

Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB)

17/11 A meeting of the Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB) was held in Committee Room 2, Whiteknights House on Thursday 1 June 2017 at 10.00 am.

Present:

[Redacted, Sec. 40]
[Redacted, Sec. 40]

In attendance:

[Redacted, Sec. 40]

Apologies were received from [Redacted, Sec. 40].

17/12 Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the last meeting held on 10 February 2017 were approved.

17/13 Matters Arising

17/03 Communications informed by feedback from the UAR visit

AWERB noted that [Redacted, Sec. 40] and [Redacted, Sec. 40] had met further outside of the meeting to discuss communications and web updates following the UAR visit.

AWERB also received a tabled paper from the National Centre for the Replacement Refinement & Reduction of Animals in Research (NC3Rs) which provided guidance for university web pages on animal research. The

guidance suggested web page content, including: University Policy; responsibility and accountability; FAQs; statistics on animal use; Openness Concordat; legislation; AWERB; and external links. In order to demonstrate the University's commitment to the 3Rs it would be helpful highlight case studies of examples of science and activities being undertaken to advance the 3Rs. The case studies were an opportunity to highlight the importance and need for the science whilst also emphasising the 3Rs aspects, or to illustrate the link between good animal welfare and good quality scientific data.

It was agreed that the guidance provided by NC3Rs along with the information provided by UAR would help the University in planning its communications and web pages. AWERB asked [Redacted, Sec. 40] and [Redacted, Sec. 40] to provide for the next meeting a written update on the work undertaken to date and upcoming activities planned.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

In regard to other matters raised it was noted that:

- Since the UAR visit three members of academic staff had undertaken UAR training ([Redacted, Sec. 40]).
- [Redacted, Sec. 40] had gathered a number of examples of good practice from across the sector following the recent Concordat 3rd Anniversary event.
- AWERB was supportive in principle of the University's ambition to compete for an openness award. It would be essential to identify what sort of resource would be required to achieve this aim; [Redacted, Sec. 40] was asked to consider this matter further.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

- There was a difference in the figures published between research conducted 'at' the University and 'by' the University in relation to the numbers of animals used in regulated procedures. AWERB noted that both sets of figures were in the public domain. In the interests of openness both sets of figures should be made available, wherever possible and subject to commercial considerations, with an explanation detailing why the data was different.
- The University currently published data by academic School and species, but had not yet published severity data. AWERB agreed in principle that severity data should be published; [Redacted, Sec. 40] was asked to bring back to the next meeting an example of what the data might look like.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

AWERB received a tabled pro forma for mid-term and end of contract review. The pro forma had been devised with more yes/no answers and had been designed to allow lay members to focus on the progress of the project and not the process. It was hoped that the form would also be less onerous for staff to complete.

Members of AWERB welcomed the approach taken. It was suggested that it might be helpful to ask whether there had been any infringements, whether there had been any Home Office involvement, and to record any research outputs. [Redacted, Sec. 40] asked members to pass any further comments on the format of the pro forma to [Redacted, Sec. 40], no later than 8 June 2017. It was hoped that the form could be trialled on a number of projects in the Autumn Term.

It was noted that Retrospective Reviews would still be subject to requirements from the Home Office.

[Redacted, Sec. 40] thanked [Redacted, Sec. 40] for his work on the pro forma which was much appreciated.

17/03 Poultry Gun

It was reported that this item was being checked by the [Redacted, Sec. 40], with colleagues. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to report back on the outcome as soon as it was known.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

17/06 Retrospective Assessment of Project Licence PPL70/8130

It was reported that no progress had been made on revisions. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to follow up on this action and to report back in writing to the next meeting of AWERB.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

17/09 Work undertaken under DEFRA guidelines

It was reported that no progress had been made on non-ASPA regulated projects. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to investigate this further and to report back in writing to the next meeting of AWERB.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

17/14 Health and Life Sciences Building

[Redacted, Sec. 40] provided an oral report to AWERB in relation to welfare and ethical issues in the BRU and the move to the new Health and Life Sciences Building.

It was reported that:

- An Implementation Group for moving the BRU had been established comprising [Redacted, Sec. 40] and the [Redacted, Sec. 40].
- The Implementation Group was producing a plan for the move which would look at the following areas: welfare of the animals; existing BRU operations; staff requirements; user requirements; expectations around licences; equipment; procedures and practices; handover and deep clean of the building.
- In regard to repopulating the new unit, a survey had been conducted on the number of strains it was envisaged would need to move. It had been identified that 10-15 lines would need to be sent away for embryo transfer, and a similar number obtained from other sources. This would ensure that all animals entering the new unit have a clean health status. Contact had been made with [Redacted, Sec. 40] to do this work.
- The aim was for clean animals to move into the new unit as it comes online, at the same time as work winds down in the current unit. Ethical considerations on welfare and research were an important strand of the Implementation Group's work.
- The timing of the move and how it would impact licences would be kept under review by the Group.
- One key issue to be addressed was in relation to staffing both units during the move. A [Redacted, Sec. 40] had been requested; funding for which was currently pending.
- Meetings were due to be held with individual researchers over the coming months. Following these meetings it would be possible to clearly define a timeline for moving. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to report back to the Autumn Term meeting on progress.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

[Redacted, Sec. 40] informed the AWERB that the cost of continuing to run the existing BRU had not been factored into any planning, neither had the costs for using [Redacted, Sec. 40] for rederivation. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to write to [Redacted, Sec. 40] in regard to the work being undertaken by the Implementation Group. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to write a short paper for the next meeting of the [Redacted, Sec. 40]

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

[Redacted, Sec. 40] enquired as to whether the Implementation Group had yet considered which projects would continue in which building, the timing of moves and the ethical issues around whether any animals would need to be culled. [Redacted, Sec. 40] replied that these discussions had not yet taken place but would do once meetings had been held with individual researchers. The AWERB noted that as well as ethical considerations, there would also be cost considerations in purchasing new animals. [Redacted, Sec. 40] encouraged the University to consider starting reservation and bio storing of tissue as soon as possible in preparation for the move.

[Redacted, Sec. 40] asked whether there was still any opportunity to influence the design of the public areas to help facilitate more visits/openness around the unit. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to raise this with the [Redacted, Sec. 40].

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

[Redacted, Sec. 40] asked [Redacted, Sec. 40] to ensure that the [Redacted, Sec. 40] was kept informed of progress to date.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

17/15 Review of the Animal Research Policy

The AWERB received and noted the Animal Research Policy which had last been reviewed in 2016.

Suggestions for changes included:

- To reflect that not all changes overseen by ASPA
- To recognise what documents had already been published.
- Research Animal Department – not a branch
- Remove conflation of ‘at’ and ‘by’.

Members of AWERB were asked to forward any further changes to the Secretary.

17/16 Items for future meetings

It was agreed that the following items would be discussed, in each case on the basis of a written paper, at the next meeting:

- Progress on moves to the new Health and Life Sciences Building
- Progress on the 3Rs. [Redacted, Sec. 40], were asked to produce a report for the Spring Term meeting on progress on the 3Rs.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

17/17 Any other business

Induction

AWERB received a tabled paper on Developing induction materials for AWERB members.

It was noted that [Redacted, Sec. 40] was stepping down as [Redacted, Sec. 40] at the end of July; [Redacted, Sec. 40] had been appointed from 1 August. [Redacted, Sec. 40] agreed to give consideration to an induction to AWERB. It was suggested that induction material could be brought into work on wider education/openness.

Action: [Redacted, Sec. 40]

17/18 Dates of meetings in the Session 2017-18

To be confirmed