stages until 2009/2013. The EU ban on the sale
69 of new animal tested cosmetics has thus been agreed but a complete sales ban won't come into
70 effect until 2013 at the earliest.

71 The UK and a few other countries have introduced a whole or partial ban on cosmetics animal
72 testing, but animal testing for cosmetics continues in the rest of Europe and around the world.
73 This means that consumers are presented with animal tested cosmetics in major high street
74 stores across the country, despite confusing "not tested" claims on bottles, which usually only
75 relate to testing of the final product and not, crucially, to the ingredients.

76 We believe that it's still necessary to work within the EU to apply pressure for appropriate
77 timetables for the replacement of animal tests and for proper implementation of the Directive's
78 objectives.

79 We also claim in the appropriate legal forums and councils for immediate attention to the
80 development and validation of non-animal testing methods.

81
82 We aim to drive animal testing out of the cosmetics, household products pesticides, medications,
83 food additives, packing materials, by campaigning hard that animal tests are not specifically
84 required by law: to market a product a company must demonstrate its safety, but this can be
85 done by using approved non-animal tests and combinations of existing ingredients that have
86 already been established as safe for human use.

87
88 We welcome the recent EU initiative to fund with EUR 50 million, European research teams
89 able to develop alternatives to animal testing for cosmetics and related industries, but we ask for
90 stronger and efficient application of alternative testing that have a key role to play in the process
91 towards full replacement of animal safety tests in the scientifically complex area of systemic
92 toxicity.

93 In particular, we claim a little success and usage of following alternative tests:

- 94
95 • Replacement refers to the preferred use of non-animal methods over animal methods
96 whenever it is possible to achieve the same scientific aim.
97 • Reduction refers to methods that enable researchers to obtain comparable levels of
98 information from fewer animals, or to obtain more information from the same number of
99 animals.
100 • Refinement refers to methods that alleviate or minimize potential pain, suffering or
101 distress, and enhance animal welfare for the animals still used
102

103 104 **CONCLUSION AND COMMITMENT**

105
106 We propose that FYEG draw up a protocol about its ethical commitments to:

- 107
108 • promoting a cruelty-free policy within FYEG structure and relative activities;
109 • providing suppliers (hotels, meeting rooms ,transport companies, catering suppliers,
110 restaurants and any other necessary supplier) to give firm guarantees on certification of
111 using or providing free cruelty products;
112 • promoting or private funding within its members organizations, a list of companies
113 whose products are guaranteed as not tested on animals, in collaboration with national
114 and European animal welfare groups;
115 • not consequently accepting sponsorships from companies that practice vivisection in
116 general and that test directly or indirectly on animals;
117 • promoting a working group engaged with the realization of a cruelty free, FYEG friendly
118 companies Booklet to be distributed to Member Organizations, and the realization of a
119 specific seminar together with EGP representatives aiming at giving awareness and
120 pressure on timetables done by resolutions carried from the European Parliament.