

August 30, 2002

William Reilly, Chair
WWF-US
1250 24th St., NW
Washington, DC 20037

Dear Mr. Reilly:

On behalf of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), our more than 750,000 members and supporters, our 37 contact groups internationally and our affiliate offices in Europe and India, I am writing to seek your studied consideration of an alternative framework for the testing and assessment of chemicals for endocrine-disrupting effects. As you may know, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program threatens to become the largest animal-testing program in U.S. history, with the potential to kill as many as 1.2 million domestic and wild animals for every 1,000 chemicals tested. We therefore urge the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) to formally endorse PETA's proposed alternative testing framework and to promote its adoption by the EPA as a guide in the development of its endocrine program.

As you know, the framework under which the EPA is currently operating in developing and validating assay systems was recommended by the agency's former Endocrine Disruptor Screening and Testing Advisory Committee (EDSTAC). As an organizational member of this committee, you will also recall that EDSTAC's membership did not include any representation from the animal protection community, a fact that is clearly evident in the committee's recommendations. For example, EDSTAC recommended the development of multiple, redundant animal-based tests, which undermines the global move toward the reduction, refinement, and replacement (3 R's) of animals in testing and research. Nowhere is this more evident than in EDSTAC's recommendation to expand the limited Congressional mandate to examine "estrogenic" effects "in humans" to include other hormone types and animal species—which could potentially quadruple the number of animals killed in this chemical-testing program.

As the driving force behind the design and development of the EPA's endocrine disruptor screening program, I hope you will concur that the WWF has an obligation to do everything in its power to reduce the number of animals who will be killed in this program. In particular, we ask that you endorse our alternative testing framework (see attachment) and invite you to join us in promoting the preferential development, validation, and use of non-animal assay systems to replace the animal tests currently under development by the EPA.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter or its contents, please feel free to contact PETA's science policy advisor, Troy Seidle, at TroyS@peta.org. Thank you again for your time and consideration. We look forward to your positive response.

Sincerely,



Mary Beth Sweetland
Senior & Director
Research & Investigations Department

